



BS
2665
.F693

ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

EDINBURGH·

PRINTED BY TURNBULL AND SPEARS

FOR

T. & T. CLARK.

LONDON: . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

DUBLIN: . . . J. ROBERTSON & CO.

Lately published, by the same Author, in demy 8vo, price 8s. 6d.,

THE SYMMETRICAL STRUCTURE OF SCRIPTURE ;

Or, Scripture Parallelism Exemplified in an Analysis of the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, and other passages of the Sacred Writings.

“The book is worth study; it is evidently the production of no ordinary man, and is pervaded by a spirit at once scientific and devout.”—*Homilist*.

“The present work is a very superior performance, the author writes like a Christian and a scholar.”—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*.

“No one could rise from the perusal of his chapter on the Sermon on the Mount (for instance), without feeling himself possessed of a better arranged and more systematic knowledge of that beautiful passage of scripture than before.”—*Clerical Journal*.

“This work has rendered considerable aid to biblical investigation. We are thankful to any man who, like the author, labours to teach us to love the Bible more, by making us understand it better.”—*Christian Observer*.

“Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the extent and merits of the principle he contends for, there will be few who can rise from the perusal of Dr Forbes's work without feeling a sincere respect for his scholarship and talent, and spirit as a biblical critic, and without being constrained to confess that new and interesting questions have been opened up as to the meaning and structure of not a few passages of the Word of God.”—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS,

TRACING THE TRAIN OF THOUGHT BY THE
AID OF PARALLELISM,

WITH

NOTES AND DISSERTATIONS

ON THE PRINCIPAL DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH THE
EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE.

BY

REV. JOHN FORBES, LL.D.,
EDINBURGH.

EDINBURGH :

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXVIII.

P R E F A C E.

AMIDST the multiplicity of Commentaries that we possess on the Epistles of St Paul, there seems still to be a want of a concise Analytical Commentary, the great object of which shall be to enable the Biblical student, while keeping prominently before him the text, to trace the plan and train of thought followed by the Apostle, to mark the transitions and connecting links in the argument, and to perceive the mutual relations and interdependence of its various parts. Instead of the profusion of notes on every minute phrase and difficulty, amidst which the connexion is lost and the attention distracted and wearied, such a Commentary ought to be so brief as to enable the reader, almost at one sitting, to survey the whole subject in its general bearings and connexion—the peculiar difficulties and points requiring elucidation being reserved for separate notes or dissertations.

To furnish such an analysis, no method (it has long appeared to the author) is so well adapted as the arrangement of the text by Parallelism. By grouping the Epistle into the original paragraphs designed by the author, Parallelism enables us to concentrate our attention on a small portion till its leading idea is discovered. Proceeding thus paragraph after paragraph, and stating to ourselves in concise terms the leading idea elicited in each, we can compare it successively with the paragraphs that precede and follow, and gradually ascertain the true relations and connexion of the whole.

The object accordingly of the present work is twofold:

1st, To furnish a specimen of such an analysis and arrangement of the text as seems most desirable for the reader to possess, when first entering on the study of a difficult book of Scripture, in order to give him a clear and comprehensive view of its main scope and design; and 2dly, By the application of the principles of Parallelism to an entire book of Scripture, to give to the public an opportunity of verifying the correctness of the eulogium pronounced by the author, in a former work,* on the importance of Bishop Lowth's discovery of the Parallelism of Scripture, "as furnishing one of the most valuable aids ever presented to the interpreter, and calculated, when its principles have been more fully developed, to throw a new and clearer light on a great part of the sacred volume."

It is, indeed, with the most unfeigned diffidence that I at length venture to publish the results of my examination, by these principles, of the argument of the Epistle to the Romans. No one can be more deeply sensible, than I myself am, of my incompetency to do any justice to the high argument of St Paul in this Epistle. The profound subjects which it handles have tasked the powers and divided the opinions of some of the highest intellects and most spiritual minds in the Christian church; and I would never have presumed to think that I could make any contribution to its interpretation, of novelty or value sufficient to warrant my adding to the many excellent Commentaries upon it already existing, were it not for the strong conviction I entertain, that in *Parallelism* we possess an instrument of analytical investigation, the powers of which have hitherto been very imperfectly appreciated—and which, if used aright, enables even ordinary minds frequently to trace the sequence of thought, where it has escaped the penetration of the most highly gifted.

* "The Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," Preface, page v. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

For the proofs of its utility in this respect the student may be referred to almost every point discussed in the notes—the object of which is not to furnish an exhaustive Commentary, by repeating in my own words what has already been so much better expressed by others; but to *illustrate those passages alone, which Parallelism seems to place in a new and clearer light*. More especially the attention of the reader is directed to the perfect order and perspicuity which it introduces into what has generally been considered a very intricate and perplexed passage, ch. v. 12-21; and to the new light in which it exhibits that passage, as containing the central, animating thought of the whole Epistle. That thought is not, as is usually stated, *justification by faith* as the leading doctrine of the Epistle—presented, as has been objected to the bare forensic theory, in the cold, lifeless form of *Imputation*,—as if by a legal fiction, and mere outward reckoning of Christ's righteousness, believers were justified without any necessary change passing immediately upon the heart. The grand truth here enunciated is the warm living reality of a personal UNION with CHRIST (contrasted with the previous union with Adam), by which, in place of the "SIN" and "DEATH" communicated by the first head of humanity, Christ's "RIGHTEOUSNESS" and "LIFE" are communicated to the believer, and become the inward quickening mover of every thought, feeling, and action. Thus is the distinction preserved, yet the indissoluble connexion clearly evinced, between *justification* and *sanctification*, as being but two aspects of one and the same UNION of the believer with Christ,—just as the dying branch ingrafted into the living vine is then only *reckoned*, and may justly be declared to be, a sound living branch when the union has taken place—because the assurance is then given of its being *made* so finally and fully, the vital juices of the vine having already begun to circulate within it.

In singling out Dr Hodge as the object of the strictures I

have felt constrained to make on the bare Imputation-theory, it has been very far from my desire to cast any slight on his opinions. On the contrary (as in the similar instances of Calvin, Edwards, &c., whose views on certain points I have controverted), it is from the high regard I entertain for his opinions, and their general accordance with my own, that I have deemed it necessary to correct what in them appears to me to be erroneous. In these days, when every established opinion is being questioned, it becomes the friends of truth carefully to examine the foundations of all their opinions, and unsparingly to remove whatever is seen to be defective; since its continuance tends to weaken the whole superstructure, and presents a point of attack for the enemy.

Let not the reader be startled at finding, on most of the leading points of the Epistle, a divergence from the interpretation of all former commentators. The conclusions arrived at are in one sense *new*, and yet *old*; *new*, inasmuch as they contain something different from that of any single interpreter, but *old*, inasmuch as each will find his own view included, but with his opponent's superadded. In short, the result, to which I have been brought by that strict comparison of different passages to which Parallelism compels the student, is that our views of Scripture language, as of Scripture truth, are in general too limited and one-sided; and that in Scripture—as in a diamond with many facets, each reflecting a different ray of light, visible singly, to the exclusion of the others, to him who looks only on one side—he who would form a just appreciation of the whole, so as to see the full beauty and varied brilliancy of the precious gem, must turn it round and round, and survey it on every side.

Nothing will be found here to unsettle the great points of Christian doctrine on which all the wisest and best men of different ages are agreed. The maxim, “*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus,*” with its proper limitations, must

be held as the sure criterion of truth, unless we are to land in universal scepticism, and to regard no point as definitively established, from which, as a settled basis, we can start for farther investigation of the truth. Had any of my conclusions touched these fundamental truths, I should have required no more decisive condemnation of their falsity, and of the unsoundness of the process by which they were reached. It is on those points alone, on which conflicting opinions have been held by wise and good men on different sides, that I venture in so far to differ from all, and yet truly not to differ. The very conflict in the opinions of candid and judicious inquirers seems demonstrative of some defect in their interpretation. This will be found, I believe, to originate in the inadequate apprehension they have formed of the depth and comprehensiveness of the conceptions and language of the Apostle. All the contending interpretations are right in their measure; all are defective. One side of the truth has been caught, but it is to the exclusion of another. The higher conception has been missed, which recognizes all, and reconciles all.

No better instance to illustrate this can be found than the interpretations given to the leading expression of the Epistle, which meets us at the very opening of the doctrinal discussion, the *Righteousness of God*, i. 17. Are we by this expression to understand with Origen and others, 1. The *justice* or *retributive* righteousness of God; or with the evangelical school, 2. The *justifying* righteousness of Christ, *reckoned* to the believer; or 3. The *imparted* or *infused* righteousness of God? We answer, without hesitation, Each and all combined. Each is defective without the other. If the first alone is held, what but this first and most obvious view of God's righteousness—which, as being itself perfect, can, when exercised in judgment, accept of nothing less than a perfect righteousness—drove the Erfurth monk almost to despair when he saw himself condemned by it without hope?

But when it flashed upon him that in the gospel of Jesus was manifested, *2dly*, a perfect righteousness, exhibited by the Saviour as man both in doing and suffering, and which by faith he could appropriate as his own, peace was given at once to his troubled soul. Did this *justifying* righteousness, however, supersede or exclude the former view? The very reverse. He saw the *retributive* righteousness of God magnified, more than it could have been by the destruction of himself and a whole world of sinners, in the atoning death of the holy Son of God, bleeding in the room of guilty sinners; and God still to be *just*, while He *justified* him who believed on Jesus.

But, *3dly*, Is this justifying righteousness, appropriated through faith by the believer, sufficient? No—"the wrath of God is still revealed against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men;" and when the final judgment arrives, if one speck or stain of sin remain in the believer, he can never stand in the presence of that God, who cannot look on iniquity without abhorrence. That "the gospel of Christ," therefore, in which St Paul glories, may prove "the power of God unto salvation," "the righteousness of God revealed therein" must be one *imparted* also to the believer—not to the old man in him, in whom "dwelleth no good thing," and who, as incapable of amendment, is doomed to utter death—but to the new man formed in him, who as "being born of God cannot sin," and who at the resurrection shall be presented "holy, and unblameable, and unreprouceable in His sight," Col. i. 22.

Thus, then, though it has different aspects, there is but *one* righteousness, that is, God's; for "there is none good [righteous] but one, that is, God;" and any righteousness possessed by the creature must flow from union with Him who is the alone source of all righteousness. All these three aspects of righteousness the believer sees combined, and is enabled to apply and appropriate to himself, in Him who is "THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

With few exceptions (always noted) where the meaning seemed imperatively to require a change, the rendering of the Authorised Version has been retained, for two reasons: 1st, In order to draw the greater attention to the few alterations made; and, 2dly, To prove to the unlearned reader how little the exact correspondence of the Parallelisms is dependent on any questionable changes in the translation. In seven instances only (i. 3, iii. 21, vii. 3, 10, and 25, viii. 38, and xii. 2) it has been found necessary to restore the order of the original Greek, where the transposition of the words in the English has destroyed the Parallelism.

In drawing up the Contents and Indexes, the only material errors I have remarked are:—

Page 121, line 14, for *δικαλω*, read *δικαιώσω*.

Page 292, line 14, for Gal. i., read Gal. ii.

Page 319, line 17, for *spiritual*, read *physical*.

Page 340, line 4, *לָהֶם* has been omitted in the

maxim, *בְּלִישׁוּרְאֵל יֵשׁ לָהֶם חֵלֶק לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא*

Page 340, line 12, for *or*, read *and*.

Page 369, line 10, for *Θεσῦ*, read *Θεοῦ*.

Page 422, line 2, for IV., read V.

Page 445, line 24, for *senses*, read *attention*.

Page 459, line 10, for *ninety*, read *ninety-nine*.

In a few instances the Greek accents have broken off in passing through the press.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
TEXT OF EPISTLE, WITH ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY,	1-61
PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON PARALLELISM,	63-88
Parallelism not confined to Poetry, <i>Rhythm</i> being the distinctive characteristic of Hebrew, as of all other Poetry,	65-68
The existence of Parallelism in the New Testament argued from Three of its characteristics, which are equally applicable to Prose as to Poetry,	
I. The orderly arrangement which it introduced into the whole of a composition, exemplified in Isaiah xl.-lxvi.; Psalm xxxv.; the 10 Sections of Genesis; 7 of Judges; and similar arrangements in Romans,	68-79
II. The Epanodos,	80-85
III. Arrangement by numbers,	86-88
DIVISION AND OBJECT OF THE EPISTLE,	89-92
NOTES AND DISSERTATIONS,	93-475
"THE SON OF GOD," in Chap. i. 4,	93-101
Refers to the temporal, not the eternal Sonship.	
"The Spirit of holiness,"	98-101
"THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD,"	102-144
Result of the investigation—that Righteousness has a three-fold meaning, or aspect—1. Retributive; 2. Justifying; 3. Sanctifying,	102-107

	PAGE
DISSERTATION ON RIGHTEOUSNESS, and its cognates,	108-124
"Justify," a <i>creative</i> word—what God <i>declares</i> being as certain as if already done,	108-111
Signification of Righteousness in Old Testament,	113-115
Signification as determined by comparison of Rom. i. 17 with i. 18; and of i. 17, 18 with iii. 21-26,	116-118
"From faith to faith,"	121-124
Objections by the Author of the "THE PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH" answered,	125-144
1. That it "cannot refer to God's attribute of justice,"	125-130
2. That it "refers merely to an objective external relation,"	130-133
3. That it does not refer to "an inward condition of righteousness,"	134-137
4. Argued especially from 2 Cor. v. 21,	138-141
Summing up of the whole discussion,	141-144
Notes on Chap. ii.,	145-154
Notes on Chap. iii. 1-4, 10-18, 21-26,	155-170
"THE GLORY OF GOD,"	170-175
Notes on Chap. iv.,	175-179
Notes on Chap. v.,	179-188
On the reading <i>εχωμεν</i> , "let us have peace,"	179-183
Connection of the whole Chapter,	184-188
"THE LOVE OF GOD,"	188-192
COMPARISON BETWEEN ADAM AND CHRIST, Chap. v. 12-21,	192-257
Central passage of the Epistle. UNION with Christ its great subject—by which, in place of the SIN and DEATH derived from union with Adam, Christ's LIFE and RIGHTEOUSNESS become the portion of believers, who (judicially) receive "justification unto LIFE" by Christ's righteousness reckoned to them, ver. 18; and (morally) by Christ's "RIGHTEOUSNESS unto sanctification" imparted, are "made righteous," ver. 19,	192-203

	PAGE
Objections of Dr Hodge,	203-206
a. Relation of Adam—and so of Christ—to his seed <i>causative</i> ,	207-216
All sin (actual or imputed) is <i>through</i> Adam,	207-212
Ends answered by the appointment of Adam as the representative of his race,	212-216
b. Oneness in nature, as with Adam, so with Christ, not merely imputed, but at the same moment imparted <i>potentially</i> , is the truth here taught,	216-237
Answer to Dr Hodge's objection that this contradicts the doctrine of the Reformers. Paul reconciled with James. Justification involves sanctification. Connexion of vers. 18 and 19,	219-223
Dr Hodge's change of interpretation in new edition of Commentary. His meaning of <i>καθ' ἑσραμ</i> . His stronghold. His connexion of vers. 18 and 19,	224-231
Summing up of discussion. Great defect of the bare forensic theory—its making God condemn men while innocent. Strange oversight of the distinction made by St Paul between the <i>order</i> of the effects of Adam's act, and that of the effects of Christ's work, on their respective seeds,	231-237
c. "All"—"The Many." In what sense applicable to both sides of the comparison,	237-240
Points of Difference (ver. 15-17) between Adam and Christ,	240-255
The true connexion of this passage discoverable only through Parallelism. Distinction between the GRACE (of justification), and the GIFT (of sanctification). All the terms referring to each view (the Judicial and the Moral) are kept remarkably distinct, yet justification and sanctification shown to be indissolubly connected.	
Reason of Deviation from strict Parallelism in ver. 21,	256-257
Notes on Chap. vi,	257-262
SIN and DEATH, as the keywords, prescribe the division of this Chap. and of Chap. vii.	

	PAGE
“DIED (DEAD) to SIN.” “THE BODY OF SIN.” “THE BODY OF DEATH.” “FLESH OF SIN,”	263-272
Notes on Chap. vi. 16, 17, 18, 19, 23,	272-274
WHO IS THE HUSBAND in Chap. vii. 1-4?	274-280
Parallelism of Chap. vii. 3,	280
Interpretation of Chap. vii. 6,	281-282
IS THE PERSON DESCRIBED in Chap. vii. 13-25 REGENERATE OR UNREGENERATE?	282-294
Meaning of “LAW” in Chap. vii. 21, 23, 25; viii. 2,	294-295
Note on Chap. vii. 25,	295-296
Parallelism of Chap. viii. 1-3,	296-298
Notes on Chap. viii. 1-4,	298-310
The passage refers both to justification and sanctification.	
Meaning 1. of “LAW” in vers. 2 and 3, particularly of “THE LAW OF SIN AND DEATH,”	304-306
2. Of “CONDEMNED SIN,”	307-309
3. Of “τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νόμου,”	309-310
“CREATION GROANING,” Chap. viii. 19-23,	310-320
The prevalent interpretation excludes from “the Creation” that which alone gives propriety to the description—Man. “The whole Creation” depends for its final perfection on Man, and will be glorified in his glorification,	
310-317	
Geology, so far from opposing, rather confirms this conclusion, 317-320	
THE CHERUBIM seems to involve the same idea,	320-327
Note on “not willingly” in Chap. viii. 20,	327
Note on Chap. viii. 19-21,	327-328
Note on the greatness of the promises made to the Church, and on the probable duration of the Millennium,	328-330

	PAGE
"THE LOVE OF GOD," Chap. viii. 28-39,	330-333
Remarkable Parallelism between the fruits of justification by faith, in chap. v., and those of sanctification by the Spirit in chap. viii.,	333-335
Connexion of Chap. ix., x., xi.,	335-337
Notes on Chap. ix.,	337-354
The usual interpretation 1. Makes God to determine the <i>use</i> which each is to make of his privileges ; 2. Destroys responsibility ; 3. Furnishes an excuse for impenitence ; 4. Makes St. Paul adopt the very argument of the Jews, which he was opposing,	337-340
Defence proposed by Dean Alford untenable,	340
The principal error lies in not perceiving that as the argument from the instances of Isaac and Ishmael is <i>typical</i> , so must be that from the instances of Jacob and Esau ; and more especially that no interpretation can be correct which is not equally applicable to Jacob and Esau, as <i>nations</i> and as <i>individuals</i> ,	344-348
The "unrighteousness," therefore, against which the Jew reclaims in ver. 14, is that God should place Israel on the same footing as the idolatrous Gentiles,	348-349
Note on Chap. ix. 33, the words of which give the division of Chap. x.,	354
Notes on Chap. x.	354-370
Verses 6-10, not an instance of <i>accommodation</i> ,	355-361
Notes on vers. 14-21 ; Ver. 18 not an instance of <i>accommodation</i> ,	361-370
Notes on Chap. xi.,	370-375
Notes on Chap. xii. 14-21,	376-377
Notes on Chap. xv. 4-6,	377-379

	PAGE
DISSERTATION ON PREDESTINATION AND FREEWILL,	380-475

God is not the author of sin. The creature is: and therefore can *originate* an act which is not God's. We must, therefore, make the distinction between God's *permitting* and *causing* the acts of man—and consequently between predestinating *causatively* and *permissively*. Man's will *has* resisted God's will: and may *continue* obstinately to the end to resist it. Grasp firmly the principle, *All good originates with God; all evil with the creature*; and most difficulties vanish. Election and its glory belong wholly to God; Reprobation and its responsibility, wholly to man. Scripture draws this distinction, 380-386

The doctrine of the WESTMINSTER CONFESION defended from objections, 387-434

I. That it limits God's Love, 388-399

The objection is founded on the fallacy, that "God *could*, if He chose, save all, and yet will not." A freewill, that may resist to the last God's will, is God's gift to man. He cannot give and withdraw this power at the same time. God limits (so to speak) His own power by every arrangement He makes. (Hence He *could not* pardon without an atonement. He *cannot* change man's evil will without his own consent.) Only thus can the true nature and grandeur of the scheme of redemption be understood, and God's Love be seen to be unlimited and universal,

II. That it precludes all probation, 399-414

Though Regeneration is wholly God's work, man must give his consent to the cure. No merit in his accepting the gift, 401-404

"Who maketh thee to differ from another," 404-405

Man's part in Repentance and Faith distinguished from God's 407-408

Common grace distinguished from special, 409-410

God's preparatory training, 410-414

	PAGE
III. That God's election and man's choice are incompatible, .	414-417

A working together of man with God is taught and required in Scripture. The initiative on the man's part in choosing his partner for life precludes not the woman's choice, who can accept or refuse.

IV. That the necessity of any <i>condition</i> for Salvation on the part of the Elect is denied,	417-422
--	---------

What is denied, is the necessity of any *meritorious* condition for man's salvation—"moving God thereunto." This does not exclude the requirement of a *negative* condition—the *non*-existence of that obduracy which differentiates the Reprobate—illustrated by the election of Israel and of St. Paul. God's Election is thus not arbitrary—not making a *distinction without a difference*—not an *inequality in His ways*.

V. That God's Sovereignty determines the fate of all, irrespectively of any difference in the individuals themselves,	422-428
---	---------

Sovereignty determines the gifts to each, not the improvement to be made of them. When forfeited, it belongs to God's mercy alone to restore them to whom He will. On the score of *right*, none can claim favour. But God is *impartial* also, and "will have all men to be saved." This the teaching of Rom. ix. 14-24, and Jeremiah xviii.

All these objections are founded on two erroneous assumptions of Calvin, from both of which the Westminster Confession stands perfectly free,	428-434
---	---------

If man is in a state of <i>probation</i> , not only must he possess an independent power to choose life or death, but the motives to each, placed before him by God, must be so equally balanced that he can turn the scale to either side,	435-438
---	---------

Objections to the prevailing view of Predestination,	440-442
--	---------

All removed by the view here propounded,	442-443
--	---------

	PAGE
EDWARDS ON THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL,	443-475

The three principal fallacies in this treatise, are :

- | | |
|---|---------|
| I. Instead of distinguishing he confounds the two meanings of Will—which have given rise to two merely verbal controversies, | 446-448 |
| II. He confounds freedom of <i>Will</i> with freedom of <i>action</i> —and withdraws attention from the important question of <i>moral</i> freedom of will, | 448-450 |
| III. He forgets the distinction between Matter and Mind—between inert Force and self-moving Power, | 450-475 |
| Mistake as to motives, | 454-456 |
| Strictures on the opinions of Sir W. Hamilton, Mr J. S. Mill, and the Duke of Argyll, | 456-468 |
| Three Cardinal Faculties of the Human Mind, | 468-472 |
| Strictures on the opinions of Professor Bain, | 472-474 |

ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY

ON THE

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

TO AID IN TRACING THE TRAIN OF THOUGHT.

INTRODUCTION.

Verses 1-7.—The threefold arrangement of the Address of the Epistle is observable: 1. The Writer, v. 1; 2. His Subject, v. 2-6; 3. The persons addressed, v. 7.

Again, his great subject, the *Gospel* (v. 2-6, forming an epitome of the whole Doctrinal Exposition) is subdivided into three parts:

1. The *previous* preparation for it in the promises of God's Son coming in the flesh, v. 2, 3.

2. Its *present* effectual adaptation for the salvation of souls, through the investiture of the God-Man with Power, to communicate as the First-born from the dead His own (human) Sonship to many brethren as partakers of His resurrection from the dead, and of the Spirit of holiness, v. 4.

3. The provision made for its *future* progress, and universal diffusion, v. 5, 6.

Writer—claims to be heard.

CH. I. 1. Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ,
Called to be an Apostle,
Separated unto the Gospel of God,

His subject, 2-4 ; and commission, 5-6 ;

2. Which he had promised afore by His prophets in the Holy Scriptures,
3. a Concerning His Son,
b Which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.
4. c { And ordained¹ the Son of God with power,
According to the Spirit of holiness,
By the resurrection of² the dead,
Even Jesus Christ our Lord ;³
5. By whom we have received grace and apostleship,
For obedience to the faith among all nations for His name ;
6. Among whom are ye also the called of Jesus Christ :

Persons addressed—salutation.

7. To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints :
Grace to you and peace,
From God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

His interest in their spiritual welfare, 8-16.

Thanks to God for their faith ; with reason
(" FOR " v. 9) in confirmation of his sincerity :

8. First I thank my God
Through Jesus Christ
For you all,
That your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world.
9. For God is my witness
Whom I serve with my spirit
In the gospel of His Son,
That without ceasing I make mention of you,

and Prayer to God to be permitted to visit them ;
with reason (" FOR," v. 11) in confirmation of
his sincerity.

¹ " Declared to be," A.V., see Notes.

² " From the dead," A.V.

³ The words " Jesus Christ our Lord " are placed here in v. 4, as in the Greek, instead of v. 3, to which they have been transposed in the Auth. Version. There is a beautiful gradation in the original ; a, v. 3, " concerning His Son," refers to the incommunicable Sonship of the Only-Begotten in His pre-existent state ; b and c, to that Sonship, which in its two stages, at the incarnation and resurrection, He assumed that He might communicate it to " many brethren "—b referring to His state of humiliation ; c, of exaltation—by which He became "*Jesus* (Matt. i. 21)—*the Christ—our Lord* " (Acts ii. 36). See Notes.

- 1 . Always in my prayers making request
 If by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey
 By the will of God,
 To come unto you.
11. FOR I long to see you
 That I may impart unto you some spiritual gift
 To the end ye may be established ;
12. That is,
 That I may be comforted together with you,
 By the mutual faith both of you and me.

Long-cherished desire to discharge his high trust
 among them also.

13. Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren,
 That oftentimes I purposed to come unto you,
 But was let hitherto,
 That I might have some fruit among you also,
 Even as among other Gentiles.
14. I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians,
 Both to the wise and to the unwise.
15. So as much as in me is, I am ready
 To preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also :
16. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ :

THE DOCTRINAL EXPOSITION—(i. 16—viii. 39).

The principal subject proposed, v. 16, in the reverse order of treatment ; comprehending A. The universality of the Gospel-righteousness, as necessary “ to every one,” “ to the Jew first and also to the Greek ”—treated in i. 18—iii. 20, (and in ix.—xi. see Notes). B. The condition of its attainment, “ believing ” (or “ faith ” v. 17,)—treated in iii. 21—iv. 25. C. The Gospel is the power of God,” *δύναμις*, to accomplish “ what the Law was power-less to do,” *τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου*, viii. 3, viz., to condemn sin effectually, and to bring in a life-giving righteousness—treated in v.—viii.

These three topics are repeated in v. 17, in the order of treatment :—1. (A) The Gospel reveals the great need of “ every one, “ the Righteousness of God ” (contrasted with “ all un-righteousness of men,” v. 18) in all the fulness of its

meaning, as 1. Retributive, condemning sin ; 2. justifying ; and 3. sanctifying. 2. (B.) This Righteousness is appropriated from first to last (in all three meanings) by “*faith*.” 3. (C.) It is a power of God by which men shall “*live*”—the emphatic word of the quotation from Habakkuk ii. 4, which sums up all three topics, and forms St. Paul’s text,

ὁ δὲ δίκαιος — ἐκ πίστεως — ζήσεται.

“ But the RIGHTEOUS — by FAITH — shall LIVE.”

For it is the POWER of GOD unto salvation
To EVERY ONE that BELIEVETH,
To the JEW first, and also to the GREEK.

17. For therein is the RIGHTEOUSNESS of GOD revealed
From FAITH to FAITH ;
As it is written, “ THE RIGHTEOUS shall LIVE by FAITH.”¹

A. Ὁ ΔΕ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ. THE RIGHTEOUS
SHALL LIVE BY FAITH.

This *Righteousness* is needed for “ EVERY ONE ” (Ch. i. 18—iii. 20) since all “ unrighteousness of men ” exposes to “ the wrath of God,” and *all* “ restrain the truth in unrighteousness.”

18. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven
Against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men,
Who restrain² the truth in unrighteousness.

I. The Gentiles—are “ without excuse,” because having had the means of knowing God³

19. Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them ;
For God hath manifested⁴ it unto them :

¹ “ The just shall live by faith,” A.V.

² “ Hold,” A.V.

³ Observe the two reasons assigned by “ Because,” *διότι*, in v. 19 and v. 21, for each of the expressions “ restrain,” and “ the truth,” of v. 18 :

—“ the truth,” I say, as known to them : “ Because that which may be known of God,” &c., v. 19.

—“ restrain,” I say : “ Because that when they knew God, they glorified Him not,” &c., v. 21.

⁴ “ Shewed,” A.V. Our translators often obscure and weaken the point of an allusion as here, by altering the translation of one and the same word when repeated, or of its cognate.

20. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world
Are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,
Even His eternal power and Godhead ;
So that they are without excuse :

they yet degenerated 1. into *ungodliness*—dishonouring God,
and degrading His glory to the level of the beasts ;

21. Because that when they knew God,
They glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful ;
But became vain in their imaginations,
And their foolish heart was darkened.
22. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,
23. And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God
Into an image made like to corruptible man,
And to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.

2. into *intemperance*—dishonouring themselves (by the righteous retribution of God), and degrading their nature beneath the beasts that perish ;

24. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness,
Through the lusts of their own hearts,
To dishonour their own bodies between themselves ;
25. Inasmuch as they¹ changed the truth of God into a lie,
And worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator,
Who is blessed for ever ! Amen.
26. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections :
For even their women did change the natural use
Into that which is against nature ;
27. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman,
Burned in their lust one toward another ;
Men with men working that which is unseemly,
And receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which
was meet.

and 3, into “ all *unrighteousness*,” against others.

28. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge,
God gave them over to a reprobate mind,
To do those things which are not convenient ;
29. Being filled with all unrighteousness,²
Wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness ;
Full of envy,
Murder, debate, deceit, malignity ;

¹ “ Who,” A.V. Greek, *ótives*, *inasmuch as they*.

² “ Fornication,” added in A. Vers.

- Whisperers, (30) backbiters, haters of God,
 Despiteful, proud, boasters,
 Inventors of evil things,
 Disobedient to parents,
31. Without understanding; covenant-breakers,
 Without natural affection,¹ unmerciful;
32. Who knowing the righteous sentence² of God,
 That they which commit such things are worthy of death,
 Not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.

II. Having thus urged the Gentiles to flee to God's Righteousness for their salvation, since they both knew and had already experienced it in part in its *righteous sentence*, *δικαίωμα*, i. 32, on their sins, and which was now being more fully revealed by the Gospel, i. 18, St Paul proceeds to warn the Jews of their greater need, to provide against "the revelation of the *righteous judgment* of God" *δικαιοκρισίας*, ii. 5, to be made "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," ii., 16; and brings home their guilt to them, at first more covertly 1-16, afterwards more directly, 17-29.

Still more "without excuse" (ii. 1 comp. i. 20), from their greater knowledge, are those who judge others. [The projecting lines in ver. 1, 2, 6, 11, 16, may be read continuously, and form the skeleton of the argument, which the other parts serve to fill up.]

- C. II. 1. Therefore thou art without excuse,³ O man,
 Whosoever thou art that judgest:
 For wherein thou judgest another,
 Thou condemnest thyself;
 For thou that judgest doest the same things.

God's judgments are impartial, and inevitable,

2. But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth
 Against them which commit such things.
3. And thinkest thou this, O man,
 That judgest them which do such things, and doest the same,
 That thou shalt escape the judgment of God?

¹ "Implacable," added in A. Vers.

² *δικαίωμα*, *righteous sentence* (alluding to the *condemning righteousness* of God, 1, 18). The A. V. renders it "judgment."

³ "Inexcusable," A. V. Compare I. 20, and see Note to I. 19, foot of page.

4. Or despisest thou the riches of His goodness, and forbearance,
and long-suffering,
Not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance ?
5. But after thy hardness and impenitent heart,
Treasur'ing up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath,
And revelation of the righteous judgment of God ;

in righteous accordance with the actions of men ;

6. Who will render to every man according to his deeds ;
7. A { ^a To them who by patient continuance in well-doing
 ^b Seek for glory, and honour, and immortality,
 ^d Eternal life :
8. B { ^a But unto them that are contentious
 ^b And do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness,
 ^d Indignation [shall be] and wrath :
9. B { ^d Tribulation and anguish,
 ^b Upon every soul of man that doeth evil,
 ^a Of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile ;
10. A { ^δ But glory, honour, and peace,
 ^β To every man that worketh good,
 ^α To the Jew first, and also to the Gentile :

neither the more perfect knowledge of law availing the Jew, nor his less perfect excusing the Gentile.

11. For there is no respect of persons with God :
12. A { For as many as have sinned without law,
 { Shall also perish without law ;
13. B { And as many as have sinned in the law,
 { Shall be judged by the law,
 B { For not the hearers of the law are just before God,
 { But the doers of the law shall be justified ;
14. { For whenever Gentiles¹ which have not the law
 { Do by nature the things of the law,
 { These, having not the law, are a law unto themselves ;
15. A { Which show the work of the Law written in their hearts,
 { Their conscience also bearing witness,
 { And their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing
 { one another :
16. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men
By Jesus Christ according to my gospel.²

¹ "When the Gentiles," A. Vers.

² See Notes.

Neither, 1st, the boasted name of JEW will avail for justification or acceptance with God, v. 17, nor 2dly, the covenant of CIRCUMCISION, v. 25, without obedience to the Law.

1. Neither the name of JEW, with all his ten claims, beginning (v. 17), culminating (v. 18), and ending (v. 20) with the possession of the LAW, will avail :

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| 17. | { | But if ¹ thou art called a Jew, |
| | | a Five claims of personal privileges before God.
And retest in the LAW,
And gloriest ² in God, |
| 18. | { | And knowest His will,
And approvest the things that are more excellent,
Being instructed out of the LAW ; |
| | | b Five, of superior enlightenment above the Gentiles.
And art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind,
A light of them which are in darkness,
An instructor of the foolish,
A teacher of babes, |
| 19. | { | Which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the LAW : |
| 20. | | |
| <p>b refuted in b, and a in a—with charge against the Jews (in c) of the same three cardinal vices, 1. unrighteousness, 2. intemperance, 3. ungodliness, as had been brought against the Gentiles, i. 21-32.</p> | | |
| 21. | { | b. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? |
| | | e. { (1)Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?
(2)Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery?
(3)Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege ³ ? |
| 22. | { | a. Thou that gloriest ³ in the Law, through breaking the Law dishonourest thou God? |
| 23. | | |

Nay God's word testifies, that His Holy Name put upon them as *God's* people is dishonoured by their greater wickedness.

¹ "Behold," A. V., since the Text. Rec. has 'Iōe instead of 'Ei δē.

² "Makest thy boast of," A. V. See Footnote to I. 19.

³ "Makest thy boast of," A. V. See Footnote to I. 19.

24. { For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles
through you,
As it is written.

2. Nor will the outward covenant of CIRCUMCISION avail, without keeping the Law.

25. { For CIRCUMCISION verily profiteth,
If thou keep the law ;
But if thou be a breaker of the law,
Thy CIRCUMCISION is made uncircumcision.

Therefore a transfer of privileges and superiority will be made to the believing Gentiles by the righteous Judge,

26. { Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law,
Shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned¹ for CIRCUMCISION ?
27. { And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law,
Judge thee who by the letter and CIRCUMCISION dost transgress
the law ?

who has respect to the true Jew (= "Praise"), and the inward circumcision.

28. { For he is not a JEW which is one outwardly ;
Neither is that CIRCUMCISION which is outward in the flesh :
29. { But he is a JEW which is one inwardly ;
And CIRCUMCISION is that of the heart, in the Spirit and not in
the letter ;
Whose praise is not of men, but of God.

From the apostle's refutation of the two pre-eminent Jewish claims it would seem to follow that there was no advantage (1) of being a "JEW," and (2) of "CIRCUMCISION." Both objections are stated in iii. 1; the reply to the 1st is given in ch. iii.; to the 2d in ch. iv.; the former bringing out still more strongly the sin of the JEW and his need of a righteousness without LAW; the latter, the necessity of FAITH, as the alone means of justification.

¹ "Counted," A. V. See Footnote to I. 19.

The substance of the reply to the 1st Objection is that the Jews enjoyed a great advantage in the possession of God's Word as disclosing God's threatenings against all sin, and promises of a Saviour, v. 2; and cutting off by its revelation of God's *faithfulness* to His word, v. 3, 4, and *righteousness* in his judgments, v. 5-7, those vain pleas that the Jews would urge for God's still exhibiting towards them the *milder* aspect of these attributes, so as to spare them notwithstanding their *unfaithfulness* and *unrighteousness*. For this indulgence, if carried out impartially, would exclude all exercise of these attributes in their severer aspect, towards Gentiles as well as Jews, make God wink at sin, and man be indifferent to evil, v. 6-8. Pre-eminence in *knowledge* the Jews had indeed enjoyed, which should have convinced them of sin and led them to the Saviour; but in respect to righteousness before God they had none, v. 9, the law only testifying the more distinctly against their guilt, v. 10-20, and shutting them up to thankful acceptance of the righteousness of God; which is then described in its gracious, complete, and pride-excluding nature, and as attainable by faith alone, 21-31.

The objection branches out into three: that the reasoning in ch. ii. (1.) denies all advantage to the Jews, v. 1, 2; (2.) makes God unfaithful to His promises, v, 3, 4; and (3.) unrighteous in his judgments, v. 5-8.

(1.) It denies all advantage to the Jews.

III. 1. What advantage then hath the Jew?

Or what profit is there of CIRCUMCISION?

2. Much every way;

Chiefly because that they were intrusted with¹ the oracles of God.

(2.) It makes God untrue to His word.

The answer is—Nay, these oracles testify that God is ever true—true to His threatenings as well as to His promises, but that all men are liars—false to their engagements to God, and must like David acknowledge themselves to be so; and are therefore shut up to the mercy to be revealed in the gospel.

¹ "Unto them were committed," A.V.

3. For what if some did not believe?
Shall their unbelief make the faithfulness¹ of God without effect?
4. God forbid:
Yea, let God be acknowledged true,²
And³ every man a liar;
As it is written,
“That Thou mightest be justified in Thy sayings,
And mightest overcome when Thou art judged.”

(3.) It makes God unrighteous in His judgments—if the Jew is to be as hardly dealt with as the heathen—for surely our unrighteousness in not observing God’s covenant cannot make God unrighteous in His observance of it, or allow Him to punish what can only enhance the more by contrast His own righteousness, v. 5.

The answer is (v. 6, 7)—Is God unrighteous who inflicteth wrath? If so, how shall He judge the world?—for the whole *world* of sinners, Gentile as well as Jew, might on this ground plead, “If the truth of God hath &c.—why am even I—however sinful I may be—to be judged a sinner?”

5. But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God,
what shall we say?
Is God unrighteous, who taketh vengeance? (I speak as a man)
6. God forbid;
For then, how shall God judge the world?
7. For if the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto
His glory,
Why yet am even I⁴ to be judged as a sinner?

To bring such a principle to its legitimate conclusion :

8. And [why] not rather,
As we be slanderously reported,
And as some affirm that we say,
Let us do evil that good may come?
Whose condemnation⁵ is just.

¹ “Faith,” A.V.

² “Let God be true,” A.V. The Greek is *γνωσθω*, “Let God be *made*, or acknowledged.” See Notes.

³ “But,” A.V.

⁴ “Am I also judged,” A.V. See Notes.

⁵ “Damnation,” A.V.

It is on the score of "righteousness before God" only, that all advantage is denied to the Jews.

9. What then? Are we better than they?
 No, in no wise;
 For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles,
 That they are all under sin.

Their own scriptures, at various periods of their history, bring charges of general corruption against them,

10. As it is written,
 11. There is none righteous, no, not one; Ps. xiv. (xiii.) 1-3
 There is none that understandeth,
 There is none that seeketh after God.
 12. They are all gone out of the way,
 They are together become unprofitable;
 There is none that doeth good, no, not one.
 13. Their throat is an open sepulchre; Ps. v. 9
 With their tongues they have used deceit;
 The poison of asps is under their lips; Ps. cxl. 3
 14. Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Ps. x. 7 (ix. 28)
 15. Their feet are swift to shed blood; Isa. lix. 7
 16. Destruction and misery are in their ways;
 17. And the way of peace have they not known; Isa. lix. 8
 18. There is no fear of God before their eyes. Ps. xxxvi. 1 (xxxv. 2)

in order that Jew, as well as Gentile, may be humbled in acknowledgment of iniquity, and accept the free offer of God's righteousness now made in the gospel.

19. Now we know that what things soever the law saith,
 It saith to them who are under the law:
 That every mouth may be stopp'd,
 And all the world may become guilty before God:
 20. Because¹ by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified
 in His sight;
 For by the law is the knowledge of sin.

¹ "Therefore," A.V. But the Greek is *διότι*, not *διό*.

B. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ ζήσεται. "THE RIGHTEOUS SHALL LIVE BY FAITH."

The gospel reveals a righteousness by FAITH and not by LAW. ALL having thus in A. (i. 18—iii. 20) been convicted by law of unrighteousness, hence arises the necessity of a "RIGHTEOUSNESS apart from law," "yet borne witness to by the law," v. 21; a "righteousness of God by FAITH," free to "all them that BELIEVE," v. 22; and harmonizing all God's perfections (as expressed in a series of antitheses). It is "*freely*" bestowed—yet purchased by a "*redemption*"-price, v. 24; by the "*grace*" of God—whose "*propitiatory*" has yet been sprinkled by Jesus' "*blood*" of expiation, v. 24, 25; showing God to be *righteous* (β)—(in time *past* by its type under the law, (*b*), but still more manifestly *now* by the true propitiatory, (*b*))—even while *pronouncing the ungodly righteous* through faith (*a*).

21. { But now without the Law
The righteousness of God¹ has been manifested
Being witnessed by the Law and the prophets;
22. { Even the righteousness of God which is by FAITH of Jesus
Christ,
Unto all and upon all them that BELIEVE:
For there is no difference;
23. For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;
24. { a Being justified freely by His grace
b Through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,
25. { b Whom God foreordained² to be a mercy seat,³
a Through faith in His blood,
{ For a declaration of⁴ His righteousness,
b { Because of the passing over of sins in time past,⁵
{ During⁶ the forbearance of God;

¹ "The righteousness of God without the Law," A.V. This transposition destroys the parallelism.

² "Set forth to be," A.V. in the text; but the margin has "foreordained." See Notes.

³ "Propitiation," A.V. See Notes.

⁴ "To declare," A.V. See Notes.

⁵ "For the remission of sins that are past," A.V. See Notes.

⁶ "Through," A.V. Ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, with which is contrasted ἐν τῷ νόῳ καίρω. See Notes.

26. b { Unto the declaration of His righteousness
(In this present time; ¹
β That He might be just,
a And the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.
- c Faith excludes glorying,
d Justifying freely without law—which would
allow merit, could man obey it perfectly ;
c Placing circumcised and uncircumcised on equal
terms before their common God,
d Yet not destroying, but establishing the law—
by Christ the representative of His people
satisfying its justice and fulfilling the
righteousness it demands.
27. c { Where is glorying ² then ?
(It is excluded.
28. d { By what law ? Of works ?
Nay ; but by the law ³ of faith.
For we reckon ⁴ that a man is justified by faith
Without the works of the law.
29. c { Is He the God of the Jews only ?
Is He not also of the Gentiles ?
Yes, of the Gentiles also :
Seeing it is one God,
30. { Which shall justify the circumcision by faith,
And uncircumcision through faith.
31. d { Do we then make void ⁵ the law through faith ?
(God forbid : yea, we establish the law.

Answer to 2d Objection (ch. iii. 1). "What profit is there of CIRCUMCISION?"—is it not the token of the covenant by which

¹ "To declare, *I say*, at this time his righteousness," A.V. See Notes.

² "Boasting," A.V. See Footnote to I. 19.

³ "The *law* of faith." Observe how careful St. Paul is to magnify the Law, even when obliged by Jewish errors to strip it of its false glory ; and to show that when renouncing Law as the source of justification, the Christian is "not without law to God, but under law to Christ" (I Cor. ix. 21). Compare Rom. viii. 2, "The *law* of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus," &c.

⁴ "Therefore we conclude," A.V. The true reading seems to be λογίζόμεθα γάρ, not ὄνν as in the Text. Rec.

⁵ The reverse being indicated already in the parallel stanza by the expression "the law of faith."

we Jews are declared "God's justified and righteous people?"—deferred till the second Section of the argument, as affording so clear a proof, that

FAITH alone justifies, wholly irrespective of all works, v. 2-8 ; of Circumcision, 9-12 ; of law, 13-16 ; a faith of which Abraham's is the pattern, 17-25.

Chap iii. 30 had again called up the objection (the Jews' great stronghold) "What profit is there of CIRCUMCISION?"—the covenant appointed by God to Abraham and his seed to be in their "*flesh*," Gen. xvii. 13 (comp. Rom. ii. 28 and iv. 1), and on which all their national privileges were founded. This covenant, they would urge, was established with Abraham, not at first, but after many years of obedience proved by *works* (iv. 2) on his part, to which it formed God's public attestation, by His constituting him the father of a peculiar people, distinguished by this rite, to whom He engaged to be "their God," Gen. xvii. 8, by "an everlasting covenant," and in connexion with which Abram received his new name of "Abraham," *i.e.*, "a father of many nations," xvii. 5. Surely here was some ground for "glorying," iii. 27, iv. 2, and distinction above others. But if, as the apostle affirmed, "circumcision which is outward in the flesh," ii. 28, commend not to God ; if He be God alike of "the circumcision and uncircumcision," iii. 30, "What shall we say then that Abraham, our father, hath found as pertaining to the *flesh*?" The general answer, as in the case of the "advantage of the Jew," iii. 1, was of course, "Much every way." But before stating the special advantage, ver. 11, St. Paul guards the main point (1-8) viz. :—

Whatever distinction Abraham might thus obtain before men, before God he had no ground of glorying, v. 2. FAITH alone, not any works that he had done, had obtained for him justification before God, as "witnessed by the law," v. 3, "and also by the prophets," v. 6-8 (see iii. 21).

C. IV. 1. What shall we say then that Abraham our father
Hath found as pertaining to the flesh ?¹ [Not justification :]

¹ "As pertaining to the flesh, hath found," A.V.

2. For if Abraham were justified by works,
He hath whereof to glory—
But not before God.
3. For what saith the Scripture?
“Abraham believed God,
And it was reckoned¹ unto him for righteousness.”
4. Now to him that worketh
Is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.
5. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly,
His faith is reckoned¹ for righteousness.
6. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man.
Unto whom God reckoneth righteousness without works saying,
7. “Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven,
And whose sins are covered ;
8. Blessed is the man to whom the LORD will not reckon² sin !”

Circumcision had no part in Abraham's justification, since God had pronounced him justified many years previously.

9. Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only?
Or upon the uncircumcision also?
For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.
10. How was it then reckoned?
When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision?
Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.

The benefit of circumcision to Abraham consisted in its being a seal, or attestation to him of God's acceptance of his faith, and of the certainty of the promises being fulfilled which his faith had grasped. These promises were twofold. The first was that he should be “father of a great nation,” Gen. xii. 2, Ab-ram=“high, or renowned father.” Even in this case, as “the FATHER of *circumcision*,” ver. 12, Abram was at the same time fitted for the higher distinction of being “the Father (and pattern) of all them that believe,” by its being seen that his faith, as being so long prior

¹ “Counted,” A.V. See Footnote to i. 19.

² “Impute,” A.V.

to his circumcision, alone justified him, not the fleshly rite, ver. 11, 12.

The proof that Faith alone justifies, is still more direct in the second promise, v. 13-18, the Messianic, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." By this promise Abraham is constituted "heir of the world," v. 13, through Christ his seed—a promise independent of "the Law," and of the impossible condition of fulfilling its demands, v. 13-15; being a gratuitous promise, to be grasped by faith alone, and so "sure to all the seed," v. 16; and solemnly renewed at Abraham's circumcision by the new name then given to him—Ab-raham—"FATHER of many nations—" thus, by the mode and time of its renewal, fitting him to be, and constituting him, "FATHER of us all," v. 17, "before Him whom he believed;" the import of whose words he had apprehended, "*I have made* [not, "*I will make*"] thee a father—" by faith realizing like God, as if already accomplished, "those things which be not as though they were."

11. And he received the sign of circumcision,
 A seal of the righteousness of the faith,
 Which he had yet being uncircumcised:
- a m. { That he might be the FATHER of all them that believe,
 } Though they be not circumcised,
 } (That righteousness might be reckoned unto them also;
12. r { And the FATHER of circumcision to them who are not of the
 } circumcision only,
 A b { But who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father
 } Abraham
 } Which he had being yet uncircumcised.
13. a For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world,
 b Was not to Abraham or to his seed through the Law,
 c But through the righteousness of faith.
14. d For if they which are of the Law be heirs,
 e Faith is made void, and the promise made of none
15. f Because the Law worketh wrath; [effect:
 f For where no law is, there is no transgression.
16. e Therefore it is of faith,
 d That it might be by grace;
 a To the end the promise might be sure to all the seed;
 b Not to that only which is of the Law,
 c But to that also which is of the faith of Abraham,

17. { Who is the FATHER of us all,
 As it is written,
 “ I have made thee a father of many nations,”
 Before Him whom he believed, even God,
 Who quickeneth the dead,
 And calleth those things which be not as though they
 were ;
18. { Who against hope believed in hope,
 That he might become the FATHER of many nations,
 According to that which was spoken,
 “ So shall thy seed be.”

So strong was Abraham's faith, that though he knew that God had restricted the fulfilment of the promises to his seed, to a son to be born of “ his own body ” and “ of Sarah's womb, now dead,” he yet believed on God as able to “ quicken the dead :”

19. And being not weak in faith.
 He considered not his own body now dead.
 When he was about an hundred years old,
 Neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb :
20. He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief ;
 But was made strong in faith, giving glory to God ;
21. And being fully persuaded
 That what He had promised, He was able also to perform.
22. Wherefore also it was reckoned¹ unto him for righteousness.

a “ father ” or pattern of faith thus to us, teaching us to look not to ourselves, “ dead in trespasses and sins,” but unto “ Him that raised up Jesus,” our representative, “ from the dead ;” and to see, by a faith like Abraham's that can realize “ those things which be not as though they were,” “ our offences ” already made an end of, and our old man crucified in His death ; but our new man raised up, and our justification attested as complete, in God's justifying His Righteous One by raising Him to a new and endless life. (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 17, “ If Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins.”)

23. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was reckoned¹ to him ;
 24. But for us also, to whom it shall be reckoned,¹

¹ “ Imputed,” A.V.

- If we believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead ;
25. Who was delivered for our offences,
And was raised again for our justification.¹

C. Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ΖΗΣΕΤΑΙ. “THE RIGHTEOUS SHALL LIVE BY FAITH.”

The Gospel is the POWER of God unto salvation. Ch. v.-viii.

Connexion of Chaps. v.-viii.

The Gospel is “the POWER of God” δύνامي Θεοῦ to accomplish “what the Law was power-less to do” τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, viii. 3,

Chap. V. By giving Peace here, and the Hope of God’s glory hereafter, more especially through the UNION with CHRIST of believers, communicating in place of the “SIN and DEATH” derived from our union with Adam, “RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE” by Christ, through superabounding Grace.

Chap. VI. The free-grace character of these gifts, so far from encouraging to sin, ensures and incites to its conquest ;

Chap. VII. While the Law, on the contrary, so far from restraining, strengthens the power of SIN and DEATH, keeping up even in the Christian, whenever he looks away from Grace to Law, a state of unhappy conflict.

Chap. VIII. This necessitates a complete deliverance of the believer from all dependence for salvation on the “Law (proved to be) of SIN and DEATH”—a deliverance to be effected by the SPIRIT of LIFE in Christ Jesus” (v. 2,) ever increasingly working out the fulfilment of “the RIGHTEOUSNESS of the Law,” (v. 4, at which the Law ineffectually aimed) through the close union of believers with Christ, by which they are “in Christ Jesus,” v. 1, and “Christ in them,” v. 10 ; and “by His

¹ “In these words of v. 25 (as Dean Alford well remarks) the Apostle introduces the great subject of Ch. v.-viii.—DEATH as connected with SIN, and LIFE as connected with RIGHTEOUSNESS.”

SPIRIT" (v. 11) making them "sons of God," v. 14, and causing even sufferings, 18-25, and "all things to work together" for their final salvation, 28-39.

CHAPTER V.

Having been justified by Faith, let us consider and cultivate diligently, as the great sources and encouragements of purity and progress, the fruits that spring from this: and 1. "Let us hold fast PEACE (for "through Christ we have had access into this grace," v. 2) with God" here, v. 1; and 2dly, "Let us glory in HOPE of [attaining] God's glory" hereafter, v. 2.

Ver. 3-10. Since we can "glory even in tribulations," which so far from enfeebling "work out HOPE," v. 3, 4; which cannot fail, since it worketh by LOVE, v. 5 [FAITH, v. 1, thus bringing in its train the other two cardinal graces, v. 2 and 5] an emanation into our hearts from God's marvellous Love to us in Christ, which having accomplished for us the first great step, v. 6-8, much more will complete the rest, v. 9, 10.

Ver. 11-21. Nay more, since we can glory in God as now our God, with whom we have been brought into the closest fellowship—*ὁὶά τὸὐτο*, on this account," v. 12—that, v. 12-21, by a UNION WITH CHRIST, as close as our former union with Adam which brought to us "SIN AND DEATH," "RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE" are now become ours by Grace, through Christ.

- C. V. 1. Therefore, being justified by FAITH,
 Let us have¹ Peace with God
 Through our Lord Jesus Christ;
 2. By whom we have had our access also² by faith
 Into this Grace wherein we stand,
 And let us glory³ in HOPE of the glory of God.
 3. And not only so but also let us glory in tribulations,⁴
 Knowing that tribulation worketh patience;

¹ "We have peace," A.V. See Notes.

² "By whom also we have access," A.V. See Notes.

³ "And rejoice in hope," A.V. See Notes.

⁴ "But we glory in tribulations also," A.V.

4. And patience, experience ;
And experience, HOPE ;
5. And Hope maketh not ashamed,
Because the LOVE of God is shed abroad in our hearts
By the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.
6. For when we were yet without strength,
In due time Christ died for the ungodly.
7. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die ;
Yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to
die ;
8. But God commendeth His love toward us,
In that while we were yet sinners,
Christ died for us.
9. Much more then, being now justified by His blood,
We shall be saved from wrath through Him :
10. For if when we were enemies,
We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son,
Much more, being reconciled,
We shall be saved by His life.
11. And not only so, but also as we glory in God,¹
Through our Lord Jesus Christ,
By whom we have now received the reconciliation²—on this
account :³

Not *justification by faith*—mere *imputation* alone of Christ's righteousness—but UNION WITH CHRIST, by which He becomes *all* to the believer—his *justification* and *sanctification* equally—forms the grand central doctrine of the Epistle. As by the connection between us and Adam, SIN with its inseparable attendant DEATH entered into all (long previously to the Law, v. 13, 14); so, by a Union as intimate with Christ (not Law, which but aggravated the evil, v. 20, but) Grace transfuses into all, united to Christ by faith, the counteracting principle of RIGHTEOUSNESS, with that LIFE of God inseparably bound up with it, which "God hath given to us in His Son," 1 John v. 11—thus realizing fully the Prophet's words, "The RIGHTEOUS shall LIVE by Faith."

¹ "But we also joy in God," A.V.

² "The atonement," A.V.

³ "Wherefore," A.V.—beginning a new sentence. See Notes.

This passage (v. 12-21) accordingly treats both of justification (j, j, j) and of sanctification (s, s, s), Sin and Righteousness being regarded both in their *judicial* (j, &c.), and *moral* (s, &c.) aspects; in their condemning, or justifying (j, &c.), and in their reigning and assimilating powers (s, &c.).

To vindicate the justice of both judicial sentences (v. 18)—If “condemnation” to Death passed on all, then in all and each there must have been Sin (v. 12, and 14), so that they “were made sinners” (v. 19): So, on whomsoever the “Grace” (v. 15) of “justification of Life” (v. 18) has been conferred, on them simultaneously the “Gift of Righteousness” (v. 17) “unto sanctification” has been also conferred, in germ only, but conveying the assured certainty of their eventually being “made [perfectly] righteous” (v. 19).

As through Adam SIN, and by Sin DEATH entered into all,

12. { As by one man
 A { SIN entered into the world,
 { And DEATH by sin;
 { And so death passed upon all men,
 { For that all have sinned;

independently of the Law, which came in afterwards;

13. { For until the Law sin was in the world;
 14. B { But sin is not imputed when there is no law:
 { Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses,
 { Even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of
 { Adam's transgression.

- C { Adam in this being a type of Christ;
 { Who is the figure of Him that was to come.

yet with a difference in favour both of the GRACE (j) which *justifies*, and of the GIFT by Grace (s) which *sanctifies*:

15. { j. { But not as the offence,
 { So also is the GRACE;
 D { For if through the offence of the one
 { The many died;
 { c { Much more the GRACE of God, and the GIFT by Grace
 { which is by the one man Jesus Christ,
 { Hath abounded unto the many;
 16. { s { And not as it was by one having sinned,
 { So is the GIFT:

17. *D* { *j* { For the judgment was
From one [offence] to condemnation ;
But the GRACE is
From many offences unto justification :
s { For if by one offence
Death reigned by the one ;
Much more they which receive the abundance of the
GRACE and of the GIFT of righteousness
Shall reign in life by the one, Jesus Christ.

So are procured for all through Christ Jesus,

1. Deliverance from Death, or “Justification of Life ;”

18. *C* { *j* { Therefore as by one offence
Judgment came upon all men to condemnation ;
Even so by one act of righteousness
The Grace came upon all men unto justification of life.
2. Deliverance from sin, or “Righteousness unto Sanctification,” vi. 19 ;
19. *s* { For as by the disobedience of the one man
The many were made sinners ;
Even so by the obedience of the one
The many shall be made righteous.

independently of the Law (which only aggravated the evil), both being conferred solely through Grace ;

20. *B* { Moreover the Law entered
That the offence might abound ;
But where sin abounded,
Grace did much more abound ;

so that SIN ending in DEATH is, by God’s Grace, superseded by RIGHTEOUSNESS ending in LIFE, through Jesus Christ.

21. *A* { That as SIN hath reigned
In DEATH,
Even so might Grace reign through RIGHTEOUSNESS
Unto eternal LIFE
{ By Jesus Christ our Lord.

By the words of ver. 20, “Moreover the Law entered, that the offence might abound, &c.” the Apostle might seem to disparage Law, while he magnified Grace. This brings up the

competing merits of LAW and GRACE, in their power to deliver from Sin and Death, *i.e.*, to sanctify and justify, which accordingly forms the subject of the next two chapters.

In Chap. vi. we have the two objections on these points (urged by the legalist) against Grace refuted.

In Chap. vii., we have the two objections on these points against the sufficiency of the Law established; yet the Law itself vindicated, and shown to be "holy, just, and good."

SIN and DEATH, (and their opposites RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE), as they are the key-words of chap. v. 12-21, so are they of chap. vi. and vii., giving to each its twofold arrangement, vi. 1-14; 15-23: vii. 7-12; 13-25.

CHAPTER VI.—OBJECTIONS AGAINST GRACE.

Objection 1. (v. 1-14).—If justification be by "grace" alone, encouragement is given to "*continue in sin.*"

VI. 1. What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin,
That grace may abound? God forbid.

Nay—being "justified from sin" is equivalent to having "died to sin," see v. 7. This we did by UNION with CHRIST, which imparts to us all that is His. If He died to sin, we died, and can no longer live to sin, (a); assimilation to His death specially, being the truth represented in our incorporating union with Him in baptism (b), but to rise to a new life of holiness (c).

2. a } We who died to sin,
 (How shall we live any longer therein?¹)
3. { Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into
 Jesus Christ,
 b } Were baptized into His death?
4. { Therefore we were buried with Him by our baptism into
 His death?²
- c } That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by
 the glory of the Father,
 (Even so we also should walk in newness of life.

For if UNION with Christ makes us partakers of His death,

¹ "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" A.V.

² "We are buried with him by baptism into death," A.V.

it will make us equally so of His resurrection (a); knowing that our crucifixion with Him is for the entire destruction of our "body of sin," and release from sin's service (b); since he that has died to sin is judicially absolved from all claims of sin, either to condemn or rule over him (c).

5. a { For if we have become united to¹ the likeness of His death,
 (We shall be also to² the likeness of His resurrection.)
6. b { Knowing this that our old man was³ crucified with Him,
 { That the body of sin might be destroyed,
 { That henceforth we should not serve sin.
7. c { For he that hath died [*i.e.* to sin]
 { Hath been justified from sin.⁴

But if dead with Christ, life also with Him shall be ours, to yield no more to death (a), knowing that such is Christ's life (b). So reckon all claims of sin and death over you cancelled in Him, and an endless life to God already begun (c).

8. a { Now if we died⁵ with Christ,
 { We believe that we shall also live with Him.
9. b { Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead
 { Dieth no more;
 { Death hath no more dominion over Him.
10. { For in that He died, He died unto sin once,
 { But in that He liveth, he liveth unto God;
11. c { Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed
 { unto sin,
 { But alive unto God in⁶ Christ Jesus our Lord.

Thus we have the strongest encouragement to yield no obedience to sin, while in this body, "mortal" indeed, v. 12, but only that it may be raised a glorified body "alive from the dead" unto God, v. 13, from the assurance that sin's lordship over us is broken, since we are no longer under LAW which only

¹ "We have been planted together in the likeness," A.V.

² "In the likeness," A.V.

³ "Is crucified," A.V., *συνεσταυρώθη*.

⁴ "For he that is dead is freed from sin," marg. "justified," A.V. This section therefore (1-14) is the *judicial* view, compare v. 11, "reckon ye also yourselves, &c."

⁵ "We be dead," A.V., *ἀπεθάνομεν*.

⁶ "Through Jesus Christ," A.V.

forbade, but under GRACE which also supplies both the power and the will to overcome sin.

12. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body,
That ye should obey it in the lusts thereof :
13. Neither yield ye your members
As instruments of unrighteousness unto sin ;
But yield yourselves unto God,
As those that are alive from the dead,
And your members
As instruments of righteousness unto God :
14. For Sin shall not have dominion over you ;
For ye are not under the Law, but under Grace.

Objection 2. (v. 15-23).—If sanctification (“righteousness”) be a “gift” (ch. v. 17), encouragement is given to sin.

If secure of final victory over sin, and freed from the restraints of Law, which exacted Righteousness as a due from its servants, and under Grace which bestows it freely as a “gift,” shall we not think ourselves free to yield to sin, at least *occasionally*? (Comp. “Shall we *sin*,” with “*continue* in sin,” v. 1).

15. What then? Shall we sin
Because we are not under the Law, but under Grace? God forbid.

Nay. The service betokens the master served. Either you gave yourselves to “Sin” (and he is still your master) and “unto Death” as its end; or you gave yourselves to “obedience,” and “unto Righteousness” as its end. There is no middle course.

16. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves bond servants¹ to obey,
His bond servants¹ ye are to whom ye obey?
Whether of Sin unto death,
Or of obedience unto righteousness?

You cannot and must not attempt to serve two opposite masters. Being freed from the bondage of sin, ye have made yourselves over voluntarily to the *bondage* [ἰδουλωτότητι] of righteousness. (I use, on account of your still carnal appre-

¹ “Servants,” A.V.

hension, the figure "bondage"—to enforce the necessity of *undivided* obedience to righteousness, and to guard the Christian's emancipation from under the Law against being misconstrued into a claim of any freedom to sin—of what in truth is the only real freedom, the delighted obedience of children to a Father). Prove, therefore, whom you serve, as formerly you did while under the Law by giving yourselves "to uncleanness (inward), and to *law-lessness* (outward) unto "*law-lessness*" (or *dis-obedience* to all law), so now under Grace by yielding yourselves as undividedly and progressively "to righteousness unto sanctification."

17. { But God be thanked that ye *were* the bond servants¹ of sin,
 { But ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, whereto ye were delivered.²
18. { Being then made free from sin,
 { Ye became the bond servants¹ of righteousness,
19. I speak after the manner of men,
 Because of the infirmity of your flesh.
- { For as ye have yielded your members
 Bond servants¹ to uncleanness, and to lawlessness unto lawlessness,³
 { Even so now yield your members
 Bond servants¹ to righteousness unto holiness [sanctification.]
20. { For when ye were the servants of sin,
 { Ye were free from righteousness.

Encouraged farther by the remembrance of what were the fruits (*self-earned*, v. 23) of sin, and the false freedom, v. 20, with which it dazzled you; and what are the very opposite fruits not earned, but bestowed by God's *grace*, v. 23, which are as certainly attached to the true freedom of God's service, v. 22, viz., "holiness and everlasting life."

21. What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed?
 For the end of those things is death.
22. But now being made free from sin,
 And become servants to God,

¹ "Servants," A.V.

² "Doctrine which was delivered you," A.V.

³ "To iniquity unto iniquity," A.V.

- Ye have your fruit unto holiness [sanctification],
 And the end everlasting life.
23. For the wages of sin is death,
 But the grace¹ of God is eternal life, in Jesus Christ our
 Lord.

CHAPTER VII.—OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE LAW.

The emancipation of the believer from the LAW in order to union with Christ. Its mode, v. 1-4. Its necessity, v. 5-25, since the Law could effect neither his sanctification, v. 7-12, nor his justification, v. 13-25.

In vi. 14 it was said that we are no longer "under the Law." But the objection occurs, How, legitimately, can we be released from its dominion? This is shown under the figure of a marriage union. It is only over the *old man* in us that the Law has power, having no claim over us till we have sinned, since "the Law is not made for a righteous man," 1 Tim. i. 9; and over the wife (collectively, the *church*, individually, the *soul*, the *Ego*, "I myself," of v. 25), only from her connexion with the old man as her husband. Deliverance from the old man, therefore, if it can be effected, will at the same time effect a legitimate release from the Law. This has been accomplished for us in Christ. It was our "old man" (vi. 6) that was in Him put to death on the cross (Christ came "in the likeness of *sinful flesh*," viii. 3), thus setting us free as a bride to be married to a new husband, the risen Christ.

N.B.—Were the Law the first husband, as usually held, not only is the figure marred, but this would represent the Law as having generated fruit unto death in the sinner; whereas St. Paul is most careful to prove that the Law was only the innocent *occasion*, not the producing *cause*, and responsible *father* of sin and death, (see v. 7 and 13).

I. Death alone can absolve from the obligation of Law.

- C. VII. 1. Know ye not, brethren,
 For I speak to them that know the law,
 How that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

¹ "The gift of God," A.V. χάρισμα. See Notes on ch. v. 15.

2. Thus in the marriage bond, the death of the husband releases the wife.

2. For the woman which hath an husband
Is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth ;
But if the husband be dead,
She is loosed from the law of her husband.

3. So then as long as her husband liveth,
She shall be called an adulteress,
If she be married to another man :¹
But if her husband be dead,
She is free from the law, so as to be² no adulteress,
Though she be married to another man.

3. So the Church, or soul, is freed from "the old man," the first husband, (and so from the Law), by our old man being crucified with Christ, vi. 6, and is thus fitted for a new union with Christ.

4. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by
the body of Christ,
That ye should be married to another,
Even to Him who is raised from the dead,
That we should bring forth fruit unto God.

In v. 5 and 6 we have two propositions stated, L. (Law), and G. (Grace). L. is illustrated and proved in the remainder of chap. vii. (v. 7-25), and G. in chap. viii. (especially in v. 1-4).

L. The necessity of emancipation from the Law, and legal spirit, since it occasions both SIN and DEATH.

5. For when we were in the flesh,
The motions of sins which were by the Law
Did work in our members
To bring forth fruit unto death.

¹ "So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress," A.V. See Notes.

² "From that law ; so that she is no adulteress," A.V.

G. The certainty of this emancipation, with its happy results.

6. But now we are delivered from the Law,
 Having died in that whereby¹ we were held, [*i.e.*, in our old man]
 That we should serve in newness of Spirit,
 And not in the oldness of the letter.

L. Expanded and illustrated, in two sections, v. 7-12, and 13-25.

In v. 5, it was asserted that "SIN was by the Law," and that "DEATH was its fruit." Hence seems to arise the allegation that the Law must be evil. The Apostle's answer is, The Law in itself is "holy and just and good," v. 12, and "spiritual," v. 14; but though not the guilty *cause*, it is yet the "*occasion*," 1. of SIN; it cannot sanctify, v. 7-12: 2. of "DEATH;" it cannot justify, v. 13-25. Hence follows Proposition G., the necessity of deliverance from this "Law of SIN and DEATH," viii. 2.

1. The Law cannot *sanctify*; (it leads to the *knowledge*, v. 7, not the conquest of sin); its very strictness irritates to SIN. It is not the *cause*, but it is the *occasion* of sin.

N.B.—St. Paul proves this from his own *past* experience in his unconverted state, when the Law first began to produce in him its work of conviction of sin and condemnation. [Verbs all *past*.]

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

Nay, I had not known sin,
 But by the Law;
 For I had not known coveting,²
 Except the Law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

8. But sin taking occasion by the commandment
 Wrought in me all manner of coveting:³

¹ "That being dead wherein we were held," A.V. See Notes.

² "Lust," A.V. ἐπιθυμίαν.

³ "Concupiscence," A.V. ἐπιθυμίαν. See Footnote on I. 19.

9. { For without the Law
Sin was dead ;
And¹ I was alive,
Without the Law once :
10. { But when the commandment came,
Sin revived,
And I died ;
And the commandment was found for me,
Though [ordained] unto life,
To be itself² unto death.
11. For sin taking occasion by the commandment
Deceived me, and by it slew me.
12. Wherefore the Law is holy,
And the commandment holy, and just, and good.

2. The Law cannot *justify* ; its very spirituality gives the vantage to sin to work DEATH, even to the most advanced saints. It is not the *cause*, but it is the *occasion* of death.

N.B.—St. Paul proves this from his own *present* experience as a Christian. [Verbs all *present*.]

This is an argument *a fortiori*. If even to those who are no longer “in the flesh,” the remains of Sin would work death, so far as the Law is concerned, much more was this true of us when we were “in the flesh,” vii. 5.

Here, as in ch. v. 12-21, St. Paul blends beautifully justification with sanctification, to enforce the indissoluble connexion between them ; the very argument being, that there can be no justification by the Law in this life, since there can be no perfect sanctification—even by the aid of the Gospel.

13. The Law is
not the *cause*
of Death to me. { Was then that which is good made DEATH unto me ?
God forbid.
- The Law occa-
sions Death. { But sin, that it might appear sin,
Working death to me by that which is good ;
That sin by the commandment
Might become exceeding sinful.

¹ “For I was alive,” A.V. ἐγὼ δὲ.

² “The commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.”

The Law is not in fault : I acknowledge it to be "spiritual" and "good ;" but its very spirituality shows me by contrast to be still carnal in part, and a captive to sin, but an unwilling one.

14. For we know that the Law is spiritual ;
But I am carnal, sold under sin.
15. For what I do I allow not :
For what I would, that do I not ;
But what I hate, that do I.
16. If then I do that which I would not,
I consent unto the Law that it is good.
- Now* indeed I can say, It is no more I ;
for through Grace the prevailing bias of
my will is on the side of God, while before
(see v. 8) it was for sin.
17. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that
dwelleth in me,
18. For I know that in me (that is in my flesh) dwelleth
no good thing :
For to will is present with me,
But how to perform that which is good, I find
not :
19. For the good that I would, I do not ;
But the evil which I would not, that I do ;
20. Now if I do that I would not,
It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.
- "The flesh thus lusteth against the
Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh—
so that we cannot do the things that we
would," Gal. v. 17.
21. I find then a law
That when I would do good,
Evil is present with me ;
22. For I delight in the Law of God
After the inward man :
23. But I see another law in my members
Warring against the law of my mind,
And bringing me into captivity to the law of
sin which is in my members.

So that we ourselves "which have the first fruits of the

Spirit," while in this "body of sin," vi. 6, and "of death," vii. 24, "do groan within ourselves, waiting for the redemption of our body" as our completed deliverance, Rom. viii. 23, which the Law never can effect, but "God" alone (whom "I thank") "through Christ." Comp. viii. 3.

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 24. | The Law cannot
deliver from Death. | } | O wretched man that I am! |
| 25. | | | Who shall deliver me from this body of death? ¹ |
| | | | I thank God—through Jesus Christ our Lord. |

Thus I myself (Paul) am still so far carnal, though the bias of my will is now toward God, that looking to the Law I could not be justified.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| But if judged <i>now</i>
by the Law, since
still I sin, I die. | } | So then I myself |
| | | With my mind serve the Law of God,
But with my flesh the law of sin. |

CHAPTER VIII.—G. expanded and illustrated.

Ver. 1, 2. *No* [ὅθεν, *i.e.*, an *entire* freedom, here and hereafter, from] condemnation is therefore to those who are in Christ [and to such only]; for the [new 1 Cor. ix. 21] law [constraining to obedience by love] of the SPIRIT with its LIFE-giving power has made Christians free from the old Law [now proved to be the occasion, and therefore the "strength," 1 Cor. xv. 56] of SIN and DEATH.—Ver. 3. There is "no *condemnation*;" for God has "*condemned sin*" itself, our great enemy and accuser, to extinction; *objectively* in Christ, 1. being "made sin for us," and put to death, while yet 2. "He knew no sin," but defeated its every effort to tempt Him; *subjectively* in believers, in their being enabled, "in Christ," to join in the condemnation of sin to extinction, 1. in giving up their

¹ "From the body of this death," A.V. See Philippi's Commentary, and Hofmann's Schriftbeweis, I. p. 552. *τούτων* is placed last emphatically.

old man to death, and 2. in giving no place to sin in their new man, who “cannot sin, being born of God:”—ver. 4. thus while freeing from dependence on the Law, yet accomplishing its “righteous requirement” to 1. condemn sin in man, 2. justify, and 3. sanctify.

VIII. 1. There is therefore now no condemnation

2. { To them which are in Christ Jesus ;¹
For the law of the SPIRIT of LIFE
In Christ Jesus hath made me free
From the Law of SIN and DEATH.

3. { For what the Law could not do,
In that it was weak through the flesh,
God sending His own Son
In the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin,
Condemned sin in the flesh ;

4. That the righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us,
Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Ver. 4-6. But this ensured freedom from “condemnation” will hold good only provided our habitual walk (though imperfect here through the remains of the flesh, vii. 25) is not after the flesh, but after the Spirit (ver. 4). “For” 1. (v. 5 and 6) the fleshly walk would argue the still fleshly mind; “For” 2. the fleshly mind is [“condemnation” to] death: whereas the spiritual walk bespeaks the spiritual mind, and the spiritual mind brings (a) “*life*” and (b) “*peace*.”

5. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh ;
But they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.

6. For to be carnally minded is death ;
But to be spiritually minded is life and peace.

“*Peace*,” I say (b), v. 7, 8 (in place of “*enmity*,” v. 7), is the fruit of the Spirit; and (a) v. 10, 11, “*life* because of righteousness,” v. 10, quickening finally even the death-doomed body, v. 11.

[Compare the striking parallel of the fruits of faith in ch. v.,

¹ “Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit”—is added in A.V. The addition destroys the Parallelism.

to the fruits of the spirit in ch. viii.; "*peace*," ch. v. 1, in place of "*wrath*," ch. v. 9 (viii. 7, 8); "*life through righteousness*," ch. v. 17 and 21 (viii. 10); and the "*hope of glory*" ch. v. 2 (viii. 21, 24) not diminished by "*sufferings*," ch. v. 3 (viii. 18, 35-37), but sustained by "*love*," ch. v. 5 (viii. 35, 37, 39).]

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---|------------------------------|
| 7. | { | Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; | |
| | | For it is not subject to the law of God, | |
| | | Neither indeed can be; | |
| 8. | { | And they that are in the flesh cannot please God. | |
| 9. | | { | But ye are not in the flesh, |
| | | | But in the Spirit, |
| | If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you:
But ¹ if any man have not the Spirit of Christ,
He is none of His. | | |
| 10. | { | And if Christ be in you, | |
| | | The body is dead because of sin, | |
| | | But the Spirit is life because of righteousness. | |
| 11. | { | But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead | |
| | | He that raised up Christ from the dead [dwell in you, | |
| | | Shall also quicken your mortal bodies | |
| | | By His Spirit that dwelleth in you. | |

We have thus every obligation to obey not the flesh but the Spirit, since if we thus evidence that we are led by the Spirit we shall live :

12. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors,
Not to the flesh, to live after the flesh :
13. For if ye live after the flesh ye shall die;
But if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the
body, ye shall live.

because sons of God, if we share in the filial spirit of the Son of God, v. 14, 15, the Spirit Himself bearing joint-witness with our spirit that we are sons, v. 16, and joint-partakers hereafter of Christ's glory, if now of His sufferings, ver. 17.

14. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God

¹ "Now," A. V.

- They are the Sons of God.
15. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to
But ye have received the Spirit of adoption, [fear;
Whereby we cry, Abba, Father.
16. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit
That we are the children of God;
17. And if children, then heirs;
Heirs of God;
And joint-heirs with Christ,
If jointly we suffer with Him,
That jointly also we may be glorified.¹

And well may we Christians suffer, seeing we are sustained by such "HOPE of glory" (comp. ch. v. 2 with viii. 21 and 24) unspeakable, v. 18; and "willingly" may wait and endure, since all around us are waiting with vague longings for what we with intelligent faith discern to be the assured issue and glorious consummation of our sufferings—deliverance from that state of wretchedness, corruption, and death, inflicted on a ruined world, after man's fall, "*not willingly*," with its own consent (since it saw not the gracious design), but in order to awaken the HOPE of a full and final restoration of all—not only of mankind, but of "the whole creation" that suffered with them—to be accomplished by the introduction of a "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," v. 19-23.

The salvation provided is one not of attainment, but of expectancy; not of sight, but of hope. But if such hope is ours, with patience surely may we wait and endure, v. 24, 25.

18. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time
Are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.
19. For the earnest expectation of the creation²
Is waiting for the revelation³ of the sons of God,
20. For the creation² was made subject to vanity,
Not willingly, but by reason of Him who subjected it,⁴

¹ "If so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together," A. V.

² "The creature," A. V.

³ "Waiteth for the manifestation," A. V. See Footnote on i. 19. The *revelation* of this verse evidently refers to "the glory which shall be *revealed* in us" of ver. 18.

⁴ "Hath subjected the same," A. V.

21. In hope that the creation¹ itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption
 Into the liberty of the glory of² the children of God.
22. For we know that the whole creation
 Groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now:
23. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits
 of the Spirit,
 Even we ourselves groan within ourselves,
 Waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.
24. For in hope are we saved:³
 But hope that is seen is not hope:
 For what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?
25. But if we hope for that we see not,
 Then do we with patience wait for it.

Besides, as our patience is supported by the hope of the full *future* "restitution of all things," so even now the Spirit aids our *present* weak gropings and undefined aspirations after renovation.

26. Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities:
 For we know not what we should pray for as we ought:
 But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings
 which cannot be uttered.
27. And He that searcheth the heart knoweth what is the mind of
 the Spirit,
 Because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will
 of God.

Nay, all things are made to conduce to the spiritual progress of those who 1. (A) have been brought to "love God" (the subjective side); and 2. (B) are "the called according to God's purpose" (the objective side).

28. And we know that all things work together for good,
 A { To them that love God,
 B { To them who are the called according to His purpose.

B For God's purpose includes every step in their salvation, from the first to the last. (Comp. ch. v. 9, 10. "If [even now] reconciled by the death of his Son, much more we shall be saved by his life from wrath" finally.)

¹ "In hope. Because the creature," A. V., see Notes.

² "The glorious liberty," A. V. But this obscures the connexion with "the glory" of ver. 18.

³ "We are saved by hope," A. V.

29. For whom He did foreknow, [Son,
He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His
That He might be the first-born among many brethren.
30. Moreover whom He did predestinate, them He also called;
And whom He called, them He also justified;
And whom He justified, them He also glorified.
31. What shall we then say to these things?
- B* 32. If God be for us, who can be against us?
He that spared not His own Son,
But delivered Him up for us all,
How shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?
33. Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect?
34. It is God that justifieth: who is he that condemneth?
It is Christ that died; yea rather, that is risen again:
Who is even at the right hand of God; who also maketh
intercession for us.

A If once brought to "love God," which can only be through our union by faith with Christ, our love can never fail, because Christ's love can never fail to us. All tribulations and trials, as they rivet His, so they rivet our love but the closer to Him.

35. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?
Shall tribulation,¹ or distress,² or persecution,³
Or famine,⁴ or nakedness,⁵
Or peril,⁶ or sword?⁷
36. As it is written,
"For thy sake we are killed all the day long,
We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter."
37. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through
A Him that loved us.
38. For I am persuaded that neither death,¹ nor life,²
Nor angels,³ nor principalities,⁴
Nor things present,⁵ nor things to come,⁶
Nor powers,⁷
39. Nor height,⁸ nor depth,⁹
Nor any other creature,¹⁰
Shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in
Christ Jesus our Lord.

¹ "Nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come," A.V. See end of Preliminary Remarks on Parallelism, p. 87.

DISPENSATIONAL DIVISION.

I. ISRAEL'S REJECTION.

The Jews' present exclusion from Christ's salvation, chargeable not on God, chap. ix. 1-29, but on themselves, 30-33.

"All things work together for good to them who are the called according to God's purpose," viii. 28. But how does this consist with the rejection of God's first-called people, the Jews? "What becomes I. of our privileges? II. of God's truth? III. of His justice?—if we Jews are excluded from the blessings of Christ's kingdom, and the 'sinners of the Gentiles' admitted? We are God's *elect* people, *predestinated unconditionally* to these blessings. God's word is pledged for their fulfilment, and no unfaithfulness on our part can make His word void."

(Compare with I. II. III. the same three objections, and the answers in iii. 1-8.)

I. The privileges of the Jews remain untouched.

The Jews *are* God's "elect predestinated people." But elected to what? To be God's *outward* people: predestinated, to *typical* privileges. These privileges have been yours. Yours are "the adoption, and the glory," &c., ver. 4. But the shadows of the Old Dispensation entitle not to the realities of the New, but only prefigure them; the carnal Israel (ver. 4) typifies the spiritual (ver. 6); the outward adoption (ver. 4), the true adoption of the "children of God," &c. Of you is the Christ, but "as concerning the flesh," ver. 5.

- C. IX. 1. I say the truth in Christ, I lie not,
My conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost,
2. That I have great heaviness,
And continual sorrow in my heart.
3. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ
For my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh;

4. Who are Israelites ;
 To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the cove-
 nants,
 And the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the
 promises ;
5. Whose are the fathers ;
 And of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came,
 Who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

II. God is not unfaithful to His promises.

The Jews maintained that “*all* Israel has a part in the world to come,” and in the spiritual blessings of Christ’s kingdom ; founding 1. on their carnal *descent* ; 2. on their *works*, and superior *merit* as compared with the Gentiles. The 1st is refuted in both a and b, the 2d in b (specially in d).

6. Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect.

They “are Israelites,” ver. 4 ; but all are not Israel spiritu-ally, that spring from Israel naturally ;

For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel :

Theirs “are the fathers,” ver. 5 ; but descent from these en-sures not to all even the *temporal* promises, which were allotted according to God’s free pleasure : proved from Isaac, not Ishmael ; Jacob, not Esau, being chosen to inherit them : the former case (ver. 7-9) typifying, that with regard to the *spiritual* promises, not the children of the flesh (like Ishmael), but those supernaturally born by faith on God’s promise (like Isaac) are heirs ;

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 7. | { | Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children ; | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. | | But “In Isaac shall thy seed be called :” | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | | <table style="border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: middle; padding-right: 5px;">a</td> <td rowspan="2" style="font-size: 2em; vertical-align: middle;">{</td> <td>That is, They which are the children of the flesh,</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: middle; padding-right: 5px;">c</td> <td> <table style="border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: middle; padding-right: 5px;">e</td> <td>These are not the children of God ;</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>But the children of the promise</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Are counted for the seed.</td> </tr> </table> </td> </tr> </table> | a | { | That is, They which are the children of the flesh, | c | <table style="border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: middle; padding-right: 5px;">e</td> <td>These are not the children of God ;</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>But the children of the promise</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Are counted for the seed.</td> </tr> </table> | e | These are not the children of God ; | | But the children of the promise | |
| a | { | That is, They which are the children of the flesh, | | | | | | | | | | |
| c | | <table style="border: none;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: middle; padding-right: 5px;">e</td> <td>These are not the children of God ;</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>But the children of the promise</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Are counted for the seed.</td> </tr> </table> | e | These are not the children of God ; | | But the children of the promise | | Are counted for the seed. | | | | |
| e | These are not the children of God ; | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | But the children of the promise | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Are counted for the seed. | | | | | | | | | | | |
- For this word is one of promise,¹
 “At this season² will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.”

the latter case typifying (in addition), that as the *outward* privileges promised previously to natural birth, so the *spiritual*

¹ “For this is the word of promise,” A. V.

² “Time,” A. V.

blessings, are bestowed of God's free grace and purpose, irrespectively of all merit or demerit, previous to spiritual birth ; and that as God showed love to Jacob and his seed, and rejected Esau and his seed, so now He may choose the Gentiles, the younger son, and reject the Jews, the elder brother.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 10. | { | And not only this ; but when Rebecca also | | |
| 11. | | { | Had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac ; | |
| 12. | | | { | For the children being not yet born, |
| | | | | Neither having done any good or evil, |
| 13. | { | d | That the purpose of God according to election might stand, | |
| | | | Not of works but of Him that calleth, | |
| | | | It was said unto her, "The elder shall serve the younger;" | |
| | | | As it is written, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." | |

nor works avail.

III. God is not unrighteous in his judgments ; 1. in showing mercy to the Gentiles ; 2. in rejecting the Jews. (In answer to the obvious objection arising from ver. 11-13. "What ! no regard paid to previous merit or demerit ? For surely we, God's people and worshippers, deserve more than idolatrous Gentiles !")

14. What shall we say then ?

Is there unrighteousness with God ? God forbid.

1. Why not show mercy to the Gentiles, as He did to you Israelites, when guilty of idolatry and rebellion against Him at Sinai ? (Exod. xxxiii. 19.)—mercy to sinners being of God's free grace, not to be extorted by any desires or efforts of men.

15. For He saith to Moses, [Ex. xxxiii. 19.]

"I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy,

And I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."

16. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth,

But of God that showeth mercy.

[Jews]

[Gentiles]

2. Why not judicially harden you Jews for your perverseness, as He did to Pharaoh whom He placed on the throne of Egypt, as a fitting instrument, by his proud self-willed opposition to His commands, to execute God's very plans, and to make His power and name conspicuous in his defeat and destruction ? (ver. 17.) So that God Himself (ver. 18) is the only competent judge, who are proper objects of mercy, and who of severity.

17. For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, [Exod. ix. 16]
 “Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up,
 That I might show My power in thee,
 And that My name might be declared throughout all the earth.”
18. Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, [Gentiles]
 And whom He will He hardeneth. [Jews]

Objection.—If God hardens men, and has mercy just as He wills: if all is according to His “determinate counsel and foreknowledge,” (see Acts ii. 23, where on the same plea the crucifiers of the Lord would have been blameless), and our very wickedness is made to subserve His purposes, why find fault with what is only working out His irresistible will? [Ver. 19 = “Why yet am even I to be judged as a sinner?” iii. 7.]

19. Thou wilt say then unto me,
 “Why doth he yet find fault?
 For who resisteth¹ His will?”

Answer I.—If you take your stand on God’s *right* (ver. 14), I appeal to *right* too. What impiety in sinful *man* to question the acts of the sovereign Maker of all, who surely out of the corrupted mass of humanity has a right to make and unmake as He pleases? [Ver. 21 = “Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance?” iii. 5.]

20. Nay but, O man,
 Who art thou that repliest against God?
 Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it,
 Why hast thou made me thus?
21. Hath not the potter power over the clay,
 Out of² the same lump,
 To make one vessel unto honour, [Gentiles]
 And another unto dishonour? [Jews]

ANSWER 2. But what *justice* requires is one thing; what God’s *mercy* prompts Him to do is another. Not then to appeal to God’s sovereign right, of which He needs to render account to none—looking to what we can see, if He has long borne with you, “vessels of wrath fitted to destruction” [*by yourselves, καταρτισμένα*], (His very forbearance being the occasion of hardening you to be more conspicuous objects of His

¹ “Hath resisted,” A.V.

² “A.V. leaves out “Out,”

The Jews then have themselves alone to blame for falling short of salvation, since they seek it not by faith (which their own prophet, Isaiah xxviii. 16, requires) in Christ as the Saviour of all.

30. What shall we say then?
 That the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness
 Have attained unto righteousness, even the righteousness which
 is of faith;
31. But Israel which followed after the law of righteousness
 Hath not attained to the law of righteousness.
32. Wherefore?
 Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works
 of the law,
 For they stumbled at that stumbling-stone,
33. As it is written,
 "Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence:
 And WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH on Him shall not be ashamed."

II. THE GROUND OF ISRAEL'S REJECTION.

(viz., in their not *knowing*, (ch. x. 2, 3, and 19) *i.e.*, recognizing God's righteousness, and the condition of its attainment).

Faith is God's condition prescribed to *all*. But the Jews, alas! will not see that their own law shuts them up to Christ as its end for righteousness (a) "to *every one*"—(b) that *believeth*."

- Ch. X. 1. Brethren, my heart's desire
 And prayer to God for Israel is,
 That they might be saved.
2. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God,
 But not according to knowledge.
3. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness,
 And going about to establish their own righteousness,
 Have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.
4. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness
 To every one that believeth.

b. Proof that "believing" or faith is the condition.

1. For righteousness by Law demands to *do* its commands and live.

5. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law,
That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.

2. But righteousness by Faith, as taught in the Law itself, Deut. xxx. 11-14, requires no such impossibility. God has done all.

6. But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise,
"Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven?
(That is to bring Christ down from above);

7. Or, Who shall descend into the deep?
(That is, to bring up Christ again from the dead);

Man has but cordially to *believe*, and humbly to confess his ignorance and weakness, and the Lord's all-sufficiency;

8. But what saith it?
"The word is nigh thee
c Even in thy mouth,
d And in thy heart:"
That is, the word of faith which we preach;

9. c That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus,
d And shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him
from the dead,
Thou shalt be saved.

10. d For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness,
c And with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.

a. Proof that to *all*, Gentiles as well as Jews, this condition is to be offered—from the testimony of Isaiah xxviii. 16, and of Joel ii. 32.

11. For the Scripture saith,
d "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."
12. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek;
For the same Lord over all
Is rich unto all that call upon him.
13. c For "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall
be saved."

Now "every one's calling on the Lord" involves their hearing and believing—and our being sent and preaching (as Isaiah lii. 7 indicates) to *all*; (why therefore be jealous of our preaching to the Gentiles?)

14. How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed?
And how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard?

- And how shall they hear without a preacher?
 15. And how shall they preach except they be sent?
 As it is written,
 "How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of
 peace,
 And bring glad tidings of good things!"

though, alas! all have not listened to our mission, as Isaiah also predicted liii. 1, in words specially applying to Israel;

16. But they have not all obeyed the gospel,
 For Esaias saith,
 "Lord, who [of us] hath believed what we heard?"

whose words also prove our obligations to preach to all, and to make all hear.

17. So then faith cometh by hearing,
 And hearing by the word of God.

But that no excuse for unbelief may remain, I ask—

1. Have not all had an opportunity of hearing, in accordance with God's original, all-embracing scheme of love, foreshadowed in His own preaching to all by His glorious works? Ps. xix. Compare Rom. i. 20.

18. But I say, Have they not heard?
 Yes, verily, "Their sound went into all the earth,
 And their words unto the ends of the world."

2. But I ask,—Israel! Surely it cannot be that *they* did not know (God's voice when He called)? But, alas! both Moses and the prophets predicted that thus it should be—that the Gentiles would listen, but Israel gainsay.

19. But I say, Israel!—did they not know?²
 First Moses saith,
 "I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people,
 And by a foolish nation I will anger you."
 20. But Esaias is very bold and saith,
 "I was found of them that sought me not;
 I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me."

¹ Our report, A. Vers. See Notes.

² "Did not Israel know?" A. V. See Notes.

21. But with regard to Israel¹ he saith,
 "All day long I have stretched forth my hands
 Unto a disobedient and gainsaying people."

III.—ISRAEL'S RECOVERY.

I. Is then Israel's rejection *total* (chap. xi. 1-10)? Nay, this were to exclude myself. They are *God's people, foreknown*; and, as in the apparently universal defection in Elijah's time, there is ever "a holy seed" (Isa. vi. 13) to preserve the stem alive (comp. v. 16 and 29), a surviving remnant, yet solely of grace.

- XI. 1. I say then,
 Hath God cast away His people? God forbid!
 For I also am an Israelite
 Of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.
2. God hath not cast away His people, which He foreknew.
 Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias?
 How he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying,
3. "Lord, they have killed Thy prophets,
 And digged down Thine altars;
 And I am left alone,
 And they seek my life."
4. But what saith the answer of God unto him?
 "I have reserved to myself seven thousand men,
 Who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal."
5. Even so, then, at this present time also there is a remnant,
 According to the election of grace.
6. And if by grace, then is it no more of works:
 Otherwise grace is no more grace.
 But if it be of works, then is it no more grace:
 Otherwise work is no more work.

Israel, then, as a *whole*, is not cast away, as the elect few prove, who have humbly submitted to receive salvation as of grace, which the great mass scorning to do have justly been blinded as the prophets foretold.

7. What then?
 Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for;

¹ "But to Israel," A.V.

But the election hath obtained it,
And the rest were blinded

8. (According as it is written,
" God hath given them the spirit of slumber,
Eyes that they should not see,
And ears that they should not hear ") unto this day.
9. And David saith,
" Let their table be made a snare and a trap,
And a stumbling-block, and a recompence unto them :
10. Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see,
And bow down their back alway."

II. Is Israel's rejection *final*? No; it has been overruled for the immediate conversion of the Gentiles, which in its turn will revive the Jews, and thus issue finally in new life to the whole world. Think not, therefore, Gentiles—for I seek the true glory of my office as apostle to you specially, in attempting if by any means I can rouse some of my own countrymen—that you are unconcerned in the fall, and far more in the recovery of Israel;

11. I say then,
Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid!
But rather through their fall
Salvation is come unto the Gentiles,
For to provoke them to jealousy.
12. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world,
And the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles,
How much more their fulness?
13. For I speak to you, Gentiles;
Inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles,
I magnify mine office,
14. If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my
flesh,
And might save some of them.
15. For if the casting away of them
Be the reconciling of the world,
What shall the receiving of them be,
But life from the dead?

of which their connection with the fathers would warrant the hope, as the first fruits consecrate the whole, and the root determines the final character of the branches.

16. For if the first fruit be holy,
 The lump is also holy ;
 And if the root be holy,
 So are the branches.

Their present rejection, with your substitution in their place, warns against all boasting on your part (17-22), while their restoration to their original privileges is much more probable than that God should have called the Gentiles. (23, 24).

17. And if some of the branches be broken off,
 And thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them,
 And with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree
18. Boast not against the branches ;
 But if thou boast
 Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.
19. Thou wilt say then,
 The branches were broken off,
 That I might be grafted in.
20. Well ; because of unbelief they were broken off,
 And thou standest by faith,
 Be not high minded, but fear ;
21. For if God spared not the natural branches,
 Take heed lest He also spare not thee.
22. Behold therefore the goodness
 And severity of God ;
 On them which fell severity,
 But toward thee goodness ;¹
- If thou continue in His goodness ;
 Otherwise thou also shalt be cut off :
23. And they also if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in ;
 For God is able to graff them in again.
24. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature ;
 And wert grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive tree ;
 How much more shall these, which be the natural branches,
 Be grafted into their own olive-tree ?

This restoration, so natural and desirable, I am now authorised to foretell as certain, ver. 25, in consonance with pro-

¹ See Preliminary Remarks on Parallelism, p. 84.

phcey, vers. 26, 27, with the unconditional promises made to the fathers, vers. 28, 29, and with that all-compassionating wisdom and goodness of God, which shuts up all in turn in sin, each to react upon the other, that all may humbly submit to receive salvation as of unmerited grace, vers. 30-32.

25. For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery,
 Lest ye should be wise in your own conceits,
 That blindness in part is happened to Israel,
 Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in,
 26. And so all Israel shall be saved:
 As it is written,
 "There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer,
 And shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob ;
 27. For this is my covenant unto them,
 When I shall take away their sins."
 28. As concerning the gospel,
 They are enemies for your sakes ;
 But as touching the election,
 They are beloved for the fathers' sakes ;
 29. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.
 30. For as ye in times past were disobedient to¹ God,
 Yet have now obtained mercy through their disobedience ;²
 31. Even so have these also now been disobedient,³
 That through your mercy they also may obtain mercy.
 32. For God hath shut up all in disobedience,⁴
 That He might have mercy upon all.

The apostle concludes with an exclamation of adoring admiration in contemplating the unsearchable depth (a), of the unmerited bounty (b), of the unconselled wisdom (c), and of the incomprehensible knowledge (d), manifested in these arrangements and in the whole plan of salvation here unfolded, of that God, who is the originating Source, the controlling Director, and the ultimate End of all !

¹ "Have not believed God," A. V.

² "Unbelief," A. V.

³ "Not believed," A. V.

⁴ "Concluded them all in unbelief," A. V.

33. a O THE DEPTH!
 { b Of the RICHES,
 c And¹ of the WISDOM,
 d And of the² KNOWLEDGE of God!
 a How unsearchable are His judgments,
 And His ways past finding out!
34. d For who hath known the mind of the Lord?
35. { c Or who hath been His counsellor?
 b Or who hath first given to Him
 And it shall be recompensed unto him again?
36. a For OF Him, and THROUGH Him, and TO Him are all things,
 To whom be glory for ever. Amen.

PRACTICAL DIVISION.

From the Doctrinal exposition flows the Practical; from "the mercies of God," the duties incumbent on Christians. All being "OF, THROUGH, and TO God," xi. 36, let there be a consecration to God of the whole man; of the "body" ver. 1, (hitherto so "dishonoured," i. 24, and "dead because of sin," viii. 10, but already in part "quickened by the Spirit," viii. 11, to be "a living sacrifice," xii. 1), or outward activities, ver. 1; and of the "mind," or inward dispositions, ver. 2, as a "service" to God, ver. 1—as a fulfilling of "the will of God," ver. 2.

- XII. 1. I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God,
 That ye present your bodies
 A living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God,
 Which is your reasonable service.
2. And be not conformed to this world:
 But be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind,
 That ye may prove what is the will of God,
 Good, and acceptable, and perfect.³

This principle of doing all as a "service" to God, in fulfilment of His "will," must be applied to all our duties.

I. Duties to our fellow-Christians, or to the Church, ver. 3-13. All gifts being OF the grace of God, and success in

¹ "Both of the wisdom," A.V.

² "And knowledge," A.V.

³ "What is that good, and acceptable and perfect will of God." A.V.

their exercise alone THROUGH the Lord's grace, I, in dependence on "the grace given unto me," call on each of you to form a humble and sober estimate of his capacity and place, as a trust assigned to each OF God "according to the measure of his faith," ver. 3, for the good of all, vers. 4, 5, and THROUGH God to employ them TO God's glory, as "service" to Him,

3. For I say, through the grace given unto me,
 To every man that is among you,
 Not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think ;
 But to think soberly
 According as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.
4. For as we have many members in one body,
 And all members have not the same office ;
5. So we being many are one body in Christ,
 And every one members one of another,

6-8 in "Faith," on the Lord (not in himself,) in "proportion" to which he may expect God's blessing, Matt. xvii. 20, 21, [applicable to both cases with their subordinate divisions ; to "Prophecy," "teaching, exhortation ;" to "Ministry," "giving, ruling, shewing mercy."]

6. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us,
 (1) Whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion
 of Faith ;
7. (2) Or ministry, let us wait on our ministering ;
 (3) Or he that teacheth, on teaching ;
8. (4) Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation ;
 (5) He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity ;
 (6) He that ruleth, with diligence ;
 (7) He that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.

9-11 in "Love" unfeigned, seeking the true good of one's neighbour, not indolently sparing the evil, but cleaving to the good, with brotherly self-denying affection, which can arise only from a zealous, fervent "*servi*ng the Lord," ver. 11.

12, 13, in "Hope" of *God's reward* only, which will lead to "rejoice" always, to be "patient in tribulation" even, and unfaltering in prayer, and to show disinterested kindness to the poor and to strangers.

9. Let Love be without dissimulation :
 Abhor that which is evil ;
 Cleave to that which is good,
10. (1) Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love,
 (2) In honour preferring one another ;
11. (3) Not slothful in business ;
 (4) Fervent in spirit ;
 (5) Serving the Lord :
12. (6) Rejoicing in Hope ;
 (7) Patient in tribulation ;
 (8) Continuing instant in prayer ;
13. (9) Distributing to the necessity of saints ;
 (10) Given to hospitality.

II. Duty towards Enemies.

To carry out God's " service " and " will," " Bless," as He has done, even enemies, ver. 14 ; and in order to this, be sympathizing, ver. 15, condescending, ver. 16, forbearing, giving no offence, ver. 17, with thoughts of peace to all, ver. 18, leaving vengeance to God as His prerogative, ver. 19, overcoming like Him evil with good, ver. 20, 21.

14. Bless them which persecute you :
 Bless and curse not.
15. Rejoice with them that do rejoice,
 And weep with them that weep :
16. Be of the same mind one toward another.
 Mind not high things,
 But condescend to men of low estate :
 Be not wise in your own conceits.
17. Recompense to no man evil for evil ;
 Provide things honest in the sight of all men ;
18. If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.
19. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves,
 But rather give place unto wrath: for it is written,
 " Vengeance is mine ; I will repay, saith the Lord."
20. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him ;
 If he thirst, give him drink :
 For in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.
21. Be not overcome of evil,
 But overcome evil with good.

III. Duty to rulers (more especially addressed to the Jewish Christians). Pay obedience to rulers, as “*service*” to God, as fulfilling His “*will*,” since they “are ordained of God” and resistance to them will incur His condemnation, v. 1, 2 ; civil government being a *divine* ordinance conducive to the good of all, v. 3-5.

- XIII. 1. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers,
 For there is no power but of God :
 The powers that be are ordained of God.
2. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power,
 Resisteth the ordinance of God :
 And they that resist shall receive to themselves condemnation.¹
3. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.
 Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which
 is good,
 And thou shalt have praise of the same :
4. For he is the minister of God to thee for good,
 But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid :
 For he beareth not the sword in vain ;
 For he is the minister of God,
 A revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.
5. Wherefore ye must needs be subject,
 Not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake.

Pay therefore to them, as “God’s ministers,” tribute, and generally to all their dues, ver. 6, 7,

6. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also :
 For they are God’s ministers,
 Attending continually upon this very thing.
7. Render, therefore, to all their dues ;
 Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom :
 Fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour.

leaving no debt unpaid but one, LOVE, which, the more you pay, the more you will feel due—enforced by two considerations: 1. (ver. 9, 10) that “love is the fulfilling of the law,” the true doing “the *will* of God ;” 2. (ver. 11-14) that the time for attaining conformity to the mind of the Lord is ever becoming shorter.

¹ “Damnation,” A.V.

8. Owe no man anything, but to love one another,
For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.
9. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not
kill,
Thou shalt not steal,¹ Thou shalt not covet ;
And if there be any other commandment,
It is briefly comprehended in this saying,
Namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.
10. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour ;
Therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.
11. And that knowing the time,
That now it is high time to awake out of sleep,
For now is our salvation nearer
Than when we believed.
12. The night is far spent,
The day is at hand.
- Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness,
And let us put on the armour of light.
13. Let us walk honestly as in the day ;
Not in rioting and drunkenness,
Not in chambering and wantonness,
Not in strife and envying ;
14. But put ye on the Lord Jesus,
And make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

IV. Duty towards those who differ from us, particularly of the strong to the weak (more especially addressed to the Gentile Christians).

Here the principle specially applies, of conforming all to the "service" and "will of God." Since all a Christian does, or forbears to do, is or ought to be "*unto the Lord*," the strong must not despise, nor the weak condemn his brother, since it is *to the Lord* that each is responsible.

- XIV. 1. Him that is weak in the faith receive ye [but] not to doubtful disputations.
2. For one believeth that he may eat all things ;
Another who is weak eateth herbs.
3. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not ;
And let not him which eateth not, judge him that eateth :
For God hath received him.

¹ The A. V. adds, "Thou shalt not bear false witness," which is not found in the best MSS., and would derange the parallelism.

4. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?
 To his own master he standeth or falleth: yea, he shall be
 holden up,
 For God is able to make him stand.
5. One man esteemeth one day above another;
 Another esteemeth every day alike.
 Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.
6. He that regardeth the day,
 Regardeth it unto the Lord;
 And he that regardeth not the day,
 To the Lord he doth not regard it.
 He that eateth, eateth to the Lord,
 For he giveth God thanks;
 And he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not,
 And giveth God thanks.
7. For none of us liveth to himself,
 And no man dieth to himself.
8. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord,
 And whether we die, we die unto the Lord.
 Whether we live, therefore, or die,
 We are the Lord's:
9. For to this end Christ both died and revived,
 That He might be Lord both of the dead and living.
10. But why dost thou judge thy brother?
 And again, thou,¹ why dost thou set at nought thy brother?
 For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ,
11. For it is written, "As I live, saith the Lord,
 Every knee shall bow to me,
 And every tongue shall confess to God."
12. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.
13. Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge this
 rather,
 That no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his
 brother's way.

More particularly the stronger must see that "in these things he *serveth Christ*" and the welfare of His little ones; abstaining from doing before them that which, however allowable for oneself, is sin, if it lead others to sin by doing what their weak consciences condemn.

14. I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus,
 That there is nothing unclean of itself:

¹ "Or why," A. V.

But to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean,
To him it is unclean.

15. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat,
Now walkest thou not charitably.
Destroy not him with thy meat,
For whom Christ died.
16. Let not then your good be evil spoken of :
17. For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink,
But righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.
18. For he that in these things serveth Christ,
Is acceptable to God,
And approved of men.
19. Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace,
And things wherewith one may edify another.
20. For meat destroy not the work of God.

All things indeed are pure ;
But it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.

21. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine,
Nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or
is made weak.
22. Hast thou faith ? Have it to thyself before God.
Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he
alloweth,
23. But he that doubteth is condemned¹ if he eat, because he eateth
not of faith ;
For whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

Each one not pleasing himself, but, like Christ, who so zealously identified Himself with the cause and glory of His Father that "the reproaches of them that reproached God fell upon Him," Ps. lxxix. 9, seeking the spiritual good of others for the building up of God's church—that in suffering for God's sake we may have the same "patience and comfort" vouchsafed to us as to the sufferer in the psalm; our great end ever being that all may "*glorify God*" by receiving one another in mutual love, "as Christ received us" all, Jews and Gentiles, "to the *glory of God*:"

¹ "And he that doubteth is damned," A. V. See Footnote on I. 19.

- XV. 1. But we¹ that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak,
 And not to please ourselves.
2. Let every one of us please his neighbour,
 For his good to edification.
3. For even Christ pleased not himself,
 But as it is written,
 "The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell upon me."
4. For whatsoever things were written aforetime
 Were written for our learning,
 That through the patience and the comfort of the Scriptures
 We² might have hope.
5. Now the God of patience and comfort³
 Grant you to be like-minded one toward another,
 According to Christ Jesus :
6. That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God,
 Even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.
7. Wherefore receive ye one another,
 As Christ also received us,
 To the glory of God.

for Christ is the centre of loving unity to both—to the Jews fulfilling "the *truth*" and "the promises" vouchsafed to their fathers ; to the Gentiles, the predictions of "*mercy*" contained in the Old Testament prophecies, (compare Ps. c. 5. cxvii. 2).

8. For⁴ I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision,
 For the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the
 fathers ;
9. And that the Gentiles
 Might glorify God for His mercy ;
 As it is written,
 "For this cause I will confess to thee among the Gentiles,
 And sing unto thy name."
10. And again He saith,
 "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with His people."
11. And again,
 "Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles,
 And laud Him, all ye people."

¹ "We then," A. V. The "But," *δέ*, marks the antithesis between the *weak* and the duty of the *strong* towards them. The weak sin, if they do that the lawfulness of which they doubt, "*But* we, the strong, ought, &c."

² "We, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might," A. V.

³ "Consolation," A. V. See footnote on I. 19.

⁴ "Now," A. V.

12. And again, Esaias saith,
 "There shall be a root of Jesse,
 And he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles ;
 In him shall the Gentiles hope."¹
13. Now the God of hope
 Fill you with all joy and peace in believing,
 That ye may abound in hope,
 Through the power of the Holy Ghost.

CONCLUSION.

The Apostle expresses his confidence in the Roman Christians, and apologises for writing thus freely to them, on the ground of his apostolical calling, v. 14-16, and successful labours, v. 17-21. These hitherto had prevented his coming to them, but he hopes now soon to accomplish his intention, v. 22-29, and meanwhile begs an interest in their prayers, v. 30-33.

14. And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish
 15. one another. Nevertheless, brethren, I have written the more boldly unto you in some sort, as putting you in mind, because of
 16. the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being
 17. sanctified by the Holy Ghost. I have therefore whereof I may glory through Jesus Christ in those things which pertain to God.
 18. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make the Gentiles obedient, by word
 19. and deed, through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God ; so that from Jerusalem, and round about unto
 20. Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ. Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named,
 21. lest I should build upon another man's foundation : but as it is written,
 To whom He was not spoken of, they shall see ;
 And they that have not heard shall understand.
 22. For which cause also I have been much hindered from coming

¹ "Trust," A.V., which obscures the connexion with ver. 13, "Now may the God of hope, &c." See I. 19 footnote.

23. to you. But now having no more place in these parts, and having
 24. a great desire these many years to come unto you ; whensoever I
 take my journey into Spain, I will come to you : for I trust to see
 you in my journey, and to be brought on my way thitherward by
 25. you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company. But now I
 26. go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased
 them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for
 27. the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them
 verily ; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been
 made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to
 28. minister unto them in carnal things. When, therefore, I have per-
 formed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you
 29. unto Spain. And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall
 30. come in the fulness of the blessing of Christ. Now, I beseech you,
 brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the
 Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for
 31. me ; that I may be delivered from them that do not believe in
 Judæa ; and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be
 32. accepted of the saints ; that I may come unto you with joy by the
 33. will of God, and may with you be refreshed. Now the God of
 peace be with you all. Amen.

Recommendation of Phebe, probably the bearer of the Epistle, ver. 1, 2. He sends various salutations, v. 3-16. Cautions against those who cause divisions, v. 17-20. Salutations from Paul's companions, v. 21-24. Closing Doxology, v. 25-27.

- XVI. 1. I commend unto you Phebe, our sister, which is a servant of the
 2. Church which is at Cenchrea : that ye receive her in the Lord, as
 becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she
 hath need of you ; for she hath been a succourer of many, and of
 myself also.
 3, 4. Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus ; who
 have for my life laid down their own necks ; unto whom not only
 5. I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles. Likewise
 greet the church that is in their house. Salute my well-beloved
 6. Epenetus, who is the first-fruits of Achaia unto Christ. Greet
 7. Mary, who bestowed much labour on us. Salute Andronicus and
 Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow prisoners, who are of note among
 8. the apostles, who also were in Christ before me. Greet Amplias
 9. my beloved in the Lord. Salute Urbane, our helper in Christ, and
 10. Stachys my beloved. Salute Apelles approved in Christ. Salute
 11. them which are of Aristobulus' household. Salute Herodion my

- kinsman. Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus, which
 12. are in the Lord. Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour
 in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which laboured much in
 13. the Lord. Salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother
 14. and mine. Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas,
 15. Hermes, and the brethren which are with them. Salute Philologus
 and Julia, Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints
 16. which are with them. Salute one another with an holy kiss. The
 churches of Christ salute you.
17. Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions
 and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and
 18. avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus
 Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches
 19. deceive the hearts of the simple. For your obedieence is come
 abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf; but
 yet I would have you wise unto that which is good, and simple
 20. concerning evil. And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under
 your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with
 you. Amen.
21. Timotheus my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater,
 22. my kinsmen, salute you. I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute
 23. you in the Lord. Gaius mine host, and of the whole church,
 saluteth you. Erastus the chamberlain of the city saluteth you,
 24. and Quartus a brother. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be
 with you all. Amen.
25. Now to Him that is of power to stablish you,
 According to my gospel,
 And the preaching of Jesus Christ,
 According to the revelation of the mystery,
 Which was kept secret since the world began:
26. But now is made manifest,
 And by the scriptures of the prophets,
 According to the commandment of the everlasting God,
 For the obedience of faith,
 Made known to all nations:¹
27. To God only wise through Jesus Christ—
 To Him be the glory² for ever. Amen.

¹ "Made known to all nations for the obedience of faith," A. V.

² "Be glory through Jesus Christ," A. V.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

ON

PARALLELISM.

AN objection will immediately be raised to the *strange* form in which the text is presented in the present commentary. Is it pretended, by its being printed in lines like verses, that the Epistle to the Romans is in poetry? Far from it. In the first place, had any other method suggested itself of bringing before the reader with equal clearness the parallelism of the corresponding members in St. Paul's composition, it would have been adopted. But if the artifice of printing rhymed verses in separate lines has been employed for the sake of assisting the reader, to distinguish more readily correspondences in *sound* (where it was not absolutely necessary, as some German hymn-books prove, in which the whole is printed continuously without any break), why may not the same artifice be employed, with the same or even greater propriety, for the far more important purpose of assisting the reader, to trace the correspondence in *sense* between two or more parallel lines?

But, secondly, let the Biblical student at once divest his mind of the confusion that has too long subsisted between parallelism and poetry, as if they were synonymous, or inseparable at least in Hebrew composition, as well as of the very limited idea that is attached to parallelism itself. To the mistaken notions generally prevalent on this subject is owing, I believe, in great part the prejudice against the application of parallelism to the New Testament.

The usual supposition is that parallelism is to be found only in poetry, of which it is considered as the distinguishing characteristic. Unquestionably it does form a marked feature in Hebrew poetry; but it is by no means confined to it, but prevails extensively in passages the most prosaic. Of this we have in the Old Testament a striking example in the Decalogue, which exhibits, as I have shown elsewhere,* an exactness of arrangement in lines, paragraphs, and numbers, so definite that no line or scarcely word could be altered without destroying the beautiful symmetry of the whole; while at the same time we discover by its aid a profound significance of meaning and manifoldness of relations between the different commandments, such as no other mode of composition but the parallelistic could have conveyed in so few words. Equally profound, comprehensive, and significant in the New Testament are the Lord's Prayer, and the seven Beatitudes which exactly correspond to the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer.† It is not meant to deny that the parallelism of line responding to line originated in the need, which poetic feeling always finds of some sort of recurring rhythm, to give expression to its thought, although it is an entire mistake to suppose, as has been generally done since the days of Bishop Lowth, that this is the only or even principal formal characteristic of Hebrew poetry, which, on the contrary, consists in Hebrew, as in other languages, in a definite metrical rhythm of sound, free, indeed, but clearly perceptible and gratifying to the ear. The error which has prevented the general recognition of this lies in searching for a regular succession of *long and short syllables*, as in the classical languages, instead of seeing that the metre depends, as in modern languages, on *accent*. This is not the place to enlarge upon such a subject, but a few examples written in Roman characters and properly accented may perhaps suffice to

* See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 138-158. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

† The substance of the remarks on these portions of Scripture will be found also in a small pamphlet of 32 pages entitled, "The Seven Beatitudes, Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments," published by James Taylor, 31 Castle Street, Edinburgh.

satisfy the Hebrew scholar of the reality of the metre. By marking distinctly in reading the accented syllables, pausing at the cesura in the middle of the lines, and passing over quickly, as in every living language, the little words, such as pronouns, the rhythm will be easily caught, and the student, by a little practice, will soon derive a pleasure and profit from reading the poetical books and the prophets never before experienced.

The following rude imitation of the rhythm and pauses of Psalms cxxvi. and cxxxiii. may assist the student in catching the rhythmical flow of the Hebrew original :—*

PSALM CXXVI.

1. When the Lord brought back—the captives of Zion,
We were as men in a dream !
2. Then was there filled—with laughter our mouth,
And with singing our tongue.

Then said they 'mong the heathen,

“Great is the Lord—in His doings with these !”

3. Great is the Lord—in His doings with us,
And right glad we have been.
4. Bring back, O Lord—our captive bands,
As the water streams—in the south.
5. The sowers in weeping
In singing shall reap.
6. Going forth he may go and weeping,
Bearing his hand full of seed :
Coming back he shall come with singing,
Bearing homeward his sheaves.

The Hebrew in Roman Characters.

1. B'shūv' Y'hōvah'—eth-shivath' Tziōn',
Hayi'nu k'chol'mim' !
 2. Az' yimmalē'—s'choq' pinu',
U'l'shonénu rinnah'.
- Az' yom'ru vaggioim'

* The vowels are pronounced as in Italian, ā as in *ah!* ä as in *at;* ē as a in *ale;* é as in *met;* ī as ee in *eel;* u as oo in *moon,* &c. ; and the apostrophe ' as a very short ē.

- Higdíl' Y'hövah'—laäsoth' im ël'leh :
3. Higdíl' Y'hövah'—laäsoth' immánu,
Hayi'nu s'mëchím'.
 4. Shuvah' Y'hövah'—ëth-sh'vothénu,
Kaäphiqim'—banne'ghev :
 5. Hazzor'im' b'dímah'
B'rinnah' yiqtzóru.
 6. Halokh' yelëkh' uvakhoh'
Nosë' méshekh hazzára ;
Bo' yavó v'rinnah'
Nosë' älummothav'.

PSALM CXXXIII.

1. Behold now how good—and how pleasant to see
Those that brethren be—in unity dwell !
2. As the ointment rare on the head
Flowing down to the beard,
To Aaron's beard,
That flowed down to the hem of his robe.
3. As Hermon's fresh dew that comes down
Zion's holy mount upon ;
For there to descend—God His blessing doth send
Even life for evermore.

Hebrew.

1. Hinneh' maht-tov'—ü"mahn-naïm',
She'veth achim'—gam yä' chad :
2. Kashshémen hattov'—al-harosh'
Yorëd' al-hazzaqän'
Z'qän" Ahä rön',
Shei yorëd'—al-pí middothaiv'.
3. K'tal' Chermön'—sheiyored'
Al-haräre'y' Tzi ön' ;
Ki shäm tzivvah' Y'hövah'—ëth-habb'rakkah'
Chaiyim'—ad-häolam'.

The rhythm of Psalm cxxvii. is the same as that in the Scotch metrical version,

Except the Lord do build the house
The builders lose their pain ;

Except the Lord the city keep,
The watchmen watch in vain.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Im-Y'hövah'—lo-yivneh' váith,
Sháv' am' lú—vonāv' bó
Im-Y'hövah'—ló-yishmör ir'
Shāv' shāqad'—shomēr'</p> <p>2. Shāv' lakhe'm—mashkímey qum
M'achārey"—she'veth
O'kh'ley" léchem—haātsavi'm
Khēn' yittēn'—lídídó shēnā'</p> | <p>3. Híneh' nachálat'h—Y'höváh
baním'
Sakar'—p'ri habbátan
4. K'chitsim'—b'yad' gibbor'
Kēn' b'ney"—hann'urim'</p> <p>5. Ashrey' hagge'ver—āsher' millē'
Eth-ashpathó—mēhe'm
Lo-yevóshu—ki y'dabb'ru'
Eth-oy'vim'—bashsháar.</p> |
|---|---|

Psalm cxiv. consists of four short stanzas and runs thus :

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. B'tzēth Yisraēl—mimmitzráim
Beyth Yaāqov'—mēam' loēz'
2. Hay'thah' Y'hudah'—l'qodshó
Yisraēl'—mamsh'lothav'.</p> <p>3. Haiyam' raah'—vaiyanōs'
Haiyardēn'—yissōv' l'achōr'</p> <p>4. Heharim'—raq'du ch'eylim'
G'vaōth'—kivney-tzōn.</p> | <p>5. Mahl-l'khá haiyām'—ki thanūs'
Haiyardēn'—tissōv' l'achōr'
6. Heharim'—tirq'dú ch'eylim'
G'vaōth'—chivney-tzon.</p> <p>7. Milliphney Adōn'—húli áretz
Milliphney Elóah—Yaāqov' [yim
8. Hahophkhí hattzūr'—āgam-mā'-
Hallamish'—l'may'no-māyim.</p> |
|--|---|

The rhythm of the whole of Psalm xxxiii. will be easily caught, consisting as each verse does of two lines with three accents generally on each.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Rann'nū' tzadiqim' bāyhövah'
Lāy'sharím navah' th'hillah'.
2. Hodú lāy'hövah' b'kbinnōr'
B'ne'vel asōr' zamm'ru-lo'.</p> | <p>3. Shíru-lo shir' chadash'
Heytívu naggēn' bith ruah'.
4. Ki-yashār' d'var'-Y'hövah'
V'khōl-māāse'hu be'ēmunah'.</p> |
|--|---|

The utility of attending to the rhythm is shown in the last instance I shall adduce, to exemplify the usual metre of the prophets, Isaiah xli. 1, 2.

1. Hachāríshu ēlay' iyim'
Ul'ummim' yachálp̄hu khóach
Yigg'shú āz' y'dabbēru
Yachdav' lammishpat' niqrávah.
2. Mí hēir' mimmizrach'
Tzē'deq yiqraē'hu l'raglo'

Yitten' l'phanayv' gōyim'
U'm'lakhím' yārd.*

The knowledge of the rhythm would have saved the Septuagint translators, and, following them, almost all the versions till the latest, from an error which they have made in joining in ver. 2, צֶדֶק, *righteousness*, to the first line in place of the second, translating,

“Who raised up the righteous man [Heb. righteousness] from the east.”

instead of

Who hath raised up from the east
Him on whose steps righteousness attends, &c.

It will thus be seen that in Hebrew, as in other languages, that which distinguishes poetry from prose, besides the more elevated diction, is the recurrence of a more or less regular rhythm ; and consequently that in maintaining that Parallelism (though forming a marked feature of Hebrew poetry) has impressed its peculiar arrangements on any composition, we do not thereby necessarily assert it to be poetical.

PARALLELISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The way being thus so far cleared by the removal of the preliminary objection against the existence of Parallelism in prose, the student will be more inclined to listen to the arguments for its extension to the New Testament.

I. It is necessary that he divest his mind of the too common idea, that Parallelism is limited, principally at least, to a

* The short, quick, monosyllabic יָרַד *yārd*, (*niedertritt*, Aug. Hahn, Stier, treads down ; *niederwirft*, Ewald, throws down, prostrates), representing by the very sound (Scottice *dirt*), and abruptness of ending in the line, the forcible pressing or casting down on the ground of the conquered kings, recalls the similarly expressive onomatopoeia of Virgil, Æn. V. 481, Sternitur, exanimisque tremens procumbit humi *bos*.

correspondence of two or more lines to each other, in which word is balanced against word, and thought against thought, so that occasionally an obscure expression in one line may receive light by comparison with the parallel expression in the other ; but that with this exception, it is more a subject of curious interest than of any real practical utility to the interpreter. Were this indeed the whole extent to which Parallelism influences the composition and arrangement of the writer's thoughts, there might be some reason for the depreciatory estimate usually entertained of its claims to our attention. But though, in its more simple form, at first confined probably to the reiteration, or amplification, in a second line of the thought expressed in the first, parallelism soon began to be extended to triplets, quatrains, and even five, six, and seven-lined stanzas, in which varieties of correspondence subsist between the different lines so as to combine them into one whole. Next, since a more complex idea could not always receive adequate expression in the compass of a single line with its parallel, a couplet instead of a single line came to be placed in parallelism with another couplet, or a triplet with a triplet, quatrain with quatrain, &c.,* until at length the love for exact arrangement and symmetrical order found full gratification only when it extended to the entire composition, so as to combine its various parts into one organic whole. Of this we have a remarkable example in the Later Prophecies of Isaiah, xl.—lxvi., the whole of which (27 chapters in all) consists of 3 equal sections with 9 chapters in each, the close of each section being marked by the recurrence of the same idea (in ch. xlviii., and lvii., "There is no peace, saith the LORD (my God) to the wicked," and at the final close, lxvi. 24, by an expansion of the same idea). Each section again is subdivided into 3 threes; the centre, and therefore central thought, of the whole being the very remarkable liii. chapter, predictive of the vicarious sufferings of the Redeemer with their triumphant issue. This chapter (which, however, as is now generally ac-

* See examples of all these varieties in "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 17-34.

knowledged, ought to have begun with the last three verses of chap. lii., v. 13-15, "Behold my servant," &c.), consists of 3×3 verses in the middle (liii. 1-9), the grand subject of which is the humiliation and ATONING sufferings of the Messiah (and pre-eminently the central 3 verses, 4-6), enclosed on both sides by 3 verses predicting the exaltation and glorious results that should follow from His humiliation and sufferings (lii. 13-15, and liii. 10-12).* The threefold division of the whole prophecy is indicated at the commencement, xl. 2.

"Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her,
 I. That her warfare is accomplished,
 II. That her iniquity is pardoned,
 III. For she hath received of the LORD's hand
 Double for all her sins :"

these topics being farther enlarged upon in 3 verses each : the I., in ver. 3-5 ; the II., in 6-8 ; and the III., in 9-11. Each topic is then fully handled in nine chapters : the I. in ch. xl. 12—xlvi. 22 ; the II. in ch. xlix—lvii. ; and the III. in ch. lviii.—lxvi.

A somewhat similar division (as will be shown at the end of these remarks on Parallelism) prevails in the Epistle to the Romans, though not carried out to the same remarkable degree of symmetry ; the whole Epistle being divided into three parts, each of which again is subdivided into three.

The opening words of a Psalm, or other poetical composition, frequently give the arrangement of the topics intended to be handled. Thus in Psalm xxxv. the first verse states the two principal topics : †

A. Plead my cause, O Lord, with them that strive with me ;
 B. Fight against them that fight against me.

* See "Der Prophet Jesaja von D. Moritz Drechsler, 3^{ter} Theil, fortgesetzt von Franz Delitzsch und August Halm," and "Commentar über das Alte Testament von Keil und Delitzsch, Dritter Theil, 1^{er} Band."

† In order to follow with ease the following remarks, the student should provide himself with the "Paragraph Bible" (published by the Religious Tract Society, in crown 8vo), which he will find a most useful copy for his general reading.

Here we have David's two petitions for defence against his enemies :

- A. is an appeal to the *righteousness* of the Lord, as the *Judge* of all the earth.
- B. is an appeal to the *power* of the Lord, as a "man of war."

These two topics are accordingly treated in succession, and (as is the more usual arrangement) in inverse order ; B being first enlarged on in the rest of the first 10 verses ("Take hold of shield and buckler," v. 2, &c.), and A in the last 10 verses, 19-28 (observe "mine enemies *wrongfully*," v. 19 ; "*Judge* me, O Lord my God, according to Thy *righteousness*," v. 24, &c.) : while in the intervening central strophe, 11-18, (its close marked, like that of the other two strophes, by a promise of thanksgiving and praise) David, as the plea for God's interposition in his behalf, contrasts the very opposite conduct of his enemies towards him, with his towards them.

Of the three great topics of the Later Prophecies of Isaiah, xl.—lxvi., the first is (xl. 2) the "warfare" or service appointed for God's Israel to accomplish, viz., to put down the idolatry of the world, and subdue all nations to God. For this a *wisdom* and a *power*, surpassing human, is evidently required. It is God's alone to endow His "servant" with these requisites. With ch. xl. 12, begins the treatment of this first subject, and the division of the rest of ch. xl.* is into 3 pairs of 3 verses (separated from each other by the recurrence of an intercalary verse, or refrain, v. 18 and v. 25), in which the two topics of God's *wisdom*, and God's *power*, as able to make Israel sufficient to overcome every enemy and obstacle, are thus regularly distributed :

- 12-14. Who can compare with God in *wisdom* ?
- 15-17. Who can compare with God in *power* ?
- 18. "To whom then will ye liken God," &c.
- 19-21. Is it man's vain *wisdom* } that can resist God's purpose ?
- 22-24. Is it man's vain *power* }

* See the arrangement of the previous portion in p. 70.

25. "To whom then will ye liken me?" &c.
 26-28. Why doubt the *power* and *wisdom* of Him who "created, and numbers the host of heaven?" who "*fainteth* not," neither is there "searching of his *understanding*."
 29-31. Who therefore can fit the weakest instruments for His purpose, giving "power to the faint," &c.

Let it be observed particularly that *the recurrence of almost the same words* in the refrain, v. 18, and v. 25, points out at once to the student of Parallelism the division of the whole passage.

It is in exact accordance with this division by the two topics, that in the graphic account which follows in ch. xli. of the contest to which the Lord challenges the idols and idolaters, He shows both His predisposing *wisdom*, and His *power* in the *prediction* (v. 2-4), of the first Deliverer whom He is to "raise up" and *strengthen* for the deliverance of His people (viz., Cyrus, who is to deliver them from the captivity of Babylon), as an earnest of the coming of the second and greater Saviour; and calls on the idols for a like display of their foreseeing *wisdom*, and efficacious *power*, ver. 21-23.*

The division is indicated sometimes by a refrain at the close of each section, as in Isaiah ix. 8—x. 4, the recurrence of the words

For all this His anger is not turned away,
 But His hand is stretched out still,

marks the termination of each of the four sections or strophes (ix. 12, 17, 21; x. 4): or sometimes by the repetition of the same word (*catchword*, as it has been called) at the beginning, as "Hearken to me," three times repeated in Isaiah li. 1, 4, 7: "Awake! awake!" three times in li. 9, 17; lii. 1. The tripartite division of the whole of Micah's prophecy, each division "forming a whole, complete in itself, and in which the various elements of the prophetic discourse—reproof, threatening, promise—are repeated,"† is marked by the catchword "Hear," i. 2; iii. 1; vi. 1.

* For other examples, *e.g.*, Moses' Song, Deut. xxxii., see "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 263-272, &c.

† See Hengstenberg's *Christology*, Vol. 1, p. 409, T. and T. Clark, Edinb., 1854; *Commentary on "Die heilige Schrift, von Otto von Gerlach;" The Minor Prophets*, by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., p. 291.

To a people once familiarized with this orderly succession of thought by their poets and prophets, the transference of the same method to prose was most natural. Accordingly, we find a regular arrangement introduced into the prose books of Old Testament Scripture. Thus the book of Genesis, after a general introduction (i.—ii. 3) strikingly appropriate to it, to the Pentateuch, and to the whole volume of revelation,* is divided into 10 sections, each beginning with the words, "These are the generations" (ii. 4; v. 1; vi. 9; x. 1; xi. 10; xi. 27; xxv. 12; xxv. 19; xxxvi. 1; xxxvii. 1). These are subdivided into 5 and 5, the first 5 sections bringing down the history to the call of Abraham, the Flood forming the centre of this subdivision, while the 1st and 4th sections correspond, and the 2d and 5th; in the last 5 sections Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob occupy the more prominent positions at the beginning, middle, and end; while the generations of Ishmael and Esau are thrown into the intermediate and subordinate places.

1. The Primeval earth, Fall, Sons of Adam, Expulsion of Cain, and growing corruption, ii. 4—iv. 26.
2. The Antediluvian Patriarchs, 10 to Noah, v. 1—vi. 8.
3. The FLOOD, vi. 9—ix. 29.
4. The renewed earth divided among Noah's sons, corruption, and dispersion of Babel, x. 1—xi. 9.
5. The Post-diluvian Patriarchs, 10 to Abraham, xi. 10—xi. 26.
6. The history of ABRAHAM, xi. 27—xxv. 11.
7. The generations of Ishmael, xxv. 12—xxv. 18.
8. The history of ISAAC, and of Jacob till Isaac's death, xxv. 19—xxxv. 29.
9. The generations of Esau, xxxvi. 1—xxxvii. 1.
10. The history of JACOB, to his death and that of Joseph, xxxvii. 2—l. 26.

The Book of Judges, in its main central division, is subdivided into 7 sections, exhibiting seven pictures of the state of things during that period of Jewish history, and each commencing with the phrase, "And the children of Israel *did the evil*

* See this brought out in a most satisfactory manner in Part I. of "The Threshold of Revelation," by the Rev. W. S. Lewis, 1863, Rivington.

thing in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim," &c. (See ii. 11; iii. 7; iii. 12; iv. 1; vi. 1; x. 6; xiii. 1.)*

The 12 mighty acts, or exploits, of Samson are divided into two series of 7 and 5, as indicated by the words at the close of each, "*And he judged Israel twenty years,*" xv. 20; and xvi. 31. The first seven exploits may all be said to centre round Samson's marriage with the woman of Timnath, as accompaniments or results, and seem to be arranged as follows, each alternate exploit relating to the slaughter of the Philistines:—

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Kills a lion, | } | The first 3 are immediately connected with the marriage. |
| 2. Slays thirty Philistines, | | |
| 3. Burns their corn, | | |
| 4. Smites the Philistines hip and thigh, | | To avenge his wife's death. |
| 5. Bursts the two new cords. | | |
| 6. Slays the Philistines with the jaw bone of an ass, | } | The last 3 are all connected with the place <i>Lehi</i> = the Jaw bone. |
| 7. Prevails in prayer to have his thirst slacked by a fountain cleft in <i>Lehi</i> . | | |

The last 5 exploits seem thus connected and arranged—

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------|
| 8. Carries off the gates of Gaza, | | Love to the second woman. |
| 9. Bursts the seven withs, | } | Love to the third woman. |
| 10. Bursts the new ropes, | | |
| 11. Carries off the pin of the beam, &c.) | | |
| 12. Overthrows the temple with the Philistines. | | |

Examples of similar arrangements in the Epistle to the Romans are

1. The three divisions of the Doctrinal Exposition (i. 16—viii. 39) are marked by the recurrence of the same, or cognate, words at the beginning of each:—

A. I. 17. Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ, &c.

"For the *righteousness* of God is therein being revealed," &c.

B. III. 21. Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, &c.

But now without the law the *righteousness* of God, &c.

† See *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum alten Testament, Das Buch der Richter* von Ernst Berthean, p. xxv; see also *Symmetrical Structure of Scripture*, p. 124.—and the sevenfold division of the Book of Psalms, p. 134.

24. δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν, &c.

Being justified [or, declared *righteous*] freely, &c.

C. V. 1. Δικαιωθέντες ὄν ἐκ πίστεως, &c.

Having then been justified [or, declared *righteous*] &c.

In all three divisions δικαιούνη Θεοῦ, the **RIGHTEOUSNESS** of GOD, is set forth as man's great want, but in a different aspect in each, and with an evident progression.

In A. it is the Righteousness of God more as *condemning* men, and disposing them to condemn themselves for their want of righteousness—as “the *wrath* of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness of men,” bringing in all guilty, Gentiles and Jews, before God, and thus demonstrating the need of a *saving* “Righteousness of God” to all.

In B. it is the *justifying* Righteousness of God “by the FAITH of Jesus Christ” that is the prominent view, “unto all and upon all them that BELIEVE.”

In C. it is the *blessing* and *sanctifying* Righteousness of God, as the consequence of the *justifying*; as indicated by the contrast between δικαιούμενοι in B. iii. 24, the participle of incomplete, continuative action, = *a-being justified*, each on believing—and δικαιωθέντες (with which C. begins), the participle of complete action, *having been justified*, evidently marking the advance to the results or fruits of justification (or God's declaring the believer righteous), viz., His *imparting* to him **RIGHTEOUSNESS**, with all its concomitants.

The threefold division thus follows exactly the order of the passage from Habakkuk (ii. 4) which the Apostle places at the head of the Doctrinal Exposition (ch. i. 17) as the text on which he is to comment—

Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος

But the righteous

ἐκ πίστεως

by faith

ζήσεται

shall live.

A. He shows in A. who is ὁ δίκαιος, “the **RIGHTEOUS**,” by placing in marked contrast to “the righteousness of God,” i. 17, “all unrighteousness of men,” ver. 18; for of men “there is none righteous, no, not one,” iii. 11, but those only who, acknowledging themselves justly condemned by the righteous-

ness of God, feel shut up to the necessity of receiving righteousness as a free gift from God, and appropriate it accordingly by faith.

B. Ἐξ πίστεως, “*by faith*,” is his second theme in B, to show how man can attain to this title of “righteous.” The words with which B begins are not as in A, δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, “the righteousness of God,” but Νῦν δὲ χωρὶς νόμου, “But now *without Law*,” denoting that the righteousness by which we are to be justified is by no works of law, or of our own; it is a “righteousness of God, by *faith* of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that *believe*,” iii. 22; “being justified *freely*,” &c.

C. The third expression, ζήσεται, “*shall live*,” marks the result—LIFE—a new life that shall be imparted as a gift to the believer, of which he can say, “I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me,” Gal. ii. 20. Such, to express it in one word, is the *practical* result, or fruit of justifying faith, expanded into its various particulars in C. These are, as expressed in ch. v., “Peace with God” now, and “hope of the glory of God” hereafter; for the work, if once begun, must be carried on to perfection. If once “justified by Christ’s blood,” and “reconciled to God by the *death* of His Son, much more we shall be saved by His *life*,” v. 9, 10. In place of the SIN and DEATH communicated by Adam, v. 12, “RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE” shall be communicated to all that are united to Christ Jesus, v. 21.

2. A second example in Romans is ch. ii. 17-23, or indeed the whole passage, 17-29. See NOTES.

3. The twofold division of ch. ii. 17-29 made by reference to the two principal privileges of the Jews, the name of JEW, 17-23, and the covenant of CIRCUMCISION, 25-29, still continues to give arrangement to the two succeeding chapters. It gives rise to the two questions in iii. 1,

“What advantage then hath the JEW?
Or what profit is there of CIRCUMCISION?”

and the answer to the first of these questions is given in the remainder of chap. iii., and that to the second in chap. iv.

4. “SIN” and DEATH,” occurring at the beginning and

close of ch. v. 12-21 as the two great evils introduced by Adam—with deliverance from these in inverse order by the bestowal of the countervailing blessings through Christ (**j**), “justification of LIFE,” v. 18, and (**s**) being “made RIGHTEOUS,” v. 19 (or “the gift of RIGHTEOUSNESS,” v. 17, “unto sanctification,” εἰς ἁγιασμόν, vi. 19); characterized also as (**j**) “the GRACE” and (**s**) “the GIFT,” v. 15, 16—prescribe the twofold division that prevails throughout the whole passage.

These two clearly distinguished, yet intimately connected, ideas continue to define the lines of thought, and determine the twofold division of both ch. vi. and vii., the division being marked in each by the repetition of the same or similar words, like the refrain in ver. 18 and 25, mentioned above (p. 71), dividing Isaiah xl. 12-31:

Ch. vi. 1. “What shall we say, then? Shall we continue in sin
That Grace may abound? God forbid.”

vi. 15. “What then? Shall we sin
Because we are not under the Law, but under Grace? God
forbid.”

and so in like manner in the following chapter—

Ch. vii. 7. “What shall we say, then? Is the Law SIN?
God forbid.”

vii. 13. “Was then that which is good made DEATH unto me?
God forbid.”

The clear distinction in this last instance between the experience of the past described in vii. 7-12, as indicated by the *past* tenses used throughout, and that of the present in v. 13-25, indicated by the *present* tenses, assists in the settlement of that much-agitated question, Is the description given in ver. 14-25 that of a regenerate, or unregenerate person?

5. The recurrence of the same three objections on the part of the Jews, and in the same order, in ch. iii. i-8, and ix. 1-14, serves by the comparison to throw light upon both.

6. Much light is cast on the whole of that great battlefield of theologians, ch. ix., by the perspicuous arrangement of all its parts furnished by Parallelism.

7. The words in ix. 33 [πᾶς] ὁ πιστεύων, &c. [“Whosoever,” or] “He that believeth on Him shall not be ashamed,” recur

again in x. 11. This marks the two stages in the argument of this chapter. Πιστεύων, *believing*, or *faith*, as the only means of salvation, is the subject of x. 1-10; παντα, or the *universality* of faith, as necessary for *every one*, forms the subject of 12-21.

The recurrence of the same or similar words, however, does not always indicate the *beginning* of a new subdivision of the same subject, but frequently serves rather to mark its *close*, as being the summing up of the subject proposed in the words when first enunciated. It is thus of great use in pointing out where a paragraph or section begins and ends. Thus the repetition of the same words in ch. vii. 17 and 20 marks the beginning and end of a paragraph.

v. 17. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

v. 20. It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

Even when from a previous connection of two subjects, if one is again introduced to be enlarged on, the other previously connected one may be expected to follow—as, in the division of ch. vii. mentioned above, after the introduction of SIN in v. 7, we expect the parallel question to follow respecting DEATH; so that thus viewed the two sections, 7-12, and 13-25, may so far be regarded as one—still, each section, if viewed apart by itself, is complete, and, as such, is marked out by the correspondence of its conclusion to its commencement. Thus, in the former of these, 7-12, the question in v. 7,

What shall we say then? Is the Law sin?

which has its parallel in the question with which the succeeding section begins (in v. 13),

Was then that which is good made Death unto me?

yet finds another equally exact parallel in the answer returned to it in v. 12 at the close of its own section (which is thus marked and rounded off as a whole so far complete in itself):

Wherefore the Law is holy,
And the commandment holy, and just, and good.

Viewed in this aspect, what follows in v. 13-25 is in so far a new subject, and the description therefore of a person, (the presumption is) in a different condition (regenerate), from that referred to in v. 7-12 (unregenerate).

Attention to this rule of Parallelism (that the close usually returns back to the subject proposed at the beginning) will sometimes assist in discovering the connection where it might otherwise escape us. Thus in Rom. xii. 14 the Apostle evidently begins a new subject, having passed on from the inculcation of the duty of Christians towards their *brethren*, to that which they owe to *unbelievers* who oppose them :

Bless them which persecute you.

If we inquire where is the parallel which marks the close of this section, we shall find on looking forward a striking correspondence in the last line of the concluding verse of this chapter, v. 21,

Overcome evil with good.

Next we observe that the other line of each verse exhibits a like correspondence, inculcating the same duty *negatively*,

v. 14. Bless and curse *not*;

v. 21. Be *not* overcome of evil;

and, finally, that the connection between the two verses is farther mediated by the intervening parallel in v. 17,

Recompense to no man evil for evil.

We are thus led to trace the connection between these and the apparently unrelated v. 15 and 16, which has generally escaped commentators, and to see that v. 14-21 form one connected whole, prescribing the duty of Christians to unbelievers. See the Notes.

II. Another arrangement of Parallelism as found in poetry would commend itself to the writers of plain prose, the use of the *Epanodos*, or Introverted Parallelism. This figure Bishop

Jebb has defined to be, “literally, *a going back*; speaking first to the second of two subjects proposed: or, if the subjects be more than two, resuming them precisely in the inverted order; speaking first to the last, and last to the first.”*

The purpose of this arrangement is to give prominence to what is intended to be the principal object of the reader’s attention, by placing it first and last, thus producing and leaving the stronger impression. Short instances of this figure given by Bishop Jebb are—

“Behold, I send you forth as sheep,
 In the midst of wolves;
 Be ye therefore prudent as the serpents;
 And harmless as the doves. Matt. x. 16.

“There is a beautiful propriety in placing *first* and *last* the *sheep* and the *doves*. Innocence, or harmlessness, is *essential* to the Christian character: prudence, especially that prudence which guards against the machinations of wicked men, however desirable, is not *essential*; without it men may be Christians in all integrity and purity of heart. The essentials, then, designated under the resemblance which all true disciples of our Lord must bear to the most innocent of animals, are made emphatic by their position; while the adventitious danger, and the adventitious safe-guard—the ravening wolves, and the serpentine prudence—are placed obscurely in the centre.”†

ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην,
 καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις,
 πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν,
 καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους.

Hearing of thy love,
 And of the faith which thou hast,
 Toward the Lord Jesus,
 And to all the saints: Philem. 5.

* Jebb’s Sacred Literature, p. 335. See also the Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, p. 42.

† Jebb’s Sacred Literat., pp. 340, 341.

that is, the epanodos being reduced ;

Hearing of thy love
To all the saints ;
And of the faith which thou hast
Toward the Lord Jesus.*

We have here a crucial instance demonstrative of the very point we are labouring to establish—the existence of parallelism in the New Testament. On the principles of parallelism, familiar to the readers of the Old Testament, the relation of the various members of this sentence to each other would be at once plain and perspicuous ; in any other view the arrangement is inexplicable and unmeaning.† Any attempt to connect *πίστιν* with *εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους*, “to all the saints,” by translating it “*fidelity*,” must be at once dismissed as a palpable evasion of the difficulty. The obvious and natural arrangement of the words would be

Having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus ;
And of your love to all the saints :

as we find St. Paul has elsewhere expressed himself (see Eph. i. 15, and Col. i. 4), placing the initial virtue of faith first and the love which flows from it second. Whence, then, the departure from the natural order in the present instance ? The object which St. Paul had in view in the letter which he addresses to Philemon at once explains the apparent anomaly. The letter to Philemon, as Bishop Jebb remarks, “was a private memorial, designed to rekindle in the breast of an injured master the flame of Christian charity towards an offending but

* Jebb's Sacred Liter. p. 345.

† Compare the following remarks : “The natural position of the 5th verse of St. Paul's epistle to Philemon should have been thus : *Hearing of thy love to all saints, and the faith which thou hast in our Lord Jesus Christ*. Our translators improperly retained the transposition, which will not be endured in English.”—Blackwall's Sacred Class. vol. I. p. 87. And the still stronger remark of Gilbert Wakefield, “I have followed my inclination here in *Anglicising* the peculiar phraseology of the original, and would gladly have followed it on many other occasions if prejudice could have borne it ; but too many still look with pious admiration on *unintelligible obscurity*.”

repentant slave ; now this object would clearly be promoted by making *love toward the saints* the prominent member of the period. Yet, when coupled with that *faith in Christ* from which, even in thought, it should never be disjoined, how *could* the requisite preponderance be given to *brotherly love* ? It would seem by the very artifice of composition here addressed, and by that alone. Had "love to the saints" been first put forward, and then finally dismissed to be succeeded by "faith toward Christ," the former idea would have been eclipsed by the latter ; while, on the contrary, had "faith toward Christ" been the foremost member of the period, it would have so pre-occupied the mind as to keep the succeeding member, "love to the saints," decidedly subordinate. St. Paul therefore distributed his terms like a consummate master of language : he placed *love* first, and the *object of that love* last ; including *faith toward Christ*, the originative fountain of all Christian love, between those two extremes ; thus, instead of detracting from the grand impression, the mention of Christian faith promotes it ; thus, for a season, the greater light lends his beams and delegates his sway to the lesser. The departure, therefore, from the common order in this passage of the epistle to Philemon is at once persuasive as matter of argument, and beautiful as an ornament of composition."*

The example now given is singular in the sharp line drawn between the two sets of parallel lines. It must not, however, be supposed to be generally the case (and this will remove the objection raised by some critics to certain examples in my former work on parallelism) that, while the terms employed to correspond with the subjects in the parallel lines are more

* Jebb's Sacred Lit. p. 347. From this instance (it may be remarked in passing) it will be seen that there is no inconsistency between the prominence assigned to the idea which is placed at the beginning and close of a parallelistic arrangement, and the importance which we have elsewhere claimed for the *central* thought of a passage (see Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, p. 145, 192, 193, 311). Undoubtedly the idea which is placed first and last is thereby brought more immediately before the view of the reader, and receives the greater *prominence*, while that which is in the intermediate position is more *obscure* ; but though more hidden, the central idea may, like the heart, be the *animating centre* of the whole, sending its vitalizing energy and warmth to the very extremities.

characteristic of them in one aspect, a strict line of demarcation is thereby always intended to be drawn so as to exclude their application to the other subject. Thus, in another instance cited by Bishop Jebb,

Testifying both to the Jews,
 And also to the Greeks,
 Repentance toward God,
 And faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ: Acts xx. 21.

the bishop remarks, "The apostle's ministry was twofold—among the Jews and among the Greeks; each branch of that ministry is here characterized by that department of instruction which St. Paul was in the first instance obliged to enter upon with each class of his catechumens. To the Gentiles he primarily testified repentance toward that one almighty God from whom they had wandered; to the Jews who already acknowledged and adored that almighty God he primarily testified the additional necessity of Christian faith. The form of epanodos gives due prominence to that faith in Christ which was the ultimate aim of his ministry, and keeps in due subordination those truths of natural religion which were chiefly introductive.

"This division must be restricted to St. Paul's *initiatory* labours among Jews and Greeks; for it is certain that, when occasion required, he preached repentance to the former; and, when they were sufficiently prepared, he preached Christianity to the latter."*

In like manner, in St. Paul's usual salutation in his epistles,

Grace be unto you,
 And peace
 From God our Father,
 And from the Lord Jesus Christ: Rom. i. 7.

the parallelistic arrangement shows that *grace* is more especially attributed to the Lord Jesus Christ, as is the case generally in the New Testament (see Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 9, xiii. 14; Gal. i. 6, vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; 1

* Jebb's Sacred Lit. p. 343.

Thess. v. 28 ; 2 Thess. iii. 18 ; Philem. 25 ; Rev. xxii. 21), and *peace*, to God the Father (see Rom. xv. 23, xvi. 20 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Phil. iv. 7, 9 ; Heb. xiii. 20) ; but it would be erroneous to conclude that St. Paul did not mean to affirm both qualities as belonging to both Father and Son. Just as in the benediction, 2 Cor. xiii. 14,

The *grace* of our Lord Jesus Christ,
And the *love* of God,
And the *communion* of the Holy Ghost,
Be with you all. Amen.

we find each of the persons of the Godhead characterized by an epithet more peculiarly appropriate to that person ; but it is by no means meant to affirm *grace* to belong exclusively to our Lord Jesus Christ, or *love* to God, or even *communion*, *κοινωνία*, to the Holy Ghost, as 1 Cor. i. 9 and 1 John i. 3 prove.

Examples of the epanodos in the epistle to the Romans are :

1. Behold, therefore the goodness,
 And the severity of God ;
 On them which fell, severity ;
 But towards thee goodness. Romans xi. 22.

On which Bishop Jebb remarks, “ Goodness at the beginning ; at the close goodness ; this epanodos speaks for itself.”

2. Ch. ii. 7-10. Good (A)—Evil (B)—Evil (B)—Good (A).
3. Ch. ii. 12-15. Gentiles (A)—Jews (B)—Jews (B)—Gentiles (A).

For the reason of the prominence here assigned to the Gentiles above the Jews, see the notes on these verses. From this last example, too, we see the importance of attention to this rule of parallelistic arrangement, since the knowledge of it might have saved Whitby, Macknight, and others from giving an interpretation of verses 14, 15 in direct contradiction to the very point which St. Paul was labouring to establish, and to sound doctrine.

4. For the most remarkable instance, ch. v. 12-21, and the very important results that flow from its examination according

to the principles of parallelism, the reader is referred to the notes.*

5. Sometimes this figure has place where the parallel subjects are far apart. Thus the same three cardinal, or generic, sins with which the Gentiles are charged in i. 21-31, are shown to be equally chargeable against the Jews in ii. 21, 22, where, however, they are placed in the inverse order for the reason stated in the notes. Combining the two together we find they form a regular epanodos, in which *ungodliness* is seen to stand first and last, to denote that departure from God, as it is the beginning, is also the consummation of all iniquity.

6. Another beautiful instance occurs in the correspondence between the *revelation*, ch. i. 17, and *manifestation*, iii. 26, of the RIGHTEOUSNESS of God in its judicial aspects, where the prominence is given to the *saving* aspect above the *condemning* by its being placed first and last, see Dissertation on *Δίκαιοσύνη*, &c., p. 118.

The observation of such parallelism between two related statements even when far separated, and of the distinction so clearly drawn between the two apparently conflicting, yet now reconciled, aspects of God's *condemning* yet *justifying* RIGHTEOUSNESS, would be comparatively easy to Jews trained by their early habits of thought to look out for such correspondence and contrast.

7. It is in longer passages, particularly where the connexion is apt to escape the reader, that attention to this figure aids the student in recovering it. Thus, in ch. viii. 28-39, the orderly connexion of the whole passage is immediately perceived when we observe that the "*love of God* [which is in Christ Jesus, ver. 39]," which is stated as the first characteristic of those for whose "*good all things work together*," ver. 28, meets us again at the beginning and close of verses 35-39, leading us to give the full pregnant meaning to the expression "*the love of God*" as being still *God's* love [like the corresponding expression, "*the righteousness of God*"] even when exhibited by the believer towards God, being but the flowing

* See also for other examples iv. 11-18, and 13-16; ix. 22-29; xi. 33-36.

back, towards the Source, of His own fulness of love [as of righteousness] imparted to His creature, and thus reconciling, by combining them together, the two conflicting interpretations of "the love of Christ (or of God)."

III. A third characteristic of parallelism was almost equally applicable to prose as to poetry, and therefore naturally came to be transferred to the former—the employment of special *numbers* to impart symmetry to the composition, and occasionally to stamp their symbolical significance on the particulars enumerated. Thus *ten* being the symbol of completeness, the decalogue contains ten commandments* to signify that it is a complete code of religious and moral duty. To denote its divine origin, the number *three* is stamped on it seventeen different times, the whole forming a series of triplets, one within the other, in paragraphs and lines, with one significant exception.† The particulars enumerated in commandments iv. and x. of those who are to observe God's holy Sabbath, and of our neighbour's possessions which we are not to covet, are in both cases seven (the covenant number), to denote that they are under the sanction of God's covenant.

The tendency of the Hebrew mind to adopt this definiteness of arrangement, even in the most simple enumeration of particulars, often exhibits itself where we should least expect it. Thus the order, in which the various articles of the possessions with which the Lord had blest Abraham are detailed, evidently owes to parallelism its strangeness, as it appears to us, in separating the "*he-asses*" from the "*she-asses*" by the interpolation of the "men-servants and maid-servants" between them; and the *number* of articles enumerated, 7, (the number of a covenant) is referable to the desire of indicating the fulfilment of God's *covenant*-promises to Abraham,

* Most of the laws of Moses are in like manner arranged in groups of *Ten*, one great object being probably to assist in their recollection. See *Die sieben Gruppen Mosaischer Gesetze*, von Ernst Bertheau; *Commentar zum Pentateuch von M. Baumgarten*; *Commentary on the Pentateuch by Otto von Gerlach*, &c.

† See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," p. 146, &c.

¹
 And he had sheep and oxen,
²
³
 And he asses
⁴
 And men servants,
⁵
 And maid servants,
⁶
 And she asses,
⁷
 And camels.

Gen. xii. 16.*

Examples in the Epistle to the Romans are, the enumeration, in ii. 17-20, of the *ten*-fold privileges claimed by the Jew; in viii. 33-34, the *seven*-fold exemption of Christians under the new covenant from condemnation, beginning with the general challenge in ver. 33 to all accusers, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" and followed up by three pairs of unanswerable pleas in the three succeeding lines of v. 34; and, in v. 35, the *seven*-fold exemption from the seducing power of the most trying temptations; which is amplified into *universal* exemption (signified by the number *ten*) in ver. 38, 39, from every influence in the whole universe, past, present, or future, that might seek to separate the believer "from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord;" in xii. 6-8, the *seven*-fold gifts attached to faith; and in xii. 10-13, the *ten*-fold graces of fervent love, and cheering hope, the ten being divided (as in ii. 17-20) into five and five.

In the last of the three examples in chap. viii. there is a singularity of arrangement, as in the enumeration of Abraham's possessions, that deserves attention:—

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,
 Shall be able to separate us from the love of God
 which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

* For additional examples see "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 140, 147; "The Seven Beatitudes," &c.

Parallelism explains and vindicates the correctness of the reading according to "the very strong consent of the ancient MSS." (Alford), by which "nor powers" is separated from its congeners "nor angels, nor principalities," and which Dean Alford considers so inexplicable that he unhesitatingly pronounces "some confusion has evidently crept into the arrangement." The principle of arrangement would seem to be, to place alternately *inanimate* and *animate* objects, reserving "creature," which may apply to either, and sums up the whole, to the last line; in order to denote that "the dominion over all the works of God's hands" originally designed for man (Gen. i. 26; Ps. viii. 6), which he had lost by having bowed down to and "served the creature," Rom. i. 25, should now, through his union with Christ Jesus, be restored to him, "*all things* being put in subjection under his feet," Heb. ii. 8.*

Whether every part of this Epistle which I have arranged in parallelisms has been designedly so composed by St Paul may admit of very reasonable doubt. Indeed the indistinctness of the parallelism in some passages has caused me considerable hesitation, whether I should print them in parallelistic lines or not; there being no good reason why there should not be an intermixture of both modes of composition in the New Testament, of plain prose with parallelistic lines, as there unquestionably is in the prophetic writings of the Old Testament. But it surpasses all bounds of reasonable calculation and belief that, through *mere accident*, so large a number of passages could be made to assume so plausible an appearance of symmetrical order, if no such rule had regulated their composition. Let the reader calmly examine (as illustrated in the notes) chap. ii. 6-15, and 17-29; iv. 11-18; v. 12-21, the parallelism of which last passage has struck several writers, *e.g.*, the Rev. J. Owen, the latest translator and Editor of Calvin's Commentary on the Romans; vi. 2-11, noticed in part by Prof. Jowett, Epistles of

* See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," p. 323.

St. Paul, vol ii., p. 189 ; viii. 28-39, &c.; and the majority of students will, I think, arrive at the same conclusion to which I myself have been compelled. But if any still demur to the reality of parallelism existing in the New Testament, let them accept the present arrangement as a mere *tabulated form*, convenient for marking the successive stages in the Apostle's reasoning, and assisting the student to perceive the mutual relations of the various parts of the argument;* and let them judge impartially of the present attempt to facilitate the study of this most difficult Epistle, irrespectively of the question whether or not the *form* in which it is here presented was in the mind of the writer at the time of its composition.

GENERAL DIVISION AND OBJECT OF THE EPISTLE.

The Epistle evidently consists of three parts,

- I. The Introduction, chap. i. 1-16.
- II. The main body of the Epistle, i. 16—xv. 13.
- III. The Conclusion, xv. 14—xvi. 27.

The introduction and conclusion appear, as is often the case in the books of Scripture, to correspond.

The introduction consists of three subdivisions :—

1. The salutation, or address, i. 1-7.
2. An expression of St Paul's feelings towards the Roman Christians, i. 8-15.
3. The announcement of the great subject of the Epistle—the *Gospel*, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, revealed, ἀποκαλύπτεται, as the power of God, δύναμις Θεοῦ, unto salvation through faith, ἐκ πίστεως, unto all, Jew and Gentile, παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, i. 16, 17.

The conclusion in like manner consists of three corresponding subdivisions :—

* The utility of such an arrangement has struck Mr J. R. Crawford, Master of Berkhamsted School, who, without the observance of strict parallelism, has published “for the use of ministers, students in theology, &c., the Epistle to the Romans in Greek, arranged in paragraphs and lines according to the principle of logical analysis,” Longman, 1860.

1. Various expressions of St Paul's feelings towards the Roman Christians, xv. 14-33.

2. Salutations to and from various persons, xvi. 1-24.

3. A closing ascription of praise "to God that is of power," τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ, to establish the Romans according to his *Gospel-revelation*, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου . . . κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν, made known to *all* nations, εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, for the obedience of *faith*, εἰς ὑπακοήν πίστεως, 25-27.

The main body in like manner consists of three subdivisions. The Practical subdivision, xii.—xv. 13, stands evidently apart from the rest. Of the two preceding subdivisions the second, consisting of ch. ix.-xi., has been regarded by commentators generally as possessing a peculiar character of its own, as treating of the *dispensational* dealings of God towards Israel and the Gentile nations, and may therefore be termed *Dispensational*. It has, however, a close connection with the preceding or *Doctrinal* division, i. 18—viii., so that both have been by some commentators classed together, as forming the *Dogmatical* portion of the Epistle.

It has been a question of considerable difficulty to determine of whom the church at Rome principally consisted, since its members are expressly called *Gentiles* by St Paul (ch. i. 6 and 13, a proof that the majority must have been such), and yet the whole tenor of the Epistle presupposes a *Jewish* habit of thought and education, and an intimate knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures. The difficulty receives its most satisfactory solution from the hypothesis that the first converts in all the Gentile churches were principally "proselytes of the gate," who would therefore naturally have much acquaintance and sympathy with Jewish views, and were in danger of being seduced from the simplicity of the faith in Christ Jesus alone for salvation, by the converts of Jewish extraction, who, in their zeal for the law of Moses, urged its adoption upon all who would attain to a full participation in the blessings of the covenant. It became important, therefore, to point out the true relation between Judaism and the Gospel.

This view accords well with what evidently forms the great object of St Paul in writing to the chief of the Gentile nations,

viz., as the Apostle of the Gentiles, to show, in opposition to the lofty pretensions to superiority on the part of the Jews, the extension of God's mercy on equal terms to *all* the families of the earth, and the perfect *parity* of Jew and Gentile, now made one in Christ Jesus, in reference to the Gospel; which is equally necessary to both i. 18-iii. 20—is offered on the same terms, viz., of faith, to both iii. 21-iv. 25—is the only and all-sufficient means in itself to confer on both “all things that pertain unto *life and godliness*,” v.-viii.—and which will finally by the all-outruling providence of God be successful in gathering within the ample pale of the Christian church all the nations of the earth, ix.-xi.

Throughout the whole epistle, accordingly, there is a constant alternation and contrast of Jew and Gentile, of Law and Grace, and of Works and Faith: with an especial reference to the objections likely to arise in the mind of a Jew to God's apparent change of purpose in respect to His ancient people.

The more immediate occasion probably of St Paul's writing this epistle was, the state of development which the Christian church had now reached, when the unpleasant truth was beginning to force itself upon the Jewish converts, from the preponderating and daily increasing number of Gentile believers, that the former superiority of Israel was at an end; nay, that under the Gospel dispensation, from the general unbelief of their countrymen, their nation was about to be rejected, and a people to be taken from the midst of all nations in their stead. This hypothesis furnishes an intimate bond of connexion between chaps. ix.-xi. and the preceding doctrinal discussion, and assigns an adequate reason for the remarkable anxiety, which St Paul evinces to remove every scruple on this point by his repeating and answering again in chap. ix. the same three objections of the Jews to which he had already given replies in chap. iii., viz., that the equalization of Jew and Gentile under the Christian dispensation would amount to a denial—1. Of their distinctive *privileges* (iii. 1-2, compare ix. 4, 5)—2. Of the *truth* of God's promises (iii. 3, 4, compare ix. 6-13)—and 3. Of the *righteousness* of His dealings towards Israel, if the great body of God's own people were now to be cast off and

idolatrous Gentiles taken in their stead (iii. 5-8, compare ix. 14-33). It will thus also be seen why the *universality* of the Gospel salvation forms the first (i. 18-iii. 20) and the last topic, (ix.-xi) in the dogmatical portion of the epistle, as indicated by its repetition (in the first statement of the topics to be handled, ch. i. 16) under two synonymous forms of expression, "to *every one*—"to the *Jew* first, and also to the *Gentile*."

NOTES AND DISSERTATIONS.

- 3 a. Περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,
b. Τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,
4. Τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει,
Κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης
Ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν,
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

It would be difficult, perhaps, to point out elsewhere within the same compass an equal number of expressions, each and all of which seem to have been so generally misapprehended by the prevailing current of interpretation.

The difficulties connected with these verses are :

1. Is ἐν δυνάμει “with or in power” connected with ὀρισθέντος = “manifested with power (to be) the Son of God,” —or “with υἱοῦ Θεοῦ, the Son of God,” = ordained (constituted) the *Son of God with power*?

2. In what sense is Christ here designated “the Son of God?”

3. Are we to assume for ὀρισθέντος the unauthorised meaning of “declared,” in the sense of *manifested, proved to be*, of which Olshausen confesses there is no instance “to be found either in profane or scriptural writers,”—or to retain its usual signification of “*ordained, constituted, decreed, determined*?”

4. Why is the expression, “by the resurrection of the dead” ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν used, instead of that which might have been expected, and which the authorized version has employed, “the resurrection *from* the dead?”

5. What is the meaning of the expression, “the Spirit of holiness?” Does it denote Christ’s Divine Spirit, or the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Trinity?

Only, we believe, by keeping in view that the Apostle’s mind was so full of his great argument, that already in the very opening of his epistle he presents in condensed form its main topics, shall we arrive at a satisfactory solution of these difficulties, or catch the full import of the words.

These topics are enumerated (see Analytical Commentary) in i. 16, 17, (d) “The gospel is the *power* of God unto salvation—(e) to *every one*, Jew or Gentile—(f) that *believeth*—(g) being God’s righteousness by faith, now revealed, yet already announced though more obscurely in the Scripture, “As it is written, The righteous shall live by faith.”

Now, in this short preface (i. 1-5), not only have we (g) “the gospel of God” declared to be no novelty, but that “which He had promised afore by His prophets in the holy Scriptures,” and the design of St. Paul’s apostleship to be to bring men to (f) “obedience of the *faith*, (e) among *all nations*”;—but to come to the principal subject, viz. (d) that “the gospel of Christ is the *power* of God unto salvation” to effect “what the Law was *power*-less to do,” τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, viii. 3:—

1. We have this main feature of the argument clearly announced by the words τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, “ordained the *Son of God with [in] power.*”* When? or how? “By the resurrection of the dead,” ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, which is involved in the resurrection of Him who is “the Resurrection and the Life.” Only by His resurrection did Jesus become “the Son of God *with power.*” Previously “He was crucified through *weakness,*” ἐξ ἀσθενείας. On His resurrection, henceforth “He liveth by the *power* of God,” ἐκ δυνάμεως Θεοῦ, 2 Cor. xiii. 4, “being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit,” 1 Pet. iii. 18, and thereby “made a quickening Spirit,” 1 Cor. xv. 45, to all that are in

* Not τοῦ ἐν δυνάμει ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ, as perspicuity would have required, had the intended meaning been “with power declared to be the Son of God,” as in “Authorized version, revised by five Clergymen.”

union with Him ; they having died with Him in His death to sin, but being quickened and raised again in His resurrection (Rom. vi. 2-11), and made with Him "sons of God," as being "led by the Spirit of God" (Rom. viii. 14), and empowered to "walk no more after the flesh, but after the Spirit" (Rom. viii. 4, compared with i. 3, 4).

In these few pregnant expressions of i. 4 we have a distinct reference to that striking analogy and assimilation, afterwards more fully developed in chaps. v., vi., vii., viii., as subsisting between Christ and "them that are His," by a union as intimate as was the previous union with Adam of his posterity, by which all that belongs to the Head is transmitted to the members.

2. The principal misapprehension, which has led to all the rest, relates to the expression "the Son of God with power," ver. 4. The reference here is not, as usually interpreted, to the *eternal** Sonship of the Word, which is incommunicable, as in it He stands alone as "the *only-begotten* Son of God," but to that aspect of the Sonship, in which, as having assumed human nature, He is "the *First-born* among many brethren," Rom. viii. 29 ; "the *First-begotten* of the dead," Rev. i. 5, and which Sonship He can communicate to all that are in union with Him. On this Sonship as man, it may indeed be objected that He previously entered when He first "became flesh," according to the words of the angel to His mother, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee ; therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*," Luke i. 35 ; but it was "the likeness of sinful flesh,"—of our human nature with all its *weakness* (sin only excepted)—that He then assumed : then only He became "the Son of God *with power*," † when He rose as "the first-born from the dead," Col. i. 18.

* Already asserted in ver. 3 (a) *περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*, "concerning his Son," when speaking of His state before He was born into the world.

† Compare Christ's words, Mat. xxviii. 18 (to which St. Paul probably alludes), "And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All *power* is given unto me in heaven and in earth." See also 2 Pet. i. 16.

The correctness of this view is confirmed by the beautiful analogy thus seen to exist between the Head and the members. Christ's initiatory Sonship in His incarnate state has its parallel in that still imperfect sonship to which believers are born while here in the flesh. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," but "it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is," 1 John iii. 2. "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit" (Rom. viii. 11), bestowing on us the full "adoption—to wit, the redemption of our body" (viii. 23). "Sown in *weakness*, it shall be raised in *power*," 1 Cor. xv. 43. Then only, on our resurrection, shall we become in the full sense "sons of God;" exactly as to our Head the promise and "*decree*" of Psalm ii. 7, "Thou art my Son; *this day* have I begotten thee" was fulfilled (see Acts xiii. 33 and Heb. i. 5) on that morning that God quickened Him and raised Him up from the grave as the First-begotten of the dead and the First-born among many brethren; begetting Him again, as it were, to a new and endless life, which He was to have the glory of imparting to an innumerable multitude.

3. In allusion to this "*decree*," perhaps, St. Paul uses the word ὀρισθέντος, "*decreed, ordained, constituted.*" At all events, it denotes "the *objective fixing, appointing* of Christ to be the Son of God with power," not (as Dean Alford) "*the subjective manifestation in men's minds that He is so*"—a meaning unexampled. To speak of Christ as thus appointed is in exact analogy with many passages of Holy writ.

Acts x. 42. "It is he which was *ordained* (ὁ ὀρισμένος) of God to be the Judge of quick and dead."

Acts xvii. 31. "He will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath *ordained*" (ὀρίσει).

Acts ii. 36. "God hath made (ἐποίησεν) that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ,"—viz., exactly as in the case before us, by His having "raised up" Jesus, and "by His right hand exalted" Him, ver. 32, 33, having *made* Him "Lord," *κύριον*, in fulfilling the words of Ps. cx. i., and "Christ," *Χριστόν*, "in the full and glorious sense in which

that term was prophetically known" (see Dean Alford *in loc.*).

Heb. i. 4. He *hath by inheritance obtained*, *κεκληρονόμηκεν*, "a more excellent name than they"—that is, the name of "the Son of God," as immediately proved by quotations referring to Him, not as the Logos or Eternal Son of God (as usually explained), but in His mediatorial capacity, as the *Θεάνθρωπος*, viz., from Psalm ii. 7, as here; 2 Sam. vii. 14, "He *shall be my Son*," &c.

4. "By the resurrection of the dead," *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*. This expression is selected (instead of that which we should have expected, *ἐξ ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν*, "by the resurrection *from* the dead"), in anticipation of the principal subject of the epistle, the union of believers with Christ in His death and life. In His dying they have died; in His rising again from the dead they rise, Rom. vi. 5, 8, 11. "The resurrection of Jesus involves in it *the whole Resurrection of the dead*. Comp. John xi. 25, "I am the Resurrection and the Life" [and Acts xxvi. 23, *εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*, "that, *as first of the Resurrection of the dead*, he should proclaim light unto the people."] Thus, in these words, lies wrapped up the argument of chap. vi. 4, ff." Dean Alford's Com. on Rom. i. 4.

Bengel draws attention to the parallelism of the expressions in ver. 2, 3 :

τοῦ γενομένου	ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ	κατὰ σάρκα
τοῦ ὀρισθέντος	ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν	κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁ- [γιοσύνης.
Who was born	from the seed of David	as to the flesh.
Who was ordained	from the resurrection of the dead	as to the Spirit of [holiness.

Here it seems evident that "from the resurrection of the dead" bears the same relation to Christ's birth as *the Son of God*, as "from the seed of David" bears to His birth as *the Son of man*—the preposition, *ἐκ*, *from*, marking in both cases the source *from* or *out of* which the relation springs. Consequently the reference here is not to the *eternal* Sonship of Christ, but to that which He acquired *in time* as the God-man.*

* That the Sonship *in time* depends on His *Eternal* Sonship, nay, could never

5. But the expression which specially requires elucidation from a reference to the general scope of the Epistle, and the assimilation which it is St. Paul's object to point out as existing between Christ and his members, is "*according to the Spirit of holiness*" *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης*; which all the later German Commentators, and following them Dean Alford, assert, cannot denote the Holy Spirit, but, as being placed in antithesis with "*according to the flesh*" *κατὰ σάρκα*, which marks the *human nature* of Christ, must designate the higher *Divine nature* of the Son.

To see the fallacy of this conclusion, one needs but to observe that as in the expression "from the resurrection of the dead" is wrapped up the argument of ch. vi. (the death of the old, and the resurrection of the new man in Christ Jesus, see above p. 97, and Alford *in loc.*), so in the antithesis of "*according to the flesh*,"—"according to the Spirit of holiness" we have wrapped up the argument of chap. viii., in which believers are represented as being enabled to "walk no longer *according to the flesh*, but *according to the Spirit*," (viii. 4), because, by their union with Christ, they are now "sons of God" (ver. 14), as being "led by the Spirit of God." The Spirit meant in both cases must be the same, and must be one in which believers can participate. But in ch. viii. beyond all question "the Spirit" denotes "the Spirit of God," not the renewed and quickened *spirit of man*. The Spirit, consequently, intended in Rom. i. 4, "according to which Christ is constituted the Son of God with power," is that Holy Spirit "of God" (viii. 9) which can be communicated to all that are Christ's, by which they are begotten anew, as Christ by the power of the Father, comp. Psalm ii. 7, and enter on a new and endless life. It does not designate Christ's original Divine nature, which is incommunicable, nor even *directly* His glorified humanity, but denotes the Spirit by which God

have had existence, unless He had been truly and originally the Son of God from all eternity, is no objection to the distinction here drawn, no more than that He could not have become the God-man, unless He had been originally God, forms any objection to the distinction made between His incarnate and pre-existent states.

“glorified his Son Jesus” Acts iii. 13, “*the Spirit of Him* that raised up Jesus from the dead” (Rom. viii. 11), by which Spirit if it “dwell in you” that believe, “He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by *His Spirit* that dwelleth in you.” This is in exact accordance with the usual representations of Scripture with regard to the God-man, that in all things He was made like unto His brethren, that He might be an example and encouragement to all that are His. As *man*, it was not through His own Divine power or Spirit, but through the *Spirit of God*, asked and received from His Father, that He did all things. Through “the *Spirit* descending and remaining on him” (John i. 33), [so that henceforth He was “full of the *Holy Ghost*” (Luke iv. 1)] He wrought “miracles, wonders, and signs” (Acts ii. 22); being “anointed with the *Holy Ghost* and with power, He healed all that were oppressed of the devil” (Acts x. 38); He cast out devils by the *Spirit of God*” (Mat. xii. 28); through the *Eternal Spirit* He “offered himself without spot to God,” Heb. ix. 14; and, finally, He was “raised up from the dead” by the same *Spirit* (Rom. viii. 11), and so “made a quickening Spirit” unto others (1 Cor. xv. 45), having “received of the Father the promise of the *Holy Ghost*,” that He might “shed it forth” abundantly upon all, Acts ii. 33.

But, it is urged, we must adhere strictly to the precise antithesis between “according to the flesh” and “according to the Spirit,” and as the former evidently refers to the *human nature* of Christ, the latter by the exigencies of language and grammar must designate the *holy Divine nature of Christ himself*,—not the Holy Spirit.

To this we beg to reply :

1. Great caution is required in the application to Scripture of some of those rules which are considered binding on our Western writers. The very prevalence of parallelism in Scripture and the habit of tracing comparisons and contrasts which this produced, permitted a greater freedom of departure at times from the precise parallel, to mark by the very deviation finer shades of meaning which might have escaped those not

habituated to this mode of composition. Instances in this epistle are:

v. 12. By one man
 Sin entered into the world,
 And death by sin;
 And so death passed upon all men
For that all have sinned.

instead of,—

And sin passed upon all men,—

as the strict parallelism would have required.

So vi. 23. For the wages of sin is death;
 But the *gift of God* is eternal life.

instead of “the wages (or reward) of righteousness.”

A still more apposite instance occurs in viii. 10, which will be noticed immediately.

But 2. The general usage of the New Testament is against the meaning alleged for “*the Spirit*,” when opposed to “the flesh.” In this antithesis, “the Spirit” generally denotes the Spirit of God, as the ruling and counteracting *principle* opposed to the *principle* of “the flesh,” as in Rom. viii. 9. “But ye are not in *the flesh*, but in *the Spirit*, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you.” It is *man’s spirit* indeed (in opposition to his *flesh*, or *body*), that is rendered *spiritual* by the indwelling and renewing of God’s Spirit. Still, instead of contrasting man’s spirit with his flesh or body, the Scripture, in order to ascribe the glory of the change to the true source, brings into prominence the agent by whom the spirit of man is quickened and spiritualized. This is strikingly exemplified in the instance to which we have referred above, in Rom. viii. 10 :

If Christ be in you,
 The body is *dead*, because of sin;
 But the spirit is *life*, because of righteousness.

Here *our* logical rules would require the contrasted line to have been,—

The body is *dead*, &c.,
 But the spirit is *quickened* (made alive), &c.

But there is a marked departure from the strict requisitions

of parallelism in order to show the source from whence the new life and nature are derived.

The reason why "the Spirit of holiness," πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, is used instead of "the Holy Spirit," πνεῦμα ἅγιον, may perhaps best be discovered by comparing the expression with the evidently contrasted one in Rom. viii. 3, ἐν ἰμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, "in the likeness of *the flesh of sin*," where "the flesh" corresponds to "the Spirit," and "sin" to "holiness" antithetically. In the verses before us (i. 3, 4) κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης refer evidently to Christ's two states of being. While in the flesh and its weakness, He was "in the likeness of the flesh of sin," and His appropriate work was to "give that flesh for the life of the world," John vi. 51, "crucifying therein our old man," Rom. vi. 6, and (as He came περὶ ἁμαρτίας) "condemning sin in the flesh," Rom. viii. 3. "The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified, John vii. 39, xvi. 7. When raised from the dead and "constituted the Son of God with power," His new state of being becomes no longer ἐν ἰμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, but κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, in which He has no more to do with sin, having "died to sin once for all," Rom. vi. 10 (compare Heb. ix. 28 and Rom. viii. 3). *Holiness* is now the distinguishing characteristic of the state of glory on which He has entered, and this it is His great work to impart to His followers, now that He has "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost to shed it forth" abundantly as "*the Spirit of holiness*." The desire to suggest this assimilation to Himself in holiness of those in union with the glorified Saviour, by the communication of the Spirit, occasioned probably the change from the usual denomination, πνεῦμα ἅγιον, *Holy Spirit*, (which would have failed to suggest it) into πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, "Spirit of *holiness*," i.e., whose essential character is holiness, or to make holy—in the same manner as "the flesh of sin" means the flesh, whose character is sin, or to incite to sin.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.

CHAPTER I. 16, 17.

The most important expression in the Epistle to the Romans is *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, "the Righteousness of God." To the investigation of its meaning and the cognate expressions, a separate dissertation has been devoted. It may be of advantage, however, to state at the outset the results to which the investigation leads. These are, that far too limited a signification has been assigned to this term, and that all the three meanings of the term found in Scripture are intended to be combined in the revelation of "the Righteousness of God," which makes it "the Power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The three meanings are—

1. God's *retributive* Righteousness or justice (now manifested in God's condemnation of sin, shown in giving His Son to die for man's sin on the cross—to induce thereby the believer to concur cordially in its condemnation in himself);

2. God's *justifying* Righteousness (now manifested in Christ's exhibiting in the character of man a perfect righteousness—imputable to, and appropriable by, the believer, for his pardon and acceptance with God);

3. God's *sanctifying* Righteousness (also manifested in Christ as "the Lord our Righteousness," changing the believer's heart the moment he is united by faith to Christ, and progressively mortifying within him all sin, and imparting eventually to him universal righteousness—appropriable in like manner through faith by the believer.)

The majority of Commentators have restricted the meaning here to God's *justifying* Righteousness, some even going so far as to translate *δικαιοσύνη* generally by "justification," or God's "method of justification." Nearly every expression, however, in these two verses, 16 and 17, where the phrase first occurs, points to more than mere *justification* of the believer.

1. The Gospel is called the "*power* (*δύναμις*) of God unto sal-

vation." Now the power of the Saviour implies an act, an efficiency. All His *δυνάμεις* were *acts* of healing, not merely *declaring* whole. Compare Mark v. 30, "knowing in himself that *virtue* (*δύναμιν*, power to heal) had gone out of him." Mark vi. 14, "Therefore mighty works (*αἱ δυνάμεις*) do show forth themselves (*ἐνεργοῦσιν*, *work*, shew themselves *operative*, *effective*) in him." Power,* properly speaking, is not required to justify, or merely *declare* righteous; that for which power is needed is to *make* righteous, to "sanctify and save," and (viii. 2, 3) to "condemn sin [and death] to extinction in the flesh." But, to remove all doubts of his meaning, the apostle cites from Habakkuk, for the text as it were on which he was to descant, "The righteous shall live by faith." It is a life-giving power by which "the righteous *lives*," not a mere sentence by which he is *pronounced* righteous.

2. "Unto salvation," *εἰς σωτηρίαν*. Salvation implies more than merely *declaring* safe. Christ was called Ἰησοῦς = ὁ σωτήρ, the Saviour, because "He shall save His people from their *sins*" (Matt. i. 21), that is, not merely from the guilt and punishment of sin, but from sin itself, from its pollution and power. St Paul, in Rom. v. 9, 10, expressly distinguishes being "*saved*," as the completed deliverance of the believer, from the initiatory step of being "*justified*" and "*reconciled*."

3. To the "salvation" of v. 16, or rather to "the power of God unto salvation" in v. 16, is plainly equivalent, in v. 17, "the righteousness of God," which therefore must include righteousness *imparted* as well as *imputed*.

4. The restricted signification usually assigned to the phrase, "the righteousness of God," could only have arisen from overlooking the marked antithesis of the two *revelations* ("is revealed") in ver. 17 and 18, and neglecting to observe that "the righteousness of God" in the one is declared to be a full remedy for the "unrighteousness of men" which calls forth the wrath of God in the other. The former must be commensurate with the latter. If "*all* unrighteousness of men" entails God's "wrath," the "righteousness of God" revealed as "th

* "*Power to forgive sins*" is not *δύναμιν*, but *ἐξουσίαν*, Mat. ix. 6; Mark i. 10; Luke v. 24.

power of God" that is to avail for salvation, must include the extinction of all unrighteousness. It cannot be restricted to the idea of imputation alone, and mere justification of the sinner, but must be meant to include his sanctification also, crucifying even now, and ensuring the full and final destruction of the old man with all his "ungodliness and unrighteousness," so that at the last, if he is to be "saved from wrath," v. 9, he shall be presented wholly "faultless before the presence of God's glory," Jude 24.

Imputed "righteousness" would be a sufficient counterpoise for the *imputed* "unrighteousness of men," were this all that was in question, from consideration of their connection with their first parent Adam. But no allusion is here made, as in ch. v., to this connection; on the contrary, the whole of the argument in i. 18-31 is directed to show that the Gentile world had *personally* been guilty of the unrighteousness described, summing up the whole with asserting their consciousness of the righteousness of the judgment of God impending over them for having "*committed* such things;" and ch. ii. (17-24 especially) brings the same charge against the Jews, of *actual, personal* sin. Unless, therefore, we would make St Paul to have proposed a glaringly inadequate remedy for the evil he so feelingly depicts, we must consider the righteousness of God in i. 17 to include an impartable as well as imputable righteousness, so thoroughly to be communicated and inwrought in the believer, that no speck of unrighteousness, when the final judgment comes, must remain, since "the wrath of God is revealed against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men."

But besides these two meanings, or views, of "the Righteousness of God," the references in the context just mentioned to "the *righteous* sentence of God" (*δικαίωμα*, i. 32) in the case of the Gentiles, and "revelation of the *righteous* judgment of God" (*δικαιοκρισία*, ii. 5) in the case of the Jews, show that the Apostle, in the "revelation of the Righteousness of God" in i. 17 had in view God's *attribute* of *retributive* Righteousness also, or *justice*, as exhibited and vindicated in the Gospel. This, however, is put beyond doubt in

the next passage, in which he enlarges on "the Righteousness of God" as "now manifested," iii. 21-26, in the Gospel; where he states that it exhibits God as *just*, while "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Again, in ch. iii. 5, "But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God," "the Righteousness of God" beyond all doubt refers to God's own attribute of Righteousness (here = faithfulness to the declarations of His word).

How then are all these three meanings of the Righteousness of God (1, as His personal attribute; 2, as imputed; and 3, as imparted, to the believer) to be fully reconciled? By rising, we reply, to the largeness of the Apostle's conception and corresponding language, and perceiving that it is *God's own Righteousness* which is now revealed by the gospel, as being brought into contact with man, and rendered capable of communication to him that he may become a "partaker of the Divine nature," 2 Pet. i. 4; which, while God pronounces the believer to be righteous, yet evinces that He Himself is righteous by the awful penalty which He exacted for sin in the atoning death of His own Son; a righteousness which, while it is imputed by the gracious sentence of God to those who hitherto have been ungodly and confessed sinners, will yet prove the truth of God's sentence by its immediate implantation in the heart, and by the progressive but ultimately perfect renewal of his whole nature in holiness. It is, in fine, *God's own* righteousness (for there is none other*) which, being gloriously manifested in all its fulness and extent in the incarnation, life, and death of His blessed Son, is communicated to all who become united with Christ by faith, and ingrafted into Him as branches into the living vine, so that all that is His becomes theirs. *Legally* regarded, His righteousness is their justification; *morally* regarded, their sanctification. These

* "There is none good but one, that is God," Mat. xix. 17. This seems to be one reason why the expression almost universally used in Scripture is "the righteousness of God" (once only "the righteousness of Christ," 2 Pet. i. 1, if it be an exception, see Dean Alford *in loc.*), to remind us that there is but *one* righteousness. It is by Him in whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" that believers are rendered righteous, and "made partakers of the Divine nature." He is one with God, and therefore "the Lord our Righteousness."

two can never be separated in fact, however necessary or useful it may be to distinguish them in thought. They are but two aspects of one and the same thing—of Christ in union with the believer, received and appropriated by faith as “the Lord our Righteousness,” “that we may be made the righteousness of God in Him,” 2 Cor. v. 21. Regarded as *in Him*, as branches in the living vine, and become members of His body, we are *declared righteous*, or justified, as being part of Him, the Righteous One. But if we are *in Christ*, Christ is *in us* (comp. Rom. viii. 1, and 10), as the life of the vine is in the ingrafted branch, and has changed the whole current of our thoughts, feelings, and life, His Spirit animating us as the Lord our Righteousness or Sanctification.

For the clear perception of the truth with regard to justification, it is of great importance to see that it is to Christ alone received into the heart by faith, as *He is in Himself*, and *will finally make us*, that regard is to be had in our justification, not to what He *has already made us*, or will, so long as we are in this world, make us; the righteousness which He imparts to us while here below being still defiled and imperfect through an admixture of the evil derived from our old man, and therefore incapable of justifying.

But while this distinction between justification and sanctification is most important, and worthy of all the labour bestowed upon it by our Reformers to clear it from every obscurity, we must still carefully guard against the *exclusively* forensic use of this phrase—“the righteousness of God”—as tending to foster error on the opposite side. Justification has in some minds come to be regarded as a sort of merely legal sentence pronounced by God as it were *outside* of the sinner, and which might for a time at least have no corresponding *inward* reality; as somewhat similar to the sentence of an earthly judge which might absolve a criminal, and yet leave him in heart the same man it found him. No word of God is thus false and imperfect like the vain words of mortals. As pronounced by God, justification is a *creative* word. “He saith and it is done.” When He pronounces righteous, He makes righteous,* not in

* “When God doth justify the ungodly on the account of the righteousness

entire immediate reality, but in certain prospect ; not entirely, we say, if we regard the whole *complex nature* of the old and new man, since the old man, though slain, still lingers on for a time, but perfectly in the *new man* then born, who “cannot sin because he is born of God” (1 John iii. 9). But even regarding the complex nature, the moment God justifies or declares righteous the great change is begun. The man has passed from death unto life. The prevailing bias of his whole nature is reversed. The heart is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness. That germ of righteousness is immediately implanted, in all its completeness and integrity of parts, which will hereafter expand in due and orderly development, “first the blade, then the ear, and finally the full corn in the ear.” Christ is received into the heart as a *whole*, “the Lord our righteousness,” for justification not alone, but for sanctification also.*

So inveterate, however, has the more restricted meaning of the expression “the righteousness of God,” especially in this epistle, become in the minds of the Christian world, and so mixed up with doctrinal considerations, that it seems necessary to enter into a full examination of the whole subject in order to remove the mystifications that have gathered around it.

Let us, therefore, now proceed to a more extended investigation of *δικαιοσύνη*, righteousness, and the cognate words.

DISSERTATION ON *δικαιοσύνη*, RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND ITS COGNATES.

1. The primitive is *δίκη*; and without entering into the question whether originally it referred to the law of *usage*, or

imputed unto him, He doth at the same instant by the power of His grace make him *inherently and subjectively* righteous or holy.—Owen on Justification, vol. V., page 127, Goold's edition.

* It is important for the elucidation of other expressions in this epistle (“the love of God,” “the glory of God,”) to observe that in all three meanings of “righteousness,” even when it refers to the believer as righteousness *imputed* and righteousness *imparted*, it is still called “the righteousness of God” (that is, *God's* righteousness in a possessive sense), as indicating that even when it becomes ours it is still originally and truly God's, an emanation from the alone Source of all righteousness.

to the law of *right*, it is undoubted that subsequently its common acceptance, like the corresponding term קָרָן in Hebrew, was *right, justice*, what the law prescribes, or conformity to law. Hence—

2. $\Delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, *righteous*, denotes one who is in conformity with the law.

God is $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, because He always is, and acts, in conformity with His own law.

Man is $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, when he is in, or is brought into, conformity with God's law.

3. $\Delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}$, *to put right with the law, to justify, declare just or righteous*; never in Scripture to *make* righteous, as Owen has clearly proved (see *Treatise on Justification*, vol. v., pp. 126-136).

The Romanist signification, and the doctrine founded upon it, have no foundation in the scriptural usage of the word. Still, there is an implication in the term "justify," when it is *God* that is said to justify, that it does not possess when it is man that justifies, which gives some plausibility to the Romish error, and which has not received sufficient attention from Protestant interpreters. When God justifies, or declares a man righteous, it must be implied that he *is*, in some sense, *righteous*. We cannot suppose God, by a mere legal fiction, declaring any one righteous, unless there be a foundation, in *fact*, for the declaration. An earthly judge may, because he may be deceived; and at best, when he justifies, he declares but that which already is, that the man is just or innocent who has been brought before his tribunal. His word is powerless to make any internal change upon the man. Not so with God; His words are not like man's, vain and ineffectual. With God word and deed are one. When He speaks, it is done. In His mouth $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}$ is a *creative* word. He declares the believer righteous, and he is righteous—*potentially*. What God declares is virtually as good as done, though not now perfectly, not even during the whole of the believer's life here below, yet eventually he shall be made altogether righteous, as certainly as if the change had been instantaneously completed. *Actually* a fundamental change has already

passed upon him. He is changed from the love of sin to the love of holiness; from making his own will and pleasure his presiding aim, to making God's will his supreme will. *Potentially*, he is "become a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new," 2 Cor. v. 7. The power to resist evil, and the guarantee that he shall become finally and fully triumphant over it, and be purified from every stain of sin, have been given to him. The old man has been crucified within him; a new man has been created who "cannot sin, because he is born of God," 1 John iii. 9.

When Christ said to the leper, "Be thou clean, he became instantly clean, not merely outwardly and ceremonially, but inwardly in his body, whether the change was immediately visible to the beholder or not. When the woman touched the hem of Christ's garment, instantly the issue of her blood was stanch'd. When Jesus spit on the blind man's eyes and put His hand upon them, though he saw as yet but imperfectly men as trees walking, his perfect cure was already pledged and insured to him, Mark viii. 23-25. So soon as the believer is united to Christ by faith and made a member of His body, he is "in Christ" (Rom. viii. 1), and "Christ is in him," v. 10. Ingrafted into the living vine, the branch which was fast decaying and would soon have died, immediately that the union takes effect, receives fresh vigour and life, so that now it may be pronounced a sound and healthy branch, as forming part of the healthy tree. As therefore through our union with Adam, it is said, "by the disobedience of the one man the many were *made* sinners" (Rom. v. 19), that is, not merely *imputatively*, but *actually* and *inherently* sinful (ver. 19 being the resumption of the statement in ver. 12, "As by one man sin [as a ruling, pervading principle] entered into, and passed through to all")—so through our union with Christ "by the obedience of the one shall the many be *made* righteous," that is, not merely *imputatively*, but *actually* and *inherently* righteous, it being implied that Christ's righteousness is communicated to them in order to a full impartation finally.

This view, be it carefully observed, in no way interferes with the great Protestant doctrine contended for so earnestly at the

Reformation, that the justification of the believer is an act of pardon and acceptance passed at once upon the sinner, immediately on his believing, with a reference to the perfect righteousness of Christ alone *imputed* to him, and not to the measure of righteousness at first *infused*—which being imperfect even throughout the whole of the Christian's life on earth, since the remains of the old man are still found in him, could never justify in the sight of the heart-searching God. This we strenuously maintain. It is as regarded only *in Christ Jesus*, (and not at all in respect to what the man is in himself, or has been made even by the grace of God,*) that God justifies the believer, having respect solely to the perfect righteousness exhibited by Christ in human nature.

What we contend for is a fuller meaning to be attached to the word "justify" or *pronounce righteous*, when spoken of God, than is generally assigned to it, viz., that Christ is in justification to be regarded and reckoned as the source of *righteousness* in the full extent of the word's signification, that is, of perfect and unqualified exemption not only from the *guilt*, but eventually from the *power* of sin. Christ's righteousness is reckoned to the believer as the certain means of removing not the *condemnation* alone that rests upon him for sin, but the ground of that condemnation, *sin* itself, and of communicating to him its opposite, righteousness. *Reckoned*, observe, we have said. The true distinction between justification and sanctification is thus fully maintained, that justification is but an *imputation*† or *reckoning* of that which is not

* This is the very argument of Rom. vii. 13-25. See the Notes on the passage.

† It will be evident that thus an equally extended signification must be given to the word "imputation" also. As usually stated, it is with a view to the *pardon* of sin alone and acceptance of his person, that Christ's righteousness is said to be imputed to the believer, thus giving some colour to the objection that it is by a mere legal fiction that God justifies, or declares righteous. Whereas if it were distinctly stated and recognized that *all* that Christ has done is imputed to the believer as his in certain prospect, immediately on his acceptance of the Saviour, that is, is reckoned in the eye of God and of faith, to be of as certain attainment as if already his in full possession, so that Christ is his for *sanctification* as well as for *justification*, much of the offence taken against this doctrine would be removed.

the believer's own, but belongs to another, whereas sanctification is its *impartation*.

This view, it will be seen, explains a difficulty which must have often struck reflecting minds. With what propriety can God be said to "justify the ungodly"—that is, to declare righteous, those who yet fall far short of being *righteous*? Rom. iv. 17, (we believe), supplies the answer. God, who sees the end from the beginning, declares not that which immediately *fully* is, but that which shall be. The believer is righteous "before (*κατέναντι* in the sight of) Him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not, as though they were." * And as God reckons, so are we also enjoined with assured faith to reckon ourselves: "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin*, but *alive unto God*, through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vi. 14. The man whose eyes Jesus had touched could have said at once, "Whereas I was blind, now I see," though at first his vision was indistinct, and he saw "men but as trees walking." He had passed from darkness to light, and his perfect cure was assured the moment the Saviour touched him. Justification and sanctification are thus indissolubly connected by the Scriptural representation, though clearly distinguishable. God's *declaring* righteous implies also necessarily His *making* righteous or holy eventually.

It is by looking too exclusively either to the *legal* view, or to the *moral* view, and attempting to tie down the words of Scripture to one unvarying technical meaning, that any difficulty has been found in entering into the more enlarged and comprehensive views which it aims to inculcate, by using what appears almost contradictory language at different times, in order to guard both sides of the truth. Sometimes the result of God's creative word that justifies and regenerates is alone regarded, and it is said of the believer (looking only to the *new man* formed in him), "Whosoever is born of God *doth not commit sin*: for His seed remaineth in him; and he *cannot*

* Saying (in the instance to which St Paul refers) unto Abraham, when as yet he had no child, "I have made thee a father of many nations."

sin, because he is born of God" (1 John iii. 9). But in order to guard against misunderstanding, the same apostle says elsewhere, "If we say that *we have no sin*, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8). If St. Paul has said, Rom. vi. 2, 11, that the believer is "dead to sin," he yet reminds us, ch. vii. 13-25, that the remains of sin still "dwell within him," ver. 17, 20, necessitating thereby a continual conflict, and causing the performance to fall so miserably short of his highest aspirations after holiness, as to extort from him the exclamation, "O wretched man that I am!" Had this practice of the Scriptural writers been kept in view, there would not have been the difficulty found by many, in seeing how one and the same person, Paul, in the character of a *regenerate* person, as he looked on this side or on that,—could (in Rom. vii. 13-25) depict so feelingly his shortcomings through sin, earnestly panting for the full deliverance from its power (which he foresaw "through Jesus Christ" (ver. 25), but to be accomplished only with his deliverance "from this body of death")—and yet turning so immediately to the other side of the picture, could exultingly realize through faith, as if already attained, that "the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (viii. 2).

4. Δικαίωσις, the act of declaring righteous or justifying, justification, Rom. iv. 25, v. 18.

5. Δικαίωμα = τὸ δεδικαιωμένον, that which is judicially *declared to be righteous*;

(1.) either, *to be done*, *i.e.*, a righteous requirement, or ordinance, as Rom. ii. 26, Luke i. 6,

(2.) or, *when done*, *i.e.*, a righteous act, as Rom. v. 18, Rev. xix. 8. Or again,

(3.) a *righteous sentence*, either of condemnation, as Rom. i. 32,

(4.) or of acquittal, as Rom. v. 16.

6. Δικαιοσύνη, *righteousness*, the abstract noun formed from the adjective (like most nouns of this termination, σωφροσύνη, *sobriety*, "the character or conduct of the σώφρων," Liddell and Scott's Lexicon; ἀγαθωσύνη, *goodness*; γηθοσύνη, *gladness*; μεθρημοσύνη, *remissness*, &c.) expresses the *quality* or *character* of one who is δίκαιος, *i.e.* his CONFORMITY TO LAW.

In the word itself there is nothing to limit its meaning to a mere *outward* and *declared* CONFORMITY TO LAW; on the contrary, it rather suggests an *internal* disposition of the mind. There is a strong presumption, therefore, against the limitation of *δικαιοσύνη*, *righteousness*, to the meaning which some would assign to it in St. Paul's writings, of a righteousness merely *imputed*.

Δικαιοσύνη from its very composition can never mean directly *justification*, = *δικαίωσις* (as Moses Stuart, Dr. J. Brown, &c); wherever it appears to do so as in 2 Cor. iii. 9, where "the ministration of righteousness" is opposed to "the ministration of condemnation," it is either by ellipsis, the word "imputed" having to be supplied, or by metonymy; *δικαιοσύνη* here in the Greek no more directly signifies *δικαίωσις*, than "righteousness" in the authorized version is exactly equivalent to "justification."

II. If we examine the ideas which the Old Testament had prepared its readers to attach to this expression, we cannot restrict its meaning merely to that righteousness which justifies from being imputed, but must include also that which being sent down from heaven and communicated to men by the Lord "shall set us in the way of his steps" (Ps. lxxxv. 13), and *make* us to be inwardly righteous, or IN CONFORMITY WITH HIS LAW.

St. Paul has, in Romans i. 16, 17, styled the gospel "the power of God unto *salvation*," because "therein is revealed the *righteousness* of God." By this combination of "salvation" with "righteousness" he evidently means to refer us to Isaiah's favourite parallelism of these two terms,* and to lead us to deduce from thence the true meaning of righteousness. To see the import, therefore, of the term in Isaiah let us quote a few instances out of many.

* See Isaiah xlv. 8, xlvi. 13, li. 5, 6, 8, lix. 16, 17, lxi. 10, lxii. 1, &c. More immediately, however, the words of St. Paul in Rom. i. 16, 17, are borrowed from Ps. xviii., which, with the connected series of psalms, is, as Hengstenberg says, "the lyrical echo of the prophetic announcements of the second part of Isaiah" (compare especially Ps. xviii. 3 with Isa. lii. 10, where the very identical words are repeated). The recurrence in the epistle of the three principal expressions of ver. 2 of the psalm place the reference to it by St. Paul beyond

Hearken unto me, ye stouthearted,
 That are far from *righteousness* :
 I bring near *my righteousness* ; it shall not be far off,
 And *my salvation* shall not tarry :
 And I will give *salvation* in Zion,
 To Israel my glory. Isaiah xlvi. 12, 13.

Here God's *righteousness* and God's *salvation* are synonymous, and His righteousness is a remedy for the unrighteousness of men—for "the stouthearted that are far from righteousness ;" sufficient, therefore, to break their stout hearts, as well as to release from punishment.

Drop down, ye heavens, from above,
 And let the skies pour down *righteousness* :
 Let the earth open, and let them bring forth *salvation*,
 And let *righteousness* spring up together ;
 I the LORD have created it. Isaiah xlv. 8.

Here again righteousness is described as a blessing to be sent down from heaven by the Lord, that it may spring up and bear its harvest on the earth ; a righteousness, therefore, not merely to be *outwardly* attributed to men, but *inwardly* to be received into their hearts and to bear fruit.

For Zion's sake will I not hold my peace,
 And for Jerusalem's sake I will not rest,
 Until the *righteousness* thereof go forth as brightness,
 And the *salvation* thereof as a lamp that burneth.
 And the Gentiles shall see thy *righteousness*,
 And all kings thy glory. Isaiah lxii. 1, 2.

The righteousness to be given to God's Zion is a righteousness that can be *seen*, infusing its *character* into all her true members, so as to make them *righteous*. Thus—

doubt. "The Lord hath made known his *salvation* ; his *righteousness* hath he *revealed* (see *margin*, ἀπεκάλυψε in Septuagint) in the sight of the heathen."

That "righteousness" is not here restricted to the idea of *justification* is evident from the concluding verse of the psalm :

Before the Lord ; for he cometh to judge the earth ;
 With *righteousness* shall he judge the world,
 And the people with *equity*.

I will also make thy officers peace,
 And thine exactors *righteousness*. Isaiah lx. 17.
 Thy people also shall be all *righteous*. lx. 21.
 That they might be called trees of *righteousness*,
 The planting of the LORD, that he might be glorified. lxi. 3.

But, indeed, we have but to look back to the opening of the book of revelation to be assured what must be the expected *salvation* promised by the evangelical prophet to fallen man. *Sin* was the great evil brought on man at his fall, and which "entered into the world" through Adam's first transgression; *righteousness*, therefore is the alone salvation that can avail to fallen man, not a mere *external, legal justification*, but the restoration of an *internal, moral state of conformity* to God's holy law.

III. In Rom. i. 17, accordingly, this meaning of righteousness seems certainly to be included, viz., as *sanctifying*, as well as *justifying* the believer. Without this the "salvation" would be incomplete. The gospel being called "the *power* of God unto salvation" points more to the efficacious supernatural change produced upon the will and heart of the sinner, requiring the exercise of divine *power*, than to the mere *sentence* of justification or *declaration* of righteousness.

The comparison of verses 17 and 18 strongly confirms this. The "*righteousness of God*" in the one is evidently contrasted with and proposed as a full remedy for the "*unrighteousness of men*" in the other, which it can effectually be, only if *imparted*, as well as *imputed*.

IV. But this passage, when closely examined, will oblige us to take a still more enlarged view of the meaning of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, and to include in it God's personal attribute of righteousness or justice, in other words, God's judicial righteousness in its *condemning*, as well as *justifying* aspect.

Let us compare ver. 17 and 18.

- v. 17. Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται,
 "For therein is the righteousness of God being revealed," &c.
 v. 18. Ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ Θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ,
 "For the wrath of God is being revealed from heaven," &c.

There is a manifest parallelism between these two verses.

In both there is a *revelation* announced as in the course of being made (*ἀποκαλύπτειται* is the Present of *Imperfect* or *continuing* action).

In ver. 17 the revelation is of the "Righteousness of God," as being "the power of God" to save men from their sins, or as a counteractive against the unrighteousness of men. In ver. 18 the revelation is of "the wrath of God," to deter men from their sins, or as a counteractive against the unrighteousness of men.—The apostle evidently means to place "the Righteousness of God," in ver. 17, in opposition "against the unrighteousness of men," in ver. 18. In ver. 18 again, "the wrath of God" is expressly said to be "against the unrighteousness of men." The one must therefore be the equivalent of the other. The "wrath of God" must be only another name for the "Righteousness of God" on its severer side.

The connection of thought seems to be this. St. Paul in ver. 17 had just announced the grand subject of the Gospel—the revelation of a "Righteousness of God" unto salvation as freely offered to Faith (and not to works). Aware of the objection that would immediately occur, to a Jew especially, that this view of God's Righteousness as a free gift encouraged to sin, (comp. vi. 1 and 15) as being inconsistent with God's sin-condemning Righteousness, he immediately adds, ver. 18, that side by side with the revelation of this saving Righteousness, there is being revealed by the same Gospel, still more decidedly than ever, and as the strongest inducement to accept it, God's judicial Righteousness, nay "wrath against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men."*

This wrath, it is added, is being revealed "*from heaven*"—not only as of old to the Jews, when, at the giving of the Law, God "came down upon Mount Sinai and spake with them *from heaven*," (Neh. ix. 13; Deut. iv. 36), but now even

* Exactly as in Rom. iii. 21-26, after setting forth the saving "Righteousness of God without the Law" as now manifested, Paul is careful to add that it is accompanied with the "declaration of His (judicial) Righteousness on account of the passing by of sins," in order to show that He is "righteous (just) even when declaring righteous (justifying) him which believeth in Jesus."

more clearly and pointedly in the Gospel, by God's own Son coming down from heaven to condemn sin, by Himself dying as an atoning sacrifice for it, and by the announcement of an approaching second coming, "when the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed from heaven*. . . . taking vengeance on them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thess. i. 7, 8.

That this parallelism between the two verses is intended by St. Paul, and that he means to represent the "wrath of God"* as the other side of the "Righteousness of God," seems borne out by the Apostle in the subsequent context, when calling upon the Gentiles first, and then the Jews, to flee from

* The close relation of these two verses renders unnecessary the repetition of *ἐν αὐτῷ* after *ἀποκαλύπτεται* in ver. 18, to indicate that the revelation there referred to is also made by *the Gospel*, and thus takes away the force of the objection of Tholuck and others, who argue from the absence of *ἐν αὐτῷ*, that the "revelation" (*ἀποκαλύπτεται*) in v. 18 refers to the knowledge which the Gentiles by *the light of nature* possess of God's displeasure against sin. In opposition to this view, and in proof that reference is made to a *new* revelation, now introduced by the *Gospel*, observe

1. Ἀποκαλύπτω, to "reveal," generally, if not always, relates to a manifestation made by God through *extraordinary* means.

2. Compare "For the *wrath* of God is *revealed* from heaven against all ungodliness," &c., i. 18, with

"Treasur^est up unto thyself wrath against the day of *wrath*,
And *revelation* of the *righteous judgment* of God; ii. 6

In the day when God shall *judge* the secrets of men,
By Jesus Christ, according to *my gospel*. ii. 16; and

"When the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed from heaven*. . . .
taking vengeance on them that obey not *the gospel* of our
Lord Jesus Christ," 2 Thess. i. 7, 8.

The argumentative connexion of ver. 17 and 18 will thus be seen to be: (ver. 17), "The righteousness of God is now revealed in the Gospel as the power of God unto salvation," and urged upon you for acceptance by the consideration, that (ver. 18), "The wrath of God is being also revealed in it [as it never was before] against all ungodliness," &c. Unless accepted by you in its milder aspect, as now offered to you, rest assured that God's Righteousness will meet you hereafter on its severer side. It is equivalent to St. Paul's exhortation to the Athenians, Acts xvii. 30, 31, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at [from the want of a revelation of God's righteousness] but *now* commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will *judge the world in righteousness* by that man whom he hath ordained."

God's wrath, expressly calling it God's "*righteous sentence*," God's "*righteous judgment*." The Gentiles he exhorts to embrace the Gospel, and to flee from the wrath to come, as "knowing the *righteous sentence* (*τὸ δίκαιωμα*) of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death," ch. i. 32. The Jew again, to warn him that nothing in the Gospel that Paul preached interfered with the righteous wrath denounced in the Law against sin, he thus addresses, "Thou treasurest up unto thyself wrath in the day of wrath, and revelation of the *righteous judgment of God*" (*δικαιοκρισίας*) ii. 5. The evident reference in the expression "day of *wrath*, and *revelation of the righteous judgment of God*" to that in i. 18, "For the *wrath of God is revealed from heaven*" is so striking, as almost to *compel* us to identify "the wrath of God" with "the righteous judgment of God."

If this view be correct, it establishes a beautiful correspondence between the twofold aspect* of the Righteousness of God given in this passage with the similar twofold aspect enlarged upon in ch. iii. 21-26, when again the apostle returns to the same subject of the Righteousness of God. The two passages, viewed in connection, form an Introverted Parallelism,† by which the aspect of God's Righteousness designed to be especially prominent, (the *saving* aspect) is placed first and last :

"The RIGHTEOUSNESS of God," "revealed," i. 17 ; "manifested," iii. 21.

A. Saving aspect.	I. 17. "For therein is revealed the righteousness of God," &c.
{ B. Condemning aspect.	{ I. 18. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven," &c.
{ B. Condemning aspect.	{ III. 26. "that He might be just."
A. Saving aspect.	III. 26. "and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Let us now sum up the substance of what would seem to be implied in the "revelation of the righteousness of God" here

* Compare also the light which this throws on the more comprehensive meaning than that usually assigned of God's truth and faithfulness in ch. iii. 3, 4, as meaning that God is true to his *threatenings*, as well as to His *promises*.

† See Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, p. 35 ff.

announced as being made to us in the Gospel, according to the wide extent, and pregnant fulness of meaning which the comparison with other passages of Scripture leads us to attach to the expression. "I am not ashamed," says the Apostle, "of the Gospel of Christ," since "it is the power of God unto salvation. For therein is THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD revealed"—in all its marvellous fulness, richness, and glorious results, unfolding itself on all sides, and removing every obscurity that may heretofore have attached to it—as a righteousness of God, descending first from heaven to earth (Isaiah xlv. 8)—(in the person of His own Son, "*the Lord our Righteousness*")—then descending into earth, as "a corn of wheat falling into the ground and dying" (John xii. 24)—yet only that again "the earth might open and bring forth salvation, and let righteousness spring up together" (Isaiah xlv. 8), bearing a plentiful harvest, filling the whole earth, the very "mountains bringing peace to the people, and the little hills, by righteousness" (Psalm lxxii. 3); "a handful of corn" springing up even "upon the top of the mountains, the fruit thereof shaking like Lebanon" (ver. 16)—an "everlasting righteousness" to be communicated unto men of all nations, "whosoever will believe and accept it"—and that will bring all at last "in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," Eph. iv. 13.

This is its *saving*, redeeming aspect. But in order to its producing these blessed effects in believers, it must first be revealed to us in its *severer* aspect, as the avenging "wrath of God against all our ungodliness and unrighteousness." Before the believer can rejoice in it and receive it fully into his heart, as vivifying and fructifying his whole nature, he must accept it first in its condemning efficacy, as the righteous sentence of God against all his depravity.

This latter manifestation has been made, partially even to the Gentiles, by the light of natural conscience, and still more distinctly in the previous revelations of Himself made by God to His chosen people; but now, as with the light of a sunbeam, under the Gospel, in the awful revelation of God's righteousness, and condemnation of sin in the flesh, afforded in the

person of His own Son upon the cross, "made a curse for us," "wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities," when "the Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all" (Isaiah liii. 5, 6)—the full and final vindication, however, of God's righteousness, on this its sterner side, being reserved (should His present offers of mercy be despised) for the coming "day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Rom. ii. 5), "when the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed from heaven* (compare Rom. i. 18 "the wrath of God is being *revealed from heaven*") with His mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," (2 Thess. i. 7, 8.)

To assist and enable us to enter fully into this twofold aspect of God's righteousness, and to apply it to our own souls, it has been displayed to us and realized in the person of His incarnate Son. In His taking upon Him the likeness of man we behold a representation of our own nature, first in its fallen state, having the sentence of death executed upon it, and satisfying the righteous threatenings of God's law against sin; and then raised out of death by a glorious resurrection through the Spirit of God into a new and endless life of righteousness and glory, which Christ has power to impart unto all that are in union with Him.

This latter exhibition especially of God's righteousness the Gospel alone could effect. The law could but exhibit the righteousness of God in its *condemning* aspect, and that even but partially; but it could discover no release from this condemnation. But "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3); that, by Christ's offering a complete satisfaction to God's righteousness in its judicial aspect, in bearing its penalty as our representative—and by His enabling us cordially to subscribe to the just condemnation of our sin as represented in His death for us, by our dying with Him unto sin, and yielding this mortal body willingly to the grave as the appointed means of our cure—we may be prepared to receive

the righteousness of God in its *saving* character, as now communicated by Christ to all that are born again anew and risen with Him ; so “that the righteousness of the law [that is, which the law demanded, but could not impart] may now be fulfilled [fully accomplished] in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit,” Rom. viii. 4.

Ver. 17. “*From faith to faith.*” The meaning of these words has been much contested. To elucidate them, we observe

1. Ἐκ πίστεως “*from faith,*” according to St Paul’s usage, is to be joined in sense with δικαιοσύνη, sup. γινόμενη or πορευομένη, “*righteousness by faith.*” Comp. δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως Rom. ix. 30, ἣ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη, Rom. x. 6 ; and the similar cases in which ἐκ πίστεως is joined with δικαίω, as in Rom. iii. 30 ; v. 1 ; Gal. ii. 16 ; iii. 8.

2. Ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν “*from faith to faith*” evidently forms one phrase, not to be divided. The separation of the one clause from the other is unnatural, so as to join ἐκ πίστεως with δικαιοσύνη, and εἰς πίστιν “*to faith*” with ἀποκαλύπτεται.

This excludes the interpretation “*is revealed for faith,*” that is, “*in order to be believed*” (εἰς πίστιν = εἰς τὸ πιστεῦθ-ῆναι).

3. Taking “*from faith to faith*” as one phrase, and joining both clauses with “*righteousness,*” the meaning would seem to be a righteousness (as regards its reception by man) originating from faith, and terminating in faith, beginning and ending with faith, of which, as Bengel has said, faith is “*prova et puppis* ;” as marking that the salvation offered is all, from first to last, of faith, works having no part in it. On the human side, faith *apprehends* the salvation—faith *holds it fast* to the end. On the divine side, Jesus is “*the author,* and” Jesus is the “*finisher* of our faith.” Justification is all of faith ; sanctification is equally of faith in every step of its progress. Righteousness springs ἐκ πίστεως *out of* faith, as its root, εἰς πίστιν *unto* faith, as the full grown tree.

This is in strict accordance with the quotation from Habakkuk, “*The righteous shall live by faith.*” A *life* (continuous

not a mere passing state) is here implied, the vital principle of which is faith. Compare Gal. ii. 20, "The life which I now live in the flesh, *I live by the faith* of the Son of God."

4. Nor is this inconsistent with, but rather suggests, the idea of growth and progress which others have found in the words "from faith to faith," as in the similar expressions "from glory to glory," ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν (2 Cor. iii. 18); "They go from strength to strength," ἐκ δυνάμεως εἰς δύναμιν (Psalm lxxxiv. 7). Faith, if "as a grain of mustard seed" (Luke xvii. 6), small at first, must yet expand gradually into the blossom and fruit; life, though full and entire in the child as soon as he is born, must go on and develope itself into the vigour of youth, and the strength of manhood. That a growth in faith, appropriating ever more and more of the righteousness of God, is here designed, seems strongly confirmed by the tense of the verb ἀποκαλύπτεται, "*is being revealed*" marking a continuous progressive revelation (not ἀποκεκάλυπται, "*has been revealed*"*).

* The Bishop of Ossory, in the new edition of his admirable "Ten Sermons on the Nature and Effects of Faith," p. 519, explains ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν as meaning that the righteousness of God comes to the believer *by* faith as its channel, and is given *to* faith as its object, and considers this interpretation as almost demonstrably the correct one, from comparison with Rom. iii. 21, 22. The following expressions he regards as exactly synonymous with those placed opposite:—

Rom. i. 17.		Rom. iii. 21, 22.
δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ
ἀποκαλύπτεται		πεφανέρωται
ἐκ πίστεως		διὰ πίστεως
εἰς πίστιν		εἰς πάντας [καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας] τοὺς πίστεύοντας.

The parallelism of the two passages is undoubted; but that, contrary to all analogy, the parallels are *synonymous* merely, and *not gradual* (See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," p. 6), I hesitate to believe, more especially in St Paul, whose manner is not to repeat himself without any advance in his meaning.

‡ I believe the two passages therefore to be complementary of each other.

Thus ἀποκαλύπτεται marks the *subjective* revelation made to the *believer* alone ("it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth*; for therein *is being* revealed," viz., to him, &c.). Πεφανέρωται denotes the *objective* manifestation that *has been* made to *all*, and is proposed for their acceptance, whether they will believe, or whether they will forbear.

But it is objected, *e.g.*, by Moses Stuart, that this would be to represent “the *climactic* nature of the faith connected with justification” as a principal topic. “How can this well be imagined,” he asks, “by a considerate reader of the epistle?”

The failure to perceive this character of the epistle seems to be one of the prevailing errors hitherto in its interpretation. Hence the difficulty which almost all commentators have found in accepting the reading ἔχωμεν, which is that of the great majority of the best MSS., in Rom. v. 1, “*let us have peace with God,*” from not perceiving that one great object of the Apostle is to impress on the believer that he cannot remain stationary, and to urge him on from step to step, in order to prove the genuineness of his faith by continual progress. Having attained to the first step, “being justified by faith,” that is, declared righteous, “*let us have peace with God,*” which can only be maintained by having recourse ever anew to the righteousness of God in Christ, on every fresh shortcoming; and pressing on to the end, “*let us glory in hope of the glory of God,*” as our final consummation—a hope, however, only to be fully assured by successive steps, through the painful training of “tribulation working patience, and patience experience, and experience hope.” In ch. vi. St Paul exhorts believers that as there was a continual downward progress in their former sinful life, when they yielded their “members servants to uncleanness, and to *lawlessness unto lawlessness,*” τῆ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, even so now, with a similar upward progress, they should “yield their members servants to *righteousness unto sanctification,*” τῆ δικαιοσύνη εἰς ἀγιασμόν.

The tense of the former accordingly indicates the *progressive* revelation made to the conscience and heart of the believer (ἀποκαλύπτεται, “is being revealed,” present imperfect); the tense of the latter, a manifestation made *once for all* to the whole world (πεφανερώται, “has been manifested,” present perfect).

In i. 17 ἐκ πίστεως denotes the *source* from which the righteousness comes to man; διὰ πίστεως (iii. 22) the *channel*: so that combining these two expressions with εἰς πίστιν, St Paul declares that the reception of the righteousness of God by the believer is all throughout of faith, in its *beginning, middle, and end*.

In i. 17 ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν lays the emphasis on *faith*, as the alpha and omega of the Christian life; in iii. 22 εἰς πάντας [καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας] τοὺς πιστεύοντας, on the *universality* of the Gospel salvation as designed for all who will believe.

But it will be objected, how is the meaning thus put on the words "from faith to faith" consistent with the comprehensive signification assigned to the expression "the righteousness of God," as comprising the *condemning*, *justifying*, and *sanctifying* righteousness of God? Is justification a *progressive work*? Is it not "an *act* of God's free grace" perfected at once on the sinner's coming to Christ?

True, we reply, *objectively* considered, in God's mind; but by the believer to be realized ever anew, *subjectively*,* whenever the power of indwelling sin makes itself felt within him. On every fresh outbreak of sin, all the three views of God's righteousness must advance, *pari passu*, each with the other. On the sinner's first awakening, it was the view of God's *condemning* righteousness that aroused him to the danger of his state; for "Christ came to call not the righteous, but *sinner*s to repentance." The apprehension of God's *justifying* righteousness in Christ followed and comforted him. This was simultaneously accompanied by its transforming and *sanctifying* influence exerted on his heart.

A repetition of the same process takes place each time that sin renews its attack on the believer. With every fresh experience a deeper sense of sin's awful power and malignity intensifies his view of God's holiness, and *sin-aborring* righteousness. Anew, on every fresh relapse into sin, he must have recourse to the *justifying* righteousness of Christ as the only ground of peace and pardon; and with each new appropriation of that inexhaustible love and mercy that forgiveth *all* iniquities, however repeated and aggravated, fresh accessions of that love which is "the fulfilling of the law," will be called forth in the heart of the Christian, the Spirit thereby *sanctifying* and renewing daily more and more the inward man "after the image of God in righteousness and true holiness."

* The *subjective* view is of course the one alone applicable in connection with *faith*.

OBJECTIONS

TO THE THREEFOLD VIEW OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD,
BY THE AUTHOR OF "THE PAULINE RIGHTEOUS-
NESS OF FAITH."

So fundamentally important to the right understanding of the whole doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans is the proper interpretation of this expression, "the righteousness of God," that at the risk of being considered tedious we must vindicate the pregnancy of meaning, contended for above, by replying to the objections which may be brought against it.

These cannot be better or more ably put than they have been in an article on the "Pauline Doctrine of the Righteousness of Faith" in the January number for 1862 of the British and Foreign Evangelical Review by a learned friend, who will we hope excuse this allusion to his article, as we feel assured that his single desire is, like our own, not to maintain his own shade of opinion, but to elicit the truth as far as possible, and to clear it from all misapprehensions on the one side or the other.

I. "The righteousness of God" (it is argued) "here said to be revealed cannot be held to refer to the divine attribute of justice." "The righteousness of God of which we speak is in Scripture uniformly introduced as descriptive of an ethical relation on man's side and for man. The apparent connection between the statements, Rom. i. 17, and 18, that 'the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel,' and that 'the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness of man,' lends at first sight some faint colour or semblance to the idea that they are the same. But the two statements belong to two different economies, and imply that they who have no part in the 'righteousness of God' shall be visited with the revelation of his wrath. That mode of interpreting the phrase was overcome at the Reformation. We are told of Luther, that having long had a desire to understand the Epistle to the

Romans, the expression ‘the righteousness of God,’ understood by him to mean the divine attribute, baffled and deterred him at the threshold, and after long meditations, and spending days and nights in these thoughts, the nature of that righteousness which justifies us was discovered to him ; upon which he felt himself wholly born anew, and the whole of Scripture became quite a different thing. There can be in it, indeed, no allusion to the divine attribute of justice, inasmuch as the act is one of grace. The former acceptation would furnish the idea of an incensed God, which is the purport of the law ; not of a reconciling or justifying God, which is the essence of the gospel.”

So far, we reply, is this representation from being correct, or a full statement of the case, that unless the gospel-revelation had been to Luther a revelation of the *justice* or *retributive* righteousness of God, it would have proved no gospel to him. What, we ask, had brought the monk down on his knees into the dust of humiliation before his God, but the alarming view which he had got of God’s justice arrayed against him, leaving him no possible outlet for evasion or escape ? This, it will be said, was the work of the Law. True—and *there* the Law left him. But looking up to the cross of Christ, he beheld, as he had never seen it before, the *retributive* “righteousness of God” revealed in all its majesty and severity, but magnified, vindicated, satisfied—the penalty of death which it demanded of the sinner paid in the person of his substitute the Son of God dying “the just for the unjust.” Here, then, in the very manifestation thus made of God’s *justice*, he found the great barrier between him and his God removed. God could consistently pardon his sin, because His justice was satisfied, and the truth of His denunciations against all unrighteousness vindicated : sin was fully visited and condemned.

This is the first and *negative* side of justification. For its *positive* side, his acceptance “as righteous in the sight of God,” he must have a farther view of “the righteousness of God” in Christ. As he looked again to the Lamb of God, His crucifixion, he saw, was, in another point of view, the consumma-

tion of the obedience which He had unceasingly rendered to God's law, an “obedience even unto death.” The personal righteousness of his Representative was perfect, and in attestation thereof God raised Him from the dead (Rom. iv. 25); and this righteousness of Christ, with whom through union by faith he now became identified, he was entitled to claim as *his* righteousness, and thus his justification was complete.

Still, to complete his discovery of “the righteousness of God” in Christ, there was wanting the third view of it to Luther, as the power and gift of God for *sanctification*. This discovery was not distinctly made to him till a considerable time after he had been preaching with much power and success the *judicial* view in its twofold aspect, exhibiting God as *just* and at the same time the *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus. To many believers this third view long lies concealed, clouding their minds with doubts, and preventing them from attaining to full “joy and peace in believing.” The experience of Luther we will detail in the words of an American work,* which places in a clear light the intimate connection between justification and sanctification.

“One day, while studying Romans for a lecture to the students, the words of the prophet Habakkuk, as quoted by Paul, Rom. i. 17, ‘*The just shall live by faith,*’ struck their light through his soul. Here was the grand principle of life and righteousness. He saw it, grasped it, exulted in it, and began teaching it with all the force and fire of his eloquence and genius. There were, it is true, applications of this great principle which he was not yet prepared to see, or to make, both to the Church and to his own heart and life.

“But the *principle* of justification by faith was no longer a hidden one to him, and it infused a new life and a new power into his soul and his teachings. He applied it with sunbeam clearness to the forgiveness of sins. He saw how God could be just, and yet justify him that believeth in Jesus, however great his sins might be. Selected not long after to

* “The Higher Christian Life,” by Rev. W. E. Boardman, reprinted by Alex. Strahan & Co., Edinburgh.

represent seven convents in matters of importance between them and the Vicar-General, at the court of the Roman pontiff, he set off, led by the hand of God into Rome itself to witness with his own eyes and ears the blasphemous hollow-ness and putrid corruptions of the Church. On the way he was again taken ill, and again brought to look down into the grave and up to the judgment bar of God. His sins troubled him. The old Erfurth horror of darkness returned upon him. But in the midst of it the words of the prophet, 'The just shall live by faith,' came again to him with a new force, and filled him with the light of heaven. And yet again, while looking upon the ruins of ancient Rome, and almost overwhelmed with the conviction that the Rome which then was would one day be also in ruins, the holy city would pass away, lie in ashes, the same words came to his relief and comfort again, 'The just shall live by faith.' The Church shall live, though Rome should die. Christ lives, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church.

Luther had not yet learned to take the Lord Jesus for his sanctification. He had one process for the forgiveness of sins, that of faith, and another for the pursuit of holiness, that of works. He believed in Jesus, and trusted that for the sake of Jesus, who had died, and risen again for his justification, his sins were all forgiven. But he longed for a holy heart and a holy life, and sought them by *means*, not by *faith*. The truth that Jesus is *all* to the sinner, that in Jesus he has all if he takes Him for all, he had not yet perceived. Christ a propitiation he accepted, but Christ a sanctification he rejected. Strange, that having Christ, and believing in Him, and having in Him the foundation of holiness—indeed our own holiness, just as really and fully as He is our own sacrifice for sin—we should go about to work out, or seek for holiness of heart imparted to us from God aside from, not *in* Christ. Yet so it is. So it was with Luther. At Rome he performed all holy offices, and visited every sacred place, hungering and thirsting after righteousness. One day he sought to secure a special indulgence promised to all holy pilgrims who should climb Pilate's staircase, so called, on their knees. This

staircase was said to have been transported bodily by miracle, in the night, from Jerusalem to Rome. As Luther crept painfully from stone to stone upward, suddenly he heard, as he thought, a voice of thunder in the depths of his heart, 'The just shall *live* by faith.' These words had often before told him that the just are made alive by faith, but now they thundered through his soul the truth, that even so 'the just shall *live* (be kept alive) by faith.' By faith they shall be *kept* by the power of God; by faith they shall make progress onward and upward; by faith their sins shall be forgiven; and by faith their hearts and lives shall be made holy.

Ah! Well might the historian say of Luther that 'this was a creative word for the Reformer;' now he was freed from all false processes of salvation, and fully established in the true. Faith now, as the condition, and Jesus as the salvation, he saw was the whole. Full salvation was in Jesus, and Jesus was the soul's in full, through full trust in Him. When this word resounded in this new force through his soul, it is no wonder that Luther sprang to his feet upon the stone steps up which he had been crawling like a worm, horrified at himself, and struck with shame for the degradation to which superstition had debased him, and fled from the scene of his folly. Luther himself says—'Then I felt myself born again as a new man, and I entered by an open door into the very paradise of God. From that hour I saw the precious and holy Scriptures with new eyes. I went through the whole Bible. I collected a multitude of passages which taught me what the work of God was. Truly this text of St Paul was to me the very gate of heaven.'*''

* Boardman, pp. 12-14. Many Christians, it is to be feared, never get beyond Luther's first stage, having accepted the righteousness of Christ as their justification; but, failing to see that it is equally theirs for sanctification, wander about in the wilderness distracted by fears and doubts, and never enter into the land flowing with milk and honey offered by the promises of God. Boardman goes on to detail the similar experiences of Merle D'Aubigné and others, by which, long after their first conversion, they reached this to many second great stage and fresh starting-point in the Christian life, so momentous and remarkable, that he calls it by a very expressive though objectionable term (because liable to be misunderstood), a "second conversion." The limited

This threefold view of the "righteousness of God," as *condemning, justifying, and sanctifying* the believer, thus exemplified in the instance of Luther, is that which we claim for the expression in St Paul's Epistle to the Romans and as ever present to his mind, though sometimes one and sometimes another aspect may be made more prominent. Luther's original interpretation of the expression, "the righteousness of God," erred, only in being, like that against which we contend, too restricted; not in including His justice, but in excluding the other aspects of "the righteousness of God."

II. The view of "the righteousness of God" advocated by the writer in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* is that it "refers merely to an objective, external relation," pp. 195-200, and that it is "a complete, prepared, and perfect righteousness, objectively presented," "a substantive reality; not less a fact than sin, and not less productive of results than sin, but in the opposite direction;" the entrance of each into the world, "into humanity," being the "two great events in the history of the race and confronting each other." He insists much on (see p. 201) "the manifestation of this righteousness as an historic fact (*πεφανερωται*, Rom. iii. 21)," to "its coming into existence in the incarnation of Christ. The allusion [in Rom. iii. 21, 'Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested'] is not to the preaching of it, or to what he (St Paul) calls the revelation of it in the gospel* (Rom. i. 17), but to the bringing in of this righteousness, once for all, when Christ was 'manifest' in the flesh (1 Tim. iii. 16). And the

interpretation so long put upon the phrase, "the righteousness of God," and the argument of St Paul connected with it in this epistle, has tended in no small degree to obscure this great truth, and prevented many from seeing clearly the goal, and pressing on rejoicingly to perfection.

* This (as already remarked, see Note p. 122) we believe to be a mistaken view of the meaning of *ἀποκαλύπτεται* in Rom. i. 17, which refers not to the outward "preaching" of "the righteousness of God," but to that inward revelation which is made by the Spirit of God to the believer of this great truth in all its bearings, which is ever progressively advancing (= "is being revealed"), while the blessing itself is more fully appropriated by faith. *Πεφανερωται* (iii. 21) refers "to the bringing in of this righteousness once for all."

language used by the apostle shews that it is coincident with the person of Christ, and found in him. This is evident from the way in which he speaks of one of those terms which describe the one obedience of Christ in the manifoldness of its effects and benefits. When he says that the REDEMPTION is 'in Christ Jesus' (τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν χριστῷ ἰ.ε. τῆς οὔσης ἐν), the meaning is that it is found in his person; that he is personally the redemption, just as he is called 'our peace' (Eph. ii. 14); and is furthermore described as 'made of God unto us righteousness,' (1 Cor. i. 30). It does not denote that we have it in a state of union to his person, however true that is in itself, but that it is actually IN him; that he is himself that manifested righteousness, and will continue to be so while his living person endures. The Judge there sees our righteousness and our eternal redemption, whenever he looks upon the person of Christ."

The representation here made, that "the righteousness of God" refers merely to an objective, external relation, requires to be carefully guarded in order to prevent serious misapprehension.

1. The writer here assumes what has already been shown to be a mistake, that "the righteousness of God" refers to justification alone and not to sanctification also; otherwise he would not have pronounced it to be *exclusively objective*.

But 2. even in as far as justification is concerned, we must carefully note in what sense we are to regard "the righteousness of God" as objective only, and not subjective, lest we fall into the Roman Catholic error on the one hand, or the Morisonian on the other. It is objective *only*, and not subjective, in the sense that in as far as it is regarded as the ground and meritorious cause of justification, it is nothing of the believer's own, and is wholly irrespective of the amount of change of heart that it has produced in him. It is an objective, substantive righteousness of God that has been manifested in the sight of the whole universe. It is in a word "Christ" Himself, "the Lord our Righteousness," "God manifest in the flesh." It is to what Christ is *in Himself*, not to what He *makes us* that regard is had in justification.

But this righteousness of God is subjective, in the sense that, to be available for our justification, it must be received and appropriated as our own—as “Christ *in us*,” the hope of glory. This manifestation of the righteousness of God, so far as it is merely *objective*, has been made to all indiscriminately, to angels as well as to men, to unbelievers as well as to believers. This righteousness of God has been “seen of angels” with admiration, but is not offered to them for justification. It has been manifested objectively to all men, and is said to be εἰς πάντας (Rom. iii. 22), designed “for all,” but it is available for justification only to those who *subjectively* appropriate it. It may be clearly apprehended as an objective truth, external to us, by the mere intellect of the unregenerate man, and even eloquently descanted on and proposed by him to others; but it must be inwardly and subjectively accepted by the heart, in order to become *our* righteousness. Faith *in* Christ (*i.e.* reliant *trust* in Him) is not (as we are too apt to forget) a matter of the head, but of the heart. It is “with the *heart* that man believeth unto righteousness,” Rom. x. 10.

Christ (the reviewer states) “is himself that manifested righteousness. The Judge there sees our righteousness whenever he looks upon the person of Christ.”

God (we reply) sees in Christ, objectively considered, *a* righteousness which is proposed as the ground of justification to us and to the whole world, but He sees it not as *our* righteousness, till we appropriate Christ to ourselves by faith, and are thereby “brought into a state of union with his person.” It is the Christ *in us*, subjectively received, that forms our righteousness, not Christ objectively manifested *without us*. The very expression—“*justified by faith*,”—reminds us that both elements, the objective and the subjective, must be combined, and are necessary to constitute *our—justification*. “Justification is an act of God’s free grace,” *objective* merely, as regards any particular individual, till by a *subjective* act of faith he appropriates it to himself.

With this caution must be taken the statement that “it is not denoted that we have this righteousness *in a state of union to Christ’s person*, however true this is in itself.” This remark

is probably pointed against the view of Neander, Olshausen, Lipsius, &c., that "by the phrase 'the righteousness of God' is meant an *inward condition* of righteousness, on the ground of which, whether it is already perfect or not, God pronounces men righteous by a judicial sentence." That this is its intention would seem evident from the addition, "however true this is in itself." To this extent we cordially agree with it, in as far as it is designed to guard against justification being ascribed to any "*inward condition* of righteousness" or *change* produced on the believer, and not wholly to *the Christ* within him.

Still there seems to be an incorrectness calculated to mislead in the expression, that "it is not denoted that we have this righteousness *in a state of union to Christ's person*," even with the reservation "however true this is in itself." We have Christ, we have every blessing flowing from Him, only in a "state of union to His person." This is the central doctrine of the gospel, and of the Epistle to the Romans specially, that must never be lost out of sight. The only distinction that Scripture sanctions with regard to this union is that it has two aspects, which, though in fact they are inseparable and the one implies the other, may yet be logically distinguished, and be regarded separately—"We in Christ," and "Christ in us," (justification and sanctification).

As regarded *in Christ*, we form parts, "branches," "members" of Him, and all that belongs to Him is reckoned ours, or imputed to us. As united to Him we are "justified," "sanctified," "glorified" in Him; we are already "made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus," Eph. ii. 7. All is regarded as if already perfected, the moment the believer embraces Jesus by faith, and is united to Him. "Ye are complete in Him," Col. ii. 10.

But again as Christ is *in us*, the assimilation of our nature to His is but in progress; the juices of the new vine have but begun to circulate through the ingrafted branch; the new life has not yet wholly displaced the old. All is in a state of development only and incomplete.

Still we have all, whether imputed or imparted, from Christ, only through and “*in a state of union to his person.*”

II. In commenting on the view of Neander, Olshausen, Lipsius, &c., that “by the phrase ‘the righteousness of God’ is meant an inward condition of righteousness, on the ground of which, whether it is already perfect or not, God pronounces men righteous by a judicial sentence,” the author of the article in the British and Foreign Evangelical Review remarks that “it tends to obliterate the distinction between justification and sanctification, whereas in the apostle’s language they are carefully distinguished. Thus, when there is occasion to describe in comprehensive outline what Christ is made to his people (1 Cor. i. 30), these two are kept distinct. The *holiness* (*ἁγιασμός*) is carefully distinguished from the *righteousness* (*δικαιοσύνη*) however closely connected with it; and they cannot be confounded. This is conclusive, if we are to abide by the apostle’s usage of language, and not to efface his express distinctions.”

The argument is far from conclusive. 1. Even supposing that the meaning given to “righteousness” in 1 Cor. i. 30 had been correct (viz., that it refers to justification alone), it does not follow, because two words usually synonymous receive each a more restricted and distinctive signification by being placed together in antithesis, that therefore in all other cases we must attach the same restricted meaning to each when used separately. St. Paul frequently uses the word *δικαιοσύνη*, “righteousness,” (without reference to justification specifically in contradistinction to *ἁγιασμός*, “sanctification or holiness”), where *ἁγιασμός* might, without any impropriety, be employed in its stead, e.g., 2 Tim. ii. 22, “Flee also youthful lusts; but follow *righteousness*, faith, charity, &c.” (comp. 1 Tim. vi. 11; Titus iii. 5; Eph. v. 9.) But, 2. even when the two words are contrasted, the reviewer, we conceive, has misapprehended the distinction between them. It does not consist in this, that *δικαιοσύνη*, “righteousness,” expresses an “objective and external relation in opposition to a subjective and internal relation de-

noted by *ἀγιασμός*, "holiness."* That "righteousness" must have a *subjective* meaning is perfectly clear in Eph. iv. 24, "And that ye put on the new man which after God is created in *righteousness* and true *holiness*." Here the word for "holiness" is indeed *ὁσιότητι*, but this can make no difference. But we have another instance in this very epistle to the Romans, vi. 19, in which the two identical words are employed together—*δικαιοσύνη* and *ἀγιασμός*—"Even so now yield your members servants to *righteousness* unto *holiness*;" where the verse immediately following, "For when ye were the servants [*δοῦλοι*, bondsmen] of sin ye were free from righteousness," shows the view taken of sin and righteousness to be not the *judicial* but the *moral*. The question respects principally not the *condemning*, but the *enslaving* power of sin; not the *justifying*, but the *sanctifying* power of righteousness, as ver. 16 also proves, "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto *righteousness*." "Righteousness" is here represented as the *result*, not as the *source* of obedience. Accordingly, even Philippi remarks on the use of *δικαιοσύνη* in this passage, vi. 13-20: "*δικαιοσύνη* has here the same latitude of meaning as its opposite *ἀδικία*" (comment on ver. 13); it is "evidently to be understood of the righteousness not of faith, but of life, as in verses 13 and 18 ff" (comment on ver. 16). On ver. 19, "Yield your members servants to righteousness," his comment is, "Here again *δικαιοσύνη* denotes the *principle*, *ἀγιασμός* its *manifestation* and actual realization in the life."

This interpretation of Philippi gives, I believe, the true distinction between the two words; viz., that "righteousness" is the *germinal principle*, of which "holiness" or "sanctification" (*ἀγιασμός*) is the *development*. When, therefore, it is

* In the very passage on which he founds (1 Cor. i. 30) *ἀγιασμός* is objective to the believer in the very same sense as *δικαιοσύνη*. Christ is "made to us of God" both *δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἀγιασμός*. Objectively He is presented to our contemplation in both aspects. Objectively, Christ, not the believer himself, is the source as well of *ἀγιασμός* as of *δικαιοσύνη*; but in both aspects or relations He must be *subjectively* appropriated by faith—before He can become *our righteousness*, as well as before He can become *our sanctification*.

said in 1 Cor. i. 30 that Christ is "made unto us of God *righteousness* and *sanctification*," the meaning is that He is "the *author* and *finisher*," as of our faith, so of our entire renewal from first to last, into the image of God in righteousness and true holiness. *Righteousness* is the germ, of which *holiness* is the unfolded and perfected plant, that grows up and gradually fills out all our members.

There is nothing in the word *δικαιοσύνη* to limit it to justification alone. As denoting the *initial* principle of the Christian life, and having a reference to law or right, *δίκη*, it is of course frequently associated with justification, the initial act on God's part in the salvation of the believer, and the judicial declaration of the change. But even in this case Christ, as the Lord our righteousness, has been subjectively appropriated by the believer at the same moment that God declares him righteous, that is, justifies him. And the same righteousness that, viewed in the one aspect, the judicial, leads to God's verdict of "righteous," in the other aspect, the moral, has already wrought the change on the will and heart, which is the commencement of sanctification; otherwise God's sentence of "righteous" were premature, unless His word be simultaneously accompanied by the deed.

Even had the idea, of limiting "righteousness" to justification alone, been correct, the sole sense in which it could be said to be objective only, while "holiness" is subjective, is—that though both must be *subjectively* appropriated by the believer before either the judicial sentence or the moral change can take place, yet it may be said that in justification *Christ is the object* primarily regarded, in whom the believer is included ("There is now no condemnation to them that are *in Christ Jesus*," Rom. viii. 1); whereas in sanctification the believer is *the object* that first attracts attention, in whom Christ as *subjectively* included is operative ("If Christ be *in you*, the Spirit is life because of righteousness, Rom. viii. 10). In both cases, however, the union with Christ is involved, and there is therefore an ambiguity calculated to mislead in the reviewer's expression—that the righteousness which justifies "does not denote that we have it in a state of union to his person"—

even when qualified by the clause "however true that is in itself."

At bottom, however, we believe that the reviewer and ourselves are substantially at one, and we are only anxious to guard the truth as far as possible from misapprehensions on either side. Not only have we to beware, on the one side, of the error of regarding the righteousness that justifies as exclusively *objective*; but, on the other, of that opinion which is so apt to cling to us and haunt long our minds as it did Luther's, that the righteousness or holiness by which we are sanctified is *subjectively* ours in such a sense that it is in part wrought out through our own strength, and not wholly through the strength imparted by Christ; that it is not strictly denominated a "gift of righteousness" (Rom. v. 17) to be received, but that it is a sort of compound result wrought out partly by our own strength and partly by that of the Holy Spirit. St. Paul, indeed, says of himself, "I laboured," yet immediately he corrects himself to make use of the truer expression, "Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me" (1 Cor. xv. 10). We are commanded indeed to "work out our salvation with fear and trembling," but immediately reminded that it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do (Phil. ii. 12, 13). Our work, the energy which we have to put forth, is to *receive* into ourselves of the fulness of God; for "what hast thou that thou didst not receive?" (1 Cor. iv. 7). The believer regards himself as a little child putting forth as he is bid his tiny hands to raise a ponderous weight, which the father's hands in reality upbear, or like the man with the withered hand stretching it forth at the Lord's command, because he trusted in Christ's word to receive the power. Our part is not so much a *doing*, as a *giving* of ourselves unto God; as knowing that all holiness and spiritual power are of the Lord, we have to "*yield* our members as *instruments* of righteousness unto God" (Rom. vi. 13) that His Spirit may work all in all within us. In heaven itself the perfected saint will, with all humility, confess that all his holiness or sanctification is of Christ, and not aught that he can claim subjectively as his own, any more than the righteousness of Christ which he appropriates for his justification.

III. There is still, however, another passage adduced by the reviewer on which it is necessary to make some observations.

(P. 196.) "The objective and external relation expressed by the term in question stands out in bold relief when the antithesis is drawn between Christ "made sin for us," and our being made "the righteousness of God" (2 Cor. v. 21); words which imply that in the very same sense in which he was made sin, his people are made righteousness. All attempts to give this antithesis a subjective sense must be set aside at once."

To this we demur. No passage of Scripture has been more completely evacuated of its depth and fulness of meaning by the advocates of the exclusively forensic theory than this 2 Cor. v. 21.* "In the same sense," indeed, in which Christ was made sin for his people, they are made the righteousness of God in Him. But in what sense is this? To the full extent, we believe, in both cases the transference was made of which the subjects of each were capable. It seems to be too generally forgotten, in considering this comparison, how wide is the distinction between the divine and human natures, and the respective effects produced on each by whatever they come in contact with. Man, however he might be deluded by the serpent to believe, that he could unharmed come into close contact with sin and "be like God, knowing good and evil," cannot touch sin, no more than the Jew could touch the leprosy, without being defiled. God alone can. When Christ put forth his hand and touched the leper, Matt. viii. 3, He Himself continued perfectly unpolluted. No change passed on Him. Not so with the leper. Not only did his uncleanness depart, but he was *made* whole—not merely *reckoned*, but *made* whole; his flesh became like that of a little child. So the Son of God entered into our humanity, and came into the closest contact possible for Him with the sin of our fallen nature, "being made sin for us," yet it fled from before Him;

* Those who do not destroy entirely the antithesis between "sin" and "righteousness" by rendering the first word (*ἁμαρτίαν*) a *sin-offering*, dilute *ἐποίησεν*, "he made," and *γενώμεθα* "that we might be made, or become," into "reckoned;" and hence the merely *objective* sense given to "the righteousness of God."

“He knew no sin.” No contamination passed on Him. Though assailed by sin and Satan at every avenue where it might be thought an entrance could be found, and “tempted in all points like as we are,” He continued pure from all sin, and repelled its attacks at every point. Not so can man remain unaffected when the Lord saith, “I bring near my righteousness,” Isaiah xli. 13. When the word of God comes to man, if it find entrance at all into any heart, it must be for entire change and renovation. It cannot continue unfruitful. “For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it,” Isaiah lv. 10, 11. Let “the Lord our Righteousness” be but admitted into any soul that seeks to be justified before God, and He cannot be admitted by halves. His justifying and sanctifying influences are received or excluded together. Christ “of God is made unto us righteousness,” 1 Cor. i. 30, subjective, as well as objective, and we are “made the righteousness of God in him,” 2 Cor. v. 21, (*γενώμεθα*, *made, become*, not merely are *reckoned*). In the comparison here instituted, as in that of Rom. v. (see ver. 15-17, and v. 20) there is a great *superabundance* (*ὑπερπερίσσειον*) in the effects on the divine side above the human. Inattention to this distinction has been the cause of the general restriction, by the advocates of the bare forensic theory, to mere *imputation* of righteousness or sin in those comparisons, which are employed to illustrate their influence on those affected by Christ or Adam.

We cannot, however, leave this passage without feeling constrained to remark that even to the expression, “He made Him to be sin for us,” which is used to lower the sense of the other side of the parallel, far too shallow a signification is usually affixed. The words “He made him to be sin for us” are not to be lowered to the meaning, “He *reckoned* Him sin, or a sinner;” nor (as by those who scruple to tamper with the

meaning of *ἐπιτίθειν*) to that of “He made him a *sin-offering* for us.” The expression is indeed taken from the Levitical sacrifices. When the sins of the offerer had been confessed over the head of the bullock or lamb about to be sacrificed, and his iniquity was, as it were, thus laid upon him, the victim was called חַטָּאת “*sin*,” (rendered “*sin-offering*” in A. V., see Ex. xxix. 14, 36; Lev. iv. 3, 8, 20, 21, &c.) as if it were the very sin of the offerer embodied or personified, and as such it was consigned to death. So the iniquity of His people was laid upon Christ, and He was made *sin* for us; but in a much more intimate sense than were the outward types of “bulls and goats” in the prefigurative dispensation of Moses. The offerer’s sin laid on their head could no more really affect them subjectively than could the shed “blood of bulls and goats” really “take away sin” from him. The blood and the sin in this case were but figures or shadows of the true. But in Christ the realities were dealt with. As “the *blood of Jesus Christ* cleansed from all sin,” so *sin* was condemned and crucified in Him. Let us weigh well the strength of the Scripture expressions on this subject. While we must most carefully remove from our ideas of our great Substitute, and Representative of our nature, the slightest stain of sin, remembering that, from His conception even, He was designated “that holy thing” that should be born of Mary, yet so far as sin could possibly affect such a Being, He is represented as coming into the closest contact with it, and in words almost identified with it. He came “in the likeness of *sinful flesh*” *σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, literally, “of the *flesh of sin*” (Rom. viii. 3), so that when His *body* was put to death, God is said to “condemn *sin* in the flesh.” He “bare our sins *in His own body* on the tree (1 Pet. ii. 24). So completely is He regarded as our Representative, that when He was crucified, “our *old man*” is said to be “crucified with Him, that the *body of sin* might be destroyed” (Rom. vi. 6). “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being *made a curse* for us,” Gal. iii. 13. God “*made him to be sin* for us.”

By this expression, then, “*made sin for us*,” more, surely, is meant than simply that our sin was *imputed* to Christ. It

would evidently seem to denote that it affected Him to the utmost extent that it was possible for a perfectly righteous Being, "who knew no sin," to be affected; that He became subject to every consequence (pollution alone excepted) which sin had entailed on our fallen race, sorrow, pain, agony, and death; nay, to that increased and intensified power of temptation which sin by the fall had acquired over our weakened nature, since we are assured that "He was tempted in *all* points like as we are," that He might be able to give us the assurance and encouragement of His entire sympathy with us in our utmost weakness and trials.

Not by *imputation* alone, then, but in reality and personal experience, to the utmost extent that sin could affect the spotless Lamb of God, Christ was "made to be sin for us;" and thus, on the opposite side of the parallel, Christ's righteousness must be explained to affect all who are brought into close union with Him to the utmost extent of which their natures are capable, viz., that they "may be *made*," not putatively alone, but really and in personal experience "the righteousness of God in Him."

The whole of the above discussion about *δικαιοσύνη* with the remarks on the article on "the Pauline Doctrine of the Righteousness of Faith" was shown in MS. to the reviewer, who kindly took the trouble of reading over the whole. He thus concisely and neatly summed up and pronounced his verdict, which with my reply will conclude the discussion. His words are:—

"I have read this essay most carefully; but it will not do as an essay on Paul's *δικαιοσύνη*. This whole discussion endeavours to combine these *three* things which cannot be united in *one* idea.

I. *Righteousness in God*; which is *divine*, and *surely* that is different from a *human* righteousness which the creature must have for his acceptance (i.e. his own, or Christ's).

II. *Righteousness as justifying*: this is applicable only to the *person*, or to his *standing* and his *title* and his *relation*,

not to his *nature* at all. It is a relative thing. This we have in union to Christ.

III. *Righteousness of life* or *Sanctification*: this also is from Christ; but respects the *nature* only, not the *standing* or *relation*.

1. This is progressive; the II. is not.

2. This is wrought out with our *co-operation* (unless we will be Quietists, Molinists, Quakers); the other (the II.) is only *received*."

I shall endeavour to reply to each of these points in succession.

My friend's preliminary objection is that three things have been attempted to be combined which cannot all be united in one idea.

Answer. That all three can be united in *one expression* at least, he himself has shewn, since he has expressed all three by one and the same word and idea, "*Righteousness*." Whether all three have been united by St Paul in the fuller expression, "the righteousness of God," is a question to be determined by an accurate examination of each context in which the expression occurs. It is to this criterion that I have appealed for the correctness of the threefold meaning that I have assigned to it.

I. The first special objection is that "*Righteousness in God*" is *Divine*, and surely that differs from a *human* righteousness which the creature must have for his acceptance, that is, his own, or Christ's.

Answer. The righteousness required for the creature's acceptance is, of course, Christ's. Is that not *Divine*? Because Christ must manifest His righteousness in *human* nature before it could become available to us, does it therefore cease to be *Divine*? What then do Christ's words mean, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good [righteous] but One, that is God," Matt. xix. 17. Why did Jesus reject the title of *good*, but that he who applied it to Him thought Him but *human*? Why be startled at the word *Divine* being applied

to the righteousness which justifies and which sanctifies? Was it not to make us partakers of the *Divine* righteousness that Christ came here on earth? Are not believers said to be "partakers of His [God's] holiness" (Heb. xii. 10.)—"partakers of the *Divine nature*," (2 Peter i. 4)—of God's "*glory*?" (John xvii. 22.) In what does "the *image of God*" into which Christians are renewed consist, but "in *righteousness* and true holiness?" Eph. iv. 24).*

But as another friend has since expressed the objection, "Righteousness in God is His essential attribute; and how can one of the essential attributes of God be communicated to a creature?" We answer, we know not, any more than we know how God could become man, the infinite be united with the finite, the divine with the human. The reunion of man with God, through the mediation of Christ Jesus taking the human nature up into Himself, that He might communicate of His own nature to man, is a mystery unfathomable, but nevertheless is the grand distinguishing doctrine of the New Testament, and, as we have endeavoured to show, of this Epistle to the Romans in particular. The scripture expressions quoted above denote an amazing oneness—union—fellowship with God, vouchsafed to His creatures through His son Jesus Christ, so that they are said to be made partakers of the very "*life*" of God, (1 John i. 1-3), of the divine "*nature*," "*holiness*," "*righteousness*," "*love*," (Rom. v. 5), and "*glory*;" yet they are thereby not God, but man.

This wondrous truth if fully grasped, will at once remove the objections as to the oneness of the righteousness (as of the Ist. that which is *in God*, with the II. and III., so of that righteousness) which *justifies* with that which *sanctifies*, drawn from the technical distinctions of theologians, designed to discriminate between its two aspects as justifying and sanctifying.

* Calvin saw, and expresses in the most explicit terms, that the righteousness of which believers are made partakers through Christ is "God's righteousness." See his *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, Lib. III. Cap. III. 9. "Proinde ista regeneratione in *Dei justitiam*, Christi beneficio, instauramur, a qua per Adam excideramus." "Accordingly through the blessing of Christ, we are renewed by that regeneration into the *righteousness of God*, from which we had fallen through Adam." Translation by Henry Beveridge, Esq.

The righteousness is one. But it may be viewed, either as it affects "the *person*" in his "*standing, title, or relation,*" (see II.), or as it affects "the *nature*" or life (see III.); and different predicates will of course apply to the one and to the other, *e.g.*, that the one is "progressive, the other is not." [Yet see the remarks in p. 124]. A "*standing, title, or relation,*" cannot be progressive; a "*nature*" or life, imparted by a new birth, necessarily is. Again, as to justification being "only received" (see III.), and not requiring "our co-operation," while sanctification is "wrought out with our co-operation," the danger has already been pointed out (pp. 132, 137) of drawing too sharply the distinction between these, lest justification should be regarded as altogether objective and external to us, requiring no co-operation or act of appropriation on our part; lest sanctification should be claimed as in part our own, and not considered as a gift *received* in its every stage and originating from God, "from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed." We must beware indeed on the one hand of falling into the errors of the "Quietists, Molinists, Quakers," and put forth our utmost energies, running, fighting, striving, and "giving all diligence to make our calling and election sure;" but we must equally avoid the other extreme, and remember that while called on to "*work* out our salvation with fear and trembling," it is "God that *worketh in us* both to *will* and to *do*." While the paralytic at the command of Jesus took up his bed and walked, he had not the less to acknowledge that all his power and strength were derived from Christ.

In a word then:—All righteousness is of God. There is therefore but one righteousness, and that "the righteousness of God," whether exhibited by God Himself, by Jesus Christ, or by believers in Christ.

CHAPTER II. 1-16.

Ver. 1-16. The advantage of the parallelistic arrangement in enabling the reader at a glance to trace the train of thought is observable in the first sixteen verses. Reading the projecting lines (those nearest to the left hand margin as printed in the Analytical Commentary) continuously, we have at once the skeleton of the argument:—

1. Therefore thou art without excuse, O man,
 For thou that judgest doest the same things.
2. But we are sure that the judgment of God is according to truth
 Against them which commit such things;
6. Who will render to every man according to his deeds,
11. For there is no respect of persons with God:
16. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men
 By Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

The intermediate lines here omitted are but the amplification or filling up of these outlines. Thus the three intermediate lines in ver. 1

Whosoever thou art that judgest;
 For wherein, &c.

only enlarge and complete the idea expressed in the first and last lines—

Therefore thou art without excuse, O man,
 For thou that judgest doest the same things.

So ver. 3-5 amplify the idea expressed in ver. 2; ver. 7-10 the idea in ver. 6, rendering good to the good, and evil to the evil; and ver. 12-15 that of ver. 11, no respect being paid to Gentiles or Jews, both being condemned for neglect of the light they possessed.

Ver. 7-10 furnish a good instance of the manifoldness of the relations or points of comparison often indicated by parallelism.

1. A and B are antithetically parallel in each of their lines, a corresponding with *a*, b with *b*, and d with *d*; the characters of the two classes to be compared being contrasted in *a* and *a*, their respective pursuits in *b* and *b*, and the appropriate awards to each in *d* and *d*.

In like manner *B* and *A* correspond antithetically in each of their lines.

2. But regarded in another point of view the four stanzas are introversively parallel. The first stanza, A, corresponds with the fourth, *A*, and the second, B, with the third, *B*; the blessed result to the righteous being placed first and last in A and *A*, to make and leave the agreeable impression, and to incite to the requisite conduct, while the more unpleasant idea is placed obscurely in the middle.

3. But not only is A as a whole parallel with *A*, but the individual lines of each are introversively parallel, a corresponding with *a*, b with *β*, &c., and in like manner the lines in B correspond introversively with those in *B*, so that thus (in virtue of the parallelism first adverted to of A to B, and *A* to *B*) there is a pervading parallelism throughout the whole four stanzas in each of their three lines; *a*, *a*, *a*, and *a*, characterizing the classes; *b*, *b*, *b*, and *β*, their pursuits and practice; and *d*, *d*, *d*, and *δ*, the awards to each.

Still, in the comparison which we are at present more particularly considering, A corresponds specially with *A* as presenting the favourable aspect, while B and *B* present the unfavourable. Hence, where the two stanzas B and *B* are brought into close contact in *d* and *d*, there is a nice adjustment in the selection of a *pair* of terms to match:

(B) Θυμὸς καὶ ὄργη —Indignation and wrath;
 (B) Θλίψις καὶ στενοχώρια—Tribulation and anguish.

That this nice balancing of terms is premeditated would seem justly to be inferred, since to mark the awards in the other stanzas we have in A *one* noun with an adjective, “ eternal

life," ζῶην αἰώνιον (in the accusative too in Greek, while the pairs of nouns in *B* and *B* are in the nominative), but in *A* three nouns—"glory, honour, and peace."

4. But there is a still more delicate adjustment in the original Greek (to express a nice distinction which we can only clumsily represent in English), in the change from the accusative ζῶην αἰώνιον to the nominative θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή. Ζῶην αἰώνιον, "eternal life," is dependent on ἀποδώσει, "will render," God being represented as the bestower of the blessing of eternal life; but by a euphemism very usual in Scripture (see Jebb's Sacred Literature, pp. 363 ff, and Bengelii Gnomon on Mat. vii. 24—"Salutaria Deus ad se refert: mala a se removet") the "indignation and wrath" that shall come upon the wicked are represented not as dependent upon God's award, but as the necessary result of their own deeds, to mark that their destruction is not of God, but of themselves; not "God will render to them indignation and wrath," but "indignation [shall be] and wrath." Compare another striking instance in Rom. ix. 22, 23, "vessels of wrath fitted [*i.e.*, by themselves] to destruction," as contrasted with "vessels of mercy which *He* had afore prepared unto glory."

Ver. 12-15. In these verses, which contain another introverted parallelism or epanodos, we have an instructive example of the advantages of parallelism in leading to the true interpretation.

In *A* and *B* we have two propositions stated, and in *B* and *A* are given the arguments for each respectively, but in inverse order. The case of the Gentiles is put first and last (*A* and *A*), as furnishing the strongest apparent objection to the equity of the doctrine laid down by the apostle, "that all are under sin, and brought in as guilty before God," while the statement with regard to the Jews' guilt (*B*) and its proof (*B*) are placed in the middle and subordinate place. An acquaintance with this common rule of Scriptural arrangement might have saved Whitby, Macknight, and others, from giving utterance to the very erroneous doctrinal views which will be found in their commentaries on this passage, at direct variance with the main scope of St. Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Romans, but

for which they imagined they found a sanction in the supposed connection between verses 13 and 14. These two verses, however, have no immediate connection, but ver. 14 corresponds with the first two lines of ver. 12 (A). The first proposition stated by St. Paul in A is, that the Gentiles, though they "have sinned without law, shall also perish without law." The proof of the equity of this proceeding the apostle, after having parenthetically disposed of the case of the Jews in B and B, reserves for the conclusion A, to make and leave the stronger impression, and vindicates the severity of God's judgment even in this case, by the argument that the Gentiles, though destitute of a written law, yet showed by their practising at times, however imperfectly, certain virtues required by the law, and by the possession of a conscience, with that conflict of opposing thoughts which it at times awakens, that they had a law written in their hearts, the violation of which rendered them also wholly inexcusable.*

Ver. 14, *φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶν*, "do by nature the things of the law." To guard farther against all misconstruction of this passage, the following excellent note of Philippi is added. "Paul does not say *τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν* as in ver. 13, or *τὸν νόμον τελεῖν* as in ver. 17, but *τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιεῖν*. The Gentiles do not therefore keep the law in its inward spirituality (vii. 14) and *totality*, but they observe *single* outward commandments, one man this, another that, of the law. They have *ἔργα νόμου* like the Jews, who, however, are thereby not *ποιῆται*, but merely *ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου*."

Ver. 16, "according to *my* gospel." The import of this expression does not seem to have been apprehended by commentators. Why the epithet "my" applied to the gospel? Such explanations as "the gospel which I preach," "with which I am entrusted," are surely very unsatisfactory. Unless the gospel which Paul preached had something in it distinctive from that preached by the other apostles, why specify it as "*my* gospel?" What bearing had such an epithet upon the argument in which he was engaged?

* See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," p. 45.

We have, I think, but to look to the close of the Epistle xvi. 25, 26, where St. Paul again repeats the same expression, to see in what sense he appropriates to himself the gospel which he preached as specially his own. "Now to Him that is of power to stablish you according to *my gospel*, and the preaching of Jesus Christ—according to *the revelation of the mystery* which was kept secret since the world began ; but now is made manifest—for obedience of faith [extending] to *all nations*," εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Wherein this mystery consisted is explicitly declared in Eph. iii. 6, "that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel : whereof I was made a minister according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me." This—the *admission of the Gentiles* to share on equal terms with the Jews all the blessings purchased by Christ—was the gospel specially committed to St. Paul, as immediately follows in ver. 8. "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among *the Gentiles* [ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν placed first, emphatically], and to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery," &c. See also Gal. ii. 7, "*The gospel of the uncircumcision* was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter."

Nothing could be more appropriate for St. Paul's present purpose, which is to show the complete parity of Gentile with Jew as respects the gospel, than a reference to that gospel message with which he had been specially charged as the "*apostle of the Gentiles*."

Ver. 17-29. This section will be seen to be very systematically arranged, the whole forming a Heptad or Parallelism of seven stanzas ;* the first three stanzas (ver. 17, 18 ; 19, 20 ; 21-23) relating to the JEW with his boasted possession of the LAW, and the last three (ver. 25 ; 26, 27 ; 28, 29) to his vaunted privilege of CIRCUMCISION ; while placed between the two in the centre (ver. 24) we have the testimony borne

* See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 91-93, 102-109, 166, &c.

by God's word of the sad abuse by the Jew of all his advantages, and the reproach thereby cast upon the name of his God among the Gentiles.

When we examine each of the stanzas, we shall see how carefully and artistically they are composed.

In the first two stanzas we have an enumeration of all the claims to pre-eminence, relating to the LAW, put forth by the Jew, amounting to *ten*—in Scripture the number of completeness—divided into its two halves, *five* and *five*.

In the first five lines (a) are enumerated the claims of *personal* privileges before God arrogated to himself by the Jew ; in the second five (b) his claims of superior enlightenment above the *Gentiles* :—both derived from his possession of the LAW. It is worthy of remark how skilfully this word, LAW, is disposed in these ten lines, in order to assign to it the prominence which it held in the estimation of the Jew, and which it was about to receive in much of the apostle's subsequent discussion with him.

It forms the concluding word which sums up each stanza :

“ Being instructed out of the LAW ;”

“ Which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the LAW.”

But again, when we regard the two stanzas as forming a whole of ten lines, it meets us at every point, as occupying the *first*, the *central*, and the *final* place.

In the next stanza (ver. 21-23) follows a refutation of the vaunted claims of the Jew. The first line (b) “Thou which teachest another,” &c., refers to the second stanza (b), which enumerates the claims of the Jew to superior enlightenment above *others* ; the last line (a) “Thou that gloriest in the Law,” &c., to the first stanza (a) which enumerates his claims to *personal* advantages, connected specially with his possession of the Law ; while in the three intermediate lines (c) are particularized three great sins of which the Jew was guilty,—against his neighbour, against himself, and against his God. “The three capital vices,” remarks Haldane, “which the Apostle stigmatizes in the Jews, like those which he had pre-

ferred against the Gentiles, stand opposed, on the one hand, to the three principal virtues which he elsewhere enumerates as comprehending the whole system of sanctity, namely, to live *soberly, righteously, and godly*; and, on the other hand, they are conformable, to the three odious vices which he had noted among the Gentiles, namely, *ungodliness, intemperance, unrighteousness*. [Rom. i. 21-29.] For theft includes, in general, every notion of unrighteousness; adultery includes that of intemperance; and the guilt of sacrilege, that of ungodliness." *

The order, however, in which the sins are enumerated, is reversed, as Bengel remarks; in the case of the idolatrous Gentiles, the violation of their duty to God is placed in the front, as being their most flagrant and notorious sin; while in the case of the Jews it is placed last, as amidst all their professed zeal for the honour of God, still lurking at the bottom of their hearts, and occasionally discovering itself in open acts of profaneness.

Charges against	Gentiles	{ Ungodliness,	Ch. i. 21-23.
		{ Intemperance,	24-27.
		{ Unrighteousness,	28-31.
Jews	{	Unrighteousness,	Ch. ii. 21.
		Intemperance,	22, first line.
		Ungodliness,	22, second line.

Thus the two charges viewed in connection form an example of a prevailing characteristic of scripture arrangements, the Epanodos, by which the principal subject to which attention is meant to be directed is placed first and last; so that forgetfulness of *God (ungodliness)* is denoted to be *the great transgression* in which all sin begins and ends—its originating cause to which it is to be traced as its source, and the final, consummating enormity in which it terminates. †

With regard to the arrangement of the rest of this passage (ver. 24-29), it must be kept in mind that Parallelism admits frequently of more than one arrangement, which run parallel

* Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, by Robt. Haldane, Esq., Vol. 1., p. 198.

† Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, p. 28.

to each other without mutual interference, in order to bring out various sides of the truth.* That given of the whole passage (ver. 17-29) in the Analytical Commentary, as a Heptad of seven stanzas, brings out into prominence the two-fold division—the first part (ver. 17-23), referring to the Jew, and his boast of the Law; and the second (25-29) referring more especially to his other boast of CIRCUMCISION—the two being separated by the transitional verse 24.† That this division was really *designed* by the apostle will be evident, if we look to the first verse of ch. iii.

J. What advantage then hath the JEW?

C. Or what profit is there of CIRCUMCISION?

and then observe that,

The first of these questions (J) relating to the JEW receives its reply in ch. iii., and is shown to consist principally in the possession of this very Law (ver. 2), but only “if used lawfully” (1 Tim. i. 8); not to induce boasting, but for the true purpose for which it was designed, viz., to be a “schoolmaster to bring unto Christ” (Gal. iii. 24); to make “sin appear sin, that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful” (Rom. vii. 13), and so to “conclude all under sin,” (Rom. xi. 32, Gal. iii. 22), by making “every man a liar” (Rom. iii. 4), and, above all, “them who are under the Law” to whom it speaks specially, (Rom. iii. 19); necessitating thus the revelation of “a righteousness without the Law” (ver. 21), excluding all “boasting” (ver. 27), yet so far from “making void the Law, that it establishes the Law,” (ver. 31).

2. The second question (C), “What profit is there of CIRCUMCISION?” is taken up in like manner in ch. iv., and the advantage of circumcision shown to consist, not in its giving any claim to acceptance with God, but in its being “a sign

* For instance, see in “Symmet. Struct. of Scripture” the double arrangement of the Decalogue p. 144, the multiplicity of relations pointed out between the Beatitudes, pp. 167-188, &c.

† See, for similar divisions of the *seven*, the “Symmetrical Structure of Scripture,” Psalm xxv. p. 91; Psalm xxxiv. p. 102; the “Lord’s Prayer and the Seven Beatitudes,” pp. 166, 167, &c.

and seal” of the certainty of the promised blessings to all who “walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised,” ver. 12.

It is in order to draw attention to this two-fold division of the subject, that in the argument prefixed to each in the Analytical Commentary, the words “Neither,” “Nor,” are used, viz. :—

1. *Neither* the name of JEW, &c., will avail,
2. *Nor* will the outward covenant of CIRCUMCISION, &c.

Yet this arrangement is in no way inconsistent with another,* which may be called the *continuous* arrangement, by which the argument of the whole passage is carried on uninterruptedly, the connecting words *in the text* being (not “Neither,” “Nor,” which would only have indicated the former arrangement, but) FOR, ver. 24, and FOR,† ver. 25, which mark an argumentative connexion of the verses with the immediately preceding context. The argument, as carried on *continuously*, may be thus traced :—

CLAIMS OF THE JEW.

- Ver. 17. In the first line, to which the next ten are subordinate, we have the much-vaunted name of JEW, and which in his own estimation already includes all :
- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 18 | 1. | (a) The highest personal privileges before God ; |
| 19 | 2. | (b) An immeasurable superiority above his fellow- |
| and | | men, as the teacher and enlightener of an ignorant |
| 20 | | and wicked world. |

REFUTATION.

- Ver. 21 Of b (b) How inconsistent the claim to superior enlightenment above others, when the teacher’s own mind

* Given in the “Symmetr. Struct. of Scripture,” pp. 31, 32.

† On the use of a double FOR assigning two co-ordinate reasons, see “Symmetrical Structure of Scripture,” pp. 56-58, and “Jebb’s Sacred Literature,” pp. 375-387.

is not enlightened to practise the truth ! “Thou therefore which teachest another,” &c.

Ver. 23. Of a. (a) How inconsistent the boast of privileges before God, if God is dishonoured by disobedience ! “Thou that gloriest in the Law,” &c.

Both confirmed, in the intermediate triplet (c “Thou that preachest,” &c.) by the charge of the same three cardinal sins against the Jews, as had been charged against the Gentiles.

Corroborative proofs of a and b.

Ver. 24. Proof of (b)* (introduced by FOR). FOR, so far from teaching others to honour the name of God, the evil example of His professing worshipper makes it to be reproached by others.

Ver. 27. Proof of (a) (introduced by FOR). FOR privileges profit nothing without corresponding practice.

CONCLUSION.

Ver. 26. Therefore privileges† will be transferred to him who has made the most of the little light given to him.

Ver. 27. And the superiority shall be given to him to judge and condemn pretenders to knowledge without obedience.

Ver. 28. and 29. For even the name of JEW, and his distinguishing privilege (CIRCUMCISION) will be of no avail before the judgment seat of God, if it is an outward show alone without the inward reality. JEW or JUDAH means “praise,” (Gen. xxix. 35, xlix. 8) ; but his praise must be of Him who searcheth the heart, “not of men, but of God.”

* Of b more especially—the making God's name be dishonoured by *others* being the prominent idea—though yet, as forming in the two-fold arrangement the intermediate term between the two great divisions, 17-23 and 25-29, it includes also a reference to a (ver. 23) the *personal* dishonour done by the Jew to God, as appears from the evident connexion between “*dishonourest* thou God,” (a, ver. 23) and “the name of God is *blasphemed* through you,” ver. 24.

† Instancing these in the case of the most distinguished personal privilege of which the Jew had to boast, CIRCUMCISION.

CHAPTER III.

Ver 3, 4. Here, as in the case of "the righteousness of God," i. 17, far too confined a meaning has been attributed to the expressions, "the faithfulness of God," "God is true (but every man a liar)", as if all that is meant were, that God is faithful to His *promises* only, (and not also to His *threatenings*), and that God must be maintained at all hazards to be true, even *though* every man should thereby be *made* a liar. But the objections are not put directly as from the mouth of a Jew with his narrow view, in which he would advert to the *promises* alone of God to His people. St Paul in his own name states those three objections that he knew would be urged by the Jew, but with his own pregnancy of meaning attached to the words.

His denial of all superiority to the Jew above the Gentile as to justification before God, or admission into Christ's kingdom, (he affirms),

1. Does not deny *all* advantage to the Jews, ver. 1, 2.
2. Nor make God untrue to His word, ver. 3, 4.
3. Nor unjust in His treatment of the Jews, as compared with the Gentiles, ver. 5-7.

1. To St Paul's assertion, that it is of no avail for justification before God, to be "a Jew outwardly," ii. 28, the obvious objection arises, that this denies all advantage to the Jews: "What advantage then hath the Jew [over the Gentile]?" to which the apostle replies, "Much, every way; first, indeed, that they were entrusted with the oracles of God." These were a precious trust committed to them, containing both God's law and promises—a law designed by its holiness to convince them of sin, and by its threatenings of the condemnation they justly incurred, that they might thus be shut up to the acceptance of the gracious promises of mercy to the penitent, and of an everlasting righteousness, to be introduced by a coming Saviour.

Ver. 3. "For what [should it be urged] if some had not faith?" "Shall their want of faith I reply, [and unfaithfulness to the covenant] make the faithfulness of God without

effect?" Such an inference the apostle repels with scorn: "God forbid, yea let God be acknowledged to be true"—true to His Law, true to his promises; true to the condemnation of all sin pronounced by the one, true to the assurances of a Saviour held forth by the other: "and every man [acknowledge himself to be] a liar," condemning himself as having been false to his covenant engagements to his God, that he may thus be prepared to accept of the free justification revealed to believers—confessing himself, his whole life, and all in which he formerly trusted, to be a lie—renouncing it as *error, falsehood, death*, that he may embrace Him who is alone "the *way, the truth, and the life*"—Jew, no less than Gentile, being convicted by his own conscience, that he too has "changed the *truth of God into a lie*," Rom. i. 25.

The words of ver. 4 in the original, γινέσθω δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεῦστης, imply nothing hypothetical (as usually explained), but expressly demand the confession to be made, "Let God be *acknowledged* to be [literally *made*] true, and every man to be a liar." In confirmation of this, let it be observed that the expression is borrowed from Psalm cxvi. 11, where the true Israel,* reduced to utter extremity, as Israel of old in their "hastening"† out of the land of death, and hemmed round by devouring enemies, exclaims, "I said in my hastening away, All *men* are liars"—and not to be depended upon, the *Lord* alone is my trust and help—"What shall I render unto the *Lord* for all His benefits?"‡

With this confession of man's utter falsehood, and acknowledgment of God's truthfulness, as the necessary pre-requisite for receiving justification and cleansing from God, accords beautifully§ the quotation from Psalm li. 4, where David

* That is, Christ in the first instance (Ex. iv. 22; Matt. ii. 15, compared with Hosea xi. 1; Isa. xlix. 3), and they that are Christ's in the second.

† See "Christ and His Church in the Book of Psalms," by Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, pp. 317 and 107.

‡ Compare Ps. cxviii. 8, part of the same series of Passover Psalms, predictive of a new exodus.

§ How much more appropriate, too, the fuller meaning thus given to "God's truth" and "man's lie," is to the great object of St. Paul's reasoning, needs no comment.

finds his plea for the bestowal of these blessings on the full and unreserved confession that he makes of his own utter unworthiness, and of the justice of the severe judgment which, notwithstanding His promises to David, God had through Nathan denounced against his sin, "Now therefore the sword shall never depart from thine house: because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy wife," &c., 2 Sam. xii. 10-12.

In ver. 1 and 2 he prays for God's forgiveness, and cleansing from his sin—

1. Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness :
According unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my
transgressions.
2. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity,
And cleanse me from my sin :

these petitions being enforced on the plea,

3. For I *acknowledge* my transgressions ;
And my sin is ever before me ; [humbly confessing]*
4. "Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned,
And done the evil thing in Thy sight" ;
That Thou mayest be justified when Thou speakest,
And be clear when Thou judgest.

that is, "I acknowledge my transgressions"—"that Thou mayest be justified when Thou speakest," &c.

I observe that Dr. Morison, in his late monograph on this chapter, has stated that "when the apostle adds, 'but every man a liar,' there can be no doubt that Rückert is right in regarding the addition as being, so far as the apostle's main object is concerned, unessential." It is, on the contrary, in striking accordance with his "main object," the very point that he is occupied in proving being, as he states in ver. 9, "we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are *all under sin* ; in ver. 19, "that *all the world may become guilty before God* ;" and in ver. 23, "for *all have sinned*." It needs,

* This connection appears more simple than that given in Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, pp. 121, 122.

I think, but to place in juxtaposition with these passages, "Let every man be acknowledged a liar," to see their relation.

Thus a close connexion is introduced into the whole reasoning, and a ground assigned for the selection of the expression ἐπιτετεύχθησαν, "they were entrusted" [viz., and yet, alas! proved liars and untrue to their trust]; instead of what might otherwise have been expected, such as "Chiefly, because that unto them were given, or revealed, the oracles of God," or some similar expression. It is not, we may feel assured, for the sake of a mere jingle of words that the apostle has written ἐπιτετεύχθησαν, ver. 2, ἠπίστησαν—ἡ ἀπιστία—τὴν πίστιν, ver. 3, but to indicate their intimate connexion. The Jews were intrusted with the oracles of God, that they might themselves believe and trust in God's revelation of His holy law, with its denunciations against sin, and promises of a Saviour from it, and might lead others to the same belief and trust. What, if some believed not? Shall their unbelief of God's truth make God untrue either to His threatenings or promises? Far be the thought from us. The very first end to which God's law was designed to lead was to the acknowledgment that God is ever holy and true, but that men are all unholy and untrue, and to a humble participation in David's confession, "I acknowledge my transgressions and my sin is ever before me—that Thou mayest be justified when [notwithstanding whatsoever good Thou hadst before spoken to Thy servant] Thou speakest" [now severe judgments against him].

Ver. 5-7. The precise connection of the apostle's reasoning in these verses has been much disputed. The difficulty may perhaps be best solved by drawing more sharply than is usually done the distinction between God's truth in ver. 3 and 4, and God's righteousness in ver. 5, and observing that the first relates to His word, the second to his dealings or judgments.

The import of the objection here stated is that the doctrine laid down by the apostle, that there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile in respect to justification before the tribunal of God, makes God to be unjust in His judgments or respective dealings towards Jew and Gentile. The very righteousness and justice of God, as it appeared to a Jew, would be impugned by the supposition that all are to be treated alike, and that God's

own people and children are to be put upon exactly the same footing as the idolatrous Gentiles who have forsaken the worship of the true God for false gods.*

The objection is thus put by St. Paul, "But if our unrighteousness [it might be urged, in not obeying fully God's covenant] only renders the more conspicuous the righteousness of God [in making the just distinction between His own people and the sinners of the Gentiles, and adhering to His covenant with the Jews] what shall we say?" That God is unrighteous in taking vengeance [on our breach of His covenant]? I speak [not in my own person, but] as sinful man [sometimes allows himself to speak]. God forbid; for [on this ground] how shall God judge the world? For [the whole world (*every one*) might equally urge the same argument in bar of God's judgment; *every one*, πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, as we have seen, being declared in God's word to be a liar, and God only to be true, iii. 4, and might plead], If the truth of God hath more abounded through my lie unto His glory, why yet am even I, ἐγώ, to be judged as a sinner ["even I," *i.e.*, however sinful I may be, since the greater my sin the greater is God's grace in pardoning it]?

Thus understood, the reply is conclusive, and the argument of the Jews turned completely against themselves. The objection to the view of Reiche, Olshausen, &c., who explain νόσμος (as opposed to "our [Jews'] unrighteousness") of the *Gentiles* exclusively, is removed; νόσμος, "the world," including *all*, Jews and Gentiles, answering to the πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, "every man," of ver. 4; and the ἐγώ, "even I," of ver. 7 is not I, the *Gentile*, but I, *every one*; though, of course, the reader naturally applies it more particularly to the Gentiles, whose sin specially it was declared to be, that "they changed the truth of God into a lie" (i. 25).

CHAPTER III. 10-18.

Ver. 10-18. If we examine the context of the original passages here quoted, *e.g.*, Psalm xiv., we find that those de-

* Compare the 3rd of the corresponding objections in ch. ix. 14.

noted by the phrase "none that doeth good," ver. 1, form only a *part* of the Israelites (David's enemies), contrasted with whom is "the generation of the righteous," ver. 5; in Psalm v., to those whose "throat is an open sepulchre, ver. 9, stand opposed "the righteous," ver. 12, &c. How then do the quotations in ver. 11-18 prove the point for which they seem to be adduced, that the *whole* human race without exception, Jews as well as Gentiles, "are *all* under sin," ver. 9, "that *every* mouth may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God," ver. 19?

Not directly—for St. Paul cannot mean to charge upon every individual Jew the sins recounted in these verses, no more than to say of every Gentile that he was guilty of the whole dark catalogue of vices charged against idolaters in chap. i. 18-32. The fearful picture there drawn of the heathen world, he here parallels with a similar testimony borne by the Holy Spirit in their own scriptures, to the general degeneracy of the Israelites at various periods of their history; in order to prove that they were equally guilty, nay more so, considering their superior advantages as compared with the heathen. Both descriptions were designed to testify to the universality of the fall, and to the inveteracy of the corruption which broke out into such fearful excesses, and that equally in the case of the great body of the Jews as of the Gentiles. This once conceded, and the Jews' national boast of superior righteousness overthrown, the way was cleared for each *individual's* conscience making the application to himself, "If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?" (Ps. cxxx. 3.) "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" (Prov. xx. 9). "For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not" (Eccles. vii. 20).

Viewed in this light the *universal* applicability even of the strongest expressions quoted will be evident. "There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God." These words, quoted from Psalm xiv., are indeed a description of the psalmist's adversaries, contrasted with whom is "the generation of the righteous," ver. 5; just as in Psalm xxxii. we have the "righteous and

upright in heart," who are invited to "rejoice and shout for joy," ver. 11, contrasted with "the wicked," ver. 10, to whom "many sorrows" are denounced. But who are "the *righteous*" that are thus called on to "rejoice"? The first words of the Psalm teach us, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile." The psalmist and "every one that is godly," ver. 6, differ from others, not through any freedom from sin, or righteousness of their own, of which they could boast above their neighbours, but solely because they cover not their sins, but humbly join in the confession of David in ver. 5—

I acknowledged my sin unto thee,
And mine iniquity have I not hid.
I said, "I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord:"—
And thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.

The possession of the Law, therefore, so far from leading to any boast of superiority on the part of the Jew, ought on the contrary to humble him, and prepare him, by deeper conviction of his sinfulness, for the reception of the gospel of grace. "For by the Law is the knowledge of sin," ver. 20. The Law, if "a man use it lawfully," does not puff up with the vain conceit of any fancied righteousness of one's own, but convinces of the violation of its strict and spiritual demands. "The Law is not made for a *righteous* man, but for the lawless and disobedient," 1 Tim. i. 9, being "added because of transgressions," Gal. iii. 19, and having "entered, that the offence might multiply," Rom. v. 20.

CHAPTER III. 21-26.

We have here a notable instance, of the unwillingness of commentators to see or allow the comprehensiveness of the Scripture phraseology, in the meaning which they attach to the phrase *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, "the righteousness of God," in this passage. It is impossible to deny that in verses 21, 22 it must

include the *justifying* righteousness of God, the *δικαιοῦμενοι δωρεάν*, "being justified freely," of ver. 24 being too plain to be overlooked or explained away. Again, in ver. 25, "for a declaration of His righteousness," when taken in connexion with the words immediately following, "because of the *passing over* of sins in time past during the *forbearance* of God," so evidently alludes to the apparent obscuration for a time of the *justice* or *retributive* righteousness of God in omitting to visit sin with its due penalty, that this meaning has been assigned to the expression in this verse by many of the same commentators (De Wette, Meyer, Tholuck, Philippi, Hodge, Alford, &c.) who had given it the other signification in ver. 21. Yet strange to say, they fail to perceive that St. Paul intends to combine *both* meanings, as he expressly says in ver. 26, "that He might be *just* and the *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus," and that no such strict line of demarcation ought to be drawn between the different meanings of the phrase as is generally done; but that he means to represent the gospel as a full manifestation of God's righteousness in all its bearings and varying aspects, though a prominence may in certain passages be given to one aspect above the others. In ver. 21 God's *sanctifying* or sin-extermimating righteousness must also be included, if He is to demonstrate Himself to be "*just*" finally at the last day, since "the *wrath* of God is revealed against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men."

A glance at the corresponding lines, as indicated by the parallelism, will show at once the two sides of this righteousness to which the apostle means here to give special prominence.

It is regarded, 1st, in the lines marked a, *a*, *a*, as a righteousness received by the sinner through faith, by which he is justified; and, 2dly, in those marked b, *b*, *β*, as implicating God's own inherent perfection of righteousness. In justifying or pronouncing righteous the ungodly, God's own righteousness might seem to be compromised as the righteous sovereign who has denounced death as the wages of sin, and who "will by no means clear the guilty:" but now it is declared that in the gospel has been manifested a righteousness of God which re-

conciles these two apparently incompatible perfections, of justice and mercy—God’s judicial righteousness being vindicated by the penalty endured by His own Son in the room of the guilty, so that mercy may be consistently extended to the penitent sinner.

21. *Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου*
Δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται,
Μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν,
22. *Δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,*
Εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας·
23. *Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή·*
Πάντες γὰρ ἤμαρτον, καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ·
24. a *Δικαιοῦμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι*
25. b { *Διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,*
Ὅν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἰλαστήριον
 a *Διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι,*
- b { *Εἰς ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ,*
Διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων
Ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ,
26. b { *Πρὸς τὴν ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ*
Ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ,
- β *Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον*
 α *Καὶ δικαιῶντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.*

This righteousness is characterized by a series of antitheses. It is “apart from the Law,” and yet previously “witnessed to by the law and the prophets,” ver. 21. It is “freely” (*δωρεάν*, excluding the idea of *debt*) bestowed on the believer, and yet the full “redemption”—price has been paid by Christ Jesus, ver. 24. It is of God’s “grace” (excluding the idea of *merit*), and yet full atonement has been made to God on a blood-sprinkled “propitiatory,” ver. 25. “In time past,” during God’s “forbearance” under the law, when it might seem by “the passing over of the sins” committed without any adequate atonement, that God’s righteousness was in abeyance, nevertheless blood (though of bulls and goats) sprinkled on an outward propitiatory, (the mere type of the true) served for a declaration *εἰς ἐνδειξιν*, ver. 24, of His righteousness during the

time then being ; but *now*, ver. 26 (b), ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, that the true propitiatory has replaced the typical, and the blood of the true "Lamb of God" has been sprinkled on it, it is "unto *the* [full] declaration," πρὸς τὴν ἐνδεῖξιν, v. 26, of "His righteousness at this present time."

Thus the righteousness of God, as now manifested in His imputing and imparting it to believers, is declared in no degree to trench upon his own inherent attribute of Righteousness, (or justice), which is thereby only the more fully and gloriously displayed. Full satisfaction is given to its demands as regards Himself, while He communicates of its fulness to others. He is "righteous, and at the same time pronounces righteous him that is of faith in Jesus." Those, therefore, seem evidently to err, who with a modern school confine the idea of the "*satisfaction*" made to God's righteousness, to the satisfaction He felt in His seeing a perfect righteousness which He had longed for in vain in man, at length realized in Christ Jesus, and through Him restored to humanity—though this sense is also included. The view of these theologians errs in being one-sided. They are anxious to inculcate a most important aspect of God's righteousness as manifested in the gospel—the *subjective*—as realized in man ; but they omit that on which alone it can be securely based—the *objective*—as realized, through Christ to man's apprehension, in God in both aspects of His character, as the moral governor of the universe, as well as the loving Father of all. "Mercy and truth" must first "meet together" in God, "righteousness and peace" must "kiss each other" and be reconciled in Him, and full "satisfaction" be shown to be rendered to the claims of both attributes, before they can produce their due effects on man. God's mercy must not be magnified at the expense of His truth. If God has said, "The wages of sin is death," death must follow, in the administration of the divine government, to the sinner, either in his own person or in that of a substitute;* otherwise God's truth is com-

* Nay, in the very mode of salvation appointed, the righteousness of God and the truth of His threatenings are enforced upon the sinner. Death still follows upon sin—the death of the old man and the entire surrender of the present life—although by God's grace this is turned into the very means of attaining the new life and perfecting man's cure.

promised, and the majesty of His law tarnished. How entirely consonant this is to the plain dictates of the human mind is proved by the well known story of the Locrian king, who, on his son being the first to violate the law which he had passed denouncing the loss of both eyes to any one guilty of adultery, both demonstrated his love to his son by submitting himself to the loss of an eye to save one of his son's, and yet impressed on all, only the more forcibly, his firm determination to uphold the truth of his royal word and the sanctity of his law. The Almighty has two characters to maintain, neither of which must be overlooked. He is not only the loving Father who delights to forgive the child, but He is the righteous Sovereign, whose Law must receive its full vindication; and it is the glory of the gospel, not that it "makes void the Law," but that it reconciles in most perfect harmony the apparently conflicting attributes of righteousness and mercy, and of truth and love, and shows the Lord of all to be "a just God, and [yet] a Saviour," Isaiah xlv. 21—a righteous Sovereign, as well as a compassionate Father, "visiting iniquity, and shewing mercy," Exod. xx. 5-6—"forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin," yet "that will by no means clear the guilty," Exod. xxxiv. 7—the "just" Judge, and yet "the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," Rom. iii. 26; all these seeming contradictions meeting in Him who was "God manifest in the flesh," who united in Himself both characters of "King of righteousness" and "King of peace," Heb. vii. 2.

Let us now consider more particularly some of the expressions used in this passage.

Πρόεθετο—'Γλαστήριον, v. 25.

In attempting to elucidate some of the difficulties in these verses, two principles of interpretation have been kept in view, which seem to require a more strict observance than is usually paid to them by commentators.

1. The signification of a word familiar to a writer, and uniformly attached by him to it (and its derivatives) in all undoubted instances, ought if possible to be retained in an obscure instance, in preference to any other.

Now the verb *προτίθειμαι* (used in iii. 25), and its derivative *πρόθεσις*, in the other eight instances in which they are used by St Paul, are uniformly translated “*purpose*” in the A.V., (Rom. i. 13; Eph. i. 9; Rom. viii. 28, ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9, iii. 10); and when spoken of God (as in six of these instances), they refer always to the *purpose* formed by Him in His eternal counsels for the salvation of believers. This strongly confirms the opinion of those who would retain the same meaning in ver. 25, and translate the passage “whom God *purposed* to be a propitiatory,” or, as in margin of Author. Version, “foreordained.”

Much the same principle applies to the signification to be put upon *ἰλαστήριον*, which is the word uniformly employed in the Septuagint for the *propitiatory*, or *mercy-seat*.* To assign to it any other meaning than that which St Paul knew that every reader of the Old Testament must attach to it, seems almost equivalent to saying that he wrote to be misunderstood, or was incompetent to select a fit expression to render his meaning clear and unambiguous.†

2. We ought not to suppose that any good writer heaps together prepositions or other expressions *pleonastically*, with-

* See Philippi's Commentary on this passage, in which he has well vindicated this meaning from all objections.

† Ought not the principle here enunciated to be laid down as a *Canon* of scriptural interpretation? viz., that where there is a uniform usage affixing a particular meaning to a word in the Old Testament (the Septuagint), the interpreter is bound to adhere to the same meaning in the New Testament, unless the writer or speaker has given the clearest intimations that he meant it to be otherwise understood. This would settle at once the disputed meanings of such words as *ἰλαστήριον*, *διαθήκη*, &c.

In Dr Morrison's Monograph on Rom. iii., he seems satisfactorily to have proved that there is no instance of *ἰλαστήριον* being used substantively in the meaning of a propitiatory sacrifice. He concludes for the adjectival meaning of “set forth as *propitiatory*,” which, as applied to Christ, would designate Him as the antitypical fulfilment of all the symbols of propitiation. This is a more satisfactory explanation than that of those who would translate the word “propitiation,” or “propitiator.” But I prefer the meaning “a propitiatory” or “mercy-seat” (as concentrating into one focus, on the great day of atonement, all the other propitiatory services of the year), not only for the reason stated above, but also on account of the pervading allusion throughout the whole passage (traced below) to the mysteries of the Holy of Holies.

out intending to express different ideas by each, *e.g.*, that St. Paul uses *εις πάντας*, and *ἐπι πάντας*,* “for all, and upon all” in ver. 22, without any distinct idea meant to be expressed by each (as Koppe, Rückert, Reiche, &c.); or that in ver. 25, 26, in varying *εις ἐνδειξιν* to *πρός τήν ἐνδειξιν*, he uses *εις* and *πρός* indiscriminately, merely “for the sake of euphony” (Philippi); and that no distinction is intended when he uses *ἐνδειξιν* *with*, and *without* the article, but that the one expression is merely a repetition and enforcement of the other, as in the Author. Version “to declare His righteousness,” ver. 25, “to declare, *I say*, at this time His righteousness.”†

Keeping these principles in view, we remark that all of the series of remarkable antitheses in these verses seem to be directed to two points.

1. To show that, in the manifestation of the Righteousness of God now made through the Gospel, there is an entire harmony between its two different aspects—the *retributive*, and the *justifying*.

2. To show the harmony between the former dispensation, and the present.‡

The former of these points has already been illustrated, see pp. 162-165.

The latter is that which seems calculated to throw light on the difficulties we are at present considering.

Ver. 21. There is a manifestation *now* made, *apart from the Law*; yet borne witness to *before*, by *the Law* and the prophets.

Ver. 22. This righteousness was from the first, in God’s predestinated purpose, designed *for all*, *εις πάντας*;

* That is, provided that *καὶ ἐπι πάντας* is the genuine reading. Still less, if not genuine, can we suppose that those who thought the addition necessary, considered the expressions equivalent.

† So also in the “Revision of the Auth. Version by Five Clergymen,” each is translated, “For the shewing forth of His righteousness.”

‡ On this, as an important argument for conciliating the Jew, the apostle laid much stress, as is evident from its being the first point mentioned in the introductory epitome of the principal topics of the Epistle given in chap. i. 2-6, “the gospel of God, which He *had promised afore by His prophets in the holy scriptures*,” ver. 2.

And now is "poured down"* upon all, ἐπι πάντας, that believe.

Ver. 25. God, προέθετο, † "before purposed, foreordained" Jesus Christ to be a mercy seat, to whom the eyes of believers were to be directed as their propitiatory.

b. More dimly shadowed forth, under the former dispensation, by the type of the blood-sprinkled mercy-seat, upon which the adoring gaze of the Cherubim (the emblems of the Redeemed Church) was continually bent ;

εἰς ἔνδειξιν (without the article) "for an [indefinite] exhibition" in type, "of God's judicial righteousness"—[in both its aspects of sin-condemning, and sin-forgiving righteousness] for the time then being—necessary "because of the passing over of sins in time past, ‡ during the forbearance of God." The apostle uses πάρεσιν "passing over" (not ἄφεσιν "remission") of sins. It was therefore an imperfect exhibition of God's righteousness in both its aspects that could then be made, since sin appeared to be "passed over," not truly condemned and atoned for ; and the sinner not to be truly justified, nor "sprinkled in heart from an evil conscience," Heb. x. 22, because it was "not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins," Heb. x. 4. §

* Isaiah xlv. 8. "Drop down ye heavens from above,
And let the skies pour down righteousness."

Compare Psalm lxxii. 6 : lxxxv. 11 : Titus iii. 6, &c. Or ἐπι, according to another Biblical figure, may be meant to express that righteousness is put as a robe upon believers ; compare Isaiah lxi. 10 ; Rom. xiii. 14 ; Gal. iii. 27 ; Eph. iv. 24.

† The contrast between *ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεός*, "whom God fore-ordained," ver. 25, and *ὃν νῦν δὲ πεφανερώται*, but now has been manifested," ver. 21, receives light, and confirmation that fore-ordained [purposed beforehand] is the true rendering of προέθετο, from its exact parallelism with 1 Pet. i. 20, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων δι' ὑμᾶς, "who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifested in these last times for you."

‡ Compare Heb. ix. 15.

§ The atonement and sacrifices under the Law were, like the dispensation itself and every thing under it, but "the shadows of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," Heb. x. 1. The sins dealt with were but outward ceremonial defilements, and the sacrifices offered made but a mere ceremonial atonement for these. For sin itself, the inward defilement of the heart,

This typical exhibition of God's righteousness by the blood-sprinkled mercy-seat was ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, in the time of the forbearance of God,"* as contrasted with that in ver. 26, (b), ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ "in this present time," yet preparatory to it;

(b) πρὸς τὴν ἐνδειξιν (with the article) pointing forward to the [definite τῇ†] exhibition, to be openly and fully made "of His righteousness" as complete in both its aspects, in the antitype Christ, as the true mercy-seat sprinkled with His own blood of atonement.

Thus πρὸς τὴν ἐνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, "for the *showing forth* of His *righteousness* in the time *now* present," is strikingly parallel to Νῦν δὲ δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, "But *now* the *righteousness* of God is *manifested*," iii. 21; and since in ver. 26 commentators are generally agreed in giving to δικαιοσύνη the meaning of "justice" or God's *attribute* of righteousness,—a meaning necessarily required by the expression *πάρεσαν*, *passing by*, [not *ἄφεσον*, *remission*,] (though not exclusive of the other)—the same meaning ought surely to be extended to it in ver. 21: and again, as they generally attribute to it, in ver. 21, the meaning of "*justifying* righteousness," consistency requires this meaning to be extended to it in *b* and *h*, ver. 25, 26. We have thus, as already mentioned, a clear proof of the pregnancy of meaning for which we contend, as attributable to δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ, and which St Paul immediately in the most express terms assigns to it; εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα, "*just*" and "*justifying*."

the Law made no provision. Still in dealing with the figures of these realities, and in the symbolical teaching thus conveyed, a pledge was given of better things to come, and the hope was awakened that that God, who opened up the way of return, when closed by ceremonial sins, to communion with Himself in His worship, and manifested His righteousness in providing an outward atonement by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat, would one day provide a real atonement for those sins which defiled the conscience, and justify the sinner "from all those things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39.

The "mercy-seat" therefore was εἰς ἐνδειξιν for *a* (typical) manifestation.

* Compare Acts xvii. 30, "And the times of this ignorance God winked at (ὑπεριδών, 'overlooked,') but now (τὰ νῦν) commandeth all men every where to repent."

† τὴν ἐνδ. This is the reading of all the first-class MSS., and followed by Tischendorf, Lachmann, Alford, B. F. Westcott &c.

The preposition *εις*, both in ver. 22, and 25, seems to express, according to one of its most ordinary significations with the accusative, the purpose for which any thing is intended.

In ver. 22, where it is opposed to *ἐπί*, *εις πάντα* probably signifies "designed *for* all," *ἐπί πάντα*, "poured down *upon* all;" *εις* referring more to God's original *purpose* to include all, Gentiles as well as Jews, in His promised salvation, (compare Eph. i. 5, 10, 12, 14); *ἐπί*, more to its *realization*, and overflowing fulness of accomplishment in the communicated blessings of the gospel, (so nearly Meyer, Philippi, &c.)

In ver. 25, *εις* as opposed to *πρός* would in like manner indicate the design of God in His having purposed or foreordained Christ (*προέθετο*) as a propitiatory, but more distantly and obscurely, as shown in the type of the mercy-seat, *εις ἕνδειξιν* "for an exhibition of His righteousness;" while *πρός τὴν ἑὴν* expresses the more open purpose now manifested in Christ the antitype *before* all, (*πρός* being connected with *πρό* "fore, be-fore," as *εις* = *ἐν*, with *ἐν*. "Πρός quiddam presentius notat, Rom. xv. 2, Eph. iv. 12," Bengel.)

Ver. 25. *διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, "through faith in His blood."

For a defence of the rendering in the A.V. of this phrase see note P. p. 459 of "The Nature and the Effects of Faith," by the Bishop of Ossory, 2d edition.

Ver. 23. "The glory of God."

The conclusions now reached tend to throw back a clear light on the meaning of the expression in ver. 23, "and have come short of the *glory of God*," to the examination of which we now proceed. The result will, we believe, strongly corroborate the meaning assigned to *ἡλασθήριον* of "the *mercy seat*," and evince that St. Paul had before his mind, throughout the whole passage, the typical import of the Holy of Holies with its sacred furniture.

A large number of commentators interpret "the glory of God" as meaning "the praise which comes from God." That this, however, is far from exhausting its meaning seems fairly deducible from a comparison with other passages of the epistle.

1. We read in ii. 7 of those who "seek for *glory*," and to whom God will award it, ver. 10.

2. Here, in iii. 23, of those that "come short of the *glory of God*."

3. Then in v. 2, that those who have attained to justification by faith in Christ can "rejoice in hope of [attaining] the *glory of God*."

4. Next, in viii. 30, that this glory is the final consummation of all the hopes of the Christian; for "whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also *glorified*."

5. And it is a glory so great that we may well wait and "suffer with Christ that we may be also *glorified* together" with Him. "For the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the *glory* which shall be revealed in us," verses 17 and 18; namely, at "the manifestation of the sons of God," ver. 19.

What then precisely is this glory? It is a partaking in "the glory of God." Such is Christ's promise to His followers. "The *glory* which Thou gavest Me, I have given them," John xvii. 22. The blessedness of heaven, our Lord tells His apostles, is to consist in "beholding *My glory* which Thou gavest Me," ver. 24—and being like Him, as the beloved disciple informs us, "It doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see him as He is," 1 John iii. 2.

How is this glory to be attained or communicated? By contemplating, as we are instructed by St. Paul, the glory of God as reflected to us in Him who is "the brightness of His glory." "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the *glory* of the Lord, are changed into the same image from *glory* to *glory* as by the Spirit of the Lord," 2 Cor. iii. 18.

But this passage leads us inevitably to compare the manifestation of the glory of God made to Christians in the face of Christ Jesus, with the more imperfect manifestation made under the ancient dispensation to Moses of that "glory which was to be done away," 2 Cor. iii. 7-18. He *alone* of the Israelites was admitted face to face to see that glory, and a

faint reflection of it, soon to pass away, was seen in his countenance ; while “ we [Christians] *all*, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.” The great aspiration of Moses ever was to see more and more of this glory. Hence his importunate request, after he had been already forty days and forty nights in the midst of “ the glory of the Lord that abode upon Mount Sinai,” Exod. xxiv. 16, was still, “ I beseech thee, show me thy glory,” Exod. xxxiii. 18. The Lord vouchsafed to grant his request. Let us then, that we may gain a clearer conception of this glory, observe wherein the manifestation of it consisted. “ And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed,” Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7,

The LORD, the LORD God,
 Merciful and gracious,
 Long-suffering,
 And abundant in mercy and truth ;

 Keeping mercy for thousands,
 Forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin,
 And that will by no means clear the guilty ;

 Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children,
 And upon the children’s children,
 Unto the third and fourth generation.

The union of abounding *mercy* with sin-visiting *righteousness*—of perfect *love* with perfect *holiness*—forms the essence of the manifestation of God’s “ name ” and glory here made to Moses.

But the reflection of this glory was beheld in Moses’ face, every time that he spoke to the Israelites after having been in the presence of God, though it soon faded away, so that immediately “ after* he had done speaking with them he put a veil on his face,” Exod. xxxiv. 33, in order “ that the children of Israel might not steadfastly look to the end of that

* The insertion in our authorised, as in most versions, of the word “ *till*,” for which there is no warrant in the Hebrew, completely reverses the meaning of this passage.

[dispensation] which was to be abolished," 2 Cor. iii. 13.* How then did he renew the reflection of the glory on his countenance, when he wished to enforce any new commands of the Lord upon the Israelites? By going in again into the sanctuary of the Lord, as we read in Exod. xxxiv. 34, "But whensoever Moses (*ἤνιστα δ' ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο* LXX.) went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he took the veil off (*περιηρέτω* LXX.; *וַיִּבֹרֵךְ* [the *Imperfect* or continuative, generally called in Hebrew grammars the Future], *he was in the habit of taking off* the veil) until he came out. And he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded. And the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone (in LXX. *ὅτι δεδόξασται*, that it had been *glorified*); and Moses put the veil upon his face again, until he went in to speak with Him"—his habitually veiled countenance denoting the veiled character of the dispensation which he was commissioned to introduce.

What then was the character of that glory which was beheld in the tabernacle? is our next inquiry. The part of the tabernacle in which the glory of the Lord was stately present was the Holy of Holies, and therein more immediately the propitiatory or mercy seat, according to the promise made by the Lord in Exod. xxv. 21, 22, "And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And *there* I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee *from above the mercy seat*, from between the cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony." The typical import of the furniture of the Most Holy Place, as generally understood, is: In the ark were deposited the two Tables of the Law, or of the *Testimony*, so called as *testifying* to the holiness of God, and against the unholiness of man. But the voice of accusation that it was continually sending up against His people's transgression to the

* See the notes of Meyer, Alford, or Wordsworth on 2 Cor. iii. 13; and observe particularly *ἐτίθει κάλυμμα*, "was in the habit of putting on a veil," and *πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου*, "in order that the sons of Israel might not look on the end, or the fading, of that transitory glory."—Alford.

holy God, who sat enthroned between the cherubim above, was silenced or *covered* by (the capporeth, כַּפֹּרֶת) the propitiatory *covering*, or mercy seat, on which the blood of atonement was sprinkled, so that the holy eye of God resting complacently on the blood of reconciliation was appeased and satisfied; and the eyes of the cherubim were steadfastly bent down on the blood-sprinkled mercy seat in adoring contemplation of this wondrous manifestation of *righteousness* and *mercy* reconciled, of perfect *holiness* united with perfect *love*.

There is thus the most entire coincidence and beautiful harmony between "the glory of God" as revealed in His "name" proclaimed before Moses, and as beheld in the Holy of Holies on the propitiatory (viz., the union of perfect *holiness* with perfect *love*); and again between this glory and that "righteousness of God," "*just and justifying*," now manifested in Him in whom is God's "name," Ex. xxiii. 21; and who alone could "manifest and declare that name," John xvii. 6, 26; who is "the brightness of God's *glory*," and the express image of His person," Heb. i. 3.

The glory of God, of which man has "come short" by sin, and into which it is the great object of the gospel to renew him, is that which was at first designed for man, when made "in the image of God;" that glory which, through the fall, he became powerless to behold, much less to reflect; which, faintly revealed under the old dispensation to the few admitted to approach the Holy of Holies—and, to the great body of worshippers, manifested only in the evanescent rays reflected occasionally from Moses' face, or in sudden flashes from out the dark pillar of cloud—is now laid open to the full gaze of all Christians in the face of God's own Son, in whom "mercy and truth" have again "met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other." Unto Him all are invited to come, that "beholding in Him as in a glass the glory of the Lord" they may themselves be "changed into the same image from glory to glory;" and shining as lights in the midst of a benighted world, may reflect even here below, each in his measure, the *holiness* of God in harmonious union with divine *love*.

Thus the very reason alleged by Meyer for rejecting any

reference to the “*image of God’s glory*”—viz., that “it is inconsistent with the context, and that ἡ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ [the glory of God] here intended cannot differ substantially from the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ [the righteousness of God], as its connection with the immediately following Δικαιοσύμενοι, &c. [Being justified freely, &c.], clearly shows,”—changes into a strong argument for its adoption.* The context demands this meaning to the phrase, and its identity with “the righteousness of God” has been demonstrated. The pregnancy of meaning already claimed for δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ,† and to be claimed for ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ,‡ is now seen to belong to ἡ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ. All the three expressions are brought into the finest harmony, as all pointing to the same thing—all denoting originally what belongs to God *possessively*, as His essential perfection—“*God’s righteousness*,” “*God’s love*,” “*God’s glory* ;” yet all as communicable to man by virtue of his union with God through Christ Jesus, by whom he can be rendered a “partaker of the divine nature,” 2 Pet. i. 4.

CHAPTER IV.

The argument in this chapter is most skilfully managed so as to answer a double purpose. 1. It replies to the yet unanswered objection proposed in ch. iii. 1, “What profit is there of circumcision ?” and 2. it is made equally to promote the great subject of section B, under which it occurs, viz., to prove that “Righteousness is by FAITH,” not by Law or any outward observance. This it does by showing from the instance of Abraham, in relation specially to the time and to the promise connected with his circumcision, that FAITH alone justifies, irrespectively of all works, ver. 2-8, of circumcision, 9-12 ; of Law, 13-16 ; a faith of which Abraham’s is the pattern, 17-25. §

* See Kommentar über den Römerbrief von Dr. Heinr., Aug. Wilh. Meyer.

† See Notes on i. 16, 17, pp. 102-106, and Dissertation on δικαιοσύνη, p. 108 ff.

‡ See Notes on chap. v. 5, and viii. 28-39.

§ Compare a similar instance in 1 Cor. ix., where St. Paul, in inculcating the obligation of consulting the scruples of weaker brethren, by adducing his own example of self-denial, at the same time skilfully turns his argument into a defence of the authority, dignity, and independence of his apostleship which his adversaries in Corinth had impugned.

At the close of chap. iii., it was said, ver. 29, 30, that God was the God of the Gentiles also as well as of the Jews, and therefore would “justify the uncircumcision through faith, as well as the circumcision that was of faith.” This brings up again the second of the two objections of the Jews started in iii. 1, and which had not yet received an answer, “What profit is there of circumcision?” This question is now repeated in iv. 1 in equivalent terms, If circumcision and uncircumcision are thus placed on the same footing with regard to justification before God, “What shall we say then that Abraham our father has gained according to the flesh?” Is God’s solemn covenant ratified in the flesh of every Jew according to those words of God’s appointment, “it shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant,” Gen. xiii. 13, of no avail? Are we not thereby made God’s people, and therefore accepted and justified before Him, as the fulfilment of His part of the covenant, whenever we have performed our part in obeying His command by circumcising our children? Surely to our father Abraham this rite of circumcision, or cutting off the filthiness of the flesh, was the outward sign of what God was to do for him inwardly, by circumcising the foreskin of his heart, putting away his sin, and receiving him into His covenant? If not,

What shall we say then that Abraham our father
Hath found as pertaining to the *flesh*?

The answer would be of course, as to the former of the questions in iii. 2, “Much every way, chiefly &c. ;” but before proceeding to state the chief reason (the *πρῶτον μὲν* iii. 2), which he does in ver. 11, he must first repel any supposed concession as to the main point—of justification, or right to glorying of the Jew in this respect above the Gentile. “What hath Abraham gained as pertaining to the flesh?” Not justification; “for if Abraham were justified by” obedience to this painful command of circumcision, or by any “works” whatever, he would have “whereof to glory.” But this he has “not before God,” since the Scripture ascribes his justification to his faith, not to his obedience.

3. Abraham *believed* God,
And it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Gen. xv. 6.

Thus God's method of justification, as being by faith alone, is borne witness to by the Law (iii. 21), as it is also by the prophets, as proved by David's words, ver. 6-8.

Ver. 9-10. That circumcision in no way conduces to justification is evident from the fact, that Abraham is declared in Scripture (Gen. xv. 6) to have been justified by his faith at least fourteen years *before* the covenant of circumcision was established (comp. Gen. xvi. 16 and xvii. 1).

Ver. 11. In answer now to the question, "What hath Abraham gained according to the flesh? or, "What profit is there of circumcision?" it is replied, One special benefit among others to Abraham (and to all his children by faith) consisted in this, that it became a seal or public attestation to him, on the part of God, of His acceptance of the faith which he had so long before, and of the certainty of the promises being fulfilled in their due time.

Ver. 11-18. In the circumstances connected with Abraham's circumcision as being 1. subsequent to, and the ratification of, his previous justification, and 2. the occasion of the renewal of God's promises to him, the apostle shows that we have a double proof of Abraham's being the FATHER and pattern of all believers, as indeed is symbolized in his double name, Ab-ram, and the new name that was then given to him, Ab-raham; the former denoting "high (renowned) father," as the father of the *one* chosen nation of Israel, and the latter the "father of *many* nations," *i.e.*, of all believers of every nation. This twofold division of the passage is clearly marked out by the parallelistic arrangement, in which it will be seen that the twice repeated "FATHER" ("of all that believe," "of *circumcision*"), in verses 11, 12, corresponds to the twice repeated "FATHER" ("of us all," "of *many nations*") in verses 17, 18; while the regularly arranged epanodos in verses 13-16 forms the transition from the former to the latter.

In his first relation as Ab-ram, the father of "*a great nation*," of "*circumcision*" in verses 11, 12—by the very mode and time of the institution of circumcision it was so ordered in the

providence of God, that in becoming the father of God's visible church and peculiar people, Ab-ram was at the same time fitted for the higher distinction of being "the FATHER [federal head and pattern] of all them that believe," uncircumcised, ver. 11, as well as circumcised, ver. 12—by its being seen that his faith, standing so completely apart from, and prior to, his circumcision, alone justified him, and not the fleshly rite [verses 11, 12, in connexion with ver. 10]; so that he is "the FATHER of circumcision" not to those who were merely outwardly circumcised, but to the circumcised in heart (Deut. x. 16, xxx. 6,) "who walk in the steps of Abraham's faith which he had being yet uncircumcised."*

In his second relation, as Ab-raham, *the father of a multitude*, or of *many nations*, verses 17, 18, the new name given to him on occasion of his receiving the covenant of circumcision—the proof that Faith alone justifies, and that Abraham by his faith became the father of all believers, is still more direct. The reference here is to the spiritual or Messianic promise, "In thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." By this Abraham is constituted "heir of the world," ver. 13, the spiritual "FATHER of many nations," ver. 18, through Christ his seed, in whom *all* nations were to be blessed, and who was to receive "the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession," Ps. ii. 8. It was a *promise*, and as such (it is shown in the epanodos, ver. 13-16) was independent of the Law in which the Jews so greatly gloried, which, coming "four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul the promise," Gal. iii. 17. The Law requires perfect obedience, which, as being beyond the power of man to render, would make "the promise of none effect," ver. 14; but a promise requires faith alone to grasp it, and is thus "sure to all the seed" who show like faith with Abraham, and believe God's word, as he did, to be certain of fulfilment, however contrary to the eye of sense,

* Abraham's receiving circumcision so long after his faith was reckoned to him for righteousness, taught the uncircumcised, ver. 11, that justification is attainable without circumcision, "through faith" alone, *διὰ τῆς πίστεως*, iii. 30; and, ver. 12, taught the circumcised that they are justified by their faith, not by their circumcision, which avails nothing unless it be a "circumcision of faith," *περιτομήν ἐκ πίστεως*, iii. 30.

ver. 16. Thus was he constituted and regarded as "FATHER of us all," ver. 17, before the all-seeing eye of "Him whom he believed, even God;" the import of whose words he had apprehended and appropriated, "I *have made* [not, I *will make*] thee a father of many nations," Gen. xvii, 5; by faith realizing like God, as if *already* accomplished, "those things which be not as though they were."

In the epanodos, ver. 13-16, the first three lines, a, b, c, correspond with the last three, a, b, c, directly; in a, a, we have "the promise;" in b, b, "not of the Law;" in c, c, "but of faith."

The central six lines, d, e, f, f, e, d, form an introverted parallelism, in which the first line corresponds with the sixth, the second with the fifth, &c.; the lines being antithetically parallel. In d, d, "Law" and "Grace" stand opposed; in e, we have "faith made void," in e, "faith" appropriating the promise; in f, "Law" and therefore judicial "wrath," in f, "no law" and therefore "no transgression."

CHAPTER V. 1.

Ver. 1. "Therefore, being justified by faith,
Let us have peace with God," &c.
 εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.

The difference between the two readings ἔχομεν and ἔχωμεν consists in this, that ἔχομεν represents the Apostle as simply stating one of the blessed effects that result from justification by faith, "we *have* peace with God;" ἔχωμεν, in addition, indicates the necessity of our going on "from faith to faith," i. 17, if we would fully realize and appropriate the blessings involved in free justification by faith alone, and is equivalent to,—"If justified by faith, we have peace with God, and *let us hold and enjoy it.*"* That the true reading is ἔχωμεν, we argue from the following considerations:—

* If the subjunctive ἔχωμεν is the true reading, "Let us have"—*καυχώμεθα*, which is coupled with it in ver. 2 and 3, must be subjunctive also = "Let us glory," though this has been strangely overlooked in the "Version Revised by Five Clergymen."

1. It is the reading of almost all the first class authorities, of Codd. A, B, C, D, and the Sinaitic Codex, the Greek Fathers, the Italic, Vulgate, the Arabic, and Coptic Versions, &c.

2. It is the more difficult reading, as is evident from the difficulty which most modern commentators have found in accepting it, notwithstanding the confessed preponderance of MS. authority in its favour. Consequently the alteration by transcribers from ἐζωμεν to ἐζομεν is far more probable than the reverse change.

3. It is more in accordance with the association of ideas familiar to St. Paul. His first and leading wish for all his converts was an *increase* of "grace and peace" to them from God. No epistle from him begins without it. His apostolical benediction ever is, "Grace be to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ;"* *grace* too, observe, being always placed first, and *peace* second. So, in the case before us, though the authorized version conceals this, "Let us have *peace* through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also [not "we *have*," but] we *have had*, ἐσζησαμεν, access by faith into this *grace* wherein we stand." What more natural then, for one whose most ardent desire was for growth in grace, and peace, and all the blessed fruits of faith to believers, than, even in a doctrinal passage, intended to show that such are the inseparable and indispensable accompaniments of faith, to give a hortatory turn to the expression, and to urge the Romans to hold fast the peace consequent on believing, in order to an unfaltering, onward progress?

4. Any remaining objection to the form of the expression, "Let us have peace," is removed by our finding an exactly similar expression with regard to "grace" in Heb. xii. 28, ἐζωμεν χάριν, "let us have grace;" and it is a rather striking coincidence, if we regard St. Paul as the virtual, if not actual, author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that in his two principal epistles, the one addressed to the Jews, and the other to the chief of the Gentile nations, we find two such remarkable ex-

* The desire for *increase* in these blessings is still more distinctly expressed in the benediction of his fellow-apostle Peter, "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you," 1 and 2 Pet. i. 2.

pressions—as in the former, “Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, *let us have grace*, ἐχῶμεν χάριν, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear ;” and in the latter, “Therefore being justified by faith, *let us have peace* with God, εἰρήνην ἐχῶμεν.

From the uncommonness of the expression, however, the passage in the Hebrews has not been allowed to pass without question. A few MSS. have even here altered ἐχῶμεν into ἐχομεν, but the great preponderance of authority is for ἐχῶμεν. But strong objection has been taken to the rendering of our Author. Version, “Let us have *grace*,” according to which alone it would be parallel to the case in the Romans. It is argued that if χάριν here meant “grace,” the expression must have been τὴν χάριν, and accordingly several of the ancient and the great majority of the later commentators render the expression, ἐχῶμεν χάριν, “let us manifest *gratitude*, whereby we may serve God,” &c. But as Bloomfield has well observed, “This does not suit well with the words following.” The objection holds good only against the view which represents the meaning to be, “Let us hold fast *the grace* vouchsafed to us in the new dispensation: let us continue steadfast in that faith and dispensation delivered in the Gospel, whereby alone both our persons and our services are rendered acceptable unto God.” This would, indeed, require the grace to be particularized by the article. But as Bloomfield proceeds, “It would rather seem that the sense is simply, Let us [seek to] have grace, whereby, &c.; by that use of ἐχζειν (also found at Matt. xiii. 12 and Luke viii. 18, ὅστις γὰρ ἐχζει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ), by which it signifies to have *to good purpose* by keeping and improving it. [Bloomfield might have added 2 Tim. i. 13, ῥητοῦ ἁπλοῦσιν ἐχζει, “Hold fast the form of sound words,” and James ii. 1, “My brethren *have* [hold] the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ not with respect of persons,” μὴ ἐν προσωποληψίαις ἐχζει]. And in nearly the same way, I find, Doddridge understood the passage, observing that ‘in this oblique intimation, by which it is, as it were, *taken for granted* that we may certainly *have grace* if we take proper methods for obtaining it, there is something peculiarly impressive.’ So

Hyperius [with a manifest reference to the corresponding passage in Romans] observes: ‘*Gratia hæc diligenter apprehendenda est per fidem, siquidem in ea stamus (2 Cor. i. 24), et certificati de salute æterna gloriamur sub spe gloriæ Dei.*’”

But what decides the meaning of the passage is the context. The object of the whole chapter is *exhortation* (as is evident from its very commencement) to perseverance and progress, ver. 15, “looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God,” ἵστέρῃων ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ;—“for [here we give the substance of the succeeding argument in Dean Alford’s words, preferably to our own, since he opposes our view] “*for* (not only have we the solemn warning of Esau, but) we are not under the law with its terrors, but under the Gospel with its promises,—hearing one who speaks for the last time, who speaks from heaven,—and receiving a kingdom which shall not be moved.”

“Wherefore,” the Apostle concludes, ver. 28, with a manifest reference to ver. 15, “let us have *grace* whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear,” namely, by following on more and more to know the Lord and the fulness of His salvation, otherwise some root of bitterness may spring up and trouble us, and we may “fail [come short] of the *grace* of God.”

We have but to place the two verses in juxtaposition to see that ver. 28 refers back to ver. 15:—

Ver. 15. “Look diligently lest any man fail of *the grace of God.*”

Ver. 28. “Wherefore let us have *grace*, whereby we may serve God,” &c.

5. The common reading ἔχομεν, with its complement εἰρήνην, would seem to be little better than a tautology, since the idea that it would denote is expressed already by ἐσχημαμεν, v. 2, with its complement. The “grace” or favour with God in which we stand as believers, and “peace with God” are all but equivalent terms.* To say that “we *have had access*” to this blessing, and that “we *have*” it, presents no sufficient distinction in the thought. But change ἔχομεν into

* “Χάρις expresses God’s love toward man; εἰρήνη, the state of peace and blessedness which results from it.”—Bishop Ellicott on Eph. i. 2.

ἐζωμεν, and we have a contrast more worthy of St. Paul. "Access into this grace," the Apostle will then say, "we *have had*" already on our being first justified. "Let us then *continue to have* (or hold fast) this grace"—this "peace with God."† Let us behold in Jesus "the finisher," as well as the "author of our faith." "Grace and peace with God" we attained at the beginning of our faith: "let us hold our peace, and let us glory in hope of (attaining) the glory of God" at its end.

The καὶ "also" before τὴν προσεγγωγήν "access" will thus gain in expressiveness, in connexion with the preceding clause. "Let us hold fast our peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have had *also* our access at first into this grace."

6. But ἐζωμεν, we conceive, is more in accordance with the whole context. The hortatory form tends to bring out still more clearly the object which the Apostle has in view. This is to show that the firm holding of the fundamental doctrine of justification by faith alone, with the full understanding of all that is involved in it, is necessary to a uniform progressive advancement in the Christian life. The import of the beginning of chap. v. is this: If justified before God, that is, declared by Him to be righteous, let us feel convinced that perfect righteousness is ours, *already* in present prospect, and in certain impartation in full *hereafter*; and let us hold fast peace with God, as seeing that our justification in no way depends on what we are in ourselves and on the amount of righteousness (imperfect to the last in this life) as yet inwrought into us, but on the perfect righteousness of Christ already counted and assured to us in final complete possession by God. Only, if holding fast this *peace* even now as our present possession, and the assured *hope* of glory hereafter, can we make steady progress in holiness. Let us cast aside all those guilty fears of wrath which would interfere with the former and keep the soul ever "subject to bondage;" and let us cheerfully submit to, nay rejoice in, those tribulations, which so far from weakening strengthen the latter.

† ἔχωμεν χάριν, Heb. xii. 28; εἰρήμην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, Rom. v. 1.

CONNECTION OF CHAPTER V. 1-21.

In order to see the connection of the whole chapter, let us attend first only to its great broad outlines, as indicated by the parallelistic arrangement.

Ver. 1, 2. Here, in the second and last lines of the stanza, two fruits or results of justification by FAITH are stated, viz., 1. "PEACE with God," already experienced at present; and 2. "HOPE of [attaining to] the glory of God" for the future. Christ is "the Alpha and Omega," "the author and the finisher of our faith." He begins the good work within us; He perfects it unto the end.

Ver. 1. The first blessing, "PEACE with God," is a fruit evidently involved in justification. If justified, *i.e.*, pronounced righteous by God, the cause of dispeace and enmity with Him, viz., our unrighteousness, is done away. "We have had access into a state of grace" or favour with Him; we are "reconciled" to Him, at peace with God. "Let us have" then and hold, *ἔχωμεν*, "this peace." This, however, is but the initial stage, and the emotion which this first blessing of Peace calls forth is more of a calm and contemplative nature; but to stimulate the Christian to the progress and conflict to which he is called, the apostle exhorts us to rise higher—to "glory" (*καυχώμεθα*, boast, "rejoice," in the Auth. Version).

Ver. 2. "Let us glory in HOPE of the glory of God." If justified, *i.e.*, pronounced righteous, then righteousness is assured as ours, "the Righteousness of God," that which forms the very "glory" and blessedness "of God" Himself. This, indeed, unlike the Peace, is not ours yet in actual possession, but only in hope; but "let us glory in that HOPE, in the hope of attaining finally and certainly to God's own glory and bliss.

This gives the division to the rest of the chapter, which is evidently divided into two main parts, marked by the recurrence at the commencement of each division (verses 3 and 11) of the same expression—

Ὁὐ μόνον ὀέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι,*

"And not only so, but inasmuch as we glory in, &c."

* *Καυχώμενοι* is probably the correct reading in ver. 3, as will be remarked below.

1. Therefore being justified by FAITH,
Let us have PEACE with God
Through our Lord Jesus Christ,
2. By whom also we have had access by faith
Into this Grace wherein we stand;
And let us glory in HOPE of the glory of God:
3. /And not only so, but also as we glory in tribulations;
Knowing that tribulation worketh patience,
4. And patience, experience;
And experience, HOPE;
5. And Hope maketh not ashamed,
Because the LOVE of God is shed abroad in our hearts
By the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.
6. For when we were yet without strength,
In due time Christ died for the ungodly.
7. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die:
Yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to
8. But God commendeth His love toward us, [die.
In that while we were yet sinners
Christ died for us.
9. Much more then, being now justified by His blood,
We shall be saved from wrath through Him.
10. For if when we were enemies,
We were reconciled to God by the death of His Son,
Much more, being reconciled,
We shall be saved by His life.
11. /And not only so, but also as we glory in God,
Through our Lord Jesus Christ,
By whom we have now received the reconciliation—on this account:
12. As by one man,
SIN entered into the world,
And DEATH by sin;
And so death passed upon all men,
For that all have sinned:
.
.
21. That as SIN hath reigned
In DEATH,
Even so might Grace reign through RIGHTEOUSNESS
Unto eternal LIFE,
By Jesus Christ our Lord.

Glorying, then, not merely *having peace*, the apostle en-

joins as the habitual state of mind of the Christian. But, the believer will be ready to object, how can I be continually glorying? Are there not obstacles which effectually preclude my maintaining this inspiriting feeling? And

(1.) Ver. 3-10. "Tribulations," which are peculiarly the lot of "all that will live godly in Christ." Are not tribulations the effects of sin, marks, therefore, so far of God's displeasure? It is hard under these to preserve even a sense of "PEACE with God," but how "glory" in them? Must they not damp and discourage the HOPE we are called upon to cherish? No, is the reply, not only are we to glory in hope of the glory of God, but to glory in the very thing that might seem to compromise our hope, to "glory in tribulations also," ver. 3; for these tend to strengthen our Christian graces—the grace of "patience," which "worketh experience," which again worketh the second cardinal grace in our hearts, "HOPE"—a hope which can never disappoint us, since not peace alone with God is imparted to us, but "the LOVE of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us;" shed abroad so copiously as to fill our hearts with the third cardinal grace, LOVE, and to make it flow back in a reciprocation of LOVE towards God, caused by His great Love towards us, v. 5; this love giving us the assurance that if it accomplished for us the greater work, much more must it accomplish the less; if "when sinners, when enemies," we were "justified," "we were reconciled by the death of God's Son; much more we shall be saved from wrath finally by His life," verses 6-10.

(2.) Ver. 11-21. But a much more formidable objection than even tribulations remains to bar our joy. Though justified or *declared* righteous (and righteousness constitutes God's glory and bliss) how can I glory in that which is not yet mine in full possession? Nay, it is hard enough to hold fast my sense of "Peace with God," while the remains of what we inherit from our first parent Adam, SIN and its inseparable attendant DEATH, still linger in me, and "the wrath of God is revealed" more than ever by the gospel "against all unrighteousness;" but how, in this imperfect state, can I *glory*—while still parted, as

all sin must so far part the sinner, from God? The reply is, Though God's glory is as yet ours only in hope, we can "glory in God" as already ours, ver. 11. Let us, undaunted by every guilty fear that Satan may suggest, glory in the assured hope of attaining finally to the perfect righteousness and glory of God, since we can "*glory in God*" Himself, as being already in union with Him "through" our union with His Son "our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation." If it is asked, "How is this to avail us?" "On this account," διὰ τοῦτο, verses 12-21, that as by our connexion with Adam all that was his became ours, so by our union with Christ (and through Him with God the Father) all that is His is made sure to us as our own in full eventual possession, so that the SIN and DEATH which might interfere with our enjoyment of "Peace with God" and with our "glorying in Hope of (attaining to) His glory," shall be entirely superseded and replaced finally by the perfect RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE received through Christ.

The change of reading in ver. 3, *καυχώμενοι*,* "glorying," which is that of the Vatican codex, and adopted by Mr Westcott in place of *καυχώμεθα*, though not necessary for the connexion now pointed out, is yet strongly corroborative of it, and of the correctness of the division given, which alone furnishes an adequate explanation of the use of the participle. It would thus be exactly similar to ver. 11, where the same participle *καυχώμενοι* expresses an additional reason for the confidence that "we shall be saved by Christ's life," ver. 10. "And not only so [as being reconciled, shall we be saved by His life], but also as glorying in God," &c.

The two participles, and the perfect sameness of the two commencing lines of verses 3 and 11, if this reading be accepted, would lead the reader at once to see the designed subordination of both the paragraphs which they introduce to the leading proposition in verses 1 and 2 (without prejudice

* It is preferable as being the more difficult reading. It is easy to see how *καυχώμενοι* would be changed into *καυχώμεθα* in order to assimilate it to the immediately preceding *καυχώμεθα* in ver. 2; but not *vice versa*.

to the connexion with the more immediately preceding words),

(ver. 1) "Let us have Peace with God,"

(ver. 2) "And let us glory in Hope of the glory of God,"

not only as the necessary fruits of our "being justified by faith," but

1st (ver. 3) "Also as glorying in tribulations;"

2d (ver 11) "And as glorying in God" (the source of glory).

CHAPTER V. 5.

Ver. 5. What is meant here by "the *Love of God*?" Is it God's love to us, or our love to God? For the elucidation of this question it is important to bear in mind the conclusion to which our investigation of the phrase "the Righteousness of God," led us, that it is both God's own attribute by which He is righteous, and the righteousness that is *of God*, *i.e.*, of which He is the author and giver; but that both meanings really blend into one, since even when it becomes the believer's, whether as righteousness imputed, or imparted, it is still God's righteousness in the possessive sense—originally and truly God's, as being an emanation from the alone source of all righteousness. The same was shown to be the case with the expression, "the glory of God," (see Notes on iii. 23, page 170). This furnishes a strong presumption that in the similar expression, "the love of God," the same pregnancy of meaning will be found.

This expression, however, has experienced the directly opposite treatment, both here and in ch. viii., from that commonly given to "the righteousness of God." While from the latter has been excluded the signification of *God's* attribute of righteousness, the former is interpreted by the great majority of commentators exclusively of God's attribute of love, or "the *love of God to man.*"

Now, in both instances, (as also in the cognate expression, "God's glory"), the primary idea intended, we believe to be

the *possessive* meaning, *God's* righteousness, *God's* glory, *God's* love. All good things originate with God, and it is out of His fulness that we receive. In His image we were at first created, and to that image it is the great object of the Gospel to restore us; to make us "partakers of the Divine nature"—of *God's* righteousness, of *God's* glory, of *God's* love. In the passage before us, therefore, as in ch. viii., the *primary* idea we hold to be God's love to his creatures, as v. 8 proves.

But does this exclude the other meaning of the *believer's* love to God? And in examining this expression we may take along with it the connected expressions, "Peace with God," v. 1, and "reconciled," ver. 10, and the opposite of this last, "enemies," ver. 10. Undoubtedly, with regard to all these, it is God that, according to the representation of the Scripture writers, takes the initiative, in restoring "peace with God," "reconciling the world unto Himself," 2 Cor. v. 19, and "abolishing in Christ's flesh the enmity," Eph. ii. 15. It is not we that loved God, but God that loved us" first, 1 John iv. 10. But while these blessings are all represented as free, unmerited gifts of God, man's responsibility to receive and reciprocate is equally inculcated and rendered prominent by the modes of expression adopted. In the chapter before us we are called upon to "hold (fast) peace with God," v. 1. It is "*the love of God*" that "is shed abroad in our hearts," not "*the sense, or assurance, of the love of God,*" which would be the expression, were it meant to confine the view merely to God's attribute of love. The very turn of expression always used in reference to reconciliation with God, "Be *ye reconciled* to God," 2 Cor. v. 20, "*we were reconciled* to God," "*being reconciled,*" "when *we were enemies*—never," "*God is reconciled to us,*" "*God is our enemy,*"—is intended to remind us that there are two sides to all these questions—that while God cannot but be at enmity with us, while we are enemies to Him, cannot be at peace with us, or be reconciled, so long as we are at war with Him, yet ours is the enmity and alienation of mind, ours it is to be reconciled to Him, and to receive and reciprocate His proffered love. The change of feeling to

be effected is not in the Creator but in the creature. The cross of Christ but manifests the love which the Father ever had towards His children, and is designed to prove it to them in the most irresistible manner, in order to dissipate their guilty fears, which keep them apart from Him, and to draw them unto Him whose mercy has been so long waiting to be gracious unto all that will receive it. But we must receive it first, before God can actually practise mercy towards us. His wrath must continue to be against all impenitence and iniquity. We must lay aside our enmity, that He may be at peace with us. His enemies He beseeches by His ambassadors, "Be ye reconciled to God." It is in our hearts that God's love is shed abroad only when these hearts are opened to Him; and it thaws and melts down their affections only that they may flow back in love towards Him. The love here spoken of is not God's love, as merely outwardly shown to us, but as shed abroad in our hearts as a gift; and it is placed in connexion with other Christian *graces*, "patience" and "hope."

Its connexion with the latter grace is more especially observable. When, in enumerating the fruits of "FAITH," ver. 1., the Apostle immediately after the second cardinal grace of "HOPE," ver. 2, 4, 5, mentions "LOVE," ver. 5, we can scarce refrain from believing that he meant us to regard it as the third of the cardinal graces bestowed upon believers. This will appear the more probable when we recollect how familiar to the mind of St. Paul and the other New Testament writers is the association of these three graces. Compare, "And now abideth *faith, hope, love*, these three; but the greatest of these is love," 1 Cor. xiii. 13. "Remembering without ceasing your work of *faith*, and labour of *love*, and patience of *hope*, in our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Thess. i. 3; and again, ch. v. 8, "putting on the breast-plate of *faith* and *love*; and for an helmet the *hope* of salvation. Compare also, "labour of *love*,"—full assurance of *hope*—"through *faith* and patience inherit the promises," Heb. vi. 10-12. Again, Heb. x. 22-24, "in full assurance of *faith*—let us hold fast the profession of our *hope*,"*—provoke unto *love*." See also 1 Pet. i. 21, 22.

* In the original τῆς ἐλπίδος; where, by some strange inadvertence, "faith" has been substituted for "hope" in the Authorized Version.

We seem thus justified in assigning to "the love of God" the fulness of meaning contended for, including both significations, of God's love to us and our love to God, which yet merge into one when rightly understood. It is, in truth, God's own love that is communicated and shed abroad in the heart of believers and becomes theirs. It is His Holy Spirit of love that is here said to be given to us, ver. 5. A comparison with 1 John iv. 12-16 will place clearly before us the mutual relationship of the two ideas. "If *we love* one another, God dwelleth in us, and *His love* is perfected in us. Hereby know we that we dwell in Him, and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." Ver. 19, "We love Him, because He first loved us."

The argument for the confirmation of the believer's hope from the Divine love shed abroad in the heart applies equally in both aspects. If we regard God's love as exhibited to us and what He has already done for us, in not sparing His own Son, but delivering Him up for us all, the hope rises to assurance that He will "with Him also freely give us all things," Rom. viii. 32. And, again, if God's love has prevailed to force an entrance into our hard hearts, and been shed abroad in them with all its gentle assimilating influence, the hope is warranted "that He which hath begun a good work in us will perfect it (*ἐπιτελέσει*) until the day of Jesus Christ," Phil. i. 6. The outward and inward, the objective and subjective, conspire together. "God is love," 1 John iv. 8, and "love is of God," ver. 7. If God dwell in us, we dwell in God, and *His love* is perfected in us. However clearly manifested outwardly, or discerned even by man's *intellect*, no Gospel blessing becomes ours till admitted inwardly into the *heart* with Jesus, and until the union has taken place between the believer and Christ. But so soon as this union takes place, "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit" with Him, 1 Cor. vi. 17. "The love of God is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Spirit given unto us," and "the Spirit Himself beareth joint-witness (*συνμαρτυρεῖ*) with our spirit that we are the children of God," Rom. viii. 16.*

* Compare Notes on the Love of God in Chap. viii. 28-39.

Let it not be objected that by ascribing such *double meanings* to Scripture we throw interpretation loose, and introduce into God's word a vagueness and ambiguity destructive of all sound criticism. Where the conceptions and truths propounded are large and many-sided, the language must strive, so far as such an imperfect instrument can, to partake of the same character. The pregnancy of meaning for which we plead, in behalf of the expressions now examined, is but a counterpart of what every diligent student of holy writ must feel has been attempted to be attained by the figurative language of the Prophets, admitting so manifold application, and by the gnomic* form of expression, so characteristic of the Old and New Testaments.

CHAPTER V. 12-21.

COMPARISON BETWEEN ADAM AND CHRIST.

General View of the Scope of the Passage.

This is the passage around which more, perhaps, than any other in the Epistle, the keenness of contention has gathered. Many questions have been started as to the nature of the connection here taught between Adam and his descendants, and between Christ and the human race. The more important are :—

1. (a.) Is the relation between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity causative, or incidental? Is his transgression the cause, or only the occasion of the "sin and death" that came upon his whole race?

2. (b.) Is imputation (of Adam's sin, of Christ's righteousness) the single subject of this passage, or does the Apostle also include the transmission of Adam's corruption, and the impartation of Christ's righteousness?

3. (c.) What latitude of meaning are we to assign to the

* "Gnome = That which by its comprehensiveness indicates much."—Walker's Pronouncing Dictionary, by B. H. Smart.

expressions "all" and "the many" in this passage? If in the case of the evils flowing from Adam, all, without exception, are included, is the expression to be restricted in the case of the blessings flowing from Christ? Do they extend to all, or to the elect only?

Much of the obscurity that has attached to this passage has arisen from inadequate apprehension of the place which it holds in the argument of the Apostle. It has been degraded from the high and commanding position, which every one almost instinctively feels it ought to occupy, to a secondary and subordinate place. It has been regarded more in the light of an episode, which might have been omitted without any essential loss to the argument—as a comparison, striking, indeed, and highly illustrative of a part of the Apostle's subject—but never hitherto, so far as I am aware, as that which gives organic connexion and life to the whole; as the grand central point and focus towards which all the lines of his argument converge; in which all that he has hitherto said finds its culmination, and from which the succeeding chapters vi., vii., viii. naturally branch forth as simple corollaries.

An epitome of the whole doctrinal portion of the Epistle, containing all the three points proposed for discussion, was contained as we saw in chap. i. 16, 17. Paul is not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is—1. (A.) *Universal*, as being necessary "to every one"—"to the *Jew* first and also to the *Greek*:" 2. (B.) It is to be appropriated by *faith*, not by works; it is "to every one that *believeth*;" it is "*from faith to faith*:" 3. (C.) It is the "power of God unto salvation:" And all this in virtue of its being what man required a "*righteousness* of God, (i. 17), not by Law, but by Grace (iii. 24), and consequently a deliverance from *sin*—a new *life*, by which "the just shall *live*," and consequently a reversal of *death*. All these points, it will be observed, are summed up and brought to a head in this passage.

1. (A.) With regard to the *universality* of this mode of salvation, the Apostle had, in the former part of this treatise, shown from the consideration of *actual sin*, that all stand in need of this salvation; now he proceeds to prove this still more

decisively by the consideration of *original sin*. Before, he had shown that all, Gentiles as well as Jews, had a law, the former the law of nature, the latter, of Moses, which they had transgressed, and therefore require "the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ: for there is no difference: for *all* have sinned" actually, in their own persons, as soon as they come to perform any responsible act. Consequently, the remedy must be universal and applicable to all. Now, (in ch. v. 12-21), to remove every cavil of the Jew against the Gentile's interest in Christ, and every doubt in the Gentile's own mind, of the parity of his privileges, he proceeds to prove, that long before the Mosaic law existed "sin was in the world;" that through the common father of all, Adam, "all sinned," ver. 12, ("were made sinners," ver. 19), for that all, without exception, died, even those who "had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" and therefore all need, and must be equally interested in, the redemption that is through Christ Jesus. It was a fond conceit of the Jews that their Law was the universal standard and ground of salvation. In *their own* possession of this Law they "rested," (ii. 17) as securing their salvation. Because the ¹Gentiles were ignorant of this Law, they reasoned, "this people who knoweth not the law are cursed." To destroy this conceit, the Apostle shows that long previously to the Law of Moses, both sin and death existed in the world, ver. 13, 14. All, Jew and Gentile, were alike connected with their one common father Adam. In him humanity was put on its trial, in order to prove to the conviction of us all, whether man by his own power could stand. Adam sinned and fell: and "by that one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin: and so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned," "through one having sinned," v. 16, who was the head and representative of humanity. The remedial dispensation, then, must be co-extensive with the fall. If Adam stood for all, Christ must equally represent all, Gentiles as well as Jews. If in Adam man fell, in Christ man potentially was restored. Not that we are to understand by this, that all *shall* be saved, but that all have it *put in their power* to be saved. Universal salvation has been procured for all that will

“receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness,” (ver. 17).

This is the pervading thought of the passage, which is repeated in a variety of forms. “If through the offence of the one the many died, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace which is by the one man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto the many,” ver. 15. “For if by one offence death reigned by the one ; much more they who receive the abundance of the grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by the one, Jesus Christ,” ver. 17. “Therefore, as by one offence, judgment came upon all men to condemnation ; even so by one righteousness the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life,” ver. 18. For as by the disobedience of the one man, the many were made sinners, so by the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous,” ver. 19. Thus, in Adam, humanity fell ; in Christ, humanity rose again. All are involved in the ruin of the first man ; all are equally interested in the salvation by “him that was to come.”

2. (B.) St. Paul had, in i. 16, 17, stated as the second point, that the Gospel salvation was by *faith*, and this he had proved in iii. 21-iv. 25, (“that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law,” iii. 28). In ch. v. 12-21, he repeats and enforces this truth ; regarding it, however, now more on the Divine than the human side, contrasting not *works* and *faith*, but *Law* and *Grace* (in preparation for chap. vi. and vii.) ; God’s *Law* requiring *works* on the part of the creature for attaining salvation, while His *Grace* requires but *faith* to receive its blessings. Law, he shows, cannot save, for from the very first it brought condemnation and death upon us through our representative, Adam, ver. 13 and 14 ; and, by its fuller promulgation afterwards in the Mosaic Law, only aggravated the evil, ver. 20 ; thus necessitating and preparing the way for the introduction of Grace to “abound and to reign through Jesus Christ,” ver. 20, 21.

But farther : faith, it had been stated in i. 17, is the instrument by which every blessing of the gospel is conveyed, from first to last ; “for therein is the righteousness of God revealed

from faith to faith," from the first faint commencement of faith by which the sinner lays hold on the righteousness of Christ for his justification, to its last and highest triumphs by which it progressively appropriates Christ's righteousness as the believer's inward life and complete sanctification and redemption. "The just (righteous) shall *live* by faith." This view of faith had not yet been clearly developed by the Apostle. It had been represented as the medium through which righteousness, for justification principally, was to be received (iii. 21-iv. 25), but not as a "power" which was to "work by love," to "purify the heart," and to "overcome the world." Here, accordingly, it is, that the second topic, that the gospel salvation is by faith, merges, in the progressive advancement of faith, into the third : viz., that

3. (c.) The Gospel "is the *power* of God unto salvation," i. 16. "The just shall *live* (not be quickened or made alive merely, but *live*—"have life and evermore abundantly," John x. 10) by faith, ver. 17. With the beginning of chap. v. the transition is made to this third and principal topic. The connexion of this chapter with what precedes has been generally misunderstood. Almost all expositors consider that justification by faith is still the sole subject of chap. v., and that it is only in chap. vi. that the transition is made to sanctification. Hence they have entirely missed the great object of the Apostle in this passage (12-21) : which is to show, by a comparison with the intimate union between Adam and all his offspring, the thorough and all-pervading character of the union between Christ and the members of His body, and consequently the indissoluble connexion between justification and sanctification. The main import of the comparison in chap. v. 12-21 is not, as is generally represented, a mere illustration and repetition of the doctrine of justification already stated, viz. : As Adam's sin is imputed to all his seed unto condemnation, so Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers unto justification ; but, As by our connexion with Adam, the first Head of humanity, all that is his becomes ours, so that, by his transgression, the powerful principles of SIN, and its inseparable attendant DEATH, have entered into

our nature, and reign and work irresistibly in every one that springs from him ; so by our union with Christ, the second Head of humanity, all that is His is immediately communicated to those that are in union with Him, and His RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE enter into their being, so thoroughly as finally to overcome and entirely displace the SIN and DEATH introduced by Adam (ver. 21). Hence the inseparable connexion between justification and sanctification. If our union with Christ avails for one blessing, it avails for all. The whole Christ is given to us, or none. If (as the Apostle, developing in chap. vi. the corollaries, or inferences, plainly deducible from the asserted union in ch. v., goes on to argue) Christ's death avails for our justification, His life must equally avail for our sanctification. "If we have *died* with Christ, we believe we shall also *live* with Him," vi. 8. If, entering with full sympathy and consent of mind and heart into the great object of His death as our only means of justification, we have with Him "died to sin," vi. 2, we cannot "any longer live therein." "The life which we now live is a new life through faith in the Son of God," Gal. ii. 20. Our true state is, and we must so "reckon ourselves, to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vi. 11. As soon might we think of sharing with Adam in the *sin* introduced by him and not partaking in his *death*, as suppose that Christ's *righteousness* can be ours for our justification, and not become our *life* and sanctification also.

This is the Apostle's grand subject from the beginning of chap. v. With the end of chap. iv. he had finished the consideration of justification by faith alone without works. Accordingly, in chap. v., he immediately passes on to prove, that justification involves as its inseparable consequence, sanctification. If the first step, justification, has been attained, every succeeding step is secured.* Faith, however small, if but as a grain of mustard seed at first, goes on expanding till it bear

* Compare viii. 29, 30, "Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate &c. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called : and whom he called, them he also justified ; and whom he justified, them he also glorified."

its full and matured fruits. "Having been justified by faith," not only is it ours to have present "peace with God," chap. v. 1., but to "boast in hope of" reaching the future "glory of God," ver. 2; not only does "tribulation" not diminish, but it confirms this "hope," ver. 3, 4. This hope cannot disappoint us, "because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us," ver. 5, to perfect our sanctification; for if God has accomplished for us the first and most difficult step, much more will He complete the rest. God will not leave His work unfinished. "If, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us, much more being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved [and sanctified] by His life," ver. 9, 10. "Not only so, but" this is more surely confirmed since we can now also with much better reason than the Jew (ii. 17) "glory in God" as *our God*, with whom fallen man is again restored to intimate communion "through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the reconciliation," τὴν καταλλαγὴν, ver. 11. All of us, Gentiles as well as Jews, can glory in the restoration of this union with God, διὰ τοῦτο, "on this account;" that as all, Jews and Gentiles, were involved in the Sin and Death, introduced by Adam, so all are equally interested in the Righteousness and Life introduced by Christ.

Justification cannot be all that the Apostle here declares to be ours through Christ. Two capital evils had been brought in by Adam, SIN and DEATH, as distinctly stated in the beginning of the comparison, ver. 12; and in the completion of the comparison nothing less can be asserted on the part of Christ than the full removal of the whole evils of the fall, deliverance from SIN and DEATH, and the bestowal of the two counter-vailing blessings, RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE.

Accordingly, the opening and the close of the comparison thus exactly correspond.

12. As by one man
 SIN entered into the world,
 and DEATH by sin : [even so]
21. Grace reigns through RIGHTEOUSNESS
 unto eternal LIFE,
 By Jesus Christ our Lord.

Sin was the great leading evil brought in by Adam ; death was the secondary, the consequence of the other. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." Can it then for a moment be imagined that in stating Christ's redemption as a full remedy for the evils of the fall, the apostle has forgotten deliverance from that which was the head and source of the evil, SIN itself?—in other words, that the mere *legal* view, justification, or deliverance from death, is still the single subject of this passage? It seems beyond question that sanctification, or the deliverance of the believer from the reigning power of SIN, must here also find its place. Accordingly, in the first completion of the parallel ver. 18, 19, the apostle has stated both propositions in terms so clear, as apparently to leave no ground for misapprehension—and which, we believe, would never have been misapprehended, but for the supposed doctrinal errors that appeared to flow from the obvious meaning of the words.

As this passage is so important for the full understanding of the whole doctrinal portion of the Epistle, let us, omitting for the present the points of dissimilitude in ver. 15-17, concentrate our attention first upon the rest of the arrangement, i.e., on ver. 12-14, and 18-21.

The passage forms an Introverted Parallelism,* in which the first member, A, corresponds to the last, A ; the second, B, to the next to the last, B ; &c.

* See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 35-41.

12. A { "Ὡςπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν,
καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος,
καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν,
ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον·
13. { ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ,
ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου·
14. B { ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ μέχρι Μωυσέως
καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβά-
σεως Ἀδάμ·
- C { ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος.
D {Points of disparity in the comparison
D }stated in ver. 15, 16, 17.
18. C { "Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος*
εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα,
οὕτως καὶ δι' ἐνὸς δικαιοῦματος†
εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαιοσύνην ζωῆς·
19. C { ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἁμαρτωλοὶ καταστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί,‡
οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς
δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.§
20. B { Νόμος δὲ παρεῖσθαι
ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα·
οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία,
ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις,
21. A { ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία
ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ,||
οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης
εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον
διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

The alterations of rendering from the Authorised Version in these verses are:

* "By one offence" instead of, "by the offence of one," ver. 18.

† "By one act of righteousness the grace," instead of, "by the righteousness of one the free gift."

‡ "By the disobedience of the one man the many," instead of, "by one man's disobedience many," ver. 19.

§ "Even so by the obedience of the one the many shall be made," instead of, "so by the obedience of one, shall many be made."

|| "In death," instead of, "unto death," ver. 21.

The first glance at this arrangement enables us to determine a question which has occasioned much diversity of opinion among interpreters. One member of a comparison being stated in ver. 12, beginning with "As" (*ὡσπερ*, the *protasis*), where is the other or corresponding member, generally introduced by "So" (*οὕτως*, the *apodosis*) to be found? The parallelistic arrangement at once removes all doubt, and restores order and perspicuity to a passage, which, viewed according to our modes of composition, appears intricate and obscure.

After stating the two evils, Sin, and Death, brought upon all mankind by Adam, and their universal prevalence (A), and vindicating the more questionable assertion of the universal prevalence of the former (sin), by the acknowledged prevalence of its inseparable companion, the latter (death), notwithstanding the absence of positive law to convince of sin (B); instead of stating immediately with the same fulness the opposite side of the parallel, the Apostle merely affirms the typical connexion between Adam and Christ in these respects, (C)*, and suspends the comparison, that he may first draw out some points of dissimilarity between them in D and D. The suspended comparison is then resumed and fully stated in ver. 18 and 19 (j and g); the modification introduced by the presence of the Mosaic Law is noticed in B, (ver. 20); and the parallel between the first and second Adam, as unfolded in the preceding statements, is briefly summed up in the concluding verse, A, ver. 21.

Thus we see that the "As" (*ὡσπερ*) of ver. 12, which introduces the first member of the comparison, does not meet with its exact correlative "so" (*οὕτως*), till we come to ver. 18; where, on account of the length of the interposed paragraphs, the comparison is begun afresh by "As" (*ὡς*), and branched out separately into its two divisions in ver. 18 and 19, (j and

* Here, therefore, if such must be found, we have the immediately corresponding member to ver. 12 =

A. As Sin and Death entered by one, and Death and Sin extended to all;

C. So Adam was in this respect a type of Him that was to come.

ſ)* and the two are again united and summed up in ver. 21. To indicate, however, briefly the second member of the comparison, the clause

Who is a type of Him that was to come,

is added in ver. 14 (C), before proceeding to state the points of disparity between Adam and Christ in ver. 15-17 (D and D).

But the great advantage conferred by the parallelism is that it draws our attention to the *twofold* arrangement which pervades this passage, and thus compels us to attach a more definite meaning to several of the expressions employed, than we might otherwise do.

A comparison is begun in ver. 12 between Adam and Christ, which is left incomplete, but which is again resumed and fully drawn out in ver. 18 and 19. By every rule of sound reasoning, we expect the two sides of the comparison exactly to correspond. Now in (A,) ver. 12, *two* evils are said to be introduced by Adam, SIN, and DEATH. In the completion of the comparison, therefore, in (C) ver. 18 and 19, it seems beyond question that we must have deliverance from each of these evils through Christ explicitly stated, and the bestowal of the two countervailing blessings.

In ver. 18 (j) accordingly, we have deliverance from DEATH (the penal consequence of sin), and justification of LIFE :"

18. Therefore as by one offence

Judgment came upon all men to *condemnation*; [to death]

Even so by one righteousness

The Grace came upon all men to *justification of life*.

In ver. 19 (ſ) again, we have deliverance from SIN, and imparted RIGHTEOUSNESS, ending eventually in entire sanctification, assured to believers. Instead of "*sinner*s," they "shall be *made righteous*."

* These letters j and ſ stand for *justification* and *sanctification*, the paragraphs marked by the former relating to the judicial, by the latter to the moral effects of Adam's and Christ's work.

19. For as by the disobedience of the one man
 The many were *made sinners* ;
 Even so by the obedience of the one man
 The many shall be *made righteous*.

The doctrinal precision of Paul's statement in the order of the topics is remarkable. In mentioning the two evils introduced by Adam, Sin precedes, Death follows—Sin, as the cause; Death, as the effect, ver. 12. But in the removal of these evils (ver. 18 and 19) the order is reversed. Deliverance from Death, or "justification of Life," is placed first (ver. 18); deliverance from Sin, or Sanctification, is placed last (ver. 19). Justification is thus shown to precede, in the order of thought and causation: Sanctification follows.

By this arrangement too, Sin, as being the greater evil, is placed first and last (ver. 12 and ver. 19), as the epanodos requires.

The only mode of escape from the cogency of the argument drawn from the comparison between ver. 12 and ver. 19—that the subject of ver. 19 must be deliverance from Sin in its *reigning* power, by which "the many were *made sinners*," and *sanctification* by which "the many shall be *made righteous*," (and not, as is usually explained, merely the *imputation* of sin and righteousness, by which the many are "*regarded and treated* as sinners—as righteous,")—is to maintain that in ver. 12 Sin is viewed merely in its *judicial* aspect, and is equivalent to *Guilt*. Professor Hodge is the only commentator who seems to be fully aware of the cogency of this argument, and accordingly he labours hard (both in his excellent Commentary on the Romans and in the very able articles on the doctrine of Imputation in the Theological Essays reprinted from the *Princeton Review*, which are understood to be from his pen) to prove that the *imputation* of guilt and righteousness is the only subject treated of in this passage."*

* In the new edition of his Commentary, 1864, Dr Hodge seems to have modified his view, at least in his comment on ver. 12, on which some remarks will be offered afterwards.

Three expressions, remarkably similar, and apparently equivalent occur in this passage :—

1. Ver. 12. "By one man *sin* entered into the world;"
2. Ver. 12. "For that all *sinned*" "by one having sinned," ver. 16 ;
3. Ver. 19. "By the disobedience of the one man the many were made *sinner*s."

If the idea of *sinfulness*, or depravation of nature, be admitted in any one of these passages, Professor Hodge's acute mind perceived that logical consistency required that it should be admitted in all. To avoid an apparent doctrinal difficulty, the third of these expressions, "the many being made sinners" had, by most commentators, been explained to mean simply, being "regarded and treated as sinners." Hence Professor Hodge conceived himself shut up to maintain that by each of the other two expressions, "Sin entered into the world," and "all sinned," the *whole* that is meant is, that "on Adam's account all men are *regarded and treated* as sinners."* This certainly is an inversion of one of the soundest rules of interpretation—"That the more obscure and ambiguous expression ought to be interpreted by the more clear and unequivocal," and not *vice versa*. If a participation in Adam's sin, not only in its *guilt*, but in its *corruption* also, by all his posterity, is not taught in these words—"by one man sin entered into the world," "[by one man] all sinned," it seems difficult to select stronger words to express this idea, or terms more calculated to mislead.

The reader must bear in mind that *guilt* (as distinguished from *sinfulness*) in theological language relates merely to the *imputation* of sin and liability to punishment, without including the idea of *moral criminality* and *corruption* ; and the question here in dispute is whether St. Paul in the expressions "*sin*," "all *sinned*," "the many were made *sinner*s," includes both ideas, and especially the latter, or intends *guilt* only, as maintained by Professor Hodge.

It is impossible consistently to carry this interpretation of *guilt*, as an equivalent for sin, throughout the discussion.

* See his Commentary on Romans, ver. 19.

Chap. vi. and vii. are connected in the closest manner with chap. v., being but replies to the objections which might be raised to the two doctrines laid down in chap. v. 12-21. In chap. vi. 12, "Let not *sin* therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof," the reference evidently is not to the *guilt* of Sin—to the mere charge or *imputation* of it—but to its *corrupting* and *enslaving* influence. In chap. vii., where the twofold division of SIN and DEATH laid down in chap. v. is still maintained (compare, vii. 7, "Is the law SIN?" vii. 13, "Was then that which is good made DEATH unto me?") the substitution of *Guilt* for *Sin* would entirely destroy the meaning. Thus: "*Guilt* wrought in me all manner of concupiscence," ver. 8. "*Guilt* deceived me," ver. 11. "It is not I that do it, but *Guilt* that dwelleth in me," ver. 17, &c. From these instances it is evident that *sinfulness* or *corruption* might with more propriety be substituted as a synonym for sin, than *Guilt*.

Still, this is not an exact equivalent. To see the full force of the word, we must observe that SIN is evidently personified throughout the whole discussion. He "reigns in death," v. 21; "works death in us," vii. 13; "lords it over us," (*κυριεύσει*), vi. 14, making us "obey" him, vi. 12, as his "slaves," vi. 20; "works in man all manner of concupiscence," vii. 8; "deceives and slays" the sinner, vii. 11, &c. DEATH is also occasionally personified, as being the attendant of SIN, who is its chief. "Nevertheless DEATH *reigned* from Adam to Moses," v. 14 (comp. ver. 17, vi. 9), though it is considered as altogether subordinate to SIN, and dependent upon it for its power, SIN being represented as the cause, DEATH as the effect. "By one man SIN entered into the world, and DEATH *by* SIN," v. 12. SIN is regarded as a tyrant to whose inroads Adam opened the door by his first transgression,"* and who

* SIN, therefore, ἡ ἁμαρτία (compare ἡ οἰκουσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία, vii. 17), and Adam's *transgression*, παράπτωμα, must not be confounded, as they have too often been in this discussion. By Adam's (one) "transgression," "SIN," (ἡ ἁμαρτία), i.e., the principle of sin, entered into his and our nature. The "transgression" belonged to Adam alone properly, and is only imputed to his posterity; the "sin" (i.e., sinfulness) which entered (as well as the "death" or mortality) equally affects us as him; being operative *within* us, not *outwardly* reckoned.

has extended his *reigning*, and through Death his penal influence over the whole race. SIN accordingly here denotes not merely *sinfulness*, but the *power* or *principle* of Sin.*

Had due attention been paid to this personification of SIN, and the fulness of meaning thereby necessarily attached to the word, interpreters could not have restricted the subject of this passage to *imputation* or the attribution merely of *guilt*. Imputation, as a distinctive idea, is to be found in it only in ver. 18. SIN, in the full extent of the signification of the word, including both ideas comprehended in the definition of Original Sin, *guilt*, and *corruption*, and involving as its penalty Death, is here affirmed to have entered into the world by Adam's transgression, and to have been conveyed through him to all his posterity. *Conveyance*, or communication of Sin and Death might, therefore, more justly be called the subject of the whole passage than *imputation*; as in like manner, on the opposite side of the parallel, the *conveyance* or communication to believers of Christ's righteousness as a whole, both in its justifying and sanctifying influences, is the idea meant to be expressed, and not its mere imputation alone.

To sum up our general review of this central passage of the Epistle:—We hold that Christ is here represented as the Head of redeemed humanity in contrast with Adam the head of fallen humanity, in all the blessed fulness of His redeeming power, and is declared to be an all-sufficient Saviour; our deliverer not only from Death, the penalty of Sin, but from Sin itself—from evil, both natural and moral: Christ, therefore, not only our *justification*, but our *sanctification* also; both being entirely free gifts, the righteousness imparted, as well as the righteousness imputed; and both conveyed *at once* in the moment of our being united to Christ, and by the new birth becoming one with Him, as before by natural descent we were one with Adam, and partook of the two evils introduced by him, Sin and Death. Still, as in the case of the corruption of our nature, which is only *by degrees* fully developed, the countervailing righteousness of Christ, though imparted in all

* AS DEATH ὁ θάνατος means *mortality*, or the *principle* of Death.

its integrity in the first germ implanted, shall yet only be fully developed, and entirely pervade and renovate our whole nature at the last, when Christ shall present His redeemed people "faultless before the presence of His Father's glory with exceeding joy."

a. THE RELATION OF ADAM—AND SO OF CHRIST—TO HIS SEED *causative*. See p. 192.

We are now prepared to give an explicit answer to the first question proposed, What is the nature of the connexion here taught as existing between Adam and his descendants? Is it causative, or merely incidental? Causative, undoubtedly: Adam is distinctly represented as the cause, and not merely as the occasion of sin and death to all his race; otherwise we cut entirely the nerve of the argument, arising from the parallel between Adam and Christ, to prove that Christ is "the *power* of God unto salvation." If the great object of this comparison is to show that the Second Man and Head of humanity is the efficient cause and influential source of every blessing to the members of His body, then, to render the comparison appropriate, Adam must be the *cause* of the evils that have come upon his children. If Adam merely *began* transgression; if, after his *example* merely, his posterity sin, then all that Christ is represented as doing is merely as beginning, as setting an example of righteousness. He ceases to be the *Saviour* of men—"the *power* of God unto salvation." It could not be said that after the analogy of Adam, Grace reigns through righteousness unto eternal life *by Jesus Christ our Lord*." No words could express more strongly a connexion of the closest and most influential character, as of cause and effect, between Adam and his race, than those of the Apostle. "*By one man* sin entered into the world [of men, of the rational creation] and death by sin." Nay, so completely does he appear to identify the whole race with Adam as their root, that the principle of Sin, which, immediately on his transgression, took possession of his nature, is represented as affect-

ing their nature, along with its inseparable follower, the principle of Death :—

And so Death passed upon all men,
For that all have sinned.

i.e., *by* or *through* (*διὰ*) Adam, or as it is expressed more fully in ver. 16 (s), “by one having sinned.” That this is the ellipsis to be supplied will be seen so soon as we observe, what the Parallelism renders prominent, the emphatic words, “By one man” placed at the head of the whole comparison, and which the mind must carry on throughout the whole. These words are designed to form a sort of running accompaniment to the whole ten verses generally, but more particularly to the first four lines, with each of which they are to be supplied in thought, thus :

By one man
Sin entered into the world,
And Death by sin [by one man];
And so death passed upon all men [by one man],
For that all have sinned [by one man].

This mode of supplying the ellipsis in the last line is more comprehensive than that adopted by the advocates of the bare imputation theory, viz., (“For that all have sinned) *in* Adam,” since it includes *actual* as well as *imputed* sin, and affirms that all sins whatever are *by* or *through* Adam, being but outcomings of that “original sin” inherited from him, from which “all actual transgressions proceed.” The restriction of the words, “For that all have sinned,” to mere imputation is contrary to the context. The verb “sinned” must take its meaning from what precedes and follows. “Sin” in the words of verse 12, “By one man sin entered into the world,” cannot, as has been shown, refer to mere *guilt* only, or *imputed* sin. In the words again that follow in ver. 13, “For until the Law sin was in the world,” the reference manifestly is to the historical existence of sin in the old world, as evidenced by the murder of Abel by Cain, by the general violence which had filled the earth before the flood, and which called forth that awful judgment from the Lord, because “all flesh had corrupted

his way upon the earth," Gen. vi. 12—by the sins of the Sodomites, &c.—in all which cases sin *was* "imputed" by God to the perpetrators *personally*, proving therefore that the sin for which they suffered was not *imputed* sin (in the sense of the transgression of another being reckoned to them) but their own personal sin. This is further confirmed by what follows in ver. 14, "Death reigned even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,"—words which imply that there were among those who lived between Adam and Moses some who had so sinned—"after the similitude of Adam's transgression," that is against a known positive commandment, such as those who transgressed the law given to Noah, against murder, Gen. ix. 6. The reference, therefore, again is to actual sin.

But the most convincing proof perhaps that these words, "For that all have sinned," comprehend actual as well as imputed sin, (nay, refer principally to the former, as the words immediately subjoined imply, "For until the Law, *Sin was in the world*,") is the tissue of contradictions and inconsistencies in which the imputationists involve themselves and St Paul by the restricted signification which they put upon this passage. The doctrine here affirmed according to Dr Hodge, Philippi, &c., is that all until the Law* died not on account of any sin in themselves, but merely on account of Adam's transgression imputed to them. This, it seems, is the proposition that the apostle sets himself to prove in ver. 13 and 14, that "when there was no law, from Adam to Moses," God did not impute men's personal sins to them unto death! According to this interpretation—

1. St. Paul having, in the former part of the Epistle, laboured to prove that all, even the Gentiles, were personally sinners, and knew it to be "the righteous sentence of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death," i. 32, now denies that any such sentence proceeded from Him.

2. In chap. ii. 12 he had repelled the plea, that it would be unjust that they who "sinned without law" should perish,

* It is hard to see on this interpretation what difference the introduction of the Law could make to the great majority of men, who knew nothing of it.

by the reply that, though having no express law, they were yet “*a law unto themselves,*” and had “*the work of the Law written in their hearts,*” ver. 14, 15, and consequently that it was *for their own sins* that they were amenable to God. Now, it appears, he recalls the reply, and affirms that they *had no law*, and were not amenable to God for any *sins of their own*, but suffered merely for Adam’s sin.

3. The words that immediately follow in ver. 13 as the reason for the Apostle’s statement, “*FOR until the Law sin was in the world,*” (the appositeness of which is quite evident if adduced to prove that even during that period all sinned), are altogether irrelevant and confusing if the point to be proved be, as the Imputationists assert, that until the Law men died not from inherited but merely imputed sin. They ought plainly to be omitted, or the sentence to have run in some such manner as this, “*And so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned [putatively] in Adam. For until the Law Sin [so reckoned by God] was not in the world, since Sin is not imputed [to men as their own] where there is no law ; and as nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression—the death that passed on them must have been for Adam’s sin imputed to them.*”

4. The very same words here used, πάντες ἥμαρτον,* “*all have sinned,*” were employed, in chap. iii. 23, to signify that all, even the Gentiles, were guilty of *actual, personal* transgressions. By repeating the very words Paul plainly means to refer us back to what he had already proved. On what principle can we exclude from their meaning all reference to *actual* sin, and give the words a more restricted meaning, when no restrictive clause is added by the writer ?

It is not to the ellipsis in itself of ἐν ᾧ ἁμαρτίᾳ, which the Imputationists would here supply, that exception is taken, but to its application in the present instance, in order to limit the

* The untenableness of the argument for the *putative* interpretation, deduced from ἥμαρτον being the Aorist, and therefore expressive of a *momentary* act, is evident from the same words being used in chap. iii. 23 to denote the *actual* sins of all.

affirmation to *imputed* sin alone. In a different connection the supplement would be quite legitimate. As Paul has elsewhere said, "In Adam all die," (1 Cor. xv. 22); so with equal propriety it could be said, "In Adam all sinned." This proposition is indeed involved and included in the present instance; but it is only a *part* of the truth which the Apostle means to teach. The true supplement of the ellipsis, as has been shown, is, "All have sinned *by* or *through* (*διὰ*) Adam." Not only has his transgression been counted as the sin of all, but the truth and justice of this have been vindicated by the outward manifestation of sin in all—"for there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not," (Eccles. vii. 20. See also 1 Kings viii. 46). All *died* through Adam, because all *sin* through Adam. Ever since the fall sin has been in all. "For until the Law sin was in the world," that is, the Law did not first introduce sin. The object of this remark (which, on the Putative hypothesis, ought (as we have seen) to have been omitted, or reversed) is obvious from the mention of the Law. It cannot be meant to impress upon the Gentiles that the introduction of the Mosaic Law, of which they knew nothing, had increased their guilt. It must be pointed, on the contrary, against the vain confidence of the Jews, that their Law was the standard by which all men were to be judged—on their own possession and knowledge of which they prided themselves, as a sure mark of God's favour, and of their title to the promised blessings of the Messiah's kingdom—and for their ignorance of which all other nations were, in the Jews' estimation, constituted "*sinner*s of the Gentiles." In opposition to this conceit, the Apostle reminds them that Christ's salvation is needed for all equally, since all are equally involved in sin through Adam—that long before "the Law sin was in the world," as testified by their own Scriptures, and was "*imputed*" personally and judged in many instances as there recorded. But should the gainsayer still object that "Sin is not imputed when there is no law," and that it was for the neglect of God's Law, as given by Moses, that the Gentiles were condemned, the Apostle stops all farther discussion by an appeal to the undeniable principle on

which he had already twice insisted,* that 'where Death is, there Sin must be as its antecedent cause'—and that consequently, as Death had reigned over all from Adam to Moses, the universal prevalence of Death proved the universal prevalence of Sin, whether they had sinned, or not sinned, "after the similitude of Adam's transgression," by breaking some positive commandment.

Thus, whether the transmission of Adam's sin to all his posterity came out into prominent manifestation in acknowledged acts of transgression, or remained more secret, we see that throughout the whole of this passage it is the design of the Spirit to teach us, to regard all men as involved in the closest and most intimate manner with Adam, as their representative in the probationary trial to which he was subjected. By his transgression the principles of Sin and Death entered into man's nature, and extended over all. He is to this extent the head and representative of all; his act is their act, his transgression their transgression, his fall their fall.

Objection will be taken to this view of St. Paul's argument, as teaching the inherited transmission of the guilt and corruption which originated with Adam, to all his posterity, that it represents God as acting unjustly towards His creatures, in involving them in the consequences of an act with which they had personally nothing to do. But besides that such an arrangement is in perfect accordance with what we find to be a universal law of God's providence, that children do inherit from their parents both good and evil, the objection, it should never be forgotten, is equally valid against any view we take of the case. The *fact* is, explain it how we may, *all are sinners*. So universal is the prevalence of iniquity, that no child ever did, or can, escape the contamination of vice. Whether the child, therefore, brings sin with it into the world by inheritance, or imbibes it with its earliest breath from the persons and circumstances by which it is surrounded, the *fact* is the same, and the difficulty of reconciling it with the justice

* In ver. 12, "And Death entered *by Sin*," and again, "And so Death passed upon all men, *for that all have sinned*."

and goodness of the Deity, and with the perfect responsibility of the creature, equally formidable.

Without attempting, therefore, to explain, or to penetrate into mysteries beyond our depth, we may at the same time remark some of those important ends which this arrangement of God's providence seems intended to promote. One of these is, that it forcibly impresses upon us the unity of the whole race, the intimate dependence of children upon their parents, and the sympathetic connexion between all the members of the family, so that, in reading the early history and development of the race, we are, in fact, reading our own history, tendencies, and character. No age, perhaps, requires the inculcation of this lesson more than the present, in which it has become fashionable to neglect and depreciate the Old Testament, as if now antiquated and unsuited for religious teaching to the present advanced stage of the world. No idea can be more wide of the truth. No word of God ever thus becomes obsolete or effete. "The word of the Lord endureth for ever." It is ever new, ever living, repeating itself again and again in each succeeding age, and in each individual's experience. It is God's revelation to man, embodied in the leading personages portrayed, as to what man is in himself, in his nature, and in his tendencies, that he may learn to "*know himself*"—as it is, on the other hand, the authoritative declaration of what God is, and what He has done and is doing for man, displayed in His past dealings with His creatures. Read in this light, and with a constant *personal* application as it ought to be, every part of the Word of God will be found instinct with life, "quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," Heb. iv. 12.

With this design in view, Adam is represented in Scripture not so much in the light of an individual agent as of the representative man, as the type and impersonation of *humanity*. To indicate this, in the Book of Genesis, the very name Adam is treated more as an appellative than as a proper name, with the article prefixed, (אָדָם), "the Adam," or "the man." It

is even used as a generic term, including both sexes. "So God created man [Heb. Adam] in His own image, in the image of God created He him : male and female created He them," Gen. i. 27. "This is the book of the generations of Adam [or man]. In the day that God created man [or Adam], in the likeness of God made He him ; *male and female* created He them ; and blessed them and called *their* name Adam [or man], Gen. v. 1, 2. It was *man*, therefore, that is represented as being put on trial in Adam. In Adam brought into existence in the full maturity of his powers, coming pure and unpolluted from the hand of his Maker, with one simple command to obey, we have the fairest and most advantageous trial possible made of our nature, whether man, in the exercise of that freedom bestowed upon him, would continue humbly dependent upon his God, or assert a self will of his own. If Adam failed in the trial, we have no reason to suppose that we ourselves would have acted differently, had we been in his place, even in the first instance ; much less that we should have persevered in a course of undeviating obedience during the whole time of our probation, in which *one* single failure would have forfeited all. What Adam did, therefore, each can with truth feel and say, I did. His sin was my sin. When Adam fell, I fell. I can take the guilt and shame of Adam's fall to myself, as being the fall of our common nature. I can consciously confess, "When Adam sinned, I sinned," as I can, alas ! with truth say, "My sin it was that crucified the Lord. My wicked heart rose up in enmity against Him. I was consenting unto His death." But blessed be His name who enables me now to appropriate, in like manner, the atoning death of Christ to myself, as *my* death, and thus to judge, "If one died for all, then all died."* I can "reckon myself to be dead, indeed, unto sin, (as Christ "died unto sin once,") but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vi. 10, 11.

We can thus see and read our own nature and dispositions in the acts of our first parents ; and if they were to be continued in life, and to have a race to spring from them, their progeny must, so far as we can judge, inherit their nature and

* οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, 2 Cor. v. 14.

be involved in the consequences of their first parents' transgression. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? not one." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." The son that Adam begets must be "in his own image." Either, therefore, such an arrangement as we now behold must have been established, or else we must have been brought into the world each separately and independently of the other. Had this been the case, the same trial and the same melancholy result would, we have every reason to believe, have been repeated in the personal experience of *each* of us individually; but then there could have been no history of the human race, no succession, no development, no sympathy. Each would have for himself to undergo the bitter agonies of self-reproach and despair, consequent on the first awakenings of conscience to the guilt and ruin which he had brought on himself, but without any knowledge of the possibility of redemption, or of a Saviour, who must have been revealed to each successively. The same sad history would ever be recommencing anew. But where, then, would have been that close fellowship which unites us together as members one of another, associated for weal or for woe? Where all those tender and endearing ties which bind us so intimately together, and teach us in part to realize that great truth, which our second union with one Head in Christ is designed to impress upon us with new and more constraining motives, that "the members should have the same care one of another. For whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it: or one member be honoured, all the members rejoice with it"? 1 Cor. xii. 25, 26. Where, besides, would have been the possibility of the redemption of mankind as a *whole* by Christ Jesus, the second Adam, unless we had previously been *one* in race and destiny, by our union with the first Adam?

Every objection, however, be it ever remembered, is more than answered, and the most triumphant vindication furnished of our inherited fall through Adam, by regarding it in its connexion with the salvation procured to us through Christ Jesus. Who would for a moment hesitate which condition to choose, were the alternative offered to him, to be put, like Adam

before his fall, on a covenant of perfect obedience to work out his salvation in his own strength, with the understanding that *one* single lapse would bring irremediable condemnation and death ; or with a fallen nature, to have offered to him union with an almighty Saviour, in simple reliance on whom, if only he will truly confess that in himself he is nothing and can do nothing, an all-sufficient grace, for the severest trials and mightiest efforts of his subtle Enemy, is assured through the indwelling operation of the Holy Spirit, while room is given for repentance to rise again after *many* lapses ?

Thus the situation in which we are placed by the fall, and our connection with Adam would seem to be but an *anticipation* of the condition to which we would, had a separate trial been given, have each reduced himself ; a placing us on an *advanced* stage in our state of probation and preparation for the ultimate end of our being, by sparing us the preliminary stage through which we should each have had individually to pass.

b. NOT IMPUTATION ALONE (OF SIN, OF RIGHTEOUSNESS) IS HERE ASSERTED, BUT IMPARTATION ALSO. See p. 192.

Whatever may be thought of the justice of the answer now offered to the objection arising from the state in which it has pleased God to place every child on his entrance into the world, and to which *every* explanation of St. Paul's argument is equally liable—the point on which I am more particularly anxious to fix the attention of the reader is this, that there is nothing in St. Paul's words in this passage to limit our consideration to the mere *imputation* of Adam's *guilt* to his posterity—nay, that such imputation is not directly asserted at all, but only implied. The main statement, in the comparison with which St. Paul begins and ends, is not, “By one man Sin was *imputed* to all;” but “By one man's transgression the principles of SIN and DEATH entered into his and our nature.” Not Adam's *transgression* outwardly reckoned, but Adam's *sinfulness* and *mortality*, inwardly communicated or imparted, are the principal subjects of comparison, with which are placed in

contrast Christ's **RIGHTEOUSNESS** and **LIFE**. It is not the one single act of our original parent that is here attributed to us, but his nature is declared to be our nature, his trial our trial, his fall our fall, his **SIN** (= sinfulness) our **SIN**, and his **DEATH** (= mortality) our **DEATH**.

Viewed in this light alone, can we see by contrast the full beauty and force of the countervailing union between Christ and His spiritual seed, by which His nature becomes our new nature, His death our death, his resurrection our resurrection, His **RIGHTEOUSNESS** our **RIGHTEOUSNESS**, and His **LIFE** our **LIFE**.

The connexion between Adam and his posterity designed by the apostle in Rom. v. 12-21 is of the most intimate and vital nature, and not merely of the outward and legal character insisted on by Professor Hodge in his Commentary, whom we name simply as being one of the ablest and most consistent exponents of the interpretation which finds nothing but the mere imputation of sin and righteousness in this passage.* By dwelling so exclusively as he does on imputation, he gives to the whole subject a merely external, superficial character. God

* We need scarcely say that it is not to the doctrine of imputation in itself that we object, as having the least sympathy with those (*e.g.*, Whitby, Whately, &c.) who argue against its correctness on the ground that we do not find it said in as many words in Scripture, that "Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity," that "Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers." It seems very strange and illogical that this doctrine should ever have been questioned by those who admit, that it is for Adam's sin that his race is condemned, and for Christ's righteousness that we are justified. The very words "condemnation" and "justification" are forensic terms, and imply *imputation* of guilt or of righteousness. To say that a man is condemned, presupposes that guilt has been imputed to him; to say that he is justified, involves that innocence or righteousness has been imputed to him.

Now, (according to the connexion of ideas so familiar to St. Paul) "in Adam all die." Infants die. But "death is the wages of sin." Whose sin! Not their own, for infants are incapable of personal sin. They are condemned to death therefore for Adam's sin. In other, and equivalent, terms—*The guilt of Adam's sin has been imputed to them.*

Believers in Christ are justified, or pronounced righteous: that is, righteousness is imputed to them. Whose righteousness? Not their own; for that cannot justify, being imperfect. It is, therefore, *Christ's righteousness that is imputed to them.*

is represented as acting in an arbitrary manner : imputing sin where there is as yet no real sinfulness, imputing righteousness, where yet perhaps no immediate moral change takes place. Until we learn to see ourselves *in Adam*, we can never truly take home to ourselves the shame and guilt of the fall ; until we see ourselves *in Christ Jesus*, we never shall realize as we ought the peace and comfort arising from this blessed union. Viewing ourselves *in Christ*, we can look outwards and see His righteousness covering our sinfulness from the sight of His Father ; looking inwardly, we can see, in place of sin and death, Christ's righteousness and life reigning and renewing our whole man.

Nothing, indeed, can be more entirely opposed to the spirit of the passage than the unnatural disjunction that has been made of the *guilt* from the *corruption* of sin, as conveyed to Adam's posterity. In the view of the apostle both are conveyed simultaneously. Adam is not merely our legal, but our natural representative—not *de jure* alone, but *de facto* also. We are one with Adam not by mere outward appointment only, by which his sin is counted our sin, but by inward constitution, according to which Adam could beget a son only in his own corrupted image, that which is born of the flesh being necessarily flesh. He was the root of humanity, between whom and the branches a connection subsisted of the most intimate nature, so that the corruption admitted into the stock by the one fatal act of Adam immediately and necessarily communicated itself to every branch connected with him. We must not attempt to disconnect the guilt from the corruption of sin. Sin is personified as a principle or active power, which entered into human nature, at once in its corrupting and condemning power. "By one man sin entered into the world." "By one man having sinned," "all sinned." "By the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners." We are not therefore sinners only by imputation, but sin is a living, active principle inherent in the child, which shows its real existence, as soon as he becomes capable of any moral act.

Any defect in our mode of viewing original sin must lead to

an equally defective mode of viewing the opposite side of the parallel, the communication of Christ's righteousness to the believer. So long as it is conceived that by a mere forensic act alone and legal fiction, Christ's righteousness is imputed to the penitent without any real change immediately and necessarily passing on the believer himself, it is impossible to take the full comfort and joy of this doctrine home to our hearts. Only then, when the believer comes to the full apprehension of the truth, that as really and truly as by natural birth sin is an essential part of our nature—so that, however unseen and undeveloped in unconscious childhood, the moment we come to act for ourselves, its existence and pernicious influence become manifest, and the more that our faculties unfold themselves, the more thorough and all-pervading is found to be its power—even so, by the spiritual birth and vital union with Christ, righteousness becomes an inherent part of the believer's nature, and, however small and imperceptible at first, will demonstrate its efficacious presence by the thorough change and assimilation which it will gradually make of every part to itself—then and then only, will he experience the full joy and peace in believing, which this blessed truth is fitted to impart. If the imputation of sin is not a mere forensic act, which for a time at least may have no inward corresponding reality, with as little truth has the imputation of righteousness (or justification) been regarded as a mere outward forensic act, which has no immediate corresponding reality. In justification, God's word and act are simultaneous. While He declares the sinner righteous for the sake alone of Christ's all-perfect righteousness, He at the same time makes a complete change upon the heart, and turns it from the love of sin to the love of holiness. That germ, as has been already said, or seed of righteousness, however imperceptible at first to the observer, is implanted in all its completeness and integrity of parts, which will hereafter expand in due and orderly development, "first the blade, then the ear, and finally the full corn in the ear."

But we are met with the objection, that this view is at variance with the doctrine of the Reformers, who "regarded justifica-

tion, which includes the idea of imputation, as a forensic or judicial act of God, by which the relation of man to God, and not the man himself was changed. And imputation of righteousness they described as 'that judgment of God, according to which he treats us as though we had not sinned but had fulfilled the law, or as though the righteousness of Christ was ours.' This view of justification they constantly maintained in opposition to the Papists, who regarded it as a moral change consisting in what they called the infusion of righteousness."*

Our view, we reply, is no more at variance with that of the Reformers, than James is at variance with Paul, when the former asserts, "You see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," James ii. 24; while Paul, on the contrary, declares, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," Rom. iii. 28. There seems at first sight here a direct contradiction between the two assertions, but this disappears when we calmly consider the object of each writer. Here the Scripture, as frequently, knowing the tendency of man to fly to one extreme or the other, strives by the employment of expressions apparently contradictory to arouse us to thoughtful examination, that we may "distinguish the things that differ," and give due weight to both sides of the truth. Paul is speaking of *works previous to justification*, and declares that no works or deservings of our own can have the slightest part in procuring our forgiveness with God, which must proceed alone from His own full, free, and unmerited grace, and which has respect solely to the unspotted righteousness of Christ Jesus. James, on the contrary, writing to Jews who were so prone to satisfy themselves with the knowledge of doctrines to the neglect of corresponding practice, speaks of works *subsequent to justification* as indispensably necessary to prove the genuineness of faith, which, being a principle of action, would be "dead," unless productive of corresponding fruit. In like manner our Reformers, having to oppose the vital error of the Romanists, who give to works a share in the justification of the sinner (which they ascribe to

* Hodge on Romans v. 12-21 *Doctrines*, p. 224, 1st Edition.

the righteousness *previously* infused into the believer), maintained that God justifies the ungodly—those who feel and acknowledge that in them is no righteousness at all—solely from a regard to the perfect righteousness of Christ Jesus, which becomes theirs only by their appropriating it through an act of faith, and by God's pronouncing on them the sentence of justification. They are speaking, like St. Paul, of works *previous to justification*, and as it is only on God's pronouncing the sentence of justification on the believer that he is made righteous, it is evident that there is no room for works of faith to be performed, or for righteousness to be *previously* infused.

This was the grand point which the Reformers had to labour, and to which they directed all their powers of argument to establish and enforce it on the minds and hearts of men. But their followers, not adverting sufficiently to the circumstances of their time, which obliged them in controverting the tenets of the Romanists to confine their views to this one point, have occasionally expressed themselves unguardedly, so as to seem to disjoin the righteousness immediately imparted from the righteousness imputed, and sanctification from justification, as if there were no indissoluble connection, and as if some interval could elapse, between them—as if the Christ received into the heart as “the Lord our Righteousness” could be divided into two, and were not equally the source of sanctification as of justification to the believer. They have dwelt too exclusively on the mere forensic meaning of the word justification, which it has when applied to human tribunals, and have forgotten the modification of meaning and additional idea which it necessarily involves when applied to God's judgment. In their anxiety to clear one side of the truth, they have unduly obscured the other. Justification, we maintain, *involves* and *suggests* the idea of a change not of state alone, but of character also. If God justifies a man—*δικαιοῖ*, pronounces him righteous,—he is, and must be, what God calls him, *δικαιος*, righteous.* Not that we affirm with the Roman-

* The reader, it is hoped, will pardon the repetition of what has been partly stated before, on account of the importance of the subject, and the necessity of counteracting a prevalent misapprehension as the author considers it.

ists* that *δικαίω* means to *make just*, as well as to *justify*. No point, we think, has been more clearly demonstrated than that *δικαίω* is always used in Scripture in a *forensic* sense, and signifies to *absolve, to acquit, to pronounce righteous*. But divines have too generally forgotten to notice the modification of meaning which necessarily attaches to the word when applied to the judgment of God.

One point of difference indeed has been noted, by almost all writers on justification, between the use of this word in human courts of judicature, and before the tribunal of God, with respect to the real guilt of the party tried. When a human judge justifies an accused person, he in fact pronounces him never to have been guilty of the offence laid to his charge, but to be perfectly innocent; whereas it is the *ungodly* alone, and those who confess themselves to be sinners, that God justifies and absolves from merited punishment for the sake of Christ's atonement.

But there is another distinction equally important that has been too generally overlooked. God's judgment, as well as that of an earthly judge, must be according to truth. Since it cannot, like the sentence of the latter, be true *retrospectively*, it must be true *prospectively*. In justification, God pronounces not what *was*, but what *is to be*. His word is creative. He justifies, and the man is just—in the eye of that God who sees the end from the beginning. He declares him righteous, and immediately he becomes righteous—not in word only, but in the mighty change that has passed upon him, involving, as the germ does the blossom and seed, his full and final sanctification. However tainted and leprous he may have been before, God speaks the word and immediately the leprosy departs and he is clean. He is become a new man. He has passed from death to life, from the love of sin

* Olshausen has also fallen into this error. His words are “*Δικαίω*=קִדְּשָׁה denotes the divine agency in the calling into existence *δικαιοσύνη*, which naturally includes in itself the recognition of it as such.” See his Argument of Rom. iii. 21-31. This must be exactly reversed. *Δικαίω* expresses properly to *account or declare righteous*, which includes [implies] in itself the divine agency in calling into existence *δικαιοσύνη* in the believer in Jesus.

and self to the love of holiness and God. That seed of righteousness is implanted which will quicken the whole man, and in due time assimilate him wholly to itself. Sin no longer predominates as the ruling principle. It is cast down from its throne. The Spirit of Christ rules within, and imparts the character of *righteous* to him who before was a *sinner*, and He will finally vindicate the full title of the believer to this appellation, by His bringing every thought, word, and deed into entire conformity with the will of God.

Such we believe to be the connection between verses 18 and 19, as indicated by the FOR,* which is confirmative rather than causative: not, We are justified (v. 18), because we have been *previously* made righteous (v. 19); but because in verification of God's sentence of justification we are made righteous *potentially*. The connection may thus be stated:

v. 18. Having been condemned by the one transgression of Adam, we are in like manner justified by the one righteousness of Christ.

But this in no merely outward way, or by a legal figment, but involving the realities of "Sin" and "Righteousness," as affecting inwardly those on whom the judicial sentences have passed.

v. 19. For just as by our connection with our representative Adam, "Sin (*ἡ ἁμαρτία*, *i.e.* sinfulness) entered" as into his, so into our nature begotten from him, "and by Sin, Death," so that through his disobedience we were "constituted sinners," not merely judicially but morally—so, by our union with Christ, His righteousness, as soon as it has been appropriated by faith as our righteousness for justification, becomes also inwardly our sanctification; so that through Christ's obedience all who are

* This confirmative meaning of FOR is not unusual. A striking instance of it occurs in Luke vii. 47 (though the Greek conjunction here used is *ὅτι*, not *γάρ*), "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; *for* she loved much;" that is, not that her sins are forgiven *because* she loved much, which would be in direct opposition to Scripture, which teaches that love succeeds, not precedes forgiveness (see 1 John iv. 10), but, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; FOR, *in consequence and in proof thereof*, she has loved much—as her conduct to Himself, Jesus means to say, should have shown even to Simon.

united to Him are "constituted righteous," not putatively merely, but morally, by a change immediately begun, and so thoroughly guaranteed to be completed, as to vindicate the truth of the sentence of justification pronounced upon them.*

All throughout this passage (Rom. v. 12-21), the close and essential connection of *sin* and *death*, and of *life* and *righteousness*—of the *grace* of God to pardon, and the *gift of righteousness* to render holy (vers. 15 and 17)—in technical language, of justification and sanctification—is repeatedly brought forward. Guilt and justification are not, as maintained generally by interpreters, the only ideas of the passage; but "Sin," and its consequent penalty, "Death,"—"Justification of Life," and its consequent product, "Righteousness [unto Sanctification]," have each their appropriate places assigned to them.

I should hope that what has been already said will be sufficient to convince the unbiassed reader that the obvious meaning of the words of ver. 19 is the true one. But since the great body of interpreters maintain that *imputation* alone—ascription of guilt, and of righteousness—is the sole subject of this passage (12-21), and specially of this 19th verse, and as I know from my own experience with what difficulty I have been constrained, step by step, to give up the inveterate prepossessions cherished in favour of the prevalent interpretation, I believe it advisable to answer the arguments adduced for it. No one, as has been already remarked, has stated these more clearly, or maintained the *imputationist* theory more consistently than Dr Hodge. I have been struck, however, on examining the new edition of his Commentary (1864) to find that even he has felt compelled to depart from his former interpretation of v. 12, and to allow that more is meant by "Sin entered into the world," than that it was merely imputed to all the descendants of Adam, and to give the very interpretation which I contend for as the correct one. His

* Let me remind the reader that I here state no new doctrine, but what has been recognized by the soundest divines. "When God doth justify the ungodly on account of the righteousness imputed unto him, he doth at the same instant, by the power of his grace, make him inherently and subjectively righteous or holy."—Owen on Justification, vol. v. p. 127, Goold's edition (already quoted).

words are these, p. 147, "The objection to these several interpretations (viz., 1. Actual sin commenced its course, men began to sin. 2. Depravity, corruption of nature invaded the world, men became corrupt. 3. Men became guilty, *i.e.* exposed to condemnation) is, that each by itself is too limited. All three, taken collectively, are correct. 'Sin entered into the world' means 'men became sinners,' or, as the apostle expresses it in v. 19, 'they were constituted sinners.' This includes guilt, depravity, and actual transgression. 'The sinfulness of that estate into which man fell (that is, the sin which Adam brought upon the world) consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called Original sin; together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it.' (Shorter Catechism, Ques. 18.)"

How this is to be reconciled with the interpretation Dr. Hodge has given of ver. 19, it is difficult to comprehend. In his comment on this verse, p. 173, he explains "many were made sinners," as meaning merely "we are *regarded* as sinners on Adam's account." "When, therefore, the apostle says that the many were (*καταστάθησαν*) constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, it cannot mean that the many thereby *were rendered sinful*, but that his disobedience was the ground of their being placed in the category of sinners." This seems directly to contradict what he had said on ver. 12. "'Sin entered into the world,' means 'men *became* sinners,' or as the apostle expresses it in ver. 19, 'they *were constituted* sinners.' This includes guilt, *depravity*, and *actual transgression*!"

To support his interpretation of ver. 19, Dr. Hodge asserts that "*καθίστημι* never in the New Test. means *to make* in the sense of effecting, or causing a person or thing, to be in its character or nature other than it was before."*

To his first example, "When Christ is said to have been 'constituted the son of God [with power],' he was not made Son, but declared to be such," the answer is, 1. The word here used, Rom. i. 4, is not *καθίστημι* but *ὀρίζω*. But 2.

* So also Philippi.

letting that pass, the interpretation is erroneous ; see note on Rom. i. 4, p. 96.

His next examples are, "Who constituted (*κατέστησεν*) thee ruler or judge?" Acts vii. 35 ; "Whom his lord made (*κατέστησεν*) ruler over his household," Matt. xxiv. 45. But was either ruler, *before* he was so *constituted*, or *made*? Was he not thereby "*caused to be other than he was before*?" If it be objected "*not in character or nature*," this is a mere evasion, since neither character nor nature is in question in the change spoken of. The real question is, Does *κατέστησεν*, *constituted*, mean in either instance, as Dr. Hodge affirms of ver. 19, merely, "Who made thee *to be regarded* as a ruler?" "Whom his lord made *to be regarded* as ruler over his household," or "*set him down in the rank or category* of ruler," without implying and involving that he was thereby *made* and *constituted* ruler?

But let us take the still more pertinent instances of *καθίστημι* in the New Test. which are passed unnoticed by Dr. Hodge. "If these things be in you and abound, they *make* you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful," &c. 2 Pet. i. 8, (*ὅτι ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν*, "they render you not inactive nor unfruitful.") Does the possession of the virtues enumerated by St. Peter not "*cause*" their possessors "*to be in character and nature other than they were before*?" Again, "Whosoever will be (*βουλῆ*) a friend of the world *is* the enemy of God," *καθίσταται*, "*constitutes himself* the enemy of God," James iv. 4. The very *will* to be a friend of the world *constitutes*, *makes* him the enemy of God, as Dean Alford well remarks ; he "*is* (thereby, by the proceeding in the direction indicated by that *βουλῆ*), constituted an enemy of God." Does the verb, as Dr. Hodge's argument requires, mean merely "*makes him to be regarded and treated* as an enemy," "*places him in the category of enemies*," without implying and involving that he is really an enemy of God?

The other arguments of Dr. Hodge are not more convincing. He says, "*To make clean, to make unclean ; to make righteous, to make guilty*, are the constant expressions for regarding and treating as clean, unclean, righteous, or unrighteous."

The question is, do they ever mean so simply, without implying that the persons declared to be so, are made so truly? which alone can avail for Dr. Hodge's interpretation. Let us see. With regard to the expressions, "to make clean, to make unclean," the reference evidently is to the verbs *טָהַר*, and *טָמֵא*, which in the Piel conjugation signify literally "to cleanse" and "to defile," but have acquired a peculiar technical meaning when used of the priests under the Levitical law, viz. : of *pronouncing* any person *clean*, or *unclean*. But even in this case, will Dr Hodge affirm, that the priest's pronouncing a man clean, or unclean, did not imply and involve that he thereby *became*, or *was made* (ceremonially) clean or unclean? Would any Jew, the moment that the priest had pronounced a man clean, or unclean, have dared to say or even think that he was not what the priest declared him to be? Did not the priest by his very declaration "*make* or *cause* the person to be other than he was before?" Before the leper was pronounced clean by the priest, would he have presumed to mingle with his fellow-men, which immediately after he could do? In the New Testament, when the leper says to Jesus, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," Matt. viii. 2, was all that he meant, thou canst make me *to be regarded* as clean? Or when it was prescribed to the Nazarite, that "he shall not *make himself unclean* for his father, or for his mother, &c.," Numb. vi. 7, would the most free-thinking Jew have ever argued that he was not *really made unclean* by touching a dead body?

As to the expression, "to make righteous," it is the very one in question, and I am not aware that it ever occurs in the Authorised Version but here—and "to make *guilty*," is a very different expression from being "made sinners."

Having failed in adducing any satisfactory examples of his asserted meaning of these two expressions, Dr. Hodge's next argument is, "The expression, *to make sin*, and *to make righteousness*, occurring in a corresponding sense, illustrate and confirm this interpretation. Thus in 2 Cor. v. 21, Christ is said to be 'made sin,' *i.e.*, regarded and treated as a sinner, 'that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,' *i.e.*, that

we might be regarded and treated as righteous in the sight of God, on his account. The antithesis is here so plain as to be of itself decisive."

The fallacy here (as already shown, see p. 138-141), lies in holding that the power of Christ's righteousness over man, when brought into contact with his sin, is no greater than the power of human sin over Christ when He was brought into contact with it; just as if in estimating the effects of Jesus touching the leper, and the leper touching Jesus, because the leper could bring no taint upon him, we were to limit Jesus' influence on the leper, to his being merely *regarded* and *treated* as clean. It is besides an unwarrantable lowering of the meaning of both expressions in 2 Cor. v. 21 to limit them to mere imputation. In both cases the strength of the expressions employed, "He *made* Him to be sin for us, that we might be *made* the righteousness of God in Him," implies that both Christ and man were affected to the utmost extent that the natures of each would admit. Sin could never cast the slightest taint on the perfect, sinless, and holy One; but in God's "*making* Him to be sin for us," He appointed him to descend into the deepest abyss of sin, and to be conscious of its virulence, loathsomeness, and bitterness, as no mere man could know it; He permitted sin and Satan to put forth their utmost power against Him, to tempt Him, to vex His righteous soul, to persecute, and put Him to death,—not surely that less free scope might be given to His "righteousness," but that it might exert its full sin-rebuking, justifying, and sanctifying power over us, "that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him," *i.e.*, partakers of "Christ's fulness," John i. 16, "of God's holiness," Heb. xii. 10, and "of the Divine nature," 2 Pet. i. 4.

But Dr. Hodge's stronghold, and unanswerable argument as he conceives, is his last, to which he ever and anon returns. "As so often before remarked, the analogy between the case of Adam and Christ requires this interpretation. If the first clause means either that the disobedience of Adam was the occasion of our committing sin, or that it was the cause of our becoming inherently corrupt, and on the ground of these sins,

or of this corruption being condemned, then must the other clause mean that the obedience of Christ is the cause of our becoming holy or performing good works, on the ground of which we are justified," p. 174.

This argument derives its apparent force from Dr. Hodge's mistaking the points which the apostle selects for comparison between those connected with Adam and those in connexion with Christ. St. Paul's representation is not that Adam's sin entered into and corrupted all, and that *on the ground* of this corruption their condemnation to death is to be ascribed, not to his sin, but to their own [*mediate* imputation]; but that through Adam, as the primary source, both "Sin and Death entered" simultaneously into all his offspring, and that consequently their condemnation to death, though it be through Adam's transgression, is not a merely arbitrary sentence unconnected with any sin in themselves, but receives its full vindication from the existence in each individual of corruption and sin, in the same way as the branches of a corrupt stem justly share in the sentence of condemnation pronounced against the tree.* Even so, through Christ, Life and Righteousness enter simultaneously into all who are united to Him by faith; so that the sentence of "justification of Life" passed by God upon them is not a mere arbitrary judgment unaccompanied by any Righteousness communicated to them, but like that creative word which said, "Let there be light, and there was

* Calvin saw and expressed this clearly in words for which he has been very unjustly censured. In his comment on ver. 12 he says: "Observe the order which he (Paul) keeps here; for he says that sin preceded, and that from sin death followed. There are indeed some who contend that we are so lost through Adam's sin as though we perished through no fault of our own, but only because he had sinned for us. But Paul distinctly affirms that sin has been propagated to all who suffer its punishment; and this he afterwards more fully declares when subsequently he assigns a reason why all the posterity of Adam are subject to the dominion of death; and it is this—because we have all, he says, sinned. But to sin in this case, is to become corrupt and vicious . . . and this is that sin which they call original." And again in his comment on ver. 19—"Paul shows that we are guilty through the offence of one man, in such a manner as not to be ourselves innocent. He had said before that we are condemned; but that no one might claim for himself innocency, he also subjoined that every one is condemned because he is a sinner."

light," immediately in vindication of its truth it implants a germ of righteousness, which will spring up, Isaiah xlv. 8 and eventually displace every remaining taint of corruption, making the believer at last perfectly righteous and holy.

We might almost venture the decision of the whole question, between the view now offered and that of the Imputationists, on the interpretation which their view obliges them to take of the connexion between the two verses, ver. 18 and 19.

With regard to these Dr. Hodge and I are so far agreed, that ver. 18 asserts that the condemnation of all is caused, in tracing it back to its original source, by the one transgression of Adam, and the justification of all believers by the one righteousness of Christ; and that verse 19 assigns the reason or vindication of the judgment in each case. It is as to the reason assigned that our interpretations differ. Let the reader judge which is the more satisfactory.

"By the one offence of Adam," it is said in ver. 18, "judgment came upon all men to condemnation." What is the reason assigned in vindication of this judgment in ver. 19? Dr. Hodge says that they were condemned because "they were regarded and treated as sinners." This seems very like a tautological proposition. "They were judged and condemned as sinners, because they were so judged and treated." No light, certainly, is here thrown on the apparent arbitrariness and severity of the sentence. According to the interpretation which I have advocated, the vindication of the sentence is that through Adam they were "*made sinners*," and, "that which is born of the flesh being flesh" and necessarily corrupt, were therefore justly condemned. Like the branches that spring from a corrupt root and stem, they share with it in its corruption, and consequently in its sentence of extermination.

Again, on the other side of the parallel, it is said, ver. 18, "By Christ's one act of righteousness the grace came upon all men unto justification of life." The reason for this sentence, according to Dr. Hodge's interpretation, is, "Because they were *regarded and treated* as righteous." This leaves unanswered the question, How can it be consistent with God's truth

and justice to regard and treat as righteous those who are not truly so ?

By the interpretation offered in its stead this objection is removed ; viz., because in the sight of God, who sees the end from the beginning, and “ calleth things that be not as though they were,” Rom. iv. 17, they are by the very act of justification *made righteous*, in part already in the present life, and in the full assurance of being made so perfectly at death, and “ presented faultless before the presence of God’s glory ” at the last day. Like branches that had been dying from their connection with a corrupt stem, the master of the vineyard declares them living branches, at the same moment severing them from the old tree and ingrafting them into the new vine ; and the vindication of the truth of his declaration is, that by the union now formed they are already beginning to partake of the life of the vine, and are become *in certain prospect* sound, vigorous, and fruitful branches.

Let us now sum up the results of our examination of this passage, so far as it has as yet been carried.

I. The principal object of the comparison between Adam and Christ manifestly is, to trace all the evils of the human race to Adam as the primary author ; and this for the purpose of showing that, in like manner, deliverance from these and the bestowal of all blessings are to be traced to Christ as their author.

II. These evils are all summed up in two, SIN and DEATH, as introduced by Adam. It follows, therefore, that, to make the statement complete, we must have deliverance from both of these and the communication of the opposite blessings distinctly expressed on the other side of the parallel. This, accordingly, we find done in the most explicit terms, if we interpret the words of ver. 19 in their plain meaning. In ver. 18 we have “ Deliverance from DEATH, and justification of LIFE,” through Christ Jesus ; and in ver. 19 we have “ Deliverance from SIN, and RIGHTEOUSNESS unto sanctification,” through Christ Jesus.

III. But while the principal object evidently is to trace Sin and Death to Adam, a second, and only second, object in im-

portance with the Apostle evidently is, from the emphasis with which he dwells upon it, to show that death is invariably connected with sin in every individual, so as to form the justification of his judicial condemnation as a *sinner*, Death being the follower, Sin the precursor. Not only does the Apostle *begin* with Sin as having entered by Adam into all, but three several times he repeats that Death follows from Sin having preceded it.

First, ver. 12, he states generally,

And Death [entered] by Sin.

Next, still, in ver. 12, he reiterates the same statement, with this only difference, that the *universal* prevalence of Death *in all* was in consequence of the *universal* prevalence of Sin *in all*.

And so *Death* passed upon *all* men,
For that *all* have *sinned*.

“Sinned” here cannot be limited to the idea of Sin merely *imputed*, as Dr Hodge maintains, but must include Sin *inherited* and *communicated* also ; in other words, inherent depravity or corruption of nature. This consistency with the preceding context requires, since, according to Dr Hodge’s own admission, by “Sin” in the expression, “Sin entered into the world,” is meant “guilt, depravity, and actual transgression.” Still more is it required by the succeeding context, ver. 13,

For until the Law Sin was in the world.

If “Sin *entered* into the world” means, as Dr Hodge now allows, “guilt, depravity, and actual transgression,” “Sin *was* in the world,” must mean that it continued to exist in the world, even after Adam’s death, in the persons of his posterity, manifesting itself often in outward transgressions, as the early records of Genesis testify. But, even where Sin was less apparent (the Apostle adds), from there being no positive law to reveal or take cognizance of it, still its universal existence in all was attested by the universal prevalence in all of its inseparable attendant, Death.

Ver. 13. "Until the Law *Sin* was in the world;

Ver. 14. [For] *Death* reigned from Adam to Moses," &c.

The reason why St. Paul is so anxious to enforce the inseparable connexion between Sin and Death, and to impress upon his readers that Death never can be without Sin being present, and in logical sequence preceding, as the vindication of the judicial sentence of Death passed by God, is in order to enforce the other side of the parallel, the inseparable connexion between Righteousness and Life—that wherever God's judicial sentence of "justification of Life" has passed, there, as its certain and inseparable consequence, must be "Righteousness unto sanctification;" not fully imparted, indeed, immediately, but assuredly and perfectly to be communicated finally, in order to the vindication of the truth and justice of God's judicial declaration.

Thus the connection of verses 18 and 19 becomes clear. If—

Ver. 18. "By one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation,"

the truth and justice of the sentence are vindicated, because

Ver. 19. "By the disobedience of the one man the many were *made sinners*."

And so in like manner, if

Ver. 18. "By one act of righteousness the Grace came upon all men to justification of life,"

the truth and justice of the sentence are vindicated, because

Ver. 19. "By the obedience of the one the many shall be *made righteous*."

Or to express the connection still more concisely :—

Ver. 18. One *act* of the respective Heads judicially decides the doom of the members; and justly,

Ver. 19. For the *character* (indicated by that act of the Head) influentially impresses itself on all the members, making them like himself—*sinful*, or *righteous*.

The great defect of the usual interpretation of this passage,

and of the bare forensic theory, is this—that God is represented as acting in an arbitrary manner, condemning men to the most dreadful of all evils, while yet innocent, “*before the existence of inherent depravity in them.*” This is no mere inference of mine (though strictly deducible from the Imputationist theory), but the express assertion of Dr Hodge himself. See his Commentary on the Romans, p. 156. We have here, indeed, a striking instance of the inconsistencies to which the exigencies of a false theory lead. Dr Hodge states, in p. 147, that “Sin (in ver. 12) includes guilt, *depravity*, and actual transgression;” then, in his comment on “and Death by Sin,” he says, that “Sin was the cause of death . . . the ground or reason of its infliction;” which is surely equivalent to saying that *depravity was before death*. But when he comes to the words, “For until the Law Sin was in the world,” ver. 13, he affirms directly the reverse, that *Death came before depravity*. For he defines Death as meaning, in this passage, *penal evil*. “In order to the proper understanding of the Apostle’s argument, it should be borne in mind that the term *death* stands for *penal evil*.” He then asserts that “such evil comes on men before the transgression of the law of nature, or even the existence of inherent depravity” ! p. 156.

It seems strange that perceiving thus clearly the revolting conclusion (not to speak of the inconsistency) in which his interpretation lands him, Dr Hodge should not have been led to see his error in attempting to put asunder those things which the apostle—which God Himself—has inseparably joined together,—“Sin” and “Death”—“Justification of Life,” and “Righteousness unto Sanctification.”

What the apostle teaches is, that *all the evil* (the moral element, Sin—and the judicial element, Death) originates with, and comes through the man, simultaneously as to time ; and that *all the good* (the judicial element, Justification of Life—and the moral element, Righteousness unto Sanctification) originates with, and comes through Christ, simultaneously as to time :—but that in logical sequence on the contrary, in the case of man, the *moral* element (Sin, which is all his own) comes first, and the judicial element (Death, in which

God has His part) comes second as the consequence; whereas in the case of Christ the *judicial* element (Justification of Life) comes first as the cause, and the moral element (Righteousness unto Sanctification) comes second as the consequence.

This is so clearly laid down by the apostle, that it seems strange that it should have been so generally overlooked.

On the part of Adam.	On the part of Christ.
v. 12. SIN comes first.	v. 18. Deliverance from DEATH, or justification of LIFE, comes first.
v. 12. DEATH comes second.	v. 19. Deliverance from SIN, or RIGHTEOUSNESS comes second.

Still more expressly we are told that

v. 12. "DEATH [is] <i>by</i> SIN."	v. 15. "The GIFT (of righteousness, v. 17) [is] <i>by</i> the GRACE" [of justification].
------------------------------------	--

Dr Hodge, in his eagerness to enforce the latter truth, which the Reformers had so clearly taught, that in the salvation through Christ Jesus, the judicial element (justification) precedes the moral (sanctification)—and having settled in his mind that imputation, or the Judicial view, was the only one taken in this passage—felt that, to make his parallel consistent, the judicial element (DEATH) ought to have been placed first on Adam's side of the comparison, before the moral element (SIN)—or rather that SIN ought to have had no part in the argument at all, and must therefore as far as possible be explained away. Hence his paradoxical assertion, that "DEATH stands here for penal evil," "for any and every evil judicially inflicted," and specially for that which "is a form of death," "of all evils the essence and sum," that "men begin to exist, out of communion with God, in moral darkness, destitute of a disposition to delight in God," &c.—and that "such evil comes on men *before* . . . *even the existence of inherent depravity;*"—that is, that "SIN comes by DEATH!"—whereas the apostle says expressly that "DEATH [came] by SIN."

Such are the inconsistencies to which the Imputationist theory

seems necessarily to lead, by disjoining those things which are indissolubly bound together. It makes Sin to be entailed on all, not by a necessity of nature ("that which is born of the flesh being necessarily flesh"—the branches necessarily partaking of the corruption of the stem), but by a judicial sentence of God, adjudging Sin as a penal infliction on all while yet guiltless of it,—"*before the existence of inherent depravity in them!*" The source of the error here is the very same as that which, as we shall have hereafter to point out, has led to the principal misapprehension with regard to Predestination, in ascribing the different destinies assigned to the Elect and the Reprobate equally to God's judicial sentence, as the *originating* cause—from the forgetfulness of the grand principle, that

All good *originates* with God.

All evil *originates* with the creature.

Attention to this principle would have led theologians (as with regard to the decrees of Reprobation and Election, so in the present subject) to perceive the remarkable distinction between the two opposite sides which the apostle so carefully notes in stating the parallel between Adam and Christ:—that on the evil side the moral element, the Sin of man, precedes, as the cause leading to God's judicial sentence of Death [of Reprobation]; but on the good side (while all is of God, both the judicial sentence and the gift bestowed), the judicial sentence of Justification [of Election] precedes as the cause, and the Gift of Righteousness [of salvation] follows as the consequence.

Thus all the confusion which the Imputationist theory introduced into this passage vanishes, and the doctrine of the Reformers comes out with transparent clearness. On the side of Adam, Sin comes first, and only "when it is finished (*ἀποτελειεσθαι*, completed), Sin bringeth forth Death," James i. 15. So on the side of Christ, "Justification of Life" comes first, and only when it is finished (completed), it bringeth forth "Righteousness unto Sanctification."

The doctrine of St Paul is union with Adam, UNION with

Christ; implying a union of nature, and a communication (not a mere *imputation*)—of all that is Adam's, both his SIN (= Sinfulness), and his DEATH (= mortality), to all descended from him—of all that is Christ's, both His LIFE, and His RIGHTEOUSNESS, to those in union with Him. It is by no outward, arbitrary act of judgment that Adam's Death is adjudged to his race apart from his Sin (far less that Sin itself and "inherent depravity" are entailed upon them as a judicial infliction—which would make God the direct author of Sin), but by their union with Adam and participation in his nature, the justice of the sentence of Death passed upon them receives its vindication from their participation in his Sin. In like manner, the judicial sentence of "Justification of Life" pronounced by God upon the believer in Christ, though called forth by no righteousness in its object, is no illusive sentence, but receives its full vindication by the UNION, which, as a creative word, it immediately effects between the believer and Christ, communicating to him His very nature, and imparting to him the "gift of Righteousness" "unto sanctification."

c. "ALL"—"THE MANY." (See p. 192).

There remains still the third of the questions proposed to be answered, Is the "all," "the many," on the side of those who derive benefit from Christ equally extensive with the "all," "the many," that have suffered damage through Adam?

No argument can be derived from the use of the term *οἱ πολλοί* "the many" (as might be supposed from the erroneous translation "many" in the Auth. Version) in favour of any designed limitation. The two phrases, *πάντας ἀνθρώπους*, "all men," and *οἱ πολλοί*, "the many," are all but co-extensive. "The many" are the "all" with the exception of *τοῦ ἐνός*, "the one" Adam, "the one" Christ; the employment of the word "the one," ver. 15, 19, being the cause of the change of the "all" into "the many." When the *act* of each Head of humanity, which affected all men (Adam himself, as well as his

posterity) is mentioned, the expression used is "all" (compare ver. 18, "by *one transgression* the issue was unto *all men* to condemnation; by *one righteousness* the issue was unto *all men* to justification of life;") but when the *persons* of the two Heads of humanity are regarded, then "the many" is used, as contrasted with, and including all but "the one" * who affected them by his act, ver. 15, 19.

It seems impossible to examine with candour the exactly similar terms employed in v. 18 with regard to the "all men" upon whom "the judgment came," and the "all men" upon whom "the grace came"—and again, in v. 19, with regard to "the many" affected by "the one man" Adam, and "the many" affected by "the one" Christ—and not to acknowledge that in some intelligible sense the Apostle means to represent *all men without exception* to be interested as in Adam's fall, so in the salvation procured by Christ Jesus.

This is no solitary assertion. We find frequent assertions to the same effect in other parts of Scripture. Thus we find St. Paul himself saying of Christ in 1 Tim. iv. 10, "He is the Saviour of *all men*"—not of believers alone, but "specially of them that believe." St. John says, 1 John ii. 2, "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of *the whole world.*" St. Peter says, 2 Pet. iii. 9, "God is not willing that any should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance."

From these and many similar passages it is evident that in the *benevolent* purpose or will of God (as distinguished from his *absolute* purpose) Christ's salvation is intended for all men, and that, in the words of 2 Pet. ii. 1, Christ has "bought" or redeemed all from destruction, if they would only accept of the redemption; but alas! there are many who "deny the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction." Christ has purchased for all a respite from the destruction incurred at the fall. Had it not been for His atonement, there would have been an end of Adam and of all his race. To Jesus, and what He has done for us, all owe

* For the reason of this distinction of the influential *acts* and *persons*, see the notes below.

their very existence, and every blessing and hope either for this or for another world. Through Him we have a new probation granted us and upon far easier terms than before ; so that if any fall short of eternal life, they have themselves only to blame. God “will (*θέλει*) have all men to be saved,” 1 Tim. ii. 4, but many “*will not* come unto Him that they might have life.” “The Grace of God,” as Paul here says, “came upon all men unto justification of life,” v. 18 ; but it is only to those “which *receive* the abundance of the Grace,” v. 17, that it can avail. The language here employed is that of common life, and equally easy to be understood as in the case of a proclamation made to a set of rebels by their Sovereign. “*All* are pardoned. The king’s son has procured a full amnesty for *all*”—“that will submit to the terms,” being of course understood, “lay down the arms of their rebellion, and accept the grace offered to them.”

It will perhaps be objected that there is an inequality, on the two sides of the comparison which the Apostle draws between Adam and Christ, in the way in which we are affected by each. All, it may be said, are involved in Adam’s fall whether they will or not, by natural birth and by an inevitable appointment of God ; whereas to be interested in Christ requires faith on the part of man, and spiritual regeneration on the part of God to enable him savingly to believe. To this objection we think that the view which has already been given of our connexion with Adam (see p. 216) is a sufficient answer. His transgression, and our participation in its results, sin and death, are, as we have shown, but an anticipation of what we should each have brought upon ourselves. His was an abuse of the freewill with which God had endowed him ; each of us in his place would, by a spontaneous act, have chosen our own will instead of submitting ourselves in all things implicitly to God’s will. Each of us therefore has had his trial in Adam ; each has fallen and incurred the sentence of death ; each owes to Christ the prolongation of life, and the offer of a new and far easier trial. Our probation now is, not “*Do this, and live ;*” but the far simpler and easier demand, “*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.*” All that we have to

do is to confess our own utter weakness, nothingness, and sinfulness, and to receive an Almighty and all-sufficient Saviour, offered freely for our acceptance, who will do all for us. What we lost through Adam has been more than compensated for through Christ, and every one has a far better chance of attaining eternal life than if all depended on his own efforts.

The simple explanation, then, of the words, that "by one act of righteousness [of Christ] the grace came upon *all men* unto justification of life," and that "by the obedience of the one *the many* shall be made righteous," is that St. Paul is not here speaking of what *actually* is or will be the case, but of what is freely *offered* to all. It is a perfectly free and unmerited gift that is put in the power of all to accept; but if any will "put the word of God from them and judge themselves unworthy of everlasting life," Acts xiii. 46, not God's defect in mercy, but their own obstinate perverseness is in fault.

The usual explanation that the "all" means *all Adam's natural seed* on the one side, and *all Christ's spiritual seed* on the other, is true as to the *fact*, or practical result; but it fails to bring into prominence the superabundance of the Grace of God above the sin of man (ver. 20), and the loving-kindness of the Father of all, who "*will* have all men to be saved," and "*is not willing* that any should perish."

The question, however, so far as it respects God's *will* and *purpose* to save all, is complicated with the ambiguity attached to these terms, and can only be satisfactorily discussed when we come to examine the difficult questions of Predestination and Freewill, Election and Reprobation—on which a separate dissertation will be found at the end of the volume.

CHAPTER V. 15-17.

Having thus so far, it is hoped, removed some of the difficulties which have hitherto obscured the points of direct comparison between Adam and Christ, let us next proceed to consider the still more generally misapprehended points of disparity in which they differ, as stated in ch. v. 15-17, the intricacies of which parallelism alone, I believe, is competent to unravel.

15. j { 'Αλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα,
οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα.¹
- c { εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι
οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον,²
πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ,
καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνὸς³ ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς⁴ ἐπερίσσευσεν.
16. s { καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἐνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος,⁵
τὸ δῶρημα.
- j { Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα
ἕξ ἐνὸς⁶ εἰς κατάκριμα,
τὸ δὲ χάρισμα
ἐκ⁷ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα.
17. s { εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι⁸
ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς,⁹
πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος,¹⁰
καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες
ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἐνὸς¹¹ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

N.B.—The letters j and j stand for justification or the judicial view; s and s for sanctification or the moral view.

The alterations of rendering from the Auth. Version are:—

¹ "The GRACE," for "the free gift," ver. 15.

² "Of the one the many died," for "of one many be dead."

³ "By the one man," for "by one man."

⁴ "Unto the many," for "unto many."

⁵ "By one having sinned," for "by one that sinned," ver. 16.

⁶ "From one [offence]," for "by one."

⁷ "The GRACE is from," for "the free gift is of."

⁸ "By one offence," for "by one man's offence." The reading of the Textus Receptus is τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι, instead of ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι, ver. 17.

⁹ "By the one," for "by one."

¹⁰ "The abundance of the GRACE," for "abundance of grace."

¹¹ "By the one," for "by one."

That the same twofold division which prevails in the other parts of v. 12-21 should also be found in this intermediate portion, needs but to be stated to commend itself at once to our minds. Indeed we should feel that there was a decided defect in the representation were this not the case. Two evils—Sin and Death—were stated in ver. 12 to be introduced

by Adam. In verses 18 and 19 these are declared to be removed by Christ. In the intermediate portion, verses 15-17, intended to premonish us of the points of dissimilarity existing in the parallel, we fully expect, from the intimate connexion between the two evils, a superabundance to be mentioned with regard to *both* on the part of Christ's work. So soon, therefore, as we remark that two terms, the *Grace* and the *Gift* (in themselves ἡ χάρις and ἡ δωρεά, or in their derivatives τὸ χάρισμα and τὸ δῶρημα) are three several times repeated in the compass of three verses—

15. But not as the offence
So also is the *grace* (τὸ χάρισμα) ;
16. And not as it was by one having sinned
So is the *gift* (τὸ δῶρημα) :

and again ver. 15,

Much more the *grace* of God (ἡ χάρις), and the *gift* by grace
(ἡ δωρεά) :

and again ver. 17,

Much more they who receive the abundance of the *grace* (τῆς
χάριτος) and of the *gift* (τῆς δωρεᾶς) of righteousness, &c.

can we hesitate for a moment to conclude that two distinct ideas are intended to be conveyed by these words, and that they refer antithetically, the first, “the *Grace*” which pardons the sinner, to Death, the penalty of transgression, which it removes ; and the second, “the *Gift* of righteousness” to Sin, which it removes and supersedes ?

It may at first sight appear strange that a distinction so obvious between these two terms should hitherto have been overlooked by all commentators. But our wonder will cease when we compare the two clauses of ver. 16, *s* and *j*, where, from ignorance of the principles of parallelism, they were unavoidably led to confound them. For if in accordance with our modern rules of composition we consider the first clause of ver. 16

s And not as it was by one having sinned,
So is the *gift* (τὸ δῶρημα),

to be immediately connected with the second clause,

j For the judgment was
From one offence to condemnation;
But the *grace* is (τὸ χάρισμα)
From many offences unto justification;

so that the latter, *j*, (beginning with “For”) is to be regarded as assigning the reason for the assertion in the former, *s*; we must unavoidably conclude the gift, τὸ δῶρημα, and the grace, τὸ χάρισμα, to be all but equivalent and convertible terms. But the moment that we apply the principles of parallelism to the passage, the apparent confusion and blending of the meaning of the two words immediately vanish. Two distinct propositions are seen to be laid down in *j* (ver. 15) and *s* (ver. 16), and according to the principle of *double reference* so ably illustrated by Bishop Jebb,* the first FOR (γάρ) in *j*, ver. 16, refers to the first proposition in *j*, ver. 15; and the second FOR (γάρ) in *s*, ver. 17, to the second proposition in *s*, ver. 16; and thus the *grace* (τὸ χάρισμα) in *j*, instead of referring to the *gift* (τὸ δῶρημα) in *s*, has reference to the *grace* (τὸ χάρισμα) in *j*; and the distinction between the two terms is complete.

What then is the distinction? Undoubtedly, “the *grace* of God” may include the whole benefits of redemption,† as being the *source* from whence they flow; and accordingly “the *gift*” is here derived (ver. 15) from “the *grace*”—“much more the *grace* of God” and “the *gift* by *grace*,” &c. But it more particularly denotes the *grace* that *justifies* as being the first blessing in order. Compare “Being justified freely by His *grace*” (Rom. iii. 24), and “Shall we continue in sin that *grace* may abound?” (vi. 1) viz., in justifying; the whole of

* See Sacred Literature, sect. xviii; or Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, pp. 56-58.

† Just as Sin (ver. 12), the more general word, includes also Death, its inseparable concomitant, and yet this does not prevent their being distinguished; so Grace, though involving the Gift (or justification though involving sanctification), does not prevent their being distinguished. Compare ver. 21, “even so might *grace* reign through *righteousness*.”

the first section of chap. vi. 1-14 being a reply to the objection brought by the legalist against the doctrine of *justification by free grace* alone. The derivative verb in Greek from *χάρις*, viz. *χαρίζομαι*, is frequently used in the sense of *forgiving*. "So that contrariwise, ye ought rather to *forgive* him" (2 Cor. ii. 7), in Greek *χαρίσασθαι*. "*Forgive* me this wrong" (2 Cor. xii. 13), *χαρίσασθε*. So Eph. iv. 32, Colos. ii. 13, &c. But fortunately we are not left to gather the distinctive meaning in this passage of τὸ χάρισμα, "the grace," or gracious grant, from general reasoning as to the meaning of the word. St. Paul himself has expressly told us in the conclusion of the next chapter what he here intends by the word, viz. the grace (or gracious grant) of eternal *life*, or deliverance from the second evil introduced by Adam—*death*—τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος, "But the grace (or gracious grant) of God is eternal life," Rom. vi. 23.

If again we examine the New Testament usage of the other term—the *gift* (ἡ δωρεά)—we shall find that it generally refers to the *gift of the Holy Spirit*, the sanctifier. Compare Acts ii. 38, "And ye shall receive the *gift* of the Holy Ghost," τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, and Acts x. 45, "And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the *gift* of the Holy Ghost." Compare also Acts viii. 20, xi. 17. "If thou knewest the *gift* of God," in John iv. 10, seems also to be correctly interpreted of the gift of the Holy Spirit by Dean Alford in his comment on the passage: "From recognizing this water as the gift of God, in its *limitation*, ver. 13, and its *parabolic import*, ver. 14, her view is directed to Him who was speaking with her, and the Gift which He should bestow—THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, see ch. vii. 37-39. "The *gift* of righteousness," therefore, in ver. 17 is equivalent to "the *gift* of the Holy Spirit," and consequently *righteousness* here signifies, as we had inferred on other grounds, not righteousness imputed merely, but righteousness imparted.

Thus the GRACE ("of eternal life," Rom. vi. 23) refers to justification ("of life," ver. 18), and the GIFT ("of righteousness," ver. 17) to sanctification.

That this distinction between the two terms really exists, is farther demonstrated by the remarkable parallelism of contrasted terms, which subsists between the clauses in ver. 15-19 marked **j**, and *j*, and **j**, and those again marked **s**, and *s*, and **s**. In the first series the one-ness of *the act* is the point insisted on; in the second the one-ness of *the person*.

ONE ACT—THE *Judicial* ASPECT.

j (ver. 15) “But not as <i>the offence</i> ,”	οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα.
<i>j</i> (ver. 16) “For the judgment was from <i>one</i> ” [offence],	ἐξ ἑνὸς (sc. παραπτώματος).
j (ver. 18) “Therefore as by <i>one offence</i> ,” (“Even so by <i>one righteousness</i> ,”)	δι ἑνὸς παραπτώματος. (δι ἑνὸς δικαιοώματος).

ONE PERSON—THE *Moral* ASPECT.

s (ver. 16) “And not as it was by <i>one</i> having sinned,”	δι ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος.
<i>s</i> (ver. 17) “Death reigned by <i>the one</i> ,”	διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς.
s (ver. 19) “As by the disobedience of <i>the one man</i> ,”	τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου.

That **j**, *j*, and **j**, correspond and refer to the *judicial* aspect (*justification*), while **s**, *s*, and **s**, correspond and refer to the *moral* aspect (*sanctification*), results also from a comparison of some of the other terms.

JUDICIAL ASPECT.

j (ver. 15) So also is the <i>grace</i> ,	τὸ χάρισμα.
<i>j</i> (ver. 16) the <i>judgment</i> was . . . to <i>condemnation</i> ,”	τὸ κρίμα . . . εἰς κατάκριμα.
the <i>grace</i> is . . . unto <i>justification</i> ,”	τὸ χάρισμα . . . εἰς δικαίωμα.
j (ver. 18) the issue was to <i>condemnation</i> ,”	εἰς κατάκριμα.
the issue is to <i>justification</i> ,”	εἰς δικαίωσιν.

MORAL ASPECT.

s (ver. 16) “So is the <i>gift</i> [explained by <i>s</i>],	τὸ δῶρημα.
<i>s</i> (ver. 17) “ <i>the gift of righteousness</i> ,”	τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης,
s (ver. 19) “the many shall be <i>made righteous</i> ,”	δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται.

Thus, then, in *j*, *j*, and *j*, one *act* produces *death* or *life*; and we have

The *judgment* flowing from one *offence* unto *condemnation* to *death*.

The *grace* flowing from one *righteousness* unto *justification* to *life*.

In *s*, *s*, and *s*, one *person* is the source of *sin* or *righteousness*; and we have,

By *one man's* disobedience, *sin* reigned (ver. 21), as proved by *death's* reigning—so that all his seed were made *sinner*s.

By *one man's* obedience, all shall *reign* in *life*, through their obtaining *righteousness*, ver. 21—so that all his seed shall be made *righteous*.

But wherefore, it may be asked, this distinction of one *act* in the first series, and one *person* in the second?

In the *judicial* aspect it is the *act* always, not the person, or general character, that is regarded. “If a man keep the whole law, and yet offend in *one point*, he is guilty of all.” The question for decision in every judicial trial is, Is the man guilty, or not guilty, of this particular *ACT*? “One offence,” *ἓν παράπτωμα*, of Adam, brought death on himself and all his race. “One righteousness,” *ἓν δικαίωμα*, of Christ must be pleaded before the strict tribunal of God, before sentence of acquittal can be passed for Him and His—one unbroken tenor of righteousness from first to last, “without blemish and without spot.”

In the *moral* aspect, on the contrary, the *person* in his general character, is principally regarded. We denominate men “sinner,” or “righteous” (ver 19), according to the prevailing bias of their conduct. The general character of a man it is that exerts a corrupting, or salutary influence on those around him. In speaking, therefore, of the taint of sin which Adam propagated to his race, and of the regenerating influence of Christ's righteousness, the *persons* of Adam and Christ are more naturally regarded, since it is by their *union* with each that their seeds are respectively affected.

In nice accordance with this, too, is the choice of the first expression in each pair of lines in ver. 18 and 19. In ver. 18, the expression employed is "by one *offence*," where sin's *condemning* power is regarded; but in ver. 19, "by one man's *disobedience*," where its *reigning* and *corrupting* influence is in question.

And so with regard to the opposite blessings, "by one act of righteousness" (*δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοῦματος*) is the expression employed, where the *justifying* power of Christ is meant; but "by one man's *obedience*," where the *sanctifying* influence is regarded.

To assist in following more easily the subsequent remarks, it may be useful to have before the mind's eye the plan or connection of thought of ver. 15-17, which may be thus exhibited—

15. j Yet neither is the offence
exactly parallel to the GRACE;

But there is a superabounding
c both in the GRACE,
and in the GIFT that is by the GRACE;

16. s Nor is the transmission of the Sin
exactly parallel to the GIFT;

j FOR, 1st, with regard to the GRACE (of life), &c.

17. s FOR, 2d, with regard to the GIFT (of righteousness," or of the Holy Spirit as flowing from the Grace, that is, Sanctification flowing from justification), &c.

There are two deviations from strict Parallelism in this passage (in c and s) which at first sight may seem to militate against the correctness of the distinction now drawn, but which, on closer inspection, will be found rather to corroborate it, by disclosing the cause of the change.

1. The first occurs in c, ver. 15; where, after the statement that a dissimilarity exists between "the offence" and "the grace" (*τὸ χάρισμα*) in j, we expect in c, the sentence that immediately follows, beginning with "For," simply the

proof of this statement. Accordingly, so far, the consequence of "the offence," *death*, is mentioned,

For if by the offence of the one
The many *died*:

and the superabundance on the side of "the Grace," *ἡ χάρις*, which removes the sentence of death, and gives "*life*" (see vi. 23), follows. But why the addition of "the Gift," *ἡ δωρεά*, which seems here superfluous and uncalled for by the Parallelism, and which ought apparently to have followed s?

Much more the GRACE of God,
And the GIFT by Grace, which is by the one man Jesus Christ,
Hath abounded unto the many.

The answer, on closer inspection, will be found to be this: The stanza, c, which includes both "the GRACE" and "the GIFT," *ἡ χάρις* and *ἡ δωρεά*, really applies to both j and s, between which it is placed—to the GRACE (*τὸ χάρισμα*) in j, and to the GIFT (*τὸ δῶρημα*) in s. Had the two propositions, with the assertion of the superabundance on the part of Christ in each, been drawn out at full length, they would have stood somewhat as follows:

But not as the offence,
So also is the Grace;

For if by one offence [*ἐνὶ παραπτώματι*, see ver. 17 and 18]
All men died,
Much more the Grace of God by one righteousness [*ἐνὶ δικαίωματι*,
Hath abounded unto all. [see ver. 18.]

And not as it was through one having sinned [that the many sinned],
So is the Gift [of righteousness, see ver. 17];

For if by the one man,
The many sinned [comp. v. 12, Death passed upon all, for that
all sinned, (and ver. 19)],
Much more the Gift which is by the one man Jesus Christ
Hath abounded unto the many.

But how much more concisely and tersely is the super-

abundance, in both the Grace and the Gift, expressed by the condensation of the two into one paragraph by the apostle! —and which, by being inserted between the two primary propositions, would to those accustomed to parallelistic arrangements suggest, with equal perspicuity, its relations respectively to each.

Besides, the *general* assertion of superabundance in both the Gift and the Grace being thus disposed of, allowed the *particular* points of superiority in each immediately to follow with similar conciseness of statement, yet distinctness of reference, in *j* and *s*.

j For the judgment was
From one [offence] to condemnation, &c.

s For if by one offence
Death reigned by the one, &c.

Still, neither of these two secondary objects formed the *principal* reason for the amalgamation in *c*. From the beginning of chap. v. onwards, it is the apostle's great aim, as has been before pointed out, to show the indissoluble connection between justification and sanctification. To mark this prominently it is that he combines into *one* stanza (*c*) "the Grace" that justifies, and "the Gift" that sanctifies. While in its first two lines we have conjoined, on the part of Adam, the *act* (τῆ παραπτώματι, "by the offence") by which the *judicial* sentence of Death was called forth, with the *person* indicated (τοῦ ἐνός, "of the one man") by whom the *moral* influence is exerted on the many; we have in the next two lines the superabundance above both on the part of Christ, in the GRACE that leads to the *judicial act* of Justification of Life, conjoined with the GIFT of Righteousness that exerts a *moral* influence over those that have been justified.

2. The same predominating aim of enforcing the intimate connection between justification and sanctification leads to a still more remarkable combination of both views in *s*, ver. 17,

which forms the second deviation from strict Parallelism* alluded to above.

For if by one offence
 Death reigned by the one ;
 Much more they which receive the abundance of the Grace,
 And of the Gift of righteousness,
 Shall reign in life, by the one, Jesus Christ.

Here, as being the proof of s, ver. 16,

And not as by one having sinned,
 Is the Gift.

we have (since the *moral* aspect is principally in question) made prominent—the *persons* of the two heads whose character affects their seed (“by the one,” “by the one Jesus Christ”); “the Gift” declared to be “of *righteousness* ;” and the *reigning* power, instead of the mere legal effect. Still we find, combined with this, the *legal* or *judicial* view. With “the one man” we have also “one *offence* ;” † with “the Gift” of righteousness, the preliminary “*Grace* ;” and “*death*” and “*life*,” the results of the *judicial sentence*,—all mentioned. The reason of the conjunction of the two topics is, as we have said, that the apostle, while for clearness of thought he distinguishes the judicial and moral aspects of the question, wishes to impress on his readers their inseparable connection.

We thus see the reason of the striking similarity, in form and expression, of s, ver. 17, to c, ver. 15. Though the special object of s is to exhibit the distinctive features of superiority in its *moral* effects, of the work of Christ above the

* In both stanzas, too (c, ver. 15, and s, ver. 17), the deviation from the strict forms of Parallelism in making *two* lines (the third and fourth) correspond conjointly to a *single* line (the first)—the one line containing the GRACE, and the other the GIFT—is intended to draw special attention to this connection.

The arrangement of the stanzas, therefore, in the Analytical Commentary, ought to be corrected by that now given.

† The true reading is that of Tischendorf, and Westcott, ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι. The reading of the Text. Recept. is an evident correction to assimilate this verse to ver. 15, τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι.

act of Adam, still, like c, it also sums up the combined results of the *judicial* and *moral* influences flowing from both.

Ver. 16, 17, *j* and *s*. There remains still the important inquiry, wherein consists the superiority claimed for the remedy over the disease?

The *general* answer, it may be said, is the principle involved in both *j* and *s*, that it is far more easy to injure than to cure. A child, by deranging one pinion in a piece of exquisitely connected mechanism, may spread destruction over the whole: it requires the power and skill of a consummate artist to restore it to its original efficiency; much more out of evil to educe good and to raise his original design to a still higher degree of perfection than at first. Greater is he that overcomes, than that which is overcome. The more extensive the damage, the more powerful the enemy, so much the higher is the honour and the mightier the power shown, in triumphing over them.

But to consider each case *particularly*; and I. the *judicial* aspect. It was affirmed in

j But not as the offence
So also is the Grace (τὸ χάρισμα).

The superiority claimed for the grace of the gospel, as more than remedying the evils of the offence, is

j Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρῖμα
ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατὰ κρῖμα.
Τὸ δὲ χάρισμα,
ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα.

That the word to be supplied with ἐξ ἑνός, "from one," is παραπτώματος "offence," not ἀνθρώπου, man, as many of the later commentators (De Wette, Meyer, Rückert, Tholuck, Philippi, Alford, Wordsworth, &c.), maintain, results

I. From the previous context. The proposition to which *j* refers, they conceive to be the *immediately* preceding words, (s) καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἀμαρτήσαντος; and hence, they argue, the ἑνός must refer to the same substantive in both. The very ground of their argument is cut away, the moment the Parallelism reveals to us the fallacy of their supposition, and refers

us, by the τὸ χάρισμα in *j*, back to the τὸ χάρισμα in *j*, as the proposition of which *j* is the proof. The ἐνός in *j* is thus brought into immediate connection with the παράπτωμα in *j*, as the substantive to which it has reference.

2. From the succeeding context in *s*, ver. 17, Εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι, &c. We thus see the appropriateness of the true reading, as determined by Tischendorf, and Westcott, ἐν ἐνὶ παραπτώματι, which refers back to εἰς ἐνός *sc.* παραπτώματος in *j*, ver. 16.

3. The Parallelism determines the ellipsis seemingly beyond dispute ;

Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρῖμα	εἰς ἐνός	εἰς κατάκριμα
Τὸ δὲ χάρισμα	ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων	εἰς δικαίωμα

When we observe the exact correspondence of the other terms, κρῖμα and χάρισμα, κατάκριμα and δικαίωμα, can we hesitate in deciding that εἰς ἐνός and ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων must in like manner correspond ?

Even independently of parallelism, what proper antithesis exists between “by one *man*,” and “from many *offences* ?” Must not the apostle, had he meant to express “by one *man*,” if he would not add ἀνθρώπου, at all events have written δι ἐνός (not εἰς) as in *s*, ver. 16, and in ver. 12, if he wished to make himself understood ?

4. Besides, as has been already shown, where the *judicial* view is brought forward (as unquestionably it is in this verse) the *offence*, not the *person*, is regarded. The introduction of the “one *man*” brings entire confusion into the thought. That the judgment consequent on the fall proceeded from *one man*, does not render its direful consequences less universal, nor leave any point of possible superiority to be claimed on the part of Christ’s redemption. No comparison is here intended between Adam and his descendants. The grace shown in the pardon of the “many offences,” as compared with the “one offence,” is equally applicable to Adam himself as to any of his posterity. The thought we believe to be this, and the point of superiority claimed for the Grace of the Gospel above the evil of the fall. It had been much, and all that our ordinary

ideas of a sovereign's clemency could lead us to expect, had the first act of rebellion been pardoned, and Adam, or any sinner among us, been reinstated in his original condition. Yet after all, what would this have availed? Soon again we might have fallen from perfect obedience, and as "*every sin* deserveth God's wrath and curse," we should have ruined ourselves again irretrievably. But blessed be God's name, we are, through the justification that is in Christ Jesus, placed in an infinitely better position than Adam was in his original state of innocence. The "*many offences*," which the Christian daily commits in thought, word, and deed, part not irrecoverably between him and his God. The death of Christ has made atonement for *every* iniquity; the blood of Jesus cleanseth from *all* sin. "The grace is from *many* offences unto justification." *One* offence caused the ruin. *Many* offences cannot undo the blessing. Grace triumphs over *all* offences, however numerous.

II. We have next to inquire wherein the superiority claimed for the remedy consists on the *moral* side of the question.

The simple affirmation of superiority in ver. 16,

s And not as it was by one having sinned [that all sinned],
So is the Gift [of righteousness];

finds its corresponding illustration or proof in ver. 17:

s For if by one offence
Death reigned by the one;
Much more they which receive the abundance of the Grace,
And of the Gift of righteousness,
Shall reign in life by the one Jesus Christ.

Here after observing the necessary connection as evinced by the Parallelism between s and s, we should expect to find s to have run somewhat thus, as the Parallelism seems to require,

For if by the offence of the one
Sin reigned by the one,
Much more in them which receive the abundance of the Gift of righteousness,
Righteousness shall reign by the one Jesus Christ.

But (besides the strong reason already stated) for St. Paul's blending together the judicial and moral views, (viz., in order to shew the intimate connection between justification and sanctification) a little reflection will discover with what nicety and tact the apostle has selected his expressions for exhibiting forcibly the more immediate object he had in view. Instead of saying in the second line, as combining both the judicial and moral views, he might have done (comp. ver. 21),

Sin reigned in *death* by the one,

and in the corresponding line—either following exact Parallelism,

Righteousness shall reign in *life* by the one Jesus Christ,

—or as in ver. 21,

Grace shall reign through righteousness unto life;

the expressions which he has chosen tend to magnify the superiority on the part of Christ's redemption. So entire (St. Paul's representation is) was the dominion which Sin had usurped over Adam's race, that not only sin itself, but its subordinate

“*Death* reigned by the one.”

But this only enhances the more the salvation through Christ; in that not only His Life, as well as Righteousness, reigns in believers, but so entire is the conquest secured for them over Satan, Sin, and Death, and the release from their enslaving and destroying power, that *they themselves*

“Shall reign in Life by the one Jesus Christ;”

being exalted to “sit with Him in His throne,” Rev. iii. 21, and “made kings and priests unto God and His Father,” Rev. i. 6.

The reference of the “FOR,” with which this 17th verse (s) begins, is to the beginning of ver. 16 (s), so that in the

two stanzas *j* and *s* we have an instance of two co-ordinate FOR'S (*γάρ*) referring back to two preceding sentences.*

Still, so beautiful is the concatenation of ideas in the whole of this exquisite piece of composition, that with equal propriety the "FOR" in ver. 17 may be regarded as connecting it with the immediately preceding quatrain *j*, and as rendering a reason for the statement there made.

Ver. 16 *j*. So complete (it is stated in ver. 16) is the forgiveness of believers through Grace "from many offences unto justification" (*δικαίωμα*, a sentence of full acquittal);

Ver 17 *s*. "FOR" this sufficient reason—that so complete will be their sanctification, and the emancipation finally, of those "who receive the Grace and Gift of righteousness," from all connection with sin, that they shall be entirely "delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God," Rom. viii. 21, "made (perfectly) righteous," v. 19, and shall "*reign in life* by" and "with" "the one Jesus Christ" for ever and ever.

We would now beg to draw particular attention to the strong confirmation which the connection just pointed out between verses 16 and 17 furnishes of the correctness of the interpretation which we have argued must be put upon ver. 19—viz., that the expression being "made righteous" refers, not to justification as is usually explained, but to sanctification.

The connection of ver 19 with ver. 18 we hold to be identically the same as that of ver. 17 with ver. 16, as indeed might be expected to be the case, since verses 18 and 19 evidently form the summing up of all that had been said before from ver. 12, and especially of verses 16 and 17.

In both cases the truth and propriety of God's justifying believers, or judicially declaring them *perfectly righteous*, contained in the first sentence of each (verses 16 *j*, and 18) are vindicated and enforced in the succeeding verse, introduced in each by "FOR" (verses 17 and 19), by the statement of the certain eventual renewal of believers in their whole nature into the perfect holiness of God. This renewal is conceived to be

* See Jebb's Sacred Lit. sect. xviii., and the Author's Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, pp. 56-58.

as certain in God's sight as if already accomplished, being secured and provided for in the very act of the union of believers with Christ, by which they shall not only be wholly freed from the dominion of sin, but, according to the statement of ver. 17, be made themselves to "*reign in life by the one Christ Jesus*, and according to the statement of ver. 19, be "*by the obedience of the one made righteous.*"

Ver. 21. What is the reason, it may be asked, of the deviation from the strict rules of parallelism in this verse by the insertion of *Grace*, for which there is no corresponding term in the parallel line ?

As much is to be learned often from the violation of strict accuracy in the parallelism, as from its strict observance. Had the apostle preserved strict symmetry by omitting *Grace*, and the lines have run thus,

That as Sin hath reigned —in Death,
Even so might Righteousness reign—unto eternal Life,

he would have failed to make prominent the point to which he now meant to draw special attention, that the salvation of the believer is wholly of *grace*—the very character from which the objections immediately following in ch. vi. are drawn.

Had he, on the contrary, retained *Grace*, and inserted in the corresponding line its proper counterpart *Law*, and the lines had run thus,

That as Law reigned
Through Sin in Death,
Even so might Grace reign,
Through Righteousness unto eternal Life,

the reader might have been misled to suppose that he attributed to *Law*, as its *cause*, the prevalence of *Sin*, and his Jewish opponents have been prejudiced at the very threshold, of his argument respecting the *Law*. The apostle does indeed afterwards, in ch. vi. 14, represent the reign of *Sin* and of *Law* as being commensurate—that man is under the dominion of *Sin*, as being *under the reign of the Law* ;

For Sin shall not have dominion over you,
For ye are not *under the Law*, but under *Grace* ;

But this is after he has advanced so far in his argument that he is prepared in the next chapter (vii.) to administer the corrective, and to show that though the dominion of Sin and the reign of the Law are contemporaneous, still the Law is not the *cause*, but the *occasion* only of Sin, vii. 7-12.

And now, in concluding our notes on Rom. v. 12-21, we feel constrained to ask, Who can rise from the study and contemplation of this wondrous passage, full of such profound views and pregnant meanings, with all its variously complicated yet beautifully discriminated relations and interlacements of members and thoughts, without an overpowering admiration and irresistible conviction of the *superhuman* wisdom that must have dictated its minutest details!

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 1 and 15. The twofold division of this chapter is evident from the marked parallelism between verses 1 and 15. The presumption immediately arises that it has reference to the twofold division of chapter v.—the *judicial* and *moral*—to the change introduced through Christ of LIFE and RIGHTEOUSNESS, in place of the DEATH and SIN through Adam; in other words, to justification and sanctification. This is immediately confirmed by an inspection of verses 1-14, in which it is evident that the DEATH and LIFE of believers are the leading topics, considered as forming no encouragement to sin, but a powerful discouragement against it; whereas in verses 15-23 the *reigning* powers of SIN and RIGHTEOUSNESS form the dissuasives against it. From this results the division given in the Analytical Commentary; viz., verses 1-14 state the objection of the legalist against *justification* being by the free “Grace” of God; verses 15-23 against *righteousness* (*sanctification*) being a free “Gift.”

In exact accordance with this is the nice discrimination between the apostle’s expression in ver. 1, “Shall we *continue in sin?*” and that in ver. 15, “Shall we *sin?*” In the former case the legalist might object, If according to your

doctrine the believer, while yet a sinner, is justified, that is, pronounced righteous by God, immediately on his believing in Christ without waiting to see what his works may be, where is the pressing necessity for his breaking off sin? If grace "justifies the *ungodly*," why not "*continue in sin*, that grace may abound" the more in pardoning it freely? But in the latter case (verses 15-23) it is implied in regarding (*sanctifying*) righteousness as a "gift" (ver. 17), that continuance in sin will be so far interrupted, and that righteousness, in part at least, will be imparted and practised. Hence the expression is changed to, "Shall we *sin*?" If righteousness be the mere "gift" of God for sanctification equally as for justification, and not wrought out by our own exertions, but simply received and appropriated by faith (which more properly is the work assigned to man to do), so that the believer is made willing, active, and diligent in good deeds by a power not his own,* why (he may be induced to say) not "*sin*," that is, *indulge in sin occasionally*?

In reply to this objection, nothing needs to be added to the answer already given in the Analytical Commentary, viz., that so far is the assurance, that God "worketh" in the believer "both to will and to do," from encouraging men to sin, that, on the contrary, any wilful obedience to sin would prove that sin was still our master, and that we had no part nor union with Christ, for justification any more than for sanctification. But the first objection calls for more particular examination.

Ver. 1-14. The objection here answered is that if justification be by the "Grace" of God alone, an encouragement would thus be held out to "continue in sin, that grace might abound" in pardoning it.

Such an idea the apostle rejects with an expression of abhorrence, "God forbid." It is only (as if he had said), by the most entire misunderstanding of the doctrine proposed in chap. v. 12-21, that such an abuse could for a moment be made of it. As there stated, it is alone by an entire and intimate UNION of the believer with Christ, effected by faith, that any

* Compare 1 Cor. xv. 10, "I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the *grace of God* which was with me."

of the blessings He has purchased for us can be conveyed to us. Christ's death, and burial, and resurrection to a new life, are ideally the death, burial, and resurrection of His people, to which in practice they must become conformed. How are we justified or delivered from death by Christ? Only by our consenting to die with Him to sin, and acknowledging the penalty paid by Him as justly ours; and, by thus resigning our old life as forfeited through sin, ending all farther claims of sin upon us, and breaking off all connection with it. Having then thus in spirit "died to sin," it cannot be that we should any longer live *to* sin, much less live *in* it.

St. Paul's reply here is in exact accordance with the doctrine as stated in the former chapter; advancing nothing properly new, but merely forming a corollary from the doctrine, or a fuller development of it, as showing that in itself it met and repelled all such objections. The great doctrine of the latter part of that chapter was shown to be that Adam and Christ are the two heads of humanity, imparting to all connected with them the evils and blessings introduced by each. So intimate and complete is the connection of the members with the head, that what belongs to the one becomes the property of the other. In Adam all sinned, in Adam all died. So of those that attach themselves by faith to Christ, the Head of renewed humanity, all die with Him to sin, all rise with Him to a new life. By baptism we become incorporated into Him, and members of His body. We are brought into the closest UNION with Christ, so that all things that are His become ours. But more especially it is into a connection with Him in His *death* that we are introduced by baptism (ver. 13), which is the washing away of the sins of the old man and burying him under its cleansing waters. Christ died not for Himself, but for our sins. His death therefore is our death; so that "if He died for all, then have all we died" with Him to sin, and dissolved all connection with it, having liquidated every claim that the tyrant had to call on God's law to give sentence against us. We are dead and buried with Christ by being baptized into His death. But if His death is our death, His life is equally our life. We have risen with Him to a new

and endless life, and have the assurance of a full and final victory over sin secured to us as a privilege by our union with Christ. This should form the strongest encouragement to us (verses 12-14) not to allow the slightest power any more to sin in this body of ours, "mortal," indeed, since it must be broken down that it may be purified from the last remnants of sin, but only in order to its being built up anew as a glorious spiritual body, free from every taint.

Such is a general idea of the argument of this passage. But in order fully to grasp the view of the Apostle, we must keep in mind that our UNION with Christ, by which His righteousness is communicated to the believer, has two sides, an *objective*, and a *subjective*.

Objectively considered, Christ has died for us; has risen again. It is our old man that was crucified in Him; it is our new man that rises with Him. All is *already virtually accomplished* for the believer in Christ. If truly brought into union with Him by faith, like the branch ingrafted into the vine, His power is pledged for gradually imparting to us the fulness of His own life and strength, and (what the tree cannot do) working in us a complete assimilation of nature, and conformity to Himself, in a way that we cannot always nor fully trace, "the seed cast into the ground, even when men sleep, springing and growing up, we know not how." (Mark iv. 26, 27. Compare John iii. 8, "The wind bloweth," &c.)

But (unlike the branch also in this) man is a voluntary and moral agent; and the union with Christ, to be genuine, must be *subjectively* and progressively realised by us. It must be an intelligent, sympathizing, co-operating union, that sees in all that Jesus has done, not only the procuring cause, but the very mode and pattern, of our recovery and cure. We must pass through the same stages through which Christ passed. We must consent to die with Him to sin; we must rise with Him to a new life. We must learn to deny ourselves, to crucify our old man, or life, and receive a new life springing out of death. Thus entering intelligently into the mind and purpose of God and Christ, and comprehending, in part at least, the grace and love of the plan of redemption combined

with righteousness and truth, the believer is called upon, and is enabled to "glory in tribulations," and to welcome sufferings and death, both as the righteous wages of his sin, and as the necessary means of his discipline and cure. Regarding his present life as forfeited, he resigns his body as a "mortal" (*Θνητόν*, death-doomed) body (vi. 12), "dead because of sin" (viii. 10), to be broken down, so soon as it may please God, that it may be raised up anew as a "spiritual," sin-purified habitation, like to Christ's glorified body.

The answer in ver. 2-14, briefly stated, is: By our union with Christ, including both the *objective* and *subjective* aspects, God reckons* to us all that is His, as if already accomplished in us. He "died unto sin" for us; "He liveth unto God. Likewise *reckon* ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God," ver. 11, assured that God's grace will finally perfect this change within you. How groundless, then, the objection, that God's freely justifying the believer, i.e., *reckoning* him already "dead to sin and alive to righteousness," encourages to continue in sin! How? *dead* to sin, and yet *live* to sin! (ver. 2). If certain of final victory, that "sin shall not have dominion over you," (ver. 14), what stronger encouragement could be offered to "give place to it by subjection, no, not for an hour?"

The answer is stated in three stanzas, ver. 2-4, 5-7, 8-11 (with the inference drawn in a fourth, ver. 12-14), exhibiting a remarkable threefold correspondence† in each, marked a, b, c.

In a, Death and the new life are contrasted (in all the three stanzas).

In b, Christians are called upon to appreciate ("know") what is implied for them in the death of Christ.

In c, Death to sin sets free for a new life.

* This, therefore, (ver. 1-14) is the *judicial* view; compare ver. 7, "*justified*," and ver. 11, "*reckon ye also*," &c. This confirms the correctness of the idea that ver. 1-14 form the reply to the objection that would naturally be raised against *justification by faith* alone; while ver. 15-23 refer to the objection against *sanctification being the gift* of God.

† Professor Jowett has remarked, in part, this parallelism.

VER. 2-4.

a. Justification implies *dying* to sin with Christ (see ver. 7), and rising with Him to a new life (of holiness) ; which is incompatible, therefore, with our living still to sin.

b. "*Know,*" as you surely must, that *death* to sin, as resulting from Christ's death, was that which was specially signified and sealed to us by our incorporating union with Him in baptism, "the washing away of the filth of the flesh," and burying the old man under the waters of death.

c. But a death undergone, only that we might come forth, "born of water and of the Spirit" (John iii. 5), into a new life ; like Israel from their baptism in the Red Sea (1 Cor. x. 2), or like Noah, born into a new world—having escaped through the overwhelming waters that buried the pollutions of the old (1 Pet. iii. 21). Like them, therefore, we are bound and encouraged to forget all past relations, and thenceforth to "walk in newness of life."

VER. 5-7.

a. For if we realize this our union with Christ, so as to "bear about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus," 2 Cor. iv. 10, and consent cheerfully, as the means of our cure, to an entire "likeness of His death," by the breaking down of our sin-impregnated body,* we shall attain to the full likeness of "His resurrection" in a sin-purified, glorified body like Christ's.

b. *Knowing* that our crucifixion with Him is for the entire destruction of our "body of sin," vi. 6, and release from sin's service;

c. Since he that has died to sin is justified, or judicially absolved, from all claims of sin either for penalty or dominion.

* See the following Dissertation on "Died to Sin," "The body of Sin," &c.

VER. 8-11.

a. But if dead with Christ, life also with Him shall be ours, to yield no more to death ;

b. *Knowing* that such is Christ's life.

c. So reckon all claims of Sin and Death over you cancelled in Him, and an endless life to God already begun.

DISSERTATION

ON "DIED (DEAD) TO SIN."

"THE BODY OF SIN." "BODY OF DEATH." "FLESH OF SIN."

The import of the expression "died (dead) to sin" (vi. 2, 10, 11, comp. ver. 7) has been much contested. Is it a *moral*, or a *legal* death that is here meant? being dead to the *power* of sin, as maintained by the majority of commentators, or to its *guilt* alone, as Fraser (Scripture Doctrine of Sanctification), and Haldane contend? And in close connection with this question, as we shall see, is another—What is meant by "the body of sin" in vi. 6, the "body of death" in vii. 24, and by "the flesh," in vii. 18, ("the flesh of sin," *σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*, viii. 3), &c.? Is there any reference here to the natural body, and to the literal flesh, as being the seat of sin? Or are these entirely figurative expressions, denoting merely the *whole mass* of embodied sin, and the *fleshly* nature of man?

The design of the apostle in chapter vi. is to illustrate and enforce still more strongly his position in chap. v., of the completeness of the provision made in Christ for the justification and sanctification of the believer, and the indissoluble connection between these two blessings. This he does in the form of answers to the objections (ever brought by legalists against the doctrines taught in chap. v. 12-21), that justification by the "Grace" of God alone, and sanctification as "the Gift by

Grace," give encouragement to perseverance in sin : the reply to the first being contained in vi. 1-14 ; to the second, in ver. 15-23. It is under the first of these heads, that the expressions in question, "died unto sin," "dead unto sin," occur. The terms in which the objection to the apostle's doctrine is here expressed are borrowed from the 20th verse of the preceding chapter, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." "What shall we say then?" is the objection that immediately occurs ; if justification is by the grace of God alone without works, and if the greater the sin of men, the greater is the glory of God's grace in pardoning it, should we not "continue in sin that grace may abound?" The answer of St Paul to this objection, after repelling with abhorrence the very thought of such an abuse of God's grace, is, "How shall we that have *died to sin* live any longer therein?" The import of this reply, as understood by many commentators, is, How inconsistent would it be to renounce, as we do by our very baptismal engagements, all sin (ver. 3), and yet to continue in the practice of it—to profess to die to sin, and still to live therein ! To this it has been well replied, If this be all that is meant, the apostle's answer to the objection is most unsatisfactory and inadequate. It is merely to say, If we profess to cease to sin, how can we belie our professions ?—an inconsistency, alas ! to the existence of which every day's experience bears witness. It would seem, too, to be a contradiction to Paul's previous reasoning, which down to chap. iii. 20 went to prove that man is incapable by mere *resolution* to renounce sin. No security whatever would, by this view of the apostle's reply, be provided against the believer's continuance in sin.

Those accordingly who oppose this interpretation, as Fraser and Haldane, maintain that to have "died to sin" must express not a duty, but a privilege of Christians ; that it "does not in any degree relate to their character or moral conduct, but exclusively to their state before God ;"* that it signifies solely "dead to the *guilt*, not to the *power* of sin." This,

* See Haldane on Rom. vi. 2.

it is affirmed, is the only interpretation consistent with the assertion in ver. 10, that "Christ died unto sin once," and the consequent exhortation in ver. 11, "Likewise [that is, in like manner] reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin," that is, to be wholly freed from its guilt and legal penalty—the only sense, it is argued, in which Christ can be said to "have died to sin."

Unfortunately, however, for this legal interpretation, so far as it would exclude all reference to the moral character of believers, it cannot be carried consistently throughout this very passage. Ver. 6 refutes it. In the course of the argument we find two manifestly equivalent expressions used by the apostle for "died to sin;" viz., in ver. 4, "being buried with Him by our baptism into His death," and in ver. 6, "our old man was crucified with him." Now in this latter instance it cannot surely be maintained that all that is meant is that we have "died," or "been crucified," to the *guilt* of sin—that our old man has endured a mere *legal* crucifixion. Haldane himself interprets it, that our "*sinful nature* was crucified together with Christ." In Gal. vi. 14, the same figurative expression occurs with the addition, "unto the world." "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world;" where the mere legal interpretation is inadmissible, that Paul was crucified, or died, to the *guilt* of the world. Besides, it may be asked, Has the Christian Church been all along in error in applying this expression to a *moral* death to sin, in evidently borrowing from it the terms in which she urges upon her children the duty "more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness"?

These contradictory interpretations can be reconciled only by rising to the largeness of the apostle's conceptions, which will be found to comprehend and harmonize both ideas. In this we shall be assisted by again having recourse to the parallel drawn in the preceding chapter between Adam and Christ. So intimate is the union between Adam and his seed, that the moment a child is born, all that is Adam's immediately becomes his. He has sinned with him; he has died

with him. Sin and death have entered into his nature, and we need not to wait for their manifestation in outward act to be assured that they are already operative within. So it is with the new-born babe in Christ Jesus. As soon as by an act of true faith the believer becomes one with Christ Jesus, all that is Christ's immediately becomes his. We have died with Christ. We have risen with Christ. His resurrection-life has become our new life; we are "made to sit together with Him in heavenly places," Eph. ii. 6. In the eye of that God who sees the end from the beginning, all these blessings procured by Christ are as fully assured to the Christian, as if he were already in full possession of them.

This is the objective, or "*legal*" side of the comparison as it is expressed by Fraser, Haldane, &c., though it will be seen that the expression "*legal*" gives a very inadequate representation of the case, in affirming that it is only to the *guilt* of sin that the believer has died. It is to sin as a whole, to its power as well as to its guilt, that he has virtually died in Christ as his representative and substitute. Christ's victory is his victory. Christ in dying to sin, not only paid the penalty due to it, but put an end to all that power, which, inasmuch as He came "in the likeness of the flesh of sin," was conceded to sin over Him—to tempt Him, to vex His righteous soul, and to cause Him intense anguish and death. In dying to sin, He died entirely to its power—to *all* connection with it. Such also is the state of the new man in Christ Jesus; Christ's victory assures us of a like final victory over sin: "For sin shall not have dominion over you;" and it is the privilege and duty of Christians thus to regard themselves. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord,"—dead virtually, potentially to its *power*, as well as to its guilt, in short, to *all* connection with it.

But our union with Adam has its subjective, as well as its objective side. Although, as has been said, the moment a child is born, sin and death are already in his nature, yet sin has still to develop itself in his acts, and it takes years before death, even in its temporal form, exhibits its full power over his

gradually decaying frame. We as it were identify ourselves with Adam by our own voluntary acts, and appropriate each to himself subjectively the fall and its consequences in the exercise of our own individual responsibility. The same holds true of our union with Christ. The moment that this is accomplished by an act of true faith, the man is become a new creature. He has passed from death to life—from the life of the old man, which is but a living death, to the life of the new man which “is hid with Christ in God.” All is already accomplished in Christ for the believer in the sight of God, who “calleth those things which be not as though they were.” Yet all remains still to be realized in his own individual experience. He must make each step his own by his voluntary appropriation and acts. He must pass through every stage of life and death through which Jesus passed. He must live over again His temporal life of suffering, self-denial, and daily mortification of every earthly desire. He must conclude with His obedience even unto death as the closing scene, if he would partake hereafter of His resurrection-life of glory. Of this Jesus warns all His disciples in the most express terms, when His apostles were shocked at His prediction of His own approaching sufferings and death. “If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life [in its temporal, sensuous form] shall lose it [as his eternal life]; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake [temporarily] shall save it [eternally].” As it was through death that Jesus passed into His resurrection-life, by the cross that he attained to the crown, so must all His followers learn from His life of self-sacrifice to deny themselves, to take up their cross daily, and to become obedient even unto death.*

* Thus we see that the objective view in no way excludes, or is opposed to, the subjective view, but that the one is the fitting complement of the other. Neander has well expressed this connection:—

“The principle of the whole transformation of the life which proceeds from the Spirit of Christ is implanted at once in believing, by one act of the mind. Man by means of faith is dead to the former standing-point of a sinful life, and rises to a new life of communion with Christ. The old man is slain once for all; Rom. vi. 4-6; Coloss. iii. 3. Paul assumes that in Christians, the act by

We must not confine our views of Christ's death to its atoning virtue alone—all-important though this be, and, indeed, the basis on which every other view of it must rest. Like every other great appointment of God, Christ's death answers more than one purpose. It has its different sides, none of which can be overlooked without detriment. It was designed as an example to us, as well as our great means of reconciliation with God, as a model or pattern according to which all His followers must be conformed. Christ "died to sin," not only in the sense of bearing its penalty, but also so as to mortify and overcome it wholly by resisting it even unto death. He came "in the likeness of the flesh of sin," and was thereby exposed to all the temptations of sin and Satan equally with us. And how did He overcome sin and death? By mortifying daily every desire of the flesh, living not for Himself, but making it "His meat to do the will of His heavenly Father," and continuing "obedient even unto death." By death He overcame and "destroyed him that had the power of death," Heb. ii. 14. "The captain of our salvation must be made perfect through sufferings," Heb. ii. 10. "Being put to death in the flesh, He was quickened in the Spirit," 1 Pet. iii. 18, so as to be "made a quickening spirit" to others, 1 Cor. xv. 45,—and "ordained the Son of God with power by the resurrection of the dead," Rom. i. 4,—procured and virtually assured to *all in union with Him* by *His* resurrection. "Forasmuch then as

virtue of which they are dead to sin, and have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts is already accomplished ideally in principle. Hence he infers, How can they who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Rom. vi. 2; Gal. v. 24. But the practice must correspond to the principle; the outward conformation of the life must harmonize with the tendency given to the inward life. Walking in the spirit must necessarily proceed from living in the Spirit, Gal. v. 25; the former must be a manifestation of the latter. Hence Christians are always required to renew the mortification of the flesh, to walk after the Spirit, to let themselves be animated by the Spirit."—Planting and training of the Christian Church, Vol. ii. p. 138, Eng. Trans., Thos. Clark, Edinburgh. |

The apostle has strikingly expressed the connection between the objective privilege and the subjective duty in Col. iii. 3-5, "*ye have died*, and your life is hid with Christ in God. *Mortify* [put to death] *therefore* your members which are upon the earth."

Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh," we must "arm ourselves likewise with the same mind," 1 Pet. iv. 1. We must "be crucified with Him unto the world, and the world be crucified unto us," Gal. vi. 14. We must bear about with us in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh," 2 Cor. iv. 11, and "as our outward man decays, our inward man will [thus] be renewed day by day," 2 Cor. iv. 16.

And this is true in the literal sense, much more than we are accustomed to regard it. As Christ died to sin, even so must we die to sin. It was through death—through submitting to a *literal* death of the body—that He overcame death, and him that had the power of death. So it is appointed to His followers. Christ has entirely changed to them the character of death. It is no longer to be looked forward to with dread as a mark of the wrath and condemning sentence of God, and as a forestalment of the second and more awful death; but it is to be embraced voluntarily, and even cheerfully, as the very mode of cure by which we can be freed completely from the dreadful malady of sin, which has so entirely corrupted every part of our diseased frame, that it is called a "body of sin" (Rom. vi. 6), and a "body of death" (vii. 24). So completely has sin set up its throne in our bodily members, that in this "our flesh dwelleth no good thing" (vii. 18), and the body must be broken down in order that the last remains of sin may be separated from it, and that we may attain to the full "adoption" of being God's children, even "the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 23.) "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. xv. 50.

We must look upon our present life as a doomed life, sooner or later to be given up wholly, and which, therefore, we ought to be prepared to resign at any moment that God may require it, being willing to spend and be spent in His service. We must "present our *bodies*" specially, "a living sacrifice unto God" (Rom. xii. 1), to be consummated at their literal death. Compare "I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand" (2 Tim. iv. 6).

What a different complexion, let us remark in passing, would

this view give to our expectations of death, were we habitually looking forward to it as the means of our perfect cure and purification, and as the gate of transition to unmixed holiness and glory! Instead of shrinking back from sufferings and death, we should gladly welcome them, nay "*glory* in tribulations," and, with the Apostle, *long* to be "delivered from this body of death,"—"having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better."

Only thus viewed can any satisfactory solution be offered of the origin of this phraseology, or the expression of St. Paul in Rom. vi. 12 receive a distinct definite meaning, "Let not sin reign, therefore, ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι, in your *mortal*, or *death-doomed*, body"—an expression passed over too slightly by commentators generally—and which again has its counterpart in Rom. viii. 10, "the *body is dead* because of sin"—where surely the body in the *literal* sense is intended.

This furnishes an answer to our other question, whether the expressions of the Apostle had any reference to the *natural* "body" and the *literal* "flesh," as being the seat of sin. In a certain sense this surely appears to be the case. Not that the Apostle teaches any thing like the Manichæan doctrine of the essential malignity of matter, or that all sins arise merely from our connexion with the body. Undoubtedly, as appears from many passages (*e.g.*, Gal. v. 19-21), all sins, from whatever part of our nature they immediately spring, are reckoned among "the works of the flesh," so that it is not in contradistinction to the mind or soul, that the body is represented as the seat of all evil lusts. Still it is not without reason, or as a mere figure, that the Apostle has so frequently connected all sin with the body, and the flesh. So intimately has sin entwined itself with this sensuous life, that, as long as we are in the body, some remnant of sin cleaves even to the holiest of God's saints, and to the finest affections of our natures, each of which we must, like Abraham called upon to offer up Isaac, learn to resign, and entirely to die to in its present imperfect form: and it is only when the last tie with earth is snapped asunder, that the last dregs of sin shall disappear. "To die is"

thus great "gain,"* because only by this earthly tabernacle being broken down, and purged from all pollution, can we attain to "be with Christ, which is far better." "The natural body" must be dissolved, that it may be "raised a spiritual body."

We conclude, therefore, that the expressions, "the body of sin," and "the flesh of sin," though including all the lusts more immediately traceable to the soul and spirit, are yet not entirely figurative expressions, but have a reference to the *natural body* and *literal flesh*, as being the visible manifestation and embodiment to sense of our present earthly existence, with which sin is so closely bound up, that it will cease entirely only with the dissolution of the body.

But above all, the expression in vi. 5 requiring conformity to "the likeness of Christ's death," equally with that which we hope to attain to "the likeness of His resurrection," seems to constrain us to include, in St Paul's idea of the death to be embraced by the believer, submission also to the literal death of the body as the necessary consummation of the entire "mortification of our members which are upon the earth." If in "the likeness of Christ's resurrection" is confessedly included the resurrection of the *literal* body; in "the likeness of His death," to which we are to be conformed, must be equally implied a willing submission to the death of the *literal* body, as requisite for the complete "destruction of the body of sin." "For [only] if we have become united (or 'grown together, *σύνζυτοι* ') with Him in the likeness of His death, shall we be also in the likeness of His resurrection." "The body of sin" must be destroyed, that it may be raised a new and spiritual body. It is a *θνητὸν σῶμα*, a mortal or death-doomed body. "The body is *dead* because of Sin; but if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that

* Thus Calvin, in commenting on Rom. vii. 24 ("O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from this body of death?"), remarks, "Paul teaches us that the most perfect, as long as they dwell in the flesh, are exposed to misery, because they are obnoxious to death. Farther, lest they should indulge in lethargy, Paul, by his own example, stimulates them to anxious groanings, and bids them, as long as they sojourn on earth, to desire death, as the only true remedy for their evils; and this is the right object in desiring death."

raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your *mortal body* by His Spirit that dwelleth in you," Rom. viii. 10, 11. How naturally, then, follows the exhortation, "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your *mortal body*," (vi. 12); "yield your *members* as instruments of righteousness unto God," (vi. 13)! Why "take thought for your body" so anxiously, and make provision for this present fleeting life, since, as Christ's body was broken, so must our bodies soon be broken down also? "He that loveth his life [in this world] shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal," John xii. 25.

The argument in Rom. vi. 5 depends on the *completeness* of the assimilation to Christ in both respects. We shall attain to the complete "likeness of His resurrection" in the "body of our humiliation being conformed unto the body of His glory," Phil. iii. 21, only if we have been first completely conformed to "the likeness of His death," by "the earthly house of this tabernacle being dissolved," 2 Cor. v. 1.

CHAPTER VI. 16.

Ver. 16. There is a deviation from strict parallelism in this verse, which deserves attention. To correspond with

"Whether of *sin* unto *death*,"

we expect,

"Or of *righteousness* unto *life*."

Why the change into—

"Or of *obedience* unto *righteousness*"?

To mark, it would seem, that to SIN and RIGHTEOUSNESS, man does not stand equally affected. To SIN we give ourselves of our own free choice and power as bondsmen, for sin is the turning away of man's will from God's will into a path of its own choosing; but we cannot of our own free choice, and by an effort of will, break off from sin's bondage, and give ourselves to the service of RIGHTEOUSNESS. That righteousness, on the contrary, is the "*gift*" of God to us (v. 17) is the very proposition

which the Apostle is engaged in defending. All that we can do, therefore, he represents to be, that brought by the light of God's truth and Spirit at length to see that we are ruined and helpless sinners, utterly unable to deliver ourselves from the bondage of sin, we may and should *yield* ourselves up to God's grace, to save us, and do with us as He sees fit, in order to our cure—"as servants of *obedience*, εἰς δικαιοσύνην, for, or unto righteousness, as a "*gift*" to be bestowed upon us, and inwrought into us by His Spirit.

In order to see the reason of St. Paul's anxiety to enforce this truth, we must remember that there are two classes of readers whom he has in view in this sixth chapter; not only those who are ready to turn the grace of God into wantonness, but still more especially those of a like *legal* spirit with the Jews*—who not conscious, from living personal experience, of the sanctifying power of a simple faith, and heartfelt reception of the free grace of the Gospel, are animated with a *legal* zeal for urging men to work out righteousness in their own strength. It is with a view to the latter class particularly that St. Paul departs here from strict Parallelism. He guards himself from saying at first directly, that, on coming to Christ, believers should yield themselves as servants of *righteousness*. It is only after various cautions against misconception, that he in ver. 19 uses directly the expression, "Yield your members *servants to righteousness*."

In ver. 13 he had begun with saying, "Yield yourselves unto God," to be fashioned according to His will, and "your members as *instruments* of righteousness unto God."

Further, by way of caution, a change is made in ver. 17. After saying, "But God be thanked that ye *were* [that is, that it is a thing of the *past* that ye *were*] the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that mould of doctrine,"—we expect Paul to say, "*which was delivered you*," (as our trans-

* Compare Rom. x. 3, "Going about to establish their own righteousness, they [Israel] have not *submitted themselves* unto the righteousness of God," *i.e.*, have not confessed their utter inability to work out any righteousness of their own, and yielded themselves to God's plan, condescending to receive righteousness from Him as a gift.

lators, failing to enter into his idea, actually make him say), but he changes it into the expression, "that mould of doctrine *into which ye were delivered*,"* in order to mark that it was God, not they themselves, that handed them over to RIGHTEOUSNESS to be moulded into its image.

In accordance with this purpose, it is, that in ver. 18, the expression used in the original is, "Ye *were made* the bond servants (ἔδουλώθητε, ye were enslaved, or bound over to the service) of righteousness, instead of the less correct rendering of our version, "Ye *became* the servants of righteousness."

Now it is, at last, only after all these cautions as to our own insufficiency, and the necessity of our receiving power from God, that in ver. 19 the Apostle requires of believers, "Yield your members servants [bondsmen] to righteousness unto holiness."

Finally, once more he repeats his warning against the *legal* spirit, by the distinction he makes in ver. 23 (with a departure from strict parallelism), as to the fruits DEATH and LIFE, of the respective services of SIN and RIGHTEOUSNESS. While of the freely chosen service of SIN, DEATH is represented as the duly earned "*wages*"—of RIGHTEOUSNESS (which had itself been called "the *gift*" of God), "LIFE eternal," instead of being called the *wages* of righteousness, is significantly styled "the *grace* (χάρισμα, the *gracious grant*) of God."

CHAPTER VII. 1-4.

Ver. 1-4. Who is the *husband* in St Paul's simile? According to the great majority of commentators, the Law. The confusion and inconsistencies which this hypothesis introduces into all the terms of the comparison are surely sufficient for its condemnation.

1. It is evident from ver. 2, that in the illustration it is the husband that dies, and the wife that is set free for a new marriage. Now, in ver. 1 we have it said, "The Law hath

* Compare Gal. iv. 9, "But now after ye have known God," or rather *are known* of God; and 1 Cor. xv. 10, "I laboured more abundantly than they all, yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me."

dominion over a man as long as he liveth ;” that is, if *the Law* be the husband, the Law hath dominion over itself, as long as it (the Law) liveth !

2. Then in ver. 2 we have, “The woman which hath an husband is bound *by* the Law to her husband,” instead of “is bound to the Law *as* her husband,” as the supposed comparison would require.

3. In ver. 4 we have still another change in the figure, and an additional confusion ; for instead of the *Law*, the *husband* dying, which the first three verses led us to expect, it is *we* that die. “Wherefore my brethren, *ye* also are become dead to the Law ;” that is, according to the prevalent interpretation, the *wife* dies.

4. We have next the wife, who, we were just before told, was dead, married to a new husband.

5. But there is a still more fatal objection to the hypothesis, that the *Law* is the husband. It makes St Paul contradict himself. It would entirely preclude the defence of the Law, which he immediately subjoins. To the objections, “Is the Law sin ?” (ver. 7) “Is the Law death ?” (ver. 13) urged against his assertion of the necessity of emancipation from the Law, the apostle’s reply is, “God forbid.” The Law is not the *cause*, but only the innocent *occasion* of sin and death to man. “The Law is holy and just and good” (ver. 12). It was not the Law which was in fault, “but sin, which, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of inordinate desire” (ver. 8), “working death in me by that which is good” (ver. 13). But if the Law, as is generally assumed, be the husband, it was the Law that *generated* fruit unto death in the sinner. The Law was not merely the *occasion*, but the *producing cause* and *responsible father* of sin and death.

St Paul seems most anxious to guard against such a construction of his words. In ver. 5, it is not the Law, but “the *motions of sin* which were *by* the *Law*,” that are represented as working “in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.” In ver. 7, it is not the Law that is Sin, “but Sin” itself “takes occasion by the commandment” of the Law, and

works in the sinner "all manner of inordinate desire" (ver. 8), and death (ver. 11). In the very commencement of the similitude (ver. 2), the *Law* and the *husband*, though intimately connected, are yet carefully distinguished. "The woman which hath an husband is bound *by* the *Law* to her *husband* so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the *law* of her *husband*."

The question then remains unanswered, "Who is the husband, to whom the Church (collectively), or each soul (individually) had been first united, and by whose death the wife is set free (without being an adulteress) for a new marriage? If St Paul is consistent with himself, comparison with the preceding chapter seems to settle this point definitively. There in vi. 6 it was "our *old man*" that was represented as "crucified with" Jesus, as in vii. 4 the "*other*" or *new husband* is stated to be Christ. We seem thus constrained to adopt the view advocated by Olshausen, though it appears to have met with no favour from subsequent commentators, but which alone gives a consistent representation of the figure, and of the argument of the apostle. Olshausen's conception of the similitude is: "As in Christ himself, without prejudice to the unity of His personality, the mortal is distinguished from the immortal Christ (comp. vii. 4 with 1 Pet. iii. 18), so in man also the old man is distinguished from the new, without prejudice to the unity of his personality, which Paul subsequently (ver. 20) designates by $\epsilon\gamma\omega$. This our true personality, the proper self of man, is the wife, who in the natural state appears in marriage with the old man, and in intercourse with him brings forth sins, the end of which is death (vi. 21, 22, vii. 5). But in the death of the mortal Christ, this old man has died along with Him; and as the individual is grafted by faith into Christ, his old man dies, by whose life he was holden under the Law. As, however, with the death of Christ, the immortal Saviour of the world also arose; even so with the death of the old man, the new man becomes living: and with this, who is "the Christ in us," the *I* enters upon a new marriage, from which "the fruits of the Spirit are born."

In confirmation of this view, Olshausen remarks, that the same distinction of the *I* from the old and new man has a warrant from other representations of Scripture. "The forgiveness of sins necessarily leads to this distinction ; for sin cannot be forgiven to the old man ; that must die : not to the new, for this is sinless ; but evidently to the *I*, who is the bearer, as well of the old as of the new man, and by whom the believer can speak of *his* old, and *his* new man." This distinction lies at the foundation of the whole representation in Rom. vii. 7-25, in which the *I* is the bearer both of the old and new nature, and can speak in the character, now of the one, and now of the other—and then, as distinct from, and yet connected with, both. Thus the *I*, identifying itself with the old man, says, in ver. 18, "I know that in *me* (that is, in my *flesh*) dwelleth no good thing : " then again, identifying itself with the new, in ver. 21, "*I* delight in the law of God after *the inward man* ; " and now, as distinct from each, and bearing both, we find the *I* saying, in the summing up of ver. 25,

"So then *I* myself

With my *mind* [the renewed nature] serve the law of God,
But with my *flesh* [the old nature] the law of Sin."

Carry back this conception of the figure to the beginning of the chapter, and all confusion disappears. St Paul in chapter vi. 14, evidently representing the dominion of the Law and the dominion of Sin as being coincident and co-extensive, had asserted, "Sin shall not have dominion (*οὐ κυριεύσει*, shall not be *lord*, or *master*) over you ; for ye are not under Law [as your master], but under Grace." The ground of believers' release from the dominion of the Law, and consequently of Sin, he had stated to be that they had paid, in Christ their representative, the penalty which Law demanded for transgression ; they had "*died* to sin," vi. 2, and thereby were "become dead to the Law" also (vii. 4).

But to the legitimacy of this emancipation from the Law the Jew would strongly object, How can a man be "dead," as you assert, and yet be "alive" (vi. 11)? How can he be

freed, so long as life endures, from the just dominion of the Law? Hath not "the Law dominion over a man, *as long as he liveth*?" True, is the apostle's reply in chap. vii., "as long as he *liveth*," but no longer. And to assist your understanding of what I affirm, take the following illustration. The *I** in man is properly receptive, as a woman dependent for character, fortune, and fate, upon her husband. But the husband departed from his true condition of dependence upon God, and hence fell under the condemnation of the law; and as the wife's condition follows that of her husband, the *I* [or soul] also came under its righteous sentence. But now Christ has appeared for our deliverance; and having come in the likeness of "the flesh of sin," and borne in His own body the penalty due to our transgression, being "made sin for us," and "a curse" though He "knew no sin"—we in *our old man*, of which in this respect He is the substitute and representative, have been crucified with Christ, and become dead with Him to Sin and to the Law. Thus the *I* is set free for a new marriage-union with Christ, and a new life, begun by faith here, and to be perfected in full fruition hereafter. Thus then, "ye are become dead to the Law by the body of Christ," in the old man, but alive in the new; and so freed from the Law and its curse.

This is your *justification*,—God's pronouncing you righteous, delivered from sin and from the law, and brought into a new union with Christ and His righteousness. So God reckons to you, as if already fully accomplished; and so "reckon ye also yourselves, to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Christ Jesus."

But remember that the reality and strength of this new life, and emancipation from the law, are commensurate with the truth and thoroughness of the previous *death*. "Know ye not how that the law hath dominion over a man *as long as he liveth*?" Ye must *die* unto sin first, and give up entirely the old life as forfeited to the law, appropriating fully to your-

* The *soul*, it would seem, in the individual, as the *Church* in a collective capacity, is regarded as a female whose condition is determined by the husband with whom she is connected.

selves the death of Christ to sin as *your* death, if ye are to partake in His resurrection-life? and, as the proof of your truly having so done, realize in yourselves ever more and more this death to sin, “always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in your body” (2 Cor. iv. 10); “the outward man perishing,” that “the inward man may be renewed day by day” (ver. 16): otherwise, if ye still live to sin, you are giving dominion to the law to condemn, and finally consign you to everlasting death.

“The Law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth. For the woman,” *i.e.*, your *Ego* [soul], “which hath a husband, is bound by the law to her husband”—the old man, and to a participation in his doom—“as long as he liveth.” Only “if the husband be dead is she loosed from the law of her husband.” This “liberation from the law must not be an act of *self-will*. As little as the wife may of her own self-will separate from her husband, since his death is requisite for her liberation; so little may the *I* free itself from the law as long as the old man is living. If this is done, therefore, as is always the case, where a mere seeming faith prevails, it is a spiritual adultery, the lust after false freedom, that is, licentiousness, lawlessness. The liberation from the law rightfully takes place only where the new man has arisen in the place of the old—where, therefore, Christ is truly living in the man. There is no licentiousness, for Christ brings with Him the strictest law wherever He works; but the *yoke* of the law is removed by the love which is shed into the heart.”*

St Paul “compares the connection of individuals with the *old man* to the marriage relation, in order to shew that they are not to be considered as inseparable parts of the old man, but yet as so united to him, that it is only by his death that they are loosed from him, and from the obligations which arise out of their union to him. And he presses this comparison in order to explain that by partaking in Christ’s death, and by that alone, the sentence of death is truly executed on the old man, in such a way that the individuals consenting to that

* Olshausen on Rom. vii. 4.

participation survive the death even as Jesus did, and pass through it, and thus escape from the power and condemnation of sin, by escaping from their connection with the old man, through whom sin influences and condemns them, and yet do not defraud the law by thus escaping from it; they were under it in consequence of their relation to the fallen flesh, or old man—they were under him, and he was under the law—but now he is dead, and their relation to him ceases, and their obligations, rising out of that relation, are at an end.

“If, whilst *he* was still alive—that is, while they still walked in the flesh—they were to assume to themselves a freedom from the condemnation of the law, by taking the name of a new husband who was not under the law, they would be casting off obligations which truly belonged to them; they would be separating themselves from their lawful husband, and thus would be acting the part of adulteresses; but, as he is dead, they may now rightfully join themselves in marriage to another, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that they may bring forth fruit unto God, and who, being himself under no condemnation, communicates the same freedom to all souls truly espoused to him.”*

Ver. 3. This is one of the few instances in the Epistle in which the Authorized Version has deviated so far from the order of the Greek as to destroy the regularity of the parallelism. The first, second, and third lines in the original correspond exactly to the fourth, fifth, and sixth respectively.

Ἄρα ὅν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς
 μοιχαλίζῃ χρηματίσει
 εἰάν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ·
 εἰάν δὲ ἀπωδάγη ὁ ἀνήρ,
 ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα,
 γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ.

So then as long as her husband liveth,
 She shall be called an adulteress,
 If she be married to another man;
 But if her husband be dead,
 She is free from the Law, so as to be no adulteress,
 Though she be married to another man.

* The Doctrine of Election, by Thos. Erskine, Esq., p. 343.

Verse 6. Having ascertained who is the true husband of the preceding verses, we have a simple explanation of the expression in this verse ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, viz., “But now we have been delivered from the law, having died in that (viz., our old man) whereby we were held,” the old man being the bond by which alone “the law had dominion over” us in our Ego, or soul.

The usual interpretation is to consider ἐν ᾧ as referring to the law, ἐκείνω or τούτῳ being understood before it. The grammatical accuracy of this is very questionable. Had St Paul’s meaning been, “Having died to that whereby we were held,” this would have been clearly and unambiguously expressed by ἀποθανόντες ᾧ κατειχόμεθα. The insertion of the ἐν is perplexing, and altogether unnecessary, as is evident from δέεται νόμῳ in ver. 2. (Compare ᾧ δήποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι, John v. 4.) Others, again, as Rückert, Winer, Krehl, Philippi, consider ἀποθανόντες as joined *absolutely* to κατηργήθημεν to express the manner of the release, and interpret the words, “But now we are delivered from the law, by having died, wherein we were held.” The awkward position of ἀποθανόντες is attempted to be explained on the ground of the desire to make it emphatical. But had this been the object, it would have been more surely attained, and with restoration of perspicuity to the whole sentence, by placing it before κατηργήθημεν, thus: νυνὶ δὲ ἀποθανόντες κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα. But the correctness of the interpretation now proposed seems placed almost beyond doubt by comparing this verse with verse 3, and observing the remarkable parallelism between two of the clauses in each,

- v. 3. ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου—ἐὰν ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ,
v. 6. κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου—ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα,

- v. 3. She is free from the law —if her husband die,
v. 6. We have been delivered from the law—having died in that whereby we were held,

from which the inference seems unavoidable that ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, “in that whereby we were held,” and ὁ ἀνὴρ, “the

husband" must be equivalent terms—and consequently, that it is the *husband* that dies, and not (as usually explained) the *wife*.

We have the authority of Chrysostom (Hom. xii. γ'. [546]) for considering *that wherein we died* to be *the old man*, though he fails to carry out the figure with perfect consistency. "And how were we delivered? By *our old man*, who was held by sin *being dead and buried*. For this is what he signified by the words ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατεργάμεθα, as if he had said, The bond by which we were held was mortified and dissolved, so that that which held us holds no more, namely Sin."

IS THE PERSON DESCRIBED IN CHAP. VII. 13-25, REGENERATE
OR UNREGENERATE?

Two conflicting interpretations of this passage have obtained in the Church from the earliest times, and still continue to find each its zealous supporters; the one party maintaining that St Paul is here speaking in the character of a regenerate, the other of an unregenerate man. The mere fact of the inward struggle depicted can determine nothing on either side. That such a struggle may take place in the mind of the unregenerate, through the strivings of God's Spirit with their spirit,* and may end unfavourably, ought never to have been denied;†

* Gen. vi. 3.

† Compare the well-known passages—"Video meliora proboque; Deteriora sequor," Ovid Metam. vii. 19; and δύο γὰρ σαφῶς ἔχω ψυχάς, &c., Xenop. Cyrop. vi. 1. Yet the wide difference ought never to be forgotten between the character of the human element addressed by the Spirit in the case of the unregenerate, and in that of the regenerate man. In the case of the former, the appeal is simply to the selfishness of the natural man, alarmed by the terrors of the law, and the remonstrances of an awakened conscience, whether he will persist in that course of self-indulgence which will bring eternal ruin upon him, or will yield himself to the love and power of the Saviour who offers to heal him, and will submit to the painful treatment and discipline necessary for the cure. The struggle that thus arises in his breast is but a contest between two selfish principles, the love of present short-lived pleasure, and the fear of future endless pain.

In the regenerate man, on the contrary, the sinful bias of whose will has

and with as little justice can it be maintained that all conflict is at an end the moment a believer has fully closed with the offers of Christ. The struggle has often to be renewed, and sometimes becomes very vehement when violent temptations assail: "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh" (Gal. v. 17), and the Christian has "to wrestle not against flesh and blood" alone, "but against principalities, and powers, and spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. vi. 12). The decision between the two interpretations must therefore be made on other grounds. The only *decisive* criterion, perhaps, is to be found in a comprehensive view of the connection of the passage with the argument of the Apostle. Still, apart from this, I cannot help thinking that the preponderance is clearly on the side of those who hold that the state of the believer in Christ is here described.

For, 1. while some of the expressions, such especially as those in ver. 14, "I am carnal, sold under sin," seem strongly to favour the opposite opinion, they do, at the same time, admit of an explanation consistent with the supposition that St Paul is lamenting the imperfection of the highest state of sanctification that the believer can attain here below. His purpose so far evidently is, while he shows the powerlessness of the Law to deliver from sin, to vindicate its purity and holiness (against the suggestions, "Is the law sin?" "Is the law death?"); and, speaking of himself in comparison with the spirituality of its demands, he could say, "I am carnal;" there are still in me the remains of the old man—"In me, that is, in my flesh dwelleth no good thing." With Moses, with Job, with Isaiah, and with all the saints of God, he could acknowledge himself "of uncircumcised lips" (Exod. vi. 12), "vile" (Job xl. 4), "of unclean lips" (Isaiah vi. 5); he could deplore the remains of indwelling corruption within him, which checked the full development of his better nature, and made him do the things he would not; and in so far, he was a slave, "sold under sin,"*

been changed by the mighty power of God, and who has been brought to love righteousness and hate iniquity, the struggle is between the renewed mind and the remains of the flesh pleading for occasional indulgence.

* Those who urge the strength of the expressions, "I am carnal," "sold

brought "into captivity to the law of sin which was in his members," and which, as it would continue to harass him at times so long as this mortal life endured, made him (when deeply impressed with his weakness) cry out for deliverance from "this body of sin," that he might receive finally a new and sinless "spiritual body," free to follow without hindrance the pure dictates of God's holy law.

But while all the expressions here employed admit of an explanation consistent with the supposition that St. Paul is describing the state of a renewed man, it seems impossible to explain away with fairness the force of those expressions that specially favour this supposition. St. Paul would be contradicting all that he has elsewhere said of the *entire* alienation of the natural man from God and goodness, if he could use the expressions here employed, of a man still unrenewed by the Spirit of God. An entire change is represented as having now passed on the bias of his will (or desire), from that described of him in his former state in verses 8-11. *Then* "sin wrought in him all manner of *concupiscence*" [or inordinate desire], whereas *now* he "wills [desires] to do good," τῷ θεῷ δουλεύω ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν (ver. 21) [observe too ποιεῖν, to be *habitually doing*, not ποιεῖσαι]; "to will [good] is present with" him, ver. 18. In his *whole* man — in head, in heart, in hand—in *thought*, in *feeling*, in *deed**—he is in consonance with the law of God. In *thought*, "I *consent* unto the law that it is good," ver. 16. In *feeling*, "I *delight* in the law of God after the inward man," ver. 22. In *deed*, "I *serve* the law of God," ver. 25. It is difficult to conceive what higher testimony the greatest saint of God on earth could bear to his sincere reverence, love, and obedience, to the law of God than

under sin," as inapplicable to any but an unregenerate person, seem to forget the wide distinction between St Paul's using such expressions of *himself* (compare his calling himself "The chief of sinners," 1 Tim. i. 15) and his employing them as his (or the Holy Spirit's) estimate of the character of *others*.

Still, even with regard to others, see his words 1 Cor. iii. 1, "I could not speak unto you, but as unto *men of flesh* (σαρκίνους), even as unto babes in Christ;" and again, ver. 3, "For ye are yet *carnal*" (σαρκικοί). Though regenerate, they are yet called "*men of flesh*," and "*carnal*."

* See Symmetrical Structure of Scripture, pp. 175-178.

is here expressed. Surely if "the natural man *knoweth* not the things of the Spirit of God," "*loveth* vanity," and "is the *servant* of sin," he who has been brought to "*consent* to," to "*delight* in," and to "*serve* the law of God," must be regarded as regenerated by the Spirit of God.

2. There is a very marked distinction farther made by St. Paul between the state described in verses 7-11 and that described in verses 14-25. In the first passage all the verbs are *past*; in the second all are *present*. In verses 7-11 he had described a former state; in verses 14-25 he must mean to describe one, comparatively at least, *present*. Now all agree that verses 7-11 describe the state of an unconverted man; the natural inference is, that verses 14-25 are intended to describe that of the believer. Were a subsequent stage only in his past unrenewed state intended, why this remarkable change to the present tense, so calculated to mislead?

3. According to the uniform usage of the New Testament, the expression in the 25th verse, *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*, "I myself" refers to the individual himself, *in his own person*, who is speaking, as will be seen by examination of the other instances in which it occurs, Luke xxiv. 39, Acts x. 26, Rom. ix. 3, xv. 14, 2 Cor. x. 1, xii. 13. If we are to be guided by this usage, the question is settled. *Αὐτὸς ἐγώ* must here mean "I myself,* Paul," and describe his own *personal* experience; and as all the verbs which he employs are in the present tense, his *present* experience, and consequently that of the regenerate.

But the point to be particularly adverted to is that the words *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*, "I myself," are placed emphatically first, in a line by themselves, as the parallelism shows, so as to refer *equally* to each of the two succeeding lines,

" Ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγώ
 Τῷ μὲν νοῦ δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ,
 Τῷ δὲ σαρκί, νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας.

So then I myself †
 With the mind serve the law of God,
 But with the flesh the law of sin.

* "I, the same person," is, as Professor Jowett remarks, "contrary to the language, which would require *ἐγὼ ὁ αὐτός*."

† Not as in Auth. V., "So then with the mind I myself."

The services rendered both by the *mind* and by the *flesh* are equally attributed to the "I myself" as the actor. It is "I myself" that "serve with the mind the law of God;" "I myself" that serve "with the flesh the law of sin." This at once excludes all such interpretations as "I in myself," *i.e.*, "without the help of God" (Conybeare and Howson) which is inconsistent with "serve the law of God;"* or "my very self," that is "my *true* nature which is God's [original] work" (Wordsworth), which is equally inconsistent with "serve the law of sin." Mr. Jowett, who inclines to the latter interpretation as "seeming the best," attempts to smooth over the objection. His note is, "I, *myself*, that is, *in my true self*, serve the law of God;" and in defence of this he adds, "the remainder of the sentence may be regarded as an afterthought, in which the apostle checks his aspiration, $\delta\epsilon$ being exactly expressed in English by 'howbeit,' compare ver. 8, $\alpha\zetaορμ\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta\epsilon \lambda\alpha\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$." He candidly, however, adds, "This is not the grammatical form of the sentence, in which, of course, $\delta\epsilon$ answers to $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$. That it is the order of the thought, however, is inferred from the difficulty in connecting the words $\tau\tilde{\eta} \delta\epsilon \sigmaαρ\kappa\iota \nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omega \acute{\alpha}\muαρ\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$ either with $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$, or with what follows."

Mr Jowett has here given expression to the unsatisfactoriness of every attempted interpretation that would explain away the plain meaning of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$, as referring to Paul himself. But even if grammatically admissible, his interpretation fails by degrading to the level of an "afterthought" what evidently is intended as the sum and substance in one condensed expression of the whole preceding description. The very point with which the apostle started was to prove that "I am *carnal*, *sold* under sin," and in evidence of this he states his melancholy experience, "For that which I do, I allow not, &c.;" "To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not;" "When I would do good, evil, &c.;" "I see another law in my members, &c.;" and at length he con-

* Accordingly they are obliged unwarrantably to insert "though (I am subject in my mind to the law of God)".

cludes the summing up of the whole with the emphatic words:

Wherefore then I myself
With my mind indeed serve the law of God,
But with my flesh the law of sin;

these latter words, "with my *flesh* I *serve* (*δουλέω*, am the *slave* of) *sin*," being almost an exact echo of the proposition with which he started, "I am *carnal*—*sold under sin*." No explanation therefore can be satisfactory that does not give prominence to this as the leading idea, the *carnality* and imperfection of man, when compared with the spirituality of God's law.*

Who then are authorized to use both expressions of themselves—"So then I myself—with my mind serve the law of God—but with my flesh the law of sin?" Not the unregenerate, for they can with no propriety say of themselves, "I with my mind serve the law of God." All, *by nature*, according to St Paul, Eph. ii. 3, "fulfil the desires of the flesh and of the *mind*," *τῶν δαιμονίων*, of their own thoughts, which are ever contrary to God's—"every imagination of the thought of man's heart being only evil continually," Gen. vi. 5, till renewed by the Spirit of God. This, the apostle had just before said, was the case with himself in his description of his unregenerate state in ver. 8-11—"sin wrought in me all manner of inordinate desire" (ver. 8).

But the person here described considers himself entitled to say, when he falls short through the weakness of the flesh, "It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (ver. 17, 20); so completely is the prevailing bias of his desires and mind on the side of God. He claims for himself the character of "*delighting* in the law of God after the inward man" (ver. 22), nay of *serving* with his mind the law of God (ver. 25), though the "flesh," he laments, not yet wholly mortified, "serves" after its ineradicable nature, "the law of sin." To none but a regenerate man, it would seem, could such a description apply.

* This, it will be seen, is essential to the argument as stated in the Analytical Commentary.

4. But we have not yet done full justice to the opposite opinion by stating the strongest argument in its favour. This lies in the striking contrast between the description in ch. vii. and that in ch. viii. In ch. vii., it is argued, we have a picture dark and disheartening to its close of a "wretched man," "carnal, sold under sin," struggling ineffectually to escape from the sad "captivity into which he is brought to the law of sin," and with his last words confessing that "with his flesh he serves the law of sin." What a contrast in ch. viii.! "Now there is *no condemnation.*" The person or persons before described as "brought into *captivity to the law of sin,*" are now, through "the law of the Spirit of life, made *free from the law of sin and death,*" ver. 2. Before, incapacitated by the power of indwelling sin "to *perform* that which is *good,*" vii. 18, now, a power is given to them "that the *righteousness* of the law may be *fulfilled* [fully accomplished] in them," viii. 4, and they are enabled to "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," viii. 4. Instead of groaning under their wretchedness and bondage, the most encouraging privileges and prospects are theirs. "The Spirit of God dwells in them," ver. 9; they are "sons and heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ," ver. 14, 17, &c.

Can these things be spoken of one and the same individual at the same time and in the same stage of his progress? Is it not plain (it is asked) that, in order to show the powerlessness of the law to sanctify, the apostle describes in ch. vii. the case of a man brought by the law under strong convictions of sin, but vainly struggling for deliverance; which in ch. viii. we find brought to him by the new power furnished by the gospel, here called "the Spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus?" The latter state, indeed, is expressly declared to be that of "them who are *in Christ Jesus,*" viii. 1. Must not the former be that of those who are still "*without Christ* and without hope in the world?" But could any doubt remain on the subject, it is surely removed by looking back to the two propositions contrasted in vii. 5 and 6; of which ver. 5 receives its expansion and proof in the remainder of ch. vii., while ch. viii. forms the expansion and proof of ver. 6. Now in ver. 5, the *time*, or *state*, in which "the motions of sin which were by

the law did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death," is expressly stated to be "when we were *in the flesh.*" It seems therefore beyond all question, that the state, (illustrative of this) in vii. 7-25, must also be that of one "*in the flesh,*" or, in other words, of an *unregenerate* man.

So strong and plausible does this reasoning appear that its force can be counteracted only by a clear apprehension of the true train of the argument. The great object of the apostle confessedly is, to evince the necessity of the entire deliverance of the believer from any dependence on Law for salvation. This he does by showing that the Law, though not the cause, was yet the occasion of "SIN," ver. 7, and of "DEATH," ver. 13; in other words, that it could neither *sanctify*, nor *justify*. The former of these points he proves in ver. 7-12; to the latter he comes in ver. 13-25. Now how was this most strikingly to be demonstrated? Evidently by taking the case of a Christian in the most advanced stage of sanctification, to which even grace, with all the aids of God's Spirit, can bring him in this world, and trying him by the standard of the Law; and if even then God's holy law cannot justify, or deliver him from DEATH, but must condemn him, all dependence upon the Law must be renounced, and grace alone be looked to, for acceptance and salvation.

The connection thus with ch. vii. 5, stands perfectly clear. It is an argument *a fortiori*. If even "I myself," Paul, who am no longer, "*in the flesh,*" but "*by the grace of God am what I am,*" having laboured more than all the other apostles, yet come so far short, through the remains of the flesh in me, of that perfection after which I so eagerly long, and DEATH would be my portion were I to look to the law for justification; how much more is emancipation from the law necessary to those who are still "*in the flesh,*" since "*the motions of SIN which are [fostered] by the law, work in their members to bring forth fruit unto DEATH?*"

Again, the contrast between the state of the person described in chap. vii. 14-25, and that described in chap. viii., is by no means so great, when closely examined, as at first sight appears. If in vii. 14, the apostle laments that he is still

“carnal,” compared with the spirituality of the law, “sold under sin,” and “brought into captivity to the law of sin which is in his members,” (vii. 23), yet is he no longer a *willing* captive (vii. 15, 16, &c.). Sin no longer “works in him all manner of coveting” or lust (vii. 8), but his will is wholly on the side of God’s law. He “consents unto the law that it is good” (vii. 16); he “delights in it after the inward man” (vii. 22); when overpowered by evil, it is “what he hates that he does” (vii. 15), so that he feels himself entitled to say, “It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me” (vii. 17 and 20). He longs to be “delivered” from this state of bondage to “this body of death” (vii. 24), and “thanks God” that he sees the assurance of that deliverance for him “through Jesus Christ our Lord” (vii. 25). “So then,” he can say with truth, “I myself with my mind serve the Law of God;” but alas! from the powerlessness of even the grace of Christ to mortify wholly all indwelling sin in the believer while still in the body, “I serve with [the remains of] the flesh the law of sin” (vii. 25); and consequently were I to look to the Law to be justified, condemnation must be the result.

“No condemnation, therefore, now,” he infers, “is to them which are in Christ Jesus,” and to such alone; “for the law of the Spirit of Life set me free in Christ Jesus from the law of Sin and Death” (viii. 2). “Set me free,” ἡλ.εὐθέρωσέν με, I say, *potentially*, when I became united to Christ, not wholly, but in certain prospect; so that I can rejoice and triumph in the assurance of entire *final* freedom through “the Spirit of Life.” This freedom is partial, indeed, and incomplete in this life, for “the body is dead,” (doomed to death, a “body of death,” as I before said, vii. 24), because of sin (viii. 10), but God “shall quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit” (viii. 11). We “ourselves which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves (or even aloud at times, vii. 24) waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body” (viii. 23), “for [it is] in hope that we are saved” only (viii. 24). But we have the assurance of full and final deliverance “into the liberty of the glory of the children of God” (viii. 21), and therefore “do we with patience wait for it”

(viii. 25). "The Spirit helpeth our infirmities" (viii. 26), and "we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose" (viii. 28).

It is manifest, from this comparison of the two chapters, that the state described in chap. viii. is still, like that in chap. vii. 14-25, a mixed one—of rejoicing mingled with suffering, hope still unfulfilled, and patient waiting. The freedom attributed "to them which are in Christ Jesus" (viii. 2) is not yet become "the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (viii. 21), but must be understood in the same way as the other blessings assured to the believer, on his coming to Christ—"We died with Christ" (Rom. vi. 8) to sin; "we have risen with Him" (Colos. ii. 12); "God hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places" (Eph. ii. 5, 6). All is spoken of as accomplished for the believer in Christ, as soon as he closes with His offers of salvation. But the blessings are gradually and progressively realized by him, and will be attained in full fruition only in another world.

But in order to remove as far as possible all objection taken to the interpreting chap. vii. 13-25 of St. Paul himself, (or of a regenerate person), let us consider another ground of exception that may occur to this interpretation, drawn from the general scope of the passage. Would not the description, it may be said, of the carnality, wretchedness, and captivity to sin of the person depicted in vii. 14-25, if interpreted of such a saint as Paul, lead common Christians to rest contented with a weak faith, and discourage all aspirations after a high state of Christian perfection and purity, and the attainment of "joy and peace in believing"?

It has already been shown that a deep and often painful sense of one's own sinfulness and shortcomings does not argue a low state of spirituality, but the very contrary. There is, however, one expression, twice repeated, in this description, which, had it received the attention that it deserves, would have dispelled this illusion, viz., "Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me" (ver. 17 and 20).

Who is entitled, we would ask, to make this affirmation of himself, and thus, as it were, to cast the responsibility of sin off himself? Not Moses, when he forgot the usual meekness of his character at Kadesh (Num. xx. 8-12)—when, more jealous to maintain his own and Aaron's authority, than "to sanctify the Lord in the eyes of the children of Israel," he cried, with undue haste, to the people, "Hear now, ye rebels, must *we* fetch you water out of this rock?" and struck impatiently the rock twice with his rod—for the Lord charged home to Moses himself this indiscretion as a transgression, and made it the ground of his exclusion from entering the promised land. Not Peter, when succumbing for a moment under his old fear of man's judgment, he was guilty of dissimulation in withdrawing and separating himself from eating with the Gentiles (Gal. i. 12-21); for Paul reprov'd him for it, and showed that he "was self-condemned." For no shortcoming can this plea be justly urged but one, where with sincerity it can be said with the Apostle Paul, *οὐδὲν ἐμαυτῷ σὺνοίδα*, "I am conscious of no fault in myself" (1 Cor. iv. 4); only where nothing has been omitted that watchfulness and prayer can effect, but where notwithstanding, the *unavoidable* imperfection in this life of fallen human nature brings the believer far short of the purity at which he aims. It is the *habitual* tenor of his life, let it be observed, that St. Paul here describes. "That which I *do* (*κατεργάζομαι*, *am performing*, habitually) I allow not: for what I *will*, that *do* I not, but what I *hate*, that *do* I." In *all* his deeds, the very holiest and purest, the saint of God feels on after-reflection that he transgresses, both by way of omission and commission; so that the groaning and being burdened in his earthly tabernacle, and painful longing to be "delivered from this body of death," bespeak, on the contrary, a growing tenderness of conscience and increasing sensitiveness to the power and malignity of indwelling sin.

Nor again, is there anything in this description, when regarded as Paul's personal Christian experience, discouraging to the believer, as if he could not expect any joyful liberty and "peace in believing" so long as he is in this world; but, on the contrary, if rightly understood, its tendency is most consolatory

and encouraging to the struggling and downcast believer. "If justified," he may be ready in his despondency to exclaim, "if justified and *declared righteous* by God, yet, alas! I still feel I am far from being delivered from sin. Even in my highest aspirations and holiest moments the flesh mingles its polluting touch. 'To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.' I am a captive, 'sold under sin.' Compared with the strict requirements of God's spiritual law, 'I am *carnal*.' "

True is the representation of St Paul—such is my own, such is every believer's experience; and this—while it proves the very point at which I aim, that the highest possible attainments of righteousness in this world could not avail to justify us, so that we must wholly renounce all dependence on the Law for salvation—tends also to keep the servant of Christ ever humble and self-distrustful. It tends to wean him from love of this life, from which he finds some taint of sin inseparable, and leads him to long for deliverance, so as often to have cause to cry out, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" But, he continues, look at the other side of the Christian's experience. In the midst of troubles and tears, the Christian has within himself a well-spring of ever-abounding delight; "as sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as dying, and behold we live; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things" (2 Cor. vi. 9, 10). Though still weighed down by the flesh, he can "thank God" that he shall be delivered "through Jesus Christ our Lord." All is secured by faith in Jesus. God counts "the things which be not as though they were" already (Rom. iv. 17). "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead, indeed, unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord" (vi. 11). "The law of the Spirit, of life that is in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (viii. 3). And what can fail, nay, what endless sources of confidence and joy are opened up to those who are "heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (ver. 17); "to whom all things are made to work together for good" (ver. 28); where every step in their progress is secured, "for whom He did foreknow, them He also called, justified,

glorified" (ver. 30); who are made "more than conquerors through Him that loved us" (ver. 37)?

So far, therefore, from there being any real inconsistency in referring the contrasted descriptions in chap. vii. 13-25, and chap. viii. 1, &c., to one and the same person in the same stage of progress, it is, I believe, only when the bondage and misery in the former description are most vividly realized by the believer, that the comforts and consolations in the latter most abound. "When I am weak," says the Apostle, "then am I strong" (2 Cor. xii. 10). If I look to myself, I am nothing, and can do nothing; but "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." "We glory in tribulations" (Rom. v. 3).*

MEANING OF LAW IN CHAP. VII. 21, 23, 25, VIII. 2.

The various meanings and applications of the word LAW in these verses are not a little perplexing. The following attempt is offered to clear up the obscurity.

In vii. 21, "I find then *the law*, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." By comparison with ver. 23, the *law* here meant seems evidently to be the "*law in my members* warring against the law of my mind;" and this, again, by comparison with Gal. v. 17, where we have a similar conflict, we can scarce be wrong in regarding as the law of "*the flesh*;" "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." The *flesh*, then, here, is the lord who prescribes his law.

* On a first review of this passage (vii. 13-25) *sanctification*, rather than *justification*, would seem to be the main subject; but we have here another instance how skilfully St Paul exhibits the intimate connection between the two (comp. ch. v. 15, e; ver. 16, 17, j and s; and ver. 18, 19, Notes. The *final point* in his argument, that there can be no *justification* by the law to the believer in this life, is reached by showing the impossibility of attaining to perfect *sanctification* even by grace while in the flesh.

This law of the flesh is described by St Paul as "warring against the *law* of his *mind*, that is, of his renewed mind (which is now in accordance with the Law of God, ver. 22, "For I delight in the Law of God after the inward man"), and as taking part with, and bringing him into captivity to, another law in his members, "the *law* of *sin* which is in my members."

The representation, then, of the apostle, seems to be this: There are two lords *without* me, directly opposed to each other, God and Sin, each claiming to be supreme, and each having his law—"the law of God," and "the law of Sin." But *within* me, as renewed by the Spirit of God, there are two principles opposed to each other, "my *mind*" and "my *flesh*" (ver. 25); each, too, having its *law*—one called the "*law of my mind*" (ver. 23) and which accords with, and inclines the believer to, the Law of God (ver. 22); but the other, the *law of the flesh*, called here "the law that I find, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me" (ver. 21), and the "law in my members" (ver. 23), and which gives its aid, and inclines me, to "the law of sin."

Between these two pairs of opposing principles that strive for the mastery over me, *I*, in my *Ego*, or true personality, have made my choice; so that "after the *inward man* [and *his law*] I delight now in the *law of God*"—"I serve the *law of God*"; though yet through the remains of the *flesh* and *its law*, I am not yet fully emancipated from a constrained service to the *law of sin*.

For the still more difficult and complicated uses of Law in the threefold mention of it in viii. 2, 3, see the notes on these verses.

VII. 25.

It has been already stated (p. 285) that *αὐτὸς ἐγώ*, if we are to be guided by the usage in the New Testament, means "I myself," the speaker, and therefore Paul. It is, however,

admissible perhaps to interpret it here, "I *in myself*," as opposed to ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, "*in Christ Jesus*," (viii. 1), but in this sense only: "I in myself, notwithstanding whatever progress in righteousness the Spirit of Christ may have wrought in me, or will work in this life, am still most imperfect: with my mind,* indeed, I serve the law of God, but with my flesh the law of Sin; and tried by the Law, could not be justified, but would come under condemnation if viewed *in myself*, and not *in Christ Jesus*." "No condemnation, therefore, now is to those that are *in Christ Jesus*," and to such alone.

CHAPTER VIII.

PARALLELISM OF VIII. 1-3.

The results of Parallelism coincide with the decisions of criticism and with the authority of the best MSS. in rejecting the words "who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit" from the end of ver. 1. The evident antithesis between the "no condemnation," in ver. 1, and "condemned sin" at the end of ver. 3, seemed to mark out these two lines as parallel; but so long as I adhered to the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, I could discover no definite arrangement in the intermediate words. They immediately, however, fell into order on discarding the debatable words as an interpolation.

The general proposition with which the stanza opens, "There is, therefore, now no condemnation" to Christians, in ver. 1, evidently finds its parallel in the last line of ver. 3, in God's having "condemned" their great enemy and accuser, "Sin."

Of the four lines which follow, the first and third evidently correspond—to express that with regard to "them which are

* The Apostle uses here τῷ νοῦ, "mind,"—to denote his human spirit, so far, but not yet entirely spiritualized—not πνεύματι, which might have been confounded with the Divine Spirit, which forms the great subject of the next chapter.

1. Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα
τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.
2. Ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς
ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν με
ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου.
3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου,
ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός,
ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας
ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας
κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί.

in Christ Jesus," it is as being "in Christ Jesus" that "the law of the Spirit hath made them free." The second and fourth lines still more distinctly correspond in all their three terms. "The law" of the one answers to "the law" of the other; "the Spirit" now rules as the animating principle, instead of "Sin;" with "Life" as the result, instead of "Death." Under the new law of the Spirit, the old Law is not "made void, but established." Believers are emancipated from it as the source of dependence for salvation (as the Jew was inclined to make it), and from the servile spirit thus engendered; but it is by its being transformed for them into a new life-giving *law* of freedom.

In the next four lines we have opposed to "the powerlessness of the Law," in the first line, the mighty power of "God and His Son" to save, in the third; while, in the second line, we find the "weakness" of the Law ascribed to "the flesh," and in contrast with this we have, in the fourth line, the Son victorious over Sin, though He came in the very weakness and "likeness of the flesh of sin."

Another coincidence between the results of Parallelism and Criticism is observable in the junction, to which Parallelism leads, of the words, in ver. 2, "In Christ Jesus," with the words "hath made me free," instead of what would seem at first sight their more obvious connection with the preceding words, "The law of the Spirit of life." Had the latter been the intention of St. Paul, the article could scarcely have been omitted

in Greek, more particularly since an ambiguity would thus have been created, “requiring *ὁ*, or *τοῦ*, or *τῶν*, to be prefixed to *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, according as he meant these words to be joined to *νόμος*, or *πνεύματος*, or *ζωῆς*.”* On the contrary, the connection with *ἡλ.εὐθέρωσεν* “corresponds exactly with the import of the preceding and following verse. For the point to be proved is that for ‘them which are *in Christ Jesus* there is no condemnation.’ Now, the reason why there is none, ver. 2 states, is, because ‘*in Christ Jesus*’ they are made free from the Law of Sin and Death through the Spirit of Life. In proof of this latter proposition, again, it is shown in ver. 3, that Sin has been condemned not through the Law, but *in Christ*. This explains, too, the reason why *ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, ‘*in Christ Jesus*,’ is placed emphatically first before *ἡλ.εὐθέρωσεν*, ‘made me free,’ viz., to mark distinctly the reference to *τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, ‘them who are *in Christ Jesus*’—as well as to point the contrast with the *τοῦ νόμου* of ver. 3, the powerlessness of *the Law*.”

Fritzsche contends for this connection of the words on the ground of the *Parallelism*—which he terms “*verborum concinnitas*,” and of which he says Paul was very fond, “*cui Paulus magnopere studet*.” His remark is, that if “*in Christ Jesus*” be added to “made me free,” “the Law of Sin and Death” will correspond exactly to “the law of the Spirit of Life;” but if joined with the preceding words

The law of the Spirit of Life *in Christ Jesus*,

there would be nothing to correspond with “*in Christ Jesus*” in the line,

From the Law of Sin and Death.

VIII. 1-4.—There has been much controversy whether this passage refers to justification alone, or to sanctification also and chiefly. Ver. 4 seems strongly to favour the first interpreta-

* See Philippi's *Commentar über die Römer*.

tion. For in order that there may be "no condemnation" to believers, it is stated that "sin" itself must be "condemned" (ver. 3), and that so thoroughly that "the righteousness of the law" may "be fulfilled" in them (ver. 4). The righteousness here demanded, if the end proposed (of "no condemnation") is to be attained, must be a *perfect* righteousness, and consequently, it would seem, can be none other than the righteousness of Christ imputed for *justification*, since no such *personal* righteousness, free from all admixture of sin, and such as could claim a verdict of acquittal, can be attained by the believer in this life—as the Apostle had just shown from his own experience, in vii. 13-25. The idea of sanctification, therefore, it is argued, especially from ver. 4, must be entirely excluded from the passage.

But, again, it seems equally plain from other expressions that sanctification must be here involved. The very ground assigned for there being "no condemnation" is that believers are "made free from the law of sin and death"—an expression which, whatever further meaning it may bear, includes, at least, (as will be shown in the notes on ver. 2, 3, below) emancipation from the law, or controlling influence, of sin and death, and points, therefore, to sanctification.

Again, it is said, "What the Law could not do, God has done," by sending His own Son—"condemned sin in the flesh." The import of this expression has not been sufficiently weighed by those who would restrict this passage to justification alone. More must be meant by it than merely passing sentence of condemnation on sin. This the Law could do. This it was its very function to do. But what the Law could not do, if we look closely to the connection of the Apostle's words, was to condemn sin, so that there should be "no condemnation" (viii. 1) to the sinner—so to condemn sin, that yet man should live, and "the righteousness of the Law be fulfilled in him" (viii. 4). This could be done only by the condemnation for him of sin, both past and future—that is, by procuring for him not only perfect justification, but perfect sanctification also. It was in this latter respect especially, that the Law failed, "in that it was weak through the flesh."

Thus we are placed in a dilemma by the two prevalent interpretations. The difficulty, it would appear, can be removed only by explaining the righteousness to be fulfilled in the believer (see ver. 4), not of the imperfect righteousness that can be reached in this life, but of that perfection in holiness which Christ will have consummated in believers, when He presents them at the last day to His Father "faultless before the presence of His glory."

To this view a consideration of the context seems clearly to point. Sufficient attention does not appear to have been given to the word *οὐδὲν*, "no condemnation," which the Apostle places emphatically at the beginning of chap. viii., *οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα*, "No condemnation, therefore, now is," &c., as if his argument led him to lay a stress upon the *completeness* of the freedom from *all* condemnation—not for a *time* merely, but *for ever*—of those in Christ Jesus. That the expression "no condemnation" is intended to refer not to justification alone in this life, but to the final acquittal also at the tribunal of God in the day of judgment, seems necessarily involved in the preceding reasoning in chap. vii. 13-25. Sin is there described as still adhering to the saint while in this life, notwithstanding his utmost efforts to be freed from it. Now, where sin is, there, according to St. Paul's teaching, is *death—condemnation* to sin's penalty. The condemnation may be suspended for a time, but must ultimately follow, unless the cause is removed. Till, therefore, there is a *complete* release from sin, there can be no *completed* release from the condemnation.* But that complete release from sin, the believer in Christ has in full and assured prospect, and therefore the Apostle can say,

* Hence his representation of the earnest longing and cry of the believer for entire deliverance, "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of *death*;" and his consolatory reply, "I thank God [for the deliverance assured] through Jesus Christ our Lord." Hence his representation in viii. 10, that the condemnation still rests, though not on the Ego or true personality, yet on a part of our nature, and has to be executed upon it: "The *body* is dead [doomed to death] because of sin;" and that "we which have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body," viii. 23.

“No condemnation, therefore, now is to them which are in Christ Jesus”: none *here*, because, though sin still cleaves to them and clogs their heavenward aspirations, they are entitled to view themselves not as they are *in themselves*, but as they are “*in Christ Jesus*,” and to say, “Now, then, it is no more *I* that do it,” &c. ; none *hereafter*, because “the body now dead” and condemned to be broken down “because of sin” (viii. 10) will be quickened by the Spirit, already dwelling in it (ver. 11), and be raised up a spiritual body, purged from all sin, with the perfect “righteousness of the law fulfilled” in it. Here, in this life, “we *are saved*”* (viii. 24) from wrath, but “we are saved *in hope*” only, in view of that full atonement for our iniquities that Christ has offered, and of that perfect righteousness which He has brought in to communicate to all His followers. There, in the future world, we *shall be saved*† from wrath” (v. 9), from that “wrath revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men” (and which must, at the final day of reckoning, burn against all in whom any sin is found), by our being presented by Christ perfectly “holy, and unblamable, and unreprouvable in God’s sight” (Col. i. 22), free from every “spot” of sin, “or wrinkle or any such thing.”

We believe, then, that the first four verses of chap. viii. include the sanctification, as well as the justification of believers, for the following reasons :

1. With chap. viii. we reach the conclusion of the apostle’s chain of reasoning. The proposition with which he started in chap. i. 16 was, that “The gospel is the *power* of God unto salvation,” (δύναμις), as being able to accomplish what the law could not do, both to *justify* and to *sanctify*. To this expression there is an evident allusion in the phrase (viii. 3) τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, “what the law was *power-less* to do,” God has

* The exact expression is ἐσώθημεν, we *were* saved, referring to the first coming to Christ and washing away of sin in baptism, and so passing from death unto life.

† σωθησόμεθα. “We *shall be* saved,” referring to the full and perfected salvation of the believer in his consummated holiness and final acquittal in the day of judgment.

done in Christ. The argument would be defective, unless *both* ends were stated to be attained.

2. The more immediate context strongly corroborates this conclusion. In chap. vii. the inability of the law had been proved, in 7-12 to *sanctify*, in 13-25 to *justify*. In chap. viii. the inability of the law is said to be removed by the gospel. Consistency demands us to conclude, in *both* respects.

3. The words, indeed, with which chap. viii. begins, “No *condemnation*” might appear at first sight to restrict us to the judicial view alone. But when we look at the reason assigned in ver. 2, for this entire deliverance from condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, viz., that they are set free from “the law of *sin* and *death*,” it is evident that the “no condemnation” must include, as its necessary condition, deliverance from both *sin* and *death*, i.e., from *sin* both in its *reigning* and *condemning* powers.

4. When, further, the reason of this deliverance and “no-condemnation” is added in ver. 3, that God had “*condemned* sin in the flesh,” the meaning must be that sin is condemned to lose its whole power over believers. It had a *double* power—power to condemn to death, and power to enslave and reign over the life. It can no longer subject to the penalty of death; it can no longer hold believers under its dominion, to do its base drudgery.

5. Ver. 4. “That the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us.” The blessing here promised must correspond on the positive side with the removal, on the negative side, of the evils which it had to counteract, *sin* and *death*; and as these were twofold, so must “the righteousness of the law” be twofold, and include both the *justification* and *sanctification* of the Christian.

The connection of these verses accordingly appears to be :

Ver. 1. “No condemnation, therefore, [that is, an entire freedom from all condemnation, both in this life and in the next] is now to them who are in Christ Jesus ;”

Ver. 2. “For the [new] law of the spirit of life hath in Christ Jesus set me free from the [old] law [as a covenant of works, because it is ineffectual for the purpose of producing

Righteousness and Life, it having proved, on the contrary, the occasion] of Sin and Death, and thus has set me free from the dominion of sin and death, which was coincident with that of the Law.

Ver. 3 and 4. The Law was inefficient and "weak," not, however, from any defect in itself; for had man continued in innocence it would have led to righteousness and life. But it was inefficient to recover man when fallen; it was "weak through the flesh," or his corrupt nature; for to effect his recovery it must condemn sin," and induce him to condemn it in the past; and it must condemn it to extinction in him in the future. But this it was powerless to do without condemning and extinguishing the sinner.

This it is that God's plan—"the gospel, the *power* of God unto salvation"—has effected. Christ has become our Representative, being "made sin for us, though He knew no sin." In Him God "condemned sin," by His enduring the penalty of death to atone for past sin, and yet surviving that endurance; and condemned it to defeat and utter extirpation for the future by Christ's foiling its every effort to tempt and overcome Him, crucifying and putting it to death in the flesh in all its forms, and working out a perfect righteousness.

And thus to all who are in Him he imparts the same mind and power—to condemn sin in the past, by our dying with Christ to sin, and resigning this present life as justly forfeited through our sin, and to condemn sin for the future by mortifying daily the flesh with all its lusts, and receiving from Christ a new life, over which sin has no power; for "whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for His seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin because he is born of God" (1 John iii. 9); so that, although if we regard the believer as a complex whole or Ego (vii. 14-25), consisting of the old and new man, there are still the remains of sin struggling against the new man in him, yet the means and security are provided of sin being fully and finally condemned and extinguished, and *perfect righteousness* being fulfilled in him at last.

If this interpretation be correct, we have an exact counterpart to ch. v. 18, 19 (see notes on these verses, and on verses

16, 17), and another proof of the care which St Paul takes to show how intimately and indissolubly justification and sanctification are linked together. He loses no opportunity to enforce the truth, that God cannot justify or *declare* any righteous, without having put everything in train to *make* them righteous; and that none is entitled to “reckon himself to be dead to sin” who is not striving to die daily unto sin, or to regard himself as justified, unless he is also aiming after, and progressively advancing towards perfect sanctification.

There are three expressions in these verses that call for more particular notice: 1. ὁ νόμος, “the law,” in ver. 2 and 3; 2. κατέκρινεν, “condemned sin,” in ver. 3; and 3. τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου, “the righteousness of the Law,” in ver. 4.

1. ὁ νόμος, “the Law,” in viii. 2, 3.

We come now to the most difficult of all the significations of the word “Law” in the threefold mention of it in viii. 2, 3. These seem to be even more incongruous and complicated than those already examined in vii. 21 and 23, &c., p. 294.

2. For the *Law* of the Spirit of Life
In Christ Jesus set me free
From the *Law* of Sin and Death.
3. For what the *Law* could not do, &c.

The third “Law” here mentioned in ver. 3 is manifestly the moral law. What is the intimate connection between it and the two which precede, that the apostle would seem to intend by their close juxtaposition?

And 1. What is denoted by “the Law of sin and death?” Is it simply the *power* of sin and death, here personified as ruling principles (or rather of SIN as the lord, and DEATH as its attendant, and the executioner of its sentences)?—which is the opinion of most modern commentators, and which seems to be strongly confirmed by comparison with “the law of sin” in vii. 23 and 25. Or is the “Law” here meant the *moral law*, as in 1 Cor. xv. 5, where “the strength of sin” is said to be “the Law”?—which is the view held by De Dieu, Semler, Böhme, Ammon, Reiche, Haldane, and Hodge, and in the “Sum of Saving Knowledge.”

These two interpretations are not so far apart as at first sight they appear to be. Both must be combined. They are indeed all but identical. But those who, like the majority of commentators, leave out the latter meaning, destroy the beautiful connection of St. Paul's reasoning. His great object has been to show that Christians must be emancipated from the Law, because the dominion of the Law and the dominion of Sin and Death are co-existent and co-extensive. "The Law worketh wrath," iv. 15. "Where no Law is there is no transgression," *ibid.* "*Sin shall not have dominion over you, because ye are not under the Law,*" vi. 14. In vii. 5 he proceeds more explicitly to prove that these two fatal evils of SIN and DEATH are inextricably bound up with the LAW.

5. For when we were in the flesh,
 The motions of SIN, *which were by the Law,*
 Did work in our members
 To bring forth fruit unto DEATH;

and to deduce from this the consequent necessity of the believer's being delivered from the LAW;

6. But now we are delivered from the LAW,
 Having died in that [old man] wherein we were held, &c.

The proof of the first of these propositions he gives in vii. 7-25, by showing that the Law, though not the *cause*, was yet the *occasion*, 1. of SIN, ver. 7-12, and 2. of DEATH, ver. 13-25.

Having thus completed the proof of the first proposition, he now proceeds to state the other as the necessary inference from it, and we have but to place side by side the statement in vii. 6 with the reassertion of it in viii. 2, to see their close correspondence :

- vii. 6. But now we are *delivered from the Law, &c.*
 viii. 2. For the Law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath
made me free from the Law of Sin and Death.

It seems impossible to doubt that *the Law* from which deliverance is obtained in both cases must be the same; and as in vii. 6 "the Law" is confessedly the Moral Law, in viii. 2

it must have the same meaning. But the apostle has most carefully avoided denominating the Law of God, "the Law of SIN and DEATH," until he had clearly defined in what sense it was to be so regarded, viz., not as the responsible *cause*, but as the innocent *occasion*, of the two evils.

In being delivered, therefore, from "the law," *i.e.*, the dominion "of Sin and Death," the believer must at the same time be delivered from the dominion of the (Moral) Law as a covenant of works [since it is the occasion, and therefore "the strength, ἡ δύναμις," of SIN and DEATH; 1 Cor. xv. 56]; and thus the two interpretations merge into one. But both must be combined, since the one would be essentially defective without the other. It is from "the law," *i.e.*, the dominion, "of Sin and Death," that the believer seeks deliverance: but the very point which the apostle wished to bring into prominence was, that that "Law" of God, to which the Jew looked so confidently for salvation, favoured this dominion, and that entire emancipation from it *in this respect* must be effected, since, whenever regarded as a ground of dependence for righteousness and life, it became a "Law of Sin and Death."

But, 2. How does the explanation now given of "the Law of Sin and Death" stand related to the use of "the Law" in ver. 2, "The *law* of the Spirit of life"? Why is it, that after the apostle had in the last two chapters been contrasting "Law" and "Grace," he here seems almost to identify them, by the paradoxical title which he has given to the covenant of grace—"the *law* of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus?"—at the very moment, too, that he is speaking of deliverance from "the *Law*" to the Christian?

Evidently* to soften to Jewish objectors the apparent harshness of the epithet, "the Law of Sin and Death," applied to that Law which they regarded with so just but indiscriminating reverence, and to indicate by the application of the term "Law" to that which he substituted in its place, as the ground of the Christian's dependence for Righteousness and Life, that so far from being contrary to the Law, it main-

* Compare Footnote to chap. iii. 27.

tained and fulfilled it in its true and highest purpose—evidently to signify to all that the Christian, though no longer “under the Law” as a means of salvation, is still “not without law to God, but under the Law to Christ,”* 1 Cor. ix. 21. There is perfect propriety in speaking of the *law* of Christ, since it *constrains* and *governs*; although its subjects obey voluntarily and from the heart.

2. Κατέκρινεν, “condemned sin,” in viii. 3.

Κατέκρινεν, “condemned,” manifestly refers back to κατάκριμα, “condemnation,” in ver. 1. The “*no condemnation*,” as we have seen, covers the whole field between the *justification* of the believer on his first being “in Christ,” and his final *acquittal* in the day of judgment: “*condemned sin*,” therefore, must have an equally extensive signification. To see the full force of the expression, accordingly, let us consider it in both lights.

And, 1. As to the justification of the believer in this life.

“What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God” has now done by “sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh”—He has “*condemned Sin* in the flesh.” This the Law was powerless to do. It condemned the *sinner*, but spared the *sin*; whereas God through Christ has condemned *sin*, but spared the *sinner*. The Law—in so far as it but commands, “Thou shalt not do this thing,” and denounces the penalty, “In the day that thou doest this that I forbid, thou shalt surely die”—appears more, and makes God appear, to the sinner, in the light of an enemy envying him the enjoyment of what he most covets, and denouncing wrath, not so much against his lust, as against himself. But when the grace of God appeared in Christ taking our sin upon Him, and suffering for it, then the true object of God’s wrath and condemnation became evident. It could not be against the person of man’s Representative that God’s judgment was awakened, for He was His own beloved and spotless

* Compare the parallel instances in iii. 27, “the *law of faith*,” where *law* and *faith* are combined, and iii. 31, “Yea, we establish the law through faith,” where they are contrasted, yet declared not inconsistent, but converging to the same end.

Son, in whom He was ever well pleased, but solely against the *Sin* that He represented—for “He made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin.” It was our *old* man that was crucified in Christ, but only that a new man might be raised out of his grave. The flesh was put to death, “that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” God was thus seen in His true character as a Sovereign indeed, and a God of perfect righteousness and holiness, “condemning *sin*,” yet as a merciful and gracious Father, loving and saving the *sinner*. “What the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh,” God, in giving His own Son as a propitiation for sin, and Jesus in accepting death as its righteous penalty, has done—He “condemned sin”—not only *objectively* in the sight of the whole world, as an evil and accursed thing deserving death, but *subjectively* also in the minds of all who enter into His wondrous plan for their redemption. He condemns sin in believers by inducing in them the conviction how evil and destructive a thing sin is to the well-being of God’s creatures and to the order of His universe, since it required so extraordinary a remedy to readjust them. Believers are thus led to join sincerely in the condemnation of it, and in the righteousness of the curse pronounced against the flesh and all its lusts. The great barrier, distrust of God’s love, is thus removed from the sinner’s mind, filial confidence is inspired, and we are enabled to enter cordially into God’s plan for helping us out of the pit of ruin, and curing the disease of our fallen nature, by consenting to the mortification of our own evil wills, and the entire crucifixion of the flesh, that we may be raised to a new life of holiness and endless glory.

There is “no condemnation,” therefore, to those who have been justified through faith in Christ, because in Jesus submitting to death as an atonement for our sin, “God has condemned sin in the flesh” already. The penalty has been exacted, and remains no more to be paid. “Christ having died to sin once, dieth no more.” And so, to all who take Him as their representative, and, acknowledging the justice of God’s sentence against their sin, voluntarily consent to the crucifixion of their old man, sin is *condemned* once for all in

the flesh ; they “ accept of the punishment of their iniquity,” Lev. xxvi. 41 : and there remaineth “ *no*” more “ *condemnation*” to them as being in Christ Jesus.

2. This sentence, however, of “ no condemnation,” is but provisional, involving, for the vindication of God’s truth and justice, the removal, when the final judgment arrives, of every even the slightest ground of accusation from any remains of sin (since “ to be carnal-minded” in *any* degree “ is death,” viii. 6, and “ the wrath of God is revealed against *all* unrighteousness of men”). We are thus compelled to attach a fuller meaning to the words.

“ There is no *condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus,” because “ sin” itself is “ *condemned*,” *i.e.*, “ judged,” “ cast out” (see John xvi. 11, xii. 31)—condemned to utter extinction. Jesus “ condemned sin,” and God in Him, not only by His enduring the penalty for it, but by His continually mortifying it, and crucifying every desire and movement of the flesh ; and finally, by “ dying unto sin once,” He “ made an end of sin” (Dan. ix. 24), and “ through death destroyed him that had the power of death” (Heb. ii. 14). The victory He thus gained in His own person, He has secured for all who are brought into union with Him. “ Sin,” that great enemy, is “ condemned” to full and final extinction, so that, to believers, when placed before the throne of God at the last day, “ *no*” ground of “ *condemnation*” shall remain. Every vestige of sin shall be effaced, and they shall be presented “ *faultless*” before the presence of His “ glory with exceeding joy,” Jude 24.

3. τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νόμου, “ *The righteousness of the Law*,”
in viii. 4.

It matters little to the argument which interpretation we put on δίκαιωμα here, 1. righteous act (conduct) required by the Law ; 2. righteous requirement, or, 3. righteous sentence, of the Law. If the all but identical expression in ii. 26, τὰ δίκαιώματα τοῦ νόμου is to be the rule, *the requirement of the Law* will be the proper signification. Others consider that

δικαίωμα is here placed in antithesis to *κατάκριμα*, *condemnation*, and must therefore mean *sentence of acquittal*. But, perhaps, as in *δικαιοσύνη*, all the three shades of meaning which the Apostle had already assigned to *δικαίωμα* in the preceding part of the Epistle, are intended here to be concentrated, and represented as fulfilled, in the fulfilment of *τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου* accomplished by the Gospel "in them which are in Christ Jesus," combining,

1. The righteous *sentence of condemnation* of i. 32—through God's having now "condemned sin" in Christ, and leading those that are Christ's to join in the condemnation of it, and of the flesh with which it is inseparably interwoven.

2. The *sentence of acquittal* of v. 16, (where it is opposed to *κατάκριμα*)—having its truth already in the justifying sentence passed, in God's mind, on believers viewed in Christ, and to have its perfect fulfilment in their full and final acquittal at the bar of God in the day of judgment.

3. "The one [unbroken tenor of] righteousness" in v. 18 (*ἐνὸς δικαιοσύματος* opposed to *ἐνὸς παραπτώματος*)—to be then and there fulfilled and realized for ever, when every spot and blemish shall be finally removed from the redeemed.

Thus *τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου* would be, the Law's righteous 1. sin-condemning, 2. sinner-justifying, 3. believer-sanctifying requirement or sentence, which the Law itself aimed at, but could not accomplish because of the weakness of the flesh.

CHAPTER VIII. 19-23.—CREATION GROANING.

No more striking instance, perhaps, can be exhibited illustrative of what we believe to be the source of most of the disputes and misunderstandings that have arisen in respect to the controverted points in this Epistle, than the present passage, which still remains a *quæstio verata* and *crux interpretum*, simply, it would appear, in consequence of the too restricted view which commentators generally have taken of its scope, and of the principal expression in it; and from their failing to enter into the largeness of view of the Apostle.

The principal term is ἡ κτίσις, "the creation," the various significations assigned to which are thus summed up by Dean Alford from De Wette :

1. Inanimate Creation.
2. Men not yet believers.
3. The yet unconverted Jews.
4. The converted Gentiles.
5. The converted Jews.
6. All Christians.

Dean Alford, with the great body of modern interpreters, explains it of

7. All animate and inanimate nature, except *man*.*

This last mentioned opinion, in our humble judgment, just leaves out that which gives propriety, consistency, and beauty to the whole representation. Omit *man*—the animating centre of the whole—and with what propriety could we speak of the creation, or creature, being made subject *willingly*, or "not *willingly* to vanity?" *hoping* for deliverance? *waiting* "for the manifestation of the sons of God?" Restrict the creation to the mere brute creature, and to unconscious nature, and the whole becomes a mere figure of rhetoric,—encouraging Christians too to wait, and hope, and suffer in emulation of the patient expectation, hope, and endurance exhibited by the *irrational, material* creation around them!† If πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις, "the whole creation," does not embrace man, what more comprehensive term could St. Paul have used, had he meant to include him? The reasons must be strong indeed that can justify this exclusion. What are these?

1. *Christians*, or the regenerate, it is argued, must be excluded, because of the antithesis in ver. 23, where "we which have the first fruits of the Spirit" are contrasted with "the whole creation."

* Another interpretation which has been ably advocated by Moses Stuart, and which has much truth to recommend it, though it still labours under the same defect of undue limitation as the others, presents the directly opposite view to Dean Alford's, viz., that by creation is here meant *mankind in general, man* as a whole, the *rational* exclusive of the *irrational* creation.

† Compare ver. 19, "For the earnest expectation of the *creation* waiteth," ἀπεκδέχεται, with the conclusion, ver. 25, "Then do *we* with patience wait for it," ἀπεκδεχόμεθα.

But may the part not be distinguished from the whole without denying it to be a part of it? Where is the impropriety in drawing a distinction between creation (including all mankind) as a whole, and those who from their privileges and hopes might be supposed exempted from the sufferings and distress common to all others? The peculiar expression here selected to characterise those specially singled out from the whole—"we who have the first fruits of the Spirit"—seems to indicate very distinctly what portion of God's creation the Apostle had particularly in view, even in the very comprehensive term "the whole creation," as about to be benefited by the new birth. "We who have the first fruits of the Spirit" points clearly to those who shall receive a much larger and more extensive outpouring of the Spirit yet to come—doubtless that predicted to be "poured out upon all flesh" (Joel ii. 28)—we need not say, of *men*. The designation, "we which have the first fruits of the Spirit," in the mouth especially of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, seems intended to contrast the little flock yet gathered, with the countless multitudes of "all the families of the earth," whom he anticipates as brought to the Lord when "the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in" (Rom. xi. 25), and "all Israel shall be saved" (ver. 26). This is the rich harvest contemplated whenever "*the first fruits*"* are mentioned in the New Testament (see Rom. xi. 16; xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; xvi. 15; James i. 18; Rev. xiv. 4). It appears improper, therefore, to limit the meaning of the expression, as seems generally to be done, to the *first gifts* of the Spirit received by *indi-*

* The Genitive after ἀπαρχή. "first fruits," according to the almost universal usage of Scripture, is partitive, that is, it denotes the whole or mass of which the first fruits form a part; as "the first fruits of thy corn, of thy wine," &c., Deut. xviii. 4; "Christ the first fruits of them that sleep," 1 Cor. xv. 20; "Epanetus, who is the first fruits of Achaia," Rom. xvi. 5. According to this usage, the expression "we which have the first fruits of the Spirit" supposes a much larger number who are to receive of the *full outpouring* of the Spirit. Compare James i. 18, "That we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures," and Dean Alford's note upon the passage, "The first Christians, to whom St James is writing, were, as first born of the great family, dedicated as first fruits to God. Wiesinger beautifully says, "The thought fully given would be this: they, by Regeneration, were dedicated as the first fruits of a

vidual believers as a foretaste and earnest of more and greater, though these, of course, are included as hereafter to be bestowed at the perfecting of the individual, when he attains to his full "adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body" (ver. 23), "raised up and quickened by the Spirit" (ver. 11)—a consummation, however, which the Apostle represents as to be attained only by the perfecting of the whole body of believers at the general resurrection and "manifestation of the sons of God" (ver. 19).

2. The other half of mankind is held to be excluded by ver. 19; for, it is argued, it cannot be said of the *heathen* and the *unregenerate* that they are waiting with earnest expectation "for the manifestation of the sons of God."

It seems to have been forgotten by those who insist on so rigid an interpretation of these words, that the objection is, to say the least, equally fatal to their own explanation. For in what tolerable sense can such an expectation be predicated of the irrational and material world, that is not more truly applicable to mankind as a whole? Is there not in all a desire for deliverance from the present transitory, unsatisfactory state, on which vanity, decay, and corruption are so strongly stamped? a hope of escape, as expressed by Cicero, "quum ex hac turba et colluvione discedam" (De Senec. xxiii. 84)? an expectation, to which even heathens gave expression, of a better age to dawn some day on the human race?

"Aspice venturo lætentur ut omnia sæclo"—

VIRG. ECL. IV. 52.

an Elysium which all nations have pictured to themselves? Is there not a "fond desire and longing after immortality" natural

sacrificial gift, which shall only be completed with the offering up of all *κτίσματα*, *creatures*. [This expression] manifestly extends wider than merely the great number of the regenerated, whom no man can number; it embraces all creation, which we know shall partake in the ultimate glorious perfection of the sons of God, cf. Rom. viii. 20, 21."

The agency of *the Spirit* in the renewal of the fallen race of mankind is the prominent subject of the context. This seems to be the reason of the change of expression into "We which have the first fruits of the Spirit," in place of that which the more general usage would have led us to expect, "We who are the first fruits of the creation."

to the minds of all, to which the unbelieving Jews gave utterance when told by our Lord of that "bread of God that cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world," "Lord, evermore give us this bread" (John vi. 34)?—although, alas! the great majority, like them, seek it not in the way of God's appointment, but shrink from the "labour" and painful self-denial necessary to be undergone, in order to participate in that "meat which endureth to everlasting life."

The words in ver. 19, therefore, can only mean that all in this vain, imperfect state are pointing forward to, and more or less consciously longing and sighing after, a happy change and deliverance from present vanity and evil—to be attained, *as we Christians only know*, at "the manifestation of the sons of God." The same, evidently, is the interpretation that must be put on ver. 21; the rigidly literal interpretation of which is equally incompatible with the prevalent explanation.

Ver. 20. The expressions here still more decidedly forbid the exclusion of *man* from "the creation." "The creation," it is said, "was made subject to *vanity*"—an expression which would seem specially to point to the doom pronounced on *man*, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return" (Gen. iii. 19), and which is embodied in the very name of its first victim, *Abel*, = *vanity*.

"*Not willingly.*" In figure, merely, can this be applied to unconscious, inanimate nature; more truly to the irrational animate creation, for all struggle against pain and death: but in its true and highest sense only to man, who alone has the *anticipative fear* of death, and was subjected to it as the final consequence of his sin, "not willingly,"* and of his own accord,

"*But by reason of Him who subjected it,*" in judgment, yet in mercy—not as its final state, but

Ver. 20, "*in hope,*† because (or that) even the creation itself," so fallen and subjected to vanity as well as those now "the sons of God," shall be delivered from "the bondage of corruption," &c.

* See Note A. at the end of the Dissertation.

† See Note B. at the end of the Dissertation.

In what or whom was this subjection designed by God to excite "*hope*"? In the *inanimate, unconscious* portion of creation? or in the *irrational* animals? or in *man*? Surely this expression must compel us to see that *man* is he whom the apostle hitherto, down to ver. 22,* has principally in his mind, as subjected to vanity by the merciful dispensation of God; in order that seeing the wretched, unsatisfactory, and perishable nature of all things here below, even the unregenerate might be led to see the vanity of seeking happiness in earthly enjoyments, and desire to "be delivered from the bondage of corruption" and brought into "liberty"—that liberty which *we Christians* now know as consisting in "the glory of the children of God." *Man in general* we say; for what else prepared the innumerable multitudes of the heathen, converted by the preaching of the apostles, to listen to the gospel, but the sickening experience they had had of the vanity to which they were left, and the bitter fruits they had reaped from sin? Shut out here, as the prevalent interpretation does, the Gentiles and the great body of the unconverted, and what a strange omission is attributed to St. Paul! In speaking of that glorious restitution of all things, which has been the theme of all the prophets, and the great hope of the Church since the world began, St. Paul, it seems, mentions on the one hand the little flock that had then received the first fruits of the Spirit; and on the other hand, the material and irrational creation; but the innumerable multitudes of "all the families of the earth" not yet converted to Christ, he who was specially called to be the apostle of the Gentiles passes by, without a thought on their condition or destiny! The *natural, material* world is brought into marked prominence, but the world of perishing *men*† is left out!

The only legitimate question, then, would rather seem to be, Whether "the creation" is to be restricted to the rational creation alone, or to be extended to the whole creation, animate and inanimate? The latter certainly seems to be the obvious interpretation suggested by the reiterated employment

* Where St Paul by the expression *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*, "the whole creation," now expressly includes *all* creation as sympathizing with man.

† See Note C at the end of the Dissertation.

of the word "creation;" and the expression in ver. 21, *καὶ αὐτῆς ἡ κτίσις*, "even the creation itself," appears to decide the question. It plainly implies something in the preceding context with which it stands in contrast. This can only be "the sons of God." Let us suppose, then, "creation" to mean *mankind* only. Since "the sons of God" differ from mankind only as a part from the whole, the expression in ver. 21 must have been *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*, the *whole* [rational] *creation*, not *καὶ αὐτῆς ἡ κτίσις*, "even the creation itself." If the creation had included none but man, there would have been no proper contrast; had it not included (besides those, though not yet, still capable of becoming, sons of God) also the whole surrounding creation—which is so intimately associated with the race of mankind, that when they wholly return unto the Lord, there will be a general "restitution of all things," Acts iii. 21, and a "new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," 2 Pet. iii. 13.

The same conclusion seems to follow from ver. 22, "We *know* that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain, &c." To what source of knowledge does the apostle here refer? Evidently, it would seem, the allusion must be to God's revelation of the truth in Scripture, and (when we take this verse in connection with ver. 20, "The creation was made subject to *vanity*,") to the Book of Ecclesiastes in particular, the burden of which is "Vanity of vanities! all is vanity." Not only "every man at his best estate" is represented in Scripture to be "altogether vanity" (Ps. xxxix. 5), but all things around him to be impressed with the same character, presenting a ceaseless, unsatisfying round of resultless changes, fatiguing eye and thought that attempt to follow them. "All things are full of labour; man cannot utter it: the eye is not satisfied with seeing, nor the ear filled with hearing. The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun," Eccles. i. 8, 9.

The state of the irrational creation, animate and inanimate, reflects the fallen state of man, the lord of all; so intimately has it been associated with him, that it follows his fortunes in his original, fallen, and glorified states. In his original state

“God made man upright,” Ecc. vii. 29; and all created with him, God pronounced to be “very good,” Gen. i. 31. Man sinned, and “the ground was cursed for his sake,” Gen. iii. 17. When “all flesh [of men] had corrupted his way upon the earth,” Gen. vi. 12, the flood sent for man’s chastisement “destroyed every living substance which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven,” Gen. vii. 23. When God’s people depart from Him, and He casts them out from His presence, then “the earth” too is represented as being made “empty and waste,” Isaiah xxiv. 1. “Because the inhabitants thereof have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting covenant, therefore hath the curse devoured the earth; the new wine mourneth, the vine languisheth; the earth is moved exceedingly; the earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard” (ver. 5-7, and 19, 20, compare Isaiah xxxiii. 9, xxxiv. 4; Jer. xii. 4; Joel i. 10-20, &c.). When again the Lord restores His people, all nature is called upon to rejoice with them, “Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful and all that is therein. Then shall the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord,” Ps. xcvi. 11-13. True, these expressions are poetical, but there is, we believe, a real and profound truth which underlies them. In the grand personification before us, which with the succeeding context is conceived in the highest strain of poetry, St Paul represents all nature as sympathizing with man, and groaning and travailing together in the pains of labour, as it were, looking and longing for the *παλιγγενεσία* or regeneration of all things, in which, the mystery of man’s redemption being finished, all creation around him (being originally designed for his use) shall be perfected and transformed into a fitting habitation for glorified humanity.

Is it objected that Geology reveals to us the fallacy of any such dependence of earth’s fortunes on the character and conduct of man? that there existed death, and suffering, and change before man came on the scene, and that all that has taken place since is but in accordance with the regular laws of natural development? consequently, that we have no just

ground to believe that the invariable course of nature will be in any way alterable by man's moral state or progress? Let us beware lest by such reasoning we fall into the condemnation of those who "in the last days shall come, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things *continue as they were* from the beginning of the creation," (2 Pet. iii. 3, 4); or even under the rebuke of the Lord himself, administered to those who questioned the possibility of the resurrection, "Ye do err, not knowing *the Scriptures*, nor the *power of God*," (Matt. xxii. 29). Is not this precisely the unphilosophical *assumption* of those who would insist that because God in His usual providence acts according to uniform laws, therefore, He can never depart from these for any higher purpose—in other words, that miracles are inadmissible? Just as if a man should argue that once an artist has finished a finely adjusted time-piece, and commenced its regular motions, he precludes himself from ever afterwards making the slightest change on its movements, or interfering to adjust it for any purpose, however desirable! Why, *man*, as a being possessed of intelligent mind, has interfered to an immense extent with the physical state of the globe, altering the very climate by cutting down forests and draining the ground, changing by cultivation and commerce the distribution and relative numerical proportions of plants and animals, and putting a new face on the whole outward appearance of nature; and shall the Supreme Mind be excluded from interposing in His own creation, should any important end call for His interposition, and for the manifestation of His presence and superintending hand?

Nay, is such a supposition consistent with the previous development in the progressive stages of creation? Look back to the close of the early geological period, when the last of the primitive rocks ceased to be formed. What a striking change must the first introduction of an entirely new element, in the production of *vegetable life*, have occasioned? New laws, peculiar to organic nature, now enter in, superseding in part and over-ruling those formerly predominant. In like manner, when the next progressive stage is reached by the in-

roduction of *animal life*, a new and higher law is established, contravening and subordinating in many respects those previously established; as is proved by the fact, that the moment death takes place, "the higher law by which certain chemical affinities are arrested in living organic bodies ceases to operate; and the lower law by which the particles of matter seek their natural affinity resumes its reign."* When, therefore, at last, the highest being appeared on the stage, for whom all this long preparation had been making—for whose use, and pleasure, and instruction, earth had laid up its mineral stores, brought forth its vegetable productions, and nourished its countless multitudes of fish and fowl and beasts, over which he was appointed to "have dominion,"—does this theory of development, so much in favour at present, all at once cease to be applicable? Here is a being of superior mould, rational, responsible, and immortal, "made in the image of God," and designed for a higher sphere. Must the lower and spiritual world, contrary to the previous analogies, still continue to be predominant, and prescribe its laws to the higher and spiritual? Or, are we not entitled to expect that the laws of the moral and spiritual world, with which this being, with his heavenward aspirations, is so intimately connected, will now assume their due pre-eminence—manifest from time to time their over-ruling and predominating presence and influence, whenever man's education and training for his future sphere require—and finally mould "*all creation*" into full accordance with the glorious destiny pre-ordained for man? If God displayed His supernatural interposition (i.e., distinct from the previous "*uniform experience*") by bringing new powers into existence in the creation first of *vegetable*, and then of *animal* life, with how much greater reason may we look for visible manifestations of His supernatural interposition, when He had crowned His creation by the introduction of a being, capable of appreciating these indications of His superintending providence and care? Are we not entitled to expect that the superiority of the moral and spiritual creation over the natural and material

* The Tripartite Nature of Man, p. 207, by Rev. J. B. Heard.

will be marked, by His making the final perfecting of the latter dependent on that of the former ?

All the meanings, then, of *ἡ κτίσις*, the Creation, given above, including specially man, are, we conceive, to be combined in the interpretation of this passage, and only then will the grandeur and truth of the Apostle's magnificent idea be seen. Christians are encouraged patiently to suffer with Christ for a short time here, by the consideration—that on the endurance of their portion of those sufferings, (which are necessary for the perfecting of each member and of the whole body of Christ), is suspended the advent of that glorious “restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began,” (Acts iii. 21), but which can be accomplished only when the destined number of redeemed souls is complete, and the last member has been added to the body of Christ. Well, then, and cheerfully, may those sustain their share of “that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ for His body's sake,” (Col. i. 24), who, having “received the *first fruits* of the Spirit, have therein an earnest of that abundant outpouring predicted on “*all flesh*,” and of that *universal harvest* which shall cover the whole earth, “when all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord,” (Ps. xxii. 27); a harvest to be crowned, but only when completely gathered in, by the preparation of a suitable storehouse for receiving all its fruits, and of fitting mansions for the habitation of the Saints in glory—by the founding of a “*new heavens* and a *new earth* wherein dwelleth righteousness.”

In conclusion, let me suggest, Have we not here the same idea involved as that of which we have an embodiment in the Cherubim, the glorification of the creaturehood, and final perfection of the whole creation, as represented by the heads of the four principal departments of animated creation—the lion, the ox, the man, and the eagle? In this divinely instituted emblem, the glorified forms of the other creatures are represented as dependent on that of *man*, whose form dominated and pervaded the whole, forming the characteristic feature of the group; for “they (it is expressly stated in Ezekiel's vision

of the cherubim, i. 5) had the likeness of a *man*," and the agency they exerted was that of man, for "the likeness of the hands of a *man* was under their wings" (Ezek. x. 21)—thus significantly indicating that the destiny of the whole creation is bound up with that of man. With him all fell; with him all rise again. All was made at first for man, who was commanded to have dominion over the works of God's hands. All with and from him awaited that progressive development and perfection which God had designed for His creation. But man transgressed; corruption and death became his portion, and all with him "was made subject to vanity." But God did not leave man altogether without hope. Besides the prospect held out to him of a future deliverance in the very sentence pronounced upon the Tempter who had seduced him, he might discern somewhat of the gracious intentions of his Creator in the bright visions of the cherubim, set to guard the entrance of the paradise which his sin had forfeited. For while in "the flaming sword" he beheld God's *holiness* debarring all self-willed attempts to force an entrance to the tree of life—in the glorious appearance of those "*living creatures*" of *earth*—living still notwithstanding the entrance of death into the world, and admitted to close proximity and intercourse with God, in the midst of whom *man* was seen pre-eminent—there seemed to be held out a hope that through God's *mercy*, not only man should at some future period be restored to even a higher state of dignity and happiness than that which he had lost, "but that the creation itself should be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God."

With the Cherubim the presence of God was ever associated from the first. The vision of the cherubim formed to our first parents their place of worship and "throne of grace," before which they presented their offerings and prayers. For when Cain was driven away by God from the place where they dwelt, his complaint was, "From thy *face* shall I be hid," (Gen. iv. 14); and the sacred historian emphatically adds, "And Cain went out from *the presence of the Lord*" (ver. 16). The same emblem was renewed to God's chosen people, bringing Him

and them into the closest communion. In the cherubim placed within the tabernacle in the Holy of Holies, the Israelites might behold God's presence and favour again accorded to His creatures, a meeting-place* vouchsafed for God and man by His own appointment, and the restoration to man of his lost dignity and dominion, since God condescended to set up His throne, "dwelling between the Cherubim" in the midst of His people, making them a "kingdom of priests" unto Himself. Nay, the very mode of this restoration, as we can now see, was shadowed forth, by the cherubim being interwoven into the texture of "the veil, that is to say, His [Christ's] *flesh*" (Heb. x. 20), and into the curtains of that tabernacle which was prefigurative of a "greater and more perfect tabernacle," even Christ's *body* (Heb. ix. 11), wherein dwelt "the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9); signifying that the redeemed were to become "members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones" (Eph. v. 30), and to be made one with Him unto whom "all power is given in heaven and in earth" (Matt. xxviii. 18).

As every other part of the tabernacle finds its antitype in Christ (even those parts that signified *man's* relation to God as a worshipper, as the candlestick that was to "give LIGHT over against it," Exod. xxv. 37, Num. viii. 2; the BREAD of presentation on the holy table, &c.), so the cherubim seem to point us to Him, who is the head of glorified humanity, and the Archetype of all creation, *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνίστηκεν*, "the first-born of all creation, because in Him were all things created . . . and in Him all things subsist," Col. i. 15-17.

In Ezekiel, the restoration of man's lost dominion is still more clearly revealed in the vision vouchsafed to the prophet of the glorious moving throne of God (carrying out in the mighty march of God's providence the counsels of His wisdom), in which the form of *man* was predominant throughout: for

* "There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony," Exod. xxv. 22.

on the throne itself was "the appearance of a MAN above upon it" (Ez. i. 26); and among the "four living creatures,"* as has already been remarked, the figure and agency of man were pre-eminent; the whole vision plainly denoting that God's government of the world was directed in subserviency to His people and Church, and that *man* was in some mysterious manner admitted to participate in its administration and to sit "on the throne of the Lord" (1 Chron. xxix. 23), as his vicegerent and servant.

This truth was brought into full prominence and light in the "four living creatures" of the Book of Revelation, placed in connection with "the four and twenty elders" (Rev. iv. 4-11), to denote the twofold character, as *ruling* and *ministering*, of God's church. This twofold character had been represented in Zechariah iv. 12-14, by the "two olive branches," and "two anointed ones [the kings and priests] that stand by the Lord of the whole earth." The same twofold character is denoted by the "two witnesses" of Rev. xi. 3-6, who are distinctly identified as emblems of the true church, by being styled "the two *olive trees*, and the two *candlesticks* standing before the God of the earth," to minister, and endued with power to shut heaven [like Elijah], and "over waters [like Moses] to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues as often as they will." So in Rev. iv. 4-6, under the double type of the "four [*ζῶα* not *beasts*, but] *living creatures*," and "four and twenty elders," the "people of the saints of the Most High" for whom are reserved "the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven" Dan. vii. 27, are represented as being "made unto our God both *kings* and *priests*" (v. 10): "*kings*," by the four† living creatures being in the closest proximity to God, "in the midst

* That the idea of *dominion* was specially connected with the "four living creatures," ζῶα, of Ezekiel is made still more clear by the contrasted "four beasts," θηρία, of Daniel, typifying the *world-kingdom*, with its bestial, self-glorifying, God-defying dominion, antagonistic to the kingdom connected with God's chosen people, who were called to be "a kingdom of priests unto the Lord," to advance *His* name and rule, not their own glory and dominion.

† "Four," with a face directed to each of the four quarters of the heaven, to mark that Sion's children shall be "princes in *all* the earth," (Psalm xlv. 16.)

of the *throne* and round about the *throne*” (iv. 6); *priests*, by the “elders” being “*four and twenty*” in number,* corresponding with the twenty-four courses into which David divided the Jewish priests (1 Chron. xxiv. 4-18), that they might serve God day and night. Yet, though thus distinguished, the living creatures and the elders are at the same time represented as forming properly not two separate classes, but one in whom both offices were concentrated. The “living creatures in the midst of the throne” are engaged also in *priestly* service, for “they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty” (iv. 8); and the elders have “on their heads *crowns* of gold” (iv. 4). Thus together they represent the one universal Catholic Church—“a *kingdom* of *priests*,” (combining the two ideas into one expression) unto the Lord, according to the early promise to the Church (Exod. xix. 6).

How amazing—how condescendingly gracious, are thus the counsels of the Most High towards man, the lowest and weakest of His rational creatures! How calculated to humble all pride of men and angels—God’s exalting man by His grace out of the deepest humiliation of his fall to be partaker of His “throne” (Rev. iii. 21) and “holiness” (Heb. xii. 10)—and thus, through the meanest and weakest of instruments, triumphing over the great Enemy of God and man, by educing good out of the evil which he had introduced into God’s fair creation—fulfilling in this the words of Psalm viii. 2,

Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength,
That thou mightest still the Enemy and Avenger.

The promise made in Psalm ii. (the opening psalm of the septenary cycle ii.-viii.), to the “*Son of God*,” of universal dominion over the “uttermost parts of the earth,” we have fulfilled in Psalm viii. (the concluding psalm of the *seven*), to

* The *sic* wings of each of the *four* living creatures make up the same mystic number of *twenty-four*: another correspondence seemingly designed to mark the unity of the two emblems, as designating the one Catholic Church of the Redeemed under its two aspects.

the "Son of man," both in the Head and His members (Compare Heb. ii. 6-9), by "all things being put under his feet" (ver. 6). To the prophetic eye of the Psalmist a vision is vouchsafed of that glorious period when "the kingdom of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ" (Rev. xi. 15), and God's Name shall become "excellent in all the earth" by the restoration of man to the lost "image of God," and to the rightful dominion over all the creatures (Ps. viii. 7, 8), to which in the depth of his degradation he had bowed down himself in service (Compare Deut. iv. 15-19, and Rom. i. 23.)

For a time, indeed, on account of man's sin (the Psalmist says),

"Thou didst lower him for a little beneath the angels *—
 But with glory and honour thou dost crown him ;
 Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands,
 Thou hast put *all* things under his feet." Vers. 5 and 6.

"For in that He put *all* in subjection under him, He left *nothing* that is not put under him" (Heb. ii. 8. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 27 ; Eph. i. 22), exalting him even beyond the angels into oneness and "fellowship" (1 John i. 3) with Himself through "the Son of man" Jesus Christ—who now by the gracious promise, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in His throne" (Rev. iii. 21), encourages all His true followers to "suffer with Him, that they may be also glorified together" with Him.

Thus in the Cherubim, as in St Paul's description, the destiny of the creation is represented as intimately associated with, but entirely dependent on, that of man. All having been with him "subjected to vanity" in consequence of his

* There is a change of tense here which has been overlooked by interpreters, the first verb "thou didst lower" being in the preterite (future with Vau conversive), while the succeeding verbs are in the simple future or present. More literally, perhaps, the words might be translated, "Thou didst bereave him for a little of God" (compare the same construction in Eccles. iv. 8), that is, of that Divine dignity and "image" in which he was created, and fellowship with God in "dominion" over the works of His hands.

fall, are represented as sympathising with him, and “groaning and travailing in pain together,” “in hope of being delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.” All are waiting to be glorified and perfected with and for man, when paradise shall be again restored, with its “water, and tree of life” (Rev. xxii. 1, 2), and “the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and He shall dwell with them” (Rev. xxi. 3), and “there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain,” ver, 4; but “*every creature* which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them” shall be “heard saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever” (Rev. v. 13).

One objection to this view may still linger in the minds of some, of those especially who hold that *man alone* is denoted by the Cherubim, from their forming too mean a conception of God’s *material* creation, as if it were unworthy and unsuited to be associated with glorified spirits in eternity. Every such objection will vanish, if we consider that the Lord Himself disdained not to take a part of the dust of the earth into union with Himself to constitute His body for ever—for with the same body which was laid in the grave He rose and ascended into heaven. The objection is virtually the same as He Himself has met in Matt. xxii. 29, “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God;” and His apostle, in 1 Cor. xv. 36-38, “Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain; but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him”—how dissimilar often in beauty and grace to the bare seed which had been laid in the earth! God’s judgment pronounced on all His works at the creation of this world was, that all were “very good,” however they may have been marred since by man’s sin, or retarded in their destined development. But God’s destined purpose cannot fail. No particle of matter which God at first created has ever been, so far as we can see, or ever will be, annihilated. “Heaven

and earth," indeed, we are told, "shall pass away;" but so does man, only, however, to rise again transfigured and glorified; and why may not the "new heavens and the new earth" that are promised, spring out of the ashes of the old, transfigured and expanded into new forms of inconceivable grandeur and beauty?

NOTE A. Page 314.

No fully satisfactory explanation perhaps of this expression, οὐχ ἐκούσα, "not willingly," has yet been given. May not the thought which St Paul meant to suggest be this?

The leading idea of the passage with which he starts is that if we would be "glorified jointly with Christ," we must willingly "suffer jointly with Him." Now, remarks the Apostle, whether willingly or not willingly, all do and must suffer, for in consequence of man's sin all creation at first was "made subject *not willingly* to vanity; in hope," however, thereby meant to be awakened, of being hereafter delivered from this bondage. The appointed means of this deliverance is our *voluntary* submission to suffering. Let us Christians, therefore, who can now enter intelligently into God's plan and method of cure, suffer *willingly* with Christ, seeing that the cross is the only preparation for the crown—suffering, for the attainment of glory—and cheerfully submit ourselves to the sentence of vanity, transitoriness, and death, pronounced on the present state, being animated by the assured expectation that we shall thereby not only secure our own blessedness, but hasten on the redemption and glorification of all creation, which awaits our final "manifestation as the sons of God."

The "*not willing*" subjection would thus be designed to suggest the *willing* subjection which Christians should render to "the sufferings of this present time."

This meaning of "willingly" is one familiar to St Paul, as will be seen by comparison of 1 Cor. ix. 17, "For if I do this thing [preaching the gospel] *willingly* [ἐκῶν, i.e., with my own free will and full consent, as shown by preaching it "without charge"] I have a reward," &c.

That this is the meaning of the "*not willing* subjection" seems evident from the corresponding terms "waiting," "hoping to be delivered from the bondage," "groaning and travailing in pain." It became a comparatively *willing* subjection, and "patient waiting" only to those who have been made intelligently to see, and with assurance to hope for, the glory to result from such *willing* subjection and patient endurance.

NOTE B. Page 314.

It has been much questioned with what verb ἐπ' ἐλπίδι in ver. 21 is properly to be connected—with ὑπετάγη, or with τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, or with ἀπεκδέχεται? With regard to the two former, the question seems immaterial, since τὸν

ὑποτάξαντα but repeats *ὑπετάγη*. "It was subjected [by God] in hope"—not willingly, but by reason of Him who subjected it—in hope, that, &c. The true view, however, appears to be that it applies to all three verbs; that ver. 20 is properly parenthetical, and while the composition is so skilfully arranged that *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι* "in hope" applies equally to each of its parallel lines, it still more appropriately refers to *ἀπεκδέχεται* "waiteth" in ver. 19, the two lines of which find each its respective equivalent in the parallel lines of ver. 21 (ver. 20 being interjected parenthetically):—

19. a Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως
 b τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται,
 20. τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη,
 οὐχ ἐκούσά ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα,
 21. a ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς
 b εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ.
19. a For the earnest expectation of the creation
 b Is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God,
 20. For the creation was made subject to vanity,
 Not willingly, but by reason of Him who subjected it,
 21. a In hope, that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage
 of corruption,
 b Into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.

In a. and a. we have the *expectation, or hope*, that animates *creation*; in b. and b. we have the final consummation to which it points.

The reason of the repetition of *ἡ κτίσις*, "the creation," in ver. 21, will now be evident, and especially of the emphasis placed upon it by the addition of *καὶ αὐτῇ*, "itself also;" both of which seemed uncalled for, so long as ver. 21 was regarded as connected only with ver. 20. The sentence apparently should have run thus: The creation was made subject to vanity by reason of Him who subjected it, in hope that *it* shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption," &c. But so soon as the Parallelism points out that the principal reference in ver. 21 is to ver. 19 (ver. 20 being parenthetical), it is immediately seen that the repetition of *ἡ κτίσις*, "the creation," and the addition to it of *καὶ αὐτῇ*, "itself also," is necessary in order to mark the antithesis between it and *τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "the sons of God."

The question too becomes comparatively unimportant, whether we are to translate *ὅτι* in ver. 21, "that," or "because." "The earnest expectation of the creation is waiting for the revelation of the sons of God, . . . in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered"—or "is waiting in hope, because the creation itself also shall be delivered," &c.

NOTE C. Page 315.

In explaining the words, "in hope that (or because) the *creation* itself also shall be delivered into the liberty of the *sons of God*," as including *man* or *all*

mankind—that no countenance is necessarily given to the delusive doctrine of *universal salvation*, will be evident from comparison with other passages where equally general language is employed; it being left to the reader's understanding to make the necessary exceptions of those who "reject the counsel of God against their own souls." "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw *all men* unto me," John xii. 32. "God so loved *the world* that He gave His only begotten Son . . . that *the world* through Him might be saved," John iii. 16, 17. "And so *all Israel* shall be saved," Rom. xi. 26. "The *abundance* of the sea shall be converted unto thee, *the forces* of the Gentiles shall come to thee," Isaiah lx. 5. "Thy people also shall be *all righteous*," Ibid, ver. 21. In the last two instances, which refer to millennial times, there must of course be excepted from the universality predicted those that will yield but feigned obedience to David's son (Psalm xviii. 44, see margin), who will form the secret leaven that shall once more break out in the countless hosts of Gog and Magog (Rev. xx. 8), threatening again to overwhelm "the camp of the saints and the beloved city." Yet after making all necessary allowance, the largeness of the expressions employed in these and similar passages warrants us to look forward to a glorious harvest of souls for which the present seed time has been but preparing.

The comprehensiveness and grandeur of St Paul's conception in this passage, and of the magnificent promises to the Church yet awaiting their fulfilment even in this world, will then only be adequately apprehended, when full recognition is given to what seems one of the clearest conclusions to be drawn from the Apocalypse, viz., that the present *suffering Davidic* period of the Church now running—variously designated as the time of "the woman" being fed in the wilderness for 1260 days (xii. 6), or 3½ years (xii. 14); of "the holy city" being trodden under foot for 42 months (xi. 2); of "the two witnesses" prophesying in sackcloth for 1260 days (xi. 3); of the prevalence of "the beast out of the sea" for 42 months (xiii. 5), (all these times being equivalent* and equal to 3½ years)—is placed in marked contrast to the *Solomonic* period of 1000 years (or Millennium), when "righteousness and abundance of *peace* shall flourish, and Christ shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth" (Psalm lxxii. 8), and His saints "shall live and reign with Christ a thousand years" (Rev. xx. 4). Whatever may prove to be the length of the present suffering period of the Church, already extended to 1800 years—long though it may appear to the sufferers, yet short in the eyes of Him with whom "a thousand years are but as yesterday when it is past" (Ps. xc. 4, "Behold I come *quickly*" Rev. xxii. 7), and in the eye of faith—it is represented but as 3½ years compared to 1000 years, the duration of that blessed period when "the kingdom of the world" shall have "become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ" (Rev. xi. 15. There seems to be a gross inconsistency in interpreting the 1000 years to represent simply a thousand *common* years, while the 3½ years

* And apparently contemporaneous, since all date their commencement from the foundation of the Christian Church. For surely from the very first the Church has been in "the wilderness," "the holy city has been trodden under foot," the witnesses have prophesied in sackcloth," and the beast began to rise out of the sea, since St Paul could even in his day say, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work," 2 Thess. ii. 7.

with which they are contrasted are explained to mean 1260 years or some such lengthened period. We have here a period long enough to answer the objections made to the slowness of the progress, and scantiness of results hitherto obtained, and suited to the magnitude and length of the preparation—some four or five thousand years (according to the varying chronological systems) that elapsed from the creation to the first coming of the Saviour.

CHAPTER VIII. 28-39.

THE LOVE OF GOD.

We find in this passage the same intimate connection and blending of the two significations of this expression, as denoting both God's love to the Christian, and the Christian's love to God, as we contended for in chap. v. 5-8.

The passage forms an introverted parallelism, or epanodos, where the first and last terms correspond, and the second and third; *A* answering to *A*, and *B* to *B*. Two characteristics are mentioned of those to whom "all things work together for good," 1. their disposition towards God, "To them that love God," and 2. God's previous purpose of love towards them, "To them who are the called according to His purpose." The second point, as usual, is first taken up and enlarged upon in *B*, viz., the security of believers, from the impossibility of the failure of *God's purposes*; in order to end in *A* (ver. 35-39) with the still more needful point to be proved, the perseverance of the believer amidst the severe trials to which he would be exposed in holding fast *his love to God* to the end. If the arrangement of the passage (given in the Analytical Commentary) which seems so obviously to commend itself, be correct, the believer's love to God must be involved in ver. 35-39. But indeed the very exigency of the Apostle's argument requires this. His object is to prove the infallible security of those who have once been brought to "love God"—that "all things work together for good" to them—and to remove every fear from their minds of finally falling short of their eternal salvation. Now what of all others, in his hours of deep despondency, is the anxiety which presses most heavily on the mind

of the trembling believer? Not, may not *God's love* change towards me? but, may not *my love* towards Him change? The apostle's answer must remove this chief ground of anxiety, or it fails in the most essential point. How then does he meet this objection? Having illustrated in *B* (ver. 29-34) the *divine* side of the saints' security from the unchangeableness of God's purposes of love towards them, he comes to illustrate the same point, as regarded on the *human* side (their having been brought to "love God"). Instead of saying, as we might have expected, Who shall separate our love from Christ?—in order that he may show the intimate connection of their love to God, with His purpose of love to them in Christ on which he had just been expatiating, and thus point out the only true ground of their love being kept steadfast to Him—he traces it to the source from which it flows, and changes the expression into, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ (*i.e.* from Christ's love to us)? Our love to Christ cannot fail, because Christ's love towards us cannot fail. Our love is but the reflux of that continuous love which He is ever pouring into our hearts. The stream can never cease, because the source from which it is derived is ever flowing. It is "God's love that is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us." What power then can separate us from the love of God? "No man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand," John x. 29. But in this power, adds Jesus, "I and my Father are one," ver. 30. Once in vital union with Christ, nothing can sever the believer from Him.

Both meanings of the expression "the love of Christ," are here, as in ch. v. 5, beautifully blended together. The very difficulty which commentators have had in deciding which of the two meanings is here intended seems sufficient to prove this. No doubt the first and primary idea in these words (as in the corresponding expression "the love of God" in ver. 39) is, in Scripture, Christ's love (God's love) as flowing out towards us, and this idea would first suggest itself to the reader, as the apostle designed. But the other idea of this love flowing back towards Christ (and God) cannot be excluded, if the reply is relevant to the very point in question, *viz.*, that "to them

that *love God*, all things shall work together for good." The same felicitous ambiguity, as we cannot but regard it, is still preserved in the words immediately following :

Who shall separate us from the love of Christ ?
Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution,
Or famine, or nakedness,
Or peril, or sword ?

Do these words mean (as the majority of later commentators maintain), shall these severe trials alienate Christ's love from His people ? They do ; for the apostle immediately adds, How can this for a moment be supposed since they are endured for *His* sake ?

As it is written,
 For *Thy sake* we are killed all the day long,
 We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Beyond question they can only tend to increase His love towards them.

But again, do they not suggest the idea which Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Ambrose, Erasmus, Doddridge, Barnes, &c., hold them directly to express, that these severe trials shall not be permitted to alienate *our love* from Christ, and to lead us to give up in despair the conflict to which He calls us ?

Certainly the apostle's succeeding words point to this conclusion: "Nay in all these things *we* are more than *conquerors*." It is "*we*" that are engaged in the conflict—" *we*" that shall be "conquerors." It is *our* love to Christ that is in danger of giving way ; but the apostle here assures us that our love shall be rendered superior to every enemy that would seduce us from our allegiance ; adding, again to bring us back to the source from whence alone our love can be derived,

Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors—
Through Him that hath loved us.

The steadfastness of our love is thus based on its only sure and lasting foundation, the unchanging and everlasting love of Christ to His redeemed. "All things shall work together for

good" to those who have once yielded their souls unto Christ, and have been brought to "love God." As their trials increase, His love and consolations will more and more abound, and will preserve their love steadfast to Him by those fresh accessions of His own love which He will pour unceasingly into the hearts of His people.

PARALLELISM BETWEEN CHAPTERS V. AND VIII.

There is a remarkable parallelism between chapters v. and viii.; the fruits of (*sanctification* by) the Spirit in ch. viii. being the same (only in a fuller and more amplified form), as those of *justification* by faith, enumerated in ch. v.

If in chap. v. we find stated as one of the first fruits flowing from justification by faith, "peace with God" (ver. 1), in place of "wrath," ver. 9; in ch. viii., we find the spiritual-mindedness induced by the Spirit declared to be "peace," ver. 6, in place of the "enmity against God" of the carnal mind, ver. 7, and of God's *displeasure* against those "that are in the flesh," ver. 8.*

If in ch. v. we find the other two cardinal graces represented as flowing from Faith—"HOPE," vers. 2 and 4, and "LOVE," as "shed abroad in our hearts," ver. 5; in ch. viii., those who "have the first-fruits of the Spirit" are said to be "saved by HOPE," ver. 24, and are characterized as those "that LOVE God," ver. 28.

If in ch. v. "*tribulation*," so far from disturbing this hope of Christians, is said to work "*patience*, and patience experience, and experience HOPE," ver. 3, 4; in ch. viii., Christians,

* The distinction between the "Peace" of ch. v. and that of ch. viii. (since there is always an *advance* in the second member of a Parallel beyond the first, see "Parallel Lines Gradational, in Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 5-12) appears to be, that in the initial stage Peace arises more from the removal, by justification, of guilty fears, and of the dread of condemnation: while in the more advanced stage it arises from the alleviation (by the growing sanctification through the Spirit) of that disquiet and distress which St Paul had just before, in vii. 13-25, so feelingly depicted as at times existing even in the renewed man, from a consciousness of the remains of indwelling corruption.

though "*groaning* within themselves" at "the *sufferings* of this present time," ver. 18, can yet "wait for the adoption," because "saved by HOPE," ver. 24, may can "with *patience* wait for it," ver. 25.

In ch. v. the object of this Hope is stated to be that of attaining to "the *glory* of God," ver. 2; in ch. viii. the object of the "expectation and hope" is declared to be deliverance into "the liberty of the *glory* of the children of God," ver. 21, and being jointly "*glorified* with Christ," ver. 17.

In ch. v. "the *Love of God* shed abroad in our hearts," is represented as flowing from *God's Love*, which He had "commended to us," by His giving "Christ to die for us while we were yet sinners," ver. 8, 9, and giving us the assurance of our being finally "saved by His life," ver. 10; in ch. viii. the cause that has led any to "*love God*," ver. 28, and the certainty that no tribulation, nor distress, nor trial shall be able to separate them from this love, are traced to the unchangeable *love of Christ* and *of God* towards them, ver. 35 and 39, which will keep their love from falling away, and make them "more than conquerors through Him that hath *loved* us," ver. 37.

In ch. v. the relation to God into which justification introduces the sinner is that of being "*reconciled* to God," ver. 10, and finally "saved from wrath by Christ's life;" in ch. viii., the relation is represented as closer still into which those "led by the Spirit of God," ver. 14, are brought—even of being "*sons of God*," "*children*," "*heirs*," "*heirs of God*, and *joint heirs* with Christ," ver. 16, 17.

In ch. v. 12-21 the two great evils of "SIN and DEATH," which the *Law* could not remove, but made to "abound," are represented as done away by faith and the union with Christ which it effects, and the two countervailing blessings of "RIGHTEOUSNESS and LIFE" introduced in their stead; in ch. viii., the Law of the Spirit of LIFE in Christ Jesus "hath made" them which are in Christ Jesus "free from the *Law* of SIN and DEATH," ver. 2, so "that the RIGHTEOUSNESS of the Law can now be fulfilled in them," ver. 4, "the Spirit" being "LIFE because of RIGHTEOUSNESS," ver. 10.

If in ch. v. the blessings of Christ's purchase are represented as inseparable, so that the attainment of the first step ensures the final completion of the whole; the very same intimate connection of all the steps, one with another, is asserted in ch. viii.: thus

In ch. v., "If justified by Christ's blood, much more we shall be saved from wrath through Him" finally, ver. 9; "if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by His life," ver. 10.

So in ch. viii., "Whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified," ver. 30. And again, "He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?" ver. 32.

Chapter viii. thus returns back to, and sums up the subject with which chapter v. had begun—the indissoluble connection between justification and sanctification, and the full and all-sufficient provision made in Christ Jesus for the perfecting of the saints, and carrying them on progressively and continuously "from faith to faith," from step to step, till their consummation in glory.

CHAPTER IX.-XI.

Here the Apostle might have concluded the main subject of his Epistle, all the three topics proposed in ch. i. 16 having been so far discussed. But it lay very near his heart to vindicate to his countrymen God's dealings with regard to Israel, and to show them their true standing in relation to the universal scheme of redemption through Christ, if by any means he might still remove the stumbling block out of the way of some of them at least, and win them over to Christ. He had, in proposing his subject (i. 16), twice mentioned the universal applicability of the Gospel-salvation, as being, 1st, "to every one," and, 2dly, "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile," thus indicating his intention to revert again to the same subject with which he

had begun, as being the view of the Gospel under present circumstances most necessary to be insisted on (see p. 92). Accordingly, the sequel, or last Section (ix.-xi.), is, as Olshausen has remarked, parallel to the first (A. i. 18.—iii. 20), so that we have here an instance of the Epanodos, the object of which is to bring the main subject into prominence by placing it first and last. In both sections the subject is *the relation of Israel, and of the Gentiles, to the new way of salvation*. But in i. 18-iii. 20, it is regarded more on the side of the *Law*—as condemning Israel equally with the Gentiles, and necessitating them equally to have recourse to the gospel. In ix.-xi., it is regarded more on the side of *Grace* (on the part of God, as possessing a right to prescribe His own terms of acceptance), and of *Faith* (on the part of man, as the one only condition for attaining salvation, and which is demanded equally of Israel as of the Gentiles).

Another point of resemblance between the two sections consists in the striking parallelism between the three objections of the Jew in iii. 1-8, and those in ix. 1-23 (see pp. 10, 39-42, 91).

The subject of chapters ix.-xi. may thus briefly be characterized :

Chap. IX. The Jews' present exclusion from Christ's salvation, with the election of the Gentiles, is not chargeable on God—as a breach of His ancient covenant with them, which was unconditional, only as regarded the *outward* and *fleshly* privileges of "adoption, &c.," and of the Christ "being theirs as concerning the *flesh*"—but on their want of faith, which failed to appropriate to themselves the *internal, spiritual* privileges, in regard to which the former were but typical and preparative :—

Chap. X. "Righteousness by faith" being announced in their own Law and prophets as the indispensable condition for all (1-13), and which must, therefore, be preached to all the nations of the earth" (13-21).

Chap. XI. Yet is Israel's exclusion not total (1-10), nor final (11-24), but shall, by the wondrous guidance of God's providence (33-36) result in shutting them up at length to a con-

viction of their own "disobedience" (*ἀπειθειαν* ver. 32), and so stir them up to embrace salvation by grace with an earnestness of penitence and faith, which shall prove like a revival from the dead to the whole world (ver. 15), and thus fulfil God's original promise and covenant to Abraham, that "In thee, and in thy seed, shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (25-36).

CHAPTER IX.

According to the view generally taken of St. Paul's argument in this chapter, his reply to the objection of the Jews, that their rejection from Messiah's kingdom would be a violation of God's unconditional promises to their fathers, is to this effect: That not *all* the children of Abraham, not *all* Israelites, are included in the promise, but only the *spiritual* children of Abraham, and *true* Israelites, who are made such of God's own special election and grace. In the dispensation of His mercy God is entirely sovereign, selecting and rejecting its objects according to His own free will and pleasure, as proved in the cases of Isaac and Ishmael, of Jacob and Esau; the latter case proving incontestably that God's election is entirely irrespective of any difference in the individuals themselves, since it was made before the children were yet born, or had done either good or evil. It is God's to compassionate, God's to harden, whom He will. Although, therefore, the great body of the Jewish nation be rejected, God's truth is vindicated in the portion saved, the spiritual Israel "whom He hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles," ix. 24.

The prevailing interpretation thus sees in this chapter a predestination of individuals, causatively determining beforehand, irrespectively of anything in themselves, not only the privileges and opportunities to be granted to different men, but the *use* which each is to make of them. The obvious objections to this interpretation are so formidable, when fairly stated, as to create the strongest suspicion of some lurking fallacy in the steps by which such a conclusion is reached.

1. It represents the righteous Judge of all the earth as

determining the everlasting doom of His creatures in what appears an arbitrary and capricious manner, creating an Esau for the very purpose of destroying him (as if a potter could make a vessel merely in order to destroy it again)—the Father of love, who commands His children, in imitation of His own loving-kindness, Mat. v. 45, to “*love* their enemies,” ver. 44, as “*hating*” Esau for no fault of his own, before he was born, or “had done good or evil”—as “hardening his heart,” by His own predestinating decree, before that heart was brought into existence, or was capable of any moral feeling or choice.*

An unwarrantable signification too is thus put upon the expression to “harden,” which elsewhere in Scripture signifies a *judicial* act on the part of God, righteously exercised towards those who *previously* had hardened their hearts against Him.

2. It destroys human responsibility. Esau, the type of the reprobate, is represented as hated, hardened, and condemned, by an eternal counsel and act of God, not from any thing dependent on himself either to do or to leave undone; being born originally with a sinful nature, and being excluded from all capability of subsequent repentance by the sovereign withholding from him of the indispensable grace.

As however these objections will have little weight with those who fancy them to be the very objections anticipated and answered by St Paul in verses 14-21, let us observe farther, that,

* Few have had the courage to state the case thus clearly to their own minds, and to confront the difficulty boldly, as Haldane has done in his note on ix. 13, (“Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated”). “Jacob was loved before he was born, consequently before he was capable of doing good; and Esau was hated before he was born, consequently before he was capable of doing evil. It may be asked why God hated him before he sinned personally; and human wisdom has proved its folly by endeavouring to soften the word hated into something less than hatred; but the man who submits like a little child to the word of God, will find no difficulty in seeing in what sense Esau was worthy of the hatred of God before he was born. He sinned in Adam, and was therefore properly an object of God’s hatred as well as fallen Adam. There is no other view that will ever account for this language and this treatment of Esau.”

That is to say, so far as we understand Haldane, God does what He declares to be sin in man. We are forbid to hate the sinner (till he has become utterly reprobate), and bid only hate the sin. But the holy and just God is represented as first bringing Esau into existence as a sinner, and then giving him no means or capability of recovery, and so hating and dooming eternally His creature for what he had no power from first to last either to do or to forbear!

3. St Paul had in the former part of the Epistle laboured to bring home sin to the individual consciences of his countrymen by an appeal to "the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds," &c., (ii. 5, 6), in order, thereby, to awaken them to the necessity of giving up their unbelief and resistance to the gospel. But now, it seems, in chap. ix., he undoes the whole effect of his former appeals to their consciences, by furnishing them with a ready-made excuse for their unbelief, in the predestinating decree of God which doomed them unconditionally to this rejection of Christ, and rendered any and every effort on their part to believe unavailing.

Could a more complete defence for the worst abuses of the doctrine of Predestination be devised, or a more plausible excuse be furnished to the sinner for casting off all blame and responsibility from himself for his wickedness and unbelief?

4. By the prevalent interpretation St Paul is made to adopt the very line of reasoning, with one modification, pursued by his opponents. The Jews were all high Predestinarians, and maintained that they were God's predestinated people, elected unconditionally to all the blessings of God's covenant. "We," they argue, "are the Isaac, the Jacob, whom God hath chosen, while all others are represented by the rejected Ishmael and Esau. And it is vain to argue that our unfaithfulness has forfeited our privileges. Our election is unconditional, wholly independent of merit or demerit, good or evil on our part, as was shown in the case of God's choice of our father Jacob in place of Esau: for before the children were born, or had done good or evil, it was said to Rebecca, 'Two *nations* are in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger,' Gen. xxv. 23—a prophecy by its very terms referring not merely to the children as individuals, but to their seed as nations; as is further evident from the words of Malachi, i. 2-4, 'I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid *his mountains* and *his heritage* waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Whereas *Edom* saith,' &c."

Such, evidently, were the favourite arguments by which the Jews supported their principle of the unconditional Predestination of their nation, and from which it had passed into a maxim כְּדִישְׂרָאֵל יֵשׁ חֵלֶק לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא “All Israel have their portion in the world to come.”

St Paul, it seems, endorses the whole argument, with this sole exception, that not the *whole* nation was thus unconditionally elected, but only a *part*. But the *principle* is fully admitted, that eternal salvation and reprobation in no way depend on the act or will of man, or anything that he can either do or forbear, but solely on the predestinating decree of God. All probation of man, or responsibility on his part, are thus at an end.

To this it has been replied that according to a habit of St Paul of “INSULATING *the one view of the subject under consideration with which he is at the time dealing*,”* the *human* side (man’s free-will and responsibility), is here kept out of sight, and the *Divine* side (God’s sovereignty and unconditional predestination) alone insisted on, while at other times “*we shall find that free-will asserted strongly enough for all edifying purposes*.”† A distinction of much importance has been here overlooked. The assertion of two truths which *we may be unable to reconcile* is one thing; the assertion of two *irreconcilable*, because contradictory, propositions (*i.e.*, where the very terms of the one proposition contradict and exclude the other), is another and very different thing. Of the former we have an example in the case of God’s justice and mercy in the justification of sinners; the reconciliation of which, though human reason could not discover the mode, till revealed by the gospel, it could not pronounce to be impossible or to involve self-contradiction. But the view given of God’s sovereignty by the prevalent interpretation of this passage, entirely excludes the idea of any *responsibility* or probation on the part of man, since it makes God *causatively* to predetermine not only the privileges and opportunities to be granted to differ-

* Dean Alford’s Greek Test., Argument of Rom. ix.

† *Ibid.*, Comment on ix., 16.

ent men, but *the use which each is to make of them*. The Divine side here is all in all. The human is entirely excluded. All free-will on man's part, as conducing to his everlasting destiny, is denied by this representation. Previously to any capability of this, and irrespectively of any foreseen act or choice of theirs, God determines the destiny of each of His creatures, and all the steps leading to the final result—*loves* one, and *hates* another—hates him, therefore, as a *creature*, not as a *sinner*—hardens him, not (observe) *judicially*, but *before he has done good or evil*. “This view (the Supralapsarian theory of Predestination) represents God as reprobating the non-elect by a sovereign act, without any respect to their sins, simply for His own glory. This appears to be inconsistent with the divine righteousness, as well as with the teaching of Scripture. The non-elect are “ordained to dishonour and wrath *for their sins*, to the praise of his glorious justice.”* (Confession of Faith, ch. iii., sect. iii., 7—with which, therefore, this view is also inconsistent.)

We put it to any candid mind, Can such a representation of the infinitely holy, righteous, and loving Father of all, with whom is no respect of persons, be possibly correct? Must there not be some lurking fallacy in the interpretation and reasoning, which land us, inextricably, in such a conclusion?

We are thus compelled to seek for another interpretation.

One principal error seems to lie in not observing that the argument, from both of the instances quoted by St. Paul, is typical. This many commentators allow to be the case in the first instance of Isaac and Ishmael, but they have very inconsistently omitted to extend the same principle to the succeeding instance of Jacob and Esau.

The argument of St. Paul appears to be the following :

Chap. ix. 1. Most intensely and from the depths of my heart do I grieve for the present rejection of my countrymen from the blessings of the Redeemer's purchase; so that there is no

* Outlines of Theology by Rev. A. A. Hodge, p. 181, ch. x., 7. 4. Dr. Hodge, it may be presumed (see Preface) endorses this proposition of his son's, and yet interprets Rom. ix. in direct opposition to it.

sacrifice so great that I could not make for them, could it but procure their repentance and admission into Christ's kingdom. And this all the more when I call to mind the distinguished privileges with which God had so richly invested them, all fitted and designed to prepare them for the reception of still higher and priceless privileges. But I cannot for a moment admit that this rejection is any reflection on the truth of God's promises. "All things," I have said, viii. 28, "work together for good to them who are the called according to God's purpose." But how, my countrymen rejoin, is this consistent with your alleged rejection by God of us, His first called people? My reply is, You, Jews, entirely misapprehend your standing with regard to the spiritual blessings promised through the Christ. You are a typical people; your calling but an outward calling, and your privileges typical of the spiritual privileges of the new covenant of grace. The covenant made with Abraham was in its higher aspect a spiritual covenant, embracing "all the nations of the earth," and the intermediate covenant ratified with you at Mount Sinai, "which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul" the former, so as to make it of none effect.

Ver. 4. You are indeed "Israelites." But the outward Israel is typical and prefigurative of another and spiritual Israel. "They are not all [the true] Israel, which are of [the outward] Israel," ver. 6.

Ver. 5. Yours are "the fathers." But "neither because they are the [carnal] seed of Abraham, are they all [His spiritual] children," ver. 7.

Ver. 4. To you "pertaineth the adoption." "Israel is my son, even my first born," Exod. iv. 22. But sons, as a whole nation, only by an outward national adoption, which is but typical of the spiritual individual adoption.

Ver. 5. Of you cometh "the Christ:" But this is "concerning *the flesh*" only, not that He thereby is yours according to *the Spirit*.

In short, all these *outward* privileges are yours, and you have already enjoyed them. You are "Israel;" to you "pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the

giving of the law," &c. But the enjoyment of these outward privileges was but designed to prepare you for embracing by faith the real inward privileges, when they came and were offered to you; and if, instead of accepting these, now freely offered to you, on the terms which God prescribes, you pride yourselves on the possession of the shell and reject the kernel, you have but yourselves to blame.

Ver. 6. The exclusion of the great body of Israel from the blessings of Christ's gospel is no violation of God's promise, since these pertain alone to the *true* Israel,

"For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel,"

a truth which we have had before occasion to remark in i. 28, 29.

Ver. 7-13. *All* the children of Abraham are not "children of God," but those only whom He elects of His own free choice (see Analytical Commentary, a and b); who are born not by the power of "the flesh," but by the power of God's "promise" (c); independently of all previous merit or demerit of their own (d).

These truths have been clearly announced in type, and pre-figured in the history of your first patriarchs.

(a and b). That *all* the children of Abraham are not thereby heirs of God's spiritual promises, but that He chooses out freely whom He will, is taught typically in the instances of Isaac and Ishmael, of Jacob and Esau. Of the *outward* promises made to Abraham (the earthly inheritance of Canaan, and the carnal descent of the Saviour from his seed) Isaac was chosen as the heir and not Ishmael; Jacob, and not Esau; clearly typifying, that the heirs of God's *spiritual* promises are appointed of His own free pleasure, on a principle of selection of His own, independently of all fleshly descent.

What that principle is, and what entitles to the privilege of being spiritually sons and heirs of God, is farther indicated in two of its aspects by each of these instances.

(a, more especially in c). By the first, in which Isaac was born by the power of God's promise, not as Ishmael by the

natural power of the flesh, is typified that God's true children and heirs are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God," John i. 13.

The *typical* application of this case of Isaac must be intended by St. Paul, whether we consider it to be expressly taught by the words "that is" (ver. 8), or not. Many commentators do thus explain the words. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called: *that is*, [typically] they which are the children of the flesh [typified by Ishmael], these are not the children of God [spiritually]; but the children of promise [typified by Isaac] are counted for the [true, spiritual] seed." This explanation seems confirmed by the similar interpretation given by the Apostle of the differing births of Isaac and Ishmael in Gal. iv. 22-24. "It is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born *after the flesh*; but he of the freewoman was *by promise*. *Which things are an allegory*," that is, are typical of the old and new covenants. The words in Rom. ix. 8, "that is," would thus be equivalent to "which things are an allegory."

But suppose with other commentators (as Moses Stuart) that the words "that is" are merely equivalent to "which signifies," and are designed only to explain more fully the import of the preceding words, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called:" *That is*, They which are Abraham's children by natural descent, as Ishmael, these are not all the children of God [*theocratically*], but only the children given to him by promise [Isaac and his descendants] are counted for the [*theocratic*] seed," and heirs of the *temporal* promises. Still the typical parallel, which we have shown to form the marrow of the whole argument, must be supplied by the mind of the reader. The question under discussion is, Who are the *true* Israel, the *spiritual* children of Abraham, entitled to the *spiritual* blessings procured by Christ; and it cannot for a moment be maintained, that it is to Isaac as *literally* the child of promise, and merely because born of Sarah beyond the course of nature, that the inheritance of *eternal salvation* is ascribed; or that Ishmael is excluded merely because he was *literally* a child of the flesh,

and born of Hagar according to the common powers of nature. These outward distinctions must be typical of the internal and spiritual. The reader readily completes the terms of the parallel for himself, thus :

“ As not fleshly descent, but the promise of God, gave a title even to the *external* Messianic privileges granted to Isaac, not to Ishmael : so with regard to the internal and spiritual blessings, not the children of the flesh (like Ishmael), but those supernaturally born by faith on God’s promise (like Isaac) are heirs.”

(b, more especially in d). By the second instance is indicated, that merit or demerit previous to *spiritual* birth, makes no difference in God’s election of the heirs of the eternal covenant. This is clearly shown in the type of Jacob and Esau, antecedently to whose corporeal birth, before they could have done either good or evil, the preference to the blessings of the *temporal* covenant was given to the younger above the elder (“The elder shall serve the younger”), and openly manifested in the history of their respective seeds (“Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated”).

This instance was peculiarly adapted to meet the proud self-righteousness of the Jews. “What !” they were ready to exclaim, “are we, so long the servants of the Lord, and depositaries of God’s holy law, to be put on a level with the idolatrous Gentiles in reference to the privileges of Messiah’s kingdom !” The type showed that antecedently to spiritual birth or regeneration, comparative merit or demerit could make no distinction in giving a title to blessings which proceeded solely from God’s free grace and mercy. Be it that all other nations were polluted “sinners of the Gentiles,” as the Jews termed them, and that they, the Jews, were so superior in righteousness as they fancied themselves, still this gave them no claim to justification before God. Let them beware, lest the very self-righteous claim which they thus set up might place them below the more humble Gentiles, and realize in them the type that “the elder (brother, the Jew) should serve the younger” (the Gentile).

It is of great importance to determine the correct interpretation of this latter instance of Jacob and Esau. It admits of

no reasonable doubt that the issue here involved, as contemplated by St. Paul, is election, not merely to temporal privileges, but to the spiritual blessing of eternal salvation. To be convinced of this, we have but to look to the scope of the chapter (see Analysis of the argument in the Commentary), and particularly to the distinction made in ver. 6 between the natural and spiritual Israel, "They are not all Israel [spiritually] which are of Israel" [naturally]; and again in ver. 8 between "the children of the flesh," and "the children of God." St. Paul's "heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart," for his brethren according to the flesh, so great that he could wish himself accursed from Christ for them, cannot be supposed to be only, or specially, because they were about to lose mere *outward* privileges, and that high station they had hitherto enjoyed among the nations of the earth, nor yet for the signal *temporal* calamities about to fall on Jerusalem and the Jewish people; but like his Lord, he wept because "the things that belonged to their *peace* were now to be hid from their eyes," Luke xix. 42. The question under discussion was, Who are the true Israel and children of God, and heirs of the spiritual blessings to be conferred by the Messiah. Consequently, if the prevalent interpretation be correct, that *literally* Jacob is here represented as elected to eternal life, and Esau reprobated to eternal death by God's absolute decree, altogether *irrespectively of their conduct*, "the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil," there seems no escape from the conclusion that the most extreme type of absolute Predestination, or what is called the *supralapsarian* doctrine, is expressly taught in this passage; and that the reprobate are represented as ordained by God to "dishonour and wrath," not "for *their sin*, and to the praise of His glorious *justice*," (as taught in the Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 7), but simply and solely out of God's sovereign will and pleasure, antecedently, and without any anticipative regard, to what the creature might do or choose.

It is of great consequence, therefore, that we are furnished with a criterion by which we can test the validity of this and every interpretation offered. The test consists in this, that

no interpretation can be correct, which is not equally applicable to Jacob and Esau, both as *nations*, and as *individuals*. That the nations descended from Jacob and Esau are here intended is evident from both quotations in ver. 12, 13. As to the first, "The elder shall serve the younger," we have but to look to the context in Gen. xxv. 23 to see that this prediction referred to them principally as nations—"And the Lord said unto her [Rebecca], Two *nations* are in thy womb, and two manner *of people* shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one *people* shall be stronger than the other *people*; and the elder shall serve the younger." The second quotation makes this still clearer, if possible, being the *fulfilment* of this prediction, as given in Malachi i. 2-4, "Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness. Whereas *Edom* saith, *We* are impoverished," &c., "and they shall call them the *people* against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever."

It is equally evident, however, that St Paul has respect also to Jacob and Esau as *individuals*, from the words, "The *children* being not yet born," &c.

No interpretation, therefore, we repeat, can be correct which is not equally applicable to Jacob and Esau, whether considered as *nations* or *individuals*.

If we apply this test to the prevalent *literal* interpretation, and regard Jacob and Esau first in their *national* capacity, Jacob, or the *whole nation* of Israel, will thus be represented as loved by God still, and elected to *eternal salvation*! Thus the very claim of the Jews, "*All Israel* have their portion in the world to come," which St Paul had set himself to refute, he ends by admitting to the full! Again, apply the test to Jacob and Esau as *individuals*, and the supralapsarian doctrine is unequivocally established; and Esau, and by parity of reasoning all the Non-Elect, are doomed to everlasting death, irrespectively of "any evil" committed by them!

But assume, on the contrary, that, as in the previous instances of Isaac and Ishmael, Jacob and Esau are here only regarded as *types* of the Elect and the Reprobate, and the

typical comparison will be found equally appropriate, whether they are regarded *individually* or *nationally*. The comparison will stand thus: As previously to the *natural birth* of Jacob and Esau, and of the nations sprung from them, God chose the one and rejected the other as the inheritors of the land of Canaan, and all the blessings connected with it—altogether irrespectively of the merit or demerit of either, and simply of His own sovereign pleasure; so previously to *spiritual birth*, God grants or refuses the gift of eternal life, altogether irrespectively of antecedent merit or demerit (the truth being, as already shown, that the merit is none, the demerit universal), on the terms which His own good pleasure prescribes. These are (as already shown by St Paul, and repeated below in x. 3, 4) that He gives it gratuitously to those who, renouncing all dependence on their own “works,” and every attempt to “establish their own righteousness,” submit themselves, in simple faith and dependence on God’s mercy, to receive as a free gift “Christ as the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;” while those alone are rejected who refuse to yield this submission and faith.

ix. 14-29. St Paul had shown that God was perfectly free to bestow the Gospel privileges on whomsoever, and on whatsoever terms He pleased, since no works or merit could be pleaded as a title on the part of any one to receive them; and, consequently, that He might, if He saw fit, reject the Jews as His people, if they would not submit to the terms of the Gospel, and choose the Gentiles, if they accepted these terms. He now proceeds to answer the objection which he knew would immediately occur to a Jew, that it would be inconsistent with God’s *righteousness* (justice) to recognise no distinction of merit or demerit between Jews and Gentiles.

Ver. 14. “*What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God,*” that He should cast off His own people the Jews, who, with all their shortcomings, have been the only witnesses for His name, and take into His favour instead His enemies, the idolatrous Gentiles?*

* That the *unrighteousness* that might seem chargeable upon God from the

first in ver. 15, 16, to the former in ver. 17; and the principle deducible from both cases is stated in ver. 18, viz., that God Himself is the only competent judge, as to who are fit objects for His mercy, and who for severity.

1. Ver. 15, 16. God may have mercy on whom He will. He pardoned you, Jews, when at the very foot of Mount Sinai, where you had just ratified a solemn covenant with Him, you broke it almost immediately after by worshipping a golden calf; how much more may He have mercy on the Gentiles, who have never sinned so grievously against privileges bestowed? Then He pardoned you at the intercession of Moses; but, at the same time, testified to the freeness and sovereignty of His mercy, and vindicated to Himself the prerogative of selecting its objects, in the words addressed to His servant, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy; and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion," Exod. xxxiii. 19.

Ver. 16. All are sinners before God; and it is not of man's will or man's running to extort from God His terms of justification on which He will receive them. These it belongs to God, who showeth mercy, to prescribe, and to receive whom He will, and on what conditions He will.

2. Ver. 17, 18. As to God's now allowing you Jews to go on and harden your hearts in unbelief—God, in like manner, is the only competent judge who are fit subjects of His grace, and whom He shall judicially harden by leaving them to the indurating effects of their own obstinacy and impenitence. Look at the case of the ancient enemy of your nation, Pharaoh. You know how he hardened himself against God, and you have read in your Scriptures how, with just retribution, God at length "hardened his heart," so that "seeing, he could not see, and hearing he could not hear, neither could he under-

immediately preceding argument refers not, as usually explained, to God's electing some to eternal salvation, and reprobating others out of His mere good pleasure, but to His treatment of the Jews and Gentiles respectively, is evident, 1. From comparison with the corresponding objection in iii. 5-8, being the third of the three objections (iii. 1-8) which find their exact parallel in the three in ix. 1-29 (See Analytical Commentary, pp. 10, 39-42, and 91). 2. From the constantly alternating reference to *Jews* and *Gentiles* in the remainder of the chapter, ix. 15-29, as marked in the Analytical Commentary.

stand." Beware lest you, like him, by your obstinate resistance to every appeal which God makes to you, be joined to the "untoward generation" of your countrymen, to be spared a little longer only that God's "power," and "name" may be the more conspicuous in your destruction.

"He *hardeneth*."—It is very instructive to observe in this case of Pharaoh how exactly retributive God's hardening his heart is represented to be, as a strictly judicial act of God, in measuring back to him precisely the same measure that he had meted. Ten times we read of Pharaoh's hardening his heart (or his heart "remaining hard") against God; viz., Exod. vii. 13,* 14, 22, viii. 15, 19, 32, ix. 7, 34, 35, xiii. 15 (literally, "Pharaoh *hardened himself* not to let us go"):—and ten times we read of the Lord hardening Pharaoh's [once, xiv. 17, it is (including of course Pharaoh) "the Egyptians'"] heart, viz., Exod. iv. 2, vii. 3, ix. 12, x. 1, 20, 27, xi. 10, xiv. 4, 8, 17. But Pharaoh had previously hardened, or kept hard, his heart *seven* times, before the Lord for the first time is said judicially to harden his heart (in iv. 2, and vii. 3. we hear simply what God *was* to do, "I *will* harden his heart"); and it is only towards the close, after Pharaoh had resisted so many efforts to soften his heart, that we read so frequently that God hardened his, and his people's, heart.

God's "hardening the heart," accordingly, is no arbitrary, uncalled-for proceeding on the part of God, arising from a secret predestinating decree, but is always a judicial act induced by the *previous* wickedness of its objects. It is the Scriptural and truer view of what men generally recognise as the *natural* consequence of sin obstinately persisted in, that it goes on from bad to worse, and finally scars and deadens the conscience. It is a consequence which God in mercy, and to deter from wickedness, has attached to all sin. But it is only after long continued perseverance in a vicious course that it reaches its highest and final stage; and, as we learn from the words of the

* The Auth. Version has here, by mistake "He [God] hardened Pharaoh's heart," instead of "Pharaoh's heart *was hardened*, or remained hard," the expression in Hebrew being exactly the same as in ver. 22, and in viii. 19, (15 Heb.)

Lord with regard to this very case of the Jews, only at last, when every means has been exhausted in vain by God and the Saviour to reclaim the impenitent, that the sentence goes forth that "the things that pertain to their peace shall be hid from their eyes," Luke xix. 42.

It was probably from their inability to enter into this view that the Septuagint translators used the passive voice and the softer expression *διετηρήθης*, "thou hast been preserved" [under the former plagues] to translate *הִצַּלְתִּיךָ* in Exod. ix. 16. St. Paul's rendering, *ἐξήγειρά σε*, not only by its active form exhibits God's more immediate agency with regard to Pharaoh, but seems designed by the more forcible expression, "I have raised thee up," (instead of *διετήρησα*), to bring into prominence God's predisposing agency, and to denote that it was He who had assigned to him his place in history, and conspicuous station on the throne of Egypt, for the very purpose of making him a standing monument of His own power and retributive justice in the destruction of those who presumptuously oppose His purposes. The passage in Exod. ix. 14-17 is therefore thus to be understood: "I will at this time send all my plagues upon thine heart, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people; that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth. For now had I stretched out [*יָשַׁתְּ* in a conditional sense] my hand, and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence, thou wouldest have been cut off from the earth. But in very deed for this cause have I raised thee up [assigning thee thy place and power, knowing the abuse of these that thy proud and stubborn heart would prompt thee to make of them against me] for to show in thee my power [by delivering my people, notwithstanding the utmost opposition of the mightiest monarch and kingdom on earth], and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth. As yet exaltest thou thyself against My people, that thou wilt not let them go?" Thinkest thou, that thou canst in the smallest degree frustrate My purposes? They are all unalterably fixed and certain: and thou and all thine have been foreordained and raised up only to subserve my unchangeable counsels, and by the abuse of that free will wherewith I have endowed thee, and by thy

very wrath and self-willed resistance to praise me, and to glorify me by thy continued opposition and final destruction.

Such, too, is the sentence now gone forth against Israel. God had assigned to them their conspicuous station which they had so long held in the history of the world, and still upheld them, only to glorify Him by their foreseen obstinate resistance to His purposes, and the awful judgment that would at last overtake them. Because they resisted every effort that He made to reclaim them, and the greatest of all in sending His own beloved Son to them, He had now hardened their hearts, so that "the things which belonged to their peace were hid from their eyes;" and all the apostle could do was to warn individuals to come out and save themselves from the untoward generation of their countrymen.

Ver. 19. Here the apostle knew the Jew would be ready to reply, If God shows mercy to whom He will, and hardens men just as He will, "Why doth He yet find fault?" It is His will that we should be hardened—"whom He will He hardeneth"—why then find fault with us for being in the very condition in which He wills us to be? He wills it; and "who resisteth [can resist] His will?"

The cavil here is equally valid, as if Pharaoh had replied to the Lord, "If thou hast raised me up, and placed me where I am for thy purposes, why blame my continued hardness of heart against thee, since it is but fulfilling thy will?—as if those addressed by St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, because he had declared that it was "by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God" that Jesus was delivered to crucifixion and death, had therefore rejected, as incompatible with this, his appeal to their conscience, "Ye have taken" the Christ of God "and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" him, Acts ii. 23— as if, because it is God's righteous appointment that drunkenness leads on to other vices, and that any sin habitually indulged in brings others in its train, the sinner should cast off all responsibility for these additional vices which he has brought upon himself and say, "Why doth He yet find fault?" Are we not in this fulfilling God's will and appointment? Well might the apostle sternly rebuke such impiety, "Nay, but, O

man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to Him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" The figure here seems borrowed from such passages as Isaiah xxix. 16, and xlv. 9, which expose the presumption of the creature in questioning the sovereign right of the Creator to do with him as He will—as if the clay should impugn the wisdom or right of the potter to assign to it a particular form—Why make me such a being as I am? Why give me a nature and free will that entail upon me such consequences?

Ver. 21. The next figure, "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" is evidently borrowed from Jer. xviii. 4-6, where we have a farther application of the figure employed by Isaiah. For not only do we find insisted upon, as in Isaiah, the absolute right of the Creator over the creature, and the necessity of the unqualified submission and unreserved acknowledgment of this right by the creature (particularly when sinful), before God can show him any favour or mercy; but farther, we find mentioned particularly the *vessels* made by the potter, and the distinction for which they were designed. Indeed the parabolic narrative in Jeremiah seems so beautifully illustrative of the very point which the apostle is endeavouring to establish in Romans, that it appears impossible to doubt his allusion to it. God had designed the Jewish nation for a vessel of honour; but, by their abuse of their privileges, and rejection of Christ, they had constrained Him to cast them off, and make them, in the meantime, at least, into a vessel of dishonour. So the vessel in Jeremiah's narrative, that was wrought on the wheels, "was marred in the potter's hand," that is, did not take the form that he had designed, doubtless from some defect in the proper quality of the clay; so he made it again another vessel [for a meaner use] as seemed good to the potter to make it." But while thus, by both prophet and apostle, the most absolute right is claimed for God to deal with His creature as to Him seems best, both are most careful to add that this right is never exercised to punish, but in accordance with the greatest mercy

and patience, which wait long for the repentance of transgressors. "At what instant," it is immediately added in Jeremiah, "I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." And thus, in like manner, St. Paul in Rom. ix. 22 reminds the Jews of the "long-suffering endurance" which God had shown towards them, "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction."

ix. 33. "And whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."

The same words are repeated in chap. x. 11. It is of consequence to note this, since it is a common mode in Scripture of marking out a stage in the argument. All that lies between the statement of the proposition and its repetition form part of its proof or illustration, or is at least intimately connected with it. In the case before us, it gives the division of chap. x. If we adopt the reading of the Textus Receptus, $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ δ πιστευόντων ἐπ' αὐτῷ, "Every one—who believeth on him," &c.; it will be found that δ πιστευόντων, or *faith*, as the only means of salvation, is the subject of x. 1-10, while $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, or its *universality* (as necessary for *every one*), forms the subject of the rest of the chapter, or at least of verses 11-18. If, according to the reading of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Westcott, we omit $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$, "every one," in ix. 33, and read it only in the restatement of the proposition in x. 11, the contrast between the two will only mark out the division still more emphatically to the student of Parallelism, more especially as already on the repetition of δ πιστευόντων he had found $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$ added to it in ch. x. 4 ($\pi\alpha\nu\tau\iota$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ πιστευόντι).

CHAPTER X.

x. 4. "Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

Of this proposition the Apostle immediately goes on to give

the proof from Moses' writings. As to the first proof, ver. 5, and its import, all commentators are agreed :

“For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law,
That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.”

Now, since no man ever has done, or can do, perfectly all that is required by the law, it is evident that whoever depends on it for justification and life must fail, and therefore is shut up to cast himself on the mercy of God as promised in Christ Jesus. The Law, by its convincing us of sin, and of our inability to deliver ourselves from its power, is a “school-master to bring us to Christ.”

But with regard to what follows, ver. 6-10, commentators are much divided, the majority seeing a mere accommodation of the words originally spoken of the Law in Deut. xxx. 11-14 to the righteousness of faith as revealed in the Gospel. The existence of this alleged principle of *accommodation* in any instance is very questionable. The presumption is strongly against it. If we believe that the same Spirit speaks in both Testaments, we are entitled to expect that the words quoted from the Old Testament in the New will not be employed in a loose, declamatory way, merely for illustration, but will, by their treatment, furnish a model or precedent for the interpreter to follow in other cases, in seeking to elicit the true meaning of the ancient oracles. Two of the instances most relied on in proof of this supposed accommodation, occur in the present chapter, the one being the quotation before us, and the other the quotation from Psalm xix. in ver. 18 ; in both of which, to say the least, such a use seems most inappropriate. St Paul's great object in reasoning with his countrymen is to prove to them, *out of their own Scriptures*, that God's mode of salvation from the first had been always the same (simple faith in Him), and that their Law was but a provisional dispensation, designed to prepare for the universal gospel which was to embrace all equally, Gentiles as well as Jews. Is it likely that the arguments adduced to persuade the Jews of this from their own Scriptures would, even in part, be words turned from their true meaning in the Jewish

Scriptures—nay, in the immediate case before us, that what the Apostle cites as a description of the *Gospel* was in reality, as employed by Moses, the very reverse, namely, a description of the *Law*—which the Jew maintained to be sufficient for salvation?

We seem thus almost compelled to seek a different interpretation from the common for the passage quoted from Deut. xxx. 11-14, and to find in it an anticipatory intimation of the higher dispensation for which Moses' law was intended to prepare. And where should we more naturally expect to find this than in the last public exhortation which he addressed to his countrymen before his death?

Accordingly, in turning to Deut. xxx. 11-14, we are struck with this, that these words occur at the conclusion of an address, in which Moses predicts to his countrymen that the Law, inasmuch as they would not use it lawfully for its true end (of leading them from a conviction of their own weakness and ignorance to God's mercy alone for every blessing), would fail of its purpose; and only, when they had experienced it in its "curse" as well as "blessing" (xxx. 1), and, brought at length, in their dispersion among the nations, to see the folly of every dependence but God alone, they should turn unto Him for help, that then He would turn to them and "have compassion" upon them, and "*circumcise their hearts and the heart of their seed to love the Lord their God*" (xxx. 6). It seems impossible to read, in connection with these words, Jeremiah's account of the "*new (or gospel) covenant*" (comp. Heb. viii. 8-12), and not to see that both refer to the same promise: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel—and this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord, *I will put my law into their inward parts and write it in their hearts.*" Jer. xxxi. 31, 33. And again, "Behold I will gather them out of all countries whither I have driven them in mine anger and in my fury and in great wrath, and I will bring them again unto this place: . . . and I *will give them one heart* that they may fear me for ever for the good of them and their children after

them; and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them to do them good: but *I will put my fear in their hearts*, that they shall not depart from me." Jer. xxxii. 37, 40. The phraseology and whole description of Jeremiah seem evidently borrowed from, and based upon, the original passage in Deuteronomy.

The chief fault of the Israelites (as indeed of every human being), Moses warned them, would be that of not relying on God as the alone source of all *wisdom* and *power*, but making to themselves some other god or dependence. To impress this upon them he begins his discourse (Deut. xxix. 2) by reminding them that to God alone they were indebted for all that they then enjoyed: "Ye have seen all that the Lord did before your eyes in the land of Egypt unto Pharaoh," that it was God and God alone that did all for you, that you had only to "stand still and see the salvation of your God." You beheld "the great temptations which thine eyes have seen, the signs and those great miracles; yet the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day," because you feel not your own *ignorance* and *weakness* as you ought, and need of applying to God to teach and keep you. In the wilderness, Moses proceeds to say, they were led by God, and all was provided for them by Him without any care or toil of their own: "I have led you forty years in the wilderness; your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink [aught prepared by man] that *ye might know that I am* the Lord your God." Would they but look to God's "*word*" they would find in it all wisdom and strength sufficient; but alas! they would seek to forbidden sources of secret wisdom and strength, not content with what God had revealed to them, forgetting that "the secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law," xxix. 29. Moses here reminds his countrymen of a characteristic temptation into which they would be prone to fall, of a prying curiosity into things forbidden, instead of a simple belief in God's word

and practical observance of what it commanded, and of which before, in ch. xviii., he had warned them to beware. Take heed that "there shall not be found among you any one that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer" (Deut. xviii. 9-11), seeing that the Lord your God hath promised to give you all necessary instruction, and to "raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren," who "shall speak unto you all that I shall command him, and unto whom ye shall hearken," verses 15, 18. Unto whom should a people seek? as Isaiah repeats to them at a later period, "Unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and that mutter? Should not a people seek unto their God? To the *law* and to the *testimony*; if they speak not according to this *word* it is because there is no light in them," Isaiah viii. 19, 20.

But alas! (Moses proceeds to say in ch. xxx.) it will be only "when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee," and you shall be brought to feel and acknowledge your own ignorance and weakness and turn unto the Lord for help, that He "will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live" (ver. 6); only when by your own sad experience you shall be taught that by no *wisdom* or *power* of your own you can be enlightened and saved, but by simply following God's "commandment and word" (verses 11 and 14). You may be no more able to see how that law and that word can be effectual for your salvation, than in the day when you were dying of the bite of fiery serpents in the wilderness, you could understand how looking to a lifeless brazen serpent could heal you; but the same implicit faith in God's appointment and obedience are required, and simple receiving of the salvation provided for you. Not any mighty works of your own, not any depth of secret wisdom fetched from afar does God demand of you, but the simple confession with the mouth, and belief in the heart, of God's word as

sufficient to enlighten and save: "For this commandment which I command thee this day, it is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven that thou shouldest say, Who shall go up for us unto heaven and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? Neither is it beyond the sea that thou shouldest say, Who shall go over the sea for us and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it? But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it" ver. 11-14.

The slight changes that the apostle has made upon these words in quoting them, and his interpolated comments ("that is, to bring Christ down from above;" "that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead") are for the purpose merely of bringing more pointedly before his hearers their immediate application to themselves.

"See (Moses concludes), I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil" (ver. 15); "therefore choose life that both thou and thy seed may live" (ver. 19). And what is this life of which Moses speaks? It is God himself; "for He is thy *life* and the length of thy days" (ver. 20). Simple, humble faith in God as their all in all, and the source of life, wisdom, and every blessing, was that which Moses here required of his people.*

From this examination of these two chapters of Deuteronomy it will be seen, that not only is the line of exhortation remarkably similar to that of the argument pursued by St Paul in Rom. x. and xi. (as to the rejection of Israel, their final con-

* When we understand, by the "commandment" and "word" of God here, the Law, not as abused by the Jews of St Paul's day as a ground of "boasting" and self-reliance from their mere possession and outward observance of it, but as tending by the purity of its moral precepts to humble and convince the soul of sin, and by its typical sacrifices and cleansings as revealing God's designs of mercy to pardon and sanctify—why might not Moses here speak of the Law in its more enlarged sense, as involving its "end" and "fulfilment" (Mat. v. 17), as David does in his description of it in Psalm xix?

The law of the LORD is perfect—converting the soul;

The testimony of the LORD is sure—making wise the simple.

The statutes of the LORD are right—rejoicing the heart;

The commandment of the LORD is pure—enlightening the eyes.

version and restoration, and the unsearchableness of the judgments and secret things of the Lord until revealed to us), but that *faith* in God's *word*, as supplying all needed wisdom and power, and bringing both nigh to those who embrace it, is the subject of Deut. xxx. 11-14, as of Rom. x. 6-10.

Thus too the close of Moses' last address to the children of Israel is brought into striking consistency with the conclusion of the song, Deut. xxxii., which he bequeathed as his parting warning to them. For it, in like manner, testifies to them that "the Lord will judge His people" (ver. 36) for their want of faith in Him; and then only will "repent Himself for His servants," when they shall have been brought, by long and hard experience, to see the vanity of every trust but in the living God, who demands implicit and childlike faith in Himself as doing all in all, and as the alone source of salvation: "See now that I, even I am He, and there is no god with me. I kill, and I make alive; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand."*

The argument then of these verses (1-10) I conceive to be this:—

Ver. 1-4. *Faith* is the condition God requires for salvation, not "works of Law." But alas! the Jews, in their perverted zeal and "unlawful use of the Law" (1 Tim. i. 8), will not see that it shuts them up to Christ as "the end of the Law for righteousness." This it does whether regarded in the false light in which the Jews view it, or in that in which God's word has placed it.

1 (ver. 5). Let us regard it, as do the Jews, in the light of a dispensation "which could have given life" (Gal. iii. 21). The condition which it requires is perfect obedience ("The man that *doeth*," &c.) But this no man is able to render. In Christ alone perfect righteousness is to be found.

2 (ver. 6-10). Let us regard it in the light in which God's word has placed it, as a *rule* of life binding on those *already* redeemed by God's own might and wisdom.† Of His redeemed,

* See "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 271, 272.

† "I am the Lord thy God which *have brought* thee out of the land of Egypt," —*Therefore*, "Thou shalt have no other gods," &c., Exod. xx. 2, 3.

God can require nothing too hard or unattainable, so that thou shouldest say, "Who shall go up for us to heaven," &c., but will assuredly send the needed help, and bring "the word very nigh unto thee, that thou mayest do it" (Deut. xxx. 12-14), "for He [not the Law] is thy *life*" (ver. 20).

Thus will it be seen that the principle enforced by Moses in the Law (since God's mode of salvation must be the same under the Old Dispensation and the New) is *faith*—faith not in what man's own power could do, or wisdom devise, but in the salvation and righteousness which the Lord Himself should provide.

CHAPTER X. 14-21.

As stated above, in the note on ix. 33, (ὁ πιστεύων, "he that believeth"), *faith*, as the only means of salvation, is the subject of x. 1-10, after which is taken up (πᾶς, "every one," or "whosoever"), the *universality* of faith, as necessary for *every-one*. This is indicated by the repetition in verse 11 of the words of ix. 33, πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων, &c., "*Every one* that believeth on Him shall not be ashamed." But it is still more distinctly pointed out by the comment which immediately follows in verse 12, "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord over *all* is rich unto *all* that call upon Him;" and it is enforced by a quotation to the same effect in ver. 13 from another prophet, Joel ii. 32.

Πᾶς γὰρ ὅς ἀν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται.

"*Every one* that shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

The reason of St. Paul's again recurring to this subject (one of the three principal topics of the epistle, see Commentary on i. 16), the *universality* of the gospel, is to vindicate the equal offer of it made, and especially by himself, as Apostle of the Gentiles, to all indiscriminately, both Jews and Gentiles; and to remove, if possible, the prejudices against it on this account of his countrymen, who zealously claimed for themselves a superior title to the blessings of the Messiah, if

not a monopoly of them, "forbidding to speak to the Gentiles," 1 Thess. ii. 16.

Ver. 14. If their own Scriptures spake of "*every one, calling on the Lord,*" the *calling* of all, St. Paul argues, involved the *believing* of all, the *believing* implied the *hearing*, the *hearing preachers*, the *preaching* that the *preachers* should be *sent* to all, ἀποσταλῶσιν—in other words the *apostolic* mission to the Gentiles.

Ver. 15. Then, as is his wont, in arguing on any point where the prejudices of his countrymen interfered, he refers in proof of it to their own Scriptures (Isaiah lii. 7),

"How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace,
That bring glad tidings of good things!"

Ver. 16. That *all* indeed would not listen was too true, but this had been foreseen and foretold by the same prophet in the same passage, in words too referring more especially to the Jews themselves (Isaiah liii. 1.),

Τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;
Which [of us] hath believed what we heard?

Still, though all would not hear the apostles, this very passage proved they were bound to preach to all, and to let all hear;

Ver. 17.

Ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς,
Ἢ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ φήματος Θεοῦ.
So then faith cometh by hearing,
And hearing by the word of God.

No one reading the original Greek, can doubt that ἐξ ἀκοῆς, "faith cometh of *hearing*," alludes expressly to the words quoted from Isaiah, in ver. 16, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν. But as these words are usually translated, "Who hath believed our *report*?" there is no proper connection between them; and the commentators have agreed generally to ascribe to St. Paul the solecism of using the same word, ἀκοή, in two consecutive sentences, in two different meanings,* and to charge

* See especially Philippi's attempted defence of this in his comment on this verse.

him with the impropriety of deducing an inference from Isaiah's words, which in any translation of his epistle into another language must be all but unintelligible.

To vindicate the translation here offered by which the impropriety is removed, I extract from the "Symmetrical Structure of Scripture," pp. 314, 315, the remarks on the change of rendering I had there ventured to make from the authorised version of Isaiah liii. 1,

Who [of us] hath believed that which we heard?

By the common rendering, "Who hath believed our report?" the prophet is represented, rather incongruously, first as speaking in the name of the prophets who had forewarned the Jews of "the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow," and then, in the immediately subsequent verses, as classifying himself with his unbelieving countrymen who rejected the Messiah, ver. 3, "He was despised, and *we* esteemed him not," &c. A transition so sudden should not be assumed without pressing necessity. By the rendering here proposed, "Who [of us] hath believed *that which we had heard?*" this harshness is avoided, and the words become, not the complaints of the prophets on account of the unbelief of their countrymen, but the lamentation of the Jews themselves in the latter days over their long-continued blindness and infidelity, when they shall come at length in deep mourning to "look upon Him whom they have pierced." But it was the observation of the parallelism that led me principally to this interpretation. The word in the Hebrew which is rendered "our report," (שְׁמֵעָתֵנוּ) *sh'muathēnu*, is evidently chosen with a distinct reference to the verb in the previous verse (שָׁמְעוּ) *shām'u*, "they had heard," of which it is the verbal noun, and points attention to a striking antithesis between the last two lines of lii. 5, and the first two lines of liii. 1.

- LII. 15. So shall he sprinkle many nations ;
 Kings shall shut their mouths at Him ;
 a For that which had not been told them they have seen,
 b And that which they had not heard they have considered.
- LIII. 1. b Who [of us] hath believed that which we had heard ?
 a And to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed ?

Here *a* and *a* correspond, and the two central lines *b* and *b*. The Gentiles (*a*), have had their eyes opened, and “have seen” the marvellous salvation wrought by God through His Messiah, though they were prepared by no previous prophecies and dispensations of God; while (*a*), “the arm of the Lord,” so evidently manifest in it, has not been revealed to the Jews, though accustomed to the previous revelations and interpositions of Divine power. Again (*b*), what the Gentiles “had not heard” before, they at once “have considered” and believed; but (*b*), what “we had heard” so often announced to us Jews by the word of God, “who hath believed?”

When we examine accurately the use of the word שְׂמוּעָה, *sh'muah*, rendered in the Authorised version “report,” it appears rather extraordinary that a meaning should have been so generally attached to it, for which, so far as I can find, there is no authority in Scripture. It is a derivative from the verb שָׁמַע, *shama*, “to hear;” and the literal signification of the word here used is, as in the margin of the Bible, our “*hearing*” or *hearsay*. Now, as every hearer presupposes, as a correlative, a speaker or reporter, and every hearsay implies a report, it is evident that in many cases the word which really signifies “hearsay” may, without impropriety or confusion, be translated “report.” But this does not authorise us *in all cases* to regard them as identical, and to maintain that when we add a possessive pronoun for instance to the noun, “our hearsay” and “our report,” are equivalent. “Our hearsay,” is the news *which we hear* (this indeed is frequently added, as in 1 Sam. ii. 24, “it is no good report [or hearsay] *that I hear*;” 1 Kings x. 7, “the fame *which I heard*,” &c.); “our report” is the news *which we report*. In the former case we are the *hearers*; in the latter, the *reporters*. If we apply this to the instance before us, it is evident that in the words, “Who hath believed our hearsay?” the prophet speaks not in the name of the reporters or prophets, but of the repentant Jews who had *heard* the word of God, but did not till now believe.

To justify this *causative* or *Hiphil* meaning attributed to שְׂמוּעָתֵנוּ (= “what we have caused others to hear”), appeal is

made to an alleged similar signification of its Greek equivalent ἀκοή. This assertion seems equally groundless and founded on the same mistake. The instances to which Hengstenberg appeals (“Christologie, i. 322, 1st edition), are three. The first is Rom. x. 16, in which Paul has quoted the Septuagint translation of the passage before us, *τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν*. Now it is rather remarkable that the context refutes the meaning of “report” here attributed to ἀκοή. The point of the succeeding words, *ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς*, is in a great measure lost by our not possessing a proper equivalent in our language for ἀκοή. The literal translation of the context would be, “But they have not all *heard submissively* (ὑπήκουσαν), the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our *hearing* [i.e., what we have heard]. So then faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, Have they not *heard*?” Nothing can be clearer than that the *primary* reference here is not to the *reporters*, but to the *hearers*. His second example is Gal. iii. 2, “Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the *hearing* of faith?” Here Law and Faith are opposed, and the characteristic requisitions of each, *works* and *hearing*. And the Apostle demands of the Galatians, whether it was by their *working* which the Law requires, or by their *hearing*, which faith requires, that they received the Spirit. In both cases it was *they*, the Galatians that had to *work*, *they* that had to *hear*. Bengel’s note is “ἐξ ἀκοῆς πιστεως, *ex auditu fidei*. Exquisite sic denotatur natura fidei, non operantis sed *recipientis*.” Hengstenberg’s third example is not more favourable to his view; 1 Thess. ii. 13, *παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ’ ἡμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, “when ye received the word of God *which ye heard* of us.” Here, unless we will confound altogether λόγος and ἀκοή, we must consider the first as denoting the Gospel as spoken by the *preacher*, and the second as received by the *hearer*.*

* See some farther remarks confirmative of the rendering of Isaiah liii. 1. in the “Symmetrical Structure of Scripture.”

I have been much confirmed in the soundness of my conclusions by observing that Dr. Hengstenberg (to whom I had sent a copy of my work by our mutual

Ver. 18-21. St. Paul concludes the chapter by replying to two supposed objections.

1. Ver. 18. Have we not fulfilled God's purpose in giving the opportunity to all, Israel and Gentiles, to hear?

2. Ver. 19. Is it possible, if all have heard God's gospel-call, that *Israel* specially should not know [acknowledge] and receive it?

Ver. 18. 1st. "*But I say, Have they not heard? Yea, verily, their sound went,*" &c. To the question whether all, Jews and Gentiles, had not had the opportunity of hearing God's message, τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 17), the reply is taken from Psalm xix. 4, "Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." This is the second passage from this chapter to which a confident appeal is generally made, as furnishing a palpable instance of *accommodation, i.e.*, of a New Testament writer clothing his own thoughts in words taken from the Old Testament, but which, as originally employed, had no reference to the subject they are employed to illustrate in the New Testament. Such a misapplication of the Jewish Scriptures would, as has been shown in the preceding alleged case of accommodation in ver. 6-8, have been singularly out of place where the great object of the apostle is to convince his countrymen, that it has been God's intention from the first to extend the blessings of salvation equally to all the nations of the earth. To overcome the strong prejudices of the Jews against this unwelcome truth, no argument of his own, he well knew, would have the same effect as one taken from their sacred books. Hence his quotation in ix. 33 from Isaiah, "Whosoever believeth on Him," &c., repeated in x. 11; a second from Joel ii. 32 in ver. 13, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord," &c.; and a third from Isaiah liii. 1 in ver. 16, contrasting the unbelief

friend, Mr. Meyer, his English Translator), has, in the 2nd edition of his "Christology," adopted my change of rendering, both of Isaiah liii. 1, and Rom. x. 16, with the arguments in support of the change deducible from each of these passages. See "Hengstenberg's Christology," vol. ii. pp. 274, 275. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1856.

of the Jews with the conduct of "the many nations" of the previous verse, who should "see and consider what they had not been told nor had heard," lii. 15. That all therefore might "call and believe," it was necessary that they should "hear," that there should be "preachers," and that these should be "sent," ver. 14, 15. In summing up, then, his argument as to the universality of God's counsels of grace for all the ends of the earth, and in defence of his own apostolic mission to the nations, he would, we may be assured, carefully avoid weakening the force of his previous "reasoning with them out of their own Scriptures," by wresting their words to a purpose altogether alien to their true meaning.

I am happy, therefore, to have the authority of Calvin, Stier, Hengstenberg, Alford, and others, for regarding the words of Psalm xix., here quoted, as possessing a real argumentative force, when interpreted according to their genuine meaning as designed at first by the Psalmist. Calvin's words are, "I understand his quotation, therefore, according to the proper and genuine meaning of the prophet; so that the argument will be something to this effect:—God has already from the beginning of the world manifested His divinity to the Gentiles, though not by the preaching of men, yet by the testimony of His created works. For though the gospel was then silent among them, nevertheless the whole workmanship of heaven and earth did speak and make known its author by its preaching. It hence appears that the Lord even during the time that He confined the favour of His covenant to Israel, did not yet so withdraw from the Gentiles the knowledge of Himself, but that He ever kept alive some sparks of it among them. He indeed manifested Himself then more particularly to His chosen people, so that the Jews might be justly compared to domestic hearers, whom He familiarly taught as it were by His own mouth; yet as He spoke to the Gentiles by the voice of the heavens, He showed by this prelude that He designed to make Himself known at length to them also."*

* Calvin's Commentary on Rom. x. 18.

Dean Alford well remarks :—“ Psalm xix. is *a comparison of the sun and glory of the heavens with the word of God.* As far as ver. 6 the glories of nature are described : then the great subject is taken up, and the parallelism carried out to the end. So that the apostle has not, as alleged in nearly all the Commentators, merely accommodated the text allegorically, but *taken it in its context*, and followed up the comparison of the Psalm.” †

Ver. 19. The conclusion of the chapter returns to the beginning *Μὴ Ἰσραὴλ. οὐκ ἔγνω*; “*Israel! did they not know [when God called]?*”

To see the true meaning of these words, we have but to compare them with the proposition to be proved, as stated in ver. 2, 3, “I bear them [Israel] record, that they have a zeal for God, but *οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν* *not according to knowledge.* Ἄγνωστοί τε γάρ, “For *not knowing* the righteousness of God,” &c.

Thus alone too is the emphasis brought out which is laid upon Ἰσραὴλ. by its position in the sentence. While both Israel and the Gentiles heard (ver. 18), was it *Israel* that did not know, *i.e.*, recognize and acknowledge, suppl. τὸ ρῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 17), the message of God (or, as to *μὴ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν*, suppl. any of the equivalent phrases τὴν ἀκοήν, ver. 16, or τὸ ἐναγγέλιον, ver. 16, or τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, ver. 3)?—and the *Gentiles*, on the contrary, that did discern and obey? How exactly the quotations from the Old Testament agree with this view is manifest,

I was found of them that sought me not ;
 I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.
 But as to Israel he saith ;
 All day long have I stretched forth my hands
 Unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

Had the common interpretation of this passage been the true one, “Did not Israel know”—suppl. God’s intention of

• Dean Alford’s Comment. on Rom. x. 18.

calling the Gentiles and their own unbelief and rejection?—the emphasis being here on *knowing*, or *not knowing*, the arrangement of the words must have been *μη οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰσραήλ*; which is the reading of only a few MSS., and an evident correction by those who did not see the true force of the question.

Moreover, the parallelism of the two questions,

Ver. 18. Ἀλλὰ λέγω, Μη οὐκ ἤκουσαν;

Ver. 19. Ἀλλὰ λέγω, Μη Ἰσραήλ οὐκ ἔγνω;

naturally suggests to the reader to supply the same noun (*τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*, &c.) to the latter verb, as to the former. The common interpretation would have required *τοῦτο* to be added to the latter verb, if the reference was intended to ver. 18, “Yea, verily, Their sound went,” &c.

I am happy to find that I have one Commentator (and one of the very best of modern Commentators on the Romans), Philippi, who has taken the same view of the passage that, for the reasons assigned, occurred to myself. Dr. Heinr. A. W. Meyer, however, objects that Philippi’s interpretation is contrary to the critical canon that “with *μη* interrogative a *negative* answer is always expected—and, consequently, with *μη οὐκ* an *affirmative*.”

There is, however, no departure from the rule in the interpretation now proposed. The reply *expected* to the questions in vers. 18 and 19, is in both cases affirmative, though in the one case the expectation is realized, in the other disappointed.

Ver. 18. *Μη οὐκ ἤκουσαν*; “No? it was *not surely* that they [all] did not hear?” *i.e.*, “All surely heard?” The expected affirmative answer is confirmed:—“Yea, verily, their sound went into all the earth,” &c.

Ver. 19. *Μη Ἰσραήλ οὐκ ἔγνω*; “No? it was *not surely* that Israel did not know,” *i.e.*, *Israel* surely knew [God’s call]?” The *expected* affirmative:—“Yes, verily, Israel knew and recognized God’s call”—is, alas! reversed by the sad reality, which had been foreseen and foretold by Moses and the prophets: “First, Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy,” &c.

It need scarce be remarked how common the meaning

here assigned to "know" [=to *recognise, acknowledge*] is in Scripture; *e.g.*, "If thou hadst *known*—the things which belong unto thy peace," Luke xix. 42; "because thou *knewest* not the time of thy visitation," ver. 44; "and yet hast thou not *known* me, Philip?" John xiv. 9; "The world hath not *known* thee," John xvii. 25; "they have not *known* my ways," Heb. iii. 10.

CHAPTER XI.

VERSES 25-32.

25. For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this
 Lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, [mystery,
 That blindness in part is happened to Israel,
 Until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in,
 26. And so all Israel shall be saved.

It may be well to mark the points of correspondence in the parallel lines of this five-lined stanza which may not at once strike the student: thus

Mystery concerning Israel.	Israel.
Bearing on the Gentiles' conduct.	Gentiles.
<i>Partial</i> blindness for a time.	Israel.
Bearing on the Gentiles' destinies.	Gentiles.
<i>All</i> Israel at last saved.	Israel.

In like manner in the quatrain, vers. 26, 27,

26. There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer,
 And shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob;
 27. For this is my covenant unto them,
 When I shall take away their sins;

the correspondences are:

Covenant-promise.
Removal of sin.
Covenant-promise.
Removal of sin.

Again in the six-lined stanza, vers. 30-32 :

30. For as ye in times past were disobedient to God,
 Yet have now obtained mercy through their disobedience ;
 31. Even so have these also now been disobedient,
 That through your mercy they also may obtain mercy.
 32. For God hath shut-up all in disobedience,
 That He might have mercy upon all ;

the correspondences are :

Disobedience.
 Mercy.
 Disobedience.
 Mercy.
 Disobedience.
 Mercy.

VERSES 33-36.

St. Paul concludes the Dispensational Division as he had done the Doctrinal, with a grand poetical outburst of rapturous admiration, extorted from him by the magnificence of the views which had just been opened up to his mind of the glorious plan and dispensations of God. Yet how little has its beauty generally been understood or felt ! Many see in it but an expression of awe at the dark and mysterious depth of God's unfathomable counsels of predestination, which forbid instead of inviting our contemplation. Nothing can be a more total misapprehension of St. Paul's meaning. He does not represent the depths of God's riches and wisdom and knowledge as totally incomprehensible to us in every degree, and under all circumstances ; but, on the contrary, after making to us a revelation of God's wondrous attributes and ways, (so totally unsearchable, indeed, by our own unassisted power, and past finding out till it pleases God to reveal them to His creatures), he calls upon the Romans, and all intelligent Christians, to contemplate and adore with him their profundity and magnificence, and to strive to "comprehend with all saints what is their breadth, and length, and depth, and height."

It is indeed the predestination of God that calls forth the admiring exclamation of the apostle. But the predestination of which he speaks is not the dark and fearful mystery it is often represented, from the contemplation of which we shrink back, as if God, by some awful sovereign decree, chooses out some to eternal life, but hardens the rest arbitrarily without their being in the least more guilty than the others, or having any probation or choice given them in the matter. Neither here, nor in chapter ix., as we have shown, does he teach any such "horrible decree," as Calvin has well termed it.* The predestination of which St. Paul's writings are so full, is God's predestination or pre-arrangement of the whole scheme of redemption, and His gracious purposes of mercy for the restoration of a fallen world. "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning." He did not form man and place him in a state of trial with any uncertainty as to whether he would stand or fall. No; He foresaw the fall with all its consequences. He saw the fearful and desperate state of corruption and impotency into which man would fall, and provided a full and efficient remedy for all his necessities. The Lamb of God was slain in the Divine purpose from the foundation of the world. All the dispensations of God, the whole history of the world till the time Christ came, was but an unfolding of God's scheme of redemption, and a preparation for its accomplishment. "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son," Gal. iv. 4. And this was but a new starting-point; for St. Paul is enabled by the Spirit to look forward, and opens up to our view the future ordering of God's providence, by which He will certainly bring to pass His intentions of mercy to all, Jews and Gentiles, leading them to Christ by a way that they know not, and drawing them to Himself in complete conformity with that freedom of will and responsibility with which He has endowed His creatures.

In accordance with this view, the apostle, in Rom. viii. 28, tells us that "all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His

* See his *Institutio Christiane Religionis*, lib. iii., cap. xxiii. 7.

purpose." Nothing can be more encouraging or consolatory to the humble believer than this Scripture doctrine of Predestination. All has been foreknown, all foreseen, all prearranged in God's gracious purpose. God cannot be taken at unawares. He knows His creatures—their depravity, their weakness, their backsliding hearts; but He has provided a salvation adequate for every want and weakness, and which will carry on to perfection the work in all those whom He has foreseen to be susceptible of salvation. Every step in this progress has been prearranged. "Whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified," Rom. viii. 29, 30. No enemy, no unforeseen occurrence, can defeat God's purpose. In this prearranged and predestinated scheme, each individual has his preordained place according as God foresaw that he would yield himself to His regenerating spirit, or reject the counsel of God against His own soul, and do despite unto the Spirit of grace. Each is made to subserve God's great purpose, either by his submission or resistance. The very wrath of man is made to praise Him, and to work out His grand scheme; whether it be an individual like Pharaoh, "raised up" by Him, and set in a place of power that God might show His "power" in his overthrow; or a whole people, as the Jews, "taking, and by wicked hands, crucifying and slaying" the Son of God; in every instance, they but fulfil what "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts ii. 23) had "determined before to be done" (iv. 28).

The apostle proceeds, in chaps. ix.-xi., to consider the rejection of the Jews. It might at first sight appear strange that they who had been so highly favoured were now to be cast off from being the people of God, while the Gentiles were to be taken in their stead. But all this, he shows, had been completely foreseen and predicted by God. The rejection of the Jews was on account of their hardness of heart and unbelief, and refusing to submit themselves to the righteousness and method of justification appointed by God. Still, St. Paul

shows, God overruled their wickedness and rejection for the advancement of the Gospel. Their fall was made the riches of the Gentiles. The casting away of them became the reconciling of the world. In like manner, by the mercy shown to the Gentiles, the Jews, he says, shall hereafter receive mercy ; for the Gentiles, by their admission into the covenant, shall provoke the Jews to jealousy, and occasion their seeking to be restored again to their former place as the people of God ; and their deep humility and devotedness on their restoration will in its turn react on the slumbering faith of the Gentiles, and be like "life from the dead" to the whole world. "For God hath shut up all to unbelief" (ἀπειθείαν, disobedience, ver. 32) *i.e.*, shall bring all, Jews as well as Gentiles, to a conviction of their sin, and a feeling of their need of redemption—"that He might have mercy upon all,"—that all may be rendered susceptible of receiving His grace, and the justification of the Gospel, which is given to *faith in Christ*, *i.e.*, to a complete renunciation of all faith in one's self, or in anything we ourselves can do, and an entire reliance on Christ's power and fulness, from a sense of our own utter weakness and poverty.

It is in adoring contemplation of this deep and wondrous plan of God (by which, in the dispensations of His providence, unfathomable to our reason but for His revelation of it, He has been leading the Gentiles to faith in Christ, and will hereafter bring in His ancient people, the Jews,) that St. Paul exclaims (chap. xi. 33-36), "O the depth of the *riches*," that is of the boundless amplitude of God's love, and the fulness of the blessings conferred in the Gospel ; "and of the *wisdom*," shown in devising the most effectual means for accomplishing His purposes of grace, and adapting them to the necessities of man ; "and of the *knowledge* of God," in the vast sweep of Divine comprehension that could take in the wide extent and endless bearings of the fall, as well as the remedies necessary for its reversal, so as to provide a Saviour able "to save to the uttermost," and under every conceivable circumstance, "them that come unto God by Him" (Heb. vii. 25).

Observe the beautifully artificial arrangement of this passage, as given in the Analytical Commentary.

“ Having proposed the subject—

O the depth of the riches, and of the wisdom, and of the knowledge of God, he first enlarges on the quality of *depth*, which he had attributed alike to God’s riches, and wisdom, and knowledge :

How unsearchable are His judgments,
And His ways past finding out !

Riches, wisdom, and knowledge, are then, in a fine epanodos, enlarged upon in the inverted order ; first, knowledge :

For who hath known the mind of the Lord ?

secondly, wisdom :

Or who hath been his counsellor ?

thirdly, riches :

Or who hath first given to Him,
And it shall be recompensed unto him again ? ” *

Finally, returning again to the original subject, the *Depth* of these attributes of God (a)—on which he had enlarged as his central subject, (a)—he closes with it (a), ascribing all riches, all wisdom, and all knowledge, to God :

FOR OF HIM, and THROUGH Him, and TO Him are all things.

He is the beginning, middle, and end of all—the Author, Director, and Final Cause of all created existence. “ ‘ OF Him are all things,’ as their eternal source ; ‘ THROUGH Him are all things,’ inasmuch as He brings all to pass which in His eternal counsels He purposed ; ‘ TO Him are all things, as being His own last End ;’ the manifestation of the glory of His own perfections being the ultimate, because the highest possible, design of all His procedure from first to last.” †

* See Bishop Jebb’s Sacred Literature, pp. 117-121.

† Commentary on the Romans, by David Brown, D.D.

CHAPTER XII. 14-21.

The greater part of this passage evidently inculcates love towards enemies. Verses 15 and 16, however, seem at first sight to be altogether unconnected precepts. But when we remark how exactly parallel the concluding words in ver. 21 are to those of ver. 14, with which the passage opens,

14. Bless them which persecute you :
 Bless and curse not.
 21. Be not overcome of evil,
 But overcome evil with good,

we cannot believe that St Paul broke the connection by the intercalation of an altogether irrelevant subject. We shall thus, I think, be led to perceive that the duty of "blessing our enemies," and "overcoming their evil with our good," is inculcated in a very beautiful manner in verses 15 and 16, by calling upon us to sympathize with the erring, from a fellow-feeling of our own weakness and liability to the same infirmities and temptations as others. If we remember that, but for God's mercy to us in softening our hearts, we might have been as blind opposers of the truth and persecutors as others; instead of looking on our persecutors with anger, we shall regard them with pity, and strive by every means of forbearance and love to soften them and win them to the truth. It is to this fellow-feeling of their being men "of like passions" with ourselves, that St Paul here appeals, and calls on us to enter into the thoughts and feelings one of another, making them, as it were, our own;

15. "Rejoice with them that do rejoice.
 And weep with them that weep,
 16. Having the same mind one toward another"—

ἑταροῦντες, the participle, showing that "Having the same mind," &c., is closely connected with "Rejoice," &c. = entering into the circumstances of others, and in the case of enemies, there-

fore, making the same allowance for their feelings as if they were our own ;

“ Not being high-minded,
But condescending to the lowly ;*
Be not wise in your own conceits”—

as if you were wiser or better than others but for the grace of God, or could not fall into as great sins as they.

That such is the meaning of this last phrase, will be evident from comparison with Rom. xi. 25, where the very same phrase, “ lest ye should be wise in your own conceits,” is used, to warn the Gentiles against entertaining high-minded thoughts of themselves, when they regarded the blindness and rejection that had come upon the Jews (see the same argument in Gal. vi. 1),

17. “ Recompensing [therefore] to no man evil for evil,
[But] studying things good in the eyes of all men ;”

that ye may commend the truth by your practice (compare xiv. 16, “ Let not then your *good* be evil spoken of,” and Matt. v. 16, “ Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your *good* works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven”); thus “ overcoming evil with your *good*.”

CHAPTER XV. 4-6.

The Apostle has just (in ver. 3) applied to Christ the quotation from Ps. lxix. 9, “ The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell upon me.” From this, in ver. 4, he infers, “ For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through *the* patience and *the* comfort, διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως, of the Scriptures, might have hope.” The obvious conclusion from this connection surely is, that “ *the* patience and *the* comfort of the Scriptures” here mentioned must be found in the psalm from which

* Still *participles* in these two lines, φρονούντες, συναπαγόμενοι.

the quotation was taken. Further, it seems plain, that this patience and this comfort, under the reproaches endured for God's sake, must have formed part of the experience of *Christ Jesus*—as typified by the sufferer in the Psalm; for the words that immediately follow in ver. 5 are, "Now the God of patience and comfort grant you to be like-minded one toward another, *according to Christ Jesus,*" *i.e.*, after the example of Christ.

It is, then, by the example of Christ, as set before them in the psalm, that His followers are called upon to sacrifice their own feelings, and not seek their own pleasure, but to accommodate themselves to the weakness and imperfections of others, for the edification of that body for which Christ toiled and denied Himself, and forebore, and endured reproach—encouraged by the hope that God will impart to them similar patience and comfort, as He did to their Master while on earth.

I think that a beautiful allusion to this psalm has been missed by overlooking this connection. More passages are cited from Psalm lxix. in the New Testament, as applicable to Christ, than from any other, so that we seem justified in considering the sufferer of the psalm as typical of the Messiah. The description given of him applies in a striking manner to the Saviour. So intensely desirous is he represented for the glory of God, that "zeal for God's house had eaten him up," and "the reproaches of them that reproached God are fallen upon him" (ver. 9); and so desirous is he of saving others from their opposition to God, and bringing them to His service, that he "wept and chastened his soul with fasting" (ver. 10) for their sins. In accordance with this zeal for God's house, and for building up the spiritual temple of the Lord, St Paul calls upon us Christians (xv. 2) "not to please ourselves, but every one to please his neighbour for his edification," or the building up in the faith of weak believers, that they may become living stones in the spiritual temple of the Lord. If, in their anxiety to promote God's cause, they might have, like Christ, to endure reproaches from His enemies, he holds out to them the encouragement derived from

the example in the psalm, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through the patience and the comfort of the Scriptures might have hope," ver. 4. The source of the two principal expressions in this passage, τῆς ὑπομονῆς and τῆς παρακλήσεως, "*the patience* and *the comfort* of the Scriptures," repeated emphatically in ver. 5 as having their source in God, we find apparently in the Septuagint translation of this psalm (lxviii. in the Septuagint), ver. 20, in ὑπέμενα, "I looked," or *waited patiently*, for one to take pity—the verb from which is derived the noun ὑπομονή, *patience*—and in παρακαλοῦντα, "a *comforter*"—from which comes παράκλησις, "*comfort*." But though he *waited patiently* for a *comforter*, none such (the sufferer says) he found among men—as Christ in His last sufferings found himself alone, and forsaken even by His own disciples. In his extremity, then, he turns to God (ver. 29), "Let thy salvation, O God, set me up on high,"—the experience of which will call forth a song of praise (ver. 30), "I will praise the name of God with a song," &c. And in the full assurance that in his patiently waiting for God he will find in Him a "*Comforter*" and deliverer, he adds (ver. 32), "The humble shall see this and be glad, and your heart shall live that seek God."

It is this *patient waiting*, then, of Christ, and this *comfort* which He received, that Paul calls on us here to imitate, "that we through the patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." And he prays (ver. 5) "Now may the God of patience and comfort [that gives and rewards patience, and imparts comfort] grant you that ye be like-minded one toward another, according to [the example of] Christ Jesus, that"—like as Christ in the psalm calls upon "the humble that seek God" to join in one universal song of praise unto "the Lord that heareth the poor and will save Zion,"

Ver. 34. "Let the heaven and earth praise Him.

The seas, and everything that moveth therein"—

so, "ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ" (ver. 6).

DISSERTATION

ON PREDESTINATION AND FREEWILL.

THE difficulty of reconciling the antagonistic truths of Predestination and Freewill has exercised the minds of men from an early period. The danger is of stating the one truth, or rather the inferences thought to be deducible from it, in terms so extreme as virtually to exclude the other; either of so magnifying God's Predestination as to destroy man's freewill and responsibility, or of so magnifying man's freewill as to make God dependent on His creature, and man to be the author of his own salvation.

Before entering on this much vexed question, let it be premised that the difficulties connected with predestination can with no fairness be charged specially to Revelation, as any presumption against it, since they equally affect all religions and all philosophies; and in selecting the Westminster Confession of Faith as an exponent of the doctrine, all who are acquainted with the strong statements of that document on the subject will allow that, if these are shown to be consistent both with sound reason and with Scripture, and with God's perfections as well as with man's responsibility, the difficulties of the question have been fairly met.

The following observations are offered not in the vain expectation of solving the *intrinsic* difficulties necessarily connected with mysteries far transcending the grasp of our finite minds, but in the humble hope of clearing away some of the *factitious* difficulties which human speculations have superadded; and more particularly for the purpose of pointing out the palpable distinction, which has been so generally overlooked, between predestination to good, and fore-ordination to evil; between election as originating with God, and reprobation as originating with the creature; and thence deducing the consequences which flow from this important distinction.

The distinction itself is manifestly implied in the following

carefully weighed statement of the Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 1. (1). "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass: yet (2), so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away but rather established." Here both sides of the question seem to receive their due weight, (1). God's free predestination is strongly asserted, and yet (2) man's free-will duly maintained. *All things* are declared to be ordained from eternity by God, good or bad, yet with this most important distinction, that while God is the *author*, that is, the *originating* cause of all that is good, He is not "the author of sin," that is, the originating cause of the evil in the hearts of His creatures.

But if God is not "the author of sin," the creature must be its author. God has delegated to man* a portion of his own power, however small, yet sufficient to constitute him an independent agent by giving him a will which can *originate* an act opposed to God's will. Sin is the breaking off of the creature's will from God's will. But God's will cannot oppose His own will: it must therefore be the self-willed and self-originated act of the creature. God is the source of all good, and of good only. Hence we deduce the universal principle,

All good originates from God.

All evil originates from the creature.

If this principle be kept steadily in view, it will dissipate much of the error and difficulty that have gathered around the subjects of our inquiry.

Predestination is thus divested of its most objectionable aspect. All things are predestinated by God, both good and evil, but not *pre-necessitated*, that is, *causally* preordained by

* Satan, it may be objected, originated sin. True; and this proves our proposition that not God, but the creature, is the author of sin. But in the case of the first commencement of man's sin, the temptation indeed originated with Satan, but the yielding to that temptation was the act of man's own free-will. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of *his own* lust, and enticed," James i. 14.

Him, unless we would make God "the author of sin." Predestination is thus an indifferent word, in as far as the *originating* author of anything is concerned,* God being the originator of good, but the creature of evil. Predestination, therefore, means that God included in His plan of the world every act of every creature, good or bad. Having decreed to create free-will beings, that is, creatures having the power of breaking off, or not breaking off, that state of creaturely dependence of their wills on His holy will, and of union to Himself in which He had formed them, and knowing what each in the exercise of his free-will would choose, even though it were the evil, He included it in His plan, and to this extent foreordained it, over-ruling it to subserve His own wise and holy purposes. If in one sense, therefore, He may be considered as the first

* Predestination, as *generally* understood, includes both good and evil. The distinction (afterwards adverted to) made by the authors of the Westminster Confession of Faith, and of the Authorized Version, between Predestination and Foreordination, by confining the former to the foreordination of the Elect only, while Foreordination includes evil as well as good, has not been generally observed; otherwise it might perhaps have prevented the neglect of the important distinction on which we insist.

That the error should so generally have passed current of attributing a *causal* import to predestination, in defiance of the principle admitted by all, that God, although He predestinates everything, is yet not "the author of sin," need not excite so much surprise, when we reflect on the inveteracy with which an error, of a somewhat similar nature in grammar, still retains its place—of denominating the participle of *continuing* or *imperfect* action, "writing," "*scribens*," "*γράφων*," a *present* participle, notwithstanding the palpable inconsistency of applying such a term to the expressions, "He *was* writing," "he *shall be* writing." "He *is* writing," is indeed *present*: but in the former of the other two instances, "writing" is *past*, and in the latter *future*—proving that the imperfect participle "writing," implies in itself no time, but expresses only the *continuance* of the action of the verb, and which is present, past, or future, according to the verb with which it is connected.

The origin of the error in this case seems to be that in using the participle "writing," we more frequently conceive of ourselves as being *present* at the act when going on. So in predestination the more frequent conception regards the foreordination of the *Elect* to salvation: and because, with it is also combined (though a perfectly distinct question) a direct *causal* influence of God, which originates, carries on, and perfects the work of salvation in the Elect, the idea has been improperly extended to the predestination of the reprobate, as if some *causal* influence were exerted by God in His decreeing or permissively pre-ordaining their foreseen perseverance in sin and consequent condemnation.

cause of all, yet is He but the *permissive*, not the *causative* or *originating* author of sin.

To make this distinction clearer, let it be observed that no act *in itself* is sinful—that is, no *outward* act, as distinguished from an act of volition. The character of every act depends on the disposition or motives from which it proceeds. The same act may be good or bad according to the intention of the agent. Every act of every creature in truth is in so far executed by God. He it is that lends the power, that nerves the hand, that upholds the will. “In him we live and move and have our being,” and we cannot do a single act, good or bad, without Him. Every act of the creature therefore is, in a certain sense, also an act of God—even the most wicked; namely, in as far as He permits it, and gives the power for its performance. But it is wicked, only in as far as man’s will and intention are concerned: on the part of God, it is good, being permitted only as made to issue in the wisest and best ends. Thus the most heinous exhibition of man’s depravity ever perpetrated, the crucifixion of our Lord, was on the part of God the highest manifestation of His love and goodness ever made to the universe, and *as such* was permitted and predestinated by Him.*

* There need therefore be no difficulty in conceiving the distinction between God’s *permissively*, and *causally* predestinating an action. If God, as all allow, can *permit* an act of sin in His creatures, of which, as being originated by them, He is not the causal but only the permissive author; it cannot be hard to conceive that such an act has been only permissively, not causally *fore-ordained* by Him.

The *certainty* of the fulfilment of all God’s purposes ought to be carefully distinguished from their *necessity*—that is, from any supposed causal influence on the part of God as requisite in all cases to ensure their certainty. It is an unwarrantable limitation of God’s foreknowledge to deny that He can with *certainty* foresee what He leaves dependent on the free-will of His creatures, and can adjust it so as to work out infallibly His own pre-arranged purposes. The Westminster Confession of Faith stands entirely free from this fundamental error, into which both Calvin and Jonathan Edwards have fallen. See ch. v. 2. “Although in relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immutably and infallibly; yet, by the same providence, He ordereth them to fall out according to the nature of second causes either necessarily, *freely*, or *contingently*.” The authors of the Confession evidently saw no inconsistency between the fore-ordination of God and the free-will of His creatures.

God's free predestination and man's freewill both met in one and the same act. "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of *God*, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain," Acts ii. 23.

Man, therefore, in as far as his volition and intention are concerned is an *originating* cause or author. He originated sin at first: he originates the resistance to the strivings of God's Spirit that would rescue him from sin and renew his nature. He has the awful power given to him to resist to the uttermost and quench God's Spirit, and to reject the counsels of God against his own soul; and God cannot withdraw this power without undoing His own work and destroying man's free agency and responsibility.

Election and Reprobation will thus be seen not to be exact contraries.

Election originates in the free grace of God.

Reprobation originates in the free-will of man.

To God belongs the whole glory of the salvation of the Elect.

To man belongs the whole responsibility of the ruin of the Reprobate.

Thus is the main point for which the Calvinist is so zealously vindicated, viz., that the whole glory of man's salvation from first to last is wholly attributable to God's "mere free grace and love," and not to anything fore-seen in the creature "moving Him thereunto."*

But so far is the opposite of this from being true, as has been too hastily assumed, viz., that the doom of the reprobate is in like manner owing merely to the sovereignty of God, and not to anything special foreseen in the creature "moving Him thereunto," that the very reverse is the case. It is with the creature that the evil originates; it is with the creature that persistence in it rests, not with God; and to the continued resistance, foreseen by God and fore-ordained by Him *permissively* and not *causatively*, of the obstinately impenitent to all the strivings of God's Spirit with them, it is to be ascribed that God decrees "to pass them by, and to ordain them to

* Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 5.

dishonour and wrath for *their sin*, to the praise of His glorious justice.”*

This most important distinction as to the origination of good and evil, and its recognition in God's decrees, are frequently indicated in scripture. Thus, in speaking of the “vessels of wrath,” and the “vessels of mercy” in Rom. ix. 22, 23, there is a most marked distinction made by St. Paul. Of the former he uses the passive participle “fitted to destruction,” *κατηρητισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν*; while of the latter, the “vessels of mercy,” the active voice of the verb is used, and the preparation is directly attributed to God as the originating author, by the words, “which *He had afore prepared* unto glory,” *ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν*. We have a very striking instance in Matt. xxv. 34, 41, in the distinction made by our Saviour between the sentence which He will pass at the last day on those on His right hand, and that on those on His left. To the former the address is, “Come, ye blessed,” to the latter, “Depart, ye cursed;” but how significant the addition to the former, “Come, ye blessed of *My Father*,” contrasted with its omission to the latter!—not, “Depart, ye cursed of *My Father*,” but simply, “Depart from me, ye cursed,”—to remind His hearers that while the blessing upon the one was all of God, the curse upon the other was solely of themselves. Not less significant is the departure from strict parallelism in the remainder of the verdict, “Inherit the kingdom prepared *for you* from the foundation of the world,” contrasted with, “Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared *for the devil and his angels*.” In the case of the saved, the kingdom is stated expressly to have been designed for them: “Inherit [as the intended heirs] the kingdom prepared *for you*,” but in the case of the lost, “the everlasting fire” is said to be “prepared” not for *you*, but “for *the devil and his angels*.” In the former case the blessing proceeds from a predestinating purpose “according to the good pleasure of His will” formed “before the foundation of the world,” marking God's gracious design in the creation of His responsible creatures: in the latter the

* Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 7.

reprobate are represented as rendering themselves amenable to a punishment not prepared for them, but for the malignant enemies of God and man.

And so generally throughout Scripture, wherever the opposite dooms of the righteous and the wicked are mentioned, we usually find the former ascribed to God, the latter to men themselves: thus, "The wicked shall go away into eternal *punishment* [due as that which they have *earned* for themselves], but the righteous into eternal [not *reward*—which would have been the proper antithesis to "punishment"—but] *life*." Mat. xxv. 46. "The *wages* of sin is death; but [not the *wages*, but] the *gift* of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vi. 23.

Even when it is stated that a *wicked* act of man had been foreordained, as in Acts ii. 22, that it was "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" that Jesus was "delivered" up to death, still God's counsel respects not so much man's act by which it was brought about, as God's gracious purpose of redemption, which He overruled man's criminal crucifixion of Christ to work out; and so far from God's foreordination of this event being represented as exerting any *causal* influence over the Jews to lead them to the perpetration of this fearful iniquity, St Peter charges the full responsibility of it on the Jews, as being the guilty authors: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, *ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.*"

We find the Election of believers, but never the Reprobation of the unbeliever, referred to the *εὐδοκία*, "*good pleasure*" of God's will, Eph. i. 5, 9; Phil. ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 11; and so in the Shorter Catechism, Quest. 20, "God having, out of His *mere good pleasure* [in the corresponding Quest. 30 of the Larger Catechism, "of His *mere love and mercy*"] *elected* some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace," &c. Election is a *spontaneous* act of God's own benevolence, uncalled for by anything in the creature "*moving* Him thereunto." Reprobation is a *judicial* act of God, *forced* upon Him by the hard-hearted obstinacy of the impenitent "*mov-*

ing him thereunto." The authors of the Westminster Confession of Faith (chap. iii. 3, 4, 5, 8, x. 1), of the Larger Catechism (Quest. 12, 13), and of the Shorter (Quest. 7), have evidently felt and hinted at this distinction, by their restricting the term *Predestination* to designate God's counsels with regard to the elect alone, while *Fore-ordination* is the word employed to include all the wicked as well as the righteous. We may add the translators of the Authorized Version of the Bible—compare Rom. viii. 29, 30, and Eph. i. 5, 11, with Acts iv. 28, in which last passage the rendering is "determined beforehand," although the Greek verb is the same, *προορίζειν*, which is used in all the other passages. The highly Calvinistic Synod of Dort repudiates and "detests with its whole heart" the opinion that "in the same manner as Election is the source and cause of faith and good works, Reprobation is the cause of unbelief and ungodliness" (Acta Synod. Dordrechtanæ, p. 275). Peter Dumoulin, in a paper which he read before the Synod, says, "If God has predestinated the Elect to faith, it does not follow that He has predestinated the Reprobate to unbelief. In the order of things, impenitence precedes reprobation; but faith is subsequent to election, as being one of its effects." Ibid. p. 294.

The distinction to which attention has been drawn will, I believe, if followed out to its legitimate consequences, furnish a satisfactory reply to all the objections usually urged against the views of Predestination and Election set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which has been the object of frequent animadversions of late, as if no longer tenable amidst the enlightenment of the present age.

And in order to limit the field of our remarks on this extensive subject, let us confine our attention to the case of those to whom Christ is proposed for acceptance. The question as to the final state of Heathens and of those who have not had the means of knowing the gospel, is one of useless and unauthorized speculation, being among those "secret things that belong unto the Lord our God." All that it behoves us to know with regard to these is, that, as Christians, we

are bound to use every means to extend the knowledge of Christ's salvation to all, and to preach the gospel so far as it is in our power to every creature. But with regard to those whom the knowledge of the truth has never reached, and who, as the Confession of Faith states, "are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word," (chap. x. 3), it were presumptuous in us to exclude them from salvation, and to limit the influences of the Holy "Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth."* (Ibid.) All such we may safely leave to the uncovenanted mercies of God, assured that "the Judge of all the earth will do right," and that each will finally be judged, not according to that which he had not, but according to that which he had.

Limiting, then, our consideration to Christian countries, and to those to whom the gospel offer is known, let us advert to some of the objections generally urged against the doctrine laid down in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

I. It is said, *The view given of Election limits the highest attribute of God, LOVE. It represents Him as confining His grace and salvation to a favoured few, while He denies them to others. "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, He is pleased in His appointed and accepted time effectually to call, by His word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ," &c. (Chap. x. 1.)*

Now, in the first place, if we believe that salvation is *in fact* limited to a certain number, and that there are some who shall be eternally lost, no sound objection can be brought against the fulness of God's love from the mere circumstance that what takes place in time should have formed part of the purposes and predestinating decrees from all eternity of that

* If a sweeping sentence of condemnation is passed upon all Gentiles on the ground that Scripture has distinctly said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that *believeth not* shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 16); are those who thus argue prepared to include in the same sentence all children that die in infancy, as being born in sin, and incapable of believing?

God with whom there is no time, but all past, present, and future, forms one eternal NOW. On this point we cannot do better than quote the following excellent remarks of Professor Crawford. "The purposes of God are but His actions in prior intention; and His actions are but His purposes in actual accomplishment. . . . Now, inasmuch as it is fully believed by all Christians that God's actual procedure—though to our minds it be often mysterious—is wise and just and good and holy; they needs must ascribe the same characteristics to His eternal purposes, by which that actual procedure, and nothing else, was predetermined. They cannot consistently regard it as objectionable that God should have previously resolved to do those self-same things in which, when He actually does them, they believe that there is nothing objectionable."*

Again, "men are exceedingly apt, when speaking or hearing of 'the decrees of God,' to attach to them the idea of *express commands* or *peremptory enactments*, by which the will of some uncontrollable sovereign is authoritatively declared and rigidly enforced, or otherwise to ascribe to them some direct and potent influence in bringing to pass the events to which they relate. This, however, is altogether a misconception. The decrees of God are merely His purposes. He alone, except when they are prophetically announced, is cognisant of them; and He alone, if we may so speak, is influenced by them. They are God's secret designs for the regulation of His own procedure. *But they are not rules or laws prescribed for the guidance of others; still less are they powers or agencies exerted for the coercion of others.* Considered in themselves, they are confined to God alone; and they must first have had effect given to them in His actual doings—in other words, they must have ceased to be mere purposes, by being carried out and embodied in action—before any other being in the universe can be influenced by them. It is a gross error, therefore, to speak of the purposes of God *as exercising a compulsory influence on His creatures.*

* "The Fatherhood of God," by Thomas J. Crawford, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. Appendix p. 424. 2d edition.

For, in fact, it is not by His purposes at all, but only by His actual procedure, that any influence, whether compulsory or otherwise, can be exerted upon us.”*

We ought therefore to put away entirely from our view the priority to their actual execution of God’s purposes of Election or Reprobation, as most liable to lead to false conceptions and inferences—and to acquiesce in the conclusion that whatever is right for God to do, must be equally right for Him to decree; and that His decrees exert no control over man’s free will, since we cannot for a moment suppose that God omitted to include in His decrees whatever is necessary for the free exercise of the responsibility of the creatures whom He was about to bring into existence.

Still it will be urged,—“This does not touch the real objection. In His *actual procedure* God is represented as showing mercy to some which He refuses to others in exactly similar circumstances, all being sinners. In Scripture God is represented as ‘good to all : and His tender mercies, as over all His works,’ (Psalm cxlv. 9). He ‘will have all men to be saved,’ (1 Tim. ii. 4), and is ‘not willing that any sinner should perish,’ (2 Pet. iii. 9). But according to the Calvinistic view, He is represented as singling out as He pleases some of the objects of His love, and passing by others without giving them equal chance with the favoured few. *He could, if He chose, save all, and yet will not save all.*”

Now, here—in this last proposition, which is incautiously conceded by the defenders of the Confession, as if it were an incontrovertible axiom—lies the great fundamental error, which it is most necessary in the present time to expose. No wonder that those who take this opinion for granted, and feel justly confident at the same time of this as an unquestionable truth, that God’s love is impartial and boundless, should indulge in dreams of universal salvation, and refuse to entertain, as so many do at present, may reject with scorn the very idea of the eternity of future punishment, however expressly stated in Scripture (Mat. xxv. 46), and deem it incumbent on them to give a forced interpretation to the phrase “eternal,” exclusive of its plain obvious meaning of *endless* or *everlasting*. Any

* Crawford on the “Fatherhood of God,” Appendix, p. 427.

theory, it must be acknowledged, stands self-condemned that limits any of God's perfections, except (and this is in reality no exception or limitation) in what would involve a self-contradiction. Now, here it is that we find the solution of the apparent difficulty, in the fallacy passing unobserved of the assertion that God "*could*, if He chose, save all," and not seeing that it involves a self-contradiction. Few seem to have realized to themselves what the true nature of free will is, or wherein the real difficulty of the problem consists of the reconciliation of predestination and God's agency with man's free will and responsibility. They seem to think that God has but to will it, and the hearts of all would be instantly changed. If this were correct, why does He not change all? and where were the need for all the complex and wonderful combination of moral means and motives displayed in the scheme of redemption, to accomplish what a word could effect?

It has been forgotten what is involved in the very creation of a freewill being. It is the endowment of a creature with a power that may form a volition contrary to God's holy will, and may by its own free act break off from its normal condition of creaturely dependence on God's will, and resist obstinately and finally, if it so determines, every effort of God for its recovery and reunion with Him; since by the very terms and essential character of a *freewill being*, God precludes Himself from putting forth His mere power to effect a change, unless He would undo His own work, and be chargeable with self-contradiction. God has thus, so to speak, limited His own power. But in truth there is no real limitation either of His omnipotence or sovereignty. It detracts not from His omnipotence to say that He cannot do and undo a thing at the same time; that He cannot both give and withdraw a power at the same moment. It is no infringement on His sovereignty, if it is He Himself that thus limits Himself, unless we will maintain that in every thing God creates and endows with certain properties His sovereignty is infringed, since in creating a lion He precludes Himself from making it an eagle, so long as it continues to be a lion.

In this sense there are many things that God cannot do, since nothing can be done that is inconsistent with the previous

arrangements that He has made. Else, where were the scope for God's wisdom in devising those beautiful adjustments and adaptations,* which call forth the admiration of every observant mind in both the natural and moral worlds? It is to be feared that the profound wisdom of God exerted in the production of the marvellous harmony which pervades all His arrangements is not sufficiently appreciated, from the vague idea being entertained by many that God has but to will anything whatever, however inconsistent or contradictory, and it will immediately be done. But God cannot, for instance, make two and two to be five, black to be white, two angles of a triangle to be less than the third angle, air to be lighter, yet heavier, than water, or falsehood to be truth, injustice to be justice, or wrong right; nor alter any of those essential relations which subsist between the things that He has created, *without altering the things themselves*. In the moral world, He could not, having passed His word, "In the day thou doest that which I have forbidden thee, thou shalt surely die," simply set aside His truth, and pardon the sinner at once upon his mere repentance. Death must follow, if God's word is to be kept inviolate and the sanctions of His holy law maintained—death, endured first by man's great Representative, who alone by His perfect holiness could pass through the ordeal undestroyed; and then, secondly, by virtue of the full atonement and power thus procured for man, by the believer himself voluntarily giving up his present forfeited life, and submitting to the death of the old man, that he may receive in the new man a new and spiritual life, thoroughly purged from every defilement and unholy tendency. It taxed (if we may so speak with all reverence) the highest resources of infinite wisdom to devise that marvellous scheme, into which angels themselves desire to look, by which the seemingly conflicting claims of "mercy and truth are met to-

* As, for instance, in that most wonderful instance of mechanism and contrivance, "the wing of a bird." See some striking observations on this subject in the Duke of Argyll's "Reign of Law," pp. 128, ff. "Nothing is more certain than that the whole order of nature is one vast system of Contrivance. And what is Contrivance but that kind of arrangement by which the *unchangeable* demands of law are met and satisfied?" p. 129.

gether, righteousness and peace have kissed each other," Psalm lxxxv. 10.

But even when all difficulty on the part of *God* had been removed, and the way was opened for His mercy being extended to the penitent sinner in full accordance with the demands of His justice and truth, another obstacle, scarcely less formidable, on the part of *man*, remained to be overcome, arising from the freedom of choice with which God had endowed him, before the proffered salvation could be made available to fallen man. This difficulty has been entirely overlooked by those who hold that, now that Christ has satisfied God's law, God has but to put forth His Spirit, and all, as many as it is His good pleasure, will be immediately converted and saved. If this were correct, why, we must again ask, are not all without exception saved? Christ's death, it will be allowed by all, was a sufficient "propitiation for the sins of the whole world," (1 John ii. 2). Is it, then, by *God Himself* that the atonement made by His blessed Son is limited? and the sacrifice of Jesus, shorn of much of its glory by the mere *arbitrary* exclusion of so many lost souls from its provisions? Can we with any propriety suppose that for any less reason than the sheer impossibility and necessity of the case, and the self-contradiction involved in the opposite result, Satan is permitted to mar God's work and destroy so many souls who might have formed additional gems in the Redeemer's crown? "God," we are told in the most express terms, 1 Tim. ii. 4, "will have *all men* to be saved," and he who wills the *end* must, if sincere, will the means also, so far as they are dependent on himself. Again and again, with the most solemn asseverations, God assures us, "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked," Ezek. xxxiii. 11; xviii. 23, 32. We cannot see how it is possible to reconcile these declarations with God's truth, if a single soul be lost that He could by possibility save. God is "not willing that *any* should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance," 2 Pet. iii. 9. A simple wish of His, it is supposed, could save them, and yet He will not put it forth, though a St. Paul would have sacrificed himself to have procured the salvation of his brethren according to the flesh!

On such a view no satisfactory Theodicy, or vindication of the divine government, can ever be based. But admit, that involved in the very creation of responsible agents is the inalienable power of resisting God's holy will, and continuing obstinately in that resistance in despite of every means used for their recovery, and all our most formidable difficulties vanish. We remove from God, and attribute wholly to the creature, the origin of evil—the limitation of the atonement—the ruin of lost souls—and the eternity and irreversibility, even by Omnipotence itself, of the fearful doom of everlasting destruction which they bring upon themselves. We preserve intact all God's perfections, and dissipate the dark cloud which rested on the sincerity of His professed desires and offers for the salvation of *all*, and on what He claims as the highest glory of His name and nature, the boundlessness of His mercy and love.

We sadly detract from the grandeur and wisdom displayed in the marvellous scheme of redemption by overlooking the true nature and arduousness of the great task which God had to accomplish. The mighty problem of the universe which the Gospel professes to solve is this : “ Given a race of responsible creatures whom God has endowed with free-will, and with the awful power of breaking off their wills from His holy will, and who have abused this power to rebel against Him : how is He, in perfect consistency with the nature which He has bestowed, and retaining to them their unconstrained freedom of choice, to induce them, while their minds are still in their natural state of aversion to holiness, to consent to God's renewing their hearts and reversing the corrupted bias of their wills, so that they shall renounce all that they have hitherto so dearly loved ? ” Only, it seems evident, by convincing them on the one hand of the misery and danger in which they are involved—and on the other hand, by awakening in them a confidence of His willingness and power to save them, and to apply an effectual remedy to their disorder, if they will only yield themselves to Him to treat their case as He sees fit ; only by Himself putting forth such a mighty power of love, combined with righteous wrath against sin, as has been exhibited in the

sacrifice and death of His own Son on the cross, to convince them of the destructive nature of sin, and of the sincerity and depth of His love and anxiety for their salvation, and of the efficacy of the remedy provided ; so that the sinner is led at last to see the extent of his misery and ruin, and to trust to the mercy which seeks his recovery, and thus yields himself at length to the treatment of the great Physician, rather than persevere in what manifestly must so soon prove irremediable destruction.

The mighty power of God put forth in the gospel of His Son and the wonder of His redeeming influences consist in this, that while He leaves unimpaired the free-will of His creatures, yet in complete consistency with this freedom—by the overpowering motives brought to bear upon the sinner in the exceeding riches of the gospel of His Son, by the sweet and winning influences of His wondrous grace, and by the application of the grand truths of redemption to our minds by the Holy Spirit—He bends the stubborn heart, subdues its rebellion, melts down its hardness, and draws it to Himself with the cords of love to yield itself to be changed, renewed, and sanctified by His Holy Spirit.

It is a *moral*, not a miraculous, power which God puts forth in inducing sinners to consent to their spiritual cure, and to the rectification by His *miraculous* power of the perverted bias of their will, and the regeneration of their depraved nature. God's miraculous power, like His physical, cannot be resisted. His moral power can, and alas ! is resisted every day. It is an alarming truth, the force of which we ought to be most cautious in weakening, that by the very nature of our constitution as free-will beings God has given to us the awful power that we may resist, if obstinately so inclined, the utmost striving of His Spirit with our spirit, and bring upon ourselves that state of spiritual insensibility and hardness which is called in scripture, "the sin against the Holy Ghost," "which cannot be forgiven, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," (Matt. xii. 31, 32)—because no higher manifestation of God's righteousness and love, than that already made in Christ, remains behind to awaken and influence the deadened soul to repentance. The scripture is full of the most solemn

warnings to us that we may "resist" (Acts vii. 51), we may "grieve" (Eph. iv. 30), we may "quench" (1 Thess. v. 19), we may "do despite to" (Heb. x. 29) the Spirit of God. We may "reject the counsel of God against our own souls" (Luke vii. 30). With every one God's Spirit is striving from the first moment of moral consciousness to recover him, or more correctly to *induce him to give his consent* to his recovery, from that state of corruption in which all are involved. This is what Christ has procured for every individual of Adam's race by His great work of redemption. Without Christ we cannot think a good thought, nor make one movement towards conversion. His Spirit it is that awakens the soul sunk in the lethargy of sin. His power must bring forth the captive from the bondage of iniquity; His grace must incline the stubborn will, and supply to us the power to perform. He must "work in us both to will and to do" (Phil. ii. 13). Yet the sinner may refuse to be awakened and close his eyes wilfully against the light vouchsafed; he may harden his heart in obstinate impenitence and unbelief; he may do despite unto the utmost strivings of God's Spirit. He may refuse to work along with God. God will not constrain the will, for this were to destroy the very nature of the responsible creature He has made, and to deny to him all probation. If man is, as I suppose all will allow, in a state of probation here, that probation must consist in something that depends on man's will, not God's, to do or not to do, to choose or to reject, to yield up or to keep back. Little as it is that man has in his power, yet God leaves that little to every individual that is sufficient to prove him, and which he may, if he is obstinately headstrong, withhold.

We thus escape the dilemma, which cannot otherwise be avoided, of either limiting God's love, or landing in the dangerous gulf of universal salvation. If all are not saved, this must arise either from a want of *will* on the part of God, or from a want of *power* necessitated by the circumstances of the case. Strange to say, the former of these alternatives has been that generally adopted. The highest of God's attributes, LOVE, has been, without any plea alleged of constraining necessity or self-contradiction, circumscribed in its universal extension to all. If God

can save all, and yet *will* not save all, it is impossible to maintain that His love is unbounded and impartial. We contradict at the same time by such a supposition the most express and unambiguous declarations of Scripture—"God is not *willing* that *any* should perish" (2 Pet. iii. 9). "He *will* have *all men* to be saved" (1 Tim. ii. 4). "God is the Saviour of *all men*, specially of those that believe" (1 Tim. iv. 10). Grant the possibility of saving all, and it is impossible to maintain the infinitude of His love and to stop short of His bringing about by some means finally the *universal* salvation of *all* His creatures.

But it will be said that we land ourselves thus in equal difficulty in limiting the omnipotence of God. God is willing to save all and yet *cannot*. The reply to this objection has already been given. God's omnipotence is not really limited, by the impossibility of reconciling direct contradictions. By the very circumstances of the case God has, by the creation and maintenance of a free will in the responsible creature, precluded Himself from putting forth His mere power to constrain a change, and it forms no real limitation to His power that He cannot contradict Himself and stultify His own work. This limitation (if such it can be called) to His power His own word has pointed out, "What *could* have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" (Isa. v. 4); Jesus "*could* there do no mighty work . . . because of their unbelief" (Mark vi. 5, 6). But nowhere do we read of any limit, but what the hard-heartedness of men themselves assigns, to the lovingkindness and tender mercies of the universal Father, who "will have all men to be saved." "For God so loved the *world*, that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John iii. 16).

Let not therefore the impénitent unbeliever so abuse the doctrines of predestination and electing grace, as to attribute his own obstinate impenitence to any want of love and mercy on God's part to him. The fault lies wholly with himself—he is his own undoer. God's Spirit strives with every man till by his repeated acts of resistance he at length destroys all

susceptibility in himself of being renewed. In no case, we firmly believe, even that of the greatest sinners, has aught been omitted by God which He knew could possibly avail for their amendment.* None shall be able in the last day to plead, "Thou art a hard taskmaster, reaping where thou hast not sown," and demanding repentance and conversion where Thou didst not furnish sufficient means and motives, or withheldst arbitrarily the grace necessary for conversion. Who can doubt the sincerity of Jesus' desire and the zealousness of His efforts to save His countrymen, which yet their own perverse will frustrated? "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often *would* I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would* not!" (Matt. xxiii. 37.) Take the case even of Judas. Dare we question the sincerity of the Saviour's desires and exertions to soften the heart of His infatuated disciple, or presume to

* To the suggestion which so readily rises to our minds, that the possession of greater advantages and stronger evidences would in many cases have led to sincere repentance, and yet has been withheld, the words of the Saviour are a sufficient answer, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead" (Luke xvi. 31). If it be replied, as is frequently done, that Jesus Himself supposes such a case, "If the mighty works which were done in Chorazin and Bethsaida had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes" (Matt. xi. 21), we deny the legitimacy of the implied inference, that He meant by these words to denote a *lasting* and *effectual* repentance. Jesus is here impressing on His countrymen the greatness of their guilt by contrasting it with that of others, as elsewhere He says, "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it; because they repented at the preaching of Jonas" (Matt. xii. 41), without implying that the repentance of the Ninevites was anything more than temporary. How short-lived it was we learn from the subsequent denunciations of the prophet Nahum against that city. Ahab, we read, humbled himself before the Lord when he heard from Elijah the evil that was to come upon him and his house, and "rent his clothes and put sackcloth upon his flesh and fasted, and lay in sackcloth and went softly" (1 Kings xxi. 27), so that the Lord in consequence delayed the execution of His vengeance till his son's days. Yet no one, we presume, ever supposed these words to imply that Ahab's repentance was a thorough and "godly repentance unto life, not to be repented of," or that they were meant to reverse the deliberate verdict passed by the sacred writer on the review of Ahab's whole life and character. "There was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord—whom Jezebel his wife stirred up" (1 Kings xxi. 25).

think that anything that wisdom could devise, or benevolence dictate, was omitted by Him to avert His awful doom? Even to the very last He intermitted not His efforts but made a final touching appeal—which we should have thought the hardest heart could not have withstood, now that he was aware that his designs were known to his Master—by dipping the sop of intimate friendship in the dish, according to Eastern custom, and presenting it to him with its well understood import, “What! thou, my familiar friend, whom I have admitted to the closest intimacy, lift up thy heel against me!” But Judas was of the number of those whom (if we will accept the simple meaning of Scripture language), in consequence of their persevering abuse of the means of grace, “it is *impossible* to renew unto repentance” (Heb. vi. 4-6).

II. A second objection which is urged against the doctrine of the Confession of Faith is that *it destroys all probation and responsibility of man in receiving or rejecting the gospel. In Scripture man is ever represented and addressed as being under probation, and called upon to choose life or death. “Believe and be saved: believe not and thou shalt be damned.” But the Confession represents man as being “altogether passive in regeneration”* (chap. x. 2), and “not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto” (chap. ix. 3), and affirms that those “not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the word, and may have some common operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved” (chap. x. 4). Thus, in reality, mankind have no probation, neither the elect nor the non-elect. The elect can make no movement of themselves, till God’s predestinated time arrives; and when the Spirit begins to operate upon them, His operation is irresistible. The non-elect are equally passive. Born in sin and in a state of moral impotency, they can take no step whatever for their deliverance from their hopeless condition, because the Spirit’s indispensable aid is by God’s predestinating decree refused to them. Man’s responsibility is thus wholly at an end. If all is God’s work, and man’s nothing; if man is

necessitated to follow God's leading, or to remain inactive, as the case may be, the whole responsibility plainly rests with God, of evil as well as of good. Man is degraded to a mere puppet, the strings of which are pulled from without, and which possesses no living power of its own, but which must move exactly as it is moved, according to a secret decree by God of election or reprobation. If the representation of the Confession of Faith destroys every claim to merit on the part of the elect, it is at the expense of destroying equally all responsibility and demerit on the part of the impenitent in not complying with the offers of redemption.

In reply to this objection we would say, Most truly does the Confession of Faith pronounce man to be "*altogether passive in regeneration.*" And does not Scripture, we would ask, does not reason affirm the same? Scripture represents fallen man as being "by nature *dead* in trespasses and sins," and his conversion as being equivalent to a "new birth," a "new creation." This birth, this creation, reason tells us, must be wholly God's work. If the very change consists in leading the will to choose and love holiness and God, instead of sin and self to which it had become inseparably wedded by habit, how can the will change its own fixed bias, and will against will? If the very cure to be effected is the removal of the *moral inability* of the will for good and holiness, the unconverted sinner must be equally powerless to make any movement towards holiness, as the impotent man to restore power to his own limbs.

But where then, you ask, is there any place for man's agency to come in? Evidently man's place must be *previous* to regeneration. The blind, or impotent man, cured by our Lord, was utterly incapable of restoring sight to his blind eyes or strength to his paralysed limbs. This was Christ's work alone. But he could cry, "Thou son of David, have mercy on me." He could feel the misery and helplessness of his sad condition (though for the consciousness of this in the case of the spiritually blind the sinner must have been indebted to the teaching of the Holy Spirit), and could see from all that he had heard

and learned of Christ that He was able and willing to heal him ; and he must acknowledge this and apply to the Saviour, otherwise the great boon would never be granted. The demand of Jesus ever was, "Believest thou that I can do this?" and "He could not," and would not, in consistency with the great lesson that all His external miracles were intended to teach, "there do any mighty work" (Mark vi. 5) where He found a perverse "unbelief." The *moral* inability of the will, which man has contracted through sin, does not involve its *natural* inability. Though the glory of Bartimeus' cure was wholly Christ's, in which the blind man neither had nor could claim any share, yet he could and must persevere in his cry to Jesus, notwithstanding the rebuke of the multitude, and when called, cast away his garment and hasten to Him, otherwise his cure would never have been effected. When Christ said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again," so far from furnishing to him an excuse for remaining in listless inactivity till it should please God to regenerate him, He laid the responsibility upon him of his own regeneration, and of taking those steps on condition of which alone this blessing would be granted him. The husbandman has not the slightest power to make the seed sprout, or to make a blade of corn to grow, yet he must do his part by preparing the soil, and trust to God's goodness to prosper his endeavours ; and although in common language he may be said to have raised the crop that has sprung up, yet, if he is a humble and devout man, he will attribute the whole produce and praise to God alone.

In accepting the salvation offered to him by Christ, there is no demand made upon the unregenerate man which the *natural* freedom of will still remaining to him, notwithstanding the fall, is unable to fulfil. When the Spirit of God, who is striving with every man (at least till he becomes utterly hardened and reprobate), has brought the sinner to see the fatal nature of his malady, with the certainty of death impending over him, and the infinite power and mercy of the gracious Physician who offers to heal him, it is but an act of selfish prudence, a choosing of life instead of certain death, a "loving of those that love you," of which even "sinners" are

capable (Luke vi. 32), if the sinner at length in despair places himself in the hands of the great Physician to do with him as He will, and consents to take the medicine, however unpalatable, which is necessary for his cure. There is no merit nor moral goodness in his at length yielding himself up to God's rescuing hand, unless we will contend that the debauchee, whom his benevolent physician has, after long-despised warnings, at last persuaded of the fatal consequences of persisting longer in his gross self-indulgence, shows the least moral goodness in yielding himself at length to the treatment of one, who has given the most convincing proofs of his power to cure his disease, and his anxious wish still to save him. There would indeed be greater unreasonableness in the infatuated wretch who would none of the physician's counsels, recklessly preferring a short-lived pleasure to life, "Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die" (1 Cor. xv. 32); but this gives not the slightest claim for merit to him who submits himself to the regimen necessary for a successful cure. In like manner, there is an aggravation of guilt and folly on the part of the man who perseveres in refusing all God and Christ's gracious offers, and a *negative* superiority therefore on the part of him who yields himself at length to be cured of his malady—to this extent, that he *ceases to be* his own undoer. Whereas the man who continues obstinately to resist the strivings of God's Spirit *is* his own undoer. The act is *solely his own*, not God's. But if I on the contrary yield at length so as not to be my own undoer, do I therefore claim to be my own saviour? If overcome at last by my fears, and by the invitations and blessed influences of God's Holy Spirit, who has so long striven in vain with my heart, I differ to this *negative* extent from the obdurate rebel, have I thereby acquired any merit or ground of boasting? If I justly confess myself to be utterly unworthy, and cast myself on the free grace of God, and on the merits and power of Christ for my change and recovery, do I by that act prefer a claim to superiority above others? If for every thought that has ever crossed my mind of giving up my rebellion, I acknowledge myself indebted to the suggestion of God's Spirit, do I thereby set myself above others? No,

surely. The very act of faith in Christ presupposes and implies an utter renouncing of all faith in myself, or dependence on any thing that I can think or do, as having good or merit in it. It is an acknowledgment that in me dwelleth only evil, and that all good proceeds alone from God. The greater demerit of another imparts no merit to me.

There seems, however, to be a prevalent misapprehension on this subject against which we must guard, as if in attributing greater demerit to the unbeliever for his rejection of the Saviour, some claim for merit would thereby be established for the believer, if any self-determined act of his be required as the condition of his conversion. An important distinction has here been neglected. Merit and demerit (just as election and reprobation) have been placed upon an exactly equal, though opposite footing. Because all are equal in as far as merit, or rather *no merit*, is concerned, it has been inadvertently concluded that all are equal as to demerit. It has been forgotten that "some sins in themselves, and by reason of several aggravations, are more heinous in the sight of God than others,"* and that "there is a sin unto death," (1 John v. 16). So far as merit is concerned, all are equal, so that, all being sinners, none has the slightest claim on God's mercy. Justice would equally condemn all, the debtor that owes fifty, as well as him that owes five hundred pence. Those, therefore, whom God saves are chosen "out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith, or good works, or perseverance, in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto."† But it has been too hastily assumed that there is no difference on the other side "moving Him" to the reprobation of the non-elect. It is forgotten that while *all good originates with God, all evil originates with the creature*, and that there may be such persevering obstinacy shown by the latter, as will yield to no motions of God's Holy Spirit, but may resist the counsel of God to the uttermost; that while there is no merit, and therefore no degrees in merit, there are degrees in demerit. While in the case of two

* Westminster Shorter Catechism, question 83.

† Confession of Faith, ch. iii. 5.

mutinous seamen—who, having long resisted every effort on the part of their captain to reform them, have at last, through their continued intemperance, fallen overboard, and are on the point of being swallowed up by the waves of a stormy ocean—one grasps the rope, thrown out by his master's mercy, and is saved, while the other rejects it, or depends on his own efforts to save himself, and is drowned; has the former ground to boast that he is his own saviour? There was assuredly more mad wilfulness and obstinacy in his hardened companion who refused to accept the proffered aid, and to yield himself at length to the necessary discipline of the ship; but the recklessness of the latter imparts no merit to the former. While the one can ascribe his deliverance to nothing *in himself* “*moving*” his captain “*thereunto*,” but solely to his master's compassion, the other had equal mercy shown to him, but his destruction was entirely his own doing. When the prodigal son returned to his father and was received with such overflowing love, of which he confessed himself utterly unworthy, would the sense of the entire freeness of his father's goodness, and of his own absolute demerit, have been at all diminished, by learning that another of his father's sons, who had run the same course of riot as himself, refused to cast himself into those arms by which he himself had been so warmly welcomed? Would the greater obduracy and infatuated perverseness of his brother, extenuate, in the pardoned brother's eyes, his own guilt, or lead him less to ascribe his own forgiveness to *free unmerited grace*?

This prepares us for the right solution of that question, “*Who maketh thee to differ from another?*” From looking principally to the one side (that of the elect), and seeing the plain answer that must be returned, it has been assumed without due reflection, that the same must be the reply with regard to the other (the reprobate), and hence the charge of injustice and partiality that has been preferred against the doctrine, that attributes regeneration wholly to God as His special work, in which man is “*altogether passive*.” If God alone makes one to differ from another, then is He the author equally of reprobation, as of election. But the answer to the

question, "Who maketh thee to differ from another?" must be the very reverse when addressed to the one class, from what it is when addressed to the other. If the question is put to the elect, the unhesitating reply will be, "God's free grace alone hath made me to differ from others, and the undeserved mercy of Him who arrested me when utterly destitute of any righteousness of my own, and plucked me out of a wicked world, though no better than others, but ready, if left to myself, to have run the same career of wickedness as the most abandoned sinner." To the same question, the answer of the reprobate (whatever *at present* the deceitfulness of the human heart may suggest), in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, must be, "My own perversely obstinate will alone caused my ruin, which resisted the unceasing efforts of God's Spirit to soften me, and quenched every influence of His grace, offered equally, and pressed upon me as on others."

I cannot, however, though at the risk of tiring the reader's patience, leave this subject without drawing attention to some other distinctions necessary to prevent misapprehension. The power attributed to the natural man in p. 402, of giving up his resistance to God's Spirit, and, when alarmed by the consequences of sin and allured by the offers of deliverance, at length yielding himself reluctantly to the great Physician, must not be confounded with the willing and delighted surrender of himself to Christ, as the Saviour from *sin*, which the regenerate man is enabled to make the moment that, on his consent being given to his cure, God opens his heart and changes it from the love of self and sin to the love of God and holiness. Man's part and God's part ought here to be strictly distinguished. The sinner must not be allowed to think that he has nothing to do for his conversion; yet the whole glory of the cure and mighty change effected must be ascribed to God. The sinner's consent, however, must first be given before the cure is wrought, since herein consists our very probation. The moment the consent is given—the blind eye is opened, the deaf ear unstopped, and a new life and world burst upon the enraptured sense. The heavy burden of sin is removed from off the heart of the

believer ; he feels himself a new man ; and love to God and Christ fills his soul and constrains him to willing and heartfelt self-surrender.

I am aware how difficult it is to conceive aright, much more to express one's self with the requisite caution and correctness, in attempting to draw the line of demarcation between the agency of God and that of His responsible creatures, where both must contribute their part to the result. It is hard to define where God's part ends, and the little part left to man begins ; and the present is but a humble and imperfect attempt to indicate in what direction at least the point of reconciliation between the two is to be sought, and to show that the electing and predisposing grace of God, and the free will and responsibility of man, are not contradictory or mutually exclusive of each other. I have made the attempt only because I know the exceeding pain caused to many sensitive minds by the *apparent* harshness and inequality of God's dealings with part of His responsible creatures, when it was supposed that by an absolute decree He had predetermined the life, conduct, and eternal fate of all according to His mere arbitrary pleasure ; because I have known in others the paralysing influence, continued for years, of the fixed idea that they could do nothing, absolutely nothing, to hasten or promote their own amendment and regeneration, but must wait for God to move them ; and, above all, because I feel strongly that it is equally necessary, while casting down every self-exalting claim on the part of the believer, to remove from the unbeliever every excuse for his impenitence and carelessness, grounded on the plea that he can do nothing to forward or retard his own salvation, since all is God's gift, and everything is irrevocably fixed and predetermined independently of him. It is most important to disabuse the minds of heedless and impenitent sinners of every such pretext, and to impress them with a deep conviction that the responsibility is theirs, and that though they can do nothing for their deliverance without God, still there is a somewhat left to themselves to prove them—something which, as natural men, they can do or forbear, and which if they neglect, they, and not God, are their own undoers.

Everywhere in Scripture the sinner is called upon to *repent* and *believe*. Neither of these can he do without God. Repentance and faith both are called *gifts* of God, *saving graces* vouchsafed by His Spirit. Still, since it is the *natural* man that is called upon to repent and believe, it is beyond question implied that there is a something connected with these acts, which he can and must do in order that God may do the rest, and which is *dependent on his will* in its present unregenerate state to contribute. He may *refuse* to repent and believe; he may *withdraw*, therefore, his refusal of these gifts which God is pressing upon him. This leads us to see that besides the divine element in faith and repentance, there must be a human element also in them, which the sinner has to supply. Of these two elements we can trace some of the distinguishing features.

“*Repentance* unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it unto God, with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience.”* A *true* sense of his sin, *as sin*, only the spiritual man can have; but the natural man can have a sense of the misery and ruin of it, and either banish this consciousness when it recurs, or cherish and deepen it. *Grieve* for sin aright, as being a dishonour to God, he cannot, nor *hate* it, since he still loves self-indulgence, and hates righteousness and self-denial; but he can feel “grief and hatred” for the *consequences* it will entail upon him, and let his mind dwell on these, so as to make him desire at length deliverance from them.

Again, that saving “*faith*, whereby we receive and rest upon Christ alone for salvation as He is offered to us in the gospel,”† is a spiritual grace for which the believer must be indebted wholly to God. But there is much in preparation for this, that the natural man can do in the way of learning and believing in the work and power of Christ to save. Even “devils” can “*believe* and tremble” (James ii. 19); and by the powers of

* Shorter Catechism, ques. 87.

† Shorter Catechism, ques. 86.

unregenerate nature we can make ourselves acquainted with all that Jesus has done and taught and suffered on our account, and can see and appreciate its adaptation to our wants as fallen creatures, nay, have the conviction and *faith*, that if we would only submit ourselves to the great Physician, He is both "able and willing to save to the uttermost." All this is evident from the case of preachers who have descanted eloquently on these topics and have yet been themselves unregenerate men. The conviction of our malady, and the assurance of the saving virtue that resides in Christ, we can either deepen by frequent reading and reflection, and thus prepare the soil for the reception of the truth, or we can treat these convictions with indifference or neglect. The unregenerate man can be just and upright and benevolent in all his dealings, seek after truth, and practise many of the moral virtues. The cultivation of these good qualities tends to render a man more susceptible of the great spiritual change, and seems to constitute what our Saviour calls the "good and honest heart" (Luke viii. 15), and the being "not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark xii. 34); while the indulgence of the opposite evil qualities debases and hardens the heart, and deadens its susceptibility.

Nevertheless, for this susceptibility, and for all the preliminary steps by which the mind of the natural man has been gradually brought to the state in which he is prepared to yield—and this is the point to which I now desire to direct particular attention, and which it is hoped will remove any lurking objection still felt to the statement in p. 402—for all this state of preparedness, I say, the sinner is indebted to the gift and grace of God. From earliest youth God's Spirit is striving with every one. Without this, which is a part of Christ's purchase for the recovery of a ruined world, we cannot see how fallen man, if he had been left wholly to himself without God's restraining grace, would not have become wholly and incurably reprobate at once like the devils. But for *all* Christ has procured a reprieve, and the opportunity and means of probation and recovery. To all is given *common grace* to restrain, and rouse, and prepare. This must not be confounded with *special grace*, but carefully distinguished from it.

Special grace is that by which a man is converted, regenerated, born again, made a new creature. *Common grace* is that which is common to all, of which all men, even the unregenerate, are partakers. Even of that generation which was the most corrupt that ever lived, the generation before the flood, when "all flesh had corrupted its way before God," the Lord says that His Spirit strove with them though there was a limit to His patience and forbearance, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man" (Gen. vi. 3); and the ground of condemnation to every unbeliever at the last will be that he has resisted God's Spirit to the uttermost. Nothing but the restraining grace of God checks the overflowings of iniquity which otherwise would quickly overwhelm the earth. The testimony of Scripture is that man by his fall is clean gone from righteousness; that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually"* (Gen. vi. 5). Every better thought that stirs within him, every desire after amendment is derived from God's Spirit. Man "by nature" is "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. ii. 1, 3), as insensible of himself to everything spiritual as the drowned man is to this world; and as it is only by the efforts of others that the drowned man is awakened to sensibility, so it is through the influence of the Spirit purchased by Christ, that the dead soul is awakened to any sense of spiritual things. This process of awakening is carried on in both cases to successive stages, often much against the will of the patient; for I have been informed by one that had been drowned, that so painful were his feelings on the first dawning of sensibility, that if he could have spoken he would have entreated those who were endeavouring to resuscitate him to let him die in peace; and we know from many instances that equally painful and opposed to natural desires are the first awakenings to spiritual life. Here, then, it seems to be, at

* Not that the sinner has no good thoughts or desires after what is right or which suggest better things, else were he already as the devils, but that even for these he is indebted to what Christ has done in restraining the natural course of sin, and procuring for man a new trial; and that in every conflict between God's will and his own self-will in the unregenerate man, the *final choice* is "only evil continually."

this early stage, that man's awful responsibility in fixing his own eternal doom occurs. While yet he is the subject of these motions of common grace, he may at length be brought to yield consent to the oft-repeated strivings of God's Spirit to arouse him ; or he may—such is the fearful power involved in freewill—resist the utmost strivings of the divine Spirit with his spirit ; he may grieve, he may quench, he may do despite unto the Spirit of God. He may reject the counsel of God against his own soul.

But if he proceed not to this awful length, still *common grace* is not sufficient for his regeneration. *Special grace* is absolutely necessary—a grace of which he must have been brought to feel the indispensable need, and for which, in all converted men, we believe at some period of their awakenment, when the soul has been aroused to a full sense of its desperate depravity and utter helplessness, a cry of indescribable anguish and longing (like St Paul's, "O wretched man that I am!") rises up from the depths of the soul unto Him who can alone rescue it from everlasting ruin.

This is a truth on which our Lord often and urgently insists. By the powerful influence of common grace Nicodemus had been awakened so far as to overcome his strong Pharisaical prejudices and to come to Jesus by night. But our Lord warns him that he could not become His disciple, nay, that he could not *see* the kingdom of God even, unless he should "be born again." This birth was as impossible for Nicodemus to effect for himself as for a child to forward his own birth, or for a blind man to open his own eyes. Still he must feel the necessity of this new birth for himself, of this new sense of vision being given to him ; and though he could do nothing positive for their attainment, he could yet believe in the Lord's power to bestow them ; he could cry, Lord Jesus, have mercy on me.

Now whence is it that the natural man is to gain even this preliminary knowledge and conviction of his own darkness and need, that are to lead him to come to Jesus for help ? It must, our Lord tells us, be "*given*" to him by God. It is by the previous teaching and training of "the Father" that he can be

prepared to seek or to listen to Christ. This is the great truth again and again insisted upon by our Lord in John vi., especially in the words of ver. 37, "All that *the Father giveth me* shall come to me," the principal bearing of which has not been duly apprehended by commentators. Their aspect to our Lord Himself they have indeed pointed out, as consoling Himself for the unbelief of His hearers by the assurance that His labours could not be in vain since all God's chosen ones must infallibly come to Him; but they have failed to appreciate their aspect towards those whom He was addressing, and the impression which He designed them to make on them, as showing them the source of their unbelief and its only cure. Yet that this was their principal design will be seen by looking to the words with which He sums up the whole discourse in ver. 65; where again he assigns the cause of their unbelief and its only cure, in terms almost equivalent to those in the verse under consideration. There, as here, He had just charged them with their unbelief (ver. 64), "But there are some of you that believe not;" compare ver. 36, "But I said unto you, that ye also have seen me and believe not." There (ver. 65), He immediately assigns its cause and points to where alone they can find its cure, "Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father," which is very nearly the same as here (ver. 37), "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me." The unbelief in both cases is connected with *the Father's not giving*, in the one case, *not giving unto them to come to Jesus*; in the other, *in His not giving them to Jesus*; for the remedy, they must look to the Father to give them—or to them—else they can never come to the Saviour. This truth again he reiterates in different words in ver. 44, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him."

Jesus, by these words, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me," cannot mean to furnish them with an excuse for their unbelief, as if the cause of it lay not in themselves but in His Father who had not given them unto Him; but, on the contrary, His object must be to show them that its true cause lay in themselves, in their want of that humbled mind

that has come to see its own sinfulness, ignorance, and insufficiency, and that its only help is in God; as he says to them in chapter viii. 46, 47, "Why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words. Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Ye must first listen to God in that preparatory teaching which He has given you, and to His Spirit striving with you, before you can receive me. This is the truth which Jesus is pressing on the Jews in the whole context of this, and the preceding and succeeding chapters, "I said unto you that ye also have seen me, and believe not" (vi. 36), that is, ye have seen me manifesting, in all my works and words, the power, wisdom, and other perfections of God, but ye believe me not as revealing to you God, because, alas! ye have no sense for the Divine. "Ye seek me not because ye saw the miracles," and the presence of God in them, "but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled" (vi. 26). So long as ye look merely to outward things, and have no eye nor ear for that which is divine, you will see in me but a mere man, poor and despised. As your fathers did of old, so do ye. Though they heard "the *voice* of God speaking to them out of the midst of the fire" (Deut. iv. 33), and had so long beheld His *shape* in the form of the pillar of cloud and fire that manifested His presence in the desert, still Moses had to expostulate with them, "Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear unto this day," (Deut. xxix. 4). So now, though God's *voice* bore witness to me at my baptism, and His Spirit was seen descending on me in the *shape* of a dove, and my words and my works are continually revealing His will, and power, and presence, I have to expostulate alike with you, "Ye have neither heard His *voice* at any time, nor seen His *shape*, and ye have not His word abiding in you," (John v. 37, 38)—otherwise ye would have recognised the Divine in me. But if all that the Father has done before in His preparatory teaching to awaken you has passed unheeded by you, how can ye listen to me? "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (v. 46, 47.)

Recognise, then, the source of all your unbelief in the darkness and obduracy of your carnal minds, and acknowledge your insufficiency and need of Divine teaching and aid. Ye cannot give yourselves unto me; the Father alone can give you unto me. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "It is written in the prophets. And they shall be all taught of God; every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father [and such only] cometh unto me." Pray, therefore, unto Him, that He would *give*, that He would *draw*, that He would *teach* you. If you would have God's *special* grace to qualify you for the higher blessings of His kingdom, see that His *common* grace be allowed to effect its preparatory work on your souls.

There is thus, we see, a previous teaching and training here ascribed to the Father, necessary to the natural man before he can come to Christ, and which must first be received and improved by him. He must be brought to know that he is sick before he will apply to the Physician. He must acknowledge that He is a sinner, before He will seek unto Him, who "came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." God's *law* must first accomplish its work in him, in convincing him of the evil of sin, and his own inability to do God's will, or to effect his own salvation, before he will appreciate Christ's *gospel*. And here, in this preliminary stage, is the place for man's responsibility as regards his conversion; and on his improvement or neglect of the opportunities then afforded, the righteous rule will find its application, "Whosoever hath [and hath improved], to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath" (Mat. xiii. 12).

From the beginning to the end, then, all is of grace; for every better thought that stirs within us, for the very first conception of any life higher than the temporal, and for every desire and aspiration after it, we are indebted to God's Spirit; and when, through the preparatory means employed by God, His Spirit has at length called forth these desires with such distinctness in the soul as to render it responsible and justly condemnable for their rejection, or to lead to further desire for

some change, then comes on, we conceive, that critical trial, decisive of our doom, whether we will stifle every conviction that has been awakened in us of our danger, and of the destruction which we are preparing for ourselves by impenitence, or will yield at length to Christ, that He may save us from certain ruin by changing and renewing our hearts, and restoring us again to the image of God.

Let me close with an illustration, which may perhaps, better than all reasoning, make clear the point which I have been endeavouring to establish. Take the case of an habitual drunkard. When the reflection has been brought more intensely home to his mind of the injury already done to his health, character, and prospects, by his wretched habit, and of the certain ruin that he is speedily preparing for himself, we can suppose him, in one of his lucid moments, yielding himself at length to a skilful physician, who, he is convinced, has devised a perfect remedy for his disease; and this, while no love for sobriety, as regarded in itself, is as yet awakened in his mind, but the ruling propensity still continues unbroken. The craving for his unhallowed indulgence may continue as strong as ever, and he yet be induced to beseech the physician, "Save me from myself."

III. It is objected that *God's election and man's election (or choice) are incompatible. If God chooses out the objects of His favour according to His own good pleasure, and "passes by" all others, man cannot consistently be called upon to choose life or death. The one choice excludes the other.*

The apparent inconsistency here, and difficulty of reconciling the parts of God and man, are no greater than necessarily attach to the whole subject. If God created man, spirit, soul, and body—if He upholds, guides, and controls my every power at every moment, so that in Him, "I live and move and have my being"—how can there be any movement or act of mine that is not wholly God's, or that can be dependent on me to put forth or forbear? Yet I know by my own consciousness that such is the case, and that I possess a power which is my own freely to exercise; above all that there is an act which is

wholly my own, and which I dare ascribe in no respect to God—SIN, or the indulgence of *my self-will* in opposition to God's holy will. God, therefore, can make and has made me a free-will, responsible being; and in *every* individual act, if I am to be responsible for it, there must be a something, however small, left for me, which I can freely contribute or withhold. If man, for instance, has nothing to do of himself, and can do nothing to promote or retard his conversion and renewal, he can omit nothing, and therefore is not responsible for not believing and being converted. If God absolutely does all and leaves nothing whatever for man to do, then any omission is God's, and He is responsible for the omission, not man. But the very call to man to repent, to be converted, to believe, implies some such power granted him to follow it, otherwise it would be utterly unmeaning. If man is placed on his trial as a moral agent, and called upon to make a choice which is to determine his doom for eternity, it is inconsistent to suppose that, by an absolute decree of election or reprobation, this choice is precluded, this trial foreclosed, and that God in His decree forgot the very freewill and responsibility with which He was about to endow His creature. In meditating on this question it will not do to "insulate the one view of the subject," to "keep the human side out of view, while the Divine side alone is insisted on,"* to such an extent as to introduce statements or representations of Scripture-teaching, which directly contradict and exclude any independent volition on man's part; no more than it is correct to magnify the human side, or so to explain it as to interfere with the perfect sovereignty and predestination of God.

What the Bible (as well as reason) teaches is a *co-operation* all throughout of God and man. We must be "workers together with God" (2 Cor. vi. 1), as for the salvation of others, so for our own. We must "*work out* our own salvation with fear and trembling," because "it is God that *worketh* in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure" (Phil. ii. 12, 13). While God is represented as doing all in all, He does nothing without man's concurrence. From the very beginning

* Dean Alford's Introductory Remarks to Romans, ix.-xi.

of the spiritual life to its end the doctrine of mutual co-operation is taught. While the conversion of the sinner is represented as God's great work, yet that a something is left to sinners themselves to contribute for which they are responsible is evident from the words, "*Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die?*" (Ezek. xxxiii. 11). It is God's to revive the soul "*dead* in trespasses and sins;" yet this must not be so rigidly interpreted as to exclude the exhortation, "*Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light*" (Eph. v. 14). It is the Lord's prerogative to "*create in us a clean heart and renew a right spirit within us*" (Ps. li. 10); yet God's own word expressly enjoins "*Make you a new heart and a new spirit*" (Ezek. xviii. 31), proving that man's consent is necessary for the new creation. A something, therefore, remains in every case for man's will to supply, as the condition on which God will act, and without which He will not perfect His work. Every exhortation addressed to man in Scripture, every call even to the unconverted to repentance, presupposes such a power in them to follow it. We cannot for a moment attribute to God such a mockery of His creatures as to call upon them to do what He well knows they can take no step whatever to further. The act of regeneration itself, the healing of the diseased soul, the power to stretch out the paralysed arm to lay hold on the offered remedy, is indeed wholly Christ's, but, as all Christ's miracles prove, it must be preceded by what the natural man can supply—the sense of his own need, the earnest desire and request to be healed, and belief in the Physician's power to effect the cure; besides what these analogies could not clearly represent—the entire surrender of himself by the patient into the hands of his Physician to submit to any treatment or discipline, however painful, that He may deem necessary for his perfect cure.

It is for us, therefore, to see that we be careful to contribute our part. Let none presume ever to suppose that God can be wanting to *His* part, or to cast the blame of his own negligence and impenitence on the predestination of God. He will have all to be saved, and calls upon all men to come unto Jesus that

they may have life; and it were blasphemy to suppose that He offers for the acceptance of His creatures a gift which He had *causatively* foreordained that they should be unable to receive. He is ever working by His Spirit for *good—and for good only*—and strives with every man until he, by his own obstinate resistance, has destroyed within himself the susceptibility of renewal and done despite to the Spirit of grace.

We are not left without an analogy in God's providential arrangements to assist us in understanding the compatibility of the power of choice being divided between two parties. In a man's selecting a woman for his partner in life, the initiative is wholly on the man's side, who can say, "Thou hast not chosen me, but I have chosen thee" (John xv. 16). Yet this does not preclude the choice of the woman, who still has it in her power to accept or refuse the offer made to her. The election, however absolute on the man's side, is still mutual, "Draw me, and we will run after thee" (Song of Solomon, i. 4).

Thus God's election and man's election may be mutually compatible. The one choice does not exclude the other.

IV. *Still it is urged that every "CONDITION" on the part of man is denied by the words of the Confession of Faith. "Those predestinated unto life God hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as CONDITIONS or causes moving Him thereunto" (ch. iii. 5).*

The emphasis, it is replied, is laid here on the wrong word. The whole gist of the passage lies in the last words, "*moving Him thereunto,*" as will be seen by the difference of the reply that must be given in the cases of the elect and of the reprobate, as to whether there is any "condition or cause moving" God to the widely different dooms assigned to each. If it is asked, Is there anything foreseen in the creature either as "conditions or causes moving" God to the choice of the elect, the answer is, None; His own "mere free grace and love" moved Him to elect or choose them out of a godless world;

everything in the ungodly sinful creature itself could only excite His just wrath and condemnation. But this by no means excludes, as has been too generally inferred, the opposite proposition with regard to the reprobate, that there may be something foreseen in the creature to prevent God from electing him, and "*moving*" Him to this rejection. If, on the contrary, it is asked, What is the *moving, conditioning cause* of God's reprobation of the non-elect? the answer is, The man's own obstinate resistance to all the invitations and motions of God's Holy Spirit, as foreseen, is the sole cause of his ruin and rejection. "Because I have called and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity, and I will mock when your fear cometh," &c. (Prov. i. 24-28.)

What is denied with regard to the elect is that there is any thing in them as a "*condition moving God*" to their election. But this does not amount to a denial of all and every condition as differentiating them from the reprobate. Though no *positive*, there is a *negative* condition demanded, viz., that there shall be in them the absence of that self-induced obstinacy of resistance to every holy influence and final unsusceptibility of renewal which, as foreseen by God, form the ground of the decreed rejection of the reprobate. The *non-existence* in the elect, foreseen by God, of this obduracy of will is an indispensable condition of their election and salvation, though not in the smallest degree "*moving Him thereunto.*"

This we can easily understand by referring to the great type of election in the Old Testament Scriptures—the people of Israel. God, through Moses, frequently impressed upon them that there was nothing in themselves moving God to their election above other people, neither in their superior numbers nor in their righteousness. They were "the fewest of all people" (Deut. vii. 7); and as for merit or goodness in themselves He most carefully denies all claim to them on this score—"Speak not thou in thine heart, after that the Lord thy God hath cast them [the Canaanites] out from before thee, saying, For my righteousness the Lord hath brought me in to

possess this land; but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out before thee. Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land. . . . Understand, therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people" (Deut. ix. 4-6). But does it follow that there was no sound intrinsic reason for the preference which God showed in electing them, and which made the Israelites more suitable for God's purpose than any other people (as the Egyptians, Assyrians, Canaanites, &c.) would have been? Why, even we can easily discern some of those points of difference in them, and a susceptibility which they possessed of being made what God intended the subjects of His first great dispensation, and the types of the Christian Church, to be. No other nation would have answered God's purpose who were not all brethren, the children of one common father, partners together, first in the same grievous bondage, and then in a miraculous deliverance, &c.

Again, no one is more full and explicit than St. Paul in confessing that his election was solely of grace. He acknowledges himself to be "the chief of sinners" (1 Tim. i. 15), "not meet to be called an apostle" (1 Cor. xv. 9), because he was a "blasphemer and a persecutor" (1 Tim. i. 13) of the Church of Christ; and holds himself forth as a wonderful instance of God's long-suffering patience, so great as to be "a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting" (1 Tim. i. 16), that none might despair of salvation. Never was there a case of conversion more entirely attributable to that sovereign and unmerited grace of which he himself is so full and eloquent an expounder; and yet this sovereignty and utter demerit were not incompatible, it would seem, with there being a condition and difference in his case, the want of which in most of his countrymen shut them out from the salvation of Christ. "I obtained mercy," he says (1 Tim. i. 13), "because I did it *ignorantly*, in *unbelief*." This manifestly implies that had he willingly resisted, *knowing* and *believing* that this was the very Christ, and like other Pharisees continued to oppose, though convinced that this was "the heir," he would

have prevented his own conversion and shut himself out from mercy. But he "was not disobedient to the heavenly vision" (Acts xxvi. 19); and on this *negative* condition (known to God from all eternity), he implies that the grace which converted him was vouchsafed.

The terms in which the apostle elsewhere speaks of the election of believers show that it is not from anything *in themselves meritorious* that they are selected, but solely in Christ Jesus, "According as He hath chosen us *in Him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love" (Eph. i. 4). If the *meritorious cause* of the believer's election is inquired into, Christ's merits alone form the ground of God's choice. Jesus is God's *chosen One*. "Behold mine *elect* in whom my soul delighteth" (Isaiah xlii. 1); and God "hath chosen us *in Him*." But this "moving cause" of God's election is in no way inconsistent with His requiring a condition in those of His creatures to whom it is to prove availing. The condition is that fleeing out of ourselves, renouncing every claim to merit and all dependence on self, and acknowledging that "*in us*, that is, in our flesh, dwelleth no good thing," we be "found *in Him*, not having our own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ" (Phil. iii. 9). This condition—*negative*, observe, and not positive or in any wise meritorious, the *absence* of that unsusceptibility of renewal which man may bring upon himself by continued resistance to God's Spirit—is that which God, who knows beforehand perfectly what each of His creatures will choose, includes as a necessary element to be found in all comprehended in His decree of election.

We are thus led to a far more worthy conception of God's election of some, and reprobation of others, than that which is usually entertained. Election is not that arbitrary, partial, and undiscerning *distinction without a difference* which some unworthily attribute to the all perfect and loving Father of all. Where God makes a judicial distinction in their final doom between two or more of His moral creatures, there must be some ground *in them* for the distinction, however impercepti-

ble to us, even though all distinction be shut out in respect to righteousness or merit. There must be a susceptibility for the purpose for which God designs them in those whom he selects : there must be in those whom He rejects a self-wrought hardness and unsusceptibility for the end for which God created them, which occasion His righteous exclusion of them as reprobate. Election, or *choice*, between two or more things, to be intelligent, presupposes the discernment of some distinction *inherent in the objects themselves* which forms the ground of our preference. To say that we can make an election or choice among twelve, let us suppose, white marble balls all *exactly equal and similar in every respect*, is an abuse of terms. *Choose*, we cannot. We may single out blindly six of the twelve ; but it must be a mere hap-hazard, random act, where we are incapable of discerning the slightest difference between them. So it is an unbecoming conception of God's election to suppose that He makes a distinction, where there is no difference ; that some He chooses without any ground in them for preference, while others He as arbitrarily rejects, who are in no wise more objectionable than those whom He has elected.

If all men were in themselves equal in *every* respect, elect and non-elect, and God select some and reject others, without any inequality on *their* part, it is evident that *God's* ways would be unequal—a charge which He repudiates with great indignation. “Hear now, O house of Israel, Is not my way equal? Are not your ways unequal? Behold, all souls are mine ; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?” Ezek. xviii. 4, 23, 25. Still there *is* an inequality, as the different destiny assigned to the elect and to the reprobate shows. By hypothesis of those with whom we are reasoning, the inequality exists not in the *individuals* themselves. Consequently the inequality must rest with *God*.

It is wholly irrelevant to reply that God may have some other good reason for the distinction He makes, that is *external* to the persons. This is the very essence of arbitrariness and partiality—to make a distinction in the treatment of two

exactly equal for some secret reason of our own, unconnected with the individuals themselves.

The freeness of God's election is not infringed, nor the grace of His decree of mercy diminished by the condition to be fulfilled on man's part, no more than the freeness and grace of a sovereign's pardon proclaimed to a rebellious province would be lessened by the condition that all who will be benefited by it must accept the offer and lay down the arms of their rebellion—and by his selection of those only as the objects of his mercy who, he knows, have yielded unfeigned submission to his terms. This, however, like every illustration borrowed from human transactions, gives but a faint idea of the graciousness and power of God's electing mercy, which singles out and deals individually with each separate member, employing the special inducements and means best suited to arouse and reclaim each, so that for every preparatory movement towards repentance, and for every better thought, he is wholly indebted to that gracious Lord, who elects, draws him out, and rescues him from the midst of a godless world sunk in the mire and insensibility of sin.

IV. *But lastly it is objected that God's SOVEREIGNTY over all His creatures is asserted in the most unqualified terms in the Confession of Faith, that "He hath most sovereign dominion over all beings to do by them, for them, and upon them whatsoever Himself pleaseth,"* ch. ii. 2. *After mentioning God's free choice of the elect, "the rest of mankind," it is said, "God was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereigna power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice,"* ch. iii., sec. 7. *Here (it is urged) a sovereignty is claimed for God, that seems to select or reject simply according to His own pleasure the objects of His mercy and of His severity, irrespectively of any diversity in them.*

To this we reply that God's sovereignty must never be so explained as to make it contradict and supersede any of the

other attributes of God, as absolutely ascribed to Him both in Scripture, and in the Confession. While it is said in the Confession that "He worketh all things according to the counsel of His own *immutable will*," it is added "and most *righteous will*," and He is described as "most loving, gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin," ch. ii. sec. 1. Everything that is arbitrary, partial, and despotic must be removed from our idea of God's sovereignty.

There is no attribute of God on which more vague ideas have been entertained than on this of His sovereignty, nor any, the sphere of which, and its relation to His other attributes, it seems more necessary to define. In creation and in the bestowal of His gifts, God is entirely free and sovereign, assigning to all as it pleases Him their nature, their place, their endowments, and in the case of moral beings, all the variety of mental qualities and religious privileges which He sees most fitted for each. It is for God alone to determine whether any being He creates is to be an angel or a man, to be gifted with the faculties or culture of a Newton, or with only the intelligence and nurture of a Hottentot; to enjoy the full light of Christian education and teaching, or to be left to the darkness of heathen superstition. But in His moral government, and in the awards which He will adjudge to each for the improvement made of the gifts and opportunities allotted, not sovereignty, but righteousness presides, and will award to each not according to that which he had not, but according to that which he had, and to the use he made of it. It is the part of sovereignty to determine the gift, but not the reception or rejection of it, nor the use and improvement to be made of it by the recipient.

Further, in the case of those who have sinned, God is entirely sovereign to pardon or to condemn, to pass over the angels that fell, while He compassionates the fallen race of mankind—and out of the latter to choose some for mercy if He please, and others for severity, otherwise mercy were no more mercy. So far as mere *justice* is concerned, since all are rebels against Him, God might leave all to perish; and if He selects some

as objects of His pardoning mercy, it gives no claim for similar compassion to others, nor ground of complaint on the score of *justice*, should He please to pass them over. "The potter hath power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour," Rom. ix. 21. On the ground of *right* none can question God's different treatment of those who have forfeited all title to any good at His hands, "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth," Rom. ix. 18.

But it is one thing, what God has a right to do, and another what He actually does. It is one thing, what claims the creature has on God's *justice*, and quite another what God's *mercy* freely gives. And that mercy is equally boundless as all His other perfections, and knows no limits but those which the necessity of the case and the demands of His other perfections absolutely require. God's "tender mercies are over *all* his works," Ps. cxlv. 9. If He treats judicially one in one way, and another in another, both of whom appear to us to be in exactly equal circumstances, we may feel assured that it is because of some difference in them, however unobservable and inappreciable by us, that He makes the distinction—and which in the great day of judgment will be seen and acknowledged by them and by all to be exactly accordant with the most perfect mercy and impartiality. Nothing approaching to partiality, or inequality of dealing, must for a moment be attributed to God. *Impartiality* consists in treating those alike who are in exactly equal circumstances. God claims to Himself this perfection, as well as that of justice, "Are not my ways equal? saith the Lord. Behold all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine," Ezek. xviii. "There is no respect of persons with God," Rom. ii. 11. While therefore we assert God's absolute right to "show mercy to whom he will show mercy, and whom he will [judicially] to harden," of which He alone is the sole and sovereign judge, we must be careful not to attribute to Him as His *actual* procedure what would in any way be contrary to His perfect impartiality, or to any of His other perfections, such as His universal and boundless love. If God has once resolved to extend mercy to

a sinful world, we must not ascribe to Him anything like favouritism or partiality in its exercise, since He makes His offers of grace to all without exception, and has solemnly declared that "He is not willing that *any* should perish," 2 Pet. iii. 9, and that He "will have *all men* to be saved," 1 Tim. ii. 4. We must not suppose that for some secret reason of His own, altogether irrespective of anything in the creatures themselves, God shows mercy to some which He denies to others in exactly similar circumstances.

But is not this, it will be said, the very right of choosing some and rejecting others, simply *according to His own pleasure*, which St Paul claims for God in Rom. ix. 18, "Therefore hath He mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth"? The *right*, certainly. Right or justice, the criminal can never plead for his exemption from punishment, however much favour may be shown to others in what may appear similar circumstances to his own; and therefore St Paul immediately repels the cavil of the Jew that there would be "*unrighteousness with God*" (ix. 14), if the Gentiles were admitted into the Christian Covenant and the Jews rejected. None are entitled to question God's right in His different treatment of different individuals. "Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (ver. 21). The decision in such cases rests wholly with God, and none can say unto Him, What doest thou? But as St Paul immediately goes on to show (ix. 22-24), though in this respect, God giveth no account of His matters to any one, and He is the sole judge who are the proper subjects for His pardoning mercy, and who for His hardening severity, we are never for a moment to doubt that *perfect unlimited love*, and *discriminating impartiality* regulate God's procedure in every case. In the illustrative parable of the potter in Jeremiah xviii., God first claims absolute power over the Jewish, as over every nation and person, and the acknowledgment of this sovereign right from all, to deal with them as to Him seems best. "The vessel that the potter was making of clay," from some grit or other defect in the clay, (doubtless from no unskilfulness on the

part of the potter, who here represents the Lord) "was marred in the hands of the potter ; so he made it again another vessel as seemed good to the potter to make it." So God asserts His right to do with Israel, to make and unmake them according to His sovereign will and pleasure. "O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter ? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel." But having asserted this right, is it ever exercised by Him but in exact accordance with His other attributes of mercy, impartiality, and the most careful reference to the conduct of those under His moral government ? Let His own words that immediately follow in Jeremiah xviii. 7 decide. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to pull down and to destroy it ; if that nation against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them."*

Exactly so in Rom. ix., where, after asserting God's unchallengeable right alone to judge on whom to have mercy, and whom judicially to harden (ix. 14-18), and rebuking the daring impiety of sinful man in questioning the acts of the Sovereign Disposer of all (ix. 19-21), the apostle immediately goes on to show (ix. 22-24) that great forbearance and leniency had been exercised towards those "vessels of wrath," who had long been calling down God's wrath for their destruction ; and that undeserved grace was shown unto those who, renouncing every claim to any *righteousness of their own*, "submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God," (Rom. x. 3) and humbly accepted it as an unmerited gift.

* The same adjudication to *individuals*, to each in exact accordance with his use of the opportunities granted him, independently of the relations in which he may stand to others, is taught in Ezek. xviii., in illustration of the asserted equality of God's dealings.

Ver. 5. "If a man be just, &c.,—ver. 9, "he shall surely live."

Ver. 10. "If he beget a son that is a robber, &c."—ver. 13, "he shall surely die : his blood shall be upon him."

Ver. 14. "Now, lo, if he [the robber] beget a son that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth and doeth not such like," &c.—ver. 17 "he shall not die for the iniquity of his father : he shall surely live."

Paul is here, as Jeremiah, arguing with the Jews who controverted God's *right* to cast them off, after He had once called them, and against their plea of right appeals to God's sovereign right. Surely on the score of right no creature has a claim to any thing from God but what He gives of His own good pleasure. To creatures who have sinned, all is mercy, free, unmerited grace. But while the apostle brings forward God's absolute sovereignty to beat down every claim of desert, and to enforce that state of entire self-abasement and submissiveness indispensable for the reception of God's grace, it is a very different question *how* God exercises this right.

God's sovereignty is thus in itself absolute, but is controlled and regulated by His other attributes of mercy and impartiality. If, in accordance with these, He has respect in His purposes and dealings to the different ways in which His offers of grace are treated by the elect and the reprobate, it were an abuse of terms to say that there is here an infringement of His sovereignty. That is no real limitation of God's right or power, which the harmonious actings of His whole nature and perfections prescribe to their exercise.

While, therefore, the Westminster Confession of Faith ascribes, as do the Scriptures, absolute sovereignty to God, it is of course to be understood that it is in complete accordance with all His other attributes of perfect mercy, love, and impartiality, that (as stated in Chap. iii., sec. 7) God, in forming His decrees, "was pleased according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures [which alone has to decide who are the proper objects for His mercy, and who for His severity, as well as to prescribe whatever terms of acceptance He sees meet for sinners], to pass by [those who will not submit themselves implicitly], and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin [in first rebelling and then obstinately refusing His offers of mercy], to the praise of His glorious justice." It is "for *their sin*,"* (as foreseen by God) not by any supralapsarian decree,

* It is for "*their sin*,"—and let it be remembered what is the sin for which, ever since the fall, the final condemnation will be passed. Not for the

irrespective of the creature's probation—and “to the praise of His glorious *justice*,” which renders to every man according to his deeds, not of His *arbitrary sovereignty*—that God is here said to “pass by” those whom He saw it not meet to choose, “and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath.”

It will be objected that the defence now offered of the Westminster Confession of Faith is not in accordance with the *historical* interpretation of that document, as determined both by the well-known sentiments of its authors, and by the general current of opinion ever since. But we beg to remind such objectors that no public and authoritative document like the Westminster Confession—no Act of Parliament, for instance, and such *also* is the Westminster Confession—is to be interpreted as enjoining anything further than what it distinctly states, whatever may have been the sentiments of the majority of those engaged in drawing it up. Nay, the stronger that those sentiments may be known to have been, the very forbearance to give them distinct expression shews that the authors of the Confession did not deem it expedient to enforce them. It is too often forgotten with what deliberation all the statements in the Confession were weighed, the Assembly being composed of men holding very conflicting opinions, and how carefully the strong statements allowed to those on one side were guarded by counter-statements on the other. Such a formulary must be interpreted in consistency with itself, and by comparing attentively one part with another.

general sinfulness of the race. All have received a respite, and are subjected to a new probation, not like that of Adam and Eve, whether they will retain their innocence; but whether, being sinners, they will accept the salvation freely offered to them through Christ Jesus. Those, and those only, who deliberately resist the movements of the *common grace* vouchsafed to all, and the influences of God's Spirit, who striveth with every man, are “passed by” without receiving the *special grace* necessary for their regeneration (see p. 409); and for this “*their sin*” in rejecting God's offers are rejected by Him, and “ordained to dishonour and wrath, to the praise of His glorious justice.” Compare the Saviour's words, “And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil” (John iii. 19); and again, Mark xvi. 16, “He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved; but he that *believeth not* shall be damned.”

While there were men of extreme views in the Westminster Assembly, who would have been inclined, like many of their successors since, to cut at once the Gordian knot by making God's Predestination and Sovereignty all in all, and man's free will and agency nothing, there were others who insisted on vindicating God's attributes and man's liberty by the insertion of the caution, "Yet so, as thereby neither is *God the author of sin*, nor is violence offered to the *will of the creatures*, nor is the *liberty or contingency* of second causes taken away, but rather established," chap. iii. sec. 1. Some would not have scrupled to have joined in the famed *dictum* of Calvin, which entirely excludes all "liberty or contingency," and which, had it found sanction in the Westminster Confession, would have precluded the defence now offered for it, since it represents God as the cause of man's reprobation equally as of his election. The passage occurs in Book III., chap. xxiii. 7, of his Institutes, "Whence comes it, I again ask, that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations with their infant children in eternal death without remedy, unless that such was the pleasure of God? A horrible decree, indeed, I admit; yet no one can deny but that God foreknew what the end of man was to be before He made him; and *foreknew* it on this ground, that He *had so ordained it by His own decree*." These last words, in so far as they furnish any explanation of the grounds of God's foreknowledge, can only mean that God cannot with certainty foresee any act left dependent on the freewill of another, unless He Himself brings it to pass directly, or indirectly by influencing the wills of His creatures. This in reality makes God the responsible author of all things—of reprobation and its causes and consequences, equally as of election. But the assumption is wholly a gratuitous one, and in truth an unwarrantable bringing down of God's perfections to the level of man's powers. Because man foreknows as certain (and scarcely even that) no more than what he himself has predetermined to do, does it follow that God cannot? Are we so to limit God's knowledge as to affirm that if He has determined to create a *truly free-will being* (that is, one capable of forming an independent volition of *his own*), He cannot in-

fallibly foresee all the volitions of such a being, and yet reserve in His predestinating decree the freedom of choice necessary to the responsibility of the creature? Foreknowledge and causation have no necessary connection with each other. The assertion, though so confidently made by Calvin and Edwards, has no other foundation than our incompetency to comprehend God's perfections, and to explain the *mode* by which foreknowledge and freewill are to be reconciled. With equal reason might we deny the possibility of God's making a freewill creature at all, because we cannot comprehend how a creature dependent at every moment for all that he is, and has, upon the Creator, can originate an act (as sin), which is not God's; or we might deny the possibility of creation out of nothing, because, so far as human power and human comprehension reach, "*ex nihilo nihil fit.*"

That Calvin ascribes the reprobation of the impenitent not to their sin and obstinate unbelief, and to God's righteous *justice* following thereupon, but solely to God's *Will* and *Sovereignty*, he leaves no room to doubt by his repeated assertions. Thus in Book III., chap. xxii. 11, he says, "Therefore, if we cannot assign any reason for His bestowing mercy on His people except that such is His pleasure, neither can we have any other ground for His reprobating others but *His own will.*" Again, in Book III., chap. xxiii. 1, he says, "Those, therefore, whom God passes by He reprobates, and that *for no other reason* but because it is *His will* to exclude them from the inheritance which He predestines to His children." Calvin here evidently places election and reprobation on exactly the same footing, and makes God's sovereign will equally the cause of the one as of the other.

Now, not only has the Westminster Confession cautiously abstained from using such expressions, but it has distinctly asserted the very opposite. It says of the reprobate, that it is "for *their sin*" that God "ordains them to dishonour and wrath," and not, as Calvin says, "of His own *will*"—that it is "to the praise of His glorious *justice*," and not of His *sovereignty*.

In short—with regard to the Westminster Confession of

Faith—just as we have found it necessary to do with regard to many scriptural truths—attention must be drawn to distinctions which have been too generally overlooked, and which, if once firmly grasped and distinctly kept in view, would put an end to much misapprehension and controversy.

The Westminster Confession is usually called Calvinistic. It is so in the sense that it sets forth clearly and prominently the cardinal doctrine of Calvin's system, which he has so conclusively established in opposition to all Arminian and Pelagian error, that the salvation of the redeemed originates wholly with God, and is all, from first to last, solely the work of God's free, sovereign will and grace, in their election, calling, conversion, renewal, and final sanctification, "without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature as conditions or causes moving Him thereunto," chap. iii. 5.

But it is not Calvinistic in the sense of its adopting the error on the other side into which Calvin fell, of attributing Reprobation simply and solely to the will of God. Reprobation is not in its view an act of *sovereignty*, but of *justice*. It is a rejection after *probation*—which is presupposed in God's predestinating decree, and the result of it foreseen as issuing in the sin of obstinate unbelief—so that it is for this "their sin," and not from God's mere "will," that the finally impenitent are "ordained to dishonour and wrath." This probation Calvin's theory utterly ignores. Altogether irrespectively of what the creatures are to choose or do in the exercise of their freewill, he makes God to determine beforehand, of His own absolute will, the final destiny of each. "Predestination," he says, "is the eternal decree of God, by which He determined with Himself what He would have to be done with every man. For all are not created on equal terms; but to some of them eternal life is preordained, and to others eternal damnation. Therefore, according as each has been created for the one or the other of these two ends, we say that he has been predestined to life or death." Institutes, Book iii. ch. xxi. 5. God's *Sovereignty* he thus makes intrude into the province of His *Justice*. This is pure Supralapsarianism—

which, as was remarked in the Notes on Rom. ix. p. 341, is in direct opposition to the doctrine of the Westminster Confession—an ordaining, without regard to anything men are themselves to do or choose, some, like Jacob, to eternal life, and others, like Esau, “to dishonour and wrath,” not “for their sin,” but according to God’s absolute will and pleasure.

It is, indeed, “a gross error,” as Dr Crawford has well characterized it, (into which Calvin seems to have fallen) “to attach to the decrees of God the idea of peremptory enactments, by which the will of some uncontrollable sovereign is rigidly enforced, and to ascribe to them a direct and potent influence in bringing to pass the events to which they relate” (see above, p. 389). But it is not difficult to see how Calvin has been misled into this error, and how so many supporters of the Confession of Faith—influenced by his authority, and supposing (notwithstanding the cautions of the Confession) that his and its doctrine were identical—have incautiously adopted it. “Nothing,” he justly argued, “can take place but according to God’s Will. All things, therefore,” he inferred, “proceed from that Will, as their true original source.” In a certain sense this is true, so that God may be called the author of all things, *evil* as well as *good*, since without His permission moral evil could not have arisen—since, notwithstanding the abuse which, in choosing evil, God foresaw that His responsible creatures would make of their freewill, He still brings them into existence, and permits the evil to manifest itself, nay, “arranges and disposes” the very circumstances and objects that are to call forth the evil manifestations. But it is by His *permissive*, not *causative* will, that moral evil has a place in His world. “Not,” indeed, “by a *bare permission* (as the Confession states, ch. v. 4), but such as hath joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding, and otherwise ordering and governing of them, in a manifold dispensation, to His own holy ends; yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature, and not from God; who, being most holy and righteous, neither is, nor can be, the approver of sin.” More particularly, as regards the sin of our first parents, the Westminster Shorter Catechism, Quest. 13, tells us that “they

were *left* to the freedom of their own *will*;" and the Confession, ch. vi. sec. 1, says, "this, their sin, God was pleased, according to His wise and holy counsels, to *permit*." This "distinction," however, "between [causative] *will*, and *permission*," Calvin will not hear of (though it lies at the very foundation of the question); "Why (he insists) do we say that God *permits*, but just because He *wills*?" Book iii., ch. xxiii. 8. Calvin was afraid that if he conceded any originating power whatever to the creature's will, the Sovereignty of God would thereby be infringed. He does not see that by the repulsive aspect he gives to this attribute in pressing it beyond its legitimate sphere, and by making the Sovereignty of God over-ride all His other attributes, he throws an obstacle in the way of the cordial acceptance of this most important and humbling, yet consolatory truth. He does not see how much higher an idea it gives us of God's sovereignty and power, and wisdom, if, leaving the will of His creatures freely to exercise itself, He yet so overrules its determinations as, instead of obstructing, to promote His great purposes.

But further, the ascription of all things, even the volitions of the creature, to God's will as the originator and prime mover, gave a symmetrical roundness, completeness, and simplicity to the whole theory, most tempting to a logical mind like Calvin's. Let God's will take the initiative in everything, and all difficulty vanishes. God foreknows infallibly the volitions and acts of all His creatures—because He Himself originates, predestines, and orders all. Predestination and Free-will no longer appear irreconcilable. The problem is solved.

Doubtless—but how? By denying that there was any problem to be solved; by eliminating entirely the conflicting element on the opposite side of the question, and merging man's will wholly in God's will. The common sense of mankind has, it seems, heretofore been in error, in considering that man's will could originate anything—even *sin*. God is the originator of all—and, therefore, even of *sin*!

Doubtless the problem is solved. But at what an expense? The real problem or difficulty of the moral universe (see p. 394) is lost out of sight entirely, with all the power, and wisdom, and

grace, manifested in its solution through Christ Jesus. One difficulty, indeed, is removed. But it is, by introducing a host of others, which are urged as objections against the doctrine of the Confession of Faith, as supposed identical with Calvin's theory—and all of which, we think it has been shown, vanish as soon as we discard his error, and restore to freewill the originating power which is assigned to it in the Westminster Confession.

The objection of a friend suggests another distinction most important to be made, since it settles, if I mistake not, the whole question. His objection is this: "Perfect freedom of will, and freedom from sin, are by no means incompatible, as is evident from the cases of the angels in heaven, and of 'the spirits of the just made perfect.' Why, therefore, could not God from the first, had He so pleased, have preserved man infallibly in a state of perfect rectitude, without impairing his freedom of will? And if so, what prevents Him now turning the hearts of all men whomsoever He will, and saving all, if such were His pleasure, without any interference with their freewill? He has but to place sufficiently powerful motives before them, and to enforce them by His Spirit, and the change of man's will must indubitably follow. What, then, becomes of your Theodicy, or attempt to find a ground in the individuals themselves for the distinction which God makes in the election of some and reprobation of others? Must we not revert to Calvin's explanation of referring both simply to the sovereign will of God?"

The cases adduced, it is replied, are not in point. The angels were "left to the freedom of their own will." If now incapable of falling, they were not originally so, nor kept in every instance from taking the fatal step, as is proved by the case of the fallen angels. The saints in heaven, again, *have had* their probation. They were left to make, and have made, their choice. Acknowledging their own utter powerlessness to change their evil hearts, and when converted to keep themselves from relapsing, they "*chose* that better part which shall not be taken from them;" they cast themselves simply on their Redeemer, whose infinite power and love are hence-

forth pledged for their preservation. Once the believer has surrendered himself unreservedly to Christ, no being or thing, not even his own treacherous heart, can separate him even here from Christ (Rom. viii. 35), since he is "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation" (1 Peter i. 5); how much more in heaven, where there shall be no more temptation to assail, and where God's mysterious law of habit will lend its aid, by which whatever is long and perseveringly practised becomes as it were a second nature ?

The objection derives its plausibility from confounding the sphere of freedom necessary for the will in a state of probation, and that which it will have when the probation is ended. Then there will be no longer any possibility of passing from the moral condition deliberately chosen by each individual, but the irrevocable sentence will go forth, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still," Rev. xxii. 11.

The objection is founded upon an entire misapprehension, or forgetfulness of the great design of this world and of man's being here below. The whole tenor of Scripture, and all God's treatment of man in Providence and in Redemption, point to this—that the present world is designed as a state of *probation*, to give to each an opportunity of deliberately making his choice between good and evil. To render a being truly moral, and capable of the highest happiness and glory to which a creature can attain, he must, it appears, be subjected to a trial, and choose freely, and of his own accord, that better part which shall then become unalterably his. Life and death, good and evil, must be so placed before him, and his will be left so far free, as to render the choice truly his own. There is no question but that God could, by placing overpowering motives before the mind, turn it either way without putting any constraint on the will. But this would not answer the purpose He has in view, which is to prove His moral creature. For this purpose He must place the two alternatives, with the motives to each, so equally before him (at least in the great critical moments that are to decide his

doom for eternity), that man is able, by the self-determining power committed to him, to turn the scale to either side. Not *God's* will, therefore (as Calvin would have it), must determine at this particular point, but *man's* will, however much it may have been prepared and aided before by God's Spirit. Man's ⁵probation, indeed, does not now, as did that of our first parents, consist *directly* in choosing between good and evil—whether he will continue in his integrity, or fall from it; but whether, having fallen, he will rise again, or sink—whether he will accept, or refuse the salvation freely offered and pressed upon him. Now we cannot for a moment suppose that God calls upon His creature—upon the pain of life or death—to do that which He withholds from him the power to do. If God calls upon man to choose, He must leave that *little* for him freely and unbiassedly to decide, which will make the choice truly his own. That *little*, let it not be forgotten (as was shown above, p. 401), is not to remove the *moral inability* of the will—this is the great work which Divine power offers to effect for him—but by the *natural ability* which the will of fallen man still retains, to put forth his hand and receive the remedy which will release his will from its moral bondage, and bring him “into the glorious liberty of the children of God,” Rom. viii. 21.

The distinction now drawn between the *kind* of freedom indispensable for a state of probation, and the freedom which the will shall retain in a future world, I consider to be of the very highest importance in settling this most intricate question. It gets rid of all metaphysical subtleties and disputes as to the nature of that freedom of will which is necessary to constitute a moral being. In a future world, the grand question between Necessitarians and Non-Necessitarians will lose its importance, since *moral* necessity will apparently bring about all the same results of deliberation as *natural* necessity, so far at least as *moral* volitions are concerned. Given the circumstances and motives then placed before the mind, and the choice that will be made may be calculated with certainty, since the moral state of the mind (the only other element in the calculation) will then be immutably fixed for good or for evil.

But if this be the only kind of freedom conceded to the will in the present world, there can be no *probation*, *i.e.*, no possibility of moral choice between good and evil—between life and death. Deny this power of choice between these alternatives to man now, or suppose its result to depend only on God and not on the creature, and there will be no probationary trial—no more here, than there will be hereafter. Without this *probationary* freedom of will for which we contend, the present life and world become meaningless and delusive. God seems to give to man a power to choose, and yet He determines that choice for him irresistibly by the circumstances, and motives, and mind which He appoints to him. God calls upon His creature to do that which He leaves him no power to do.

Beyond all question, therefore, man must have this *probationary* power of will, in himself and of his own free motion to turn either way—in the great critical moments that are to decide his fate. Nay more, there must be no *moral necessity* even laid upon him, by the motives inclining to either side being too strong for his will to overcome—else there can be no probation, or fair trial for the creature. The motives, then placed before him by God, must be so equally balanced, that the creature feels and knows, and will acknowledge at the final judgment, that the decision was his own, in accepting or rejecting the offers placed before him for his choice.

If such be the power of will now possessed by man, and such the choice placed before him, simply to accept, or to refuse, the salvation which God offers—when by the teaching of His Spirit He has brought each to see his misery and helplessness, the grace and love that stand ready to help him, and the mighty issues that depend on his acceptance or rejection—then can we understand the intensity of the interest with which the inhabitants of heaven are represented as looking on and watching the decision of each, and “the joy that there is in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth,” Luke xv. 10. Then can we understand—if God has to restrain, as it were, His power, in order to leave His creature free to exert his power—how He can with all

truth exclaim, "What *could* have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?" Isa. v. 4. But if, as Calvin maintains, not man's will, but God's, decides the choice of the Reprobate, then the lamentation of the Almighty over their obduracy and impenitence becomes simply unintelligible: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die?" Ezek. xxxiii. 11. If God's will be that which decides the creature's choice of evil, it seems impossible to reconcile with such a supposition the solemn assertion of His own word: "God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," 2 Pet. iii. 9. In Scripture, every movement of God's *Spirit*, of God's *will*, of God's *pleasure*, is represented as ever prompting to good in His creatures, never to evil—to their salvation, never to their destruction. "The *Spirit* lusteth against the flesh," Gal. v. 17. "This is the *will* of God, even your sanctification," 1 Thess. iv. 3. "God *will* have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," 1 Tim. ii. 4. "Have I any *pleasure* at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his evil ways and live?" "I have no *pleasure* in the death of him that dieth," Ezek. xviii. 23, 32. It seems, therefore, a gross misrepresentation of the truth, and in direct contradiction to Scripture, when Calvin refers the Reprobation of the impenitent to God's will and pleasure as the *originating* cause: *e.g.*, "If we cannot assign any reason for God's bestowing mercy on His people, but just that it so pleases Him, neither can we have any reason for His reprobating others but His *will*." "You see how he refers both to the mere *pleasure* of God," Instit. Book iii., ch. xxii. 11.

Why, then, it will perhaps be asked, create beings subjected to such a fearful alternative? Let us beware, lest by such an objection we incur the censure of the apostle, "Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?" (Rom. ix. 20.) Was God to be precluded from creating such a being as man, whose very fall has fur-

nished scope for the brightest manifestations of God's perfections, and from endowing him with a moral and responsible nature, capable of attaining to the most transcendent happiness and glory—to be an “heir of God, and joint-heir with Christ”—because some fail to stand the moral probation indispensable for this end, and abuse their high capacities to their own and their Creator's dishonour ?

It is with no little misgivings that I have ventured to express my sentiments on questions so abstruse and difficult which have divided so many wise and good men : and it is only from a deep sense of their important bearing on our views of the Divine perfections and government, and of man's responsibility and final destiny, and from an anxious desire to remove, if possible, the scruples of many sensitive minds, that I at length submit them to the candid consideration of the reflecting reader. They have been the result of much anxious thought and of a sincere determination to seek, unbiassed by any preconceptions, the simple truth ; and I shall feel grateful to be shown wherein I have erred, and to be taught “ a more excellent way.” I could not, however, rest satisfied with the prevailing misrepresentations (as they appeared to me) of the doctrine set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, which have prevented many from accepting cordially the highly important truth so strongly insisted on by Calvinism, from the idea that they must accept also the false inference that has been mixed up with it. The highly important truth so prominently brought out by Calvinism, let me again repeat, is that Election and Predestination to good originate wholly with God, who by His own special grace singles out its fitting objects, and by His own sole power effects the regeneration and final perfection of the Elect, so that the glory of their salvation from first to last is attributable entirely to “ His mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions or causes *moving* Him thereunto,” (Confession of Faith, chap. iii. 5).

The false inference almost universally mixed up with this,

indeed stated to be "its necessary complement," is, that Reprobation and Foreordination to evil are owing to God's withholding from others, according to His own free will and pleasure, that special grace without which they cannot turn unto God. Those who are not included in the decree of election are represented as being passed by and left by God to perish, without receiving any benefit from Christ, but rather the contrary; since by the extension of life procured by Him to Adam and his race, without which they would not have come into existence, they have been born in a state of hopeless sin and inherited moral impotency, for the removal of which, it is represented, they can take no step whatever.

The obvious objections to such a view are so grave as to form a strong presumption that some error must lurk under it.

1. It represents God as *imperfect and deficient in love*; as able to save all if He would, and yet not willing to do so; in direct opposition, too, seemingly to His own repeated declarations in Scripture, "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," 2 Pet. iii. 9; God "will have all men to be saved," 1 Tim. ii. 4, &c., &c.

2. It represents God as *partial and unequal in his dealings*; not treating all equally who are in exactly equal circumstances (*all* being dead in trespasses and sins), and this in face of His own indignant repudiation of such inequality, "O house of Israel, are not my ways equal? Are not your ways unequal?" "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine," Ezek. xviii. 4, 29.*

3. It represents God as making the Gospel-offer to many for whom He never intended it, and beseeching them to accept a Saviour who never died for them, and afterwards condemning them for the rejection of this offer.

It avails not to reply that they know not this (that their

* The great object of the whole chapter is to show that each man's place and final destiny are dependent not on inherited, but on personal, sin or righteousness—not on any arbitrary appointment of God, but on his own choice and conduct.

names are not included in the decree of election) at present, when urged to accept the offer. They will know it at the last day, and therefore will then be able with justice to plead,—No Saviour ever died for us ; consequently, we never rejected a Saviour.

4. It makes God the *abettor*, if not the *author of sin*. God, according to the usual theory, has but to will the change of the sinner's heart to the love of holiness, and yet forbears to will it. Now, according to His own unerring word, "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin," James iv. 17. To refrain from doing good and saving life, when it was in the power of His hand to do it, Jesus held would be equivalent in Him to killing and doing evil, Mark iii. 4.* Unless, therefore, we will hold righteousness to be one thing in Christ and another in God, there must be some error in the usual representation.

5. It represents the Gospel message in such a light as throws a formidable obstacle in the way of its reception. Expressed in plain terms the Gospel message, according to the prevalent theory, would sound much as if a king sent by his messengers, to a province that was in rebellion against his government, a general offer of pardon to all, in terms to this effect :—

"We are commissioned by our Sovereign to proclaim a full and free pardon to all who will accept it, and will lay down the arms of their rebellion. The king is not willing that any of you should perish. He wills that all be saved. He therefore beseeches you, one and all, by us his ambassadors, to be reconciled to him, warning you, at the same time, that, whoever refuses, his blood will be upon his own head.

"But while we thus make offer of free pardon to all, and press upon each of you to accept it, we know that it is the secret purpose of the sovereign not to pardon all, but that he has determined to save only a select number, whom he has chosen out solely of his own absolute will, without reference to any thing that you may do or choose."

Would not such an announcement, in a great measure,

* Compare Seneca's maxim, "Qui non vetat peccare cum possit, jubet."

neutralize any good effect that the former part of the message might have produced, and lead the hearers to distrust the sincerity of the king's offers? But what must they think if the messengers were to add, "The king knows well that ever since you entered on your rebellion, those intoxicating draughts and drugs which you are in the habit of taking have gained such a power over you, that you cannot resolve on giving them up (which is an indispensable condition of your pardon) unless he administers an antidote to you to cure your craving for them. This antidote, however, he administers secretly only to those whom he has selected beforehand; and in this way, while he offers the pardon to all, you yourselves will appear to have all the blame in refusing."

If the former announcement of the king's secret purpose left any heart in the hearers to comply with the invitation, this surely would paralyse every desire or effort at amendment.

If such be a correct representation of the Gospel-offer (and I am not aware that I have in any respect overcharged it), as it would appear if expressed in plain terms according to the prevalent interpretation of Predestination—need we wonder if Predestination, instead of affording (as the Confession of Faith represents it, chap. iii. 8), "matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God, and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation, to all that sincerely obey the Gospel," is regarded by both preacher and hearers as a repulsive mystery from the consideration of which they shrink as with instinctive dread? Must there not be something wrong, where the professed creed and the systematic preaching so differ, that the minister of the word "*shuns* to declare" to his hearers "*all* the counsel of God?"

All these difficulties and objections seem to be removed by the view propounded in the foregoing pages. Every truth of importance is conserved by it, and none violated. God's attributes are maintained, yet man's responsibility not impaired. The whole glory of the Elects' salvation is ascribed to God, yet no ground is given for a charge of defect of love or of impartiality towards the Reprobate. While all merit or boasting is shut out to the believer, no excuse is left to the

impenitent on the pretext of sufficient means and grace being withheld from him. The perfections of God are not set at variance, but all are brought into harmonious consistency. God's Sovereignty is not exalted at the expense of His Impartiality, nor His Justice at the expense of His Mercy. His most distinguishing attribute of Love is not restricted by confining it to a portion of His creatures alone. God does not prepare a limited salvation for a few, and then urge its acceptance on all, and condemn for its rejection those for whom it never was designed. He does not hold out the offer of pardon to all if they will only stretch out their hand and take it, while yet the arm of every prisoner is pinioned helplessly down, with the exception of the elect few whose bonds He has secretly loosed. Election no longer appears to be an arbitrary distinction made without a difference, nor Reprobation a passing by without probation, or Saviour truly offered, or any *greater demerit* on the part of its objects "moving thereunto." Predestination assumes its true place as a blessed truth, assuring the believer that all his sin, and weakness, and dangers have been fully anticipated and provided for, and every step in his onward progress pre-arranged and ensured, so that no unforeseen obstacle or enemy can arise, to make him come short of his eternal reward. What more delightful or consolatory truth could be imagined than that which creates the assurance that, amidst the seemingly fortuitous medley of good and evil which besets our path here below, all things are under the perfect regulation and control of a heavenly Father—and that not the slightest occurrence can take place, even through the wayward wills of the wicked, that has not been foreseen, and had its place adjusted beforehand in the perfect plan of Him, who overrules all things to work out His own great and glorious purposes, for the highest possible good of all!

EDWARDS ON THE "FREEDOM OF THE WILL."

Our remarks on Predestination and Freewill would be incomplete without some notice of President Edwards' celebrated

treatise on the "Freedom of the Will," since it has been so identified in the minds of many with the doctrine of the Westminster divines, that it is conceived both must stand or fall together. So far, however, is this from the truth, that it is, in fact, in direct contradiction to it. This even his own son, Dr Edwards, President of Union College Schenectady, saw and acknowledged, as is proved by the following extract from the "Memoirs of Jonathan Edwards" prefixed to his works, p. cccxxxv. of the London Edition in 2 vols, Ball, Arnold, & Co. "Even the famous Assembly of Divines had very imperfect views of this subject. This they prove when they say, 'Our first parents, *being left to the freedom of their own will*, fell from the estate wherein they were created;' and 'God foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, so as the *contingency* of second causes is not taken away, but rather established.' These divines unquestionably meant that our first parents, in the instance at least of their fall, acted from self-determination, and by mere contingency or chance. But there is no more reason to believe this, than there is to suppose it true of every sinner in every sin which he commits."

The first quotation here from the Shorter Catechism certainly does imply "the *self-determination* of the will," which is the great point that Edwards sets himself to controvert; and the second, from the Confession of Faith, implies that *contingency*, or freedom to choose either the one way or the other, is left to man, though yet the result has been perfectly certain beforehand to God, and predestinated and provided for.

It has become the more necessary to expose the fallacies in this famed treatise, since, as Isaac Taylor remarks in his Preliminary Essay prefixed to his edition of it, it has become the text-book to which every infidel appeals as confirmatory of the doctrine of Philosophical Necessity, which binds every moral being in the chains of the most stringent fatalism, and entirely releases man from all responsibility for his actions.

Never perhaps was there a more remarkable instance exhibited of the weakness and fallibility of human reason than in this Essay. Here we have an eminently great and good man, and one of the most powerful intellects that has ever appeared,

imposing upon himself and others by an argument which has by high authority been pronounced *unanswered and unanswerable*, and which yet consists of a series of the most egregious fallacies.

1. In the very outset, Edwards begins with confounding *will* and *desire*. Instead of assisting the reader by tying down *will* or *volition* to the one proper meaning—in this aspect—of the *final choice* or determination which, all things considered, the mind eventually forms, he attempts to obliterate the distinction which Mr Locke had already drawn between them. "A man," says Edwards, "never in any instance wills anything contrary to his desires, or desires anything contrary to his will." "The thing which he wills, the very same he desires." Now, on the contrary, Abraham *willed*, (that is determined), to slay his son Isaac, but it is surely an abuse of language to say that he *desired* it. In meditating on the line of conduct proper for us to pursue, everything that would incline us to a particular course, may be said in its turn to be an object of *desire*, as it passes in review before the mind; but not of *will*, properly so called, with the exception of that *finally chosen*. Instead of mystifying himself and the reader by confounding the two words, it would have been much more to the purpose to have drawn the distinction more sharply between them, and to have pointed senses to the fact that the word *will* is often used in both meanings, and to the consequent necessity of distinguishing carefully between them. According to Edwards' definition, which would blend both senses into one, our Lord's words could have no meaning in John vi. 38, "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." In the strict sense of will, that is, the volition formed or final determination, Christ never had a will which He could call "mine own will," in contradiction to that of His Father. His will (determination) uniformly coincided with His Father's will. In saying, therefore, that He came *not to do His own will*, we must assign to *will* the meaning not of volition or determination, but of *desire*: "I came not to do my own desire, or wish prompted by my human nature." In many cases, that which is the object of our strongest *desire*, is not that which forms

our final *will*, or determination. Thus, it was an object of the most intense *desire* with our Lord, in His agony in the garden, that the cup of suffering should, if possible, pass from Him; but His *will*, or fixed determination, was to submit implicitly to whatever His Father should appoint; “Nevertheless, not my will (desire), but thine be done.”

Had this double meaning of the word *will* been kept closely in view, much misunderstanding and unseemly controversy might have been spared that have divided Christian disputants, by showing them that their contention was one of words, and not of things. In speaking of God’s will, for instance, it will be seen that when His *absolute will* is meant—as the *final determination* that He forms, all things being taken into consideration, *e.g.*, His own righteousness, and the free-will choice of His creatures—it is God’s will that impenitent sinners shall perish. But when by God’s will is meant His *desire*, or *will of benevolence*, then it is not His will that any sinners should perish, but that all should believe on His Son and live. In the former sense God’s will is never resisted; in the latter, it is, alas! resisted every day.

The same ambiguity attaches to all the words, such as *purpose*, *intention*, &c., and the various modes of expression, employed with regard to this subject. Suppose the question to be, Did Christ die for all men, or only for the elect?—there is an ambiguity which must be carefully noted, that the answer may not be misunderstood. If the *absolute will*, *purpose* or *intention*, is meant of Him who knows beforehand with certainty who will accept, and who will not accept, His offers of salvation, the answer, of course, must be, “*Christ died for the Elect, and for the Elect only.*”^{*} But if God’s *benevolent will*, *purpose*, or *intention* in giving His Son is meant, then the answer is, “*Christ died for all men.*” “He is the propitiation

* There is no ground in Scripture for the doctrine of *universal Redemption*. The only passage that might with some plausibility be adduced in its favour is 2 Pet. ii. 1, “There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that *bought them*, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.” But since these false teachers were professed Christians, the expression evidently means no more than “the Lord whom they *professed* to be their *Redeemer*, or to have bought them.”

for our sins ; and not for ours only, but also for *the sins of the whole world*," 1 John ii. 2. "We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour of the world*," 1 John iv. 14. "For God so loved *the world*, that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life," John iii. 16. "God is the Saviour of *all men*, specially of those that believe," 1 Tim. iv. 10. "As by the offence of one judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation, even so by one righteousness the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life," Rom. v. 18. Here the "all men" in the first clause includes all *without exception* ; surely in the second clause, it must have an equally universal application, and mean that according to God's *benevolent* will, purpose, or design, the Gospel salvation has been procured for all *without exception*, though many put the gracious offer away from them.

Had the ambiguity attaching to these modes of expression been observed, the forced construction put upon these and similar passages of Scripture by Calvin and others, in order to make them suit with their one-sided conception, would have been seen to be perfectly unnecessary. Why should there be any greater difficulty in understanding the simple language of the Bible on this subject than would be found in any of the transactions between man and man ? Suppose that a province of a sovereign's dominion had been in rebellion against him, and that his son had interceded for them, and came with the message, "I have procured a general pardon for all. My father is not willing that any rebel amongst you should perish; to all I bring a message of forgiveness." Every one would understand at once the implied condition, Provided that you accept the free offer and lay down the arms of rebellion. None would ever think of wasting their time in a fruitless dispute, "Is the Prince come as the saviour of all, or only of a select few ?" He is the saviour of the select few only who submit ; he is the saviour of all except those who by their own wilful rejection of the gracious offer exclude themselves. The free gift has come upon all unto pardon and acceptance.

Equally unedifying and verbal will be seen to be the con-

tention, Is the atonement of Christ limited, or unlimited? In God's *absolute* will, it is limited. In the eye of Him who sees and knows all hearts, and what each in the exercise of his freewill will choose, it is limited to those alone who will avail themselves of it. In God's benevolent will and purpose, who "will have *all* men to be saved," it is unlimited—"a propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*," 1 John ii. 2. It is unlimited, by *God's* gracious will: limited, by *man's* wayward will. "How often *would I* have gathered thy children together—and *ye would not!*" Matt. xxiii. 37.

II. The second fallacy observable in Edwards' Essay is a sophism, into which great logicians seem particularly liable to fall—apparently from their perfect confidence in their own powers to detect all fallacies in the *process* of reasoning—the assumption without due examination of *false premisses*, amounting sometimes, as in the case before us, to a complete *petitio principii*. Quietly assuming that there can be no such thing as Freedom of Will in the true sense of a self-moving or self-determining power, he imposes on himself and his readers by commencing with a false definition of the term. Liberty of Will he defines to be, "Doing as one pleases," Part i. sect. v. But this is liberty of *action*, not of *will*. This is liberty not of *pleasing*, but of carrying out one's pleasure, that is, one's volitions, after these, according to Edwards' theory, have been necessitated for him by the motives presented to his mind, and the previously necessitated state of his mind. With as much propriety might we say that a machine, or the earth in moving round the sun, has freedom of will, because, after the motive impulse is given, it is free to move, without any obstruction in the way to impede its motion. Thus viewed, the question of the liberty of the will loses all interest in a moral point of view, as it leaves no room for responsibility. This will be evident from a simple example. Suppose that I, seeing a child upon the point of drowning in deep water, have resolved to rush in and save the child's life, but am forcibly restrained by the by-standers, neither I nor others can lay on me the charge of the child's death. My act consisted in

forming the volition to save the child, and therewith my responsibility ended. That I was not free to carry out the resolve of my will and to "*do as I pleased*," was not my fault, but that of others. Again, suppose that I raise my hand with the intention of plunging a dagger into my neighbour's breast, but that my arm is arrested by others; in the judgment of conscience and of God I am equally responsible, as if I had succeeded in executing the murderous intent. In both cases the purpose, or volition, was already there; and in my power to *determine* of myself—to form, or to forbear to form, the volition—alone lies my responsibility. The freedom to *do as I had willed or pleased*, is a subsequent consideration with which the freedom of the will has no concern.

Edwards thus, as we see, denies the existence of the Freedom of the Will in any legitimate sense of the term, and consequently denies man's responsibility; for if the will is not free to form its own volitions independently, and to determine itself, it is clear that it can be as little answerable for the conclusions at which it arrives. By an erroneous definition of the term, Edwards has contrived to conceal from himself this startling result (which might have made him pause), and by the great influence of his name has led others to acquiesce in this dangerous conclusion. Starting from false premisses, which assume the whole question in dispute, he gains an easy victory. No wonder that by those who inadvertently concede the premisses, "Edwards on the Will" should have been pronounced "a work which never was answered, and which never will be answered."

But this is not the only ambiguity connected with the expression, the "Freedom of the Will." There is a *natural* freedom of the Will which is of the very essence of the Will, without which it would cease to be a will, or man to be responsible: there is a *moral* freedom of the will, the loss of which by no means destroys his responsibility, but rather aggravates his guilt and condemnation. There is, for instance, no want of *natural* energy of will often in the acts of a man under the influence of intoxicating liquors, though he has lost for the time all *moral* power of will to restrain himself: and

if under these circumstances he is hurried on to commit some flagrant act, we blame him only the more for having brought himself into this state of moral inability. This moral bondage of the will with regard to spiritual good, with man's powerlessness to free himself from it, was the great point insisted upon by our Reformers, and so strongly urged in the Westminster Confession of Faith in ch. ix.—the great importance of which Edwards, Chalmers, and other Necessitarians have unfortunately tended to throw into the shade, by mixing up and confounding together the *moral* and *natural* freedom of the Will, and maintaining that we are equally destitute of the one as of the other.

But III. The fundamental error which lies at the root of Edwards' theory, and which occasions many of the prevailing errors in Mental Philosophy and Theology in the present day, is the forgetfulness of the characteristic distinction between Matter and Mind, and the transference of the language, which is originally and strictly applicable to the former, to the latter, without making the due deduction arising from the essential distinction between them.

Now the grand distinction between matter and mind is this: Matter is essentially inert. It moves as it is moved. It is totally destitute of any inherent *power*, like that of mind,* which can repress or put forth its energy at pleasure,

* Such a power even the lower animals possess in their measure. I knew a dog that possessed it in a remarkable degree. To give one instance: A horse had thrown its rider and came galloping down the street, followed by all the barking curs of the neighbourhood. The noble watch-dog I have mentioned was sitting at his master's shop door watching the whole proceeding. He quietly waited his time till the horse came opposite his master's door, and then suddenly springing forward, he caught the horse by the bridle, and pinned his head down to the ground.

A similar instance of the sagacity of an elephant was witnessed by a cousin of my own in India, when marching up a steep ridge with precipices on either side. One of the cannons in advance farther up the hill had broken loose from its traces, and came thundering down the steep, threatening to sweep before it a whole line of advancing troops, who had no room to deploy to the right or to the left—when an elephant watching its downward progress waited quietly till it was just about to pass him, and seizing with his trunk the end of the cannon, with one powerful jerk sent it whirling over the precipice.

and determine the mode, time, and direction of its action. When we see matter move, we immediately and justly ascribe the motion to some *power* extrinsic to the matter, and inquire after the motive power, or what was the efficient cause of the motion. We never for a moment suppose that it possesses a voluntary, self-moving, originating power of its own, but that it must move or act in one uniform undeviating manner under exactly the same circumstances.

When mind acts, on the contrary—in other words, puts forth a volition, or exerts its will, it is the man himself that acts. The power is intrinsic. I do not, like a piece of inert matter, merely follow an impulse given to me from without. It is I myself that act, that originate the action or motion, which, at the same time I feel, I could repress. I am the *agent*—a term that can never for a moment be applied to matter, and which marks the grand characteristic distinction between matter and mind. If it be asked, On what evidence do I ground this distinction, and claim for myself such an intrinsic power? I answer, On the highest and surest of all evidence—on that of consciousness. I *know* and *feel* that I have *power*—power which I can put forth, power which I can restrain, the use and direction of which I can vary, and for which I am responsible; whereas the whole of science is built on the opposite conclusion with regard to material *forces*—that there is no room for any voluntary action or self-restraint on their part—that they must act, or not act, according to the most definite and invariable laws. A spring, for instance, when bent or forced from its natural state, the moment that the constraining force is removed, must instantly start back and recover its original position. I repeat, therefore, that I know myself to be the voluntary, originating cause of my own action or motion. I possess a self-moving, self-determining and directing energy within myself, in the possession of which alone consists my responsibility—and to inquire what *moved* my mind, in the proper sense of the term, is to ignore my essential nature as a voluntary agent, and to confound *power*, which mind alone possesses, with material *force*.

All this will be clear from an illustration. Standing beside

a billiard table, I observe a red ball to roll and fall into the pocket beside me, and a white ball to roll into the opposite pocket. Tracing the cause, I find that the red ball was propelled by the white ball striking against its side. But what gave the white ball its impulse?—for I never for a moment suppose that a piece of inert matter originated the motion of itself. I find it received its impulse from a cue, which again was moved by a player's arm, and this arm by the will of an intelligent agent. At length I am satisfied in my search. I have reached the primary cause, or more properly agent, and I inquire no farther. Observe the wide distinction between the last stage in the process of the inquiry and all the previous steps. In all the previous steps, in the red ball, the white, the cue, and even in the arm of the player, I trace a series of *forces* indeed, but material and unintelligent, determined wholly in impetus and direction by the impulse given to them, and with a mathematical precision so exact that the skilful player can calculate upon them with certainty. Still none of these is an efficient, originating cause, endowed with power of self-motion, or self-determination. But so soon as I have traced the series of movements to an intelligent mind, I cease my inquiry as to the origination of the motion. I have found that which I know from past experience, and from the consciousness of a similar mind within myself, to possess an innate power of originating and directing motion or action. In all the previous steps of the investigation I recognized but *matter*—in this *mind*; in those *motion*—in this *action*; in those a *cause*—in this an *agent*; in those *force*, inert, involuntary, unintelligent—in this *power*, living, voluntary, self-conscious, that can act or forbear to act at pleasure, and determine the direction and degree of the action or energy it shall put forth. All the other causes were but *secondary*, but now I have reached the *primary, efficient* cause. I have discovered the *motive, self-determining* power, and my search, I repeat, as to the origination of the motion is at an end.

Not so, however, the Necessitarian's. He immediately sets to inquire, but what moved, what determined the mind? Misled by the ambiguity of the word *motive*, and forgetful that

it is only in an improper and figurative sense that all language, *which is borrowed from sensible things*, applies to mind, the Necessitarian observing the analogy that mind cannot act without a *motive*, any more than a piece of matter can move without a *motive force*, transfers immediately the relation of physical cause and effect, true of the one, to the other. The fallacy here, and the wide distinction between the two, may at once be made clear by following out our illustration.

The mind, Edwards argues, cannot move without a motive, that is, according to him, a cause ; and a self-determining power without a cause for the determination is absurd. If so, what was the motive that moved the player's mind to make the stroke we supposed ? It was the desire of making a good score by sending both balls into the pockets at once. It was a *desire* then, it seems, that moved the balls ! While a man himself, or his mind, or whatever is to be regarded as his proper *Ego* or personality, is not allowed to be capable of originating motion, a mere abstract thing called a *desire* possesses this power, and a *desire* propelled that white ball on the billiard table !

But why does the Necessitarian stop here ? Must he not according to his principles go on to inquire, What moved this motive ? What was its cause ? Or are we to ascribe to it a self-moving, self-determining power ? But this according to the necessitarian theory is absurd. We must have a previous motive to determine and to move this motive ; and when the Necessitarian has assigned this, we next ask, But what again moved this motive ?—and so on *ad infinitum*, till we land in making God the originating cause of every act and desire, and making man a mere machine, moved as he is moved, and incapable of spontaneous choice, or responsibility.

But even this will not avail to us as a resting place. If motives are the real originating cause of every act, since no intelligent being can act without a motive, what becomes of God's own free agency ? God, no more than man, can act without a motive, that is, according to the definition we are now considering, without a motive power distinct from Himself. There is thus a power, it seems, distinct from, and antecedent

to God, and that determines all His acts; and thus we land in the Fate of the ancients, and in constituting a God above God!

All these difficulties and this confusion vanish, the moment we perceive that a motive is not really the *beginning*, but the *end*, of an agent's act of will. We have here a notable instance how easily we are misled by a word. *Motive*, according to its etymological meaning, does indeed signify a *moving power*. But it has been forgotten that, since all language relating to the mind and mental operations is borrowed necessarily from material things, it is only in a figurative sense that the word motive is used, and that we must be careful in our reasoning not to transfer to mind the *inertia*, which differentiates matter from mind. The fact is, the motive, instead of being that which *initiates* action, is on the contrary the *end* to which it tends. Take an instance. Eve saw before her a desirable fruit, and was tempted to pluck and eat by—let us take the simplest of the motives—her appetite. She “saw that the tree was good for food.” The motive, we say in common language, that induced her to put forth her hand was the fruit before her—or rather the desire of indulging her appetite. But in truth this was the *end* that she proposed to herself. Two opposite objects of desire (motives) were before her: on the one hand, God's command, and the satisfaction arising from obedience to it; on the other, the fruit, and the satisfaction arising from eating it. Eve's hand moved. What moved it? The fruit? or the felt appetite and expected satisfaction? No, but Eve herself moved it. She was the self-moving, self-determining agent, who had power to put forth her hand, or power to forbear—who had power either to continue to look on the forbidden object of desire before her, and so to intensify the temptation—or to turn away her eyes from it and fix her thoughts on the command of her God—and thus to give the preponderating influence to whichever of the two objects (motives) she herself chose.

That the mind never acts without a motive, that is, without some intelligible *end* in view, is true: it would not be an intelligent mind, were it to act without a motive. But this does

not constitute this motive or end the efficient cause (in the true sense of the term) of the mind's action. Motives are but the occasion, not the cause of agency; ends so far desirable to be attained which the agent takes under review, but between which *he* makes the selection, and *determines himself* to move towards the attainment of the end chosen. By making motives that which originates the action of the mind, Edwards transforms them into *Agents*, and the mind itself becomes a mere balance, or *motivo-meter*, for registering the comparative momentum of the motives brought to bear upon it.

Edwards, however, imagines that he has guarded against this objection by including under the term "motives" the desires and propensities of the mind itself—both the original nature of the particular mind, and the immediately preceding state into which it has been brought by the influence of previous motives, which modify considerably the influence of those now bearing upon it. This, however, does not alter in reality the merely mechanical character which he attributes to the mind and its volitions. Instead of a balance, the mind, according to this idea, may be likened to a more complex machine consisting of various levers, wheels, and other mechanical contrivances, all working into each other, the conjoint result of which, and the direction to which the action of the machine is determined in each particular case, being marked, we shall suppose, by an index hand pointed in that direction. It is manifest that the influence exerted by the motive forces brought to bear upon a particular part of the machine will be modified by its previous adjustment; besides that the effect produced by the same motive forces will vary according to the original construction, or nature, of each machine. Such is the spiritual piece of mechanism that Edwards conceives the human mind to be. If this machine is allowed to act freely, and to assume the direction which the motive forces immediately influencing it, modified by its own nature and its immediately preceding adjustment, determine, we do not see why he should hesitate to attribute to it "Freedom of Will," according to his definition of the term—and responsibility!

Every volition, according to Edwards, or determination of

the mind, is the necessitated result of the motives applied, and of the preceding state of the mind; and again, that preceding state of mind is the result of a previous state modified by the motives that were applied to it, and so on in an ascending series, till we arrive at length at the original conformation of the mind as it came from the hand of its Creator; and as each succeeding change on it with all the motives are linked together in one unbroken chain, which the human will, according to hypothesis, has no power to alter or modify, but must necessarily follow, it is manifest that God must be responsible for the volitions and actions of every man, evil as well as good; and that the man himself is no more responsible for the phenomena exhibited, than is a gun or any other piece of mechanism for the consequence of its movements.

Even Sir William Hamilton seems to have fallen into this mistake, of making motives the all in all to determine the will, in the following passage,* (quoted by Mr. J. S. Mill,† the concession in which he duly avails himself of), where Sir William, arguing against the true doctrine which had been stated by Dr Reid, leaves out entirely the self-determining power of the mind to modify the influence of the motives presented, and concedes the indefensibility, in point of *argument*, of the position, which he is still for maintaining, of the Freedom of the Will.

According to Reid, the determination is made by the man and not by the motive. "But," asks Sir W. Hamilton, "was the *man* determined by no motive to that determination? Was his specific volition to this or to that without a cause? On the supposition that the sum of influences (motives, dispositions, and tendencies), to volition A, is equal to 12, and the sum of influences to counter-volition B equal to 8, can we consider that the determination of volition A should not be necessary?" Here, Sir W. Hamilton takes up exactly Edwards' conception of the mind as a complex *machine*; the direction assumed by which, in each particular instance, is necessarily determined by the nature of the machine and its

* Foot-note to Reid's Works, Hamilton's Edition, p. 611.

† Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy, p. 498.

previous adjustment, coupled with the motive forces that may be applied to it. He seems to be unable, for the time at least, to raise himself to the conception of its being possible for God to make a free-will *Agent*, that is, a being who could himself *originate* a volition. This appears clearly from the sequel of the quotation: "We can only conceive the volition B to be determined by supposing that the man *creates* (calls from non-existence into existence), a certain supplement of influences. But this creation as actual, or in itself, is inconceivable, and even to conceive the possibility of this inconceivable act, we must suppose some cause by which the man is determined to exert it."

This is just Edwards' self-refuting argument over again. "Nothing ever comes to pass without a cause. It is as repugnant to reason to suppose that an act of the will should come into existence without a cause, as to suppose the human soul, or an angel, or the globe of the earth, or the whole universe should come into existence without a cause."* Well, we would ask, what caused the existence of the universe? It was an act of will, you answer, a volition of God. But what caused this volition? we must ask again, according to Edwards' theory. If the answer be, a previous volition; then following out his own oft-repeated argument, we have an infinite series of previous acts of will to account for each successive volition of the Creator. If he answers, God caused the act of His own will without any other cause or previous volition; even so, we say, God has made man in His own image, an *originating agent*, to the extent that he has a part in causing his own volitions—since we cannot refer those that are sinful to God.

But in order to show the confusion and difficulties in which we land ourselves by assigning to motives a definite invariable degree of force, (which the mind cannot modify), and by attributing to them the origin of our volitions, let us again advert to the case in which *motives* alone (if Edwards' theory be correct), were concerned—in their proper specific sense as

* Edwards on Freedom of Will, Part ii., sect. iii., vol. i., p. 17. Ball, Arnold & Co.

distinguished from what he mixes up with them, the character and state of the mind itself ("dispositions and tendencies," as Sir W. Hamilton calls them in the above extract). The elimination of these last, will greatly simplify the question. The case alluded to is the first moral determination to which man came between conflicting motives, at the fall of our first parents. Here the character of Eve's mind and its previous state and bias can be completely set aside, since so far as these were concerned, coming as she did pure and unpolluted from the hands of her Creator, they would have led to the opposite result.

Two sets of motives were here presented to Eve's mind, the one by God, the other by Satan. Either then, first, the motives presented by God were the stronger; in which case, how came Eve to fall? Or secondly, the motives presented by Satan were the stronger; in which case, how can any blame or responsibility attach to Eve for yielding to them? The mind, according to Edwards and all Necessitarians, must follow the stronger motive. Unless we allow to Eve's mind a self-determining power, by which she could increase or diminish the force of either set of motives, by dwelling more on the one than on the other, she had no alternative but to follow the motives that were in themselves the stronger—in the instance before us, those tending to evil. To call this a trial or probation of our first parents, is a mere mockery; and the blame, if any, must attach to Him who permitted stronger motives to evil to be placed before Eve, than those He had Himself supplied to the good. If such be the only free agency attributed to man's will, it will be impossible to vindicate God's procedure in permitting moral evil to enter into His creation, or to continue for a moment to have place in it, since all He has to do is to present always to his intelligent creatures stronger motives to good than to evil, and all will be right.

The claim, however, for the mind of this self-determining power and partial control over motives, is not to be understood as involving the denial of the immense influence of these, and of the prevailing "dispositions and tendencies" of the mind itself, in guiding its choice. The bounds are very limited indeed, within which the will is permitted to diverge to the right or

left. We all know the great power of habit which by and by becomes almost a second nature, the all but irresistible potency of overpowering temptations, and the attractive influence of any object that appeals to our darling desires and propensities. If we strive to amend any prevailing evil tendency in ourselves or others, we know how difficult it is to weaken and eradicate it, and it is only by slow degrees and repeated efforts that we can bring about any permanent change. If, therefore, we were thoroughly acquainted with a man's character and the motives presented to him, in nine hundred and ninety cases out of a thousand, it would be possible to foresee with little risk of mistake the course he will take; and the older the individual is, and the more confirmed his character and habits, the more confidently may we calculate upon what will be his conduct. On the high degree of probability that can thus be attained, all our dealings with our fellowmen are founded. This is quite sufficient to explain the fact which Mr J. S. Mill adduces as a strong proof of the Necessitarian hypothesis in the following, but slightly overcharged, statement—that we find by “experience, that volitions do, in point of fact, follow determinate moral antecedents with the same uniformity, and (when we have sufficient knowledge of the circumstances) with the same certainty, as physical effects follow their physical causes.”* That they usually do, is granted; that they necessarily or invariably do so, is the very point in dispute. That the bias of the mind may be so strong, and the motives placed before it so overpowering, that the will is wholly unable to resist them—nay, so much so, that Almighty power must be invoked to overcome them—is true, and exactly what has been maintained in the former part of this Dissertation, in the case of the unregenerate before conversion. But even in this case, a modicum of independent self-acting power, however small, must be left, sufficient to render the man responsible for either taking, or refusing to take, the preliminary steps by which he will receive the necessary aid, and be enabled finally to emerge from his state of moral bondage, “into the glorious liberty of the children of God.”

* Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy, p. 500.

It is this independent self-determining power that Mr J. S. Mill denies totally to man, and which the Duke of Argyll in the following passage of his strictures on Mr Mill's philosophy, in "The Reign of Law," meant, we had fully hoped on first reading it, to claim for man. "Among the motives," His Grace remarks, "which operate upon him, man has a selecting power. He can, as it were, stand out from among them,—look down from above upon them,—compare them among each other, and bring them to the test of Conscience. Nay more, he can reason on his own character as he can on the character of another Being, —estimating his own weakness with reference to this and the other motive, as he is conscious how each may be likely to tell upon him. When he knows that any given motive will be too strong for him if he allows himself to think of it, he can shut it out from his mind by 'keeping the door of his thoughts.' He can, and he often does, refuse the thing he sees, and hold by another thing which he cannot see. He may, and he often does, choose the Invisible in preference to the Visible. He may, and he often does, walk by Faith and not by Sight."

Here the noble author seemed to claim for man *power* in the true sense of the word, as distinguished from mere *force*—intelligent, self-acting, originating power—not, like all natural forces, necessarily and invariably determined in its movements by the antecedent conditions—but "a selecting power" over the motives presented to him—an independent "standing out from among them," and "looking down from above upon them"—nay, a power, not only of weakening, but of excluding any particular motive, as implied by the words, "when he knows that any given motive will be too strong for him, if he allows himself to think of it, he can *shut it out from his mind* by keeping the door of his thoughts."

But we regret to observe in what follows, that he unconsciously gives up the whole question to Mr Mill, by his concession of "the *abstract possibility* of foreseeing mental action." "This," he says, "depends on the proposition, that where *all* the conditions of mental action are constant, the resulting action will be constant also. But surely (he continues) this

* "The Reign of Law, by the Duke of Argyll," pp. 334-5.

is not only true, but something very like a truism. There is nothing to object to or deny in the doctrine, that if we knew *everything* that determines the conduct of a man, we should be able to know what that conduct will be. That is to say, *if* we knew *all* the motives which are brought by external things to bear upon his mind, and *if* we knew all the other motives which that mind evolves out of its own powers, and out of previously acquired materials, to bear upon itself; and *if* we knew the constitution of that mind so perfectly as to estimate exactly the weight it will allow to all the different motives operating upon it,—*then* we should be able to predict with certainty the resulting course of conduct.”*

This appears at first sight very plausible. The “selecting power” of the will seems to be retained in the words, “*if* we knew all the other motives which the mind evolves out of its own power;” but it is immediately nullified by those which follow,—“*if* we knew the constitution of that mind so perfectly as to estimate exactly the weight it will allow to all the different motives operating upon it.” The weight the mind will allow to all the different motives operating upon it, is precisely what cannot be certainly known except by the *very act of the mind* in its making its determination, and therefore cannot be “estimated *exactly*” or “predicted with certainty” beforehand. In this last “*if*,” or condition of the author’s, there lurks still the subtle fallacy of Edwards, which it seems so hard to surmount, of attributing the determination of the mind’s action to the *motives* brought to bear upon it, conjoined with the *constitution* of the mind—and not to the mind itself—not to an independent, originating power which it possesses, that modifies and can at times supersede both. This indeed His Grace afterwards plainly avows. “The doctrine of our free will does not assign to the human mind any *self-originating* power.”† It is alone by denying to it this power that he can add, “Perfect knowledge must therefore be perfect foreknowledge. To know the present perfectly, is to know the future certainly. To know all that is, is to know all

* “The Reign of Law,” pp. 338-9.

† “Reign of Law,” p. 341.

that will be. To know the heart of man completely, is to know his conduct completely also—for 'out of the heart are the issues of life.'**

This is exactly Mr Mill's doctrine of the *abstract possibility* of calculating the action of the Will, if the antecedent conditions were known. The error lies in the erroneous assumption that "*all* the conditions of mental action are *constant*." The Duke forgets, what he had before allowed, that a "variable quantity," the Will—a "selecting power"—has been introduced among them, which baffles all *exact* calculation. High probability is attainable, but not certainty (by any finite mind). This will be clear from a simple illustration. Let us suppose all the other conditions necessary for blowing up a fort to have been duly prepared—the mine dug, the gunpowder laid, one end of the conducting wire placed in contact with it, and the other attached to the galvanic battery. But let us suppose the battery to be a *variable quantity*—that it possesses an independent "selecting power" of its own to excite, or to refuse to excite, the electricity as it pleases. It is evident that the abstract possibility of calculating with *certainty* the result would thus be excluded.

Is calculation then, it may be asked, or certain prediction, altogether incompatible with freedom of will? No, we reply, at least as to *moral* actions; it is predicable of two very opposite classes: of "the spirits of the just made perfect," and of the devils. And of both for the very same reason—because, their state of probation being passed, the variable element is now eliminated. Having each made their final election—the just, being "made perfect in holiness," and kept unchangeable by the power of Christ, will follow ever the highest good; and the devils, having said to evil, "Be thou my good," will follow as certainly the evil. But so long as men are in a state of *probation*, and may sink below, or rise above the state in which the mind is at the present moment, *certain calculation* is impossible, in consequence of the presence of a variable element. As the character becomes more and more formed, the probabilities rise higher; but not till

* "Reign of Law," p. 340.

life is ended, can absolute certainty be attained, by a finite being, of the volitions of another, supposing all the elements of calculation to be known to him.*

But, objects Mr Mill, even with regard to men who are still under probation, 'All Theists must admit that God at least does at each moment infallibly calculate the will's movement: they must admit, therefore, that it is, in the abstract, capable of calculation.' Not of *calculation*—though of certain knowledge by the Infinite Mind. Here we come to the second of the two fundamental errors that have misled so many reasoners on this abstruse question of Predestination and Freewill. The fact is, as we have seen, that they cannot raise themselves to the conception of the possibility, even for God, to create a truly freewill being, possessed of a power of its own, so far independent as to be capable of *originating* an act that is its own—and not God's, nor the necessary result of any chain of sequences established by God—forgetting that sin is such an act. The second is, that if such beings could exist, it would be impossible for God to know with infallible certainty what will be their act or choice in every instance, unless there be an invariable sequence, either causatively pre-ordained by Him, or inherent in the very nature of things, between the antecedents and consequents in each individual instance. Into this error Edwards has fallen.† Into this error a still greater mind fell, Calvin in his Institutes, where he says, "God foresees the things which are to happen, simply because He has decreed that they are so to happen."‡ The ground of the error consists, as has been observed, in confounding the *certainty* of all future events in God's mind with their *necessity* (p. 383, note).

In no spirit of self-assertion then, but under a deep sense of the solemn responsibility under which the possession of such a trust lays us, it becomes us to vindicate for man a self-determining, independent power of will that can modify the influence of motives, and even, to some extent, act in opposition to its

* See the remarks already made on this subject, p. 459.

† See Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will, Part ii. sect. xii.

‡ Institutio Relig. Christ. Lib. iii. xxiii. 7. See above, p. 429.

own predominant bias. In short, we must maintain, in opposition to Necessitarians and all upholders of "invariable sequence," that in contradistinction to mere *force*, which can neither restrain nor direct its movements, there is such a thing as *power*—an originating energy, that can act or forbear to act—that can, when it sees a fitting motive, that is, a desirable end to be attained by its action, put forth of itself that action;—or if it sees two or more such ends or motives before it, can, at least when these are nearly equal, give the preference to one or other of its own proper motion. This idea (of *power*) we all have, and it is found in all languages. Whence is it derived? From the Will, and from the Will alone and its acts. A mere mechanical *force* I feel that I am not, that must follow the motive forces operating upon me from without, and the internal character of the machinery devised for me by my Maker. Making full allowance for the great influence these exercise over me, and the narrow limits left for my freewill, I still know and feel that *I*—and this it is that constitutes my own proper self, or *Ego*—that I am an *Agent*, and responsible for my moving or not moving, and for the direction I give to my movements.

For the existence of this power within me, I appeal to the highest of all evidences, Consciousness. Mr Mill, indeed, attempts to controvert this, but his arguments are far from satisfactory. First he takes a preliminary exception "to the use of the word consciousness in such an application. Consciousness," he says, "tells me what I do or feel. But what I am *able* to do, is not a subject of consciousness. Consciousness is not prophetic: we are conscious of what is, not of what will or can be."* Exactly so: consciousness assures me of the present—of my *present possession* of a power—in Mr Mill's own words, of what "*I am able to do*"—of a present, not of a future ability—"of what is" now, "not of what will or can be." I feel or am conscious that *I am* capable of action. Mr Mill seems to have confounded between a *power now* felt, and the results that *will* or *can* proceed from that power. In confirmation he adds, "We should not know that we were capable of

* Examination of Sir W. Hamilton, pp. 503-4.

action at all, if we had never acted. Having acted, we know, as far as that experience reaches, how we are able to act." This is merely, that experience brings out into consciousness the existence of a power *previously* within us, and of which our act is the result. We feel now, or are conscious of a power within us, to whose existence our attention was first directed by its exercise. Consciousness, therefore, does assure us of the *present* possession of power.

Mr Mill next controverts the assertion of Mr Mansel,* that "in every act of volition I am fully conscious that I can at this moment act in either of two ways, and that, all the antecedent phenomena being precisely the same, I may determine one way to-day and another way to-morrow." This assertion of Mr Mansel's requires of course to be qualified. I have the *natural* ability of will in all cases to act in either of two ways; I have the *moral* ability, only provided that the motives and predominant bias of the will do not bear with overpowering influence in either way. Mr Mill, however, denies the proposition totally, that we can know in any instance that we could have acted differently, all things considered, from what we did. "I ask my consciousness," he says, "what I do feel, and I find, indeed, that I feel (or am convinced) that I could have chosen the other course *if I had preferred it*; but not that I could have chosen one course while I preferred the other." And what is the instance that he selects in order to prove the truth of his assertion? Exactly one of those extreme cases, where the strongest motives and the predominant bias being involved lead with all but certainty to the one course chosen. "Take any alternative: say, to murder or not to murder"! Had he taken any common case of indifference, he could scarce have failed to see the erroneousness of his assertion. For instance, I know that at this moment I possess the power of moving my arm or leg; but by the same consciousness (or experience, if Mr Mill will have it so), I know that, all the antecedents or conditions remaining the same, I can direct my arm to the right or to the left, that is, "I can at

* "Prolegomena Logica," p. 152.

this moment act in either of two ways”*—or can take two steps forward, or four, or six, or eight, as I please, determined by nothing but my own will; and if you deny it (like the practical answer given to the famed quibble of ancient times, “No man can move where he is; much less can he move where he is not; ergo, he cannot move at all,”) I refute Mr Mill’s sophism—by *moving*, and do all or any of these actions, and in any order that fancy directs, and with no other motive but *just to prove my ability*.

In moral actions it may be more difficult to find instances of indifference, where two or more modes of action appear equally good and right. Still there are many where the motives are nearly equally balanced, and where it depends on the individual’s will to give the preponderance to the one side or the other, such as, whether he is to subscribe to a charitable fund, or to reserve the money for the wants of his own family; whether he is to grant a certain favour or assistance to a friend, where his own business or convenience interferes; whether a duty is to be done to-day, which may with little impropriety be postponed till to-morrow. On the decision taken in the daily recurring instances of this description depends in a great measure our probation—our moral advance or decline, according as we rise above, or fall below, the standard we have reached. We may strengthen—or we may diminish thus—our propensities to virtue or vice, and form habits that will in time become permanent and indelible for good or evil. In the possession of this power consists the possibility of self-discipline and of that “moral education,” which Mr Mill will not deny, may be prosecuted by a man for himself (as well as by others for him, which alone he mentions), “by eradicating or weakening such of the desires and aversions as are likeliest to lead to evil; exalting to the highest pitch the desire of right conduct and the aversion to wrong; cultivating all other desires and aversions of which the ordinary operation is auxiliary to right, while discountenancing so immoderate an indulgence of them, as might render them too powerful to be overcome by the moral sentiment, when they chance to be in opposition to

* Mill’s Examination of Hamilton, p. 504.

it.”* But how can *I* “eradicate or weaken” my *present* prevailing “desires or aversions,” if my volitions are *wholly* determined for me by the motives presented to me by the *present* state of my mind—that is, by the bias given to it by these very desires and aversions—unless *I* possess some intrinsic independent power to change or modify them?

It is on the universal conviction that we possess such a power that all our criminal jurisprudence is founded. If this power is lost, which it may be temporarily, or sometimes permanently, to such an extent as to render the individual not responsible for his conduct—in so far as we believe the loss not to be incurred by any fault of his own, we exculpate him of all blame for any overt act committed during its continuance. Thus, in cases of lunacy or monomania, where a particular idea is borne in irresistibly on the mind of the person, no judge would convict him for any act committed under the influence of this irresistible idea. We should not blame a boy for any extravagance committed by him when in a state of intoxication, if we had satisfactory proof that he had been brought into that state by some malicious person without any knowledge or consent on his own part.

The theory we are discussing is no barren nor harmless speculation. Most dangerous and pernicious would be the consequences were a belief in its truth to become common—that we possess no *self-determining* power, but that our volitions are the necessary results of the bent of our minds, and of the motives that happen to be uppermost at the time. Let the community generally adopt this theory, and with what consistency could a judge, who held this opinion, reprove or condemn for any crime a man who pleads, “You yourself know and must acknowledge that with the motives before me, and the state of my mind at the time, my conduct and choice could not possibly have been other than they were. If you say I ought previously to have restrained my evil propensities and not have allowed them to gain such mastery over me, you know as well as I that each successive state of mind is the necessary result of the preceding state, and unalterable by any

* Mill's Examination of Hamilton, p. 505.

effort of ours. Why, then, find fault with me for an act, which I could no more help, in the combination of circumstances in which I was placed, than could the ingredients of a barrel of gunpowder, when combined together in certain proportions, help exploding when a lighted match is applied to them?"

The most satisfactory guide, however, to the student out of the perplexities in which this subject has been involved will probably be found in the threefold division of the mental faculties, which is now very generally accepted as being the correct analysis of the human mind, and which shows distinctly in which department strict necessity prevails, and in which alone freedom is to be found.

According to this analysis, there are three cardinal faculties of the human mind, under one or other of which all mental phenomena may be classed, the *Intelligence*, the *Sensitivity*, and the *Will*. By means of these we *think*, we *feel*, we *act*. "All truths and facts, actual or conceivable, are comprehended within the thinking and perception of the first; all sensations, emotions, desires, and passions belong to the second; all doing or causation to the third."*

The conclusions at which the first two arrive are necessitated: consequently call for neither praise nor blame. Every sane intellect that regards the same object in exactly the same light can arrive at only one conclusion. Where the premisses are precisely the same, there is but one logical inference to be drawn; and no one ever thinks of attaching praise or blame to the conclusions of the *Intelligence*, regarded simply as such.

The same is true of the *Sensitivity*. Every object, when regarded in itself, and in one particular light, has its appropriate emotion which it calls forth. This is equally true of the moral as of the natural sensibilities. Thus an act of injustice, simply viewed in itself as such, invariably calls forth indignant disapprobation in every mind, even the most depraved; in proof of which we need only state how keenly the wicked judge and resent any act of injustice which they consider directed against themselves. Every holy character,

* Tappan's Doctrine of the Will—applied to Moral Agency, chap. I. 1.

simply regarded in itself, even the wicked must esteem and admire. The Pharisees hated Jesus only as they hated God, because they regarded His holiness merely in the light of an obstacle to the attainment of their own worldly views. The movements, then, or manifestations of the Sensitivity are equally necessitated, and beyond our *direct* control, as those of the Intelligence. In both we feel ourselves entirely passive, powerless, and irresponsible. We cannot by any effort of ours judge an object to be different from what we see it to be, nor feel any other emotion than that which its contemplation necessarily calls forth.

But when we come to the consideration of the *Will*, a phenomenon altogether new and different presents itself. We are conscious of *power*, of an *agency* we possess; and where different objects are presented to our Intelligence and Sensitivity, of a freedom in directing our attention and efforts to the one or to the other at pleasure—of a faculty therefore superior to, and capable of guiding indirectly our Intelligence and Sensitivity.

If it is asked, How do we come to the knowledge of this power, and of its freedom in its movements? we reply, Exactly in the same way as we know that we possess Intelligence and Sensitivity, and that their movements are necessitated—by consciousness.

Let us recur to our former example. I see before me an apple. I consider its form and appearance. It is round, it is glossy, and “pleasant to the eyes.” I cannot, if I will, judge otherwise. I cannot by any effort judge it to be square, or rough, or unsightly.

Again, I fix my attention on the apple. I am sensible of an agreeable emotion excited in my mind by the sweet odour which it emits, and a desire to eat it is awakened. So long as my attention is directed to it, I cannot help feeling this desire or appetite. The Sensitivity clearly is passive under it.

Again, I fix my attention on the apple. The desire becomes so strong that I put forth my hand, I pluck it, and eat. This forth-putting of power, this effort, this act, is a phenomenon altogether different from the two preceding. In

those I felt myself altogether passive ; in this, active. For the judgment passed, for the emotion felt, I neither praised nor blamed myself. They were involuntary, necessary, altogether beyond my control. Not so the effort I made in putting forth my hand. For this I feel I was responsible. I had the power to act, the power to forbear. True, the Will cannot act unless objects of action be given. I must have my Intelligence arrested, and my Sensitivity awakened by an object before me, before my Will is excited to act ; and if only one object is before me, the Will is soon so strongly excited by the pleasurable emotion that the act of appropriation will follow certainly and innocently, where there is not, nor ought to have been, a counteracting object of desire. But supposing the apple not to be mine, or, as in the case of Eve, a forbidden fruit, there is here a competition between two conflicting objects of desire ; and I feel that I have the power, and am responsible for its exercise, of making the choice between the two, and following the dictates either of appetite or of conscience.

Direct power over my Intelligence, over my Sensitivity, as has been said, I have none. But, *indirectly*, the Will has the power to regulate both. It can turn away the thoughts from one object of contemplation, and fix them more steadily upon another ; and call up thus, by the latter object, a counteracting emotion to that excited by the other. The stake and fire, if contemplated continuously by the martyr as instruments of torture, must necessarily produce in him fear and a desire of shrinking from their endurance, and would quickly lead to the abjuration of his faith. But by a determined effort of will he can turn away his mind from the stake to the Saviour—from the immediate sufferings, to the crown prepared for those that suffer for His name ; and by these higher and heavenly motives overpowering the grosser and earthly, he is enabled cheerfully to endure the death appointed him, because he regards it no longer in the light of a punishment, but as the means of attaining to the highest glories of heaven.

From the analysis of the mind now given it will be seen,

1. That *necessity* rules in two of its faculties, and that *freedom* is found only in the third.

2. The fallacy will be evident that is committed in ascribing the movements of the Will to Motives as their cause; as if a MOTIVE were *literally*, and not merely figuratively, that which *moves* and determines the Will.

In all three divisions of the Mind, the Intelligence, and Sensitivity, as well as the Will, an *object* is required for their excitement. In the instance that has been given, the apple was the object that called forth the movement of the Intelligence, of the Sensitivity, and of the Will. But in all three, the object itself, the apple, was passive. The movement proceeded not *from* the apple, but *towards* the apple. It was *towards* the apple that the judgment of the Intelligence was directed, *towards* the apple that the desire of the Sensitivity pointed, *towards* the apple that the action of the Will put itself forth. The Intelligence it was that judged, the Sensitivity that felt, the Will that acted or moved. The object towards which the Will moved (though in this latter case called the MOTIVE) is in reality, as in the case of the first two faculties, but the *occasion*, not the *cause* of its movements.

Again, as the Will is that which determines the movements of the Intelligence and the Sensitivity, by its power of directing the attention of the mind to this or to that object, and fixing it longer upon one than another, the Will must be regarded as the *regulating, moving, and determining* power of the whole mind.

“The Will,” says Mr Tappan, “is the faculty of choice and volition, or creativeness, just as Reason [Intelligence] is the faculty of knowledge. It is just as comprehensible how the Will can originate choice and volition, as how the Reason and Sensitivity can develop knowledges and emotions. The relation of cause and effect is just as comprehensible as the relation of substance and attributes.”*

Will, Mind, Spirit is that cause (in the highest sense of the term, viz., *originating, efficient* cause), and the only source of Power, in the true sense of the word, as distinguished from

* “Tappan On the Will, Part III., Moral Agency,” p. 3. To the reader who wishes to prosecute this subject farther, these Treatises are recommended as well worthy of perusal.

mere insensate Force. For the subject under discussion, it is of the utmost importance to distinguish clearly between these two ideas—between *Power* as belonging to Mind alone, and *Force* as belonging to Body or Matter.

FORCE is unintelligent, involuntary, necessary—incapable of either originating or repressing its movement or action, or of determining its time, energy, or direction.

POWER is intelligent, voluntary, free—capable of either originating or repressing its action, and of determining its time, energy, and direction.

To mix up these two very opposite ideas, as Professor Bain does in his *Philosophy*, must lead to confusion. Thus in the opening pages of his work on the Senses and the Intellect,* he tells us that “Eating, running, flying, sowing, building, speaking, are operations rising above the play of feeling. They all originate in some feelings to be satisfied, which gives them the character of proper *mental* actions. When an animal tears, masticates, and swallows its food, hunts its prey, or flies from danger, the stimulus or support of the activity is furnished by its sensations or feelings. To this feeling-prompted activity, we give the name *Volition*.” Here we have confusion between two things of very different characters—between the outward acts of the body, that is, of matter, of a machine—and the volitions of the mind that *directs* the action; or (to borrow the author’s own illustration) between the “Steam-engine” and the Engineer who directs it. The volitional movement of the body has indeed an intimate connection with the volitional act of the mind (a connection, however, far too subtle for us to comprehend); but they are so entirely distinct that the one may take place without the other. For instance, I may have put forth an effort of will to raise my arm, and yet find it paralysed; or, as happened to an esteemed friend of my own, who had been out several hours fishing in a lake seated in a small skiff, when he attempted to rise, he found himself totally unable—having, without being aware of it, been struck with paralysis of the lower limbs. The volitional effort of the will, however, was as distinctly put forth by him

* “The Senses and the Intellect,” by Alexander Bain, M.A., pp. 3, 4.

as on any former occasion, although it was no longer followed by any corresponding muscular movement.

The failure on the part of Professor Bain to discriminate between these two very distinct acts of the mind and of the body, is the more remarkable, since he elsewhere compares the physical forces of the body to those of a mere machine. In the case of a "field-labourer who goes out in the morning to plough a field . . . a large expenditure of muscular and nervous energy, derived in the final resort from his well-digested meals and healthy respiration, is the true source, the veritable antecedent of all that muscular power" put forth by him. "It is now-a-days a truism to compare a living animal with a steam-engine, as regards the source of the moving power. What the coal by its combustion is to the engine, the food and the inspired air are to the living system."* We have here the immediate source of the unintelligent material force. But of what avail would this be to the cultivation of the field without the intelligent power of the field-labourer's mind to *direct* all its movements? Or of what use would be the force of the steam for the locomotive, without the controlling will of the engineer to regulate it, to let it on and off at the appropriate times, and to direct every movement of the engine? The only stimulants or directors of the volitional movements of the body which Mr Bain seems to contemplate are "the sensations or feelings" of the animal, which he makes to move and direct the will, instead of their being regulated by the will. "The nervous system" (he observes), "may be compared to an organ with bellows constantly charged, and ready to be let off in any direction, according to the particular keys that are touched. The stimulus of our sensations and feelings. . . determines the manner and place of the discharge."† But our sensations and feelings (as has been shown), possess no *self-determining* power of their own, but are themselves wholly dependent on the objects to which the attention of the mind is directed. The human being, if we adopt Mr Bain's view, would resemble a locomotive engine, which, if we might suppose it, in addition to

* "The Emotions and the Will," by Alexander Bain, M.A., p. 434.


† Bain on "The Senses and the Intellect." p. 304.

the propelling power of the steam, to be also a large magnet, would shape its course according as it was attracted or repelled by the different poles of the magnets it chanced to meet in its path. Unless we will allow to the mind itself a self-originating, regulative power, man is but a machine, the sport of circumstances, and of the accidental sensations and feelings, pleasurable or painful, called forth at the moment. At best, Professor Bain's theory can apply only to one of the lower animals, guided solely by its instincts and the mere impulses of sense, or to a human being, when reduced by fatuity or disease to the level of a mere animal. But it leaves wholly out of account that higher power in man (as being "made in the image of God") by which he can *control* the feelings and propensities of his animal nature; and looking to the things that are unseen and eternal, and feeling his relation to an invisible and holy God, can, under the influence of God's Spirit, choose and follow out a path far exalted above the sphere of bodily sight and sense.

But fortunately for man's sense of responsibility, we are placed above all mystifications of philosophy on this subject. Stronger than all reasoning, we know and feel that we have a power to choose—to act, or to forbear to act within certain limits. The common sense of all mankind, the languages of all nations, attest this fact. All have the idea, the word—POWER. Whence did they derive this? Not from external nature, or the observation of material or bodily forces; for these (all agree), possess no *voluntary, elective* POWER, but observe the most rigid, unbending laws. It is from the mind alone, from what takes place within ourselves, that we derive this idea of self-originating, self-directing Power; which, in conjunction with the sense of right and wrong implanted in our natures by God, impresses us with the ineradicable conviction that we are accountable beings, and that on the election, which our Will possesses the power to make in this our state of probation, depends our eternal happiness or misery in a future world.

The importance of vindicating the equity of the Divine

government and the responsibility of man must plead excuse for the length to which these observations have run. The times are changed. Time was when in opposition to Pelagian and Arminian error, the side of truth needful to be enforced was the all-pervading ordination of God, and the all-effecting power of His Spirit in regeneration. But now that the pendulum of public opinion has swung in the opposite direction, now that Ultra-Predestinarianism (or in plainer terms *Fatalism*, which would bind all mental and moral movements under the same iron necessity as the invariable sequences in the material world) has become a favourite doctrine of our philosophers, and is unconsciously conceded even by some of the friends of revelation : the truth requiring specially to be pressed seems to be, while we still maintain, in the most decided manner, the certain foreknowledge and foreordination of all things by God—that yet “thereby no violence is offered to the *will* of the creatures, nor is the *liberty* or *contingency* of second causes taken away, but rather established.”



INDEXES.

I.—SUBJECTS, AND AUTHORS CITED.

- ABRAHAM, import of, 17, 177.
 Abram, import of, 17, 177.
 Accommodation, alleged instances of,
 355, 366-367.
 Adam, representative of all, 212.
 Vindication of this, 213-216.
 Alford (Dean), 97, 98, 105, *note* 173,
 182, 226, 244, 251, 311, *note* 312,
 340, 368.
 Argyll (Duke of), *note* 392, 460-462.
 Bain (Professor), 472-474.
 Beatitudes, 64.
 Bengel (Gnomon), 97, 147, 151, 170,
 365.
 Bloomfield (Greek Testament), 181.
 Boardman (Rev. W. E.), 127-129.
 Body of Sin—of Death, 263-272.
 Bonar (Rev. Andrew A.), *note* 156.
 Brown (David, D.D.), 375.
 Calvin, *note* 143, *note* 229, *note* 271,
 367, 372, 429, 430, 433, 438, 463.
 Canons of interpretation proposed, 166.
 Catchwords, 72.
 Central thoughts, *note* 82.
 Cherubim, 320-327.
 Christ in us, and we in Christ, 133.
 Condemned sin, 307.
 Conybeare and Howson, 286.
 Death, meaning of in Rom. v. 12, *note*
 206.
 Decalogue, 64.
 Died (Dead) to sin, 263-272.
 Doddridge, 181.
 Double meanings in Scripture, 192.
 Dumoulin (Peter), 387.
 Edwards, 443-463.
 Ellicott (Bishop), *note* 182.
 Epanodos, 80-85, 146, 147.
 Erskine (Thos.), 280.
 Faith—of the *heart* more than the
 head, 132.
 How far in the power of the *natural*
 man, 407.
 “From faith to faith,” 121.
 “First fruits of the spirit,” 312.
 For—sometimes *confirmative*, 223.
 Force distinguished from Power, 451,
 452, 472.
 Forensic view of justification, 106.
 Fraser (on sanctification), 263, 264.
 Fritzsche, 298.
 Genesis, divided into ten sections, 73.
 Glory of God, 170-175.
 Glory beheld in Moses' face, 172.
 God, double character of, Father and
 Sovereign, 164, 165.
 Grace, *common*, and *special*, 409.
 Graces, the three cardinal, 190.
 Guilt, meaning in theological language,
 204.
 Haldane (Robert), 150, 263, 264, 265,
 note 338.
 Hardening the heart, 350.
 Hebrew Poetry characterized by
 rhythm, 64.

- Hengstenberg (Christology), *note* 113, 365.
- Hodge (Dr), 203, 209, 217, 220, 224.
- Hodge (Rev. A. A.), *note* 341.
- Hofmann (Schriftbeweis), *note* 33.
- Holy of Holies, typical import, 173.
- Imputation, too restricted in its usual acceptance, 110, 217.
- Imputation-theory, 224.
- Imputed righteousness, 104, *note* 217.
- James and Paul reconciled as to justification, 220.
- Jebb's Sacred Literature, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 147, 153, 243, 255, 375.
- Jowett (Prof.), *note* 261, *note* 285, 286.
- Judges (Book of) divided into seven sections, 73.
- Justification — close connexion with sanctification, 245, 249, 250, *note* 294, 304, 335.
- Justify — a *creative* word, involving sanctification, 106-110, 222.
- Justify the ungodly, 111.
- Language of Scripture many-sided, 192.
- Law (The) regarded by the Jews as a universal standard of judgment, 211.
- Law, different meanings of, 294, 304.
- Law of Sin and Death, 304.
- Live by faith, 196.
- Lord's Prayer, 64.
- Love combined with holiness, 174.
- Love of God, 188-192, 330-333.
- Luther, 125, 127-129.
- Macknight, 147.
- Man's part, more yielding than doing, 137.
- Mansel (Prof.), 465.
- Mercy reconciled with righteousness, 164, 392.
- Mercy-seat, 166, 174.
- Merit and demerit, 403.
- Meyer (Dr H. A. W.), *note* 173, 174, 251, 369.
- Mill (J. S.), 459, 463, 464, 465, 466.
- Millennium, 329.
- Morison (Dr James), 155, *note* 166.
- Neander, 267.
- His view of justifying righteousness, 133, 134.
- Numbers, use of, in Parallelism, 86-88.
- Olshausen, 276, 279, 336.
- Olshausen, his view of justifying righteousness, 133, 134, 159, 222.
- Ossory (Bishop of), 122, 170.
- Parallelism, 63-92.
- In New Testament, 68-92.
- Introverted, 80-85.
- Peace with God, 189.
- Perseverance of the saints, 197, 198, 330-333.
- Philippi (Dr F. A.), *note* 33, 135, 148, 166, 209, 225, 251, 281, 298, *note* 362, 369.
- Pleasure (good of God), 386, 438.
- Power distinguished from Force, 451, 452, 472.
- Predestination, 372-375.
- Predestination and Freewill, 380-475.
- Predestination distinguished from Foreordination, 387.
- Propositions not to be confounded, 167, 170, *note* 178.
- Propitiatory, 166, 174.
- Purpose of God, 166, 238, 446.
- Reconcile, 189.
- Reformers' view of justification, 110.
- Regeneration, man's part regarding, 400, 401.
- Regeneration of all things, 316, 317.
- Revision of authorised version, by five clergymen, *note* 94, 167, *note* 179.
- Righteousness infused, 110.
- Distinguished from holiness, 134, 135.
- Righteousness of God = God's righteousness, 105, *note* 107.
- Threefold meaning, 102.
- Protest against exclusively forensic use, 106.
- Objective and subjective, 130-133, 138, 139, 164.
- Samson, twelve exploits of, 74.
- Satisfaction made to God's righteousness, 164.
- Scripture, why apparently contradictory at times, 111.
- Seneca, 441.
- Sin, definition of, 272.
- Distinguished from transgression, *note* 205.
- Meaning of, in Rom. v. 12, 205, 206.
- Sins, forgiveness of under the Law, *note* 168.

- Son of God, 95-97.
 Spirit of holiness, 98-101.
 Spirit opposed to Flesh, 100.
 Stuart (Moses), 123, *note* 311, 344.
 Supralapsarianism, 341, 346, 347.
 Synod of Dort, 387.
- Tappan (Henry P.), 468, 471.
 Testimony (The), 173.
 Tholuck, 251.
- Union with Christ, 21, 206, 236.
 Universal salvation, 329.
 Universal redemption, *note* 446.
- Veil on Moses' face, when put on, 173.
- Westminster Confession of Faith, chap.
 ii. 1, 423.
 Chap. ii. 2, 422.
 Chap. iii. 1, 381, 429.
 Sec. 5, 384, 403, 417, 431, 439.
 Sec. 7, 341, 346, 385, 422, 427.
- Westminster Confession of Faith,
 Chap. III. 8, 422.
 Chap. v. 2, *note* 383.
 Sec. 4, 432.
 Chap. vi. 1, 433.
 Chap. ix., 450.
 Sec. 3, 399.
 Chap. x. 1, 388.
 Sec. 3, 388.
- Westminster Shorter Catechism. Quest.
 13, 432.
 Quest. 18, 225.
 Quest. 83, 403.
 Quest. 86, 87, 407.
- Whately (Archbishop), 217.
 Whitby, 147, 217.
 Will, natural and moral inability of, 401.
 Natural and moral freedom of, 449.
 Will of God, 238, 432, 446.
 Winer, 281.
 Wordsworth (Canon), *note* 173, 251, 286.

 II.—GREEK WORDS SPECIALLY NOTICED.

- ἀκοή, 362-365.
 ἀποκαλύπτω, meaning of, 117.
 ἀποκαλύπτεται, 117, 122, *note* 130.
 αὐτὸς ἐγώ, 285, 295.
- διὰ (τῆς πίστεως) distinguished from ἐκ (πίστεως) *note* 178.
 διαθήκη, *note* 166.
 δικαιοσύνη, 112.
 Distinguished from ἁγιασμός, 134.
 δικαιοῦμενοι and δικαιοθέντες, 175.
 δικαίω, 108, 222.
 δικαίωμα, 112, 247, 255, 309, 310.
 δύναμις, 103.
 δωρεά, 242-250.
 δῶρημα, 242-248.
- εἰρήνη, distinguished from χάρις, *note* 182.
 εἰς distinguished from ἐπί, 167, 170.
 εἰς distinguished from πρὸς, 170.
- ἐκ *see* διὰ.
 ἐξουσία, *note* 103.
 εὐδοκία, 386.
 ἔχειν = to hold (fast), 181.
 ἔχωμεν vindicated, 123, 179-183.
- θνητὸν (σῶμα), 261, 270, 271.
- ἰλαστήριον, 165.
 καθίστημι, 225.
- ὀρισθέντος, 93, 96.
- πάντες ἡμαρτον, 210.
 πάρεσις distinguished from ἀφesis, 168.
 πεφανέρωται, 130 and *note*, *note* 122.
 προέθετο, 165.
- χάρις, and χάρισμα, 242-252.

