

CLARK'S

FOREIGN

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LXI.

Philippi on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

1879.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . . ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, . . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

COMMENTARY  
ON  
ST. PAUL'S  
EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

BY  
FRIEDRICH ADOLPH PHILIPPI,  
DOCTOR AND ORDINARY PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT ROSTOCK.

*Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition,*

BY THE  
REV. J. S. BANKS,  
MANCHESTER.

*IN TWO VOLUMES.*

VOL. II.

EDINBURGH:  
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.  
1879.

## COMMENTARY ON THE ROMANS.

---

### CHAPTER VIII.—(*Continued.*)

THE apostle has now developed the doctrine of sanctification, vi.—viii. 17, under all its aspects. As the doctrine took as its point of departure the doctrine of justification, so it has returned back to it; for the Spirit of sanctification, dwelling in us, is Himself the witness to our adoption which is acquired through justification, and therewith at the same time the security and pledge of the inheritance of life. This *ζωή*, indeed, already actually exists in us, in so far, that is, as we are already subjectively filled with the *πνεῦμα*. But in so far as the latter principle during this earthly life of ours is still constantly mingled with *ἁμαρτία*, and encompassed by the *σῶμα*, the *ζωή* still struggles with *θάνατος*, and abides in its completeness only in Christ, the absolute righteousness. And they who by faith are in Christ Jesus have to look for this life only hereafter, or in the future state, or only when Christ, with whom our life is hid in God, and who is Himself our life, shall be revealed in glory, Col. iii. 3, 4. Thus the righteousness of Christ and life of Christ as to their beginnings no doubt already exist richly in us in a subjective form, but in their completeness both one and the other ever subsist objectively in Him alone, and remain for us still an object of faith, not of sight. The present Aeon, therefore, is, as matter of course, a period of suffering; without *συνπάσχειν* no *συνδοξάζεσθαι* is possible, ver. 17. Basing himself on this last thought, the apostle seeks now in conclusion, vv. 18–39, to comfort his readers with respect to the *παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ*, and to encourage them to cheerful endurance on the ground that while, indeed, by divine appointment the *δόξα* is future, this future *δόξα* is as vast as it is



certain, and that even in the present state of weakness the πνεῦμα is our helper. Already in v. 3 ff. the apostle had shown how θλίψεις, instead of putting to shame, could only strengthen and enhance the ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. But what there, in the preliminary conclusion of his subject, he merely intimated, now, in the formal conclusion of his exposition, he makes good at still greater length and with far richer variety of illustration. The δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ and ζωή form the fundamental subject of the entire epistle. The apostle, then, having proved that in no sense has δικαίωσις continuance in sin as its necessary consequence, but on the contrary ἁγιασμός, and that only by the presence of ἁγιασμός is the ζωή, annexed to the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, made safe and sure, proceeds now to show how the θάνατος as yet still encompassing us, which manifests itself in the παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, is to be patiently and cheerfully borne out of regard to the future glory, or the ζωὴ αἰώνιος ratified and sealed. As in v. 3 ff. he had said that the tribulations of believers but strengthen and enhance the hope of this future glory, so now he shows what resources of comfort and strength for the enduring of these tribulations God has provided for us until the time when our hope shall receive its fulfilment. Ch. viii. 18 ff. therefore introduces the reasons which encourage to συμπάσχειν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν, ver. 17.

Ver. 18. The connection with the last words of the preceding verse (εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν) is rightly indicated by Calvin: "Neque vero molestum esse nobis debet, si ad coelestem gloriam nobis per varias afflictiones procedendum est, quandoquidem illae, si cum magnitudine gloriae hujus conferantur, levissimi sunt momenti." Λογίζομαι] see on iii. 28.

—γάρ] specifies the reason why the συμπάσχειν should not discourage us.

—οὐκ ἄξιος] The Etym. M. remarks: ἄξιος: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄγω, ἄξω, ἄξιος ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν σταθμῶν τὴν ἴσην ῥοπήν ἐχόντων. ἄξιος, then, is derived primarily from ἄγω (comp. Sophocles *Electra* v. 119: μούνη γὰρ ἄγειν οὐκ ἔτι σωκῶ λύπης ἀντίρροπον ἄχθος, and Hermann's remark thereupon: "ἄγειν usitatum in pendendo verbum. Translatio sumpta ab iis, qui lancem pondere gravatam deprimenda altera lance tollunt)= quod lancem trahit, quod pendit, i.e. quod pondus, momentum habet, what has weight." Comp. LXX. 1 Chron. xxi. 22, 24:

ἀγοράζειν ἐν ἀργυρίῳ ἀξίῳ, to buy at *full* price. Hence ἀξιόν τινος = *weighing as much as something, equivalent to something* = ἀντάξιόν τινος, "what counterbalances something, is just as heavy." See examples in Matthiæ, *Ausf. griech. Gram.* p. 677. So Callin. *Eleg.* v. 19: λαῶ γὰρ σύμπαντι πόθος κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς θνήσκοντος· ζῶων δ' ἄξιος ἡμιθέων, *he is to be deemed the equal of the demigods*; v. 21: ἔρδει γὰρ πολλῶν ἄξια μούνος ἐών, *deeds equalling the deeds of many*. So, too, LXX. Prov. viii. 11: κρείσσων γὰρ σοφία λίθων πολυτελῶν, πᾶν δὲ τίμιον οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτῆς ἐστίν; Ecclesi. xxvi. 15: οὐκ ἔστι σταθμὸς πᾶς ἄξιος ἐγκρατοῦς ψυχῆς, *no consideration equals a continent soul*. Now, in the present passage we read ἀξιὸν εἶναι πρὸς τι instead of the *genit. comparat.* ἀξιὸν εἶναί τινος. πρὸς with the *acc. to*, *as regards, in reference to*, often denotes the rule *according to* which one guides himself, *in conformity with*, Luke xii. 47, 2 Cor. v. 10, Gal. ii. 14, and hence also the standard *according to* which a comparison is instituted, Winer, p. 505. Therefore ἀξιὸν εἶναι πρὸς τι = *to be of equal weight* when compared with something, deemed equal thereto. But οὐκ ἄξια = ἀνάξια, of no weight, *i.e.* not worth mentioning in comparison with, etc. It is needless then here to suppose a Meiosis or Litotes ("not of equal weight," for "of far less weight"). With the sentiment, comp. 2 Cor. iv. 17: τὸ γὰρ παραντίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, and in addition: διὸ οὐκ ἐκκακῶμεν, ver. 16, and μὴ ἐκκακῶμεν, Gal. vi. 9. The Vulgata translates: "existimo enim, quod non sunt condignae passiones hujus temporis ad futuram gloriam, quae revelabitur in nobis." Protestant theology saw, therefore, in the statement of this verse a *dictum probans* against the Catholic doctrine of *meritum condigni*, of which the *bona opera regentorem* are supposed to be the ground; for, as Calov justly concludes, "Si *passiones* nostrae non merentur gloriam, multo minus *opera* merentur. Nam gravius est *passiones* sustinere propter Christum, quam pietati operam navare: et supremum gradus obedientiae est illa in *passionibus perseverantia*, unde martyribus gradum superiorem inter sanctos assignant Papistae." On the other hand, it might be objected that the reference is not at all to the intrinsic, moral worth of sufferings, but merely to their insignificance when compared with the greatness of the future glory. If I assert that a brief and

slight tribulation is not to be brought into account against an overwhelming and eternal joy, it would be perfectly consistent with this for me to submit to that tribulation all the more patiently, when in addition thereto, on account of its moral desert, it entails eternal happiness. One may certainly say conversely, that the petty and transient pleasure of sin vanishes altogether beside the weight of eternal punishment, and that, nevertheless, the first merits the second. Hence apparently Bellarmin's assertion in Gerhard, *loc. theol.*, ed. Cotta, tom. viii. p. 91: "Nam passiones hujus temporis breves sunt, gloria autem aeterna est; tamen proportio est inter has passiones et illam gloriam propter caritatis dignitatem, unde procedunt," unscriptural as it is, understood in the Catholic sense, is yet not to be refuted, as Gerhard supposes, by the *present* passage. On the other hand, against those scholastics who fancied that while it must be conceded that the *meritum condigni bonorum operum* is refuted by the statement of this verse, the *meritum congrui* of those works might still be maintained, Calvin justly observes: "Neque enim dignitatem utriusque (*i.e.* of the *θλίψις* and the *δόξα*) confert Apostolus: sed gravitatem crucis tantum elevat comparatione magnitudinis gloriae, idque ad confirmandos patientia fidelium animos." But it is part of the very idea of merit that the service and reward be of equal value. Now, eternal life so infinitely outweighs temporal sufferings, that the latter cannot be the meritorious cause of the former. Nor can love impart to the sufferings their meritorious worth; for, to say nothing of its imperfection, the apostle has here in view no other than sufferings endured in the strength of holy love, and even of these holy, loving sufferings of believers, denies that they are equivalent in worth to eternal glory. Besides, the *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*, merited by the *ὑπακοή Χριστοῦ*, and vouchsafed to *πίστις*, cannot, of course, subsequently be merited by the *ὑπακοή* of our *παθήματα*. The transient pleasure of sin does indeed merit eternal misery, because it is a breach of a divinely-imposed obligation, and rebellion against the eternal majesty of God Himself. On the other hand, the transient burden of suffering does not merit eternal happiness, because the obedience, manifested under it, is the fulfilment of a divinely-imposed obligation, after which, no less than before, we remain unprofitable servants, and because, again, obedience renders to the all-sufficient God no

service binding Him to an equivalent return. If, notwithstanding, He has assigned and promised to the doing and suffering of His children, not, indeed, heaven itself, but special reward *in* heaven, this is not a reward, duly earned and merited, from a righteous Judge, but unmerited reward from a gracious Father's goodness.

—τὰ παθήματα] here, as in 2 Cor. i. 5 ff., Phil. iii. 10, Col. i. 24, 2 Tim. iii. 11, in a physical, not, as in Rom. vii. 5, Gal. v. 24, in an ethical meaning. They are *sufferings* (*Leiden*), not *passions* (*Leidenschaften*).

—τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ] In iii. 26, xi. 5, ὁ νῦν καιρός stands in contrast with the past; here, in contrast with the future. And, indeed, this future period begins with the Parousia of the Lord, so that ὁ νῦν καιρός corresponds with the αἰὼν οὗτος, whose opposite is the αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, ἐκεῖνος, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Matt. xii. 32; Mark x. 30; Luke xx. 35. Further, ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος here is not the more comprehensive notion, "the present world-order in general," of which the νῦν καιρός, the *present space of time*, the *current course of time*, forms a part, *i.e.* the period immediately preceding the Parousia conceived as near. Rather the αἰὼν οὗτος is merely described as νῦν καιρός in order to mark the brevity of its duration. However long it continue, in comparison with eternal glory, it is still to be regarded merely as the present rapidly-fleeting *point* of time (καιρός, not χρόνος or αἰών). This consideration yields comfort in the sufferings which to us seem long.

—πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι] not πρὸς τὴν δόξαν τὴν μέλλουσαν, because the emphasis lies on μέλλουσαν placed first. It stands in sharp contrast with the νῦν καιρός. Comp. Gal. iii. 23: ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι; Matt. xxv. 34; 1 Cor. xii. 22, 23. By μέλλουσα the δόξα is neither described, as in Acts xi. 18, xxi. 27, as *near at hand*, nor, as in Heb. i. 14, x. 27 (where the emphasis lies on μέλλοντος placed *afterwards*), as *certainly at hand*, but, in antithesis to the νῦν καιρός, simply expresses what is *future* in general, what only takes place hereafter, viii. 38, 1 Tim. iv. 8, Gal. iii. 23, what therefore we are patiently to look for.

—ἀποκαλυφθῆναι] Theophylact, with whom also many modern expositors agree, observes: διὰ δὲ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἔδειξεν, ὅτι καὶ νῦν ἐστι, κρύπτεται δέ (sc. ἡ δόξα), τότε δὲ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, τουτέστι τελείως φανερωθήσεται. In favour

of this, Col. iii. 3, 4, 1 Pet. i. 4 might be appealed to. But ἀποκαλύπτειν, φανεροῦν refers not merely to the discovery of that which already exists, although in temporary concealment, but also to the revelation of that which by this very revelation comes for the first time into existence, or which has previously a concealed existence merely in so far as it lies wrapped up in the divine counsel, Gal. iii. 23. Thus ἀποκαλύπτειν, φανεροῦν is certainly merely to unveil something concealed; but that which is concealed before its discovery may just as well have a mere ideal as a real existence. Here the δόξα cannot be conceived as at present actually existing in us, only in a concealed manner, neither εἰς ἡμᾶς nor the connection of thought favouring the idea. For manifestly it is not here meant that we have at present, only hidden beneath sufferings, a δόξα which will one day be revealed, but that now we have παθήματα, but one day shall have δόξαν. Finally, according to Theophylact's view, the emphasis must have lain on ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, which is not the case. Accordingly, in this passage the δόξα is to be conceived as one which now is merely destined for us in the divine counsel, and one day by God's omnipotence to be revealed to us, *i.e.* actually exhibited or realized. As to the sentiment of the verse, comp. 1 Pet. v. 4.

—εἰς ἡμᾶς] *upron us*, so that it reaches to us, so that we partake therein. Comp. Acts xxviii. 6: καὶ θεωρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον. The Roman also would say: *in nos*; Germans: *an uns*.

Ver. 19. The majority of interpreters suppose vv. 19–23 to contain an evidence of the *greatness* of the future glory spoken of ver. 18. This is certainly the most obvious supposition. In spite of this, if the apostle's purpose were to characterize the *greatness* of the δόξα approaching, it would have been far more to the point to picture the wealth of the blessedness which we ourselves shall possess in the vision of God, instead of merely adducing the secondary and subordinate element of the glory with which the creation, then surrounding us, shall be invested. And again, it is not even the glory with which nature will one day be clothed that is described, so much as merely its waiting and longing for this glory as well as for deliverance from the liability to decay to which it is at present subject. But in saying that some one amid present suffering awaits future happiness with patience

and longing, we affirm nothing at all as to the *degree* and greatness of this happiness. On this account some expositors find in ver. 19 ff., not a confirmation of the *main* thought of ver. 18, *ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήμ. τοῦ ν. καιρ. πρὸς κτλ.*, but merely of the idea expressed in the last words of the verse, *πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκ. εἰς ἡμ.* The apostle seeks to verify, not the *greatness*, but the *certainly* of the future δόξα. But, in the first place, as already remarked, the μέλλειν, ver. 18, in contrast with the νῦν, suggests not so much the notion of the *certainly* of what is approaching in the future, as simply in general the *futurity* of that which *at present* has no existence; and again, my hoping and longing in itself certainly contains no pledge of the certain attainment of the object hoped for. If it be supposed that the expectation and longing of nature is based upon the infallible divine promise of future deliverance, given to it according to vv. 20, 21, it is indeed said, ver. 20, that the *ματαιότης* of the *κτίσις* intervened in virtue of divine ordination, but the ground of its ἐλπίς, ver. 21, is not expressly stated; and granting that the divine arrangement, of which the perishable nature of the creature is the consequence, took effect only on condition of its future restoration, still, according to ver. 21, creation only enjoys this divine assurance in connection with the promises given to God's children. But how can the certainty of a promise be ratified to me by the fact that another is to partake in the salvation which the fulfilment of the promise brings? And then, in truth, are not the ἐπαγγελίαι of future δόξα, given in Scripture to believing humanity, far greater, more numerous and definite, than those which the *κτίσις* enjoys? So that creation may indeed take to itself firm confidence from the promises given to God's children, but not the converse. But if appeal be made to the expressions ἀποκαταδοκία, ἀπεκδέχασθαι, because the *constans* exspectatio rests upon the assumption of a *certa* promissio, still this ἀπεκδέχασθαι is ascribed also to the τέκνοις θεοῦ themselves, vv. 23, 25, and waiting to the end does not necessarily imply the *certain* attainment of the object awaited, but simply describes this object as *future*, not existing at present, and takes place in the persuasion that impatient despondency cannot hasten the realization of the object hoped for. Moreover, the apostle does not treat of the certainty of final salvation until ver. 28 ff. (comp. especially vv. 31–39), and bases it there, as everywhere, upon the only

certain foundation of the *πρόθεσις*, the *ἐκλογή*, the *ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ*, comp. v. 5 ff. We believe, therefore, that while vv. 19–23 without doubt confirm merely the words *πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν κτλ.*, they refer not so much (as several of the ancients suppose, with Fritzsche, Krehl, de Wette, Meyer) to the *certainly* as merely to the *futurity* of this *δόξα*. That the *δόξα* is not *παρούσα* but *μέλλουσα* only, is shown by the waiting and sighing as well of creation as of the children of God, for what one expects he as yet possesses not. This thought, indeed, is expressly mentioned in vv. 24, 25. We have *σωτηρία* in hope merely, not in reality. Just so in ver. 21 it was said of the *κτίσις* that it possesses *ἐλευθερία* only *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*. The *δόξα*, then, is merely *μέλλουσα*, based upon *ἐλπίς*, and awaited in *ἀποκαραδοκία*. And on the very ground that, as to the present earthly life, this is the God-ordained, unalterable order of our *σωτηρία*, there can be no *συνδοξάζεσθαι* without the preceding *συμπάσχειν*, ver. 17, and we are to submit ourselves willingly and patiently to the *παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ*. The consolation, then, given by the apostle, vv. 18–25, in regard to present sufferings is twofold: first, that they come not into account in comparison with the greatness of the future glory, ver. 18; and secondly, that they are an indispensable condition for the attainment of the glory, just because the latter by divine appointment is a glory in the future, not already actually existing, ver. 19 ff. If it be objected against our interpretation (Meyer) that it is perfectly self-evident that the *δόξα* is not present but *future only*, the reply is, that no doubt this is self-evident objectively, but not at all so subjectively for human impatience, which would fain anticipate the future *δόξα*.—*ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία*] The *δόξα* lying before us is *future*, for (γάρ) the *κτίσις* still awaits it in patient expectation. *ἀποκαραδοκία* is found again in the N. T. in Phil. i. 20, in combination with *ἐλπίς*. Chrysostom's interpretation is: *ἡ σφόδρα προσδοκία*. Oecumenius on the Philippian passage says: *ἀποκαραδοκίαν φησὶ τὴν σφοδρὰν καὶ ἐπιτεταμένην ἐλπίδα, ἣν τις καὶ αὐτὴν ἐπικινῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν δοκεῖ καὶ περισκοπεῖ*. The substantive is to be derived from *καραδοκεῖν*, to expect with uplifted head, i.e. to expect with intentness or eagerness. Comp. Aristoph. *Equit.* v. 660: *ἐκαρადόκησεν εἰς ἐμ' ἡ βουλὴ πάλιν*; Schol.: *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπέβλεψεν ἢ ἐμοὶ προσέθεντο τὴν κεφαλὴν μετεωρίσαντες*. Then, generally: to expect, comp. Herod. vii. 168: *καραδοκέοντες*

καὶ οὗτοι τὸν πόλεμον, ἥ πεσέεται. From this *καρδοκία* the *cæspectatio* cherished, as it were, *erecto* or *cæserto collo et capite*; then *expectation* generally, Heb. הַחֲמָה, Ps. xxxix. 7, Prov. x. 28, where Aquila reads *καρδοκία*, for which in the latter passage in Symmachus is found *ὑπομονή*. But *ἀποκαρδοκεῖν* and *ἀποκαρδοκία* with intensive *ἀπό* expresses *waiting, expecting* till the end, therefore *constans cæspectatio*, Tittmann, *de Syn.* p. 106 sqq. Luther in the present passage: *the anxious waiting*. But the notion of anxiety agrees not with Phil. i. 20, where Luther himself renders: *as I at last expect (wie ich endlich warte)*. Here it is the expectation that keeps on the stretch till the goal is reached, that endures to the end, without letting itself be hurried to impatience or despair. This, indeed, does not preclude longing; for whoever waits *till* the end waits also *for* the end, but still has nothing in common with anxiety.

—τῆς κτίσεως] *κτίσις*, from *κτίζειν*, denotes primarily, like the German *Schöpfung*, *creation* as an act, so in i. 20; then *creation* as a result = *the created*, because here the act and the result of the act coincide.<sup>1</sup> But the *created* may either be a single creature, so that *κτίσις* = *κτίσμα*, thus i. 25, viii. 39, Heb. iv. 13, also *καινὴ κτίσις*, 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15, or may denote the entire sum of creatures, the entire creation, thus Mark x. 6, xiii. 19; Col. i. 15; Heb. ix. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Rev. iii. 14. But then, in the latter sense, *ἡ κτίσις* or *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις* parts naturally into two main divisions, the rational and irrational creation, the context determining which limitation of the notion is to be held. The first is found in Mark xvi. 15, Col. i. 23. The gospel can only be preached to the rational creation; and indeed, still more specifically, only to the human world, the higher spirit-world being either incapable of receiving it or in no need of it. But, conversely, *ἡ κτίσις* or *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις* may also signify the entire irrational creation, exclusive of intelligent beings, in which sense we, too, use the phrase, *the whole of nature*, comp. Wisd. Sol. xvi. 24, xix. 6. As now, in the present passage, neither the act of creation nor a particular creature is meant, the only meanings left are: (1) the *entire* creation, (2) the *rational* creation, (3) the *irrational* creation. The first meaning cannot here be accepted, because in vv. 19, 21, 23 the *υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ* are expressly distinguished from the *κτίσις*, and opposed to it. The second meaning

<sup>1</sup> In 1 Pet. ii. 13, *κτίσις* is used of a *human* creation or institution.



falls through for the same reason. Besides, the human world in contrast with believers, according to biblical usage, would be *ὁ κόσμος* (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2), not *ἡ κτίσις*. There remains, then, nothing but the third meaning, which is the one received by the majority of expositors, and in our days almost universally accepted. Some, indeed, would at the same time expand the notion of the *κτίσις*, and include under it everything remaining of the *entire* creation after the redeemed have been abstracted, therefore the irrational creation and unredeemed humanity. But it is readily apparent how improbable at first sight is the inclusion of elements so heterogeneous under the one notion of *κτίσις*. The only limitations *à priori* conceivable are those under (2) and (3). But then, at the very time when the glorification of God's children takes place, all men who partake in it will have been previously enrolled in the number of God's children, so that the remainder will have to expect, not *ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ*, ver. 21, but, according to 2 Thess. i. 9 (comp. Rom. ii. 8 ff.; 2 Cor. v. 10), *ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου*. Finally, the contents of ver. 20 do not agree with the fallen state of the rational creation. Therefore *κτίσις* can only denote the irrational creation exclusive of non-Christian humanity. The apostle's glance lights here only upon that portion of creation, falling within the range of vision, that is to share in the future *δόξα*; but this consists of the children of God, with the creation surrounding them. Of the fate of unbelieving humanity, he is as little thinking here as in v. 19, 1 Cor. xv. 21 ff. Other expositors, on the contrary, would narrow the notion of the *κτίσις* still further, and confine the irrational creation merely to lifeless objects, exclusive of those living. But for this no warrant is given either in the notion of *κτίσις* or in the context. Further, sky, stars, air, and earth, exclusive of the vegetable and especially the animal world, can here be so much the less intended, as the very *συστηνάζειν* and *συνωδίνειν* of irrational objects can only make itself seen and heard within the circle of the animate creation. *κτίσις*, then, "the visible, irrational world surrounding us, animate and inanimate." Other interpretations of the *κτίσις* as the unconverted or converted Gentiles or Jews, as Christendom in general, or angels, etc., as more or less arbitrary, deserve no reply. The doctrine of a renewal of the world in the Messianic age is found already, although in Rabbinical refinements, in Jewish theology. It is

based upon prophetic statements of the O. T. As, according to Gen. iii. 17, 18, the primal curse fell also on the earth, the earth also must share in the promised restoration. This restoration is directly announced Isa. xi. 6 ff. (where, also, the special reference to the animal world is found), lxv. 17 ff., lxvi. 22; comp. Ps. cii. 25, 26. On these passages 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rev. xxi. 1 are based. Finally, in the δόξα of the irrational animate creation merely a glorifying of races is to be thought of, not a resurrection of individuals.

—τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ] = τὸ ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ, in allusion to ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, ver. 18. The revelation meant is not that of the δόξα of God's children, at present concealed but still existing, but the revelation or manifestation of God's children themselves which is accomplished by means of the δόξα then to be first communicated to them; for only then, by means of the δόξα imparted to them, can they be recognised as υἱοὶ θεοῦ. "Ad creaturam ex peccato redundarunt incommoda: ad creaturam ex gloria filiorum Dei redundabit recreatio," Bengel.

—ἀπεκδέχεται] The ἀπό is used with the same emphasis as in ἀποκαρδοκία of *looking for*. In the phrase ἡ ἀποκαρδοκία τῆς κτίσεως ἀπεκδέχεται (1 Pet. iii. 20: ὅτε ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία), *constans mundi expectatio constanter expectat*, lies a twofold prosopopoeia. First of all the κτίσις itself is represented as waiting, hoping, ver. 21, sighing, ver. 22; and then, in addition to this, the ἀποκαρδοκεῖν is personified, so that ἡ ἀποκαρδοκία τῆς κτίσεως is not to be explained as a mere Hebraism instead of ἡ κτίσις ἀποκαρδοκοῦσα. This rhetorical, poetical style of speech is quite in keeping with the prophetic import of the passage. Of analogous O. T. examples, comp. Deut. xxxii. 1; Job xii. 7-9; Ps. xix. 1, lxviii. 16, xcvi. 7; Isa. i. 2, xiv. 8, lv. 12; Ezek. xxxi. 15; Hab. ii. 11; Bar. iii. 34. Chrysostom early observed: ὥστε δὲ ἐμφαντικώτερον γενέσθαι τὸν λόγον, καὶ προσωποποιεῖ τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα τοῦτον ἅπερ καὶ οἱ προφήται ποιοῦσι πολλάκις, ποταμοὺς κροτοῦντας χερσὶν εἰσάγοντες κτλ.

Vv. 20, 21. Ground of the ἀποκαρδοκία τῆς κτίσεως. It awaits in steadfast longing the revelation of God's children, because at present it is subject to ματαιότης and φθορά, but then in its turn shall share in their δόξα. —τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη] The emphasis lies on τῇ ματαιότητι placed first. But

*ματαιότης* is not absolutely identical with *φθορά*, ver. 21; but the *vanitas*, i.e. *infirmilas*, the worthlessness and nothingness of things, is the originating cause of their *φθορά*. Here *ματαιότης* stands in a physical, in Eph. iv. 17, 2 Pet. ii. 18 in an ethical sense. *ὑπετάγη*, *was subjected*, a historical fact, not = *ὑποτέτακται*, *subest*, a description of condition. That Paul does not place the cause of this fact in the act of creation, which Gen. i. 31 forbids, but, in accordance with Gen. iii. 17, 18, conceives it to have supervened in consequence of the Fall, is certain. Moreover, upon this alone is based creation's hope of restitution when the glorification of humanity takes place. Because it was involved in the Fall, it shall also take part in the resurrection. Comp. Beresch. rabb. f. 2, 3: "Quamvis creatae fuerint res perfectae, cum primus homo peccaret, corruptae tamen sunt, et ultra non redibunt ad congruum statum suum, donec veniat Pherez, h. e. Messias."

—*οὐχ ἐκούσα*] "Contra quam fert ingenium eorum,—a natura enim omnes res a corruptione abhorrent," Bucer. "Quum sensus nullus insit talibus creaturis, voluntas certe pro inclinatione naturali accipienda est, secundum quam universa rerum natura in conservationem ac perfectionem suam fertur. Invita ergo et repugnante natura vim patitur quicquid detinetur sub corruptione," Calvin. "Nam initio aliter fuit. Inde mavult *subjici Christo*, Heb. ii. 7," see Bengel; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 27 ff.; Phil. iii. 21. This reluctancy of the *κτίσις* against *ματαιότης* and *φθορά*, Erasmus finds expressed in the fact that nature, in the destruction of individuals which it is powerless to prevent, at least strives to preserve the race. "Dum aliud," says he, "ex alio propagans individuīs vicissim cadentibus ac nascentibus speciem tuetur, ne intercīdat, meditatur immortalitatem quandam sed frustra." Had creation subjected itself to vanity spontaneously, this would have taken place *against* God's will, not as now, *διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα*. But in that case it had had no well-grounded, approved *ἐλπίς*, as now, of deliverance. The redemption of humanity is grace, the redemption of nature justice; for the fall of humanity is voluntary guilt, the fall of nature involuntary suffering. No doubt humanity subjected itself voluntarily to moral *ματαιότης* merely, and struggles perpetually, as creation does, against physical *φθορά*; but, the latter being the inevitable consequence of the former, it may be said that, as it willed the

one, indirectly also it willed the other. As, therefore, the words οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα specify a weighty integral element of the whole passage, they are not to be enclosed in brackets.

—ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα] *sed propter eum, qui subjecit*, i.e. not because creation willed it, but because God who subjected it willed it so. διὰ, with the accusative, then retains its regular meaning *propter, on account of*, and is not = διὰ with the genitive, *per, through*. But Bengel justly remarks: “*propter eum, qui subjecit, i.e. propter Deum, Gen. iii. 17, v. 29. Adamus eam obnoxiam vanitate fecit, non subjecit.*” Still less than Adam or man in general is Christ, the devil, or, stranger still, with Semler, the emperor Nero (who kept back the conversion of the κτίσις, i.e. the *gentes*), to be understood under ὁ ὑποτάξας. ὁ ὑποτάξας, without any more exactly defining adjunct, assumes *God* as the well-known subject.

—ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι] Vulg.: “*sed propter eum, qui subjecit eam in spe.*” Luther: “*on his account who subjected it in hope.*” They therefore join ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι with ὑποτάξας. But, in the first place, this connection would only be probable if God, not creation, were the subject of the hope: again, οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα forms a thought complete in itself; and, finally, the connection of ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι with ὑπετάγη, instead of with ὑποτάξας, is specially appropriate, because only thus does the ἐλπίς of deliverance given to it stand forward prominently and decidedly as a reason for creation’s waiting for the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν νίων τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 19. But it is ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι = *with hope*, upon hope. ἐλπίς was the condition (ἐπί with the dative = *sub conditione*) upon which the ὑποτάσσεσθαι took place, and was withal an equivalent, so to speak, for the necessity of the latter.

—ὅτι] *that, fore ut*, states the object of the hope governed by ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι, Phil. i. 20. This mode of connection is more appropriate than to take ὅτι in the sense of *nam* (Luther: “*for creation also shall be made free,*” etc., comp. Acts ii. 26, 27) and begin a new sentence; for the waiting of the κτίσις for the ἀποκάλυψις of God’s children is not merely to be based on this circumstance in general, that it has ἐλπίς, but specially on this, that it has ἐλπίς of participation in the ἐλευθερία τῆς δόξης of God’s children.

—καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις] *et ipsa natura, it also, the creation.* καὶ

*αὐτός* here, then, is not = *ipse quoque*, as in Heb. ii. 14, or *et ipse*, *ipse adio*, but = *et ipse, acque atque alius*, as in Luke i. 36. These others are God's children, with whom creation is placed on a level "it also, creation, like God's children." The purpose is not here, which is foreign to the course of thought, to note something extraordinary, that *even* creation shall be delivered (so after Chrysostom, Theophyl.: οὐχὶ σὺ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ καταδεέστερόν σου καὶ τὸ ἄψυχον καὶ ἀναίσθητον); but ἡ κτίσις contains an exegesis of αὐτή, not essential indeed, as καὶ αὐτή, in allusion to ἡ κτίσις, ver. 20, would have sufficed, but still in use elsewhere, Mark vi. 17: αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης; Luke xxiv. 15: ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ κτλ.

—εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν κτλ.] a *constructio praeparans* for ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθ. καὶ κατασταθήσεται εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν κτλ., Winer, p. 776.

—ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς] not: "from corruptible, wretched bondage," but: "from the bondage that consists in corruption, in liability to decay." τῆς φθορᾶς is *genit. apposit.* That it is to be taken substantivally is indicated both by the allusion to ματαιότης, ver. 20, and by the antithesis in which it stands to the following τῆς δόξης. The φθορά is a δουλεία, because by it the κτίσις is fettered in its free development, is conceived as subject to it from involuntary necessity (comp. οὐχ ἐκούσα, ver. 20), Heb. ii. 15. Here, as in 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50, Gal. vi. 8, Col. ii. 22, φθορά is used in a physical, in 2 Pet. ii. 19: αὐτοὶ δούλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς, in an ethical sense.

—εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ] Luther: "to the glorious liberty of the children of God." But the order of words shows that τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ is to be joined with τῆς δόξης. In Luther's sense, Paul must have written εἰς τὴν δόξαν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῶν τέκ. τ. θεοῦ. Moreover, the δόξα τῶν τέκν. τ. θ., in antithesis to φθορά, and in allusion to the δόξα, ver. 18, for the ἀποκάλυψις of which the κτίσις waits, ver. 19, manifestly forms the prominent and leading idea. τῆς δόξης, then, like τῆς φθορᾶς, is *genit. apposit.*, and the ἐλευθερία τῆς δόξης is "the liberty that consists in the glory." But if the κτίσις is to be set free for the δόξα of God's children, this means, of course, that it will attain a glory corresponding to or homogeneous with this δόξα. The proper antithesis to φθορά is ἀφθαρσία, 1 Cor. xv. 42, 53, 54. But the expression δόξα, which includes in it ἀφθαρσία

as its negative basis, is selected to correspond with *δόξα*, ver. 18. But as the *φθορά* is *δουλεία*, so the *δόξα* is *ἐλευθερία*. Sin and death are foreign, enslaving powers. In *δικαιοσύνη* and *δόξα*, on the contrary, humanity, and in humanity creation also, has its free normal life-movement in its most peculiar sphere. On *ἐλευθερωθήσεται*, Bengel remarks: "Liberatio non fit per plenam destructionem: alias quadrupedes, quum jugulantur, cum voluptate caderent." Certainly the present passage does not suggest an absolute annihilation and subsequent new creation of the *κτίσις* (which *annihilatio mundi* the older Protestant theologians supposed, comp. the quotations in Heinr. Schmid, *Die Dog. der evang.-luth. Kir.*, pars v. § 66, 4);<sup>1</sup> but, in harmony with the *ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*, ver. 23, or our bodily resurrection, merely a transformation and transfiguration of existing nature. So, too, the Fathers taught, not an *ἀνυπαρξία*, but merely an *ἀνακαινισμός* of the world; comp. the passages in Suicer, *Thec. eccles.* II. 151 sqq., and the quotations in Klee, *Kathol. Dog.*, Bd. 3, p. 487. The Scripture passages quoted by Quenstedt for the opposite view, Ps. cii. 26, 2 Pet. iii. 10, Rev. xx. 11, Isa. xxxiv. 4, Luke xxi. 33, Job xiv. 12, are not opposed to this. Not the *κόσμος* itself, but merely the *σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*, will pass away, 1 Cor. vii. 31, and the fire, 2 Pet. iii. 10, is to be thought of as a fire of purgation, not of annihilation.

Ver. 22. *οἶδαμεν γάρ*] comp. ii. 2, iii. 19, vii. 14. There cannot be found in this verse a *proof* of the existence of the *ἐλπίς*, ver. 21, for there is such a thing as a hopeless sighing and fruitless travail. Rather here the *assertion* that an *ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως* exists, ver. 19, which, according to vv. 20, 21, is founded upon the fact that the *κτίσις* was made subject to *ματαιότης* ■ hope of future *ἐλευθερία*, is in the present verse set forth as a universally

<sup>1</sup> Otherwise Luther in his noted saying: "The heaven has on now its work-day dress, but then will put on its Sunday dress." Similarly Brenz and Nicolai. Comp. Luther's *Kirchenpost. Erl. Ausg.* Bd. 9, the two sermons on the fourth Sunday after Trinity upon Rom. viii. 18-22, p. 106: "For the sun has never been as fair, bright, and clear as in the beginning when it was made, but on man's account is half dim, decayed, and soiled; but on that day God will again purge and purify it by fire, 2 Pet. iii. 10, so that it shall be brighter and clearer than it was in the beginning." Pp. 111, 113: "This hope we have, and the whole creation with us, which on our account shall be purified and renewed in most beautiful fashion, so that one shall say: This is a beautiful sun, a fine, handsome tree, a precious, lovely flower," etc. But Luther refers the subjection of *κτίσις* to *ματαιότης*, and *φθόρα* to the abuse which the ungodly practise upon all creatures over which the latter sigh and moan.

admitted truth. That an eager expectation really does exist in creation follows from the sighing plainly apparent and obvious to us all.

—*πάσα ἡ κτίσις*] “Consideratur ut unum quoddam totum,” Bengel.

—*συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει*] The *σύν* in *συστενάζειν* and *συνωδίνειν* serves as little as in *συνήδεσθαι*, *συγχαίρειν*, *συγγηθῆν*, *συναλγεῖν*, *συγκάμνειν*, merely to add force to the simple form, but signifies that the *στενάζειν* and *ὠδίνειν* take place in common. But this cannot mean that the sighing of creation takes place in common with that of God’s children, since the *οὐ μόνον δέ*, ver. 23, shows that in ver. 22 the *στενάζειν* of the *τέκνα θεοῦ* was not yet thought of. Still less is the allusion to mankind in general, who are said to sigh along with *κτίσις*, and *vice versa*, although only the children of God attain to redemption. For in the whole section there is no reference, as we have seen, to non-believers; and were this the case here, we should expect an intimation of the reason why their *στενάζειν* alone is not satisfied. Accordingly, the *συστενάζειν* and *συνωδίνειν* denote simply the “gemitum et dolorem communem inter se partium creaturæ,” Estius. So already Theodor. Mops.: *βούλεται δὲ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι συμφώνως ἐπιδείκνυται τοῦτο πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*. The entire creation, as it were, sets up a grand symphony of sighs. That elsewhere *συστενάζειν* is used merely of sighing in common with others, not of the joint-sighing of the several members of a community among themselves, is to be admitted. But the latter meaning is quite permissible in a logical point of view, and its actual employment is simply proved by the present passage, comp. also *συμπαρακληθῆναι*, i. 12.● On *συνωδίνει*, Luther, in his marginal notes, has the remark: “As a woman in labour.” Although now *ὠδίνες*, *birth-pangs*, *travail*, 1 Thess. v. 3, *ὠδίνειν*, *to travail*, Gal. iv. 19, 27, Rev. xii. 2, is often used to denote specially severe pains of body and soul in general, here no doubt the original meaning may be maintained, because the old *κτίσις* is struggling, as it were, with severe pangs to bring forth the new *κτίσις*. “The idea of *ὠδίνειν* is based on the fact that the painful struggling of the *κτίσις* is directed towards a blessed change, with the occurrence of which the suffering has attained its end and ceases, comp. John xvi. 21,” Meyer. Similar is the figurative Rabbinical phrase *הִתְעַבְּרָה הַבְּרִיָּה*, comp. Matt. xxiv. 8, Mark xiii. 8, although

this specially denotes the sufferings immediately preceding the Messianic age, not the birth-pangs of the *κτίσις* in general, which continue always.

—*ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν*] *till now*. The *ἁδίνες* thus endure from the time when the *κτίσις* was first made subject to *ματαιότης*, until the present moment. Hence its redemption is not yet matter of fact, but only awaits it hereafter.

Ver. 23. οὐ μόνον δέ] *sc. πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις στενάζει*.

—*ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῖ*] *but we ourselves also*, namely, believers, comp. *καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν*, Luke xi. 4, xxii. 71; also Gal. ii. 17. *αὐτοῖ*, Luke xi. 46, Acts ii. 22, Rom. xv. 14, 1 Pet. i. 15, ii. 5, refers to the *second* person.

—*τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες*] *not: who have*, this would be *οἱ τὴν ἀπ. τ. πν. ἔχοντες*, but: *although we have*. The *ἀπαρχή* are the first-fruits in contrast with the full harvest. In the N. T. the genitive joined with this word is invariably *genitivus partitivus*, xvi. 5: *ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας*; 1 Cor. xv. 20: *ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων*; xvi. 15: *ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας*; Jas. i. 18: *ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων*. The same is true of nearly all passages in the LXX., the genitive appended there denoting the object of which the *ἀπαρχή* forms a part. So Deut. xviii. 4: *αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ τοῦ σίτου*; xxvi. 2: *τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς*; Ex. xxiii. 19: *τῶν πρωτογεννημάτων τῆς γῆς*; comp. too, Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 36. Even Ex. xxii. 29: *ἀπαρχὴ ἄλωνος καὶ ληνοῦ σου*, forms no exception, the threshing-floor and wine-press being put for their contents, grain and must. In the present passage, therefore, we must adhere to the constant usage, *i.e.* retain the partitive meaning of the genitive; for LXX. Ex. xxv. 2: *αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ μου*, the first-fruits belonging or due to God, Deut. xii. 11, 17: *αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν*, the first-fruits which your hands present, are exceptional cases, proving nothing on the other side, as in these passages we see easily and at once that *ἀπαρχαὶ* in the proper sense is = *ἀπαρχαὶ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς κτλ.*, that the appended genitives here cannot be *genitivi partitivi*, and what meaning they must of necessity have. In the present passage, on the contrary, in accordance with rule, no other sense can *a priori* be admitted than *ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος*, the first-fruits of the Spirit = the first participation in the Spirit in antithesis to the full harvest of the Spirit, *i.e.* the full participation in the Spirit which we are to expect one day. Nor



is there any foundation for objecting to this view, that then the *υἰοθεσία* and the *ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος* form no strict antithesis to the *ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος*, and that the object of our sighing can in that case be no other than the communication of the entire fulness of the Spirit. This were only necessary if the apostle had said that we sigh *because* we have *only* the first-fruits of the Spirit. But he says that we sigh *although* we have *already* the first-fruits of the Spirit, and with it not merely the reversion of full participation in the Spirit for the future, but also sufficient comfort for the present; so that we should naturally expect no *στενάζειν* any longer to have place in us, and especially no *στενάζειν* for *υἰοθεσία* and *ἀπολύτρωσις* (on which, in keeping with the entire connection, special stress is here laid), seeing that this very *ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος* is the seal of our *υἰοθεσία* and *κληρονομία*, v. 4, viii. 15 ff.; Gal. iv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5; Eph. i. 14, iv. 30. Further, the *ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος* does not at all preclude the *οὐ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως*, Tit. iii. 6, for even the first-fruit gift may be an affluent endowment. But if, in the present passage, instead of the fulness of the Spirit's communication, its measure and limit is specially noted, this is done, not indeed to allege a necessity for the sighing (rather is the latter described as something unexpected), but by implication to explain its possibility. Some expositors, while taking *τοῦ πνεύματος*, indeed, as *genit. partit.*, understand the *ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος* of the first communication of the Spirit received by the Christians of that age in distinction from those later, of the earliest communication of the Spirit. But manifestly in this case *ἀπαρχή* contains an utterly superfluous by-thought. Very justly Winer remarks (p. 423, former edition): "In the sighing for the glory of the children of God, it makes no difference whether they had received the *πνεῦμα* at first or some years later." Besides, such a side-glance here at other Christians is just as far-fetched as it is disturbing; and, finally, in the individualizing *ἡμεῖς*, Paul of course includes all, even the later *τέκνα θεοῦ* in opposition to the *κτίσις*; comp. too, Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* II. p. 176. Others take *τοῦ πνεύματος* as *genit. apposit.* after the analogy of *ὁ ἀρραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος*, 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, the Spirit as an earnest, so that *ἡ ἀπ. τ. πνεύματος*, the Spirit as first-fruits = *ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τουτέστι τὸ πνεῦμα*, Winer, p. 667. But—to pass by the consideration that here, as we have acknowledged, the partitive

meaning, if at all capable of explanation, has a prescriptive right before every other—according to the Scripture mode of conception and expression, the Spirit, while He is indeed the handsel and earnest of the *κληρονομία* (Eph. i. 14, iv. 30), is not Himself part of the heavenly harvest, so as to allow of His being described as its first-fruit. Still less permissible is the interpretation: “the Spirit as a blessing of special value,” because the first-fruits are the most excellent part, LXX. Num. xviii. 12. In comparison, with what other blessings could the Spirit be here called a blessing of special value? But, finally, *τοῦ πνεύματος* might also be *genit. subject.*, so that *ἀπ. τ. πν.* = *quae prima Spiritus dedit, prima Spiritus ornamenta*. These would then be the *χαρίσματα* of the Spirit, which fall to the lot of believers in this life, 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff., Gal. v. 22, in contrast with the gifts which He bestows, *ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ μέλλοντι*, i.e. with eternal blessedness, the *κληρονομία*, the completed *νίθεσία*, *σωτηρία*, and *ἀπολύτρωσις*. But, first of all, we should then expect the contents of the *ἀπαρχή* to be expressly named; and again the Spirit in Scripture is just as little described as the dispenser as the constituent element of the heavenly *κληρονομία*. But still less can the *praequantissima Spiritus munera* be meant, for what are His less excellent gifts, and on whom are they bestowed?

—*καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί*] *we ourselves also*, of whom, as those who have *τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος*, it was not to be expected. The words *καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί* thus contain a forceful and quite appropriate *epanalepsis* of the preceding *αὐτοί*.

—*ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν*] *sigh within ourselves*. *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* here is not = *ἐν ἀλλήλοις*, but = *intus, in animis nostris*, and expresses the fervour or deep inwardness of the sighing, ver. 26. Paul indeed summons Christians to collective *praise* in their assemblies, Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16, 17; but, on the other hand, *collective* sighing may be well adapted to the atmosphere of a Quakers' meeting, but scarcely to that of the primitive apostolic church. With *στενάζομεν*, comp. 2 Cor. v. 4, *στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι*. With the perpetual Abba cry of the children of God is blended a perpetual Kyrie eleison.

—*νίθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι*] *waiting for adoption*. No doubt we have *νίθεσία* already. Still we have it not, just because we still groan under the *δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς*. In like manner and still higher degree was this the case with the *νιοῖς* of the O. T.,

who, as long as they were under the δουλεία νόμου, had not attained *υιοθεσία*, Gal. iii. 23 ff., iv. 1 ff. Every gift of the gospel, while already present, is at the same time future. The germ is the plant, and yet is not the plant. Precisely in the latter respect Paul says *υιοθεσίαν* without the article, not *τὴν υιοθεσίαν*. He contemplates not merely the ἀποκάλυψις of the already-existing *υιοθεσία*, but even the *υιοθεσία*, because of the continuing δουλεία, as not yet existing. Εἰ δὲ καὶ εἶπε τοῖνυν, ὅτι ἐλάβομεν πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας, ἀλλ' ὅμως διδάσκει σαφέστερον, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ὄνομα νῦν ἐλάβομεν, τοῦ δέ γε πράγματος τότε μετέξομεν, Theodoret. The omission of the word *υιοθεσίαν* in some codices, where then ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τ. σώμ. ἡμ. must be joined together, is readily explained. A contradiction was imagined between Paul's statement and vv. 15, 16. Luther: "we also yearn within ourselves for the adoption, and wait for our body's redemption." But in this way the στενάζειν of the children of God does not stand out in prominent contrast enough with the στενάζειν of the κτίσις. Again, στενάζειν τι means not "to sigh for something," but "to bewail, bemoan something." Finally, then, we should have expected the order *υιοθεσίαν στενάζομεν*.

—τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν] exexegetical supplement to *υιοθεσίαν*. τοῦ σώματος might be *genit. object.*, as in Heb. ix. 15 = *redemption from our body*, which then would have to be taken relatively, not absolutely, namely, of redemption from the body, in so far as the latter is still subject to ἁμαρτία and θάνατος. But as τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν is without any precise characteristic definition, and for the sake of harmony with 1 Cor. xv. 51, 53, 2 Cor. v. 4, Phil. iii. 21, τοῦ σώματος is more probably to be taken as *genit. subject.*, and to be referred to the *redemption of our body* from φθορά, by which it will become a σῶμα ἄφθαρτον, a σῶμα τῆς δόξης. This perfect ἀπολύτρωσις will take place only at the Parousia of Christ, and in it will consist the complete realization of our *υιοθεσία*, on which account Theophylact rightly interprets the latter as οὐ τὴν διὰ βαπτίσματος . . . ἀλλὰ τὴν τελείαν δόξαν τὴν ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ τοῦ σώματος. The *υιοθεσία* is here identified with the ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος, in correspondence with the identification of the δόξα, ver. 18, with the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 19. With ἀπολύτρ. τ. σώμ., comp. Augustine's utterance, *de doct. Christ.* i. 24: "Quod nonnulli dicunt, malle se omnino esse sine

corpore, omnino falluntur, *non enim corpus suum, sed corruptiones et pondus oderunt.*" We have expounded the verse according to the *lect. recept.*, which, as we have seen, is free from all objection. But there are so many variants to the words *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί*, that the reading cannot be regarded as established. The most important variations are reducible to the following: for *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοί* is read either *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί*, or *αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς*, or *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς*, or even *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχ. τ. πνεύμ. ἔχοντες ἡμεῖς*, and for *καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί* either *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς*, or simply *καὶ αὐτοί*, or, lastly, simply *καὶ ἡμεῖς*. We are inclined to take the reading *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τ. πν. ἔχ. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν*, found in Cod. B and Epiphanius, and received by Lach. and Tisch., as the original one. So, too, Meyer. By it is most easily explained the addition and transposition of *ἡμεῖς*, as well as the subsequent omission of *αὐτοί*. As to the anaphoric *αὐτοί*, comp. Fritzsche on *Matt.* xxv. 17, p. 737. There is to be mentioned further, first, the reading *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί*, which owes its origin to the mistaken notion that here two subjects are spoken of, Christians in general and the apostles in particular; and, secondly, the omission of *καί* before *αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* in the reading *ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί . . . αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*, which arose from the desire to modify the epanalepsis,—certainly in that case cumbrous, and in addition feeble,—and to restore the current form, *αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*. Finally, the origin of all the other variants may also be deduced from the reading, *ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοί . . . καὶ αὐτοὶ κτλ.*, in the way specified, if the *recepta* is regarded as the original meaning, and in the first instance only *ἡμεῖς* was struck out of it in order to conform the analeptic *καὶ αὐτοί* to the preceding *καὶ αὐτοί*. The Cod. Sinait. also supports the *lect. recept.*, save that, instead of *καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοί*, it has the scarcely original transposition *ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοί*.

Vv. 24, 25 confirm *νίθεσίαν ὑπεκδεχόμενοι*, ver. 23; for (*γάρ*) our *σωτηρία* exists now *τῇ ἐλπίδι* only. Now, hope refers to what is future, ver. 24; and if we hope for what is future, a *δι' ὑπομονῆς ὑπεκδέχασθαι* is possible, ver. 25. *τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν*] Luther: "for we are saved indeed, but in hope." The emphasis rests on *τῇ ἐλπίδι* placed first. The contrast supposed is *οὐ τῇ ἀπολαύσει*, as regards hope, not as regards possession or enjoyment, comp. Tit. iii. 7: *ἵνα δικαιοθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι*,

κληρονόμοι γενόμεθα κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου. "Sic liberati sumus, ut adhuc speranda sit haereditas, postea possidenda, et ut ita dicam, nunc habemus jus ad rem, nondum in re," Melancthon. Bengel rightly observes: "Dativus, non medii, sed modi." τῇ ἐλπίδι, therefore, is not to be taken as *dativ. caus.* or *instrumen.*, for we were saved not by hope, but by faith, i. 16; Eph. ii. 8. Also, the dative here is less to be taken as a dative of *the respect in which* something takes place (comp. on iv. 19), so that our σωθῆναι would have to be limited to ἐλπίς, than as a *casus modalis* describing *the mode and manner in which* something is done = *hope-wise*, 1 Cor. xi. 5. As here ἐλπίς is opposed to ἀπόλαυσις, so in 2 Cor. v. 7 is πίστις to εἶδος. Precisely because the object present to πίστις, namely, σωτηρία, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, is *realized* but διὰ εἶδους, and only thus realized absolutely, inasmuch, therefore, as the objective blessing of salvation is but relatively present, while at the same time relatively future, ἐλπίς springs naturally from πίστις, and is inseparably united with it; for πίστις embraces the saving blessing in so far as it is present, ἐλπίς in so far as it is future. "Differunt autem fides et spes, quia fides in praesentia accipit remissionem peccatorum, sed spes est expectatio futurae liberationis," Melancthon. Respecting the N. T. idea of ἐλπίς in relation to πίστις, comp. Steiger on 1 Pet. i. 13, and Haldane here.

—ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς] But (δὲ μεταβατικόν) *a hope that is seen is no hope.* In energetic address in all languages, the *object* of my hope is itself described as my *hope*. Thus in 1 Tim. i. 1, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς Himself is called ἡ ἐλπίς ἡμῶν. He is ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, Acts xxviii. 20. But as regards its nature this objective ἐλπίς is οὐ βλεπομένη (2 Cor. iv. 18; Heb. xi. 1) = οὐ παρούσα, an object of hope that lies not before the eyes; for it is an ἐλπίς προκειμένη, Heb. vi. 18; an ἐλπίς ἀποκειμένη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, Col. i. 5.

—ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τις] *for what one sees*, is placed first with emphasis.

—τί καὶ ἐλπίζει;] stronger than τί ἐλπίζει; = *cur tandem sperat? why yet, why still* does he hope for? For which there is no longer any reason. "Cum visione non est spe opus," Bengel. Upon the intensive καί after interrogatives like τίς, ποῦ, πῶς, ποῖος, comp. Hartung, I. p. 137. The καί, therefore, is not to be omitted, with Lachmann, but to be referred to Krüger's observation

on the like omission, Xen. *Anab.* i. 8. 16 : "Sed exquisitius est (namely, the *καί* appended) quam ut librario deberi videatur."

—*δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα*] of itself is not = *δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι*, "we must wait for it patiently," but = "we wait for it patiently." For if we possess salvation merely by way of hope, and thus ourselves occupy the position of those who hope, it is self-evident that we then await this salvation with patience, instead of impatiently sinking into despair if we do not forthwith enter upon its possession. We thus find ourselves, in the natural course of things, in the position of those in whom a *δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι* takes place. But no doubt, in specifying what the true believer as such does, the apostle at the same time describes his duty as a Christian, and exhorts to its performance. Thus the reasoning of the apostle is complete within itself. We are *υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι*, ver. 23, for our *σωτηρία* is based only upon *ἐλπίς*, ver. 24. But if it is based upon *ἐλπίς*, nothing remains for the present but a *δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι*, ver. 25. And just because our attitude is not a *βλέπειν*, but an *ἐλπίζειν*, and therefore a *δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι*, the *παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ* cannot surprise or discourage us, but we willingly submit ourselves to the *συμπάσχειν*, in order to be partakers in the *συνδοξάζεσθαι*, ver. 17. *δι' ὑπομονῆς*, *perseveringly*, Heb. xii. 1; Winer, p. 527. *ὑπομονή*, *constantia* (comp. on v. 3), embraces as well the higher, active element of *patientia* as the lower, passive element. Upon the conjunction of *ἐλπίς* with *ὑπομονή*, comp. 1 Thess. i. 3, Heb. x. 36; also 1 Cor. xiii. 13 with Tit. ii. 2.

Ver. 26. Third ground of encouragement to constancy in suffering. The first was the greatness of the future glory, ver. 18; the second, the unalterable divine order according to which the glory is only future, on which account it demands a *δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι*, vv. 19-25. The third is the assistance which the Spirit gives us in present sufferings, vv. 26, 27. *ὡσαύτως δὲ καί*] *but in like manner also*, namely, as on our part a *δι' ὑπομ. ἀπεκ.* is already found.

—*τὸ πνεῦμα*] here of course (vv. 16, 23) the objective, self-existent Spirit of God imparted to believers, v. 5; Gal. iv. 6; 1 John iii. 24.

—*συναντιλαμβάνεται*] *ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαί τινος*, "to lay hold of by the hand in order to render help in need," then generally "to

be interested in one, help one," comp. Acts xx. 35 : ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων ; Luke i. 54 (according to LXX. Isa. xli. 9, Heb. פִּיטִי). συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι τινι, properly, "to take hold of a matter along with one whom we wish to help," has the same meaning, like συμπράττειν τινί, *alicui opitulari*, comp. Luke x. 40 : εἰπέ οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται ; LXX. Ex. xviii. 22 ; Ps. lxxxix. 21 ; also Luke v. 7 : συλλαμβάνεσθαι τινι. The dative is governed by the preposition = ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι σύν τινι. In LXX. Num. xi. 17 is found the construction συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι μετὰ τινός τι, "to take hold of a matter along with one," i.e. to help one in a matter. But we may render help not merely to *the weak*, but also to *weakness* (τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ). That the one to whose help we come is himself regarded as active, is not necessarily implied, and here this thought is even precluded by the notion of the weakness, the helplessness which is succoured. The σύν, then, in συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι is nowise meant to intimate that we ourselves are active, and the Spirit merely co-operates with us, still less does it serve simply to add force. Finally, least of all is there any suggestion in it of the help of the Father and the Son, to which the help of the Spirit is added. In harmony with the context, this co-operation might with most probability be referred to the help that ὑπομονή gives us, ver. 25. But as this is already implied in ὡσαύτως, σύν would be pleonastic, and instead of the dative the genitive must have been used. Paul would then have written : συναντιλαμβάνεται (= ἀντιλαμβάνεται σύν τῇ ὑπομονῇ) δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν ἀσθενούντων (or even τὰς ἀσθενείας) ἡμῶν.

—ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν] Instead of this *lectio recepta*, Lachm. and Tisch. have rightly restored the reading of the best codices, also of the Cod. Sinait., of several versions and Fathers, τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν, which Griesbach and modern expositors approve. The plural was substituted for the collective singular to correspond with the plural τὰ παθήματα, ver. 18, comp. 2 Cor. xii. 5, 9, 10. But the ἀσθένεια is not, with Ambrosiaster, to be understood of the *infirmities nostrae orationis* ; for in what precedes (comp. the ὡσαύτως) this was not so much as mentioned, and by the following τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα κτλ. merely the strongest expression of the ἀσθένεια itself is indicated. The ἀσθένεια, accordingly, is the general condition of weakness and frailty in which we are placed, the result of the fact that we are still subject to the

δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς, ver. 21, and from which, therefore, spring τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, ver. 18, and the στενάζειν, ver. 23, relating thereto.

—τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξόμεθα καθὼ δέῃ, οὐκ οἶδμεν] Confirmation (γάρ) of the greatness of our ἀσθένεια, which is specially reflected in this,—that for what and how we are to pray, we know not. The article τό substantivizes the whole sentence which it introduces, and serves in addition to draw attention to it. Accordingly τί προσευξ. καθὼ δέῃ is to be treated as *one* word, somewhat like “fitting prayer,” comp. Mark ix. 23 ; Luke i. 62 ; Acts xxii. 30, etc. ; Winer, p. 135. Overpowered by a sense of weakness, the Christian knows not how to order either the matter (τί) or the form (καθὼ δέῃ) of his petition aright. Like one deprived of sense, he is no longer able to discern for what or with what words he should pray, comp. πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε, Matt. x. 19. For the *lectio recepta* προσευξόμεθα is found the variant προσευξόμεθα, approved by Griesbach, and received by Matthiæ. Grammatically, both are allowable, Winer, p. 357. Decision is difficult, as the *recept.* is no doubt adequately attested, but copyists were more likely to exchange the future for the conjunctive more usual in this case than the converse.

—αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα] *the Spirit itself*, who best knows our wants (τί προσευξ.), and can best plead our cause (καθὼ δέῃ), no mean helper and advocate.

—ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] The adjunct ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, omitted by Lach., is apparently spurious, as it is wanting in the best authorities, is not in itself necessary, and might easily be added as a gloss (comp. ver. 34). ἐντυγχάνειν τινὶ περὶ τινος, “to meet one about a person or thing,” i.e. in order to confer with him respecting it, Wisd. viii. 21 ; Acts xxv. 24. Hence ἐντυγχάνειν τινὶ ὑπὲρ τινος, “to intercede with one for a person,” ver. 34, Heb. vii. 25 ; ἐντυγχάνειν τινὶ κατὰ τινος, “to complain of one to a person,” Rom. xi. 2. The double compound ὑπερεντυγχάνειν does not occur elsewhere, but is regularly formed after the analogy of ὑπεραπολογεῖσθαι, ὑπεραποκρίνομαι, ὑπεραγορεύω, ὑπεραγωνιάω κτλ. ὑπερεντυγχάνειν τινὶ τινος, therefore, may be construed = ἐντυγχάνειν τινὶ ὑπὲρ τινος, or even, repeating the preposition, ὑπερεντυγχάνειν τινὶ ὑπὲρ τινος. The preposition ὑπὲρ thus is not intensive, not: “intercedes *best*



for us," as Luther renders. If *ὑπερεντυγχάνει* stands alone, τῷ θεῷ is supplied, of course, in thought as the person to whom, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν as the persons for whom, intercession is made.

—*στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις*] *ἀλάλητος* may be taken either in a passive or active signification. In the first it is either = *qui dici non potest, infundus*. So Luther: "with inexpressible sighings." The sense in that case may be twofold. The *infundi gemitus* may be taken in the sense of *ingentes gemitus*, as Oecum. explains by *μεγίστοις στεναγμοῖς* (Virgil, *Æn.* ii. 3: *infandum dolorem*). But the notion of huge, strong groans does not make a very pleasing image, nor is it in keeping with ver. 27, because the strength of the groans is no reason why only God, the heart-searcher, understands their meaning. Hence the unutterable groans are better interpreted as groans, the sense and import of which cannot be embodied in words. Thus is most fittingly expressed the greatness of suffering in which thought and word alike fail man, and nothing is left but the sense of his misery and sighing. This, too, agrees with ver. 27; for although such sighs cannot be clothed in language, still the heart-searcher full well knows their meaning. But *ἀλάλητον* denotes not merely what cannot be expressed, *inexpressible*, but also what is not expressed, *unexpressed*. Then, this meaning very nearly touches upon the *active* meaning of *ἀλάλητος* = *qui loqui non potest, mutus*, so that *στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις* would be = *στεναγμοῖς οὐ λόγοις*. But if this is to yield a pertinent sense, it must be so interpreted that the reason why the Spirit intercedes for us with groans without words, with silent groans, is that the pain is so great that words do not suffice to express it. It is preferable, therefore, to abide by the current interpretation "inexpressible groans," in the meaning we have indicated, because in this way the meaning aimed at is expressed in the most forcible and direct manner, and, moreover, the analogous phrases *ἀνεκδιήγητος*, 2 Cor. ix. 15, *ἄρρητος*, 2 Cor. xii. 4, and *ἀνεκλάλητος*, 1 Pet. i. 8, favour this view. But Augustine, *Tract. VI. in John*, § 2, rightly interprets: "non Spiritus sanctus in semet ipso apud semet ipsum in illa trinitate, in illa beatitudine, in illa aeternitate substantiæ gemit, sed in nobis gemit, quia nos gemere facit." The unanimous consensus of Lutheran exegetes agreeing herewith is noted by Calov here, and see him on John xiv. 16, on which latter passage Gerhard in the *Evangelienharm.* remarks: "notanda est

regula, quod quaedam tribuantur Spir. s. relate *in nostra personam* ut ad Rom. viii." Comp. Matt. x. 20 (although it is not we that speak, but the Spirit of the Father, yet the Spirit speaks in and by us), 1 Tim. iv. 1; and Gal. iv. 6 with Rom. viii. 15. To suppose a sighing of the Spirit Himself without mediation of man's spirit, is alike without meaning and biblical analogy. But it is not without significance that here the sighing of the sanctified human spirit is traced back to its ultimate author, the Spirit of God Himself, because in this way the certainty of the sighing being heard is rendered the more secure. In the intimate marriage of God's Spirit with man's spirit, an incarnation of the former, as it were, takes place, so that the language of God's servants may just as well be described as an utterance of the Spirit of God, as the sighing of God's children may be described as an experience and articulation of the Spirit of God. It is therefore this Spirit Himself who, through the medium of the human spirit, appropriated and permeated by Him, carries on His operations in the words, acts, prayers, and sighs of the saints. Upon the Augustinian *nos orare docet*, Dannhauer therefore justly remarks: "*suavissima περιχωρήσει preces nostras permeat.*" But the distinction between the intercession of the Spirit and the intercession of Christ is chiefly to be found in this,—that Christ intercedes without us, in and by Himself, but the Spirit in and by us; Christ by the prevalence of His own merit, the Spirit on the ground of the merit of Christ. The *intercessio Christi* is *meritoria*, that of the Spirit *effectiva* (in so far as He is the *causa efficiens* of our *στεναγμός*), said the ancients.

Ver. 27. *ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας*] specifies the reason why God understands the meaning of the unutterable sighs, namely, because—which is impossible to man—He searches the hearts and knows their thoughts, so that for Him there is no need of words to explain the meaning of the sighs. *ὁ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας = ὁ καρδιογνώστης*, a familiar phrase for describing the divine omniscience, 1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kings viii. 39; Ps. vii. 9, cxxxix. 1; Jer. xi. 20, xvii. 10, xx. 12; Ecclus. xlii. 18; Luke xvi. 15; Acts i. 24, xv. 8; Rev. ii. 23. But God is here described as He that searches the *hearts*, precisely because the Spirit sighs in the *hearts* of believers.

—*οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος*] *sc. τοῦ στενάζοντος ἐν ταῖς καρδαίαις ἡμῶν.* φρόνημα = mind, meaning, aim.

—ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων] Luther: "for He intercedes for the saints according to what pleases God." So, too, the majority of expositors. ὅτι is in this case to be taken causally, and κατὰ θεόν in the sense of "agreeably to God," *i.e.* conformably to God's mind and will, or: according to His good pleasure. Origen: "*secundum divinitatem suam*;" κατὰ γνώμην αὐτοῦ, Theodor. Mopsu., comp. 2 Cor. vii. 9–11; 1 John v. 14; Winer, p. 499. But as God has been previously described as the heart-searcher, it appears superfluous to specify still further a reason *why* God knows; and, moreover, the reason specified seems beside the point, because God would know the mind of the Spirit even if His intercession were not κατὰ θεόν but κατὰ θεοῦ. And if, to escape this difficulty, οἶδε be taken, with Calvin, who explains it by "*agnoscere et simul benigne excipere ut agnitos sibi et probatos*," in the emphatic sense of approval, complacent knowledge, appealing for support to 1 Thess. v. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 19, so that οἶδε = "takes deep interest in, grants," it then anyhow remains unexplained, passing by everything else, why God is here expressly described as ὁ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας, since omniscience, indeed, does explain the divine knowledge, but not His cordial approval of a particular object. On this account several modern expositors take ὅτι here not causally, *because* or *for*, but explicatively, *that*. We must then call to mind the familiar attraction by which a word is drawn from a dependent to a principal sentence, and grammatically conformed to the latter, Mark i. 24; John vii. 27; 1 Cor. xvi. 15, etc.; Winer, p. 781; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 34. κατὰ θεόν would then be, according to Winer, p. 499, = towards God, *i.e.* before God, *coram Deo*, or = with God, *apud Deum*. But apart from the circumstance that in this case, instead of κατὰ θεόν, we should have expected merely καθ' αὐτόν (for even in 1 John iv. 8 the emphatic repetition of ὁ θεός furnishes no adequate parallel, Winer, p. 180), and that the phrase ἐντυγχάνει κατὰ τινα, instead of ἐντυγ. τινί, is not proved, the entire exposition obtained in this way is meaningless and superfluous. For after the preceding αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ver. 26, the ὅτι κατὰ θεόν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων is really quite a matter of course. And if for this reason κατὰ θεόν be taken in the sense of *agreeably to God*, the sentence no longer remains purely explicative, but with κατὰ θεόν introduces an entirely new, and,

indeed, the proper main element. It must then be explained: "God knows what is the mind of the Spirit, namely, that He pleads for the saints, *and, indeed, in a manner agreeable to God.*" The simpler course, therefore, is to abide by the most generally accepted interpretation of *ὅτι*, which indeed, as we think, may be sufficiently vindicated. That is, *οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος*, standing in the middle, is explained in a twofold way, first, by the divine omniscience, and secondly, by the fact that the intercession is *agreeable to God*. Resolving and paraphrasing the terse mode of expression, we should say: "As the searcher of hearts, God knows what is the mind of the Spirit; and He knows it also because the Spirit intercedes for the saints in a way *agreeable to God.*" That God, without doubt, knows not merely what is agreeable, but what is contrary to God, is nothing to the point; for the apostle is here laying down not a metaphysical proposition, but a comforting and animating truth. But manifestly to man's weakness of faith one truth needs to be evinced more clearly than the other. If he is tempted to doubt whether God understands the sighs of the Spirit, he is assured by the thought that these sighs are according to God's mind and will, and therefore themselves akin to the divine nature, and that in consequence like will understand like, 1 Cor. ii. 11-14. "*κατὰ θεόν*," says Bengel, "*non κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* (conf. 1 John iii. 20), ut Deo dignum, eique acceptum et manifestum est. Spiritus sanctus intelligit stilum curiae coelestis, Patri acceptum. Emphasin habet hoc, commate ineunte." But the fact that God knows the sighing of the Spirit, as an intercession pleasing in God's sight, implies for us a security that the sighing will be heard just as strong as the fact that it is an intercession *ὑπὲρ ἁγίων*; for what is done agreeably to God and for the saints cannot but be acceptable to and heard by Him. On *ὑπὲρ ἁγίων*, for saints, Bengel remarks: "Non additur articulus; *sancti* sunt et Deo propinqui et auxilio digni, pro quibus intercedit." But the *ἅγιοι* are those *ἡγιασμένοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. The thought of subjective holiness is out of the question, because here it is simply the condition of weakness and frailty that is described.

Vv. 28-39. Last and highest comfort in suffering. Assured of the love of God and, through it, of our eternal salvation, nothing beside can harm us, but everything must tend to our good; just as, finding ourselves in this position of inalienable,

celestial security, we have the world with all its sufferings beneath our feet.

Ver. 28. Fourth ground of encouragement. A mitigation of present sufferings is involved in our knowledge that to believers all things whatsoever, therefore sufferings also, work together for good, ver. 28. For those whom God has called according to His purpose, He will also save and glorify, vv. 29, 30. How then can His love do them aught but good even in what seems evil, or how with the higher should He not also bestow the less? οἶδαμεν δέ] By the continuative δέ to the special ground contained in vv. 26, 27, is here annexed a general one, which should enhearten us for the patient endurance of sufferings.

—τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεόν] comp. 1 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 24; Jas. i. 12, ii. 5. "Hic describitur subjectum a fructu eorum, quae hactenus dicta sunt, amore erga Deum; qui amor etiam facit, ut fideles omnia, quae Deus immittit, dextre in bonam partem accipiant, et omnia constanter pervincant," Bengel.

—πάντα] *everything*, perfectly general, from which in connection with the context the thought naturally follows; therefore also, or even also sufferings.

—συνεργεῖ] The addition ὁ θεός, received by Lachmann, after A, B, Orig., according to which πάντα would have to be taken, not as subject, but as object, is to be regarded simply as a gloss that arose from vv. 27, 29, where, of course, ὁ θεός is the subject. συνεργεῖν τινι εἰς τι = συνεργὸν εἶναί τινι εἰς τι, to be helpful to one for something, to contribute, assist, 1 Macc. xii. 1; Jas. ii. 22; Hesych: βοηθεῖ. Wherefore σύν is neither, as in ver. 22, to be referred to the common co-operation of all the several elements included in πάντα, nor to the love of those who love God, which is the real agent, and with which sufferings merely co-operate. It rather indicates "the notion of the fellowship in which the supporter necessarily stands with the supported," comp. συναντιλαμβάνεται, ver. 26.

—εἰς ἀγαθόν] *for good*, indefinitely, i.e. in a salutary, beneficial manner; therefore not directly = *ad aeternam salutem*. This would be εἰς σωτηρίαν, i. 16, εἰς τὴν δόξαν, vv. 18, 30, and, moreover, must in any case have been written εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. Lachmann has received the article, but it is not sufficiently attested. How the θλίψεις εἰς ἀγαθὸν συνεργοῦσι, is stated more definitely in v. 4 f. Comp. too, Eccles. xxxix. 27: ταῦτα πάντα (namely, the various

necessaries of life) τοῖς εὐσεβέσιν εἰς ἀγαθὰ, οὕτως τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς τραπήσεται εἰς κακά. But Bengel justly remarks: "*In bonum, ad glorificationem usque, ver. 30 fin.*"

—τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν] More exact definition of τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεόν. "To those who love God, namely, to those who are called according to purpose." Both expressions describe the subject with respect to its characteristic qualities; but the former (τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τ. θ.) implies the condition, the second (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθ. κλη. οὖσιν) the ground of the *συνεργεῖν εἰς ἀγαθόν*. Sufferings, of course, can only tend to our benefit upon the assumption that we love God; but the ground of their salutary operation lies not in our love, but in our calling according to the divine purpose. Rightly, therefore, Bengel concludes the remark quoted on τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι with the words: "*Mox in vocatis denotatur causa, cur huic subjecto tam lautum prædicatum tribuatur.*" And Calvin says: "*Nequis putaret, fideles, quia Deum diligunt, suo merito hoc consequi, ut tantum ex rebus adversis fructum percipiant.*" πρόθεσις, from *προτίθεσθαι*, "to purpose," i. 13, Eph. i. 9, *purpose*. Of human πρόθεσις, Acts xi. 23, xxvii. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 10; in the present passage, on the other hand, as in ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9, of the divine πρόθεσις. In what this πρόθεσις is grounded is not indicated in the word by itself. But it is not grounded in our ἔργοις, but takes place κατ' ἐκλογήν, ix. 11; κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, Eph. i. 11. It is therefore a decree grounded simply in the divine will, i.e. a *liberrimum consilium*. Further, it is an eternal decree, a πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων, and a decree made ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Eph. iii. 11. The combination of all three elements is found in 2 Tim. i. 9. This eternal decree, founded not upon our works, but in God's free will, made in Christ Jesus, has for its substance and aim, as follows from the passages cited, our σωτηρία, and has been realized, not merely objectively, and in general, in the person and work of Christ for all mankind, but is carried into effect subjectively, and in particular, in each and every individual that actually attains to σωτηρία. Now, from the πρόθεσις the κλήσις follows. Hence believers are κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί. That καλεῖν, to call, invite (Luke vii. 39, xiv. 9; John ii. 2; 1 Cor. x. 27), is used of the Lord's call to the kingdom of God without reference to the issue of this call, is shown by Matt. iv. 21, ix. 13, xxii. 3, 4, 8, 9. The same

is true of κλητός, Matt. xx. 16, where the κλητοί are expressly opposed to the ἐκλεκτοί. In the apostolical epistles, addressed to Christian churches, καλεῖν, κλήσις, κλητός (Heb. כְּלִיָּהּ, Isa. xlviii. 12, an appellation of Israel), in harmony with the nature of the circumstances, refers always to believers in whom God's call has actually, or at least assumptively, proved effectual, comp. the passages in Schmid, ταμιεύον, ed. Bruder. Although, now, Paul habitually attributes the predicate κλητοί (i. 6, 7; 1 Cor. i. 2, 24; also Jude 1; Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1) only to those in whom the divine κλήσις has accomplished its purpose, i.e. to persons who have responded to the call, so that, *as matter of fact*, "to call" and "to call effectually" coincide, still we may not on this account say that κλητός means: "to call effectually." For the effectual element here is not expressed in the predicate as such, but follows merely from the character of the person who is its subject. Christians are κλητοί, ἐκλεκτοί, πιστοί, Rev. xvii. 14, comp. 2 Pet. i. 10; ἀγαπῶντες τὸν θεόν, ἅγιοι, etc.; and these different designations bring out their different characteristic qualities. Their being called κλητοί intimates not so much their faith, as rather the objective security, the real ground and support of their faith. The believer is not placed in the communion of the saved by his own act. It is the divine πρόθεσις that chose him for it, and this ἐκλογή is made known and sealed to him by the κλήσις. For this reason, in the present passage, the thought is enervated and robbed of its proper force, if in κλητός the *effectual* element is brought forward; for the very purpose of the passage is to base the salutary operation of sufferings, not upon the effect of the κλήσις, consisting in ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεόν, but upon the κλήσις of God itself, resting on the πρόθεσις and springing out of it, as upon the only sure and unassailable foundation. "*κλητοί autem dicuntur non ratione obsequii et acceptatae vocationis, sed simpliciter ab ipsa vocatione: nam quamvis admittamus eos, qui hic respiciuntur et vocati dicuntur vere esse fideles, non tamen vi vocis κλητοί hoc inferitur,*" Calov. If, against this objective interpretation of the notion, it be objected that not all called in this sense would be justified, ver. 30, it might be replied, first, that just as little are all the justified glorified, etc.; and, again, that here the very persons spoken of are the πιστοί, the ἀγαπῶντες τὸν θεόν, ver. 28, whom God foreknew, ver. 29, in whom, of course, the divine προορισμός is infallibly carried out and gradu-

ally perfected through the κλήσις, the δικαίωσις, and the δόξα. Again, the κλήσις appears in the form of the κήρυγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, x. 12-15, 2 Thess. ii. 14, finds its conclusion in βίπτισμα, Matt. xxviii. 19, Eph. iv. 4, 5, and has for its goal the βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Matt. iii. 2; the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, Mark i. 15, 1 Thess. ii. 12; the κοινωνία Ἰησ. Χρ., 1 Cor. i. 9; ζωή, 1 Tim. vi. 12, or δόξα ἐν Χριστῷ, 1 Pet. v. 10, 2 Thess. ii. 14. Finally, if the Greek Fathers and Pelagius, in order to avoid the dogma of absolute predestination in the κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί of this verse, explained πρόθεσις of man's determination and disposition to obey the call, it suffices for the exposure of this manifest product of exegetical embarrassment, to remark that the call can in no respect be conceived as resulting from the purpose of the called one. But on κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί, Calov justly observes: "non quidem *absoluto* quodam *decreto*, sed *certo* *mediorum* *τάξει* *definito*." And: "In quibus vocatio non assequitur eventum *παρὰ* *πρόθεσιν*, *κατὰ* *πρόθεσιν* id fit."

Vv. 29, 30 confirm the truth stated in ver. 28. To those that love God, the called according to His purpose, sufferings cannot be hurtful, but only helpful, ver. 28; for God will not fail to carry out in respect to them His decree to lead them to glory, vv. 29, 30. As, then, everything must subserve the realization of this decree, neither can sufferings hinder it; as, by virtue of this decree, eternal salvation is sure to them, neither can temporal mischief overtake them; as the divine love is pledged to them with respect to the bestowal of the highest good, no evil, no mischief, really to be regarded as such, can befall them. This inference is directly expressed in ver. 31 ff.

Ver. 29. οὓς προέγνω] *whom He foreknew*, not: *whom He predestined*, expressive of divine prescience, not of divine predestination. No doubt γινώσκειν means also *decernere*, but primarily *sensu fornsi* only. In this sense we also speak of a judicial cognizance. But in this verse the word really retains its proper meaning, inasmuch as the judicial sentence or decree is essentially cognizance of the matter of fact itself, or is the immediate result of the cognizance. Comp. the Latin *rem cognoscere*. But from this it follows, of course, that γινώσκειν *τινά* cannot fitly be used in the sense of: "to make a decree about one." Moreover, confessedly this form of expression does not occur. Just as little is προγινώσκειν, therefore still less προγινώσκειν *τινά*, demonstrable



in classical usage in the meaning: *ante discernere*. But in the N. T. where *προγινώσκειν* appears, it either *must* mean *to fore-know*, so Acts xxvi. 5, 2 Pet. iii. 17, comp. Wisd. vi. 13, viii. 8, xviii. 6, or it *may* mean this, so xi. 2, 1 Pet. i. 20. The latter is true also of the substantive *πρόγνωσις*, Acts ii. 23, 1 Pet. i. 2; comp. Judith ix. 6. Accordingly, in this passage *προγινώσκειν* means: "to know before, know well beforehand." If it were intended to denote "to predestine," there would be nothing specific to distinguish it from the subjoined *προορίζειν* (so Hummius: "qui nihil aliud significare autumant quam praeordinavit, Spiritui s. manifestam assuunt *ταυτηγίαν*"); whereas, manifestly, such a distinction is here meant to be made between *προγινώσκειν* and *προορίζειν*, as is shown by the gradual progress in *προορίζειν*, *καλεῖν*, *δικαιοῦν*, *δοξάζειν*, ver. 30. But the divine *πρόγνωσις* is to be conceived as eternal, as is self-evident without its being expressly said; for if it be objected that the *πρόγνωσις* and *προορισμός* are merely described as preceding the *κλήσις* in general terms ver. 30, still, in the nature of the case, this cannot be a precedency beginning at a definite moment of time, 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. i. 4, 5. But in what character God foresaw those who were predestined to life, is here not specially indicated. They are therefore merely to be conceived in general as fitted for this destiny. But, according to the Pauline scheme of doctrine, it is impossible to discover the qualification in their moral excellence or their *ἔργοις*, but merely in *πίστις*, and indeed in steadfast *πίστις*. Otherwise the content of the *πρόγνωσις* would be incompatible with the freedom of the divine *πρόθεσις* and *ἐκλογή*. Believers are thus *κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί*, and nevertheless *κατὰ πρόγνωσιν προωρισμένοι*, which certainly can only be reconciled if faith is God's work, not their own. For only if God, in the foresight of their faith, sees in them nothing but His own creation in Christ Jesus, are a free, gracious election to life on God's part, and divine foresight of the believing reception of salvation on man's part, not mutually exclusive. The present passage, then, as the exegetical tradition of the Lutheran Church, in unison with the non-predestinationist Fathers, has rightly perceived and maintained, contains a *dictum probans* for the doctrine of *prædestinatio*, not absolute, but based upon *prævisio*. For whilst the conception of the *πρόθεσις* precludes the synergistic, the *πρόγνωσις* precludes the predestinationist extreme.

—καὶ προώρισε] = τούτους καὶ προώρισε, ver. 30. The demonstrative is included already in the relative οὗς. προορίζειν, Acts iv. 28, 1 Cor. ii. 7, Eph. i. 5, 11, *to predestine, predestinare*.

—συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ] Το συμμόρφους neither εἶναι nor γενέσθαι is to be supplied; but συμμόρφους is an accusative of the predicate, iii. 25; Jas. ii. 5; Winer, p. 285. σύμμορφος, like σύμφυτος, vi. 5, is construed just as well with the genitive as with the dative, Phil. iii. 21. But “to be conformed to the image of His Son” means: “in their form to set forth the image of His Son.” In 1 Cor. xv. 49, Paul says that we shall bear τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου; in 2 Cor. iii. 18, that we are changed into τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν; and in Phil. iii. 21, that our σῶμα is to be σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ; comp. 1 John iii. 2. The image of His Son we shall not set forth until we have attained to δόξα; for not until then will our υἰοθεσία, for which now we still wait, ver. 23, be realized,—not until then will the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 19, be accomplished. That here merely the *conformitas gloriæ*, not also the *conformitas crucis*, is to be thought of, ver. 30 proves, where the δοξάζεσθαι, answering to the σύμμορφον εἶναι τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, is mentioned as the final element in the realization of the divine προορισμός. On the contrary, in direct antithesis with their present sufferings, the apostle unfolds before believers the prospect of the glorious conditions that await them.

—εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς] *that He may be first-born among many brethren*, states the final aim of the προορισμός in reference to us. Thus not so much to glorify us as to glorify Christ has God ordained for us such glory. The creature's salvation is God's mediate aim; the glorification of the Son, or His own glorification, is the final aim of all the divine acts in creation and redemption. According to Col. i. 18, God has given to Christ the pre-eminence in all things. He is therefore not merely the μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, John i. 14, 18, iii. 16, 18, 1 John iv. 9, which He is and remains as God's eternal Son, but, as God's incarnate Son, He is also πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Heb. i. 6, ii. 10, 11. πρωτότοκος, the first-born, and on this ground the foremost,—the *choragus* in a numerous family. Christ is both the first-born (for He was God's Son by nature long before men became God's children by adoption, Col.

i. 15, 17) and the foremost,—the leader, *princeps et dux*, Gen. xlix. 3; Deut. xxi. 17; Ps. lxxxix. 27; Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5. But His eminence above us consists in this, that He *is* by nature what we *become* by adoption; that He is *in Himself* what we become *through Him*; and that He is the *θεάνθρωπος*, comp. ix. 5, 1 Tim. ii. 5, but we merely *άνθρωποι θεού*, 1 Tim. vi. 16; 2 Tim. iii. 17.

Ver. 30. The decree made from eternity necessarily finds its temporal realization. The *πρόθεσις*, *πρόγνωσις*, and *προορισμός*, as the *πρό* intimates, are to be viewed as pre-temporal; on the other hand, the *καλεῖν*, *δικαιῶν*, *δοξάζειν*, as temporal acts of God. “Quem Deus predestinavit *ante* mundum, vocavit *de* mundo, justificavit *in* mundo, eum certe magnificabit *post* mundum,” Augustine, *Soliloqu.* c. 28. *ἐκάλεσε*] *sc. διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, 2 Thess. ii. 14; Rom. x. 14-17.

—*ἐδικαίωσε*] In the case of those predestined to salvation on the ground of foresight, *δικαίωσις* must needs follow upon *κλήσις*; for where this is not the case, even the *πρόγνωσις* and *προορισμός* also did not take place. Thus the *οὗς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν* is not to be severed from the concatenated series of the entire exposition, but is only true within the limits of that series. Moreover, the fact that here the apostle, along with *δικαίωσις*, does not dwell specially upon *άγιασμός*, shows again what a primary, overruling, and central position, in his view, the former holds as regards the latter, and how little his thoughts have been drawn away from his main theme, i. 16, 17, by the more incidental exposition, vi. 1-viii. 13. Nay, so much is this the case, that *δοξασμός* is linked directly with *δικαίωσις*; and *άγιασμός* is not the *causa*, but merely the *via* leading to *ζωή αἰώνιος* procured through *άπολύτρωσις*.

—*ἐδόξασε*] The aorist represents the future act as certain, and already as good as done, comp. John xv. 6, 8, and the similar use of the present, John xvii. 11. Thus the aorist stands neither for the present nor the future (Winer, p. 346). Nor is the meaning: what is customary, no instance of which occurs in the N. T., to be accepted. Nor, again, is the *δόξα*, which, according to vv. 18, 21, is to be conceived merely as approaching in the future, to be described as already actually accomplished, and consisting in *νιοθεσία* and the bestowment of the *πνεῦμα*, vv. 9, 10, 15, 16, 23, 26. The aorist is rather to be compared with the so-called

*præteritum propheticum*, and, placed on a level with the other aorists in the verse, marks with bold, genuinely Pauline power of anticipation the equal degree of certainty with which the *δοξασμός*, just as much as the *πρόγνωσις*, the *προορισμός*, the *κλήσις*, and the *δικαίωσις*, takes place, and, as it were, has already taken place on the part of God. But Bengel's observation on the verse is noteworthy: "Non absolute parem eorum, qui vocantur, justificantur, glorificantur, numerum Paulus statuit: non negat, posse fidelem inter vocationem specialem et glorificationem deficere, c. xi. 22; nec negat eos etiam vocari, qui non justificantur: sed docet, Deum, quantum in ipso est, a gradu ad gradum perducere suos."

Vv. 31-39. Inference from vv. 28-30, conclusion of the entire exposition, and withal the highest rung in the ladder of comfort which, from ver. 18 onward, writer, like reader, has been mounting. The apostle's God-inspired confidence, with all earthly things left far beneath its feet, is reflected even in the lofty style of his language. This has been felt by nearly all interpreters, and Erasmus in his own way puts this feeling into words when he says: "Quid usquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius?" In fact, as vv. 19-23 may be called a sacred elegy, so vv. 31-39 may be called a sacred hymn, the one just as tender and touching as the other is bold and sublime both in matter and form; the one an exposition of *στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι*, 2 Cor. v. 4, the other a commentary on *καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν*, 1 John v. 4.

Ver. 31. Augustine, *de Doctr. Christ.* iv. 20, cites this passage as an instance of the "grande dicendi genus, quod non tam verborum ornatibus comtum est, quam violentum animi affectibus.—Satis enim est ei propter quod agitur, ut verba congruentia, non oris elegantur industria, sed pectoris sequantur ardorem. Nam si aurato gemmatoque ferro vir fortis armetur, intentissimus pugnae, agit quidem illis armis quod agit, non quia pretiosa, sed quia arma sunt." *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα;*] *sc. ὅτι προῦρισεν, ὅτι ἐκάλεσεν, ὅτι ἐδικαίωσεν, ὅτι ἐδόξασεν*, ver. 30. *What shall we say to these things?* i.e. what shall we infer from this? *πρὸς ταῦτα* *ad hæc*, not *propterea*, or *præterea*, *ultra*. But the inference consists in this, that our salvation rests unalterably sure upon the love of God, and that, therefore, even the *παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ*, ver. 18, cannot turn *εἰς κακόν* for us, but only *εἰς ἀγαθόν*

ver. 28. And in the same way no tribulation can wrest from us the certainty of this love of God and Christ; but, on the contrary, victorious by its power, we vanquish all sufferings.

—*εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*] That this is the case is the direct consequence of what was said, vv. 29, 30.

—*τίς καθ' ἡμῶν*;] If God the Almighty be for us, no one is against us, because beside Him all our adversaries are powerless and to be nothing accounted of. Therefore, even sufferings are to be viewed not as our foes, but as our friends, who cannot harm, but only do us good. But they do this especially by bringing as auxiliaries to actual victory over the world the experience and assurance of God's love, and by deepening in us the confident assurance of final salvation. Similar utterances to the one here are common in the Psalms, iii. 6, xi. 1, xxiii. 4, lvi. 4, 11, xci. 1-7, cxviii. 6.

Ver. 32. In confirmation of *ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, reference is made to the highest evidence of God's love, the surrender of His own Son, and in support of *τίς καθ' ἡμῶν* by *πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ κτλ.* an analogous question is asked. *ὅσῃ*] *qui quidem, who indeed*, Hartung, *Partik.* I. p. 388 ff.; Kühner, *Gram.* II. p. 400.

—*τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ*] Only seldom in the N. T. is *ἴδιος* used instead of the pron. poss. without emphasis, Matt. xxii. 5, xxv. 14; Winer, p. 191. In by far the majority of cases there lies in the word an obvious or concealed antithesis, Acts ii. 6; Rom. xi. 24, xiv. 4; Tit. i. 12, etc. So also here. The antithesis to *ἴδιος υἱός* is *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, comp. on vv. 15, 29; Schol. *Pind. Ol.* ix. 25: *θεασάμενος τὸν παῖδα, ὃς ἦν μὲν θετὸς αὐτοῦ, οὐ κατὰ φύσιν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἴδιος αὐτοῦ ἐνομίζετο.* The *ἴδιος υἱός*, therefore, is the *proper Son*; comp. John v. 18: *πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν θεόν, ἵσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ*, *His Son*, i.e. who is a son by nature, in contradistinction from adopted sons, who is at once *μονογενής*, John iii. 16, and *πρωτότοκος*. This meaning is also required by the connection, for the highest evidence of the divine love consists precisely in this, that He surrendered His *proper Son*.

—*οὐκ ἐφέισατο*] "*Deus paterno suo amoris quasi vim adhibuit*," Bengel. Comp. LXX. Gen. xxii. 12: *νῦν γὰρ ἔγνω, ὅτι φοβῆσθαι τὸν θεόν, καὶ οὐκ ἐφέισω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ.* This correspondence can scarcely be deemed accidental. Rather is it in the highest degree probable that a reference to the passage in Genesis is to be supposed. God Himself has done

what, in Abraham's typical act, He declared to be the highest proof of love. Comp. also τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν, Heb. xi. 17. Then to οὐκ ἐφείσατο is emphatically appended the positive

—ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν] comp. John i. 3. Even if special reference is here made to believers, this does not preclude the universality of Christ's sacrifice. As to παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, comp. on iv. 25. The πάντων implies that each and every believer has an equal share in God's loving act in Christ, and therefore equal right to comfort in suffering. The words ὅσγε . . . παρέδωκεν αὐτόν stand with emphasis before the question πῶς οἰχί κτλ., the reason of which they contain.

—πῶς οὐχί καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίζεται;] The καὶ is to be joined with πῶς οὐχί, not with σὺν αὐτῷ. πῶς οὐχί καὶ = *quidni etiam?* how ever should He not, how yet should He not? Comp. τί καί, ver. 24. The καὶ strengthens the meaning of πῶς οὐχί, and implies that the matter treated of here is thoroughly trustworthy and credible. If we join καὶ with σὺν αὐτῷ, and explain: *even together with Him*, we should then rather have expected the following order and mode of connection: καὶ τὰ πάντα, *even the whole, i.e. even all the rest.*

—σὺν αὐτῷ] As to meaning = *χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν αὐτόν.* With Him, namely, whom He vouchsafed to us, *i.e. having vouchsafed Him to us.* τὰ πάντα is perhaps used to correspond, certainly in a merely formal way, with the preceding πάντων. *The whole, i.e. all that He possesses, all His χαρίσματα, all that is good and for good, so that even sufferings themselves are for good, εἰς ἀγαθὸν συνεργεῖ,* ver. 28. Thus the reasoning proceeds, as in v. 9, 10, *a majori ad minus.* In contrast with ἴδιος υἱός stands τὰ πάντα. "Minus est enim nobis omnia cum illo donare, quam illum nostri causa morti tradere," Ambrosiat. *χαρίζεται*, "Quae ex redemptione consequuntur, ipsa quoque *gratuita* sunt," Bengel.

Vv. 33, 34. Further elaboration of the thought that none can harm us. God having given up His Son for us, none can be against us, vv. 31, 32; none accuse us, ver. 33; none condemn us, ver. 34. In a certain sense, therefore, a resumption and more specific analysis of τίς καθ' ἡμῶν, ver. 31, occurs. τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ;] *Who shall raise accusation against God's elect?* Negative question = no one will do this, which answer is corroborated by the words θεὸς ὁ δικαίων. The question is per-

fectly general, and includes, therefore, all even conceivable hostile powers,—Satan, law, conscience, world, etc.,—without its being meant to specify any one in particular, or exclusively. *ἐγκαλεῖν*, to call in, *i.e.* into judgment, *in jus vocare*, to summon to judgment, to accuse. Elsewhere with dat. of the person, Acts xix. 38, xxiii. 28. Here *ἐγκαλεῖν κατὰ τινος*, to bring accusation against one, like *κατηγορεῖν κατὰ τινος*, Luke xxiii. 14; Sophocles *Philoct.* 328: *τίνος γὰρ ὧδε τὸν μέγαν χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαλῶν ἐλήλυθας*; The *ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ* (Col. iii. 12; Tit. i. 1) are the *יְהוָה פִּהְיָ*, Ps. cv. 43, cvi. 5, 23; Isa. xlii. 1, lxv. 9; comp. Wisd. iii. 9, iv. 15; Tob. xiii. 10, etc., in Apoc. It comes from *ἐκλέγεσθαι*, Eph. i. 4 (comp. Harless there); *יְהוָה*, Isa. xiv. 1, etc. Comp. Mark xiii. 20: *διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο = εἴλατο*, 2 Thess. ii. 13. The *ἐκλογή* is made out of the *κόσμος*, John xvii. 6. The idea of election, grounded in free purpose, is the same in itself, whether the reference be to the N. or O. T. covenant-people. The difference lies, not in the word, but in the thing, namely, in the different design of the two. But the *ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ* are not absolutely identical with the *ἡγαπημένοις*, *ἀγαπητοῖς θεοῦ*, i. 7, although in every case the *ἐκλογή* rests upon love, and just so the *ἀγάπη θεοῦ* abides upon the *ἐκλεκτοῖς*. Nevertheless, *ἐκλεκτός* in itself is *delectus*, not *dilectus*. *ἐκλεκτοί* is substantivized, hence the genitive. The absence of the article brings out the *quality* = such as are *ἐκλεκτοί*.

—*θεὸς ὁ δικαίων*] = *θεὸς ἐστὶν ὁ δικαίων*. “It is God that justifies.” The expression is more energetic than *θεὸς δικαιοῖ*, comp. Matt. x. 20; John v. 32; Phil. ii. 13. Luther: “God is here that justifies,” which, of course, literally must have been: *ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ὁ δικαίων*. “But *θεός* immediately after *θεοῦ* has rhetorical emphasis.” If God justifies, it is self-evident that none will accuse, or that his accusation will go for nothing, because he thus sets himself in opposition to God. Following the lead of Augustine, *de Doctr. Christ.* iii. 3, and *de Divers. Quæst. ad Simplicianum*, ii. 5, Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann, and many interpreters have punctuated *θεὸς ὁ δικαίων*; and repeating *ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλ. θ.*, have taken the expression as a question. But, apart from all else, the question whether God who justifies will accuse, which is meant to repel with still greater force the possibility of accusation on the part of any one whatever, contains, at least to our taste, nothing but an unwarranted subtlety or

intolerable irony. That God the justifier may accuse, is a conception of itself altogether improbable, and rendered still more improbable by the question—so decisively negative and thoroughly assuring—*τίς ἐγκαλ. κτλ.* Against it also is the parallel passage, Isa. l. 8, 9 (comp. Job xxxiv. 29), which may the more certainly have been present to the apostle's mind, as what is there said of the Messiah, the *נִיחַיִּי נִיחַיִּי*, is here applied to His people, the *ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ*. The declaration holds good of the *Ἰσραὴλ θεοῦ*, a designation just as much of the Lord, Isa. xlix. 3, as of His church, Isa. xlix. 6; Gal. vi. 16. Just as little for the same reason is *Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανών κτλ.*, ver. 34, to be taken as a question.

—*τίς ὁ κατακρίνων;*] The *κατάκριμα* follows upon the *ἐγκλημα*, and is therefore distinguished from it in order to heighten the conception.

—*Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανών*] = *Χριστός ἐστιν ὁ ἀποθανών*. Hereby the answer, already embodied in the negative question, is further corroborated. The death of Christ is, of course, to be contemplated as an atoning death, which, precisely as such, abolished all *κατάκριμα*.

—*μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐγερθείς*] comp. iv. 25, v. 10. *μᾶλλον δέ, imo vero*, contains a correction, Gal. iv. 9; for less as the dead than as the living Christ is He able to shield us from condemnation. The *καί*, which is wanting in A B C, also in Cod. Sinait., and is erased by Lachmann, is to be deemed critically suspicious. Of itself, *imo vero* may be just as well used as *imo vero etiam, imo uideo*, comp. *μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε*, Eph. v. 11.

—*ὃς καὶ ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ*] Here, too, *καί* is wanting in A C, as well as in Cod. Sinait., and is enclosed in brackets by Lachmann. It may have arisen from the following *καί* in *ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπ. ἡ*, although elsewhere Paul is fond, in animated discourse, of repeating *καί*, Eph. i. 11, 13; Col. ii. 11, 12. Like the resurrection of Christ, but in a greater degree, His session at God's right hand carries in it the pledge of our preservation from all *κατάκριμα*; for, as exalted to God's right hand, He partakes in the divine authority, and has therefore omnipotent power to protect His own. The phrase *εἶναι (καθίσαι) ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ* is borrowed, as is well known, from Ps. cx. 1. The place of honour was at the king's right hand, 1 Sam. xx. 25, 1 Kings



ii. 19, Ps. xlv. 9, and denoted participation in the royal power and dignity, Matt. xx. 21; Mark x. 37. (Of passages in profane authors, comp. Hom. *Il.* vii. 24, xxiv. 100; Pind. *Fragment.* xi. 9, Dissen there; Hor. *Od.* i. 12. 15.) The session of Christ at the right hand of God (Mark xvi. 19; Acts ii. 33, vii. 56; Eph. i. 20, Harless there; Col. iii. 1, Bähr there; 1 Pet. iii. 22; also Rev. iii. 21) denotes, therefore, the dignity of the exalted Son of man, in virtue of which He participates in the divine government of the world. Hence He is also called καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως, Matt. xxvi. 64; ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, Heb. i. 3, Tholuck there; viii. 1. But as the right hand of God is an image of the divine power and dominion, the Lutheran *dextra Dei ubique est* is fully justified. That the heaven in which Christ sits at God's right hand is not a definite place, but the *status coelestis*, is shown not only by John iii. 13, according to which passage the Son of man, even here upon earth, was in heaven; by Heb. i. 3, according to which the certainly everywhere present μεγαλωσύνη of God is ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, as well as by the conjunction of the undeniably figurative description: καθίσαι ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ with ἐν οὐρανοῖς itself,—but especially by Eph. iv. 10, according to which Christ ascended ὑπεράνω πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα; by Heb. vii. 26, according to which He is made ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν; by Matt. xxviii. 20, according to which He is with us always unto the end of the world, not despite, but on the very ground that He has ascended to heaven. The Reformed mode of conception here takes symbolical expressions literally, because in other places it symbolizes literal expressions, whereas the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity is not a mere auxiliary to the doctrine of the Eucharist, but has an independent basis in Scripture teaching. The latter mode of conception, just as scriptural as it is philosophical, is in no contradiction either with Christ's visible ascent to heaven or His visible return from heaven; for these latter are nothing but ways of visibly representing *for our sake* His heavenly state, raised far above all earthly conditions,—a figurative *act*, analogous to the ascending and descending of God in the theophanies of the O. T., and to similar figurative *words* used to describe the manifestation of divine omnipotence. This, so far from excluding, rather includes the idea that heaven, the spiritual abode of God and the exalted Son of man, may at the same time denote that

definite place in which both reveal their heavenly glory in the highest degree, *i.e.* the abode of angels and happy spirits. Comp. Joh. Damascenus, *de orth. fid.* i. 16: λέγεται τόπος θεοῦ, ἐνθα ἔκδηλος ἡ ἐνέργεια αὐτοῦ γίνεται. God is not where heaven is, but heaven is where God is, and therefore angels and happy spirits are in heaven κατ' ἐξοχήν, because they are in God κατ' ἐξοχήν, and God is in them. Therefore the place in which they are is called heaven, even if it lie on this side the azure aether, although, no doubt, just because the ethereal heaven is an image of purity, vastness, sublimity, and unchangeableness, with a natural anthropomorphism we picture God to ourselves as dwelling in it, and are to think of finite, happy spirits, most fitly, indeed, as really living in the abode most in harmony with their condition. As to the biblical notion of οὐρανός, comp. Tholuck, *Expos. of Scr. on Mount*, on Matt. vi. 9, as to the meaning of the words εἶναι ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ, Knapp, "de Christo ad dextram Dei sedente," *Opusc.* I. p. 39. The apostle in this verse brings forward all the elements in Christ's work of redemption as a firm foundation for the certainty of our eternal salvation. As to the omission of Christ's ascension and coming again, Bengel remarks: "Non praemittitur mentio ascensionis, nec sequitur mentio adventus gloriosi. Nam illa est actus sessionis ad dextram: haec plane tollit omnia, separationem ab amore Dei intentantia, et glorificationem affert, de qua ver. 30."

—ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν] On the preceding ὃς καὶ ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, Bengel rightly remarks: "Potest servare;" on ἐντυγχάνει, on the other hand: "Vult servare." As to the high-priestly intercession of Christ, which is to be conceived as a rendering of His merit prevalent with God both in deed and word, comp. also Heb. vii. 25, ix. 24; 1 John ii. 1. "Porro hanc intercessionem," remarks Calvin, "carnali sensu ne metiamur. Non enim cogitandus est supplex, flexis genibus, manibus expansis Patrem deprecari: sed quia apparet ipse assidue cum morte et resurrectione sua, quae vice sunt aeternae intercessionis, et vivae orationis efficaciam habent, ut Patrem nobis concilient, atque exorabilem reddant, merito dicitur intercedere." The *Lutheran* exegetes and dogmatists, on the other hand, took Christ's heavenly *intercessio* not merely as *realis*, but also as *vocalis et oralis*. So, among modern exegetes, Meyer rightly here. As to the *form* of

the pleading of our heavenly intercessor, comp. my *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*, IV. 2, p. 339.<sup>1</sup>

Vv. 35, 36. τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ;] τίς is used to correspond with τίς, vv. 31, 33, 34. Things afterwards appear in place of persons, first of all in the words θλίψις κτλ. *Who* shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall *that* separate us which seems most able to do it, i.e. θλίψις, etc.? The genitive τοῦ Χριστοῦ is *genit. subject.*, not *genit. object.* The ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ is thus the love of Christ to us, not our love to Christ (comp. ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 5); for, in the first place, the purport of ver. 34 prepared the way for the thought of Christ's love to us; and again, in the parallel expression, ver. 39, the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is expressly mentioned. But, speaking generally, it were altogether incongruous to say that I am separated from my love to some one; for in the act of separation the separated persons or objects, as such, still remain, whereas here separation from my love must needs denote an annihilation or abolition of this love. But then, for precisely the same reason, our being separated from Christ's love to us cannot be understood of an abolition or annihilation of this love of Christ. To this add, first, that here is no mention of a separation of this love of Christ from us, but of our being separated from this love of Christ; and secondly, that it were a thought evident of itself, and doing, in truth, little honour to Christ's love, if it were meant to be affirmed that in the sufferings and afflictions of its friends and loved ones this love does not, as human love is wont to do, withdraw itself and come to an end. Therefore our being separated from the love of Christ, in consonance with

<sup>1</sup> In the mode of dividing the triumphant passage, vv. 33–35, Meyer has returned to the path trodden by the Greek Fathers (Orig. Chrys. and Theodoret), so that to the question, τίς ἰγκαλίσαι, etc., the answer is: εἰς ὃς ὁ δικάων· τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; and then follows the declaration, shaped in conformity with this answer, and passing over from God to Christ: Χριστὸς . . . ἡμῶν· τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει, etc. “Who shall raise accusation against God's elect?” Answer in a triumphant counter-question: “God is the justifier; who is the condemner?” (There is therefore no one to condemn, and every accusation is without effect!) And as regards *Christ*: “Christ is He that died, yea, rather rose again, who is also at the right hand of God, who also intercedes for us. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?” This interpretation, without doubt, has much to attract, only to me certainly the structure of the passage seems to suggest that, in harmony with τίς ἰγκαλίσαι κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; ver. 33, with τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει κτλ., ver. 35, a question is introduced for which nothing prepares the way, and which is not answered in the foregoing ver. 34.

the obvious and simple sense of the words, can only be found in the fact that between this love and us obstacles interpose which make access to it impossible to us. Such obstacles afflictions, above everything, may easily create for us, since they seem to us to be signs of divine wrath, and thus, again bringing an ἔγκλημα and passing κατὰ κρίμα, draw us away from the love of God by leading us to disbelief in its existence. Since, then, we no longer exist for this love, this love of course itself, at least in its unhindered operation upon us, no longer exists for us. Notwithstanding, ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be directly explained neither by "our consciousness of Christ's love" nor by "influence of Christ's love upon us," although no doubt our being separated from Christ's love manifests itself in the fact that our consciousness of it is clouded, and thus its influence upon us hindered. Accordingly, the apostle, having shown, vv. 31-34, that the love of God and Christ is assured to us, now, ver. 35, shows that it is inseparable from us, or that we are assured to it. But just as it is assured to us, as well objectively as subjectively, and with it also ζωὴ αἰώνιος and future δόξα is assured, vv. 29, 30, so is it certain that present sufferings cannot tend to our hurt, but only to good, ver. 28, and we are to endure them patiently and cheerfully quite as much for the sake of their future issue as of their present aim, ver. 17. The majuskel-codices collectively read : ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, only Cod. B has ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, a reading manifestly taken from ver. 39. For this reason also the reading of several minuskel-codices and later Fathers (among the earlier ones, only Origen wavers between τοῦ θεοῦ and τοῦ Χριστοῦ), likewise formed for the sake of restoring conformity with ver. 39, and perhaps also with v. 5 (comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 14), namely, the lect. τοῦ θεοῦ instead of τοῦ Χριστοῦ, although now it is found in Cod. Sinait. as well, cannot come into account. The ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ here, in connection with ver. 34, more readily suggested itself than the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ. Since this connection recurs in ver. 39, and, in point of fact, it amounts to the same whether we abide inseparably united with the ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ or the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, it seems perfectly in keeping, in the conclusion of the entire exposition, to go back to the ultimate source of redeeming love, to the love of the Father that manifested itself in the Son. Herewith Chrysostom's remark on this passage

is to be observed : καὶ οὐκ εἶπε τοῦ θεοῦ οὕτως ἀδιάφορον αὐτῷ καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ ὀνομάζειν ; and Bengel's : "Cum amore Christi unus est amor Dei," ver. 39. Finally, when Paul says, vv. 35-39, that nothing can separate us from the love of God and Christ, in this, just as little as in John x. 28, 29, is it the doctrine of inamissible grace, and, what follows thereupon, of absolute predestination that speaks. For although it is true that no one and nothing can pluck us from the hand of God and Christ, because their omnipotence and grace are mightier than all earthly powers, still this by no means precludes the possibility of our breaking away from that hand by our own choice and act. Though tribulation cannot, sin can separate us from God.

—θλίψις ἢ στενοχωρία] comp. on ii. 9.

—ἢ διωγμός] comp. Acts viii. 1, xiii. 50 ; Matt. v. 10-12, xiii. 21 ; John xv. 20.

—ἢ μάχαιρα] comp. Acts xii. 2. "Suae mortis genus Paulus nominat," Bengel. Comp. generally on this verse, 1 Cor. iv. 11-13, xv. 30-32 ; 2 Cor. iv. 8-11, xi. 23-27.

—καθὼς γέγραπται] Ps. xlv. (in the LXX. Ps. xliii.) 22. The citation is verbatim after the LXX. It refers especially to ἡ μάχαιρα, ver. 35. Thus we are forewarned of it, and therefore should not be surprised when it befalls us. The fate of the O. T. covenant-people is a prophecy of the fate of the N. T. church, just as the latter is a continuation of the former, and the attitude of the world to God's kingdom is the same in every age. "Sic et ecclesia V. T. et multo magis ecclesia N. T. dicere potuit et potest," Bengel. As to the historical circumstances of the psalm itself, comp. Hengstenberg, *Com.* II. 107. It is unnecessary to parenthesize ver. 36, as the flow of discourse need not be interrupted, and ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν, ver. 37, may refer at once to ver. 35 and ver. 36.

—ὅτι] *for*, merely a part of the citation, comp. iii. 10.

—ἐνεκα σου] In accordance with sufficient critical authorities, Griesbach, Lachmann, Scholz, and Tischendorf have rightly restored ἐνεκεν instead of ἐνεκα. The σου need not be applied to Christ, but, as in the psalm itself, may be here applied to God ; for the quotation is made merely for the sake of the θανάτουµεθα and ἐλογίσθηµεν ὡς κτλ., but the ἐνεκεν σου merely to make the quotation complete, and, in point of fact, martyrs die just as much for God's sake as Christ's, John xxi. 19.

—θανατούμεθα] *we are killed*, i.e. *some of us, several of us*, collectively.

—ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν] *per totum diem*, the whole day through. So the LXX., comp. Isa. lxii. 6; Ps. xlii. 3. םיהלך means this everywhere, not καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν, *quotidie, every day, daily*. Both, for that matter (as well "the whole day" as "every day"), amount in meaning to *continually*.

—ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρ. σφ.] *we were esteemed* (aorist), namely, by our enemies, who would not have slaughtered us if they had not first looked on us as sheep for slaughter.

Ver. 37. ἀλλ'] *at, but*, replies in the form of objection, Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part.* II. p. 36, 3.

—ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν] *in all this*, which is specified in vv. 35, 36.

—ὑπερνικῶμεν] *plus quam vincimus, egregie vincimus*. Luther: "we far overcome." As to the intensive or rather superlative signification of ὑπέρ, *exceedingly*, see on v. 20. Thus we are not merely equal, but far superior to these sufferings. "Amplius quam victores sumus, quoniam in cruce etiam gloriamur," Beza; comp. v. 3.

—διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς] Thus the Oriental authorities. On the other hand, the occidental reading, διὰ τὸν ἀγαπήσαντα ἡμᾶς. Vulg.: "Propter eum, qui dilexit nos," i.e. *amore compulsi ejus, qui nos amavit*. Luther: "for His sake who loved us." But this reading arose from the mistaken reference of ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 35, to our love to Christ. According to ver. 35, the ἀγαπήσας is Christ, not God, Phil. iv. 13. The aorist indicates the historical act of His death, in which His love manifested itself in its highest form, Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 25; Rev. i. 5. But we overcome through Him that loved us, because the power of His atoning love, which we embrace by faith, is the victory that overcomes the world with its anxiety and afflictions, John xvi. 33; 1 John v. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 55–57; 2 Cor. ii. 14. But if we overcome afflictions through the love of Christ, i.e. quite as much through its objective power as subjective consciousness, this indeed supplies the most decisive proof that these afflictions have not separated us from Christ's love, ver. 35. "Atque unum hoc verbum plus satis declarat, non loqui apostolum de amoris fervore, quo in Deum rapimur, sed de paterna ipsius Dei vel Christi in nos benevolentia: cujus persuasio penitus cordibus nostris infixā semper ab inferis in lucem vitæ nos extrahet, et satis ad fulturam nostram valebit," Calvin.

Vv. 38, 39. The thought suggested by the negative question, ver. 35, and by the objection, ver. 37, that no tribulation is able to separate us from the love of Christ, is corroborated by the idea of the powers that might possibly separate us from the love of God being generalized and strengthened. No tribulation is able to separate us, for (γάρ) nothing whatever is able to separate us. The special is based on the universal. πέπεισμαι] "*persuassus sum*." Victa omne dubitatione," Bengel. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 12.

—οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωῇ] joins on to ver. 36, hence the precedence of θάνατος. The reverse order is found 1 Cor. iii. 22 : πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν, εἴτε Παῦλος, εἴτε Ἀπολλῶς, εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος, εἴτε ζωὴ, εἴτε θάνατος, εἴτε ἐνεστώτα, εἴτε μέλλοντα. Just because all is ours, nothing can make us its captives. Thus nothing can separate us from the love of Christ, and *vice versâ*. The interpretation given by Grotius, after Hieronym. *ad Aglas*. 9 : "neque mortis metus, neque vitae spes," is to be taken, not indeed as a precise interpretation of the words, but as a correct paraphrase of the sense.

—οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἄρχαί] It is natural here, as in what immediately precedes and follows, to suppose an antithesis. Yet this is by no means expressed in the words themselves, and it must in any case remain altogether doubtful whether ἄγγελοι are meant to denote good, ἄρχαί evil angels, or the converse. Then, as ἄγγελοι and ἄρχαί may refer merely to one and the same class of angels, we ought apparently to think of evil angels both times, because, indeed, it is not to be supposed that good ones could ever attempt to seduce us from God's love. Nevertheless the apostle might here, just as well as in Gal. i. 8, be speaking merely hypothetically, as Theophylact early remarks : οὐχ ὡς τῶν ἀγγέλων δὲ ἀφιστώντων τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ εἶπε τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν τὸν λόγον τιθεῖς. Moreover, ἄγγελοι, without more precisely defining addition, never elsewhere denotes *evil* angels (Matt. xxv. 41 ; 2 Cor. xii. 7 ; 2 Pet. ii. 4 ; Jude 6) ; and ἄρχαί only has this meaning where the connection of thought *imperatively* requires it (1 Cor. xv. 24 ; Eph. vi. 12 ; Col. ii. 15), and consequently this application naturally follows as the only possible one. This not being the case here, we must rest content with the most probable supposition, namely, that both ἄγγελοι and ἄρχαί are to be understood of *angelis bonis*. That in reality they never make the attempt in question is indeed conceded. It

is simply meant to be intimated that even if they wished they cannot do it, and that no power whatever, be it as high as it may, not merely no earthly, but no heavenly power, is able to bring about our separation from the love of God. But this hypothetical view is not absolutely essential. It is, no doubt, true that the ἄγγελοι never spontaneously make the attempt in question. Still they might possibly, though involuntarily, become the occasion of men losing the love of God, as the *θηροσκέια τῶν ἀγγέλων*, such as obtained at Colosse, evidences; comp. Col. ii. 18, Bähr and Steiger there. ἀρχαί, angelic powers, points to a higher order of ἄγγελοι, i.e. of angels in general. "Sunt autem additae istae duae voces (ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις), ut si Angelorum nomen humiliter sonaret, istis plus quiddam exprimeretur," Calvin. Respecting the angelic orders, comp. Eph. i. 21, Harless there; iii. 10; Col. i. 16, Bähr and Steiger there; ii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22; also 1 Thess. iv. 16. That Paul recognises a gradation of rank in the higher spirit-world is certain from the passages cited.<sup>1</sup> But all more definite information is wanting. Consequently there is just as little authority for Rabbinical (see Fritzsche here) as for Arcopagite dreamings (see Dionysius, *Arcopagita de hierarchia coelesti*). On the contrary, Augustine, *Enchir.* c. 58, says strikingly: "Quid inter se distent haec vocabula, dicant, qui possunt; si tamen possunt probare, quod dicunt: ego me ista ignorare confiteor."

—οὔτε δυνάμεις] This *lect. recept.*, which the Vulg. and Luther follow, as regards MS. attestation, has only *minuskel*-codices on its side, and, moreover, creates this difficulty—that the harmony of the otherwise uniform twofold clauses is destroyed by one consisting of three members (οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε δυνάμεις). Preponderant MS. authorities (A B C D E F G, also Cod. Sinait.) place οὔτε δυνάμεις after μέλλοντα, which arrangement Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Lach., Scholz, and Tisch. follow. But external testimonies are not more decisive for this arrangement than internal reasons are against it, and clearly it is to be regarded as far more objectionable than the one in the *lect. recept.* For it is exposed in a still higher degree to the charge of disturbing the harmony of the sentence, because a clause of but one member is

<sup>1</sup> Against Hofmann, who denies a hierarchy of ranks among the angels (*Schriftbew.* I. p. 347), comp. Hahn, *Theol. des N. T.* I. p. 282 ff., and my *Kirchl. Glaubensl.* II. p. 300 f., Anm.; also Meyer and Tholuck here.



far less capable of vindication than the one with three, to which the elsewhere common conjunction of ἄγγελοι, ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις, would give rise. Moreover, apart from this, in the clause οὔτε ἄγγελοι there already occurs a deviation from the rest, in the fact that in it homogeneous instead of opposed conceptions are joined together. Again, after ζώή the law of doubling the clauses has not yet become so fixed as after μέλλοντα, and therefore its violation in the latter place is far more out of taste than in the former. Finally, the intrinsically related οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος, i.e. "neither time nor space," cannot be broken up by the interpolated οὔτε δυνάμεις. Add to this, that in the latter case no appropriate meaning can be found for δυνάμεις. If we abide by the meaning, established in Rabbinical as in Hellenistic usage: "*powers*" for "*angels*," it *must necessarily* have followed ἀρχαί. But if, in accordance with 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29, we accept the meaning: "*powers in general*" or "*miraculous powers*," after the preceding ἀρχαί, this meaning is very improbable, and, moreover, in this connection far too indefinite and meaningless. From all this it follows that the words οὔτε δυνάμεις must be described as very suspicious. This suspicion is significantly enhanced by the fact that a portion of the MSS. which place οὔτε δυνάμεις after οὔτε μέλλοντα, in addition insert οὔτε ἐξουσίαι (or even ἐξουσία) before or after οὔτε ἀρχαί. Moreover, other variations still are found, e.g. Ephraem Syr. reads: οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε ἐξουσίαι, οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε δυνάμεις οὔτε ἄγγελοι; but Basil: οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί, οὔτε ἐξουσίαι οὔτε δυνάμεις, etc. All this points to a corruption of the passage in conformity with 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. i. 21, 1 Pet. iii. 22, by which οὔτε δυνάμεις was first appended by transcribers to οὔτε ἀρχαί, and then erroneously transposed. We believe, therefore, with Fritzsche, Tholuck, and Ewald, to whom de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius also incline, that the words οὔτε δυνάμεις should be erased as spurious, and at least in Cod. Matth. f. and Clement Alex. they are actually wanting. The Philox. marks them with asterisks.

—οὔτε ἐνεστώτα οὔτε μέλλοντα] *neither present nor future*. Luther: *neither what is present nor what is future*, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; Gal. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 2. ἐνίστημι, in the intransitive tenses, means *in propinquo esse*, *to be at hand*. But not only is that at hand which impends next, or is just beginning, but

that also which is already present. Hence *ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος*, the present; *τὰ ἐνεστῶτα*, what is present.

—*οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος*] neither height nor depth. Luther: neither what is high nor what is deep. Of course here *abstr.* stands *pro concr.* Time and space are the most general forms of the universe, and serve to describe the universe of things, since everything finite which exists, exists in time and space. We must therefore abstain from more exact definitions, such as “Heaven and Hell,” “sky and earth,” etc. The apostle had first, linking on to ver. 36, mentioned *θάνατος* and *ζωή*, i.e. the greatest pain and greatest pleasure; then *ἄγγελοι* and *ἀρχαί*, i.e. the highest personal powers and authorities. To these he joins *ἐνεστῶτα μέλλοντα*, *ὕψωμα βάθος*, i.e. everything that can conceivably be found in time and space. Hence it is apparent, again, how disturbing and out of place would be the interpolation of *οὔτε δυνάμεις* between the two last clauses.

—*οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα*] nor any other (xiii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 10) creature. Bengel: “quaecunque sunt extra Deum et qualiacunque sunt.” In this the notion of everything existing but in conception is fully exhausted. No doubt in reality every creature is found enclosed in time and space, but the entire sphere of conceivable finitude is only measured with certainty by *οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα*. It is thus = nor any other creature, i.e. if, besides, such should exist.

—*δυνήσεται*] “etiāmsi multa conentur,” Bengel.

—*ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι*] *neque vi*, ver. 35; *neque per viam juris*, ver. 33; see Bengel.

—*ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τ. κυρ. ἡμ.*] comp. ver. 32, v. 5, 6, 8; John iii. 16; Eph. ii. 7, iv. 32; 1 Tim. i. 14; 2 Tim. i. 9. The love of Christ, ver. 35, is the love that moved Christ to die for us; the love of God in Christ is the love that determined the Father to give up His Son for us; but both are one and the same atoning love of the triune God. If, then, the love of God, and with it eternal life, are indefeasibly sure to us, and in the strength of this assurance we have all the powers of the world beneath our feet, then we have already triumphantly vanquished the *παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ*, which are to be deemed insignificant compared with the *δόξα* lying before us in ver. 18. Thus the close of the exposition indirectly returns to its beginning.

## CHAPTER IX.

THE theme of the epistle, announced i. 16, 17, was now unfolded under every aspect. The gospel reveals the *δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως*, and for the very reason that this is its revealed import is it the *δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν*. Nevertheless, the theme included an element awaiting further elucidation, or left a doubt needing to be more thoroughly investigated and explained. *σωτηρία* was originally designed *παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι*. But the result hitherto seemed to stand in express contrast with this design, and so far from corroborating the *Ἰουδαίῳ πρῶτον*, rather gave the impression that God had broken the promise given to His covenant-people, and rejected His chosen nation of Israel. Thus, supposing the new way of salvation established, the reproach of covenant-breaking might easily fall upon God, or, if this were out of the question, the truthfulness of the new way of salvation be contested. But the latter was already proved, and all that remained was to rebut the former objection. The apostle, therefore, in the three next chapters, works out a theodicy as regards the way in which the divine plan of salvation was historically realized. The right remains with God, the wrong falls to man. The covenant-keeping of the one and the covenant-breaking of the other are on a level. But the faithfulness and stability of the divine decree are most decisively illustrated by the fact that it reaches the goal of its realization, not merely in spite, but by the very means of the wrong and unfaithfulness of man. Thus, in the present case, Israel's apostasy is designed to bring about the salvation of the Gentiles, and the salvation of the Gentiles Israel's return and recovery; so that *σωτηρία* is not merely designed, but actually imparted *παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι*. Israel's particularistic resistance must of necessity serve directly to realize the universalism of divine grace (the *παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι*), and the premature reception of salvation by the Gentiles to confirm the fact of its being designed first of all for Israel,

because the reception of the Gentiles is not the final aim, but the historical means for bringing about Israel's ultimate *σωτηρία*. Thus God's universal plan of salvation, involving in it the particular preference of Israel, is realized, although in an inverted historical order—the result of men's perverseness; for the divine *prius* becomes a temporal *posterius*, and the divine *posterius* a temporal *prius*. The divine universalism as to design is carried into effect by the very means of Israel's historical particularism, just as the element of the divine particularism having reference to Israel fulfils itself by means of the historical realization of universalism in the Gentile world. This in general is the import of the three following chapters, ix.—xi. Respecting their relation to ch. i.—viii., see Introduction.

Vv. 1-5. The apostle had concluded ch. viii. with a song of triumph for the victorious assurance of salvation and of God's love in Christ. But, glancing at the people of Israel, apparently shut out of this salvation, he changes his tone and raises now a wail of lamentation. But, in the delicacy of his love, he does not directly state the fact of Israel's rejection, but rather assumes it as well known. He guards and clears himself from the reproach of harshness towards his nation by the assurance of his burning grief for their fate, as well as by the recognition of the many and high God-given prerogatives which can only serve to deepen sorrow for their lot, comp. also x. 1, xi. 1 ff., 14 ff.; likewise iii. 1 f., xv. 8. This *προπαλαίτησις* or *deprecatio* is to be considered as especially addressed to the Jewish-Christian portion of the church: for although the latter in Rome had not given way to the error of Pharisaic particularism, or come to regard the apostle as a teacher of apostasy, Acts xxi. 21, still in the nature of things in Rome, as everywhere, it might easily be inclined, by reference to Israel's exclusion from the Messianic salvation, to suspicion and mistrust. But the present introduction was not better adapted to ward off and provide against the suspicion and ill-will of Jewish Christians, than it was to guard against any proud self-exaltation of Gentile Christians over the rejection of the Jewish nation by God, xi. 20, 21. That we have not merely here the natural outflow of a deep sense of grief and sorrow, but that the apostle really aims at the end indicated, especially in regard to the Jewish Christians, is shown by the expressive and ardent assurance of the truth and sincerity of his grief, ver. 1.

The warmth of the apostle's feeling and sorrowing sympathy is not at all weakened by such a supposition, and in such a design we are to recognise, not a sort of clever calculation, the product of earthly self-seeking, but rather the paedagogic wisdom of holy love.

Vv. 1, 2. Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ] *Truth speak I in Christ.* "Quoniam ista inter plerosque opinio praesumpta erat, Paulum esse quasi juratum suae gentis hostem, ut domesticis quoque fidei nonnihil suspectus foret, acsi defectionem doceret a Mose: antequam de re proposita disputet, praefatione utitur ad praeparandos sibi lectorum animos: ubi falsa illa mali affectus in Judaeos suspicione se liberat," Calvin. Most of the ancient and several modern expositors take ἐν Χριστῷ as a form of oath or adjuration. But this would be πρὸς Χριστοῦ, not ἐν Χριστῷ. Thus the Greeks say: πρὸς θεῶν, *per deos* (properly, *before* the gods, but the genitive indicates the causal relation: *on account of*). The gods are conceived as suggesting or sanctioning the oath. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 307), not ἐν θεοῖς. Appeal, indeed, has been made to the Heb. אֶנְשִׁי, Gen. xxi. 23, xxii. 16; Josh. ii. 12; Isa. lxii. 8; Amos viii. 14 (where the LXX. have ὀμνύειν τινά or κατὰ τινος, comp. Heb. vi. 13, 16; Jas. v. 12), as well as to ὀμνύειν ἐν τινι, Matt. v. 34 ff., xxiii. 16 ff.; Rev. x. 6; comp. LXX. Jer. v. 7; Dan. xii. 7. But, on the ground that ὀμνύειν ἐν τινι means "to swear by one," ἐν τινι standing alone is not, contrary to all usage, to be regarded as a form of oath. Besides, a swearing by *Christ* occurs elsewhere neither in the apostle nor in the N. T. generally. We must not confound with this the adjuration of another in the sight of God and Christ and the angels, 1 Tim. v. 21. The more exact grammatical exegesis of modern days has now rightly given up this interpretation. It erases the comma which Griesb. and Knapp place after λέγω, and understands ἐν Χριστῷ = "in my association and fellowship with Christ," of the element in which the soul of the truth-speaking apostle moved, comp. on viii. 1. The εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ postulates the ἀλήθειαν λέγειν, and for the reason that he speaks ἐν Χριστῷ he certainly speaks the truth. The paraphrase ὡς Χριστιανός, 1 Pet. iv. 16, as *homo Christianus*, consequently is not indeed wrong, but it decidedly weakens the meaning of ἐν Χριστῷ, which (according to Beck on *Romans*, Stuttgart 1833) expresses "entire intimacy of most real fellowship, a being permeated by the object indicated." Similar is the designation

ἐν κυρίῳ, xiv. 14; Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; comp. 1 Cor. xi. 11; also Phil. i. 8, ii. 1. To the present formula is allied ἔστιν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, 2 Cor. xi. 10, and ἐν Χριστῷ λαλοῦμεν, 2 Cor. ii. 17, xii. 19.

—οὐ ψεύδομαι] Comp. ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ ψεύδομαι, 1 Tim. ii. 7. The appended negation in antithesis serves to strengthen the original thesis.

—συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου] As to συμμαρτυρεῖν, comp. on ii. 15, viii. 16. The σύν in συμμαρτυρεῖν does not merely emphasize the agreement of the testimony with the fact itself. Nor can appeal be made to σύννοιά μοι, *conscious mihi sum*; for that σύν here (σύννοιά μοι = οἶδα σύν μοι) has not lost its significance, is shown by the fact that this phrase cannot be interchanged with οἶδά μοι. In συμμαρτυρεῖν τινι, therefore, we must hold fast by the meaning "to bear witness along with one," as long as the sense of the passage does not expressly require the opposite. But this here is by no means the case. συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου is to be interpreted: "my conscience bearing witness with me." That is, to the assurance that he speaks the truth in Christ and does not lie, there is added by way of confirmation the testimony of his conscience. If it be supposed that conscience did not bear witness *with him*, but helped him to feel confident that he spoke the truth without any self-deception, it is to be replied that for himself he stood in no need of such a confirmation, and in any case only asserts its existence for the sake of others. It might with more reason be objected, that they who placed no confidence in his assurance that he speaks the truth in Christ would also yield no credit to the testimony of his conscience. But the apostle stands face to face, not with open enemies, but merely with suspicious friends. If these, with respect to his assurance that he speaks the truth in Christ and lies not, might yet entertain a doubt whether some self-deception did not creep in, they must needs be satisfied when he added that the testimony of his conscience in the Holy Spirit, which agrees with his assurance, runs counter to such a supposition. If they still doubted, they must have taken him at once for a wanton, unscrupulous liar. The parenthesizing of συμμαρτ. μοι τ. συνειδ. μου is to be rejected, because

—ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ] is not to be joined with οὐ ψεύδομαι, either in the sense of *instructus quippe Spiritu sancto*, or ὡς ἐν

πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ὧν, which at least is not obvious, or far less as a form of oath: *by the Holy Ghost!* which is simply impossible. For the former view, indeed, might be alleged the conformity of οὐ ψεύδομαι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ with ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χρ. But it seems to us that the antithesis is more forcible if to ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χρ. is opposed the simple οὐ ψεύδομαι, and that the appeal to the testimony of conscience interposed will have less significance if followed immediately by the confirmation of the πνεῦμα ἅγιον. It is therefore better to join together συμμαρτ. μ. τ. συνειδ. ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ, and to take it as a supplement to the whole preceding sentence, ἀλήθ. λέγ. ἐν Χρ., οὐ ψεύδομαι, not merely to οὐ ψεύδομαι. One might join ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ closely with τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου, but then the repetition of the article τῆς before ἐν πν. ἁγ. would be required. Nothing remains, therefore, but to connect it with the participle συμμαρτυρούσης. As the speaking the truth is carried out in Christ, so the testimony of conscience is carried out in the Holy Spirit, comp. ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖν, εἰπεῖν, ἔρχεσθαι, λαλεῖν, Matt. xxii. 43; Mark xii. 36; Luke ii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 3. But of course the testimony of conscience is carried out in the Holy Spirit, because conscience itself is preserved from self-deception by the Holy Spirit, and so by the φῶς and ἔλεγχος of the Holy Spirit; for the πνεῦμα ἅγιον is a πνεῦμα ἀληθείας, John xiv. 17, and of His χρίσμα holds good: καὶ ἀληθὲς ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶ ψεῦδος, 1 John ii. 27. "Criterium veri, in conscientia et corde: quam illuminat et confirmat testimonium internum Spiritus sancti," Bengel. καὶ παράγει τρεῖς μάρτυρας, τὸν Χριστόν, τὴν ἐάντοῦ συνείδησιν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, Theophylact.

—ὅτι] *that*, not: *for* or *because*. It is an objective, not causal sentence, and after ἁγίῳ a comma, not a colon, is to be placed. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 10; also Rom. i. 9; Phil. i. 8; 2 Cor. i. 23; and Gal. i. 20.

—λύπη] "In spiritualibus tristitia et (cap. 8 fin.) laetitia in summo gradu possunt esse simul," Bengel. "Longe ergo falluntur, qui ἀπάθειαν καὶ ἀναλγησίαν in hominibus piis requirunt, ne Dei ordinationi repugnent," Calvin. But on Paul's passing by in delicate forbearance the cause of his grief, namely, the apostasy and rejection of his people, Calvin remarks: "defectivae orationes ut plurimum sunt patheticae."

Ver. 3. His sorrow is great because his affection is boundless.

The greatness of his sorrow is confirmed (γάρ) by the declaration that he is ready to be devoted to destruction instead of his brethren. ὑπόμην] Luther: "*I wished*;" Vulg.: "*Optabam*," i.e. optabam aliquando, of a wish that arose in him in the past, i.e. during his Pharisaism. But, apart from the inappropriate sense both in itself and in the connection, this must have been written: ὑξάμην ποτέ. But ὑπόμην is not identical with ὑπόμην ἄν, i.e. *I should wish*, if the wish were possible; but the wish is not possible, therefore I do not wish, Hermann, *de particula ἄν*, *Opusc.* IV. 1. 12, p. 66. But it is = *I was wishing, would wish*, namely, if it were practicable, and therefore do actually wish upon this supposition. The wish, then, is conceived as continuing (not ὑξάμην ποτέ). That it cannot be fulfilled he does not take into consideration (not ὑπόμην ἄν). The thought of its being fulfilled or not remains in the background. The imperfect as an incomplete tense marks the predicate as one *that does not attain to accomplishment (sine effectu)*, but would attain to accomplishment upon certain conditions, Kühner, *Gr.* II. p. 68. Thus Gal. iv. 20: ἤθελον παρῆναι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, *I was wishing*, namely, if it were practicable, *if* it were permitted; Acts xxv. 22: ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι, *I also was desirous* (namely, if it seemed good to thee) *to hear the man*, Winer, p. 353. εὐχοίμην ἄν, *I might indeed wish*, would be far weaker, εὐχομαι, *I wish*, stronger, where the reality of the wish is no longer dependent on the condition of the possibility of its realization.

—αὐτὸς ἐγώ] Preponderant MS. attestation favours the order ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγώ, which, recommended by Griesbach, has been accepted by Lachm. and Tisch. instead of the *rec.* αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι. Cod. Sinait. reads: εἶναι ἀνάθεμα αὐτὸς ἐγώ. Indeed, the placing of the words αὐτὸς ἐγώ last, as they belong to ἀνάθεμα εἶναι, not to ὑπόμην, is in any case more natural and unambiguous, and the required emphasis can be had just as well whether the words precede or follow. Not perceiving this possibility seems to have occasioned the prefixing of the words in Cod. C and most of the minuskels. As to the meaning of αὐτὸς ἐγώ, comp. on vii. 25. Here in juxtaposition with ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου the meaning: *I myself*, in opposition to the brethren who were actually ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, must be deemed the more probable one. This is supported by the position of the words after ἀνάθεμα εἶναι, and perhaps by the fact that



the copyists who placed αὐτὸς ἐγὼ after ἡνυχόμεν γάρ took it in the meaning: *even I* who just now gave expression to the sorrow of my heart, and joined it with ἡνυχόμεν. The interpretation: *I myself*, no other, is improbable, for it were an unapostolic wish and idea that another should be ἀνάθεμα.

—ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ] ἀνάθεμα is the Hellenistic, ἀνάθημα the Attic form. So Moeris: ἀνάθημα ἀττικῶς, ἀνάθεμα ἑλληνικῶς, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phrynich.* pp. 249 and 445. But N. T. usage distinguishes between the two words. For it ἀνάθημα, in harmony with the practice of profane authors, is = *consecrated offering* (comp. Luke xxi. 5: περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὅτι . . . ἀναθήμασι κεκόσμηται. Hesych. ἀνάθημα, κόσμημα. Comp. 2 Macc. ix. 16: ἅγιον νεῶν καλλίστοις ἀναθήμασι κοσμήσιεν; Judith xvi. 19); ἀνάθεμα, on the other hand, in the N. T. corresponds with the meaning given by the LXX. to the word (comp. Schleusner). In the LXX. ἀνάθεμα corresponds with the Heb. חֵרֶם. On the conception of the O. T. חֵרֶם, comp. Hengstenberg, *Christol.* IV. 227. The root-meaning is *holy*, what is devoted to God by being destroyed, in contradistinction from חֲבִיב, *holy* in general, Lev. xxvii. 28, 29; Josh. vi. 21, vii. i. 12; Isa. xxxiv. 5; Mic. iv. 13. ἀνάθημα, therefore, like ἀνάθεμα, is *a thing consecrated to God*. But the former is consecrated to His preserving love, the latter to His destroying punitive justice; the former commended to His goodwill, the latter abandoned to His wrath.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, ἀνάθεμα is rightly explained: *consecration without redemption, ban, imprecation of destruction, curse, execration*, synonymously with κατάρρα, Matt. xxvi. 74; Acts xxiii. 12, 14; 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9, see Wieseler there. That in the case of a phrase borrowed from the O. T., the theocratic, not the Rabbinical, meaning shall predominate in the N. T., is for a sound exegesis a self-evident principle from the first. In the case, therefore, of the word ἀνάθεμα no reference is to be supposed to the excommunication from the Jewish church of which so much is said in the Mishna. In the O. T. חֵרֶם never means excommunication, not even in Ezra x. 8, and it is even doubtful whether it had this meaning at all in the age of Christ and the apostles. For this in the N. T. are found the expressions ἀφορί-

<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, occasionally ἀνάθημα is used in the sense of ἀνάθεμα, in accordance with the purely formal distinction of Moeris. So 2 Macc. ii. 13: ἀναθήματα = temple-offerings.

ζειν, Luke vi. 22 ; ἀποσυνάγωγον γίγνεσθαι, John ix. 22, xii. 42 ; ποιεῖν, xvi. 2 ; ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω, ix. 34, 35, but never ἀνάθεμα, ἀναθεματίζειν. The meaning "ban, as exclusion from the church," suits none of the passages cited, least of all 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22, Gal. i. 8, 9, nor yet Matt. xxvi. 74, Acts xxiii. 12, 14, because no one can inflict excommunication on himself. For the rest, even this excommunication, precisely in its higher degree which was called בְּרִיחַ, was likewise accompanied, at least according to the account of Maimonides, by an execration (comp. Winer, *Bibl. Realwörterbuch*, art. "Bann," Nr. 2), so that even here the connection with the O. T. root-meaning still remained. Nay, in the same way, in the later ἀνάθεμα of the Christian church, the *κατάρα* formed the chief element. Comp. Suicer, *Thes. Eccles.* I. 270, and the ecclesiastical form of cursing there quoted: ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Moreover, in the present passage the adjunct ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ is decisive for the stricter meaning: "imprecation of destruction." For it is just as inadmissible to expand and generalize the specific notion of ἀνάθεμα, "excommunication," once more to "exclusion or separation in general," so that ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ would be = *κεχωρισμένον εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, as it is to take ὁ Χριστός here, after the analogy of 1 Cor. xii. 12, where this meaning is prepared for and brought about in quite different fashion, as τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, "the Christian church." It would rather have been necessary to suppose a *constructio praeagnans* = ἀνάθεμα εἶναι καὶ χωρίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. But in this way we should not obtain the desired softening of the sense, as even then separation from the church, which is the body of Christ, is not conceivable without separation from Christ Himself, and according to N. T. ideas without divine *κατάρα* and eternal *ἀπώλεια*. Finally, one cannot be satisfied with the external, physical meaning of ἀνάθεμα, and refer it, after the example of Jerome, merely to a violent death; for, passing by everything else, such an ἀνάθεμα could not be carried into effect ἀπό, but only ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (or rather ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ). But ἀπό in the N. T. is never = ὑπό, see Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* p. 408, and Winer, p. 462. And to join ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ with *ἡγρόμην*, after the Latin idiom *petere ab aliquo*, is to bid defiance not merely to the order of words but also to Greek usage; for the Greek says, indeed, *εὐχεσθαι τινι*,

Acts xxvi. 29, and *πρός τινα*, 2 Cor. xiii. 7, but never *εὔχεσθαι ἀπό τινος*. We must therefore abide by the view that *ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* means, as modern exegesis again universally acknowledges, "to be a curse away from Christ," i.e. "to be separated from Christ to the divine wrath, and therewith given up to eternal destruction." Thus, in the first place, the *abstractum* stands *pro concreto* (*curse for accursed*). In this way the expression becomes specially energetic, the entire idea of the curse appearing exhausted in the individual, and again a pregnant construction is found, "curse away from Christ" being = "separated from Christ, given up to the curse." Comp. *καταργεῖσθαι ἀπό*, vii. 2; Gal. v. 4; *φθείρεσθαι ἀπό*, 2 Cor. xi. 3. The theocratic conception of the *קָרָה* is thus deepened in the N. T. *ἀνάθεμα*; for whereas there surrender to the divine punitive justice has physical death as its consequence, and eternal *ἀπώλεια* is merely surmised as the gloomy background, here the latter is the essential conception figuring in the foreground. Hence the O. T. *קָרָה*, physical destruction, may strike things as well, but the N. T. *ἀνάθεμα*, spiritual death, persons only. "Non enim nisi cum diabolo est, qui non est cum Christo," Augustine. Moses, glowing with like love for his people, uttered a similar wish to the apostle here, Ex. xxxii. 32 (comp. Num. xi. 15). Interpreters also compare the Jewish formula *אנו כפרתך לו*, *simus nos expiatio tua*, and remind us of the self-devotion of Curtius, of Decius, and many more. But Origen justly remarks that the apostle wishes a "Christo anathema fieri pro fratribus suis *devotione* utique, non *proaccaricatione*," and Thomas Aquinas distinguishes a twofold *separatio a Christo*, namely, a *mandatis ejus* and a *fruitione ejus*. To wish the first were criminal, only the latter can be meant.<sup>1</sup> The idea of the separation is certainly an abstract one, but still conceivable, just, for example, as the mysticism of a Fénelon could conceive to itself pure love to God in fact along with hell, and yet such separation is not at all more impracticable than the wish of the apostle expressed here. Still even Christ was actually *κατάρα ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, although in Himself He remained the holy and *ἡγαπημένος* one. He was the *εἰς ἄνθρωπος* who died *ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ*, lest *ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται*, John xi. 50 f. On the measureless depth and fulness of apostolic love, expressing itself

<sup>1</sup> So already Chrysostom: *ἀλλοτριωθῆναι, οὐχὶ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, μὴ γένοιτο, ἐπεὶ καὶ ταῦτα δι' ἀγάπην ἐποίει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀπολαύσεως ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς δόξης*

in the vow of this verse, Bengel's observation is to be noted: "Non capit hoc anima non valde provecta. De mensura amoris in Mose et Paulo non facile est existimare. Eum enim modulus ratiocinationum nostrarum non capit: sicut heroum bellicorum animos non capit parvulus." And: "Certe illud *Ego* penitus apud illum in pausa erat: tantum alios, honoris divini causa, spectabat, conf. 2 Cor. xii. 15. Ex summa fide (cap. 8) nunc summum ostendit amorem, ex amore divino accensum. Res non poterat fieri, quam optarat; sed votum erat pium et solidum, quamlibet cum tacita conditione, *si fieri posset*. Conf. Rom. viii. 38, 39; Ex. xxxii. 33."

—*ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου*] As to *ὑπέρ*, see on v. 6. Here also it involves the notion of *ἀντί*, although going beyond it in the way there indicated. Calling Jesus *ἀνάθεμα*, 1 Cor. xii. 3, Israel had made themselves *ἀνάθεμα*, 1 Cor. xvi. 22. If, now, Paul wishes *on behalf of* Israel to become *ἀνάθεμα*, he wishes to become such, no doubt, for their benefit, but still also manifestly in their stead. The *ἀποβολή* of Israel, xi. 15, passed by in silence in ver. 2, is here no doubt expressed, but still merely in an indirect and suggestive way, and so that love disarms the truth of its sting. That they are his *ἀδελφοί* is, as Bengel remarks, the *causa amoris tanti*. It is the instinct of nature that commands us to make every sacrifice of love for brethren in the flesh.

—*τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα*] forms a contrast with *ἀδελφοῖς ἐν κυρίῳ*, Phil. i. 14; *ἀγίοις ἀδελφοῖς*, 1 Thess. v. 27; Heb. iii. 1; *ἀγίοις καὶ πιστοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ*, Col. i. 2; also 1 Pet. v. 12. On the other hand, in Phil. v. 16 is found *ἀδελφὸς ἀγαπητὸς καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἐν κυρίῳ*. But the addition expresses not a disparagement, but a still more definite indication of the reason of his loving vow. Comp. Eph. v. 29: *οὐδεὶς γὰρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν, ἀλλ' ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν*. "Christus factus est pro nobis *maledictum*, quia eramus cognati," Bengel. Rightly Tholuck suggests that the apostle's appeal to the *συγγένεια κατὰ σάρκα*, as a motive for his attachment to his own nation, may serve as evidence that the N. T. recognises, which has been contested, the rightfulness of patriotism. The other passage quoted by him, Acts xvii. 26, seems less to apply here, containing rather a reason for the rightfulness of cosmopolitanism. *μου* after *συγγενῶν*, which Fritzsche erased, is to be reckoned critically suspicious. *κατὰ σάρκα* is a familiar

secondary definition (1 Cor. x. 18 ; Eph. ii. 11, vi. 5) blended with the chief word *τῶν συγγενῶν* into one idea, and accordingly is attached to it without the usual connecting link of the article (not *τῶν κατὰ σάρκα*), Winer, p. 159.

Ver. 4. To the subjective human element of natural relationship is added the objective divine one, consisting in the divinely conferred privileges of the people. If he loves his people because they are *his* people, how shall he not love them still more because they are *God's* people? But the more reasons there are for his love, the more sincere his grief, the more motives there are for his readiness on behalf of *such* a people to make every sacrifice. *ἐκεῖνα τίθησιν ἅπερ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δωρεᾶς ἐστὶν ἐνδεικτικὰ μόνον, οὐκ ἐκείνων ἐγκώμια*, Chrysost. *οὔτινες*] *quippe qui*, comp. on i. 25, ii. 15. "Hic jam aperta est causae redditio, cur tantopere ipsum torqueret populi excidium, ut paratus esset suo ipsius interitu illum redimere: nempe quia Israelitae erant. Nam relativum pronomen causalis adverbii loco positum est," Calvin. Although in reality a motive for his sacrificial willingness was implied already in the *ἀδελφότης*, the *συγγένεια κατὰ σάρκα*, the reason for it is first *formally* introduced by *οὔτινες*; for natural love forms but a subordinate element, while to love those whom God loves is a *Christian's* and *apostle's* right and duty.

—*Ἰσραηλῖται*] A title of honour, ver. 6, xi. 1 ; 2 Cor. xi. 22 ; Phil. iii. 5 ; John i. 48. They were the descendants of him who was to be no more called Jacob but Israel, champion of God, Gen. xxxii. 28, those for whom Jacob himself had implored the blessing that they should be named after him and his fathers, Abraham and Isaac, Gen. xlvi. 16 ; Isa. xlvi. 1. In the name Israelite lay wrapped up the entire dignity of the nation, for it intimated that along with his name the promise and hope of Jacob passed over to his posterity. As by the mention of the *συγγένεια κατὰ σάρκα*, patriotism may be said to find its Scripture warrant, so by the specification of the *εἶναι Ἰσραηλίτας*, as well as by that of the *πατέρες*, ver. 5, man's natural feeling of esteem and reverence for ancient, honourable name and lineage may be said to find the same.

—*ὧν*] *sc. ἐστὶ*, which is understood of itself from the preceding *εἰσι*. The thrice repeated *ὧν* (Phil. iii. 19) and the six times repeated *καί* pathetically express the accumulated prerogatives of the nation, and impart emphatic animation to the language.

After the name come, introduced by the first *ὦν*, six divinely conferred privileges, with which, then, in the last place are linked by means of the second *ὦν* the *πατέρες* as the stock, and by means of the third Christ as the crown.

—*ἡ υἰοθεσία*] comp. Ex. iv. 22, 23; Deut. xiv. 1, 2, xxxii. 6; Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8; Jer. xxxi. 9, 20; Hos. xi. 1; Mal. i. 6, ii. 10, and Hengstenberg on Ps. ii. 7. Respecting the relation of the old theocratic to N. T. *υἰοθεσία*, comp. Delitzsch, *die biblisch-prophetische Theologie*, pp. 231–257. While no *specific* distinction is found, the “O. T. shows us man at the beginning of his sonship but still under the servile tutelage of the law, the N. T. in the completeness of his sonship as one of full age.” In the O. T. passages cited, as in the present one, *υἰοθεσία* refers to God’s objective act in virtue of which the entire nation of Israel was received into a state of adoption; but still, even in the O. T., this act had to be subjectively realized by each individual by means of believing appropriation. That this was done in a comparative degree is certain. Nevertheless God’s relation of fatherhood and Israel’s state of adoption referred in the O. T. merely to the objective side of the relation, whereas, as regards the subjective side, just because of the still predominant servile paedagogy of the law, the individual believer does not call God his father and himself His son, but Jehovah his Lord and himself the son of His handmaid. This is especially evident in the Psalms, in which is disclosed to us the innermost heart of the degree of subjective faith distinguishing God’s O. T. children. Still, even in this respect exceptions are not wanting. Comp. Ps. lxxiii. 15; Gen. vi. 2; and especially Wisd. ii. 13, 16, 18, v. 5, xi. 11, xii. 7, 19, 20, 21, xiv. 3, xvi. 10, 26, xviii. 4, 13, in which passages the use of *πατήρ* in reference to God and *υἱὸς θεοῦ* in reference to believers to some extent approaches the N. T. use.

—*καὶ ἡ δόξα*] Some expositors understand *δόξα* in a general sense, and interpret it either of *the glory* which the *υἰοθεσία* had, of the *δόξα τῆς υἰοθεσίας*, which cannot hold good, because in that case *καί* must have been explicative, whereas, in every other instance in the passage, it introduces an entirely new and independent element,<sup>1</sup> or of “*the glory* of the Jewish nation in

<sup>1</sup> For the same reason *ἡ δόξα* cannot be interpreted: *ipsa felicitas iis, qui sunt υἱοθεῖν, olim in regno Christi parata*, to which is to be added that here is no reference to any *future* prerogative of the nation of Israel.

general," i.e. "of the entire dignity and entire external glory of Israel, such as manifested itself in the lofty, substantial revelations made to and among them." But if to the obvious objection that the apostle elsewhere clearly indicates *specific* privileges, it is replied that in *νίθεςία* and *δόξα* he may first of all very well have prefixed the more general privileges, it is still certain that *δόξα*, like *νίθεςία* and all the other phrases employed here, must denote a current, i.e. a specific theocratic idea to be found in the O. T. At all events such an idea is to be received, supposing it can be at all shown to be associated with the word in the O. T. But now *כְּבוֹד* in the O. T. serves not merely to denote the glory of Israel, but the glory of Jehovah. When, then, it is said generally that Israel possessed *כְּבוֹד*, our thoughts are inevitably carried back to the *כְּבוֹד יְהוָה*. This glory Israel *possessed* in the proper sense of the word. It had not merely made itself known in Israel in glorious deeds. It appeared to Moses, Isaiah, and Ezekiel, went before Israel as the pillar of cloud and fire in the desert, revealed itself on Sinai, was seen as a cloud in the Tabernacle and Temple, and according to the Rabbinical tradition, founded on Lev. xvi. 2 and contested on insufficient grounds,<sup>1</sup> sat enthroned perpetually as a cloud of light upon the ark of the covenant in the Holy of Holies in Solomon's temple. Comp. Ex. xxiv. 16, 17, xxxiii. 18, 22, xl. 34-36; Lev. ix. 23, 24; 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. v. 13, 14, vii. 1; Isa. vi. 3; Ezek. i. 28, iii. 12, 23, viii. 4, ix. 3, x. 4, 18, 19, xi. 22, xliii. 4; Ecclus. xlix. 8; 2 Macc. ii. 8; also Matt. xvii. 5; Luke ii. 9; 2 Pet.

<sup>1</sup> Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, I. p. 395 f., maintains that Lev. xvi. 2, compared with xvi. 13, rather makes against than for the Rabbinical view. But when, in the first passage, it is said that the high priest is not to come into the Holy of Holies before the Caphoreth at all times, but only once a year, namely, on the great day of atonement, "that he die not, for in a cloud will I appear over the Caphoreth," it is clear that the appearance of Jehovah in a cloud over the Caphoreth, like the apprehended presence of Jehovah always according to O. T. ideas, threatens death to the high priest. This therefore cannot be "the cloud of incense" spoken of, ver. 13, for this cloud of incense is expressly said to cause "that he die not." The cloud, ver. 2, is thus the Shechinah, which is said to be covered by the cloud of incense, ver. 13, lest it should slay the high priest. It is a strange *quid pro quo*, when Bähr fancies that the Rabbins themselves conceded the identity of these two clouds, vv. 2, 13. The passage of Abenezra quoted by him: "*sensus est, quod non ingrederetur nisi cum sullitu, quo excitanda erat nubes, ne videret symbolum illud gloriæ, ne moreretur*," affirms the exact contrary; for *symbolum illud gloriæ* is clearly the Shechinah which, according to Abenezra, was to be rendered invisible by the *nubes suffitus*.

i. 17; Rev. xv. 8. It is the symbolic, visible presence of the Lord in the midst of Israel, called by the later Jews *הַשְּׁכִינָה*, from *שָׁכַן*, "to settle down, to dwell," after Deut. xii. 11, xiv. 23, xvi. 6, 11, xxvi. 2, Ps. lxxviii. 60, according to which passages Jehovah had made His name to dwell, therefore Himself fixed His dwelling-place, in the tabernacle. Thus *הַשְּׁכִינָה*, or even *הַשְּׁכִינָה* (Buxt. *Lex. Talm.* p. 2394) = *vicinitas*, sc. *Dei*. It is mentioned also 1 Sam. iv. 22 (LXX.: ἀπόκισται δόξα Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ λεγέσθῃ τὴν κιβωτὸν κυρίου), where not *the ark of the covenant* itself, as also in the present passage some expositors have understood *δόξα* of *the ark of the covenant*, but the Shechinah enthroned upon it, or at all events the ark of the covenant on account of the Shechinah, is called *כְּבוֹד יְיָ*. We see from the latter passage that the *δόξα* of Israel consisted simply in the *δόξα κυρίου* dwelling among them, just as in Ps. cvi. 20 the God of Israel Himself is called *ὁ δόξα αὐτῶν*; and Paul perhaps specially alluded to 1 Sam. iv. 22 when he here speaks of the *δόξα* of Israel. A confirmation of this view is supplied also by *ὁ δόξα*, Heb. ix. 5 (comp. Tholuck, Bleek, and Delitzsch there), which passage makes quite as much for the Rabbinical tradition of the Shechinah as for the view that, when the *δόξα* of Israel in general is spoken of, merely this *δόξα κυρίου* may be meant; comp. moreover, Rev. xxi. 11. This symbol of the Lord's gracious presence was no doubt wanting in the second temple; but Hag. ii. 7 had promised its return, and with it, Mal. iii. 1, the return of the Lord Himself, so that nothing but a temporary suspension of the possession took place. But that promise of the latter prophet found its fulfilment in Christ, in whom the divine *δόξα*, dwelling in the temple of humanity, appeared again in Israel, John i. 14, ii. 11. Comp. Vitringa, *Obs. sacr.* v. 14, "de columna sive face ignea, u. c. 16 u. 17 de mysterio facis igneae." Moreover, the conjunction of *δόξα* in the sense indicated with *υἰοθεσία* is quite in place, for the adoption of Israel was confirmed by no other such visible and certain testimony as the gracious presence of the Lord enthroned amongst them.

—*αἱ διαθήκαι*] *The covenants or compacts*. The plural, because the covenant was made repeatedly with the patriarchs after Abraham. Comp. Wisd. xviii. 22: ὅρκους πατέρων καὶ διαθήκας ὑπομνήσας; xii. 21; Ecclus. xliv. 11: ἔκγονα αὐτῶν ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις; 2 Macc. viii. 15: καὶ εἰ μὴ δι' αὐτοὺς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς



πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν διαθήκας; Eph. ii. 12. The singular ἡ διαθήκη, which reading Lachmann has received upon authority insufficient of itself, is therefore a change made in error. The application of the διαθήκαι to the tables of the law, or, after Jer. xxxi. 31 ff., Gal. iv. 24, to the O. and N. T. covenants, is arbitrary. As to the matter, comp. the address of the Apostle Peter to Israel, Acts iii. 25: 'Τμεῖς ἐστε υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ· καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου ἐνευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς.

—ἡ νομοθεσία] *the law-giving*. Rightly observes Origen: "this is *una et semel habita per Moysen*; on the other hand, the *testamenta frequenter statuta sunt*." As Paul says not ὁ νόμος but ἡ νομοθεσία, there is no reason, comparing 2 Macc. vi. 23, for understanding νομοθεσία of the contents, the νόμος itself. Rather it is *the act* of giving the law that is meant, especially in juxtaposition with *the acts* of covenanting. No doubt the law-giving is specially significant, for the very reason that it is the giving of *the law*, and that whoever has the former has the latter; but even as an act this has its special dignity and import, Acts vii. 53, Gal. iii. 19, Heb. ii. 2, xii. 18 f., and from the first, by the form of its appearance, proclaimed the glory of its contents; comp. also 2 Cor. iii. 7. "Axioma illud in eo consistit, quod in hoc populo Deus dignatus est legem suam solemniter promulgare: quae dignitas nulli populo accidit, a qua non raro celebratur populus domini," Calov. "The *law-giving*, says Paul, expressly alluding to the solemn and sublime revelation of the law on Sinai. The Gentiles, who were a law to themselves, had a law, but no law-giving. The Israelites had received the law by the ministry of angels, and through their royal lawgivers had become a glorious nation, in possession of pure morals and precepts (Deut. iv. 8)," Besser.

—ἡ λατρεία] not, as the Vulgate has it, *obsequium*, but *the service of God*, i.e. the O. T. *cultus*, especially the service of the temple, sacrifice and priesthood, as the prime part of the νομοθεσία, Acts xxvi. 7; Heb. viii. 4, 5, ix. 1, 6. That the Decalogue did not specially ordain this λατρεία, does not preclude the opinion that the νομοθεσία denotes *the act* of giving the law. For, first of all, the third command contains, wrapped up within it, the seed and germ of the entire λατρεία; and again, the ordination of the

λατρεία itself is to be regarded simply as the development and continuation of that first chief, fundamental act of the νομοθεσία upon Sinai. Moreover, we are laid under no necessity to regard the λατρεία as an integral constituent of the νομοθεσία, but may just as well contemplate it as a new and independent element, co-ordinate with the νομοθεσία.

—αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι] *the promises, i.e. the Messianic ones.* “Correspondent hic per chiasmum *legislatio et cultus, testamenta et promissiones. Ex testamentis fluunt promissiones: et per legislationem instituitur cultus,*” Bengel.<sup>1</sup> “Nam ubi Deus semel cum veteri populo foedus percussit, novis subinde promissionibus non destitit gratiam suam offerre. Unde sequitur, promissiones ad pactum, tanquam ad unicum caput referri,” Calvin. Comp. Eph. ii. 12: αἱ διαθήκαι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας.

Ver. 5. οἱ πατέρες] The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and, in addition, the sons of the latter, for these are the πατέρες κατ’ ἐξοχήν. Comp. Ex. iii. 13, 15, iv. 5, etc., and therewith Matt. xxii. 32; Acts iii. 13, v. 30, vii. 2, 8, 11, 14, 15, 32; Rom. iv. 1, ix. 10. If also the contemporaries of Moses, Joshua, etc., are called οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, Acts vii. 19, 39, 44, 45, 51, 52, 1 Cor. x. 1, these are “our forefathers,” not οἱ πατέρες of the people of Israel *per excellentiam*. On this account we must not, to illustrate the phrase in this passage, appeal to the πατέρων ὕμνος, Eccclus. xlv.—l., where the entire choir of sainted, renowned forefathers, prophets, priests, and kings, from the times of Enoch and Noah, is brought forward. There is no sufficient reason in the present passage even for reckoning David among the πατέρες, after Acts ii. 29; just as in Rom. xi. 28 the πατέρες, with whom the covenant was made, the ἀπαρχή and the ῥίζα of the nation, ver. 16, are manifestly to be restricted to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. “Nam et hoc alicujus est momenti, trahere originem a sanctis et Deo dilectis viris, quum Deus misericordiam piis Patribus promiserit erga filios usque in mille generationes: praesertim vero conceptis verbis, Abrahæ, Isaac, Jacob, Gen. xvii. 4. Nec refert quod istud, si a timore Dei et vitæ sanctimonia separetur, sit per se vanum et inutile. . . . Verum

<sup>1</sup> “The *chiasmus* in this order of sequence is not accidental, but αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι is intentionally put at the end, in order that now, after mention of the *fathers*, to whom in the first instance the promises were given, the *Promised One Himself* may follow,” Meyer.

quoniam ista cum pietatis studio juncta aliquo honoris gradu dignatur Deus, inter Judaeorum prerogativas merito recensuit," Calvin. Similarly it may be said that only there does nobility of race claim reverence where it is combined with nobility of character.

—καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα] Israel's last and highest prerogative. ἐξ ὧν, *from whom is*, not : *to whom belongs*, in which case the simple ὧν would have been repeated. Respecting κατὰ σάρκα, comp. on i. 3. On the *acc. adverb.* τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, comp. xii. 18, xv. 17, xvi. 19; Matthiä, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 572; Kühner, *Gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 222. The τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, "as to human nature," limits the εἶναι ἐξ αὐτῶν, and precludes the idea of Christ being *merely* man.

—ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας] *who is God over all things, blessed for ever.* ὁ ὧν is = ὅς ἐστι, comp. John i. 18, iii. 13, xii. 17 (where ὁ ὧν = ὃς ἦν); 2 Cor. xi. 31. ἐπὶ πάντων, *over all things*, not : *over all persons*, πάντων being neuter, not masculine, because Christ is meant to be described as θεὸς παντοκράτωρ in contrast with the frailty of the σάρξ; and consequently it seems too narrow to limit His power to all *persons* (or, still more, to all πατέρες) instead of to all *things*, John iii. 31; Acts x. 36; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Heb. ii. 10. ἐπὶ *cum genit.* πάντων, expresses government over everything. Comp. Eph. iv. 6; Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 474, where are quoted from the classics the examples : ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλων, ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπηρετικῶν, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς φρουρᾶς, οἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων. The anarthrous θεός need not suggest to us any notion of a Philonistic or Origenistic distinction between θεός and ὁ θεός, so that the latter only denotes the absolute God, while the first denotes merely a θεός δεύτερος, God in a relative, subordinate sense. The monotheism of the N. T., which is not less strict than that of the O. T., forbids at once such a distinction between a God and a minor God. The God who gives not His glory to another knows no *tertium* between God and not-God, no distinction of God literal and metaphorical. Reason and revelation stand here in fairest harmony. On the standpoint rather of the emanationist pantheism of a Philo, has this distinction a rational meaning. Besides, in the present passage it is precluded by the adjunct ἐπὶ πάντων; for he that is θεός ἐπὶ πάντων, or θεός παντοκράτωρ, is not himself in turn subordinate to another. The absence of the article proves nothing, the use of the article being here impossible, because θεός is pre-

dicare, and the design is simply to affirm the *θεὸν εἶναι* of Christ, not the *τὸν θεὸν εἶναι*, which would be wrong, as He is not *ὁ θεός*, i.e. God the Father, or the triune God, but *θεός*, God. No doubt we might say : *ὁ θεός ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*,<sup>1</sup> but not : *Χριστός ἐστὶν ὁ θεός*, because He whose *Godhead* is meant to be asserted cannot be described as the God already *known*. The same holds true of John i. 1 : *καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*. Emphasis requiring the predicate to come first, the addition of the article (*ὁ θεός*) would have involved the whole passage in confusion, as with *καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν* immediately preceding, in the sentence *καὶ ὁ θεός ἦν ὁ λόγος* directly following we might have been in danger of taking *ὁ θεός* as subject, and *ὁ λόγος* as predicate. But the epithet *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* is here quite in place, because only the fact that He who springs from Israel after the flesh is God over all, sets Israel's most illustrious privilege in the clearest relief ; and by the natural, doxological epithet *εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, the apostle at the same time confronts the Jews' blasphemous denial of Christ's Godhead (Matt. xii. 24 ; John viii. 48) with all the earnestness of devotion, according to the canon, John v. 23. But the interpretation thus given of the sentence in question (*ὁ ὢν . . . αἰῶνας*) is not merely the most natural, but also the one absolutely necessary. For as *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* clearly postulates an antithesis, if such an antithesis, as is here actually the case, is found in the subjoined words (*ὁ ὢν κτλ.*), it is most natural to take these words as expressing the antithesis. But this is, as we said, not merely natural, but necessary in the present passage. In the opposite case the antithesis to *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* would be suppressed, and must therefore be supplied in thought. Comp. xii. 18 ; 1 Cor. i. 26 ; Col. iii. 22. But the suppression of the antithesis, and its supply in thought merely, cannot take place where, as here, the thesis only occurs for the sake of the antithesis. *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* stands merely for the sake of the following *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός*. Without this contrast the words would imply a diminution of the prerogative of Israel. The apostle would then have written simply *καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστός* ; for that the Messiah springs from the Jews is a higher privilege than that He springs from them after the flesh merely. But that

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Ignatius, *ad Ephes.* c. 18 : *ὁ γὰρ εἰς ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκυφορίθη ὑπὸ Μαρίας κατ' οἰκονομίαν τοῦ* ; *ad Smyrn.* c. 1 : *δοξάζω Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν θεὸν τὸν οὕτως ὑμᾶς σὸφίσαντα* ; *ad Rom.* c. 6 : *ἐπιτίψατί μοι αἰμητὴν εἶναι τοῦ πάθους τοῦ θεοῦ μου*.

He springs from them after the flesh who is God over all, this is the highest conceivable prerogative.

The objections raised against the reference of the present declaration to Christ are, in point of fact, thoroughly irrelevant for the unprejudiced expositor, *i.e.* for the expositor prejudiced merely in favour of Scripture, however great the weight which it is sought to attach to them. In the first place, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός is said to form no strict logical antithesis to τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, because κατὰ σάρκα always postulates κατὰ πνεῦμα as a contrast. But this would only be the case if it were said here, as in i. 3, 4, *what* Christ is κατὰ σάρκα, and *what* He is κατὰ πνεῦμα, namely, υἱὸς Δαβὶδ or υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in one respect, and υἱὸς θεοῦ or θεὸς ἐπὶ πάντων in the other. But here the design is not at all to say that the Christ who springs from the Jews as to His lower nature is man, as to His higher nature God, but that the Christ who is God over all springs from the Jews, of course in the only possible respect, namely, as to His human nature. The form of the sentence is thus thoroughly germane and unobjectionable, and not only can κατὰ πνεῦμα be dispensed with, but to add it would introduce confusion.<sup>1</sup> But the main objection is borrowed from the Pauline Christology. Nowhere else in the apostle's writings, so the objection runs, does there occur so strong an affirmation respecting Christ, just as little as any ascription of praise to Him. Nowhere else does Paul ascribe to Christ the predicate θεός, and had he done so once, reverence for his divine Lord would have led him to do it *often*. But in the first place, it is certain that, we might say, in almost every passage in which Paul names Christ and predicates aught of Him, he describes Him indirectly as God, and therefore in any case thought of Him as God, even if he did not call Him so directly. For He to whom belong divine attributes,—like eternity, Col. i. 15, 17; omnipresence, Eph. i. 23, iv. 10; and grace, Rom. i. 7, 1 Cor. i. 3, etc.; divine works, like the creation and preservation of the world, Col. i. 16, 17; and the dispensing of judgment, Rom. xiv. 10, 2 Cor. v. 10, 2 Thess. i. 7–10; and divine worship, Rom. x. 13, Phil. ii. 10, 11,—is Himself God. In the opposite case, the reproach of creature-worship brought by the Jews against the Christians would have

<sup>1</sup> Meyer allows and even maintains, against van Hengel, that *grammatically* at least (as well as according to the most likely connection) the ancient and general ecclesiastical interpretation has nothing whatever against it.

justly lighted on the apostle. All the harder is it to conceive how his interpreters can suppose that he forbore to call Christ God in the interest, forsooth, of monotheism. Directly in the teeth of this, it fell to the lot of the Christian church, in opposition to the Arianism and semi-Arianism which it is attempted to thrust on the apostle, to defend the interests of monotheism, on the ground that these very systems imperilled the divine unity.<sup>1</sup> The appeal to 1 Cor. viii. 6 (Harless on Eph. iv. 4-6) is altogether irrelevant, for there the *εἰς θεός ὁ πατήρ* is merely opposed to the *πολλοῖς θεοῖς* of the Gentiles, and the *εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* to their *πολλοῖς κυρίοις*. But that the apostle does not on this account hesitate in another connection to describe this *εἰς κύριος* also as *θεός*, follows from the fact that as of the *εἰς θεός* he affirms *ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*, so of the *εἰς κύριος* he affirms *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ*. Rightly does Origen early reply: "Non animadvertunt, quod sicut Dominum Jesum Christum non ita unum dominum esse dixit, ut ex hoc Deus pater Dominus non dicatur, ita et Deum patrem non ita dixit esse unum Deum, ut Deus filius non credatur." Besides, in point of fact, the appellations *υἱός*, *εἰκὼν θεοῦ*, *πρωτότοκος*, and *κύριος* (as is well known, the translation of the LXX. for *יהוה*), so commonly applied by Paul to Christ, are equivalent to the appellation *θεός*, and characterize at one and the same time the specific peculiarity of the *second* person in the Godhead and the relation of the God-man to the church redeemed to His service. If Paul, then, thought of Christ as *θεόν*, he could also call Him *θεός*, and the present passage alone is decisive of the fact that he actually did so. Even if he had done it nowhere else, this would prove nothing on the other side, for there are just as well matter-of-fact as linguistic *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, and in this case in reality there would simply be a linguistic *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, for the thing itself

<sup>1</sup> It is altogether past comprehension how modern subordinationism is constantly bringing against the ecclesiastical, exclusively and perfectly scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, the reproach that it imperils the cause of strict monotheism. The case stands just the other way. The doctrine of one absolute God with two relative gods having their origin from Him, shatters the unity of monotheism, and borders on pagan polytheism. On the other hand, along with the tri-personal distinction, the church has ever held fast by the *unity* of essence, and without break kept aloof from Tritheism. Hence the older subordinationists accuse it of monarchian Sabellianism (in which error the homousians Marcellus and Photinus were actually involved, not of a denial of monotheism.

occurs elsewhere often enough. *Imperative* necessity for calling Christ *θεόν* only really existed in passages like the present, where it was designed in a definite, antithetical relation to call attention to the *θεόν*, not merely the *ἄνθρωπον εἶναι* of the Messiah. We could not therefore feel the least surprise if this expression were not used by Paul elsewhere; for the other equivalent names were more descriptive, he did not need this particular *word* to satisfy his reverence for his divine Lord, and, finally, he did not write with special reference to the acuteness of his interpreters in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, who are able with such subtlety to distinguish between attributes, works, and essence, between *θεός* and *ὁ θεός*, that with them for opponents the apostle would, in fact, have drawn up the *locus* of the Godhead of Christ in the strictest Athanasian and Augustinian terminology. Even then, without doubt, the only result would have been to leave him at the mercy of the judgment passed by the consciousness of modern days on the *symbolum Quicunque*.

But over and above all this, the designation of Christ as *θεός* occurs, in fact, in Paul far more frequently than his interpreters like. Not only does he say, 2 Cor. v. 19: *θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ*, Col. ii. 9: *ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*, 1 Tim. iii. 16: *θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*,<sup>1</sup> and predicate of the man Jesus, Phil. ii. 6, the *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν* and the *εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*, expressions and designations which, as matter of fact, are identical with *ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο*; but he expressly calls Him *θεός*, Eph. v. 5: *τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ*, as the connection by means of the same article proves = "He who is Christ and God" (comp. Beza, Calov, Bengel, Harless, even Rückert there), Tit. ii. 13: *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, where, likewise, the *same* article (*τοῦ*) binds together both the predicates *μέγας θεός* and *σωτήρ*, and compels us to refer them to the same subject, Jesus Christ. Even Winer, p. 162, does not dispute the grammatical, but only the dogmatic possibility of this connection, and, at the same time, its grammatical *necessity*. But even in this case the passage remains of

<sup>1</sup> Comp. in favour of the reading *θεός* instead of *ἴσ*, the treatise of Henderson, quoted by Tholuck here, "*The Great Mystery of Godliness Incontrovertible: A Critical Examination of the various readings in 1 Tim. iii. 16*, London 1830," and my *Kirchl. Glaubensl.* IV. 1, 431 f.; cod. Alex. and Ulfilas also read *θεός*.

importance. For when it is maintained that, supposing Paul to have called Christ *θεός* once, he must have done it often, it follows from this premiss, that *since* he did it once, it will also have been done wherever the grammatical connection suggests this reference, and the tenor of thought makes for, not against the idea. But in the passage of Titus quoted, to put it briefly, it is not the ecclesiastical, but the opposite interpretation that needs to be vindicated grammatically, which, moreover, can only be done by doubtful arguments. To this add, that the *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης*, according to other scriptures and especially according to Pauline ideas, belongs peculiarly, not to God the Father, but to Christ (2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. i. 10, iv. 1, 8; just so the *ἀποκάλυψις*, 1 Cor. i. 7; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Pet. i. 7, iv. 13); and that the epithet *μέγας θεός*, as applied to God the Father, appears somewhat singular and unmeaning. There remains, then, on the other side, in point of fact, nothing but the *dogmatic* argument, which is a pure *petitio principii*. In the same way, Tit. i. 3: *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*, might be referred to Christ, in favour of which it may be said that the reference to God the Father as the subject immediately preceding would rather have led us to expect *αὐτοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*. But we do not wish to lay stress on this passage on account of 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10; Tit. ii. 10, iii. 4. Finally, we have to mention the reading received by Lachmann and recommended on exegetical grounds, Col. ii. 2: *τοῦ θεοῦ Χριστοῦ* (comp. Steiger here), as well as the relation in which *Χριστός*, *κύριος*, and *θεός*, Rom. xiv. 10, 11, stand to each other. In any case, such passages, even if at first sight still doubtful, serve still further to weaken the argument, already weak of itself, from the *rare* occurrence of the predicate *θεός*.

Just as this predicate occurs only of necessity when occasion arises, and therefore in the nature of things rarely, so with the doxology to Christ. Such a doxology is found again in Paul, 2 Tim. iv. 18, where manifestly the *κύριος* is Christ and not God, Rom. xvi. 27; 2 Thess. i. 12; Heb. xiii. 21. But in the same way that the designation of Christ as *θεός* by other apostles (John i. 1; 1 John v. 20; Heb. i. 8, 9; also Luke i. 16, 17; John xii. 41; 2 Pet. i. 2; Jude 4) is a confirmation of the Pauline use in the present passage, so with the doxology to Christ (2 Pet. iii. 18; Rev. v. 12 f., i. 6; also 1 Pet. iv. 11;



Steiger, p. 392). Moreover, even in Jewish theology, the Messiah bears the titles  $\text{יהוה}$ ,  $\text{מָלֶכֶךְ}$ , and  $\text{הַקָּדוֹשׁ בְּרִיךְ הוּא}$ . The later date of the books in which such expressions occur is nothing to the point, for such designations must necessarily have sprung from pre-Christian tradition,—post-Christian Judaism being certainly disposed, by its strong antipathy to Christianity, rather to do away with than invent anything of the kind.

Further, the interpretation of the words  $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\nu \dots \alpha\iota\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$ , advocated by us, must be described as the one universally received in the ancient church. The best proof that exegesis requires it, is the dogmatic *coup de désespoir* of certain Socinians who, in order to escape a troublesome Christological conclusion, proposed to alter the thoroughly certified reading  $\acute{\omicron} \acute{\omega}\nu \kappa\tau\lambda.$  into  $\acute{\omega}\nu \acute{\omicron} \kappa\tau\lambda.$ , “to whom belongs God, who is over all, blessed for ever,”—a critical act of violence to which the most untrammelled interpreter of to-day is unwilling to commit himself. On this account, since the days of Semler, Rationalism, walking in the steps of Erasmus, has sought to support its position by changes in punctuation, certainly, particularly in the case of Rückert and de Wette, not without retracting their own former ecclesiastical interpretation, and not without uncertainty and suspense as regards the rationalistic interpretation recently accepted by them. On the other hand, modern scriptural exegesis has again decisively returned to the ecclesiastical view. Moreover, the fact is very significant that Rationalism itself allows that it is determined by no reasons, linguistic or logical, drawn from the passage itself, but solely by dogmatic reasons, drawn nominally, no doubt, from the Pauline, not from its own doctrinal system.

Now, Erasmus proposed a twofold change of punctuation, either, with Cod. 71, to place a colon or period after  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ , or, with Cod. 5 and 47, after  $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\alpha$ ,<sup>1</sup> so that in both cases, in place of the doxology to Christ, a doxology to God appears. To the latter alteration (“God, who is over all, be blessed for ever”) the preference is given both by Erasmus and his followers. But in point of fact this, no less than its step-sister, which is treated with less courtesy, is just as impossible exegetically, as the older view advocated by us is essential exegetically. First of all, the

<sup>1</sup> So already the rationalizing Diodorus (of Tarsus, according to Fr. Fritzsche, of Mopsuestia), in Cramer, *Catena*, Oxon. p. 162:  $\text{ἐξ αὐτῶν, ῥησίων, ὁ Χριστός. θεὸς δὲ οὐ μόνον αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῇ ἐπὶ πάντων ἰστί θεός.}$

antithesis to *κατὰ σάρκα*, which, as we have seen, is required, is altogether lost on this supposition. But, again, a doxology to God the Father is here utterly out of place. Not thanksgiving and praise, but pain and grief fill the soul of the apostle, as he glances at the blessings bestowed by God on the people of Israel; for the higher the position of the people, the more lamentable their fall. These blessings were past and without effect. Nay, they served merely to aggravate the nation's responsibility, and therefore on no account called for a doxology to their author. This nation of Israel, so richly gifted, so distinguished above all other nations, has turned apostate, has rejected salvation with scorn—this is the pervading thought to be read between the lines, vv. 3–5. With this as antithesis, *οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, ver. 6, immediately connects itself. But a doxology to the God of Israel, thrust between such a thesis and antithesis, would be utterly irrelevant and confusing. But if the doxology were supposed, as Erasmus explains, to refer to the fact that all the privileges conferred on Israel had subverted the purpose of the redemption of the human race, it is to be observed in reply, that the design of the apostle, in the train of thought before us, in mentioning Israel's prerogatives, is simply to indicate the original, divinely-bestowed dignity of the people so deeply fallen, not the salvation provided for mankind by means of that dignity as its final purpose. But still less can the doxology, as Fritzsche would have it, refer by anticipation to the conclusion of the entire subsequent exposition contained in xi. 32, so that God is praised, because, although at present rejecting Israel, by means of its rejection He determined to bring to pass the salvation of the Gentiles and Israel's own ultimate restoration. (*ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός* is then said to be = *qui omnibus preest hominibus*, i.e. *qui et Judæis et Gentilibus consulit Deus*, *God who rules over all men!*) Even if we were willing to believe, which yet is very forced and unnatural, that the entire subsequent exposition, full as it is of detail and complexity, was already present to the mind of the apostle as to its final result, it was, at all events, impossible for any reader to understand this anticipatory reference. Besides, even if it were distinctly expressed, here, where the matter in question is simply Israel's *apostasy*, such a reference would have been utterly out of place.

Finally, in a doxology, according to the constant usage of the

Hebrew, the LXX., and Apocrypha, as well as of the N. T. (Matt. xxi. 9; Luke i. 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3), the predicate *εὐλογητός* and *εὐλογημένος*, Heb. *ברוך* and *מְבָרֵךְ*, where, as here, it appears without copula, must necessarily have stood first instead of afterwards. When Winer, p. 690, intimates that only empirical expositors could regard this arrangement as an unalterable rule, for where the subject forms the main idea the predicate can only stand afterwards, it is to be observed, on the other side, that in the interpretation of a formula that has become fixed, empiricism is altogether in its right place, and still more where, for the established usage, a sufficient *ratio* can be alleged. Directly that a doxology, omitting the verb substant., appears in a purely exclamatory form, the idea of praise becomes so predominant that the word expressing the praise necessarily stands at the head. It were a course little deserving to be called rational, if to a usage established by so many examples (see these in Harless on Eph. i. 3) the single exception were sought in this very passage, the interpretation of which is in dispute. The single plausible exception, LXX. Ps. lxxviii. 19: *κύριος ὁ θεὸς εὐλογητός, εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν* (Heb. simply *בָּרַךְ יְיָ יוֹמָם וָלַיְלָה*), is rather corroboratory of the rule; for there, clearly, both the different order of words and the doubled *εὐλογητός*, one treading closely on the other (making the stronger form of blessing follow the weaker one, so that one act of praise overtakes and outstrips the other), have a designed rhetorical emphasis. Otherwise the translators, following the Heb., would have contented themselves with the simple *εὐλογητὸς κύριος ἡμέραν καθ' ἡμέραν*.<sup>1</sup> Add to this, that the apostle, if he deemed it essential to place *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* first, without deviating from the rule, might have added the copula and written: *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς ἔστω εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*. Further, if *ὁ ὢν . . . θεός* is meant to have the emphasis because it contains the reason of the praise, this would not adequately account for its coming first. In that case, it might just as well have been written: *εὐλογ. ὁ θ. ὁ ὢν ἐπ. π.* = "blessed be God, *because He*," etc. In fact, nothing but an intended *antithesis* could adequately explain the absolute necessity for its coming first. The purpose must

<sup>1</sup> "Further, the reason of the divergence here is evident, the translator wishing to give the simple Hebrew sentence the form of an antiphonical responsorium," Tholuck.

have been, then, to describe God as *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων* in antithesis to Christ, and to say that only to one over all, or to *God* who is over all, not to Christ, is blessing due. But, to pass by the absence of the adversative particle, how little Pauline and biblical such a depreciation of Christ is, especially in this passage as well as generally, needs no further enforcing. Very justly, then, Steiger says on 1 Pet. i. 3: "This arrangement of the doxology, where it is not changed by relatives, is everywhere peculiar and essential to it. Compare—

"Here: *εὐλογ. ὁ θ. καὶ πατὴρ τ. κ. ἡ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἀναγεννήσας κτλ.*

"Luke i. 68: *εὐλογ. κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.*

"2 Cor. i. 3: *εὐλογ. ὁ θ. κ. πατ. τ. κ. ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν κτλ.*

"Eph. i. 3: *εὐλογ. ὁ θ. κ. πατ. τ. κ. ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς κτλ.*

"On the other side, directly relation enters, compare—

"Rom. i. 25: *τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.*

"2 Cor. xi. 31: *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ . . . ὁ ὢν εὐλογ. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.*

"Rom. ix. 5: *Χριστὸς, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.*

"It must therefore strike us at once that nothing but the most boundless caprice can permit itself to find an exception in the last passage, and of a relative to make an absolute sentence, contrary to invariable usage."

But if we put a full stop after *πάντων* instead of after *σάρκα*, we no doubt obtain an antithesis to *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα*, though an insufficient one. But, to pass by the little relevant and familiar *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων*, instead of *ὁ ὢν πάντων κύριος*, Acts x. 36, Rom. x. 12, even then the doxology to God the Father remains utterly unexplained; *θεός*, coming first instead of *εὐλογητός*, is left without even the plausible justification of an emphasis in view, or would tend directly to the disparagement of Christ; and, still further, a new difficulty springs up in the abrupt appearance of the singularly brief doxology then remaining. After all that has been said, it is evident that Tholuck, who as to the rest has among modern expositors handled the passage with the greatest care, manifestly expressed himself with far too great

forbearance when he said that we must hold by the conclusion that the difficulties rising against the explanation of the passage current in the church are incomparably slighter than those rising against the views diverging from it. We believe, on the contrary, that the ecclesiastical interpretation has everything for it and nothing against it, and *vice versa*.<sup>1</sup> “Qui hoc membrum abrumpunt a reliquo contextu,” says Calvin, “ut Christo eripiant tam praeclarum Divinitatis testimonium, nimis impudenter in plena luce tenebras obducere conantur. Plusquam enim aperta sunt verba: *Christus ex Judaeis secundum carnem, qui Deus est in saecula benedictus*.” On the basis of the present passage, Oecumenius justly triumphs over the Arians in the words: ἐνταῦθα λαμπρότατα θεὸν τὸν Χριστὸν ὀνομάζει ὁ ἀπόστολος. Αἰσχύνῃ τι τρισάθλιε Ἀρεῖε ἀκούων παρὰ Παύλου δοξολογούμενον τὸν Χριστὸν θεὸν ἀληθινόν.

Vv. 6-13. But now if the nation of Israel, distinguished by such high, God-given privileges, is nevertheless excluded from the Messianic salvation, the divine word of promise given to the nation has apparently come to nought. But this is not so. Never was the promise of salvation annexed to mere outward

<sup>1</sup> Meyer certainly says that Tholuck judges with far greater caution than I do. Nevertheless, on the ground of Meyer's very objection I am compelled to abide by the judgment above given with increased emphasis. In point of fact, this expositor has refuted not a single one of the arguments I advanced in the text. There is nothing to be discovered in him save his semi-Arian feeling against the co-ordination of the Son with the Father. His assertion that Paul *never* uses the expression *θεὸς* of Christ, and that in the apostolic writings we *never* come upon a doxology to Christ, which is all that he is able to allege against our, as we think, conclusive train of reasoning, he can only himself make good by questioning the genuineness of the Pastoral epistles. Finally, this exegete, whom we greatly honour for his grammatical accuracy and logical keenness, should himself be somewhat more cautious in presence of the ecclesiastical interpretation. Even from his purely grammatical and logical standpoint he is compelled more and more to make the most decisive concessions to the defenders of that interpretation, as is strikingly proved, to my great satisfaction, by the second edition of his Commentary compared with the first. Moreover, even Tholuck in the fifth edition of his Commentary has omitted the “cautious” qualification reprehended by us, on which account Meyer, ed. 3 and 4, is only able to commend him for his greater fairness to the objections to the ancient ecclesiastical explanation as compared with me. With our reference of the doxology of this passage to Christ, as well as with our exposition of Tit. ii. 13, even Hofmann agrees, *Schriftbeweis*, I. 127, 2, p. 144. But against his division of the sentence, according to which ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων should be taken as the first, and *θεὸς* εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας as the second predicate of Christ,—a view which Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. 453 f., also follows, comp. Meyer here. See, besides, Hahn, *Bibl. Theol.* I. 122.

connection with the national community, to bare physical relationship of race, or any similar purely carnal title whatever. The history of the people of Israel bears prophetic testimony to this. It shows how the inheritance of the theocratic blessing was bound neither to right of birth nor merit of works, but was mediated simply by God's gracious designation. Thus the Jewish  $\text{כִּלְיָאֵל יֵשׁ לָהֶם הֵלֵךְ לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא}$  is destitute of all scriptural authority, and not the  $\text{λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ}$ , but Israel's carnal universalism in reference to itself, which, withal, was a carnal particularism in reference to the Gentile world, falls to the ground. "Judaei putabant," says Bengel, "si non omnes Judaei salvarentur, verbum Dei excidere. Id refutat Paulus, simul immens, verbo Dei potius praedictam fuisse Judaeorum defectionem."

Ver. 6.  $\text{οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι}$  Not: *but it is not possible that.* To express this,  $\text{οἶον τε}$  with an infinitive following usually stands ( $\text{οὐχ οἶον τε δὲ ἐκπέπτωκεναι}$ ). More rarely the simple  $\text{οἶον}$  is used in this sense, and never with  $\text{ὅτι}$  following, Matthiä, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 896; Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 337. Moreover, in what follows Paul does not so much verify the impossibility of God's Word coming to nought as merely the unreality of this supposition. Often, no doubt,  $\text{οὐχ οἶον}$  with the verb. finit. occurs also in classical Greek, but in this case it is to be regarded as arising by attraction out of  $\text{οὐ τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν ὅτι} = \text{the matter is not of such a nature that, e.g. οὐχ οἶον ὀργίζομαι} = \text{οὐ τοιοῦτόν ἐστι ὅτι ὀργίζομαι}$ . But now Paul has not written  $\text{οὐχ οἶον δὲ ἐκπέπτωκεν}$  according to rule, but interpolated an  $\text{ὅτι}$ . We may either, with Fritzsche, explain this as a *constructio πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον*, because  $\text{οὐχ οἶον δέ}$  as to sense = *sed multum abest*, but it is far from the case,  $\text{ὅτι}$  following as in  $\text{μὴ γένοιτο δὲ ὅτι}$ ; or, with Meyer, suppose a combination of two constructions, namely, of  $\text{οὐχ οἶον ἐκπέπτωκεν}$  and  $\text{οὐχ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν}$  (as to  $\text{οὐχ ὅτι} = \text{οὐκ ἔρῳ ὅτι}$ , comp. Phil. iv. 11; Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part.* II. p. 153 f.), both of which Paul welds together, and writes:  $\text{οὐχ οἶον ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν}$ , and then, with Winer, p. 746, analyse:  $\text{οὐ τοῖον δὲ (λέγω or ἐστὶ) οἶον, "ὅτι non tale vero (dico), quale (hoc est), excidisse verbum divinum," "but I say not a thing of such a kind as (this is) that;"}$  Luther: "but I say not such a thing that." But in  $\text{οὐχ οἶον} = \text{"the matter is by no means such that,"}$  is implied an *emphatic negation*. It intimates

that the matter just complained of is something altogether different from what would compromise or reflect upon God's word of promise. "Quod ita gentis meae exitium deploro, non eo spectat, acsi Dei promissionem, Abrahae olim datam, nunc irritam et abolitam putarem," Calvin.

—ἐκπέπτωκεν] *excidit, irritum cecidit, irritum factum est, has become invalid, of no effect, void.* The radical meaning is: *to fall out of its position*, by means of which the various uses of the word in all N. T. passages may be explained, Mark xiii. 25; Acts xii. 7, xxvii. 17, 26, 29, 32; 1 Cor. xiii. 8; Gal. v. 4; Jas. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 24; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Rev. ii. 5. Analogous is πίπτειν, Luke xvi. 17, and in the *var. lect.* to 1 Cor. xiii. 8; Rev. ii. 5; also LXX. Josh. xxiii. 14; 2 Kings x. 10 (πίπτειν εἰς τὴν γῆν); Heb. לָפַד and הִפִּיץ לָפַד, as well as διαπίπτειν, LXX. Josh. xxi. 45; Judith vi. 9.

—ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ] *the word of God*, here especially, as the context shows, *the word of promise*; for if one portion of the word of God fell to the ground, in this portion the entire word of God was rendered void. Thus ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ—though certainly indirectly, not directly—signifies "the promise of the Messianic salvation."

—οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραὴλ] states the reason why (γὰρ) the divine word is not frustrated. If it applied to all Israelites in the natural sense, it would no doubt be rendered void, the greater portion of the Israelites, as matter of fact, remaining outside the Messianic salvation. But it applies simply to Israel in the spiritual sense, *i.e.* to the Israel designed by the election of God's grace to be Israel in the true sense. Those, then, are meant who are ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλῖται in the objective meaning, those to whom the prerogatives of God's people really belong by divine designation. But, of course, these are always *eo ipso* ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλῖται in the subjective meaning, John i. 48; ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖοι, Rom. ii. 28, 29; Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πνεῦμα, Gal. iv. 29; Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ, vi. 16, comp. Gesenius, *Der Proph. Jesaias*, I. 2, p. 165 f. It may be a question whether in οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, *sc.* ὄντες, Ἰσραὴλ denotes the patriarch Jacob or the nation. We think the latter, because it is most in order to distinguish in the first instance between the natural Israel spoken of before, which brought forward its claim of right, and the Israel chosen of God, to which alone by divine

right the promise of salvation applies. Only in the sequel is this distinction described as typically prefigured in the history of the patriarchal families from the beginning. Among Jacob's posterity no such relation obtained as obtained among the sons of Abraham and Isaac. No doubt Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, although not, like Ishmael and Esau, excluded from the theocratic national community, were put second to Judah, though not by divine designation, but for their own sin, Gen. xlix. 3-12. For this reason in the sequel the apostle returns only to the history of Abraham and Isaac. With the demonstrat. οὔτοι, comp. Gal. iii. 7.

Ver. 7. οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶ σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα] *nor, because they are Abraham's seed, are they all children.* As the discourse continues without interruption, a colon or comma, not a period, is to be placed before οὐδ'. The subject to εἰσὶ is not the following πάντες = "not all are Abraham's true children, because they are his natural descendants" (which would require a different order: οὐδὲ πάντες, ὅτι εἰσὶ σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, τέκνα, ἀλλ' κτλ.), but the foregoing πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ = "nor yet because they (i.e. all Israelites) are Abraham's seed, are they all children." τέκνα, like the preceding Ἰσραήλ = *true children, i.e. τοῦ Ἀβραάμ*, not τοῦ θεοῦ, for Abraham's children are not described as *God's* children until ver. 8. But, no doubt, Abraham's real children, to whom as such the Abrahamic saving promise really belongs by divine appointment, are also God's genuine children. Thus the apostle here distinguishes between σπέρμα, *seed, i.e. mere natural posterity*, and τέκνα, *children*, who are such not merely physically but legally, not merely by natural generation, but also by divine order and recognition, and who, consequently, in this capacity are also partakers in God's gracious gifts and the Messianic salvation. On the other hand, in ver. 8 σπέρμα is used in the spiritual sense. On the idea, comp. Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33, 39; and Justin Martyr, *Dialog. c. Τηρηλ. c. 44*: καὶ ἐξαπατᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς, ὑπονοοῦντες διὰ τὸ εἶναι τοῦ Ἀβραάμ κατὰ σάρκα σπέρμα πάντως κληρονομήσειν τὰ κατηγγελμένα παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ δοθήσεσθαι ἀγαθά.

After —ἀλλ'] there is no need to understand καθὼς γέγραπται, or still less, with Griesbach, to insert a colon, which the elision (ἀλλ', not ἀλλά) forbids. On the contrary, here, as xv. 3, 1 Cor. i. 31 (where certainly καθὼς γέγραπται is appended), the discourse



merges in the quotation, so that the apostle, instead of: "but in Isaac, according to the well-known divine oracle, was his seed to be named," says briefly, quoting the very words of the divine oracle familiar to his readers: "but in Isaac shall thy seed be named." Comp. also Gal. iii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. xv. 27.

—ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα] The passage is quoted from Gen. xxi. 12 exactly after the LXX., who have translated the original text  $\text{וְיִשְׂרָאֵל} \text{ קָרָא} \text{ וַיֹּאמֶר}$  verbatim. The declaration is found in the narrative of Ishmael's expulsion, and is therefore specially suited for the apostle's purpose of setting forth the distinction between the σπέρμα (*i.e.* Ishmael) and the τέκνον (*i.e.* Isaac) of Abraham. "In Isaac shall seed be named for thee," *i.e.* be held and recognised as such. Thus only the σπέρμα which is at the same time τέκνον, is genuine σπέρμα. But then the expression σπέρμα may be referred either to the person of Isaac himself or to his posterity. In the first case it is to be explained: In the person of Isaac shall thy seed, accepted as such in the real sense, consist, *i.e.* Isaac shall be thy real descendant. In the second case: The seed subsisting in Isaac shall be thy seed, accepted as such in the real sense, *i.e.* Isaac's descendants shall be thy real descendants. The Hebrew original may possibly permit both interpretations. The question is, which view Paul followed? We think the former. He might indeed, in the assertion that only the descendants of Isaac, the promised seed, who—conceived as included in the person of Isaac—were consequently themselves a posterity given by promise, were to be Abraham's genuine seed, discover the allegorical type of the doctrine that not all Abraham's natural descendants are his genuine children. But still, seeing that the Jews, against whom he is contending, were all without exception Isaac's actual descendants, to argue that these (natural) descendants of Isaac are not to be Abraham's genuine seed, because only descendants of Isaac (the son of promise) are Abraham's genuine seed, does not wear a relevant look. In addition, the ἐπαγγελία, instanced ver. 9, also refers to the person of Isaac simply, not to his σπέρμα, even as in ver. 10 ff. the persons of Jacob and Esau, as here those of Isaac and Ishmael, figure in their typical signification. The explanation here then is: That not all Abraham's natural descendants are *co ipso* his genuine children, follows from the position that only in the person of Isaac was his real seed

to consist, by which it was typically foreshadowed that only the sons of promise are children. In exact unison with this the apostle says, (Gal. iv. 28: *ἡμεῖς δέ, ἀδελφοί, κατὰ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα ἐσμέν.* Comp. Chrys. here: *διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο εἶπεν ἐν Ἰσ. κλ. σ. σπ., ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι οἱ τῷ τρόπῳ τούτῳ γεννώμενοι τῷ κατὰ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, οὗτοι μάλιστα εἰσι τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ· πῶς οὖν ὁ Ἰσραὴλ ἐγεννήθη; οὐ κατὰ νόμον φύσεως, οὐδὲ κατὰ δυνάμιν σαρκὸς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δυνάμιν ἐπαγγελίας.* And even if, in the original text, the second meaning were meant to be affirmed, Paul might still have chosen the form more suited to his purpose; for it certainly follows as matter of course, that if only the natural posterity of Isaac is the genuine seed, this is only the case because only Isaac, the son of promise, himself is accounted the genuine seed. *κληθήσεται, nominabitur, shall be named, i.e. shall be regarded as such, recognised and called so, LXX. Isa. xlix. 6, lvi. 7; Mark xi. 17; Matt. v. 19; 1 John iii. 1. σοι, as belonging to thee, the father.*

Ver. 8. *τοῦτ' ἔστιν*] "Hæc vox est explicantis *ὑπόνοιαν* latentem, quod *וְכֵן* dicitur Hebræis," Grotius. *That is = that signifies,* without on that account *ἐστίν* itself being equivalent to "signifies;" but the two expressions are only convertible because in Paul's sense the application he gives to the Scripture statement is really its deeper, inner meaning. Comp. Gal. iv. 23, 24, where the explanation of the same historical fact is introduced by the words *ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα.—οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς*] *not the children of the flesh. σαρκὸς is genit. causæ.* Ishmael represents the children born in the way of nature, *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα*, who could only boast of natural descent from Abraham.

—*ταῦτα*] *these*, comp. ver. 6.

—*τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ*] *are children of God.* Those previously called *τέκνα Ἀβραάμ* are here described as *τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ*; for Abraham being father of *the faithful*, ch. iv., his children are children of *God*, viii. 14-16. Isaac himself figures here less as a child of God than as a representative merely of God's children. The apostle, indeed, did not question his being God's child, but he viewed this as the result not so much of the fact that his natural birth took place *κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν*, as of the twofold fact that by this manner of birth he was marked out as the future depositary of the Abrahamic promises, and that God renewed with him the covenant made with Abraham, Gen. xxvi. 1-6.

Inasmuch as he was born physically, which is here emphasized, *κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν*, he is merely a *type* of those who are begotten spiritually through *ἐπαγγελία*, i.e. of the genuine children of God.

—*ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*] *but the children of the promise.* τῆς ἐπαγγελίας answers to τῆς σαρκός, *genit. causae*. Comp. Gal. iv. 23 : ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας (*sc. γεγέννηται*). Rightly, Chrysostom : οὐ γὰρ ἡ δύναμις τῆς υἡδύος, ἀλλὰ ἡ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἰσχὺς ἐτέκετο παιδιον. As Isaac was born, not through Abraham's generative power, iv. 19 ff., but through the power of the divine promise, so agreeably to this in the antitype the τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας are those objectively destined to be children through the divine ἐπαγγελία, and at the same time born to spiritual life. For the *εὐαγγέλιον*, the source of the state of sonship and inheritance, has a faith-generating force, awakening subjectively the spirit of a child of God, and actually making such. The τέκνον τῆς ἐπαγγελίας is thus withal one κατὰ πνεῦμα γεννηθέν, Gal. iv. 29. In the present passage, in accordance with the train of thought, the objective conception of God's children predominates, as in the Galatian passage (Gal. iv. 21–31, especially ver. 28) the subjective. The τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας consequently are not the children *promised* to Abraham, nor yet the children to whom a promise is given, but those made children by promise.

—*λογίζεται*] *are reckoned*, namely, by God, iv. 3, 5. They are not children by nature, but are accounted children, because the promise describing them as such was made to them. They are θέσει οὐ φύσει τέκνα.

—*εἰς σπέρμα*] *as seed*, i.e. as genuine seed in the spiritual sense of the word. Paul says here σπέρμα, not τέκνα, in allusion to the same expression in the biblical passage, ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα, ver. 8, explained in the present verse. But the explanation here given, as spirited as it is spiritual, of the Mosaic γράμμα, justly lays claim to objective truth, because, as matter of fact, even the *historical* language of the O. T. is spirit and life, and has its τέλος in Christ. At the same time it has evidential force even for opponents, because these conceded the correctness of the Midrashistic interpretation by their own use of it, and were thus smitten with their own weapons.

Ver. 9. The Scripture passage quoted, ver. 7, merely affirmed that Isaac was to be reckoned the true seed. The warrant for

applying the passage to the children of the promise was based on the fact that Isaac himself was a child of promise. This the apostle expressly supports in the present verse by a further Scripture passage. *ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος*] *for this word appertains to the promise, i.e. for this word is a word of promise.* There is therefore no need to *ἐπαγγελίας* to supply *λόγος* taken from *ὁ λόγος*, just as little as in 1 Cor xiv. 33: *οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' εἰρήνης* to the genitive is a *θεός* to be expressly added in thought. But we must not render: *for the word of the promise was this.* First of all, this must have run: *ὁ γὰρ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λόγος οὗτος ἦν*; and again here the point was not so much to specify the *contents* of the word of promise, as to declare that the word in question was a *word of promise.* Hence the emphatic precedence of *ἐπαγγελίας.* The *λόγος* quoted is taken from Gen. xviii. 10 (xvii. 19, 21) in a form differing from the LXX. and adapted to his purpose, *i.e.* an abbreviated form made by a combination of LXX. Gen. xviii. 10 and xviii. 14. The first passage runs: *ἐπαναστρέφω ἥξω πρὸς σέ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔξει υἱὸν Σάρρα ἡ γυνή σου*; the second: *εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σέ εἰς ὥρας, καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σάρρα υἱός.*

—*κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον*] Heb. *הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה*, either = “about the living, *i.e.* the present time,” namely, when it returns again, or = *ubi tempus (fuerit) reviviscens d. i. anno proximo*, so that *הַיּוֹם* is taken in the sense of “to live again,” Gesenius *s.v.*, Delitzsch and Keil here, also 2 Kings iv. 16, 17; Gen. xvii. 21. Whichever mode of resolving the phrase we adopt, the meaning comes to the same. Expositors compare Homer, *Odys.* xi. 248 f.: *περιπλομένον δ' ἐνιαυτοῦ τέξεις ἀγλαὰ τέκνα.*

Vv. 10-13. That God does not limit His election by claims of birth, appears still more clearly in the instance of the sons of Isaac than in those of Abraham. With respect to the opposite fates of Isaac and Ishmael, it might be rejoined that the latter was born of the bondmaid, the concubine Hagar; the former, of the free woman, the legal wife, Sarah, and that this merely external, physical relation possibly determined God in His choice. But it was otherwise with the sons of Isaac, Jacob and Esau. They were twins, born in lawful wedlock of the same mother. Nay, Esau was even the elder, and yet God promised to Jacob the right of the first-born and the inheritance which He refused

to Esau. And, indeed, this took place before their birth, before the children had done good or evil, so that any objection of opponents to the effect that Ishmael was rejected on account of his evil works, because he had shown himself a mocker, is cut short and repelled. But the denial of the influence of *works* upon the divine determination does not arise here as an entirely new element of thought, seeing that already in the τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ver. 8, the reference is not merely to natural descent, but—in consonance with the more comprehensive notion of the word σάρξ in Paul, iv. 1—at the same time to circumcision, works, and such like ; in short, to the entire sphere of sensuous, visible profession upon which man might possibly found a claim of right in the presence of God.

Ver. 10. One would have expected that to Abraham, with his two sons from two wives unequal in position, Isaac, with his two sons from the one lawful wife, would have been opposed. But the place of Isaac is taken by Rebecca. As matter of fact, this exchange makes no difference in substance ; for, whether a wife has sons from one husband, or a husband from one wife, there is no difference between the children as to their legitimate origin, and the right of inheritance resting upon it. But the apostle here mentions Rebecca instead of Isaac, because the divine declaration to be quoted, ver. 12, was made to the mother, not to the father. The narrower conception of *promise*, ver. 9, now merges in the more general and absolute one of the *determination* of the divine will. οὐ μόνον δέ] “ Id est : mirum est, quod dixi ; quod sequitur, magis etiam mirandum est,” Bengel. We are not, with Winer, p. 729, and several modern expositors, to supply ἡ Σάρρα λόγον ἐπαγγελίας εἶχεν or ἐπηγγελμένη ἦν ; for the ἐπαγγελία spoken of ver. 9 was given not to Sarah, but to Abraham, and, moreover, the supplement to be added in thought to οὐ μόνον δέ must be actually included in what precedes, v. 3, 11, viii. 23 ; 2 Cor. viii. 10, also vii. 7. Besides, the saying of God, quoted ver. 12, was really for Rebecca no word of *promise*, inasmuch as to her, as mother, it would have been more grateful if the elder had retained his natural superiority over the younger. We must consequently rest satisfied with supplying τοῦτο ἦν. But not only did this take place, namely, that of the two sons of Abraham only the son of promise was accounted the true seed. This, indeed, was specially referred to in what pre-

cedes, not merely this in general, that to some one a promise was given.

—ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα] *but also Rebecca*. An energetic breviloquence. Rebecca is, as it were, placed before the reader's eyes, because the view of her life, as of one ἐξ ἐνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα, of itself suggests the thought of the free, divine determination making itself known in her history, and bound to no natural claim. If we would supply a predicate, we must append a δείκνυσι τοῦτο, or συμμαρτυρεῖ ἡμῖν, or παράδειγμα ἡμῖν παρέχει, although the apostle, in the vivacity of his conceptions, added nothing definite of the kind, and such a supplement, therefore, belongs rather to logic than grammar. Bengel comes nearest the point when he proposes to supply a simple ἐστίν, i.e. *hoc loco occurrit*. But Ῥεβέκκα is perhaps best taken directly as *nominativus absolutus* (Winer, p. 226), like an *ecce*, Rebecca. We must not then suppose an anacoluthon, so that the apostle in ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ, ver. 12, would continue with an altered construction (Luther: Rebecca being with child, it was said to her), comp. Acts vii. 40; for both the confirmatory γάρ, ver. 11, and the entire construction of the sentence, vv. 11, 12, show that ver. 10 contains an independent, self-contained proposition. But no doubt the thought, merely suggested and hinted by the bare mention of the name of Rebecca, is more minutely developed in ver. 11.

—ἐξ ἐνός] *from one*, namely, as the subjoined apposition says, from Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. That ἐξ ἐνός is not to be directly connected with Ἰσαὰκ, is shown by the κοίτην ἔχουσα inserted between. The same mother had seed from the same father, and yet the divine determination concerning the seed was dissimilar. But the mother being the same did not need to be specially emphasized, as it was here evident of itself.

—κοίτην ἔχουσα] *concubitum habens*. κοίτη, *bed*, then, like εὐνή and λέχος, euphemistically for *cohabitation*, Luke xi. 7; Heb. xiii. 4; Rom. xiii. 13; Wisd. iii. 13, 16. Whether the LXX. ever took κοίτη in the sense of *effusio (seminis)*, after the remarks of Fritzsche on the present passage (tom. II. p. 291, note), must at least be deemed doubtful. At all events, in classical as well as in N. T. idiom, it denotes nothing but *cubile, lectus, concubitus*. The phrase κοίτην ἔχειν ἐκ τινος cannot, indeed, be shown to exist elsewhere; but we can easily suppose a *metonym. causae*

*pro effectu*, so that *concupitum* would be used in the sense of *sobolem habere ex aliquo*. The reason of the expression *κοίτη* being chosen instead of *τέκνα* or *σπέρμα* seems to be this, that *concupitus*, as a single act, points to the fact that the *two* offspring, the result of this *one* act, were *twain* brothers, whereas, described as *τέκνα* or *σπέρμα*, they might just as well have been begotten in succession. So Theodoret: *ἐνταῦθα γὰρ καὶ μία μήτηρ καὶ εἰς πατήρ καὶ μία σύλληψις· δίδυμοι γὰρ οἱ παῖδες· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν, ἐξ ἑνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα, ἀντὶ τοῦ, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν ἀμφοτέρους συνέλαβεν.*

—[*Ἰσαάκ*] Apposition to *ἐνός*.

—[*τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*] Not to be referred to Christians, for Abraham, not Isaac, is called the father of believers. Besides, we cannot say that they, just as much as he is, are *τέκνα ἐπαγγελίας*, for as a natural *τέκνον ἐπαγγελίας* Isaac is merely a type, not the father, of the spiritual *τέκνα ἐπαγγελίας*. The description, therefore, is a national one, valid merely for Jews and Jewish Christians. The reason why it is chosen is because the design is to prove historically that even natural descent from Isaac, such as Paul's Jewish opponents were able, without exception, to boast of, exercises no influence upon the divine determination and election of grace. Naturally they were Jacob's children, but spiritually Esau's.

Ver. 11. *μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, μηδὲ πράξαντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν*] *for whilst they were not yet born, nor had done anything good or evil.* On this the apostle founds the proof that therefore a *πρόθεσις κατ' ἐκλογὴν, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων* took place. To this it might, indeed, be objected that *future* works were present to the divine prescience, and therefore *prædestinatio propter opera prævisa* may still have taken place. But in the O. T. historical narrative the declaration certainly stands in the simple form of an absolute divine ordination, and no vestige appears there of an intimation pointing to future merit in those concerned. The apostle thus had good reason for concluding that if the works of the twin brothers had decided their destiny, that destiny would have been fixed, as commonly elsewhere, Gen. iii. 14 ff., during the course of their life, according to the good or evil deeds done by them, not by divine declaration before their birth. The subjective negation *μή* denies, not the fact, but the supposition of the fact, and refers not "*ad cogitationem ipsam Dei,*" but to the

*human* supposition = "without their having been (as one might suppose) yet born, and . . . done." οὐπω γεννηθέντων κτλ. would be = "when they *were* not yet born, and *had* not done . . ." The negation of the *conception* of work-merit acquired during their life is stronger than the bare negation of the fact, Hermann, *ad Soph. Antig.* V. 691. γενᾶν, properly *gignere*, but also, as here, comp. John xvi. 21, for *parere*. Just so, on the contrary, τίκτειν, properly *parere*, is used in the sense of *generare*, Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* I. 16, p. 30. γεννηθέντων, namely, αὐτῶν; for that the twin sons of Rebecca are meant the reader could not but understand as matter of course, not merely from the well-known account in Genesis, but also from the context in this passage, vv. 10, 12, 13. Respecting the omission of the subject with the genitive of the participle, comp. Matthiæ, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 1110 f.; Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 368; Winer, p. 736. Comp. ἐγεννήθησαν, sc. τέκνα, Heb. xi. 12; also Luke xii. 36, xvi. 4. The reading φαῦλον (like κακόν, πονηρόν = *turpe, base*) instead of κακόν, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf in Cod. A B, also Cod. Sinait. and Origen, certainly has weighty authorities in its favour. As the rarer word (in Paul it is found only again Tit. ii. 8, comp. John iii. 20, v. 29; Jas. iii. 16), it may easily have been the original one here and in 2 Cor. v. 10, so that transcribers for φαῦλον perhaps substituted κακόν as the more common antithesis to ἀγαθόν, iii. 8, vii. 19, 21, xii. 21, xiii. 3, 4, xvi. 19.

—[ἵνα] *in order that*, specifies the end for which the divine determination was declared before their birth, etc., ver. 12. As this sentence, expressive of purpose, contains a proposition of special significance for the train of reasoning, the marks of parenthesis before ἵνα and after καλοῦντος must be expunged. Just as significantly, the sentence expressive of purpose is made to precede the governing verb, Matt. xvii. 27; John xix. 28, 31; Acts xxiv. 4; Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* II. p. 626.

—[ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ] So it is to be read, according to quite preponderant authority, instead of the *lect. rec.* τοῦ θεοῦ πρόθεσις, so that the supposition of the genitive having been placed after the word πρόθεσις, to prevent its being wrongly connected with ἐκλογὴν, is apparently without sufficient ground. As to πρόθεσις, *propositum, consilium, purpose*, see on viii. 28. ἐκλογή, comp. Acts ix. 15, Rom. xi. 5, 7, 28,



1 Thess. i. 4, 2 Pet. i. 10, from ἐκλέγεσθαι, Luke vi. 13, John vi. 70, Acts vi. 5, xv. 22, etc., whence also ἐκλεκτός, Mark xiii. 20, is *electio, delectus, election*. The word is, no doubt, always used of election to *salvation*; but because ἐκλογή invariably appears as a manifestation of divine love, it does not therefore mean “gratuita misericordia, benevolentia, praecepius amor,” just as little as it does “vis eligendi, libertas,” although, doubtless, the election of itself is *free*. The apostle might have written: ἡ κατὰ πρόθεσιν ἐκλογή. But we are not on this account to regard the converse form of expression which he has chosen as ὕστερον πρότερον; but ἡ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις is either: “the determination occurring in consequence of an election,” namely, to vouchsafe the gift of σωτηρία, Winer, p. 241, so that the election is conceived as preceding the saving purpose, or: “the purpose made according to election,” namely, to save, so that the purpose is conceived as so made that in it an election takes place, and the phrase as regards meaning is not essentially different from the adjectival designation, “ἡ ἐκλεκτικὴ πρόθεσις, electivum Dei propositum,” Bengel. The latter mode of exposition is preferable, because the election *preceding* the saving purpose cannot be conceived as an abstract and indefinite one, but only as an ἐκλογή εἰς σωτηρίαν, and it seems superfluous, then, for the πρόθεσις to be added for the purpose of actually imparting the σωτηρία to the elected. But the purpose is described as made according to election, or determined by election, linked to election in opposition to an indiscriminate, universal saving decree referring to the whole human race, or to a definite class of men forming a distinct, absolute totality, as *e.g.* all the descendants of Abraham. With the paraphrase κατὰ ἐκλογὴν, comp. Heb. xi. 7: ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη; Rom. xi. 21: οἱ κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι, also 1 Tim. vi. 3; Tit. i. 9. But the paraphrase, by means of the preposition with the substantive instead of the adjective, makes the idea of election, upon which here special stress is laid, stand out with greater prominence. Just as little, then, as ἡ κατ’ ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις is to be so interpreted that the ἐκλογή is conceived as *preceding* the πρόθεσις, does it signify, on the other hand, *propositum Dei ad electionem spectans*, *i.e.* “the purpose having election *for its result*.” For, first of all, this would be more distinctly put: ἡ τῆς ἐκλογῆς πρόθεσις, and again the πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ refers

elsewhere not to ἐκλογή, but always to the σωτηρία to be imparted through Christ, 2 Tim. i. 9 ; Rom. viii. 28 ; Eph. iii. 11. Finally, the sentence expressing purpose before us *interprets* the *allegoroumenon* lying in the determination of the destiny of the twin brothers before their birth, so that the ἵνα answers to the τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ver. 8. But what is treated of is not merely the divine πρόθεσις in reference to the theocratic birthright of Jacob, but the free choice of divine grace to *eternal salvation* which was prefigured by the election of Jacob. Still, in any case, the reader would need, in unison with the whole strain of the exposition before us, to apply the Jacobitish type to the partakers in the Messianic salvation, and to draw out the precise parallel between the two.

—μένῃ] *may remain, abide firm.* Comp. מָנַח, Ps. xxxiii. 11. The opposite of μένειν is ἐκπίπτειν, ver. 6. Not on its own account, but only for the consciousness of men, did the validity of the divine decree need to be established. μένη is thus to be taken *rhetorically* (comp. iii. 4, also vii. 13) = "may prove itself valid." The present μένη, not the aorist μεῖνη, supplies *grammatical* proof that an abiding condition is here spoken of, not one that occurred but once. "Ut propositum Dei in praesenti maneret," translates Pelagius.

—οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος] Luther: "it was said to him, not from the merit of works, but from the grace of the caller, thus." He therefore erroneously attaches οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων κτλ. to the following ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ. It is rather to be connected with what precedes. If, then, we suppose it joined with πρόθεσις, we should have expected ἢ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων κτλ. If we suppose a *hyperbaton* for ἵνα ἢ κατ' ἐκλογήν, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος πρόθεσις τ. θ. μένη, so that οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος would be a more exact definition and illustration of the phrase κατ' ἐκλογήν, this appears somewhat harsh, and the supplement thereto, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλ., somewhat halting and superfluous. If, finally, we connect it with μεῖνη = "that it may abide firm, not from works," etc., the phrase μένει τι ἔκ τινος cannot be found in this sense. On this account the words in question are best taken as a supplementary qualification of the entire telic sentence: "that the purpose made according to election may have its continuance, not by virtue of works, but by virtue of him that calleth" = "and, indeed, this was to take place not

by virtue," etc. Thus the negation, instead of depending directly on *ὅτι*, may rather be closely joined with *ἐξ ἔργων*, so that *μή* was not absolutely requisite. But substantially *οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων* forms the antithesis to *κατ' ἐκλογὴν*, to which *ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος* corresponds. The saving purpose of God depends not on works, but on the choice or the will of the caller. With *ἐξ ἔργων*, comp. iii. 20, iv. 2, with *ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος*, 2 Cor. v. 18.

Before proceeding to the exposition of the next verse, let us distinctly recall the connection of thought in the preceding discussion, in order that we may see what amount of authority the doctrine of absolute predestination, which seems to find a strong point of support in this verse, is able really and truly to derive from the declaration before us. It behoves us, above all, to keep clearly in view the opposition with which the apostle has to do. The fact of the exclusion of Israel from the Messianic salvation seems to be in conflict with the divine promise, according to which the whole of Israel was to be the people chosen and destined to enjoy the Messianic salvation. The apostle was therefore compelled to examine more narrowly into the true sense of this divine promise, and to the carnal interpretation of the promise to oppose the genuine, spiritual explanation. For this purpose he goes back most pertinently to the beginnings of Israel's national history, where he sees wrapped up the divinely fixed order of the nation's development and destiny, as the plant in the germ, and its subsequent fate prefigured. Were God, as the arrogance of the Jews maintained, limited in the bestowal of salvation to natural descent, circumcision, merit of works, and similar external titles, this must needs have shown itself in the case of the first descendants of Abraham and Isaac. But here precisely the opposite is found. Without regard to birthright or merit of works, Isaac is preferred to Ishmael, Jacob to Esau,—a most striking proof that the divine determination is not bound to such external reasons. God's purpose of salvation, clearly and distinctly foreshadowed in the primeval history of Israel, is carried into effect not in accordance with the rule of legal claims, based on meritorious works and like carnal grounds, but in accordance with a free election whose only ground is the will of him that calleth. There enters into this in no respect man's personal worth or the superiority of his external circumstances, but simply the free, inner self-determination of God. There takes place a

πρόθεσις κατ' ἐκλογὴν *which is οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος*. But then it by no means follows from this, that this free, inner self-determination as to itself is a mere arbitrary caprice. It may very well have bound itself to a definite rule, which in that case may be presumed to be grounded in the divine wisdom, righteousness, and love. Only, the divine self-limitation is God's own act, which does not interfere with the freedom of His power, but only really completes that freedom in guarding and distinguishing it from the impotence of caprice.

Whether now the divine freedom as matter of fact is influenced by such immanent, regulating laws of the divine wisdom, righteousness, and love, is certainly not directly stated in the present verse, and so far the theory of arbitrary predestination may attach itself with some shadow of justification to the declaration in this verse; but at the same time the opposite is not said, and so far all that can be affirmed is, that the predestinarian interpretation is possible, but not by any means that it is necessary. Nay, this interpretation may for many reasons be described as *prima facie* exceedingly improbable. For, in the first place, the ἐκλογὴ expressly stands in opposition to ἔργα. Therefore it does not stand in opposition to πίστις. It is not, indeed, directly affirmed here that God limited His power of free determination and election to this, that He purposed to conduct to eternal life all those who, not trusting in their own works of merit, are willing to receive salvation by faith in the merit of Jesus Christ; but still by what the apostle does say, the possibility of the law of the divine self-limitation being actually of the kind here indicated, is by no means precluded. Whether in reality this is so or not, this was not the place to discuss. But certainly οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων would naturally suggest to the readers of the epistle, especially after the exposition in ch. iii. and iv., the inference, "therefore διὰ πίστεως," and, indeed, "εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας," iii. 22, so that by the divine *electio*, merely *opera*, not *fides practica*, would be excluded. Still one must guard himself against discovering this notion itself expressed in the present passage, and be satisfied with having repelled the idea of the predestinarian interpretation being necessary, and with having proved that the doctrine of universal grace may very well be reconciled with the import of this verse. Even to give formal expression to and maintain the genuine doctrine of universalism was not

here called for, where the business in hand is to withstand a carnal universalism, and for this purpose to dwell on the divine power of self-determination in its exclusive right. Hence the apostle in the first place sets this divine right in contrast with man's right, without defining more exactly the rules by which the former proceeds. But that behind the semblance of unconditional predestination as truth and reality, the divine, conditional universalism spoken of may lie concealed, may further be inferred *a priori* from the fact that all those types in nature and human life that reflect the right of a free divine predetermination do at the same time make evident the law of a divine self-limitation. The caprice, for example, apparent in the sphere of inanimate creation, in the fact that *one* tree or flower is more richly coloured and adorned than another, is done away by the consideration that no sense of deficiency, no sense of its own disparagement and another's preference, exists in unconscious nature, and that everything in its order is essential to the perfect harmony and beauty of the cosmos. But in the circle of human life, the richer endowment, the higher position in life, etc., of one above another finds its compensation in the fact that every one has received his gifts for the benefit of his brethren. Thus in the endowments of the individual the whole race is endowed, on which account the unenvying love that rejoices in another's gifts as its own is not merely a duty, but reasonable and right. A further set-off is found in this, that with higher position and endowments is associated higher responsibility; and finally, that to peculiar privileges and joys peculiar trials, necessities, and sufferings are annexed, so that even here upon earth the law of an equally distributive divine righteousness, although concealed in many ways, may be said to be actually existent and at work. But even in the sacred history to which the apostle specially refers, such compensating elements are not wanting. Even Ishmael is not left without promise, Gen. xvi. 10, xvii. 20, and is preserved by divine providence, xxi. 17 ff. Esau also receives his blessing, Gen. xxvii. 39 f., while the life of Isaac and Jacob is fertile in peculiar trials and sorrows. And the posterity of Ishmael and Esau are finally, in admission into the Messianic kingdom, in accordance with the universal prophetic promises, to obtain a share in the loftiest prerogative of the chosen people. If, then, even the posterity of the supplanted brethren are not excluded from the highest bless-

ing of salvation, still less will this be the case in virtue of arbitrary divine caprice with the posterity of the privileged brethren, the people of Israel. Thus the doctrine of absolute predestination has merely a possible and apparent, not a necessary and actual footing in the present verse. And, considering the tenor of the entire preceding exposition in this epistle, as well as the analogy of God's dealings in other matters, and the laws governing the world's condition and man's destiny, it cannot but appear from the first improbable in the highest degree.

Vv. 12, 13. ἐρρήθη αὐτῇ] On the form ἐρρήθη, comp. Winer, p. 103. Lachmann and Tischendorf, in the present passage, have restored, on inadequate authority, the non-Attic (or at least rare in Attic, Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 447) form ἐρρέθη. The latter is established in Matt. v. 21, 31, 33, and also Gal. iii. 16; comp. however, Meyer there.<sup>1</sup> The quotation is borrowed from Gen. xxv. 23.

—ὅτι ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι] LXX.: καὶ ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι. As regards the relative ὅτι, comp. on iii. 10. When in the original passage it is said: δύο ἔθνη ἐν τῇ γαστρὶ σου εἰσὶ καὶ δύο λαοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου διασταλίσονται, καὶ λαὸς λαοῦ ὑπερέξει καὶ ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι, there can be no doubt that this refers to the descendants of Esau and Jacob. The prediction received its fulfilment first of all under David, who, according to 2 Sam. viii. 14, reduced all Edom to subjection, after Saul, according to 1 Sam. xiv. 47, had waged successful war against the Edomites. No doubt, according to 2 Kings viii. 20–22, under Joram they fell away again from Judah, but Amaziah slew ten thousand of the children of Seir in the valley of salt, 2 Kings xiv. 7, 2 Chron. xxv. 11; and under him and Uzziah, 2 Kings xiv. 22, 2 Chron. xxvi. 2, they were subjugated a second time. Under Ahaz, 2 Chron. xxviii. 17, they anew recovered their freedom (comp. however, 2 Kings xvi. 6, where all that is said is that they wrested the port of Elath from the Jews), and maintained their independence until, according to Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 9. 1, xv. 7. 9, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 5. 5, they were utterly vanquished by John Hyrcanus, forced to receive circum-

<sup>1</sup> In his later editions, however, Meyer pronounces for the form ἱρρίθη, which Cod. Sinait. also supplies, even as now on Matt. v. 21 he prefers the form ἱρρίθη in all passages of the N. T. as the more usual one in later Greek. It seems to us, on diplomatic grounds, that an interchange of forms, such as is found in Plato, should be admitted in the N. T.

cision, and incorporated with the Jewish state. The apostle then applies the passage cited from Genesis (comp. vv. 10, 11, 13) not to the posterity, but to the ancestors Esau and Jacob themselves (hence ὁ μείζων, ὁ ἐλάσσων = *major et minor natu*, properly a description of the *rank* conferred by priority of birth). And no doubt even the original passage contemplates the posterity as represented in their ancestors, on which account the latter are themselves described as two nations contained in the womb of Rebecca (Heb. vii. 10). And although Esau was not subject to Jacob in his own person, still this relation, which developed itself subsequently, was implied and seminally included in the loss of his birthright, of his father's blessing, and the theocratic inheritance. Comp. Gen. xxvii. 29, LXX.: γίνου κύριος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

—καθὼς γέγραπται] *in accordance with what is written*, namely in Mal. i. 2, 3. Jacob's lordship and Esau's subjection were thus the counterpart of the divine love to one and the divine hatred of the other.

—τὸν Ἰακώβ ἡγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα] LXX.: καὶ ἡγάπησα τὸν Ἰακώβ, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα. With the prophet as with the apostle, Jacob and Esau denote the individuals, since, from the divine love and abhorrence of their ancestors, Malachi deduces the fate of the posterity in both lines. Jacob's participation in the theocratic right of the first-born, and Esau's exclusion therefrom, manifestly, according to Paul's teaching, merely furnish the type in which is expressed the law of participation in eternal salvation and devotion to eternal condemnation. We are not, then, to seek here an utterance respecting the future lot of these two individuals themselves. Comp. similar types, Gal. iv. 24 ff.; 1 Cor. x. 1 ff. "Sermo non est de utriusque fratris statu spirituali: sed externus status Jacobi et Esavi, perinde ut Isaaci nativitas corporalis v. 9, est typus rerum spiritualium. Non omnes Israelitae salvati: nec omnes Edomitae damnati," Bengel. Comp. Amos ix. 11, 12. μισεῖν is not to be taken in a privative sense, "to put after, love less," but means "to hate," in opposition to the positive ἀγαπᾶν. But the expression, like that of the divine repentance, is anthropopathic. It refers not so much to the emotion as to the effect. God's free election and rejection, fettered by no natural conditions originating with man, is described as love and hate, because with us such conduct is usually

based upon the affection of arbitrary love and hate, and issues from it. ἀγαπᾶν and μισεῖν are consequently well explained by Calvin by *assumere* and *repellere*. Similar is the use of μισεῖν, Gen. xxix. 30, 31; Deut. xxi. 15 ff.; Prov. xiii. 24; Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13; Matt. x. 37; comp. with Luke xiv. 26; John xii. 25, Hengstenberg there. "To hate father and mother and his own soul," means not to love them less than the Lord, but in case of collision utterly to reject them, or to act towards them as if one hated them, in which case love to them may exist to a high degree, although, of course, less than to the Lord. In harmony with this in Mal. i. 3, 4, μισεῖν is put in parallelism with τᾶπτεν τὰ ὄρια εἰς ἀφανισμόν and καταστρέφειν. Thus the thought of the apostle is this, that God, because He chose Jacob and rejected Esau, assigned lordship to the one, subjection to the other. The aorists ἡγάπησα, ἐμίσησα, in Paul's sense, refer to the period when the twin-brothers were born.

Vv. 14-18. If God pays no regard to any human claim of any kind, but with perfect freedom elects men to life and death, He is liable apparently to the reproach of unrighteousness. This plausible difficulty and blasphemous reproach the apostle resolves after his own fashion, iii. 3 ff., not by dogmatic reasoning, but in such a way as to silence the opponent by an authority which the opponent himself admits. If God, in the O. T. covenant Scriptures, assumes to Himself the right to favour and to harden whom He wills, He must possess the right, and therefore it can be no unrighteousness if He makes use of this right. "Satis habet scripturæ testimoniis impuros latratus compescere," Calvin.

Vv. 14, 15. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν] comp. iii. 5, vi. 1, vii. 7, viii. 31. The apostle anticipates his opponent, and himself proposes the objection or the God-opposing inference which might be deduced from the purport of the exposition contained in vv. 6-13, and especially from vv. 11-13. μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ;] comp. on μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεός, iii. 5. Here also we are not to render: *There is surely not unrighteousness with God?* so that a negative answer must follow, but: *Is there not unrighteousness with God?* since certainly this consequence, which is first negatived by the subjoined μὴ γένοιτο, seems to follow from what precedes. By the substantive ἀδικία (μὴ ἀδικία παρ. τ. θ. for μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεός), the principal idea on which the chief stress is here laid is made specially prominent.



παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, comp. ii. 11. A quality is *with* him (*peneſ cum*) that possesses it. As regards this *παρά* with the dative in the case of qualities, answering to the Latin *in*, comp. Matthiä, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 1172; Winer, p. 492. So Demosth. *de Cor.* p. 318, 13: εἰ δ' οὖν ἐστὶ καὶ παρ' ἐμοί τις ἐμπειρία τοιαύτη, si quid est in me ingenii. But the assumed unrighteousness of God consists in His free election without respect to human claims; for righteousness expresses itself in the act of rendering compensation, and takes *suum cuique* for its maxim.

—μὴ γένοιτο] comp. on iii. 4.

—τῷ γὰρ Μωϋσῇ λέγει] Confirmation (γάρ) of the repudiation expressed in *μὴ γένοιτο*. “Nam quod asserimus, Dei assertum est irrefragabile,” Bengel. Respecting the proper Coptic form Μωϋσῆς (instead of Μωσῆς), found in the best codices of the N. T., comp. Winer, p. 47.

—ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτερήσω ὃν ἂν οἰκτείρω] Ex. xxxiii. 19 literally after the LXX., comp. Keil there, also Kurtz, *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, II. p. 187. The Hebrew text has: *וְעַתָּה יְהוָה יִסְתַּחֲפֶה עָלַי וְעָלֵם עֵינָי וְעָלֵם עֵינָי*, i.e. ἐλεῶ ὃν ἐλεήσω καὶ οἰκτείρω ὃν οἰκτερήσω, *I am gracious to whom I will be gracious, or to whom I wish to be gracious*, etc. On the other hand, according to the rendering of the LXX.: *I will be gracious to whomsoever I am gracious*, etc. But the meaning is not essentially different. Respecting the distinction between ἐλεεῖν and οἰκτερεῖν, Tittmann, *de Synon. in N. T.* I. p. 69 sq. observes: “Denotant autem οἰκτερεῖν et οἰκτιρμός ipsam tantum misericordiam, s. sensum doloris ex malis aliorum, *to be merciful, mercy, sympathy*; sed ἔλεος, ἐλεεῖν, ipsum miseris succurrendi studium, *commiseration*. In his igitur plus, quam in illis cogitatur; est enim adjuncta notio beneficentiae s. auxilii, ad quod ferendum promptus est ὁ ἐλεῶν. Facilius misericordia movetur animus, sed τὸ ἔλεος rarius invenitur. Hinc etiam ἔλεος et ἐλεεῖν (ἐλεημοσύνη) de ipsis beneficiis in N. T. dicuntur, quae miseris contingunt, οἰκτιρμός nunquam.” Comp. Matt. vi. 1–3; Acts iii. 2, ix. 36. On this view ἔλεος would refer to the act, οἰκτιρμός to the feeling. But perhaps more may be said on grounds both of usage and etymology in favour of the usual distinction, according to which, on the contrary, οἰκτιρμός, οἰκτερεῖν is stronger than ἔλεος, ἐλεεῖν. On this view, ὁ ἔλεος, allied with ἵλαος, ἰλάομαι, ἰλάσκομαι, is mercy, sympathy in general; while

ὁ οἰκτιρμός, allied with οἷ and οἶκτος, is sympathy accompanied with lamentation over another's sufferings, and therefore a stronger degree of compassion. (The opposite of οἰκτιρμός is μακαρισμός.) But *stips, beneficium*, denotes ἐλεημοσύνη only in a secondary way, namely, because compassion makes itself known in almsgiving. We say ἐλεεῖν, οἰκτερεῖν τινός in the *intransitive* sense. On the contrary, in the *transitive* relation, verbs of feeling and affection take the object to which the feeling is directed, the object touched or aimed at by the feeling, in the accusative as the suffering object, Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 215 f. So here ἐλεεῖν, οἰκτερεῖν τινά. In the same way also φοβεῖσθαι, αἰσχύνεσθαι, ἄχθεσθαι, χαίρειν, ἐκπλήττεσθαι κτλ. Respecting the form οἰκτερήσω, instead of οἰκτερώ in degenerate Greek, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 741; Winer, p. 108. Respecting ὃν ἄν = *si quem, quicumque*, comp. Hermann, *ad Vig.* p. 819; *de Partic. ἄν*, II. 10, p. 113 sqq.; Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 293 f. Now, in the passage of Genesis, Moses prays the Lord: "Suffer me, I pray Thee, to see Thy glory." The Lord in part grants the request, and as the reason of this distinction adds the saying which Paul quotes in the present passage. Thus in the original passage the saying has a special reference to Moses, to whom God makes known that now certainly He is gracious to him. But as this is done in the form of a general declaration, there is ample authority for doing as Paul does here, namely, for ignoring the special application, and framing into a standing rule what took place in regard to Moses. Nay, in that passage God Himself traces back His particular dealings with Moses to the law of His general dealings with all men. This law consists in this, that His mercy is *unconditioned* by any human right or title, and is *conditioned* by nothing but His own unfettered will, which, of free choice and independent authority, decides to whom He will manifest mercy and grace. "This is the *sovereignty* of the divine compassionate will," Meyer. Now the grace vouchsafed to Moses consisted, no doubt, in a special manifestation, but this again forms the type of all manifestations of divine grace, and therefore of the mode in which the Messianic salvation is bestowed. Consequently, in the original passage, the general declaration finds its special application both to a definite subject and a definite object, but in spite of this it does not cease to retain its universal signification. The charge

of unrighteousness which Paul here repels is, no doubt, to all appearance rather aggravated than removed by the contents of the citation given. But this way of flinging back rather than answering an accusation is quite in harmony with the peculiar style of the apostle wherever he has to do with self-righteous opponents. The reply, as remarked, lies in the fact that the citation given is an affirmation of *Scripture*, the binding and convincing force of which was conceded even by the objector. The latter, therefore, could neither charge the Pauline inferences from the history of the children of Abraham and Isaac, with being an erroneous, subjective interpretation, because the Word of God itself confirmed them, nor yet object that those inferences justified the reflection of unrighteousness cast upon God, because what God affirms of Himself in Scripture must without doubt be in harmony with the idea of God, the Righteous One. Hence we are not, with Beck, here (comp. also Tholuck here) to accentuate ἐλεῖσω instead of the relative sentence ὃν ἂν ἐλεῖσω = "Mercy it is when I show mercy to any." No doubt we should thus obtain a more direct solution of the difficulty raised, but it agrees neither with the sense of the original passage nor with the apostle's style elsewhere, nor, above all, with ver. 18, where plainly the words ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ are a resumptive allusion to the purport of the present verse.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 16. ἄρα οὖν] *Accordingly then*, introduces the inference drawn from the saying of God just quoted. Comp. on v. 18.

—οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος] *sc. ἐστίν*. It (namely, τὸ ἐλεεῖσθαι, τὸ οἰκτείρεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, obtaining God's mercy) is not dependent on him that wills. See a similar supply of the subject from the context, iv. 16 : διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν; Winer,

<sup>1</sup> Bengel's observations on the whole question are well worthy of note: "Judæi putabant, se nullo modo abdicari posse a Deo; gentes nullo modo posse recipi. Ut igitur etiam homo probus adversus flagitatores morosos invidosque majore cum *σποταρίᾳ* agit (ut jus suum vel patroni tueatur, neque alieno tempore liberalitatis suae laudem prodant ac projiciant) quam revera sentit: sic Paulus contra Israelitas solo suo nomine meritisque fretos potestatem et jus Dei defendit: qua in re iis opportune phrasibus interdum utitur, quibus antehac in disciplina Pharisaica videtur assuetus fuisse. Hoc dicit: *Domino Deo nullus homo quicquam præscribere, neque quicquam ut debitum ab eo postulare et contumacius extorquere, neque ei ulla re interdicere aut rationem ab eo requirere potest, cur etiam aliis benignum se præbeat*. Itaque Paulus morosos et invidios interpellatores severiori responso abruptius compescit. Talis locus Luc. xix. 22 s. Nam nemini licet cum Deo quasi ex syngrapha agere, sin: etiam Deus cum homine severius agit. Conferatur parabola plane

p. 747: *εἶναι τινος* alicujus esse, penes aliquem esse ex aliquo pendere. The genitive expresses the relation of belonging to, or depending on, Acts i. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 21; Heb. v. 14; Winer, p. 231. So also *ἐαυτοῦ εἶναι*, to be his own master.

—*οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος*] *nor on him that runs.* *τρέχειν*, a frequent figure with the apostle (1 Cor. ix. 24, 26; Gal. ii. 2, v. 7; Phil. ii. 16; 2 Thess. iii. 1; also Heb. xii. 1), taken from the foot-race, strengthens the idea of *θέλειν*, and denotes earnest and active effort. The apostle denies that this is a meritorious ground of attaining salvation. When, on the other hand, 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff., he expressly urges to *τρέχειν* (comp. Phil. iii. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 7 f.), this summons is addressed to those who have already attained salvation, and who run in the strength of the grace they enjoy. Through *τρέχειν* they are to reach the *βραβεῖον* already freely bestowed on them through *πίστις*.

—*ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεούντος θεοῦ*] *but on God that has mercy, i.e. on the free will of the merciful God, a will limited by no willing and running of man, and by no claim based thereupon.* Respecting the form *ἐλεώντας*, from *ἐλεάω* (so here Cod. Sinait. also), received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, comp. Winer, p. 104. In addition to this place and ver. 18, it is found as a *var. lect.*, also Jude 22. But, as in ver. 18, *ἐλεεῖ* has quite preponderant attestation (only D\* F G read there *ἐλεᾷ*); in the present passage, also, *ἐλεούντος* may be regarded as the genuine reading.

Ver. 17. Confirmation (*γάρ*) of the purport of ver. 16, *e contrario*. That God's mercy or election to salvation is free, follows from the fact that He freely hardens or excludes from salvation, one conditioning the other. Whoever has unconditional power to destroy has also unconditional power to show favour. On the other hand, whoever is limited in his power to destroy, and bound

parallela Matt. xx. 13-15: *non injuriam facio tibi*, etc. Alia est igitur sententia verborum Pauli, qua satisfacit responsatoribus operariis: alia, mitior, latet in aenigmate verborum, pro fidelibus. Etiam in sacris Scripturis, praesertim ubi a thesi ventum est ad hypothesin, τὰ ἤθη (*mores*) non modo οἱ λόγοι (*rationes*) expendi debent. Et tamen commentarius nullus ita planus esse potest, quem facilius, quam Pauli textum, intelligat operarius." The point of view indicated in these words is also to be borne in mind in the subsequent exposition, especially as far as ver. 23. For the rest, the selection, as an example, of Moses, the representative of the law (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 13 ff.), is very striking. But what is said to *him* applies to all *operariis*. If the apostle was led to the selection of the example itself by this thought, certainly the phrase *laet in aenigmate verborum* would receive most ample justification.

to given rules and conditions, is also no longer free to save whom he wills, but, on the contrary, is bound to save all in whom those conditions do not meet.

—λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραώ] “*dicit, i.e. Deum sic dicentem ostendit,*” Bengel. The Scripture says to Pharaoh = God in the Scripture, etc.; comp. Gal. iii. 22 with Rom. xi. 32, also Gal. iii. 8. The Scripture being God’s word, what the Scripture says God Himself says. On τῷ Φαραώ, Bengel remarks: “*Pharaoni, qui Mosis tempore vixit.*” The example of Pharaoh was especially pertinent, because, as is evident, he had an incontestable right to the continued possession of the Israelitish people, and asserted his right in opposition to God, whence he may be regarded as a type of all who *ex syngrapha agunt*. The passage cited is taken from Ex. ix. 16, and, according to the rendering of the LXX., runs: καὶ ἔνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης, ἵνα ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν ἰσχύν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. Respecting the

—ὅτι] *recitativum*, which introduces the declaration, see on ver. 12.

—εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο] *for this very thing, i.e. for nothing else, stronger than the ἔνεκεν τούτου of the LXX.* Comp. xiii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 5; Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8.

—ἐξήγειρά σε] *I raised thee up*, Heb. הִנֵּחְתִּיךָ. The Hiphil of נָחַץ has just as well the meaning: *to make continue, preserve*, 1 Kings xv. 4, 2 Chron. ix. 8, Prov. xxix. 4 (hence the LXX. in the present passage διετηρήθης = *vivus servatus es*), as the meaning: *to set up, establish*, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, Ezra ii. 68, ix. 9; *to appoint, constitute*, 1 Kings xii. 32, 1 Chron. xv. 16; *to raise up, set up, cause to arise*, Neh. vi. 7, Dan. xi. 11, 13. Hence Paul in this passage ἐξήγειρά σε. In harmony, then, with the original text he chose the active instead of the passive form, and the meaning ἐξηγείρειν instead of διατηρεῖν, because in this way God stands forth more decisively as absolutely conditioning Pharaoh in all that he did and left undone. On this account we must not, appealing on altogether insufficient grounds to Jas. v. 15, explain ἐξήγειρά σε by a *vivum te servavi*. For, in the first place, ἐξηγείρειν has not this meaning; and again, in this case Paul would not purposely have exchanged διατηρεῖν for ἐξηγείρειν. Just as little may ἐξήγειρά σε be interpreted: *I excited thee to resistance*. So Augustine: “*excitavi te, ut contumacius resisteres.*” For, in the first place, while the synonymous נָחַץ is found in this

sense, וַיִּזְעַק is not, Job xli. 2, Deut. xxxii. 11; and again, while we say ἐγείρειν or ἐξεγείρειν τὰς ὀρέξεις, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, τὴν ὀργήν, τὸν θυμόν, or even τὸ πνεῦμα, LXX. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, Ezra i. 1, 2 Macc. xiii. 4, we do not say ἐξηγείρειν τινά, especially without specifying the person against whom we excite another, comp. ἐγείρειν τινά, ἐπὶ τινά, Matt. xxiv. 7, Mark xiii. 8, Luke xxi. 10, in the sense: *to incite one against another*. Also the interpretation: ἐξήγειρά σε, Ἰσθαι, *I appointed thee king*, is to be rejected as too restricted; for although in קִיְיָמְךָ, *I established or appointed thee*, the word *king* or *to be king* may, in case of need, be supplied as matter of course, still we cannot on this account take ἐξήγειρά σε, Ἰσθαι, *I raised thee up*, without qualification for κατέστησά σε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, or ἤγειρά σε εἰς βασιλέα, Acts xiii. 22. The only interpretation left, then, is: *I called thee into being, caused thee to arise, come forth, appear, i.e. I brought about thy entire historical appearance and position on this account, etc.*, Matt. xi. 11, xxiv. 11, 24; Mark xiii. 22; Luke i. 69, iii. 8, vii. 16; John vii. 52; also Acts xiii. according to the *rec.*; Ecclus. x. 4; 1 Macc. iii. 49. Theophylact is right in interpreting ἐξήγειρα by εἰς τὸ μέσον ἤγαγον.

—ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοί] *that I may show, exhibit, make appear in thee.* ἐνδείκνυμι = הִרְאֵה of the historical manifestation of the divine attributes, so χάριν, Eph. ii. 7; μακροθυμίαν, 1 Tim. i. 16; comp. ἐνδείξεις τῆς δικαιοσύνης, Rom. iii. 25. With ἐν σοί, comp. 1 Tim. i. 16.

—τὴν δυνάμιν μου] *my might*. Paul has purposely chosen this expression instead of the τὴν ἰσχύν μου of the LXX., because ἰσχύς rather denotes force in itself, strength, *robur*; δύναμις, rather its relation to external objects, might, *potentia*, synonymous with κράτος, ἐξουσία. Comp. Harless on Eph. i. 19. That by this power is meant not a power to save, but a power to destroy, which made itself known in the final and utter overthrow of Pharaoh, is assumed as well known from the history of the king. "δύναμιν, potentiam, qua mersus cum copiis est Pharaon," Bengel.

—καὶ ὅπως διαγγεληῖ] *and that may be proclaimed.* διαγγέλλειν *nuncios in omnes partes mittere, to proclaim thoroughly*, comp. Luke ix. 60, and διέρχεσθαι, Rom. v. 12.

—τὸ ὄνομά μου] *my name*. In the *name* of God His nature, as to itself concealed, is disclosed. The latter having made itself known in a rich variety of historical acts of revelation, הִרְאֵה נִסֵּי,

*ὄνομα κυρίου*, denotes God Himself, in so far as He is known by the testimony of His own acts, and, otherwise hidden and undescribable in His own essence, has become capable of being expressed and named in the language of men. Comp. Hengstenberg on Ps. xx. 1, xxiii. 3, xxix. 2. Here the *ὄνομα* is the name of Him who manifested Himself in such power and glory in the case of Pharaoh. Ever since, He has been called *παντοκράτωρ*, Rev. xv. 3, 4.

—*ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ*] *in all the earth*. Even Ex. xv. 14 ff. describes the impression made by the destruction of Pharaoh on the nations hostile to the people of God, comp. also Neh. ix. 10. The news of this mighty deed of God penetrated, chiefly by means of the Jewish diaspora, even as far as the Greeks and Romans, comp. the passages cited by Tholuck here. The Koran also makes frequent mention of it; and, finally, with the spread of Christianity it has been gradually proclaimed throughout the whole earth. *διαγγελῇ, nuntietur*. “Id fit hodiernum,” Bengel. Comp. also Matt. xxvi. 13. The import of the present verse seems certainly to corroborate the *supralapsarian conditus ad perniciem*. But it is evident, not merely from the history of Pharaoh, but also from the tenor of thought in the passage before us, that here the design is primarily and above all simply to place the supremacy of the divine power in more certain contrast with the arrogance of man, who fancies that he is able to mould God’s right and will in conformity with his own right and will. With this we may very well reconcile the supposition of a divine *voluntas consequens*, which, in eternal foresight of persistent rebellion against the revealed counsel of salvation, determined notwithstanding to summon into existence the individual who by his own guilt incurs destruction, and to make his scornful rejection of divine grace—a rejection occasioned, indeed, by the divine revelation, but still freely chosen—subserve the glorification of God’s punitive justice. In this way such an individual must needs, in the last resort, serve the purpose of accomplishing, although involuntarily, the divine plan and will, not his own ungodly, selfish will. Comp. also Josh. xi. 20. It need only be further observed that this universalistic solution must not be interpolated as a secondary thought in the present verse, as it is not contained in the verse singly and separately, but only to be gathered from the general tenor of the entire exposition, previous and subsequent, in this

epistle. It is sufficient to indicate how, even in the present verse, a possible point of connection for this solution is not precluded.

Ver. 18 draws out the result of vv. 15–17. ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ] *Accordingly, then, He has mercy on whom He wills.* An inference from ver. 15 analogous to the one contained in ver. 16. ὃν θέλει, sc. ἐλεεῖν, comp. John v. 21 : οὕτω καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ.

—ὃν δὲ θέλει, σκληρύνει] *but whom He wills, He hardens.* Inference from ver. 17. Seeing that we should have expected a κατακρίνειν, ἀποδοκιμάζειν, or ἀπολλύναι, as antithesis to ἐλεεῖν, and that in ver. 17 the subject is not so much the hardening as the utter overthrow of Pharaoh, several expositors, following in the wake of Carpzovius, have wished to explain σκληρύνειν by *duriter tractare, to treat harshly.* But even if this meaning is to be exceptionally admitted in LXX. Job xxxix. 16, where it is said by Strauss: ἀπεσκληρύνε τὰ τέκνα ἐαυτῆς, “it treats its young harshly,” comp. Lam. iv. 3,<sup>1</sup> at all events this is utterly untenable in the present passage. For, first of all, a stringent reason must exist for departing from the regular meaning; and, again, in every case in which the subject treated of is God’s action in relation to man, σκληρύνειν means “to make hard, harden, indurate.” In the history of Pharaoh especially the phrase had passed into a standing formula in this sense, LXX. Ex. iv. 21, vii. 3, x. 20, xi. 10, xiv. 4, 17, Heb. רָחַק or חָזַק. Here, manifestly, it was this which determined the apostle to the choice of this word. He could do this all the more readily, since, in point of fact, God’s judicial act of destruction adduced ver. 17, according to the well-known tenor of the history, was merely the result of God’s previous act of hardening; and when it was said, ver. 17, that God *raised* him up for the purpose of destroying him, as matter of course God must also have brought about the means and cause of his destruction, namely, his hardness. Moreover, even if the antithesis of ἐλεεῖν and σκληρύνειν is not quite exact in point of form, as to substance it is perfectly warranted. For, according to

<sup>1</sup> No doubt verbs in —ύνω, like those in ἰώ, signify *to make* into that which the root-word denotes. Still, just as βραδύνω occurs also in an intransitive sense = βραδύς εἰμι, so the same usage might obtain in reference to σκληρύνω = σκληρός εἰμι in the passage cited of the LXX. The subjoined object—accusative, σκληρύνω τινά—would then yield the meaning: “to be hard in respect to one,” i.e. “to treat one hardly.” For the rest, even in the passage from Job quoted by Strauss, it might be said, “who renders hard its young.” The LXX. would then have so understood the meaning of the original (חִשְׁחֵהוּ). Comp. Meyer here.



Pauline conceptions, the ἔλεος consists in the free bestowal of forgiveness and eternal life; the πίστις that receives the gift is connected therewith *eo ipso*, and here comes no more into account, because it is neither man's own act nor the meritorious ground of salvation; but exclusion from pardoning grace and salvation, on the other hand, is conditioned by man's hardness of heart. Where, therefore, the object is to emphasize the freedom of God's power to destroy, a freedom depending on no moral quality and claim of man naturally, God must also be described as hardening with perfect freedom. The divine ἔλεος consists in God's objective gift of ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν and ζωὴ αἰώνιος, not on the ground of πίστις, but on the ground of the αἷμα Χριστοῦ. On the other hand, the divine ὀργή consists in the withdrawal of this gift, or in the infliction of κατέκριμα and θάνατος, or of ὀλεθρος αἰώνιος, on the ground of the divinely-produced σκληροκαρδία. But from the ὃν θέλει σκληρύνει the ὃν θέλει κατακρίνει follows inevitably, whereas the converse inference would not have followed inevitably in like manner. Finally, the question τί ἔτι μέμφεται; ver. 19, has its logical sequence from what precedes only in case σκληρύνειν = "to harden, to indurate;" for only on the supposition that God Himself renders morally unsusceptible at pleasure does He seem to lose the right to find fault with those hardened, not if He merely punishes or favours at pleasure those guilty and without claim. Moreover, the fact of Scripture ascribing the hardening of Pharaoh not only to the divine act, but also to man's own act (Ex. viii. 15, 32, ix. 34, and again 1 Sam. vi. 6; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13, and Ps. xcv. 8), was certainly as well known to the apostle as it is at present. Nay, he himself adopts this two-fold line of teaching, ii. 5, Eph. iv. 18, and, in addition, Acts xix. 9; Heb. iii. 8, 13, 15, iv. 7. The reconciliation is to be found in this, that when man does not recognise in the leadings of his life and the revelation presented to him God's gracious will towards him, these then accomplish God's judicial will upon him, and not merely does the man harden himself amid them, but they, on their part, are ordained by God to prove the efficient medium of his hardening.<sup>1</sup> Comp. on i. 24. "Nam res omnes externae,"

<sup>1</sup> Such a means of reconciliation may also be found in the expressions κατίσχυσιν ἡ καρδία Φαραῶ, ἰσκληρύνθη, ἰβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ, Ex. vii. 13, 22, viii. 15, which lie between the expression ἰσκληρύνει κύριος τὴν καρδίαν Φαραῶ, x. 20, and ἰβάρυνι Φαραῶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, viii. 32.

says Calvin, "quæ excaecationem reproborum faciunt, illius (sc. Dei) iræ sunt instrumenta. Satan autem ipse, qui intus efficaciter agit, ita est ejus minister, ut non nisi ejus imperio agat." Comp. 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 with 1 Chron. xxi. 1. Now, in the present passage, the apostle, in conformity with his purpose, mentions only one side, namely, the divine operation, and carries on his argument, in order to humble proud opponents, without regard to its extreme consequences. At the same time, we cannot remember often enough that the opposition with which he has to do should be firmly kept in view, in order that the predestinarian interpretation of his words, which is certainly possible, may not, beyond all necessity or warrant, be thought absolutely necessary. His simple object hitherto has been to bring to the dust Jewish pride in race, circumcision, law, by means of that same word of God on which the Jew fancied he could base his own privilege of birth and inalienable claim, as well as the divine obligation towards him in return. In the face of such claims, it was important, above all things, to assert and verify God's right of choice and rejection, limited by nothing external, and therefore in this respect perfectly free. But in saying this it is by no means asserted that God's use of this right is governed by accidental caprice, that he plays with mercy and judgment according to arbitrary fancy and the despotic *car tel est mon plaisir*. On the contrary, as already observed, it is perfectly consistent with this to believe that this divine freedom carries within itself an immanent law and self-imposed limitation.<sup>1</sup> That this is actually the case is confirmed in general by the conception of God which pervades revelation, and because the doctrine of absolute predestination implies, in fact, a wanton destruction of the genuine *analogia fidei*. But the solution of the difficulty presented here is not merely supplied in the subsequent exposition from ix. 30 onward ("ὃν θέλει, *cujus vult*. Quem autem velit Deus misereri, quem indurare, id aliis locis docet Paulus," rightly says Bengel), but is already involved in the entire preceding argument of the epistle. If the subject illustrated in ch. i.-viii. has shown clearly

<sup>1</sup> "Aliud quippe est misericordiam Dei esse *liberam*, aliud eam esse *absolutam*. Illud excludit saltem *necessitatem obligationis*, et *meritorum* respectum, hoc autem omnem prorsus respectum excludit, adeoque *fidei* quoque intuitum removet. Libertas misericordiae nihil commercii habet cum *absoluta* misericordia Dei Calvinistica," Calov.

that, when all men were sinners and exposed to divine condemnation, and therefore no one could stand in God's presence on the ground of merit and legal claims, God opened a new way of salvation by atoning for the sins of mankind by the blood of Christ, and offering righteousness and life to all that believe therein, it would be, in fact, not merely to contradict himself, but also, like an unskilful marksman, far to overshoot the mark he is aiming at, if the apostle, instead of simply and repeatedly referring the work-righteous and litigious Jew to his want of merit and the necessity he was under of betaking himself in humble faith to the divine way of salvation, fancied that he ought to smite him down at a blow with the doctrine of an *absolutum decretum*. The fact that his language nevertheless apparently warrants this inference, or at least, torn from all connection with what precedes and follows, *may* bear this meaning, although by no means *necessarily*, is the consequence of the hostile attitude forced on him by his opponent. From this position he does not weakly shrink, but, instead, presents a bold front to the enemy. Here it was necessary to set right against right, and to bind the proud in the inextricable fetters of the divine all-comprehending authority, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ, καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ. There is a just and holy pride in refusing to come to an understanding with such carnal pride, and passing by its mistakes as unworthy of satisfactory reply, but instead, snaring it in its own trap. And Jewish Pharisaism was so snared, for its acknowledgment of Scripture authority took away from it the power to withstand the Pauline interpretation of Scripture here given. But for those readers who *willingly* accepted the Pauline thesis, the solution of the enigma followed, in fact, of itself. For whoever as a creature of God and a sinner ascribes to the Lord, as he ought, the right to save or condemn him at pleasure, is *eo ipso* received into the ranks of the favoured ones, and to him the inner law, hidden from the work-righteous disposition, by which God's elective freedom has bound itself, is at once revealed. The law is no other than this, that God will have mercy on the man who ascribes to him the right to have mercy on whom He wills, and to harden whom He wills; and that, conversely, God will harden the man (of whom Pharaoh, standing upon his own right, furnishes the type) who denies Him this right. Such an answer, refused by the apostle to perverse arrogance, would certainly have been given to the

humble inquirer. For the latter never dreams that he can demand salvation on the ground of merit because he is better than others, but only wonders why, whilst he himself is saved without merit, the same salvation should not be imparted to his brethren as to him, since he is no better than they. “Quorum autem Deus velit misereri,” says John Gerhard in the *explicatio* cap. ix. *epist. ad Rom. in loc. theol.* IV. p. 172, “quos velit indurare, apostolus hoc loco non determinat. Tota autem Scriptura ostendit, quod Deus in dilecto suo Filio velit misereri omnium credentium; et quod indurare velit eos, qui contumaciter ipsius verbo reluctantur, ut justitiam suam in illis declaret, quod ipsum etiam Pharaonis exemplo ostenditur.” Comp. also Calov, *Biblia N. T. illustrata*, Francof. ad Moen. 1676, II. p. 162, “de verbis indurat quos vult.” Calov remarks that when it is said that God hardens, this is not to be taken *ἐνεργητικῶς* or *effective*, but: “(1) *συγχωρητικῶς*, propter *permissionem*; (2) *ἀφορμητικῶς*, propter *occasionem*, quam ex iis, quae Deus agit, sumunt reprobi; (3) *ἐγκαταλειπτικῶς*, ob *desertionem*, quod gratia sua deserat reprobos; (4) *παραδοτικῶς*, ob traditionem in sensum reprobum et in ulteriorem Satanae potestatem.” Only, by such suppositions and qualifications the positive divine *ἐνέργεια* itself, which becomes operative in accordance with the *voluntas consequens* by means of the *verbum divinum*, is not absolutely precluded. Calov, too, denies this divine *ἐνέργεια* only in so far as it consists in *duritiem immittere vel augere*; whereas in the *δικαστικῶς*, which he also admits, and in the *παραδοτικῶς*, an element of *active operation* is involved. Comp. also *Form. Conc.* p. 821, which quite rightly regards the hardening of Pharaoh as a divine *punishment*, although certainly *Paul* does not say this in the present passage. Meyer is of opinion (ed. 2) that what I allege respecting the immanent law, which the divine freedom carries within itself, has no place here. But I never asserted that Paul has actually said this here, but only that it is not of itself precluded by what he here says.<sup>1</sup>

Vv. 19-21. Repudiation of an objection. If God has the right to harden at pleasure, at least He has no longer the right to blame the man arbitrarily hardened for his hardness. This

<sup>1</sup> This Meyer himself acknowledges, ed. 3 and 4. But in this case he ought not to deny to an exegete the right and the duty to explain the appearance of contradiction in a particular statement of Scripture by means of other statements of Scripture.

captious exception the apostle puts to silence by reminding of the unlimited power of God and the absolute dependence of man. It as little becomes the creature to murmur against its Creator as the vessel against the potter, who, as he pleases, can make it a vessel to honour or dishonour.

Ver. 19. *ἐρείς οὖν μοι*] The apostle says not *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν*, as in iii. 5, iv. 1, vi. 1, vii. 7, ix. 14, 30, but *ἐρείς οὖν*, as in xi. 19; comp. *ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις*, 1 Cor. xv. 35; Jas. ii. 18. Thus he does not himself raise the objection, but makes another raise it. And indeed, in the opponent, he is clearly thinking of an arrogant Jew, such as alone he has to do with in the whole of the present exposition. The sharp answer, *μενούγγε ὦ ἄνθρωπε κτλ.*, evinces that he has here opposed to him not a modest inquirer, but an insolent antagonist. Comp. *μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖ*, xi. 20, and *ἄφρον*, 1 Cor. xv. 36. The objection, that the apostle wrote his epistle not to Jews, but to Christians, can be no obstacle to this view. Notwithstanding, the entire train of reasoning, ii. 17 ff., is pointed directly against Jews. This could only appear strange if his readers were able to derive no advantage from this for themselves. But it is well known how constantly even Jewish *Christians* were in danger of relapsing into the Jewish mode of thought. The *οὖν* in *ἐρείς οὖν μοι* draws an inference from *ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει*, ver. 18.

—*ἔτι*] when He Himself arbitrarily hardened. “Particula valde exprimit morosum fremitum,” Bengel. With *τί ἔτι* comp. iii. 7; Gal. v. 11; Matt. xxvi. 65; Mark v. 35. The *ἔτι* is to be taken in the *logical* sense. *Why still*, when He, by His own act, abolished freedom and accountability?

—*μέμφεται*] *does He find fault?* namely, with human *ὑπείθεια*, which He Himself brought about. Hesychius explains *μέμφεται* by *αἰτιᾶται*, *ἐξουθενεῖ*, *καταγινώσκει*, as also in Mark vii. 2. The *recept.* inserts *ἐμέμφαντο*; Cod. D, *κατέγνωσαν*. In the present passage the Vulg. has *queritur*; Luther: “accuses He.” Comp. Eccus. xli. 7; 2 Macc. ii. 7; Heb. viii. 8.

—*τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε;*] *for who resists His will?* Confirmation (*γάρ*) of *τί ἔτι μέμφεται*; As He Himself hardens, He has no right to find fault; *for*, as He is almighty, every one whom He wills to harden *cannot but* be hardened. He cannot therefore require of one whom He has hardened that he should not be hardened, or blame him for his hardened condition. The perfect *ἀνθέστηκεν* is here, as xiii. 2, to be taken as present,

Matthiä, *Ausfr. gr. Gr.* I. p. 397; Winer, p. 342. The question: *who resists?* is more energetic than: *who can resist?* The fact never occurring is the most striking proof of its impossibility. With the sentiment comp. 2 Chron. xx. 6: καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ σου ἰσχύς δυναστείας, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς σὲ ἀντιστήναι; Wisd. xii. 12: τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου; Upon the αὐτοῦ Bengel remarks: "Hoc, pro Dei positum, exprimit affectum, quo Deum aversantur responsatores ejusmodi." Of course this explanation is not *essential*, the context (comp. ver. 18) showing of itself that *God* is meant. βούληματι, put emphatically first, occurring only here in Paul, instead of which, after ver. 18, we should rather have expected θελήματι, is *expressly chosen* = *captum consilium*, in contradistinction from *mere voluntas*; comp. van Hengel here.

Ver. 20. μενοῦνγε] comp. x. 18; Luke xi. 28, and Phil. iii. 8, *rec.* The conjunctive particle μενοῦν (comp. Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Partikeln d. gr. Gr.* II. p. 16) is often used in replies, and serves then partly to affirm, partly to deny or justify, Hartung, p. 400. The appended γε, which is just as little found in *classical* Greek as the prefixing of μενοῦν (comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 342), serves to intensify the notion. Here, as in x. 18, Luke xi. 28, it is simply negative or corrective *imo vero, nay rather*, although it might also be taken as ironically affirming: *yea indeed, yea verily.*

—ὦ ἄνθρωπε] *O homuncule*, contemptuously. Man is viewed in his impotence in contrast with God Almighty, the πλάσμα in contrast with the πλάσας. In ii. 1, also, ὦ ἄνθρωπε relegates the man who judges to his proper limits. Comp. Jas. ii. 20: ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ; also Heb. ii. 6, viii. 2.

—σὺ τίς εἶ;] *who art thou? quæritulus es?* σὺ is emphatically put first, as in xiv. 4; comp. ii. 3, also Acts xi. 17; Ex. iii. 11.

—ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ] *who repliest against God, i.e. that thou disputest with God, repliest to Him.* This ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι against God was already implied in τί ἔτι μέμφεται; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ὀνθέστηκε; Chrysost. rightly explains ἀνταποκρινόμενος by ἀντιλέγων, ἐναντιούμενος, comp. Luke xiv. 6; LXX. Job xvi. 8; also ἀντειπεῖν, Luke xxi. 15; Acts iv. 14; and ἀντιλέγειν, Acts xiii. 45, xxviii. 22. On the other hand, in Job xiii. 22, ἀνταπόκρισιν δοῦναι is = *vicissim respondere*, "to reply to one who has spoken," not = *respondendo contradicere*.

—μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι] *The thing formed will surely not say to him that formed it?* Here, no doubt, to the

interrogative μή a negative answer is expected; comp. on iii. 5, ix. 14. With the sentiment, comp. **Ecclus.** xxix. 16, [xxxiii. 13]: οὐχ ὡς πηλὸς τοῦ κεραμέως λογισθήσεσθε; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι αὐτό, οὐ σύ με ἔπλασας; ἢ τὸ ποίημα . . . τῷ ποιήσαντι, οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας; Isa. xlv. 9, 10: μὴ ἐρεῖ ὁ πηλὸς τῷ κεραμεῖ, τί ποιεῖς . . .; μὴ ἀποκριθήσεται τὸ πλάσμα πρὸς τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτό; also Isa. lxiv. 8; Jer. xviii. 6; **Ecclus.** xxxviii. 29, 30; Job x. 8-13; **Wisd.** xv. 7. Without doubt we must admit a reference on the part of the apostle to these declarations, or at least an allusion to them; for it is impossible to suppose an accidental coincidence with O. T. modes of thought and expressions so peculiar and so often recurring. "Neque tamen valde in applicando ad praesentem causam testimonio illo laborandum est; quando Paulus *alludere* duntaxat ad prophetæ verba voluit, quo plus ponderis haberet similitudo," Calvin.

—τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως;] *why madest Thou me thus?* ποιεῖν = *facere, fingere, to form*, comp. ver. 21, not = *tractare, to treat*. No doubt in the captious question, ver. 19, the question, as it is here formulated, was involved; for in the inference that God, if He hardens at pleasure, has no longer the right to find fault with the hardened one, the purpose is to deny Him the right to harden whom He wills, *i.e.* to form as He wills. "Severam hæc responsio atque vehementum indolem redolet. Feroces nimirum compescendi sunt," Bengel.

Ver. 21. ἢ] *or = it would then be the case that*, Matt. xx. 15.

—οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ] *the potter has not power over the clay.* ἐξουσία = *right, full authority*. "Per vocem potestatis non intelligit suppetere virtutem ac robur (ability) figulo, ut pro libidine agat: sed optimo jure hanc facultatem ei competere," Calvin. τοῦ πηλοῦ is dependent on ἐξουσίαν, so that ὁ κεραμεὺς is inserted between the governing and governed noun. By this arrangement both the dignity of the κεραμεὺς and the impotence of the πηλός are emphatically set forth; comp. Gal. ii. 6: πρόσωπον θεὸς ἀνθρώπου οὐ λαμβάνει; Heb. ix. 15; Winer, p. 238.

—ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος] *from the same lump, from the same mass, namely, τοῦ πηλοῦ.*

—ποιῆσαι] *to make*. Infinitive of more exact definition, comp. John v. 27.

—ὁ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὁ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν] *one vessel unto*

*honour, another unto dishonour.* On ὁ μὲν . . . ὁ δέ, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 21, xii. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 16; Hermann, *ad Vig.* p. 706 sq.; Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 496. The figure is illustrated by 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21: ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔστι μόνον σκευὴ χρυσᾷ καὶ ἀργυρᾷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ξύλινᾳ καὶ ὀστράκινᾳ· καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν, ἃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν. Ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκευὸς εἰς τιμὴν, ἡγιασμένον, καὶ εὖχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ, εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον. The *τιμὴ* and *ἀτιμία* of the vessel refer, therefore, to the use to which the vessel is destined. In the application the *τιμὴ* answers to the *δόξα*, ver. 23, the *ἀτιμία* to the *ἀπώλεια*, ver. 21. It might seem, then, as if in general the *tertium comparationis* here consisted simply in the adjudication of salvation or condemnation according to the free decree of God, independently of human claim. But the apostle, in harmony with the entire strain of thought lying clearly before us from ver. 18 onward, views the divine *κατακρίνειν* only in association with the *σκληρύνειν*, the divine *σώζειν* only with the *ἐλεεῖν*, the effect of which is *ἡγιασμός*. Thus in the application one and the same *φύραμα* must be the mass of mankind, presented to God as material in itself indifferent. As the potter at pleasure from the same clay forms vessels of different shape, according to their different destination, so God *ex eadem massa humana* forms holy men *in salutem*, unholy *in perniciem*. Since the *φύραμα* is described as presented to the worker, the reference is not directly to the *creation* of this *massa*, although God's temporal action always points back to an eternal decree, and, in the last resort, He must have originally created man for that for which He destined and formed him, comp. *προητοίμασεν*, ver. 23. We thus see that in vv. 20, 21 we are by no means to expect a *λύσις* of the problem in question, but merely a repudiation of the objection raised against it by means of a reference to the absolutely unconditional and incontestable power of the Creator. The apostle sets *one* abstraction against another. As the opponent leaves out of sight the free, unlimited power of God, and merely raises claims upon the divine righteousness limited by human rights, so the apostle merely sets forth this unlimited supremacy of God, leaving out of sight the love that regulates that supremacy. The creature must first be brought absolutely into the position of self-annihilation before God, in which it ascribes to Him as unlimited Sovereign the free right to save or destroy at His good



pleasure, before the immanent law of love and righteousness governing this divine good pleasure can be revealed to it. And what befits even the creature as such, still more befits the *sinful* creature which has to look for salvation, not merely from the free love of the Creator, but also from the free grace of the Judge. But the apostle here, in conformity with the polemical opposition before us, has to do merely with the creature as such, over against which, as it fancied God to be limited in His dealings by His own declarations, he has to vindicate and place on a firm basis the perfect freedom of the divine dealings. Thus the harshness of predestinarianism does not lie in the fact that it ascribes the *right absoluto decreto* to condemn or to save, whether in the supralapsarian form, to God the Creator, or, in the infralapsarian form, to God the Judge, to the honour of His own glory, but in the fact that this system imputes to God, not merely the *κτῆσις*, but also the *χρῆσις* of this right in opposition to His revealed universal love. For by this means, in the shape of a bare abstraction, the harmony of the divine attributes is rent to pieces, and wisdom, love, and righteousness appear under the absolute sway of power, instead of the latter being conceived as governed by the former attributes. An absolutely arbitrary will is not a really free, but, exactly the contrary, an absolutely unfree will. But, of course, the limitation of the divine will is merely a self-limitation, not a creature-limitation. *In abstracto*, no doubt, what Calvin maintains is right: “Quemadmodum figulus nihil luto adimit, quamlibet illi formam dederit: ita quacunq[ue] hominem conditione creaverit Deus, nihil ei adimit. Tantum illud memoria tenendum, spoliari Deum honoris sui parte, nisi tale in homines imperium ei conceditur, ut sit arbiter vitæ et mortis.” But, in reality, what Bengel observes holds good: “Figulus non facit lutum, sed fodit: Deus facit hominem, ergo majorem habet potestatem, quam figulus. Sed potestas et libertas absoluta non infert voluntatem decretumq[ue] absolutum. Si Deus totum genus humanum reliquisset in peccato et morte, non fecisset injuste: sed illo jure non est usus.” Strikingly, also, Calov: “*Absolutum Dei jus* adumbratur in potestate figuli, non autem decretum aliquod Dei absolutum. Aliud enim est *potestas Dei*, aliud *potestatis illius exercitium*. Ita Deus potestatem habuit prolapsio genere humano in peccatum omnes prorsus reprobare ceu *vasa irac*, non autem ideo hoc jure suo usus est.”

Vv. 22, 23. But gainsaying must needs be more completely put to silence, when one considers that God never made unlimited use of His unlimited right, but patiently bore with the rejected ones before abandoning them to His judicial wrath, and, at the same time, took all means, by carrying into actual effect His elective decree, to make known to the elect the riches of His glory. Thus, not only does His grace shine in the clearest light, but His punitive justice is also seen to be tempered by patience and long-suffering. In the present verse, to pass by utterly arbitrary methods, there is but a threefold explanation of the construction conceivable. First of all, we may connect *καὶ ἵνα*, ver. 23, with *ἤρεγκεν*, ver. 22. Comp. Winer, p. 713: "If God, determined to show His wrath . . . with all long-suffering endured the vessels of His wrath . . . also in order to make known the riches." In this case we may explain *θέλων* by "*because He willed*," so that the sense would be: "God patiently endured the vessels of wrath with a double purpose: first, because by their final destruction He would the more openly make known His wrath and power; and secondly, because by the deliverance of the elect, necessarily connected with the destruction of the former on the day of judgment, He would set in so much the clearer light the riches of His glory or of His glorious grace towards them." But, in the first place, it could not possibly be described as divine *μακροθυμία* for God to bear long with the vessels of wrath merely *for this purpose*, by means of their ultimate destruction so much the more strikingly to set forth His wrath and power; for, as this manifestation is directed to no other end than to glorify God's omnipotent penal justice, it is not the outcome of long-suffering brooding over the welfare of men. In any case, then, *θέλων* must be explained by "*although He willed*." It may without doubt be described as evidence of the divine *μακροθυμία*, for God, instead of making use of His right to carry into effect forthwith His almighty wrath, to keep it, as it were, within Himself, and postpone the execution of His judgment. But even then a second objection may be raised against this view, namely, that while God might indeed be conceived as *destroying* the vessels of wrath in order by their destruction to make known His grace towards the elect, on whom a like lot had fallen unless they had accepted God's free mercy, He could not be conceived as patiently *enduring* the vessels of wrath, and preserving them alive in order

to evidence His grace towards the elect. The destruction of one does indeed form an antithesis to His grace toward the other, but not the bearing with one. We should then have expected some such utterance as the following: "But how if God, when He would show His wrath and make known His power, *destroyed* without mercy the vessels of wrath fitted for perdition, in order by this destruction to manifest the riches of His glory in the vessels of mercy which He prepared before for glory?" If it were replied that it is not suffering forbearance of itself that is contrasted with delivering grace, but the *end* of this forbearance, which consists in this, by postponing the abandonment to condemnation until the day of judgment, to use the penal justice displayed on that day in the case of the condemned as a foil to set off the compassion manifesting itself at the same moment in the case of the saved, it is to be observed again that by no means could such an end be conceived as proposed by the divine *long-suffering*. It must then have been said: "But if God, although He willed to show His wrath and make known His power, with great long-suffering endured the vessels of wrath devoted to destruction, *and brought about this postponement of their punishment to the day of judgment for this purpose, by this punishment the more illustriously* to make known the riches of His glory in the vessels of compassion," etc. The words in italics were imperatively called for, and could not be merely supplied in thought. But just as little is it permissible to find the secondary purpose of *ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ* in this, that many more should be previously converted to Christ, and then on the day of judgment *ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης* make itself known in the salvation of this greater number. For, in the first place, *ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης* manifestly denotes the *intensive* fulness of divine grace, and again, the considerable supplement of thought thus called for must at least have been indicated and rendered possible by an *ἐπὶ πλείονα σκευή τῆς δόξης*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Meyer, indeed, supposes: "Had God not endured so patiently the *σκευὴ ὀργῆς*, but allowed the penal judgment at once to break forth upon them (which is to be conceived as coeval with the Parousia), He had had no space to make known His glory in the *σκευήσι* *ἐλπίους*; but that period of long-suffering was to serve this purpose, that in it such *σκευή* as were prepared by God before for eternal *δόξα* were to be called (ver. 24) and led to Christ, and thus the fulness of the divine glory to manifest itself." But the *σκευὴ ἐλπίους* were already in existence contemporaneously with the *σκευὴ ὀργῆς*. The preaching of the gospel kept creating both sorts from the beginning. The only point in question, therefore, could be about *πλείονα σκευή*

We turn, in consequence, to the second mode of construction, according to which καὶ ἵνα, ver. 23, is not to be connected with ἡνεγκεν, but with κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ver. 22. "Which are made ready for destruction, and indeed for this purpose, by this means to make known the riches of His glory in the elect." We then obtain two co-ordinate main thoughts: first, that God, although wishing to make known His wrath and power, nevertheless with great patience endured long the vessels of wrath before destroying them; and again, that their destruction was to tend in a special manner to glorify His grace towards the vessels of mercy. But it is quite inconceivable why the last chief thought, which is really more essential than the former one, instead of being at least co-ordinated with the first in form, is on the contrary made to depend in a *subordinate manner* on the secondary qualification κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. We should in this case have rather expected some such order of thought as: "But how if God prepared the vessels of wrath for destruction, to show by this means the riches of His glory in the vessels of mercy; and for this purpose with great patience endured the vessels of wrath, although wishing to make known His power?" Moreover, there was no occasion for thus stretching beyond due limits God's absolute authority; and we should have before us less a refutation of the opponent, which yet manifestly is the end in view, than a summary dismissal of that opponent.

There remains, therefore, nothing but the third mode of interpretation, according to which ἵνα γνωρίσῃ is co-ordinate with θέλω; and the verb depending on εἰ, which is to be repeated before ἵνα, is not actually inserted. "But if God, although, etc., with great forbearance endured the vessels of wrath prepared for condemnation, and (if He) to make known the riches of His glory in the vessels of mercy which He prepared before for glory"—the apostle meant to continue: "did everything necessary to con-

κρίουσ, which indispensable (as it seems to us) πλείονα is not found here. Otherwise we should be disposed to agree with the interpretation referred to; but what Meyer brings forward in later editions to remove our doubt is not satisfactory. He supposes that the apostle has in view both kinds of σκεῦη solely as to their *quality*, that the opposition thought of by him is purely *qualitative*, and that a *numerical* comparison did not concern him. But as vessels of grace exist from the beginning as well as vessels of wrath, the postponement of the judicial Parousia can merely serve to augment the *number* of the vessels of grace, not in the first instance to create vessels of *grace*.

duct these vessels to the glory designed for them, namely, called, justified, and sanctified them," comp. viii. 30, but directs his glance at once to the vessels of mercy lying in the concrete case before him, suppresses in consequence *ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς*, and, instead of this, says directly *οὗς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς*, ver. 24. This mode of construction also seems to us best to satisfy the instinctive exegetical feeling, which sees itself constrained in *ἀπώλειαν*, ver. 22, to find the conclusion of one independent idea complete in itself both as to substance and form, and with *καὶ ἵνα*, ver. 23, to begin another similar idea. Clearly the construction is to be so arranged that to the clause in ver. 22: *θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν*, the corresponding clause: *ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν*, ver. 23, may appear in *co-ordination*. Just so the tenor of the entire preceding exposition would lead us at once to anticipate that the apostle would here treat of God's dealings, not only as regards the *εἰς ἀτιμίαν σκεύη*, but also as regards the *εἰς τιμὴν σκεύη*, and endeavour to place one as well as the other in the proper light. Finally, the specific course of reasoning beginning with ver. 24, in relation to the *εἰς τιμὴν σκεύη*, favours the opinion that the preceding declaration about them, on which this course of reasoning depends, cannot have been an incidental and subordinate, but an independent sentence.<sup>1</sup>

—*εἰ δέ]* *si vero?* i.e. *quid vero si?* but now if? = but now how if? A conditional protasis with the apodosis suppressed, comp. Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part.*, etc., II. p. 212; John vi. 62; Acts xxiii. 9; also Mark vii. 11; Luke xiii. 9. The obvious supply of a *τί ἐροῦμεν; τί ἄτοπον;* or the like, seems scarcely necessary, the hypothetical protasis being really equivalent to the interrogative form mentioned. "But how if?" itself means = "But what can be said to the contrary if?" Canst thou in this case still carry on an *ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι τῷ θεῷ*? The *δέ* is metabatic, passing over from repudiation, ver. 20 f., to ignominious refutation.

—*θέλων]* although *He wished*, not: because *He wished*. In the latter case, Paul, in conformity with the following *ἵνα γνωρίσῃ*,

<sup>1</sup> Tholuck also construes and interprets as we do; and we do not see with what justice Meyer maintains that in this way "rambling and confusion is imputed to the apostle without any necessity," II. 153.

would have written: εἰ δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἵνα ἐνδείξηται τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσῃ κτλ.<sup>1</sup>

—ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ] comp. ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, ver. 17, to which words there is here a manifest allusion. With ἐνδείξασθαι, comp. iii. 25; with τὸ δυνατόν = ἡ δύναμις, comp. τὸ γνωστόν, i. 19; τὸ χρηστόν, ii. 4; τὸ ἀδύνατον, viii. 3. τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ is = *what is possible to Him, what He is able to do.*

—ἤνεγκεν] Theophyl. : ὑπέμεινεν, ἠνέσχετο; Oecum. : ὑπήνεγκεν, ὑπέμεινεν, bore, endured, Heb. xiii. 13; so that He put off their punishment and destruction, and in this His πολλὴ μακροθυμία was demonstrated.

—σκεύη ὀργῆς] answering to εἰς ἀτιμίαν σκεύη, ver. 21. Thus = *vessels* prepared for the purpose of showing wrath, destined to receive ὀργή, or to be objects of the divine wrath. Wrong here is the interpretation: σκεύη = *instruments*, which meaning is certainly just as consonant to the context in Acts ix. 15, Isa. xiii. 5: הַיָּהוּבִים וְהַיָּהוּבִים, as in the present passage it is contrary thereto. Here are meant, not instruments by which the divine wrath is accomplished, but vessels in which it is accomplished, 1 Pet. iii. 7. The formal allusion to ver. 17 already mentioned, as well as the historic tense ἤνεγκεν, suggests the reference of ὀργῆς to Pharaoh. Still the sentiment, as is shown by the plural σκεύη and the antithesis σκεύη ἐλέους, is general, so that Pharaoh is merely considered as a representative of the entire race. In the person of Pharaoh, God with great long-suffering endured the σκεύη ὀργῆς in general. From this the application, following naturally from the polemical opposition before us, is this, that in like manner ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ He at present bears with the stiffnecked Jews, who are shut out of the Messianic salvation, before the issuing forth of His penal judgment. But if we refer the vessels of wrath directly to the unbelieving Jews, we must then suppose at least a *side-glance* at Pharaoh. σκεύη ὀργῆς, without the article to indicate quality = *men who are vessels of wrath.*

—κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν] *made ready for destruction.* The reference to ver. 21, as well as ἡ προητοίμασεν, ver. 23, compels

<sup>1</sup> "ἐἶλον is placed at the *head* of the sentence, in order, by contrast, the more forcibly to prepare the mind for the notion for which it is intended to prepare,—that of the μακροθυμία," Meyer, II. 119.

us to consider God as the preparing subject. For by whom else than ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ Himself can the vessels, in harmony with the entire context, be conceived as prepared? The explanation, in itself permissible, *κατηρτισμένα* = *ready, ripe, fit* (comp. on this use of the *part. perf. pass.* as *adject. verb.*, Luke vi. 40; 2 Cor. x. 10; 1 Pet. i. 8; Rev. xxi. 8; also Gal. ii. 11), so that man himself might possibly be conceived as the author of this spiritual condition destined for ἀπώλεια, is here out of place. The expression *καταρτίζειν* also points too clearly to the figure of the potter who prepared them. We must not rebut the predestinarian interpretation of this chapter by endeavouring (which was the mistake of nearly all the older as of modern anti-predestinarian expositors), contrary to the exegetically obvious sense, everywhere to foist in a secondary universalistic conception, and thus to break off or blunt all the sharp edges of the Pauline course of reasoning. Rather we must, without prejudice, admit the possibility of the predestinarian explanation of vv. 6–23 taken by itself, as well as the strong semblance of authority that it can claim. It is enough, as already remarked, to point out that, when we keep clearly in view the polemical opposition which gave rise to these expressions so predestinarian in tone, this explanation appears by no means essential, nay, not even probable; so that another universalistic solution of the problem in question remains still open as a way of escape. But the necessity for finding such a way of escape cannot be deduced from vv. 6–23 themselves, but only from the *analogia fidei* in general, and from the general tenor of the doctrinal exposition, preceding and following, of this epistle. Not the present passage, but the teaching of Scripture in the context, and other clear, unambiguous single declarations, may be used as a point of departure or *sedes propriae* for the development of a scriptural doctrine of election, because the only object in the present passage is to maintain the freedom of divine grace in the face of every claim on the part of man; but to reply to the inquiry as to the self-limitation or absolute unlimitation of this grace does not lie within its scope. Thus, moreover, it will avail nothing, with Bengel on the present verse, to draw attention to the fact that the *ira Dei* is not *sine causa*, but assumes the punishable *peccata* of men. For in vv. 20, 21, the apostle had gone so far as to demand of his opponent this extreme concession, that God has the right to harden man, and still in wrath to

destroy him for this hardness. But supposing Him to have this right, it can no longer be objected that the deferring of punishment is no *μακροθυμία*, for the deferring of *deserved* wrath may justly be described as the outcome of long-suffering. But with regard to the circumstance of Paul writing *κατηρτισμένα*, not *ἀ προκατήρτισεν* in conformity with *ἀ προητοίμασεν*, ver. 23, the predestinarian exegete might still explain this as an accident, proving nothing of itself. We are therefore of opinion that in the present verse no answer to the question referred to can in any way be found. For all the apostle says is, that God in any case made but sparing use of His unlimited authority to harden and destroy at pleasure whom He wills; and therefore that he who has no choice but to lay his hand on his mouth if God forthwith abandon him to *ἀπώλεια*, can only submit in silence to the righteous judgment of God, if God, over and above, temper the execution of that judgment by long-suffering delay.<sup>1</sup> The *ἀπώλεια* is no doubt, as regards Pharaoh, to be understood in the first instance as temporal destruction, which in his case merely conceals the eternal destruction lying in the background; but as regards those whose representative he is, to whom here chief reference is made, directly as eternal destruction.

—*καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ*] = *καὶ ἵνα ἐνδείξῃται*.

—*τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*] *the riches or the fulness of His glory*. As to *ὁ πλοῦτος*, comp. on ii. 4; as to the neuter form, *τὸ πλοῦτος*, which F G supply here, Winer, p. 76. *δόξα* stands here in opposition to *ὀργή*, ver. 22, and thus *ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης* is the counterpart of *τὸ δυνατόν* and *ἡ ὀργή* together, which = *τὸ δυνατόν τῆς ὀργῆς*. Thus the divine *δόξα* is to be conceived as abounding in mercy and bestowing salvation, or transferring man himself into the state of *δόξα*. Comp. Wisd. xix. 21.

—*ἐπὶ σκευῇ ἐλέους*] Opposite of *σκευῇ ὀργῆς*, ver. 22. *ἐπὶ* depends on *γνωρίσῃ*. The vessels of compassion are believers, those redeemed by Christ. In reality, even in the previous verse,

<sup>1</sup> Besser remarks: "But it is conceding too much to teachers of error when it is said: this ninth chapter *may* no doubt possibly be understood in the Calvinistic sense, only it *need not* be so understood." But he himself continues: "Certainly Holy Scripture nowhere absolutely precludes erroneous understanding like a work of arithmetic." Just so! But when he adds: "but we are *not to say* that the Holy Spirit might in Paul have avoided the possibility of false interpretation by a different mode of teaching from the one he has adopted," we ask: Who then has said this?



there was merely a formal reference to the history of Pharaoh, whereas the thought in its general compass really pointed simply to those withstanding the Messianic salvation. But in the present verse even this historical background is wanting, and for this reason the reference to the deliverance of the Israelites from the hand of Pharaoh is without adequate reason, and may be entirely dispensed with.

—*ἡ προητοιμάσεν εἰς δόξαν*] *which He afore prepared for glory.* The *δόξα* stands in contrast with *ἀπώλεια*, ver. 22. It is thus the *glorious* state into which the divine *δόξα* transfers man, comp. ii. 7, viii. 18, 21. This is done when God makes man participant in His own *δόξα*, v. 2. *προετοιμάζειν* no doubt, like *καταρτίζειν*, ver. 22, embodies a figure borrowed from the preparation of a vessel. Still it does not here refer to the actual preparation, so that the *προ* would simply say that the preparation preceded the attainment of future *δόξα* in time; but *προετοιμάζειν* is = prepared afore in the divine counsel, therefore not essentially different from “to predestinate.” Comp. *προορίζειν*, *προογινώσκειν*, viii. 29, and the relation in which, viii. 30, *προορίζειν* and *καλεῖν* stand to each other, like that of *προετοιμάζειν* here and *καλεῖν*, ver. 24; comp. also Eph. ii. 10, Harless and Meyer; Matt. xxv. 34; Wisd. ix. 8; Gen. xxiv. 14. The interchange of forms *κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν* and *ἡ προητοιμάσεν εἰς δόξαν* is explained by the consideration that in ver. 22 the obvious design is not to intensify the notion of the divine *ὀργή*, but rather to emphasize the *μακροθυμία* that attends even the *ὀργή*, on which account the vessels are not expressly described as made ready by God for destruction, and that in His eternal decree, but merely in general terms as made ready for destruction. In ver. 23, on the contrary, the object in view is to emphasize the divine *ἔλεος* in the strongest possible way, on which account the divine activity itself appears as engaged in making ready the vessels of mercy, and that from all eternity. Thus only a *prædestinatio ad vitam* is asserted *ipsissimis verbis*, not a *prædestinatio ad mortem*. The thought, certainly expressed but elliptically in ver. 23, and to be completed from ver. 24, is therefore this, that, as the *σκεύη ὀργῆς* have no reason to complain, ver. 22, so the *σκεύη ἐλέους* have only reason to praise the divine *ἔλεος*, since God, who even from eternity prepared *δόξα* for them, also in time did everything



kingdom of Israel. Nevertheless, the apostle's quotation is not to be regarded as a mere accommodation, but as a proof-passage. In point of fact, God's dealings with rebellious Israel contain the law of His dealings with the rebellious universally. Moreover, by its apostasy, Israel became like the Gentiles; and the prediction of the restoration of the children of Israel to be children of God contains therefore, in point of fact, since God, *cæteris paribus*, is not merciful by chance and caprice, a prophecy of the admission of the Gentile world. And as concerns any obligation on the part of God, this was no doubt implied in reference to Israel in the covenant made with the patriarch Abraham; but it was just as much present, although in a more remote way, in reference to the Gentile world in the original promise made to the great father of mankind on behalf of his whole race. Comp. Hengstenberg, *Christology*, I. p. 49, etc. According to Hofmann, *Weiss. u. Erf.* II. p. 215, and *Schriftb.* I. p. 251, Paul intends this quotation to be applied to the Jewish people; but after ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἔθνων, ver. 24, this is quite untenable. The ἐξ Ἰουδαίων stood in no need of confirmation from prophecy, comp. Meyer. ὁ οὐ λαός μου מִיִּי אֵל, comp. x. 19: ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, concerning a no-nation, Winer, p. 597. ἡ οὐκ ἡγαπημένη מִיִּי אֵל (comp. Hos. i. 6) in the prophet is the name of his own daughter symbolically representing the house of Israel. Hence the feminine. Lo-Ammi also originally is a symbolic name of the prophet's son (comp. Hos. i. 9), which, in like manner, was meant to designate the rejected nation.

Ver. 26. The passage here quoted, combined with the foregoing citation into one connected declaration, is taken from Hos. ii. 1 (LXX. i. 10). Such combinations of different Scripture passages, even from different books, are often found in the Rabbins also.<sup>1</sup> The junction was here suggested and

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Surenhusius, מִיִּי אֵל, or βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, pp. 45-47, Thesis vii. ("Interdum plura loca sacrae Scripturae in unum contrahi solent ad efficaciorē rei demonstrationem"), and p. 466 in *den Conciliationes in loca ex V. T. ad Romanos allegata* on the present passage. ("Notandum hic est, quod Apostolus huncce locum alteri immediate subiungat, sine ulla allegandi formula, perinde ac si unus tantum esset locus, quod priscis Hebraeorum Theologis etiam in usu erat, quemadmodum constat ex thesi nostra vii. de Modis allegandi et explicandi Scripturas sacras; ubi porro ex eadem thesi constat, in duobus locis contrahendis posteriorem aliquando priori antepōni, quod hic ab Apostolo quoque factum est, ut res gradatim procedat, et unum per aliud demonstretur.")

rendered easy by the affinity between the passages, which are found in one and the same prophecy treating of the same subject. By means of the transposition, the clause: *καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου* stands at the head of the sentence, and, at the same time, a climax in meaning is obtained. The LXX. have: *καὶ ἔσται, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς, οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος*. Thus Paul merely inserts the emphatic *ἐκεῖ* before *κληθήσονται*, and omits *καὶ αὐτοί* not based on the original text (standing in the LXX. in opposition to the children of Judah, comp. Hos. i. 7).

—*καὶ ἔσται*] *הָיָה*, and it shall come to pass, Acts ii. 21.

—*ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ*] *רַחֲמָנָא דִּימְרָא*, in the place where. Comp. Hengstenberg, I. p. 220: "The place here may either be that where the people first received the name Lo-Ammi, *i.e.* Palestine, or the place of the exile where they first felt its full meaning—the misery being a *sermo realis* of God. Decisive in favour of the latter reference (Jonath.: in loco, quo abducti sunt inter gentes) is the following verse, where *לְאֶרֶץ*, the land of the exile, corresponds with *דִּימְרָא* in the verse before us." This harmonizes well with the meaning of the apostle, to whom the kingdom of the ten tribes in the land of exile is the representative of the Gentiles in *Gentile lands*. Without doubt it was said to the latter: *οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς*, in the first place by their actual severance from and abandonment by God and divine revelation, and again by the word of prophets, which, although not understood or not received by them, in Palestine sounded out towards them. Comp. Deut. xxxii. 21, where the *Gentiles* are designated a no-people, Lo-Am. Moreover, in order to justify the use the apostle makes of the prophet's saying, there is no need simply to insist upon the fact that Israel and the Gentile world belong to one and the same category, but we may advance a step farther. The kingdom of Israel, from the very beginning, and during the whole period of its continuance, was an idolatrous nation, and as such, in contrast with Judah, a representative of the Gentile nations. For this reason it was scattered among the Gentiles, never returning as a kingdom to the beloved land. It was dissolved and lost in the Gentile world, whose likeness it had assumed. Thus the entire Gentile world, of which Israel now became a part, is to be regarded as a mere extension of the people of the ten tribes. In it Israel became numerous as the sand of

the sea, not to be measured and counted, comp. in *Ποσ.* ii. 1 the words immediately preceding the present quotation. Hence what the prophet foretold to Israel actually received its fulfilment in the Gentile world. This is fully explained for the first time in 1 Pet. ii. 10, which epistle, as is well known, is addressed to *Gentile* Christians. The strong emphasis on the identity of place (*ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ . . . ἐκεῖ*) sets in so much the stronger relief the change in the divine sentiment. It is not necessary on this account to find *nothing but* this change expressed in the local reference. Still less can Paul be thinking of *Palestine*, where the Gentiles were acknowledged by the *Christians* as joint-partakers in the *υἰοθεσία*, as the central seat of the *new* theocracy, for the subject who calls in *κληθήσονται* is plainly not the Christians, but God Himself; comp. *καλέσω*, ver. 25. Finally, *ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ* is not to be applied to the communion of saints, the *coetus Christianorum*, "*ubi diu dubitatum est, an recte Gentiles reciperentur*," because the subject who speaks in *ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς*, just as much as in *κληθήσονται*, is God Himself. With *κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ*, comp. 1 John iii. 1.

Vv. 27–29. Prophetic announcement of the exclusion of Israel as a body, and the salvation of a holy remnant.

Vv. 27, 28. *Ἡσαίας δὲ κρᾶζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*] *But Isaiah cries concerning Israel.* The *δέ* leads over not so much from one prophet to another, namely, from Hosea to Isaiah, as from one subject to another, namely, from the reception of the Gentiles to the rejection of Israel save the *κατάλειμμα*. *κρᾶζειν* (viii. 15), of a loud and solemn, a confident and impassioned cry, John i. 15, vii. 28, 37, xii. 44; Acts xxiii. 6, xxiv. 21. *ὑπέρ*, as often, of the subject, *on* which something is said, written, decided, etc., therefore like *περί*, 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. i. 7; Winer, p. 479. So also in Latin, *scribere super aliqua re = de aliqua re*. *ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* stands emphatically in the last place. The quotation is from Isa. x. 22, 23, pretty exactly after the LXX. The LXX. read: *καὶ ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται. λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη.* Thus the most important deviation is the phrase *ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ* instead of *ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ* (Heb. *כְּמִסְפָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*), chosen perhaps for this reason, that here the special point is the great *number* in contrast with the *κατάλειμμα*. As regards the read-

ing, Lachmann and Tischendorf, after A B, al. Syr. Exp. Copt. Eus. Damasc. Aug., omit *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον*. In the same way Cod. Sinait.\* All that remains, then, is the sentence: *λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων κύριος ποιήσει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, and it would be necessary to suppose that copyists transferred the omitted words from the LXX. to the Pauline text. But it is a far more natural and probable view, that copyists passed straight from *συντέμνων* to *συντετμημένον*, thus in error giving rise to the omission.

—*ἐὰν ᾗ*] Heb. *וְיָשֹׁבֶה בִּי*, *for if should be*. “We have in these words a general rule, a fundamental law of the divine government that from this time asserts itself anew on every occasion. Yet, before any reduction had taken place, under Uziah and Jeroboam, the whole of Israel stood at the highest pitch of prosperity. Nay, at this very point of time, Ephraim was about to burst into new life (ix. 9). In the same way subsequently, in Hezekiah’s days, the kingdom of Judah had revived. Even in the days of Christ the nation had again increased in numbers. But, nevertheless, the result here stated always held good,” Drechsler, *der Prophet Jesaia*, I. p. 443.

—*ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης*] alludes to the word of promise, Gen. xxii. 17, comp. Gen. xxxii. 12.

—*τὸ κατάλειμμα*] *the remnant*, i.e. *but the remnant*. Lachmann and Tischendorf, after A B, Eus., read *τὸ ὑπόλειμμα*. Cod. Sinait.\* has *ὑπόλειμμα*. The meaning is the same; but it is more probable that Paul, with the LXX., wrote *κατάλειμμα*.

—*σωθήσεται*] Heb. *וְשָׁב*, *shall return*. Paul retains the expression used by the LXX., because he is here treating of the salvation of Israel. And of course the *σωτηρία* is ever the necessary result of conversion. “The preaching about the remnant which should alone be saved seemed folly, and was a stumbling-block to the nation, just as much in those days as afterwards in the days of Christ,” Drechsler, p. 444.

—*λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*] Heb. *בְּיָמֵי הַהֵם יִהְיֶה צְדָקָה עֹשֶׂה בְּרָבָר בְּלֹא-חֶסֶד; וְיִשְׁמַח יְהוָה בְּכָל-וְנִהְרָצָה אֲדָמָה, וְיִהְיֶה צֶדֶק בְּכָל-יְהוָה*, i.e. *destruction is decreed, overflowing righteousness; for extermination and a decree the Lord, Jehovah Sabaoth, sets to work within all the land*. We must here, with Gesenius, *Com. über den Jesaias*, I. p. 402 (comp. also Vitranga here), understand *וְיִשְׁמַח יְהוָה* of the divine

*punitive righteousness*, in opposition to Drechsler, who explains it of the state of the church, when all conditions and all circumstances shall be in harmony with the divine righteousness. The latter interpretation is not in keeping with the course of thought. For if but a *remnant* is to be saved, the *whole* is not restored to a state *overflowing* with (human) righteousness, nor for *this* idea is there any *authority* in what follows (*for extermination*, etc.). The question then is, how the rendering of the LXX., so different from the original text, and the quotation of the apostle, corresponding with it, are to be understood. λόγος, some expositors would take in the sense of *πράγμα*, *res*. But even if it can be shown to be probable that the LXX. so understood it, it by no means follows that Paul adopted a use of the word so alien to the Greek as well as un-Pauline. It is better therefore to abide by the usual interpretation *decree*, or even, with Meyer, to adopt the meaning *dictum*, *saying*. συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων, *sc. ἐστί*, comp. on v. 11; Herm. *ad Vig.* p. 776; Bernhardy, *Synt.* p. 470. The subject is ὁ κύριος. συντέμνειν is = to shorten, to hasten.<sup>1</sup> δικαιοσύνη is not to be referred to the righteousness of faith, but, in harmony with the original text and the idea lying before us here, to God's punitive righteousness, iii. 25, 26. Thus: "for a decree He accomplishes and hastens in righteousness; yea, a hastened decree the Lord will carry out in the earth." Consequently the divergent rendering of the LXX. agrees sufficiently with the sense of the original for the purpose of the apostle; for in both cases the fundamental thought is still this, that in the destruction of Israel and the salvation merely of a holy remnant, a divine judicial punishment is carried out. As regards the authority of the apostle for applying the condition of the people of Israel, delineated in the passage of the prophet, to the circumstances of the people in his own days and their relation to the Messianic kingdom, comp. Drechsler, p. 446.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Hengstenberg on Dan. ix. 24, *Christol.* III. p. 103, συντέμνειν (ῥῥῥ) is never = to shorten in the sense of to hasten, but = *circumcidere*, *abbreviare*, in the sense of exact limitation, precise determination. But as regards the present passage the thing comes to the same. For a decree or saying determined as shortly as possible, which the Lord accomplishes, is nothing but a *decretum* or *dictum* carried out as quickly as possible.

<sup>2</sup> "Since the prophet sees in Assyria at once the world-power in general that wars against the kingdom of God, and in the catastrophes brought about through and upon Assyria the completed evolution of the entire future, on this account, con-

Ver. 29. καὶ καθὼς προεῖρηκεν Ἡσαΐας] *and as Isaiah foretold.* To be supplied in thought: οὕτω καὶ νῦν ἔχει, "so also has it come to pass." There is no necessity, then, to punctuate: καὶ, καθὼς προεῖρηκεν Ἡσαΐας, εἰ μὴ κτλ., as if the apostle made the words of the prediction his own. The passage is taken from Isa. i. 9 verbally after the LXX. But προεῖρηκεν is not to be taken as = "said in a former passage" (Surenhus. *ibid.* p. 472: "sicut dixit Jesaias superius"), on the ground that the passage quoted, vv. 27, 28, occurs in the prophet's writings in a later passage than the one cited in this verse; for not merely is no such exact local indication found elsewhere in Paul's quotation of Scripture passages, but we have also seen how in the immediately preceding vv. 25, 26 he joins a former passage from Hosea to a later one of the same prophet without such indication, and, moreover, welds the two into *one* dictum. The *προ* in προεῖρηκεν refers rather to time, not to place = "said before, proclaimed before," Mark xiii. 23; Acts i. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 2; Jude 17.

The σπέρμα] is the κατάλειμμα, ver. 27, just as in Heb. יִרְיָ is *residuum*. Paul retains the expression used by the LXX., wherein we may find an intimation that a residue is left as seed-corn, xi. 26. σπέρμα, *semen*. "Denotatur (1) paucitas praesens; (2) copia inde postliminio propaganda," Bengel.

—ὡς Σόδομα] "ut Sodomā, ubi nemo, civis, evasit; nullum semen relictum," Bengel.

sidering the systematic method pervading God's ways with His people and the eternally identical type lying at the basis of all the Lord's dealings, it cannot but be that just as with the flow of time the future deepens more and more, and the eye in consequence discovers ever new and wider backgrounds and prospects,—that what the prophet saw in connection with Assyria will invariably recur in all corresponding conditions. Even as in the visitation through Assyria there was a remnant left for hope, so after the judgment through the Chaldeans the people rose again from a אֲשָׁרָא or אֲשָׁרַי (Hag. i. 12; Zech. viii. 6), and not less the advent of Christ is a new fulfilment of the lines traced in the present oracle. Even then there is a λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος that escapes the judgment and believes in the Lord (Rom. xi. 5), and of this λείμμα only can it be said in the true and full sense, that it serves the Lord מַשְׁכָּן (x. 20). Comp. John iv. 23. The relation of this prediction to its fulfilment in Christ would not be fully grasped and adequately expressed, even if it were said that the prophet regarded Assyria and the crisis connected therewith as a type. On the contrary, in accordance with hermeneutical principles often expressed and here needing no repetition, we may say with all confidence that the words of Isaiah apply to the days of Christ more truly and directly than to the age of Hezekiah. Rightly, therefore, may the apostle understand it as he has done, Rom. ix. 27–29."



—ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὁμοιώθημεν] *we should have become like as Gomorrah.* The phrase ὁμοιοῦσθαι ὥς τι may be understood as a *constructio ad sensum* = *comparando fieri ut aliquid* (comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 140), or as a blending of two constructions ὁμοιοῦσθαί τινι and γίγνεσθαι ὥς τι, “equalized with a thing (*i.e.* by equalization with a thing) to become like a thing,” comp. LXX. IIos. iv. 9; Ezek. xxxii. 2. Winer, p. 753, therefore wrongly classes this expression among pleonasms. To become as Sodom and Gomorrah, is to be given up without reserve to utter destruction (here to eternal ἀπώλεια). The point here is to emphasize not so much the divine grace shown in the leaving of a holy σπέρμα, full of promise, as the severity of the divine judgment upon Israel, which, with slight exceptions, abandoned the whole nation to a hardened heart. What in the days of the prophets was done in Israel in a physical sense, in the days of the apostle was done in a spiritual sense. It is the same people, standing to God in the same relation now as then, therefore overtaken by the same fate, save that the judicial punishment appears not in the O. T. physical, but in the N. T. spiritual form.

Vv. 30-33. The apostle had, first of all, given utterance to his grief for the rejection of Israel, a nation distinguished by privileges so high, vv. 1-5. He had next repelled the objection that God thus broke the pledge given in His word to Israel; for this nowhere refers to all natural descendants of Abraham indiscriminately, and God is limited by no claim preferred against Him by man, but determines in the free exercise of almighty power whom it is His purpose to save, whom to exclude from salvation, vv. 6-23. Finally, he had shown how the admission of the Gentile world and the exclusion of the mass of the people of Israel were already foretold by prophetic lips. Now, for the first time, after having cleared all objections out of the way, he directly and positively asserts the fact of the rejection of Israel and the entrance of the Gentile world in its stead, which had hitherto merely formed the groundwork and tacit premiss of his reasoning, and at the same time raises a question as to the reason of this fact. This lies solely in the work-righteousness and unbelief of Israel, and in the readiness of the Gentile world to submit itself to the divinely-fixed requirement of faith, vv. 30-33. Justly, therefore, Chrysostom early observed: αὕτη ἡ σαφειστάτη τοῦ χωρίου παντὸς λύσις . . . τοῦτο γὰρ αἴτιον τῆς ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν

φησίν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμον ἠθέλησαν δικαιωθῆναι, and Melancthon: "hic expresse probat causam reprobationis, quia scilicet nolint credere evangelio."

Vv. 30, 31. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν;] comp. iii. 1, 5, 9, iv. 1, vi. 1, 15, vii. 7, viii. 31, ix. 14. ὅτι up to ἔφθασε gives the answer. It is altogether untenable to continue the question to the end of ver. 31: "What then shall we say to the fact that the Gentiles," etc.? in which case, with ver. 32, instead of the answer being given, a new question would be asked. Still more artificial is the arrangement which, with ὅτι, begins a second question: "What shall we say then? Shall we say that the Gentiles," etc.? in which case δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως would have to be regarded as an answer interpolated conversationally in the midst of the question. In τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; the apostle asks what conclusion or what result follows from the previous exposition? No doubt the answer introduced by ὅτι was partly included in the prophetic utterances just quoted, partly assumed as the unexpressed or but intimated groundwork of the preceding exposition in the chapter.

—ἔθνη] the Gentiles, not merely: some Gentiles, or: many Gentiles, comp. on ii. 14. ἔθνη and Ἰσραὴλ being here placed in contrast, therefore one people collectively with another collectively, not the partitive, but only the generic meaning can be adopted. Even if we explain: Gentiles, i.e. men who are Gentiles, of whom, therefore, since they are μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην, we should least expect the καταλαμβάνειν δικαιοσύνην, we must still think not merely of particular Gentiles, but of heathendom collectively.

—τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην] who pursued not after righteousness, comp. i. 18–32; Eph. ii. 12, iv. 17–19, v. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 5. The striving after δικαιοσύνη, characteristic of the Jews, was foreign to the Gentiles; for as to the revealed Nomos, which gave birth to such striving in Israel, they possessed it not; and as to the νόμος γραπτὸς ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, they kept it not, either not at all, or but in rare cases, and imperfectly. The distinctive character of ethnic life is not striving after absolute rectitude, such as fully satisfies the demand of the divine law, but striving after pleasure in the enjoyment of the moment. διώκειν is a figurative expression, borrowed from running for the prize in the racecourse; comp. xii. 13, xiv. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 1; Phil. iii. 12, 14; 1 Thess.

v. 15 ; 1 Tim. vi. 11 ; 2 Tim. ii. 22 ; Heb. xii. 14 ; 1 Pet. iii. 11, and *τρέχειν*, Rom. ix. 16. With this also corresponds the metaphorical *καταλαμβάνειν* in the subjoined

—*κατέλαβε δικαιοσύνην*] “to attain righteousness, so to speak, as a prize in the race,” 1 Cor. ix. 24 ; Phil. iii. 12.

—*δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως*] *but the righteousness that comes from faith.* As to the exegetical *δέ*, comp. on iii. 22. This supplement *implicite* contains the reason why the Gentiles attained to righteousness, namely, because they submitted willingly to the righteousness of *faith*. Strikingly Meyer: “Observe the *threefold* *δικαιοσύνην*, as in ver. 31 the repetition of *νόμον δικαιοσύνης*. The whole passage is framed for pointed effect. Vehementer audire commovet ejusmodi redintegratio verbi . . . quasi aliquod telum saepius perveniat in eandem partem corporis, *Auct. ad Herenn.* iv. 28.”

—*Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης, εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ἔφθασε*] This sentence likewise is dependent on *ὅτι*. “(That) Israel, on the contrary, pursuing after the law of righteousness, attained not to the law of righteousness.” But this may also be taken as an independent sentence, which is still more emphatic, and has in its favour that *διατί*, ver. 32, refers only to ver. 31. But even then the sentence is part of the answer to *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν*; Here, as in the case of the Gentiles, the form of the treatment and conclusion proceeds *a parte potiori*. The reading *εἰς νόμον* for *εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης*, attested, no doubt, by weighty authorities (A B D E F, c. obelo, G, Cod. Sinait.\* Copt. It. Orig.), and on this account received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, still appears to have arisen merely from the negligence of transcribers. It has against it, both that it breaks in upon the uniformity of the construction (comp. *διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην* . . . *κατέλαβε δικαιοσύνην*, ver. 30), and that *νόμος* alone cannot fitly be understood of *the law of the Spirit* (Orig.) or of *the law of righteousness*. In support, we might desire to appeal to Gal. ii. 19: *ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον*, but even in this place the explanation of the first *νόμου* by *νόμου πίστεως* (comp. Winer, *ad Gal.* p. 70) must at least be described as doubtful. The parallelism between *διώκειν νόμον δικαιοσύνης* and *διώκειν δικαιοσύνην*, ver. 30, suggests at once the general meaning of the conception *νόμος*, so that *νόμος δικαιοσύνης* would be the ideal proposed for realization, the standard of righteousness set up, after which they vainly

strove. Comp. the analogous use of νόμος, iii. 27, vii. 23, viii. 2. If, on the other hand, we wished to understand νόμος both times of the Mosaic law, or the first time of the Mosaic law and the second of the law of faith, the "*norma juxta quam Deus justificat*," against this lies the consideration, first, that the designation of the νόμος (= Mosaic law) as νόμος δικαιοσύνης = *the law supplying righteousness*, absolutely, is not usual, and again, that Paul in this case might indeed have spoken of a διώκειν δικαιοσύνην νόμον but not of a διώκειν νόμον δικαιοσύνης, because διώκειν denotes the seeking after what one is endeavouring to obtain, ver. 30, but the Jews were already in possession of the Mosaic νόμος. On this account some expositors have wished, certainly quite arbitrarily, in the present passage to suppose a so-called hypallage of νόμος δικαιοσύνης for δικαιοσύνη νόμου. But even the latter designation would not be quite accurate, as the Jews not merely strove after the δικαιοσύνη νόμου, but actually possessed it, at least in its outward form, only this was unable to justify them, Phil. iii. 6 ff. But no doubt the expression νόμος δικαιοσύνης, even in the general sense obtaining here, is selected with a side-glance at the Nomistic striving of the Jews. φθάνειν, answering to καταλαμβάνειν, ver. 30, not in the primary meaning "to anticipate," 1 Thess. iv. 15, but in the meaning current later, "to come, attain;" hence φθάνειν εἰς τι = "to reach something," comp. Matt. xii. 23; Luke xi. 20; 2 Cor. x. 14; Phil. iii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 16.

—Vv. 32, 33. διατί] *sc. εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης οὐκ ἔφθασε*; Answer: ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως] *sc. ἐδίωξαν νόμον δικαιοσύνης*.

—ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμου] *but as from the works of the law*, i.e. as if they could obtain righteousness by the works of the law, ὡς φθησόμενοι εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης ἐξ ἔργων νόμου. Respecting this ὡς of subjective conception, comp. Winer, p. 771: "ἐκ πίστεως indicates the objective norm or rule; ὡς ἐξ ἔργων, one merely imagined." Amounting to the same in meaning is the explanation: "because their διώκειν was framed in the *same way* as a διώκειν whose starting-point is the works of the law. The perverse *method and character* of their effort is noted," Meyer. Comp. Kühner, II. p. 571. On good authority (A B F G, Cod. Sinait.\* Copt. Vulg. and many Fathers), Lachmann and Tischendorf have omitted νόμου. The word might here, as in iv. 2, *var. lect.*, be added by the glossarists, although in the present passage it



γωνιαῖον, ἔντιμον, εἰς τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων οὐ μὴ κατα-  
 σχυνοθῇ. The second passage, Isa. viii. 14, runs in the original :  
 וְהָיָה לְיְהוָה בְּתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מִכְשֵׁל וְרֹאשׁ יִפְּחוּ וְהָיָה לְיְהוָה יִמְצָא וְרֹאשׁ יִפְּחוּ, *i.e.* "And He (namely  
 Jehovah) is for a sanctuary (comp. Drechsler, *ibid.* p. 351), but also  
 for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses  
 of Israel." The LXX. render : (καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾗς) ἔσται  
 σοι εἰς ἀγίασμα, καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσῃς, οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι. Paul applies both passages to the same  
 subject, Christ, who to believers is a λίθος ἀκρογωνιαίος, ἐκλεκτός,  
 ἔντιμος, but to unbelievers a λίθος προσκόμματος and a πέτρα  
 σκανδάλου, as is said in 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7, where both relations are  
 expressly dwelt on and connected. On this account, Paul, while  
 taking Isa. xxviii. 16 as the basis, pertinently for his purpose, in  
 place of λίθος πολυτελής, ἐκλεκτός, ἀκρογωνιαίος, ἔντιμος, inserts  
 λίθος προσκόμματος and πέτρα σκανδάλου from Isa. viii. 14 ;  
 for he has here to do with what Christ is to unbelievers, not with  
 what He is to believers. As matter of fact there is ample war-  
 rant for the Messianic application, as well as for the combination  
 of the two passages based upon it. According to Isa. viii. 14,  
 the Lord Himself will be to believers a sanctuary, *i.e.* a place of  
 peace and comfort, of spiritual strengthening and refreshment,  
 which promise attained its completest fulfilment at the time when  
 Christ appeared as the true, spiritual temple, Rev. xxi. 22, in  
 place of the temple built with hands. But this building, invisible  
 to eyes of sense, is withal to the carnal mind a stone of stumbling  
 and a rock of offence (Drechsler, *ibid.* pp. 351–353). With Isa.  
 xxviii. 16 is to be compared Zech. iii. 9, where the stone is  
 spoken of, lying before Joshua, upon which the seven eyes of  
 God are fixed, which the Lord will polish and engrave, effacing  
 the sins of the land. This stone (comp. Hengstenberg, *Christ.*  
 III. 334, and *Com. on Ps.* cxviii. 22) is an image of the theocracy  
 and its seat, the temple, indicating its lowly condition at that  
 time, and its future glorification by the Lord. This state of  
 splendour is to be introduced by the Messiah, the servant, the  
 Zemach, Zech. iii. 8. The same is true of the tried corner-stone,  
 Isa. xxviii. 16, which is an image of the ideal theocracy restored  
 by Christ. Nay, the reference to the person of the Messiah may  
 perhaps be meant to be understood still more directly in this  
 latter passage than in the passage of Zechariah. In favour of  
 this, in the first place, is יִמְצָא, which may be more easily referred

to the Lord Himself, the founder of the theocracy, than to the theocracy such as is said to be built on a new, indestructible foundation, and again especially Isa. viii. 14. As there the Lord Himself is called the sanctuary and at the same time the λίθος προσκόμματος, so here the precious, tried foundation and cornerstone of this holy building is called the same. Since He makes Himself the foundation of the new theocracy, it is built on an indestructible basis. This promise also found its full and proper realization only in Christ, and is therefore justly applied by the apostle specially to Him. As to the fact of the Jews interpreting Isa. xxviii. 16 of the Messiah, comp. Gesen. *Com. über d. Jesaia* I. 2, p. 842.

—ιδού, τίθημι ἐν Σιών] As Paul is speaking here not of the ἀκρογωνιαίος, but of the λίθος προσκόμματος, in harmony with his purpose, he substitutes for the ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια of the LXX.,

—λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου] comp. Matt. xxi. 44. The LXX., conversely, have πρόσκομμα λίθου and πτώμα πέτρας. Paul reads in subservience to his purpose, and conformably with the Hebrew original.

—καὶ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ] namely, upon this λίθος, which in itself is a λίθος πολυτελής κτλ., and only to ἀπειθοῦσι α λίθος προσκόμματος. πᾶς is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf on weighty authority (A B D E F G, Cod. Sinait. Syr. Copt. It. Orig. all.). It may certainly have crept into the present passage from x. 11, for there it is necessary, here at least superfluous, and in the text of the LXX. is not found. The emphasis in any case lies on ὁ πιστεύων in opposition to ὁ προσκόπτων. ἐπ' αὐτῷ, which occurs in LXX. Compl., is absent in LXX. Cod. Vat., whilst Cod. Al. has ἐν αὐτῷ instead. 1 Pet. ii. 6 speaks for its genuineness. Besides, Paul may easily have combined ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ from the ὁ πιστεύων of the LXX. Isa. xxviii. 16, and the καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾦν in viii. 14. *He that relies upon Him*, believes in Him, trusts in Him. On πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινι, comp. Matthiä, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 730. The object of faith is conceived as its basis, x. 11; 1 Tim. i. 16; Luke xxiv. 25.

—οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται] LXX.: οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ, comp. 1 Pet. ii. 6; Heb. עֲלֵךְ אֶלֶךְ, *need not flee away*. According to Gesenius, here the meaning of the LXX. is said positively to

exist in the Hebrew words. In any case the difference is not important, for whoever flees comes to shame. But *he will not come to shame* in Paul's sense = he will not be disappointed, but really made partaker in salvation, comp. on v. 5. Had, then, Israel sought the righteousness that avails before God by faith instead of by works of the law, they would have believed in Christ instead of taking offence at Him, and thus through Him have attained salvation instead of coming to ruin. Accordingly, in these two last verses of the chapter the apostle gives, as observed, for the first time the real ground of the exclusion of Israel from the Messianic salvation. This is nothing else than the work-righteousness and self-induced unbelief of the people in the Messiah sent them by God. This assertion the apostle discusses in still greater detail in the following tenth chapter.

But if the guilt of Israel's rejection lies in its unbelief, the absolute predestination of God cannot be regarded as its cause. Nothing but predestinarian sophistry can maintain the opposite, and deem it possible to reconcile theses so utterly contradictory. The contradiction is first of all a logical one. If the Jews are blamed for their unbelief, they must have had the power to believe. But if to believe or not to believe was in their power, and their unbelief depended upon nothing but their perverse will, as is directly and undeniably asserted, not only in ix. 32, 33, but especially in x. 3, 11-13, 16, 21, then believing or not believing cannot be dependent at the same time on the arbitrary pleasure of divine predestination. Otherwise that were in their power which at the same time is not in their power. But the contradiction is withal a moral one as well. It is impossible for God to require what He Himself refuses, and to punish what He Himself causes. However this right of God's almighty power may be vindicated *in abstracto* in the presence of the proud gainsayer, its actual exercise contradicts not merely our divinely-implanted moral consciousness, but the revealed idea of divine justice and love. Finally, the opinion in question contradicts the whole tenor of the Pauline course of exposition. For had the apostle in ix. 6-29 alleged the *absolutum decretum* of God as the reason of Israel's exclusion, it would have been impossible for him in ver. 32, where he raises the question as to this reason, utterly to ignore the answer already given, still less in its place to give the opposite answer. He would then, either recapitulat-



ing the solution contained in what precedes, have again, with a brief summary, appealed to the unconditional predestination of God, or at least traced back the unbelief and work-righteousness of Israel, alleged here as the only reason of its rejection, to this predestination, and associated the two together. The apostle doing neither of the two, we should be obliged to go on directly to assert that he contradicted himself, as it were, in a breath; and whereas in ix. 6-29 he propounds the doctrine of unconditional elective grace, to this in ix. 30-x. 21 he opposes the doctrine of the conditioning of divine elective grace by the foresight of man's faith or unbelief. Certainly some modern exegetes have not hesitated to impute to Paul—the clear deep-thinker, the keen dialectician, the holy apostle—such a self-contradiction. But, in point of fact, not the narrowest, commonest scribbler would have been guilty of self-contradiction *in this style*. Rather must the dark shadow of predestinarian doctrine, such as seems to fall on ix. 6-29, perforce vanish, and show itself to be nothing more than an apparition, before the light of the universalistic mode of view, such as dawns upon us in ver. 30 ff.<sup>1</sup>

The only difficulty arising is, that, as we saw formerly (comp. on iii. 26), *πίστις* itself, on which salvation depends, is, according to Scripture, to be regarded as the gift of God. This view, in fact, is supported by the import of the ninth chapter. For if faith were in any way the result of man's natural powers, then the divine determination would not be as absolutely independent of every carnal condition as is asserted in ver. 6 ff., and even before man's conversion there would be a *θέλειν* and *τρέχειν*, which in ver. 16 is utterly precluded. The question thus is, how divine grace can be regarded as universal and at the same time as creative, or how the vessel of dogmatic faith can be safely steered between the Scylla of absolute predestination and the Charybdis of semi-Pelagianism or Synergism; whereas the history of the dogmatic exposi-

<sup>1</sup> It is strikingly observed by Tholuck, *Comm. on Br. Pauli a. d. Röm.* 1842, p. 531, in opposition to such alleged self-contradictions of the apostle: "According to our exposition of ix. 1-29, we have to specify as its doctrinal import: God has the right to admit into the Messianic kingdom without regard to human claims; as the import of ix. 30-x. 21: if Israel was not admitted, the fault lies in its unwillingness to submit to the way marked out by God; of ch. xi.: the hardness, which God, in consequence of this, brought upon Israel turns, however, to good, in that it helped on the admission of the Gentiles, and in the end the mass of the Jews shall obtain admission into God's kingdom."

tion of this *locus* shows that commonly it has disappeared in one or the other abyss. The attempt at an adequate solution of the difficulty in question must manifestly be relegated to the science of dogmatics. For our present purpose some general hints will suffice.

The universalistic mode of view proceeds upon the scriptural premiss, that both God's decree to redeem the human race, and its execution in the person and through the work of the God-man, as well as the summons to mankind to participate in this saving plan of God realized in Christ, have relation to every single individual of the race, and embrace all without exception. Now, inasmuch as the decree of God is made by God Himself alone, the work of Christ accomplished by Christ Himself alone, the word of God conceived and spoken by the Spirit of God alone, and thus for every individual man salvation is objectively provided *beforehand* by the triune God, the priority and causality of his salvation rests alone in God. But the important question is how the individual bears himself subjectively towards this prevenient saving decree of the Father, this saving work of the Son, and saving word of the Spirit. For although the forces of divine grace alone accomplish the work of faith (and this is the second premiss of such a doctrine of conversion as accords with just recognition of the sinful character of human nature), there may nevertheless be in the first place a diverse *preliminary* attitude of the rational and moral subject towards that revealed truth of God which is willing to put forth its energy upon him. He may either, in his indifference to the truth and bondage to passing pleasures, turn his back upon it, or, pleased with some imaginary perception of truth and practice of virtue of his own, proudly fancy himself above it. In both cases the truth passes by the individual with as much indifference and pride as he on his side passes by the truth, and, deservedly, the salvation that is treated with scorn is lost. But man may also, in his earnest endeavour after truth and holiness, become conscious of the limits of his knowledge and strength, and be thus disposed to come as an inquirer and seeker to such a revelation of God as God's word presents to him. In this consists the true *obicem non ponere*, which opens the door of man's soul for the positive operation of the word itself.<sup>1</sup> And this operation the word then carries on

<sup>1</sup> We may not object to this, that the apostle says, ὅτι ἴθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην, κατ'ἑλαβεῖ δικαιοσύνην. For by this he does not mean the libertines and

by virtue of the enlightening, converting power inherent in it, when in the soul thus prepared it sows the first seeds of repentance and faith. Therewith the deliverance of the will fettered by sin has begun through the power of divine grace. But this earliest God-given power may and must forthwith exert its energy, and thus the God-implanted germs of spiritual life be effectually nourished, and finally regeneration be completed; whereas, in the opposite case, of course, its beginnings are frustrated, and these original workings of the word are in vain. Thus, then, the new birth is a progressive development brought about by various agencies. But the natural preparation of man which it requires has in no way a meritorious significance, and man's co-operation in the work of his inner, spiritual transformation is carried on, not in his natural strength, but merely by degrees in the strength of the will which is already set free by grace, so that not only the objective counsel of salvation, the objective act of atonement, and the objective word of calling, but also the subjective new creation of man, as the sum and result of the continuous operations of God's Spirit, is not of man but of God alone, *i.e.* in no respect springs from his natural power, but only from the divine power which perpetually gives the impulse to the human. For in this entire process human activity but follows in the train of the divine activity, which transforms and elevates the preceding unbroken passive attitude of man into one of activity. The order of formation in the new birth just depicted is in any case to be regarded as the normal and appointed order. But now in it the grace of God remains universal, and yet, in the sense described, creative and alone operative, merit in man is utterly precluded, and the guilt of non-conversion thrown exclusively upon him. And these are the only elements in the doctrine in question required by Scripture, the only ones of a religious and moral

scoffers among the Gentiles, who even in his days received not the gospel, but the earnest, seeking souls, the *homines desideriorum*, who were so far from the Jewish work-righteous pursuit after *δικαιοσύνη* that they painfully felt that their seeking led to no finding, nor could do so, and who then, for the most part before the gospel message of salvation reached them, led thereto by the O. T. word of revelation, became *φεβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* and *ἐργαζόμενοι δικαιοσύνην*, and as such *δίκαιοι τῷ θεῷ*, Acts x. 35, *i.e.* deemed worthy by Him of the offer of the word of His grace, and even qualified for receiving it. For the rest, we must not prescribe to the *regale* of divine grace, suddenly, by the preaching of the word, to silence and convert even scoffers bold in sin and blinded with arrogance.

nature, and therefore of practical moment, imperatively demanding recognition and discussion. Thus, for the individual who is an object of grace, a *πρόθεσις κατ' ἐκλογὴν* really and truly finds place, because in himself he is unable to discover any reason for his admission to salvation, since his very faith as a divine operation can only seem to him a vanishing element, and itself included in God's absolute act in saving him; on which account he is only able in his own reflection to discover and recognise the reason in the fact of his election from the *masse perditionis*, an election depending on God's spontaneous purpose. But at the same time it becomes evident why this *ἐκλογή* in Scripture always appears only as *ἐκλογή* to salvation, not also as *ἐκλογή* to destruction, and why along with it, in accordance with a supplementary line of doctrine, salvation is also described as based on the *προορισμός κατὰ πρόγνωσιν*. While man's salvation is not his own merit, but Christ's merit and God's choice, his destruction is only his own fault and his own choice. And because the ability to receive salvation is said to be equally imparted to all, the divine decision of course proceeds upon foresight in one case of salvation actually received as the result of divine grace, in the other of salvation scornfully rejected as the result of individual choice. These certainly are mere hints and outlines, but they may be sufficient to mark out the definite limits within which a more comprehensive scheme of doctrinal reconciliation, supposing it wishful to remain in the track of the Divine Word, will have to move. Comp. *Formula Concordiæ*, art. ii. "de libero arbitrio," and art. xi. "de æterna predestinatione et electione Dei;" Thomasius, *das Bekenntniss der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche in der Consequenz seines Princips*, § 13 and § 16; Harless, *Christian Ethics*, §§ 21-24, and my *Kirchl. Glaubenslehre*, IV. 1, pp. 3-114.

## CHAPTER X.

THE apostle, in the first place, in vv. 1-13, elaborates still further the proposition but briefly indicated in ix. 32, 33, namely, that the reason of Israel's rejection lies in their having sought the righteousness that avails before God, not ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμου; whereas they would have been saved if Christ, instead of a λίθος προσκόμματος, had become to them the ἀκρογωνιαίος (comp. Eph. ii. 20), and they had rested their faith upon this corner-stone.

Ver. 1. As the apostle, in the beginning of the ninth chapter, where he touches on the *fact* of Israel's rejection, first of all expresses and asseverates his love to his nation and his heartfelt interest in their salvation, so too here, where he purposes to discuss more closely the *reason* of this rejection. We thus see that he here begins a new subject, and this again appears to justify the present division of the chapters. Several modern expositors, indeed, would begin a new chapter with ix. 30. But all that is done there is, in the first place, to draw out the result of what precedes, and then, by way of preliminary, to attach thereto the thesis to be developed in the present chapter. — ἀδελφοί] In the employment of this form of address as well as in its coming first (1 Cor. xiv. 20; Gal. iii. 15), the apostle's depth of feeling makes itself known. "Nunc quasi superata præcedentis tractationis severitate comiter appellat *fratres*," says Bengel. No doubt this *severitas* had been manifested, not against his readers, but only in regard to the Jews. Still the Jewish Christians especially, of whom he is chiefly thinking in the address ἀδελφοί, as well as the Gentile Christians, might easily discover an unfeeling harshness in the rigour with which the apostle had censured his own nation. For this reason he both guards against this suspicion in what directly follows, and by the word ἀδελφοί reminds them of their common fraternal relation, which will not suffer mistrust to arise, and which represents him as one who would not wilfully hurt the feelings of his brethren.

—*ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας*] As to *μὲν* without a parallel sentence following (made conspicuous by *δέ*), comp. Winer, p. 719. The antithesis omitted, especially after ix. 32 understood of itself, that they thrust away salvation from them, is expressed in substance though not in form in ver. 3. As to the conception of the words *εὐδοκεῖν* and *εὐδοκία*, comp. Fritzsche here, II. p. 369 sqq., note. *εὐδοκία* signifies just as well *inclination, good pleasure, beneplacitum*, so Matt. xi. 26, Luke ii. 14, x. 21, 2 Thess. i. 11, as *good-will, benevolentia*, so Eph. i. 5, 9, Phil. i. 15, ii. 13. The meaning *good-will* seems to us here to imply an inappropriate self-commendation, and also not to suit the following *ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἰς σωτηρίαν*; for my good-will towards another, as a condition of my heart, purely internal and without ulterior object, neither exists on behalf of one (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν*) nor is directed to a definite aim (*εἰς σωτηρίαν*). On the other hand, the meaning *good-pleasure, delight and joy of my heart*, is altogether appropriate. This meaning, again, is nearly allied to that of *desire*, as Luther renders, and Chrys. Theophyl. and Oecum. interpret: *ἡ σφοδρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας ἐπιθυμία*. Not that *εὐδοκία* of itself means “desire;” but wherever my satisfaction, good-pleasure, is directed to an object not actually existent but still to be realized, it has of course the character of a wish, comp. 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 8. Accordingly, Bengel not inaptly paraphrases the sense of the passage: “*Lubentissime auditurus essem de salute Israël.*”

—*καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*] From the desire of the heart proceeds the petition to God. Lachmann and Tischendorf, after A B D E F G, Cyr., so also Cod. Sinait., read *ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, omitting the article. Were this reading genuine, it might throw new light upon the inappropriateness of explaining *εὐδοκία* by “good-will.” The most obvious rendering would then be: “My heart’s good-will and petition is addressed to God.” Now my delight or my desire may be addressed to God, but not my good-will towards another. Moreover, in general, by the side of the fully-expressed *ἡ εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας* the simple *ἡ δέησις* would appear too bald. It would be necessary, therefore, even if the omission of the article were not mere negligence on the part of the copyist, to connect *ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν θεόν* closely together in the sense of *ἡ δέησις ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, which would be possible, because we say usually indeed *δέομαί τινας*, but also *δέομαι πρὸς τινα*, Acts viii. 24; comp. Winer, p. 247. Analogous

is Phil. i. 26 : διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ἡμᾶς. On the distinction between δέησις and προσευχή, comp. Harless on Eph. vi. 18 : “δέησις is petition ; προσευχή, prayer, i.e. προσευχή by usage has acquired the notion of a *res sacra* ; δέησις, not.” Still more strikingly Meyer, *ibid.* : “προσευχή and δέησις differ from each other like *prayer* and *petition*, of which only the former has a sacred character and may contain any matter, whereas the latter may be addressed to man also, and contains only petition.” “Non orasset Paulus, si absolute reprobati essent,” remarks Bengel on the present passage.

—ὕπὲρ αὐτῶν] The *lect. recept.* ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, instead of ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν (comp. προσέκοψαν, ix. 32), has overwhelming authority against it, and probably only arose from the ecclesiastical lection, which began with this verse. Just so ἐστὶν after ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, not sufficiently attested, is a supplement of copyists, no doubt correct in itself.

—εἰς σωτηρίαν] *for* (their) *salvation*. Specifies the aim of his desire and prayer. Theodoret : προσεύχομαι τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτοὺς τυχεῖν. Thus : “The good pleasure of my heart and my request to God for them goes forth that they may gain salvation.”

Ver. 2 states the ground of his sympathy with the fate of his nation, as well as of his desire for their σωτηρία. “Hoc ad faciendam amoris fidem pertinebat : fuit enim justa causa, cur eos misericordia potius quam odio prosequi deberet : quum cerneret eos ignorantia tantum labi, non animi pravitatem, imo quum videret non nisi aliquo Dei affectu moveri ad prosequendum Christi regnum,” Calvin. In ix. 1 ff. the apostle based his sympathy for the people of Israel upon their objective, divinely-conferred privileges ; here, upon their zeal for God and His law.

—ζῆλον θεοῦ] *zeal for God*. Θεοῦ is *genit. object*. Comp. 1 Macc. ii. 58 : ζῆλος νόμου ; John ii. 17 : ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου ; Acts xxi. 20 : ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ; xxii. 3 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 12 ; Gal. i. 14 ; Tit. ii. 14 ; 1 Pet. iii. 13 ; Lachm. With ζηλοῦν τι or τινά, comp. 1 Cor. xii. 31, xiv. 1, 39 ; Gal. iv. 17 (Acts vii. 9). Instead of ζῆλός τινος we also say ζῆλος ὑπὲρ τινος, 2 Cor. vii. 7 ; Col. iv. 13. On the other hand, in 2 Cor. xi. 2, θεοῦ in ζῆλος θεοῦ is *genit. subj.* = *divine zeal*. The same ζῆλος θεοῦ is ascribed by Paul to the Jews in Acts xxii. 3, where he says of his own Pharisaic period : ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τοῦ θεοῦ καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς

ἐστε σήμερον, comp. Acts xxi. 20, xxvi. 7. "*Zelus Dei*, si non est contra *Christum*, bonus est," Bengel.

—κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν] according to (true) knowledge, i.e. after the measure, or as the result of (true) knowledge, Winer, p. 502. κατὰ may here be translated by *cum*, "with," although it never has this signification. Το οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν answers κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, Acts iii. 17. On the distinction between ἐπίγνωσις and γνῶσις, see on i. 28; Harless on Eph. i. 17. It was not γνῶσις in general that they lacked, but ἐπίγνωσις, right knowledge, that is, the true ζῆλος θεοῦ. "Cacterum hinc discamus, quo nos bonae nostrae intentiones abripiant, si illis obsecundamus, Vulgo haec putatur optima et valde idonea excusatio, ubi is, qui redarguitur, obtendit, se non malo animo fecisse. . . . Facessant ergo vanae illae tergiversationes in bona intentione: si Deum ex animo quaerimus, sequamur. . . . Quia sola ad eum pervenitur," Calvin. Worthy of note are also the words of Flacius in Bengel: "Judaei habuere et habent scientiam: nos contra, prohi dolor, scientiam sine zelo."

Ver. 3 explains in what the οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν consists. ἀγνοοῦντες γάρ] for not knowing. As to ἀγνοεῖν, see on ii. 4. Here also it is simply = "not to know, be acquainted with," therefore not = "to mistake," or "not to recognise, to be unwilling to know." The apostle's point here is not to stamp their ἄγνοια as wilful ignorance; comp. on the other hand, Eph. iv. 18; 1 Pet. i. 14. It is true, indeed, that they might have known it, the preaching of the gospel having come to them, ver. 18. Hence, doubtless, their ignorance was their own fault. Still, what in another connection is set down to their reproach is here simply stated as a fact, for the purpose of evincing that their ζῆλος is οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, without reference to their guilt or innocence in the matter. On the other side, just as little is it meant to adduce their ἄγνοια as a ground of palliation, as in Luke xxiii. 34: οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσι; Acts iii. 17: κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε; xvii. 30; 1 Tim. i. 13. But it is simply explained that their undiscerning zeal shows itself in their not knowing God's righteousness and seeking to make good their own righteousness.

—τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην] comp. on i. 17.

—τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην] τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, τὴν ἐξ ἔργων ἰδίων καὶ πόνων κατορθουμένην, explains Theophylact. Comp. Phil. iii. 9: ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου. δικαιοσύνην is wanting



after *ιδίαν* in A B D (in the Greek; the Latin version has retained it) E, *al.*, as well as in several versions and citations of the Fathers. Lachmann and Tischendorf have therefore expunged it. But it is apparently supported by the emphasis given by the threefold use of the word (*τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην . . . τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην . . . τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ*), comp. v. 6. Copyists may possibly have omitted it, because in itself it is no doubt dispensable, perhaps also because the increased brevity of expression wore to them an appearance of elegance.

—*στήσαι*] *stabilire, to make valid, availing*, comp. on iii. 31.

—*ὑπετάγησαν*] in the reflexive sense = *submitted themselves*, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 28; Heb. xii. 9; Jas. iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 13, iii. 22, v. 5; Buttmann, *Ausf. Gr. Sprachl.* I. p. 368; Winer, p. 327. The *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* is viewed as a divine order or objective norm, to which in faith we submit; comp. i. 5 and x. 16: *ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ λόγῳ*. "Ἐποταγή submittit se τῷ θέλειν divino, voluntati Dei," Bengel. But this *θέλημα* has given us the *ἐντολή*, *ἵνα ὑποσώμεν τῷ δόγματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 1 John iii. 23.

Ver. 4 is the confirmation (*γάρ*) of ver. 3. The Jews submitted not to God's righteousness; for, Christ being the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes, if they had submitted to God's righteousness they would have received the righteousness of faith instead of setting up the righteousness of the law. *τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός*] After the example of the Ital. Vulg. and Aug., Luther: "for Christ is the *end* of the law." So, rightly, the majority of modern expositors, comp. Luke xvi. 16. The explanation of *τέλος*, *perfectio, fulfilment*, is contrary to idiom. This would be *τελείωσις*, Luke i. 45, Heb. vii. 11; or *πλήρωμα*, Rom. xiii. 10. On the other hand, the explanation, the *object* (of the law is making man righteous, and this is done through Christ) or the *aim* (of the law is Christ, because the *νόμος* as a *παιδαγωγὸς εἰς Χριστόν*, Gal. iii. 24, aims at Christ), is according to idiom, comp. 1 Tim. i. 5.<sup>1</sup> But the first idea would be expressed in a somewhat obscure and roundabout way, and the last would

<sup>1</sup> Only needing to be mentioned, not refuted, is the explanation, no doubt possible *idiomatically*, of Victorin Strigel and Steph. le Moyne: "for Christ is the *toll* of the law," xiii. 7, *i.e.* He paid to the law, as the toll-taker at the gate of heaven, the toll of absolute righteousness due on our account, and thus made possible to us entrance to heaven toll-free.

little suit vv. 6-8, where Christ is placed in *opposition* to the law, and thus figures rather as the *end* than the *aim* of the law. But in a *dogmatic* point of view, the fact of Christ being the *end* of the law is no doubt based simply upon the fact that He is the *fulfilment* and *aim* of the law. For either the law itself would be without sanction, or its abolition by Christ without reason, if He had abrogated without fulfilling it. On the other hand, the law evinces its own as well as Christ's authority, in the fact that it proposed as its *object* and *aim* to come to an *end* through *fulfilment* by Christ. The Nomos here is the *entire* law, not merely the ceremonial law. It has come to an end, because now, in place of the requirement of works, the requirement of faith is established, vii. 1-6. The Lord's declaration, Matt. v. 17, does not contradict, but corroborates the declaration of His apostle. Christ's πληροῦν is withal a τελειοῦν (καταλύνειν, καταργεῖν) of the νόμος, but in another aspect withal an ἰστάναι, Rom. iii. 31, because the Nomos is abrogated merely with respect to its external letter of requirement, and in this very way, by the spirit of faith, is established and fulfilled as to its internal truth.

—εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι] specifies the object for which Christ is τέλος νόμου = ἵνα δικαιωθῇ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων αὐτῷ. He abolished the law, that henceforth whoever *believes*, *i.e.* seeks righteousness in the way of free gift by grace, not for the sake of works of merit, may obtain the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. "Tractatur τὸ credenti, ver. 5 ss.; τὸ omni, ver. 11 ss.; παντί, omni, ex Judæis et gentibus. Caput 9, non est includendum in angustiores terminos, quam Paulus hoc laetiori et latiori capite 10, patitur, in quo regnat τὸ omnis, ver. 11 sqq.," Bengel. "The principal stress lies on πιστ., as the opposite of that which the law demanded in order to righteousness," Meyer.

Vv. 5-10. If the law requires an impossible fulfilment of its commands, ver. 5, while the gospel, on the contrary, requires faith in Christ's fulfilment of the law, which is easy of accomplishment, ver. 6 ff., then is Christ the end of the law, and every one that believes in Him has attained righteousness availing before God. Thus vv. 5-10 are a confirmatory elucidation of the import of ver. 4. Comp. the instructive treatise of Knapp: *Diatribæ in locum Paulinum ad Rom. x. 4-11*, etc., ed. 2, tom. II. xv. p. 543 sqq.

Ver. 5. γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην] = γράφει περὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

Comp. John i. 46 : *ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ* ; also John i. 15 : *οὗτος ἦν, ὃν εἶπον* ; Eur. *Troail.* 1196 s. : *τί καί ποτε γράψειεν ἂν σε μουσοποιὸς ἐν τάφῳ* ; The passage cited here, as in Gal. iii. 12, is found in Lev. xviii. 5, LXX. : (*καὶ φυλάξεσθε πάντα τὰ προστάγματά μου, καὶ πάντα τὰ κρίματά μου, καὶ ποιήσετε αὐτά.*) *ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς.* This fundamental law of the nomistic economy of revelation is repeated in Ezek. xx. 21 ; Neh. ix. 29 ; comp. Luke x. 28 ; Matt. xix. 16 ff.

—*ὅτι*] comp. iii. 10, ix. 12, 17. It is here the *ὅτι* of quotation. — *ὁ ποιήσας*] *ποιεῖν* has the emphasis in opposition to *πιστεύειν*. Just because the *νόμος* requires the *ποιεῖν* of its precepts, *i.e.* what is impossible, it cannot mediate the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, and proves itself powerless to be the author of *ζωή*, Gal. iii. 21. It must therefore yield place to the revealed economy, which is able to impart both righteousness and life.

—*αὐτά*] *sc. τὰ προστάγματα τοῦ θεοῦ.* — *ζήσεται*] comp. i. 17, viii. 13. Here again, in consonance with the N. T. stage of revelation, the *ζωή* is *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*.

—*ἐν αὐτοῖς*] *through them*, *i.e.* through his fulfilling them. The various readings occurring in this verse are partly such as call for no notice as meaningless or incongruous (Lachmann : *ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ*), partly like the reading : *γράφει ὅτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ* (Vulg. : “*Moyses enim scripsit, quoniam justitiam, quae ex lege est, qui fecerit homo, vivet in ea*”), such as are to be explained by the difficulty occasioned by the introductory *ὅτι* and the *αὐτά* and *ἐν αὐτοῖς* without direct object of reference in the text, or by its being supposed necessary to take *γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην . . . ὅτι κτλ. per attract.*, Winer, p. 781, in which case *αὐτά* and *ἐν αὐτοῖς*, as not in unison with *δικαιοσύνην*, caused a *twofold* difficulty.

Vv. 6–8. Older, like modern, expositors give different decisions on the question, whether Paul in this verse adduces the authority of a Scripture testimony in support of the assertion made in ver. 4, or whether his purpose is to confirm it by an independent dogmatic argument with a merely formal point of support in a biblical statement. The passage cited or adapted is taken from Deut. xxx. 12–14. In the LXX. it runs : (ver. 11. *ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὕτη, ἣν ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον, οὐχ ὑπέρογκός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ μακρὰν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐστιν.*) 12. *οὐκ ἐν*

τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω ἐστί, λέγων τίς ἀναβήσεται ἰμῖν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ λήψεται ἡμῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτὴν ποιήσομεν; 13. οὐδὲ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστί, λέγων τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ λάβῃ ἡμῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀκουστὴν ποιήσῃ αὐτήν, καὶ ποιήσομεν; 14. ἐγγύς σου ἐστί τὸ ῥῆμα σφύδρα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου, καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου ποιεῖν αὐτό. Now, in the first place, it cannot but seem strange that Paul does not introduce this statement, as far as he uses it, by any of the formulae usual with him elsewhere, but in such a way as to personify the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, and make it the speaker. It cannot be said that τοῦ ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει there is spontaneously supplied from ver. 5: *in the same* Moses (κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν Μωϋσῆν or ἐν τῷ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως); for, according to the present structure of the sentences, Μωϋσῆς and ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη, introduced by the adversative particle δέ, manifestly stand in opposition to each other. If Paul, then, had wished to introduce another real quotation from Moses, he must have written either in ver. 6: τὴν δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνην οὕτω γράφει, or in ver. 5 either: Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν μὲν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, or at least in a changed order: τὴν γὰρ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσῆς γράφει. As the words now run, the reader cannot help regarding Moses as the representative or personification of the Νόμος, in opposition to the personified δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως; comp. in John i. 17 the antithesis of Moses and Jesus Christ. But the circumstances being as described, the Scripture passage in question cannot be meant to stand as a proof-text from Moses.

But, further, in the O. T. passages which he uses, the apostle permits himself to make alterations, such as occur nowhere else in his writings in adducing Scripture quotations. We may be surprised at his introducing the passage by words: μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, not present in the same form either in the original text or in the LXX., and still more at his tearing asunder the O. T. passages and interpolating comments of his own on the separate sentences, a proceeding of which no second instance occurs in the apostle. But—which is the chief point—in place of the τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης of the LXX. (Heb. הַיָּם עַד אֶל־עֲבֵר לְנֶפְשׁוֹ יִמְיָ) he inserts designedly the alteration: τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, which suits his purpose; and ποιεῖν αὐτό (Heb. לַעֲשֶׂה), which makes against his interpretation, though

recurring in substance several times in the original passage, comp. καὶ ποιήσομεν, vv. 12, 13, he just as designedly omits. Were we meant to find here a proper Scripture proof, such an alteration of the text as alone makes it possible could only be described as not merely arbitrary, but almost dishonest. The apostle, indeed, elsewhere often retains a translation of the LXX. differing from the original text, where, as regards its essential content of thought, it agrees with the original, or even changes it to suit his purpose, but in this case always in agreement with the Hebrew original. It would be impossible to point out an instance in which the apostle even argues from a passage of the LXX. which differs essentially from the original text, where he finds its unaltered text, not the Hebrew, serviceable for the dogmatic object he has in view; but least of all an alteration of the LXX. where they agree with the original text, especially not such an alteration as would betray the apostle's consciousness that the LXX., like the original text, partly do not say what is serviceable to him, partly say the precise opposite, and what he therefore must have held himself justified in arbitrarily establishing *per fas et nefas*.<sup>1</sup>

But this naturally leads us to consider the *import* of the Mosaic dictum. We may allude to the fact that in Deut. xxx. (comp. vv. 1-6) the subject is the gathering of the nation from exile, the cancelling of their sins, the circumcision of their heart, in consequence of which love to the Lord their God with all their heart and all their soul will follow (comp. Knapp, *ibid.* p. 549 sqq.), and that therefore the passage points to Messianic days, and has a Messianic import, such as Paul rightly found in it. But even then it speaks merely of the fulfilment of the law in the power of the Holy Spirit, not of the imputation of righteousness through faith. It might therefore well be made use of by John for his αἰ ἐντολαὶ αὐτοῦ βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν, 1 John v. 3, but not by Paul for his specific conception of δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως; for it treats merely of righteousness of life (although certainly of one only capable of accomplishment through faith in Christ), not of the righteousness of faith in itself. And the apostle by his designed abbreviation of the text shows that he was clearly conscious of

<sup>1</sup> As to Eph. iv. 8, comp. Hengstenberg on Ps. lxxviii. 18; as to Eph. v. 14, Harless there; as to 1 Cor. ii. 9, Osiander there. In all these passages merely the form of the original passages is changed for the purpose in hand, not the essential content of thought.

this, and accordingly did not use the passage as a real proof-text. If we choose, nevertheless, to see here an actual Scripture quotation, we must then either, with older orthodox interpreters, consent to import into the Mosaic text itself a most arbitrary meaning, or, with modern rationalistic expositors, suppose that the apostle himself imputed to that text a most arbitrary, allegorical and mystic sense. We ought rather, with the majority of exegetes (comp. among the moderns, especially Rückert and Tholuck, the latter also against Meyer here), to suppose in the passage (a view favoured both by its matter and form) a free employment of the words of Moses, which the apostle uses as an apt substratum for his own course of thought. In point of fact, the form of the Mosaic dictum furnished the apostle with a thoroughly appropriate dress in which to clothe the conception he has in view, of the easiness of πιστεύειν in opposition to the difficulty of ποιεῖν. Moreover, even as to the matter, he might feel himself called upon to employ it, because at all events he saw in the original passage a fundamental Messianic reference, and held himself justified in deducing from the αἱ ἐντολαὶ βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσὶν, contained in it, as it were by a conclusion *a majori ad minus*, the still more undeniable ἡ πίστις βαρεῖα οὐκ ἔστιν. We may call this a holy, charming play of God's Spirit on the words of the Lord. In this sense Luther observes on the passage in the *Annot. ad Deuteron.*: "Dicimus, Paulum data opera noluisse Mosem ad verbum citare, saltem in priore parte, sed abundante spiritu ex Mose occasionem accepisse adversus *justitiarios*, velut *novum et proprium textum componendi*. . . . Denique non dicit, sic esse *scriptum*, sed *Justitiam fidei* sic dicit *loqui*." Rightly, though not sufficiently, Bengel also says: "Ad hunc locum (Deut. xxx. 11-14) haec quasi parodia suavissime alludit, sine expressa allegatione." If the Mosaic passage be understood of righteousness of the law in the outward sense of the word, the Pauline application may indeed be called a real parody. On the other hand, if it be applied to Christian righteousness of life, the apostolic exposition, certainly no *expressa allegatio*, but more as an *allusio*, is rather a free application, a *translatio* of the sense to an object different in form, although still akin in nature. "Si quis istam interpretationem nimis coactam et argutam esse causetur, intelligat non fuisse apostolo propositum, Mosis locum anxie tractare: sed ad praesentis causae tractationem duntaxat applicare," Calvin.

vv. 6, 7. ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει] Respecting this personification of the righteousness of faith, comp. Kuapp, *ibid.* p. 547 f.,<sup>1</sup> and Heb. xii. 5, where the παράκλησις is introduced as διαλεγομένη ἡμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς. Paul here represents not Christ, but the righteousness of faith as speaking in opposition to Moses, because he has no actual word of the personal Christ to adduce, and the O. T. dictum which he adapts could all the less be described as spoken by Christ Himself, as he does not even quote it in its original sense and proper meaning, but freely adapts it to the object in view. The, in itself, fine observation of Bengel: γράφει, *scribit, litera occidente*. Antitheton, vv. 6, 8: *dicit, voce vivida*, must not be based on the text itself.

—μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου] According to the Heb. and the LXX.: “The command is not in heaven רַחֵם, λέγων, *i.e.* that one should say,” etc. Out of this Paul forms the prohibition: “Say not in thy heart.” εἰπεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου is a Heb. idiom for “to think,” especially of thinking perverse, unholy thoughts (Ps. xiv. 1, רַחֵם רַחֵם; Matt. iii. 9; Rev. xviii. 7), which one is ashamed to speak out.

τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν;] The δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου, ver. 5, had commanded ποιεῖν in order to the bestowal of ζωή. But this ποιεῖν man must needs deem as hard and impossible as that he should ascend to heaven to fetch thence far-distant righteousness. The δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως, on the contrary, as the opposite of the δικαιοσύνη ἐκ νόμου, forbids the question: τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; It says: Say not, Who shall ascend to heaven? *i.e.* say not, Righteousness for me is as distant and high as if it lay in heaven, and I must needs fetch it thence. This interpretation quite agrees with the sense of the passage in the original connection, which must needs form the starting-point for the exposition here; for there the question: τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; is meant to express the idea that the ἐντολή is ὑπέρογκος and μακράν. ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν is an expression for an undertaking extremely difficult or impossible, Prov. xxx. 4; Wisd. ix. 16; John iii. 13.

—τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν] “that is just the same as

<sup>1</sup> “Ista enim figura dicendi, quae rebus sensu carentibus actum quandam et animos dat, . . . magnam hic vim addit orationi, ut haec ipsa tamquam ex oraculo, quo nihil possit esse certius et verius, edita nobis putemus; plane ut illa, quae in Proverbiis Salomoneis, atque alibi saepe, ex persona Sapientiae dicuntur.”

to bring Christ down." But Christ has already descended, and brought righteousness from heaven and realized it upon earth. It is therefore nigh thee. If, on the contrary, thou thinkest it far away, and seekest it in heaven, this is just the same as if thou wouldst fetch Christ down from heaven, as if thou deniedst that He has already come down from heaven and become man. According to another view, *τοῦτ' ἔστι* is meant to be a more precise explanation of the design indicated in the question = "Say not: Who will ascend to heaven? *namely*, to fetch Christ down." But neither does this harmonize with the primary meaning of the question in the original context, nor does *τοῦτ' ἔστι* elsewhere introduce the design, but simply expounds the meaning of the preceding dictum, comp. Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark vii. 2; Acts i. 19; Rom. ix. 8; Heb. ii. 14, etc. Here, too, one expects in *τοῦτ' ἔστι* to find the exposition of what is contained in *τίς ἀναβήσεται κτλ.* Some interpreters apply the passage not to the incarnation, but to the ascension of Christ. It would then have to be explained: "Who will achieve the righteousness that wins heaven?" Christ has ascended to heaven. This question then means, to drag Him down from heaven, or to deny His ascension. But then in necessary sequence *τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν* must mean: "that is to deny Christ's atoning death," or: "to bring Him out from among the dead." But now ver. 9 shows that in ver. 7 not a denial of the death but of the resurrection of Christ must be meant. Another class of interpreters would take the question of the verse as an expression not of the grief that despairs of obtaining righteousness, but of the theoretical unbelief that regards Christ's advent from heaven, or His incarnation, as not having taken place, or impossible. Then, since the righteousness of faith forbids the assertion that none can ascend to heaven to bring Christ down, none descend to the deep to bring Christ up, the gist of vv. 6-8 is the command: "Be not unbelieving (*namely*, in Christ's incarnation and resurrection), but believing." Thus, by the authority of Moses himself, Christ is proved to be the end of the law, for the righteousness of the law in Moses demands doing; the righteousness of faith, believing. The former righteousness, then, is superseded by the latter. But apart from the fact that this interpretation makes the apostle find in the Mosaic dictum a most arbitrary, oracular, hidden meaning, it would have been far more



simple and appropriate in this case, to the Mosaic saying: *ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς*, to oppose the *prophetic* dictum: *ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, as in Gal. iii. 11, 12. Moreover, it may be objected that, if Moses at one time demands *ποιεῖν*, at another *πιστεῦν*, this does not necessarily prove that through *πίστις* the *νόμος* has come to an end, but may just as well prove that Moses contradicts himself, and that therefore his authority is altogether doubtful, or that it remains uncertain to which of two mutually destructive statements we ought to give credit. Were it replied that such a belief in the untrustworthiness of O. T. declarations is inconceivable even upon the standpoint of Jewish opponents, it is still certain that, by his arbitrary alteration and exposition of the text, Paul would with too evident and systematic wantonness have laid bare the very point and pith of his reasoning to the attacks of these opponents. But, finally, the question: *τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*; would not express unbelief in the *possibility* of Christ's incarnation, which must have been expressed by the converse question: *τίς καταβήσεται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; For that no one can ascend to heaven to bring Christ down, by no means proves that Christ Himself cannot descend from heaven. In the same way, as expressing unbelief in the possibility of Christ's resurrection, we should have expected in ver. 7 not the question: *τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον*; but rather the converse question: *τίς ἀναβήσεται ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου*; The antithesis in vv. 6–8 to ver. 5 is therefore as follows: The law brings not righteousness, for it commands the doing of its precepts, which is impossible; the gospel, on the contrary, brings righteousness, for it commands not perfect obedience, but proclaims the perfect obedience already rendered in Christ, and merely commands us believingly to receive this, which is easy and within reach. Therefore is Christ the end of the law, because He fulfilled it. With Him all depends on faith, which is possible and easy, not upon doing, which is impossible. *δικαιοσύνη* and *ζωή* are the goal to be arrived at. As this cannot be reached in the way of the *νόμος*, but only in the way of *πίστις*, the *νόμος* as matter of course can merely serve as a *παιδαγωγός* to *πίστις*, and as soon as the latter appears, must pale and vanish before it as the moon before the rising sun, Gal. iii. 21–25.

—*ἢ*] or, i.e. say just as little — *τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν*

ἄβυσσον;] *i.e.* Who can descend into the abyss, to bring up far-distant and unattainable righteousness? Both in the original text and the LXX. the expression: τίς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης; intimates the great difficulty of the task, comp. Ps. cxxxix. 9; Bar. iii. 29, 30: τίς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτήν (φρόνησιν, ver. 28), καὶ κατεβίβασεν αὐτήν ἐκ τῶν νεφελῶν; τίς διέβη πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ εὗρει αὐτήν; Knapp, *ibid.* p. 552 f. Only, the designed reference to Christ leads the apostle to alter the expression. The antithesis of οὐρανός and ἄβυσσος or ἕδης is found also elsewhere, comp. Job xi. 8; Ps. cvii. 26, cxxxix. 8; Amos ix. 2; Ecclus. xvi. 18, xxiv. 5; Matt. xi. 23.

—τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν] to bring up Christ from the dead is to deny that He has already risen. If I do what is already done, I thereby deny that it is already done. To ask despairingly whether righteousness is attainable, is equivalent to doubting Christ's resurrection, or to a practical denial of it; for by means of His resurrection Christ brought to light the righteousness that He had realized, and offered it to the apprehension of faith, ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν, iv. 25; Acts ii. 31 f.; 1 Cor. xv. 17. Respecting the abyssus as the abode of the dead, comp. Knapp, *ibid.* p. 554 f.; respecting the phrase: ἀνάγειν ἐκ νεκρῶν, Ps. xxx. 3; Wisd. xvi. 13; Heb. xiii. 20.

Ver. 8. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει;] *sc.* ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη, as though it were said before: ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὐ λέγει, which as to the *meaning* is no doubt implied in ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει μὴ εἶπης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. The formally inexact antithesis gave rise in It. Vulg. (*sed quid dicit scriptura?*) and others to the reading ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;

—ἐγγύς σου τὸ ρῆμά ἐστιν] The word of legal righteousness is far away in heaven and in the deep, because, in order to the bestowal of σωτηρία or ζωή, it requires a doing which is out of reach. The word of the righteousness of faith, on the contrary, is near, because all that it requires is faith within easy reach, faith in Christ's actually existent fulfilment of law and observance of righteousness.

—ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου] Epexegetis of ἐγγύς, antithesis of ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ and ἐν τῇ ἀβύσσῳ. The word is near, because it merely requires faith in the heart and confession

with the mouth. Paul omits the *καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶ σου* of the LXX., which neither occurs in the Heb. nor suits his purpose.

—*τοῦτ' ἔστι*] As in vv. 6, 7 the meaning of the *human* thought is indicated (= *τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ἔστι Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν* or *ἀναγαγεῖν*), so here the meaning of the *divine* declaration. We may explain *τοῦτ' ἔστι* either *that is* = *τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστι τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως*, or *that means, namely*, in which case *τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως* = *that means, the word of the faith, ἐγγύς σου ἐστίν* would need to be repeated. The first explanation is to be regarded as the more likely one.

—*τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως*] = *ὁ λόγος, ἡ διδασκαλία τῆς πίστεως*. *τῆς πίστεως* is *genit. object.*, as in Gal. iii. 2: *ἀκοὴ πίστεως*; 1 Tim. iv. 6: *οἱ λόγοι τῆς πίστεως*.

—*ὁ κηρύσσομεν*] namely, we preachers of the gospel. "Atque illud praeceptum, illam de fide doctrinam, tradimus (*κηρύσσομεν*), nos scilicet, Evangelii praecones, non nostro arbitrato, sed Dei ipsius et Jesu Christi auctoritate. *Vid. Comm.* 14, 15, et Marc. xvi. 15," Knapp. A special reference to Paul, *which I preach*, would seem little in place here, where the stress is not at all on the person, but on the evangelistic office. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 11 with Gal. ii. 2, v. 11.

Ver. 9. *ὅτι*] Most expositors take *ὅτι* as an exegetical particle = *that*, serving to specify the substance of the *κήρυγμα*, ver. 8. It is better taken by Luther and several expositors in the causal sense = *for*. In the first place, *τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὁ κηρύσσομεν*, ver. 8, corresponding with *τοῦτ' ἔστι κτλ.*, vv. 6, 7, plainly forms a brief, self-contained, explanatory sentence; and again, while there was no need to specify the well-known purport of the evangelic Kerugma, there was need to justify the application of the dictum quoted in ver. 8 to the preaching of faith. Since faith in the heart and confession with the mouth impart salvation, ver. 9, by the saving word to be found so near—in the mouth and in the heart—nothing else can be meant than the word of faith (and the word of confession necessarily associated therewith), ver. 8.

—*ἐὰν ὁμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου*] corresponds with *ἐν τῷ στόματί σου*, ver. 8. The reason of the precedence of *Homologia* and of its separation from *Pistis* is merely the formal one of an allusive resemblance to the dictum made use of in ver. 8. Of course the apostle neither admits a confession without faith

nor a faith without confession, but the confession is to be contemplated as *believing* confession, and the faith as *confessing* faith. This is especially shown by 1 John iv. 2, 3, 15, and 2 John 7, where the exclusively mentioned *ὁμολογεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* manifestly includes in it *πιστεύειν*, 1 John v. 1, comp. Knapr, *ibid.* p. 864. "The same act of praise and confession takes place in two ways, first, *before God alone*, secondly, *before man*, and is really a work of the faith of which Paul treats, Rom. x.," Luther.

—*κύριον Ἰησοῦν*]=*κύριον ὄντα Ἰησοῦν*, comp. John ix. 22; 1 John iv. 2. *κύριον* is thus the predicate=*Jesus as the Lord*, and is placed first for the sake of emphasis. Respecting the *κυριότης* of Jesus, comp. Knapr, *ibid.* p. 565 sqq. As here, so also in 1 Cor. xii. 3: *οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν κύριον Ἰησοῦν εἰ μὴ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ*, the confession of Jesus as the Lord is pointed out as the specific characteristic of the Christian position. And certainly this acknowledgment includes within itself all the other elements of the Christian faith. "In hac appellatione est summa fidei et salutis," Bengel. But the apostle adduces this general truth as the object of confession,—in the first place, because it was every way fitting to make the general precede the special (*ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἡγάγειν ἐκ νεκρῶν*); and again, because the incarnation, which he might have mentioned in allusion to ver. 6 as the object of Homologia, has not for him so *special* a dogmatic significance (even in John it only gains significance through the polemical opposition to Docetism) as the resurrection which he at once proposed in allusion to ver. 7 as the object of Pistis. Hence it does not seem to us in keeping, for the sake of obtaining a closer correspondence with what precedes, with some expositors (comp. Tholuck here), to make the confession, that Jesus is the *κύριος*, equivalent to the acknowledgment of the truth, *ὅτι καταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, ver. 6. Although in itself it is beyond question that Christ by the fact *ὅτι καταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* and made Himself a *δοῦλος*, purchased for Himself the right of *κύριος* in relation to His own, a right which He possessed by *designation* from the beginning, although He only entered on the exercise of this princely right on His return to heaven; still it is just as true that the apostles never elsewhere place the *κυριότης* of Jesus in direct relation with His incarnation, but that it serves to characterize either His premundane or postmundane existence, and therefore points Him out either as Son of God or

the exalted Son of man, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6, xv. 47; Acts ii. 36; Phil. ii. 9–11; comp. also Harless on Eph. i. 2.

—καὶ πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου] corresponds with ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, ver. 8. Regarding ἐν, comp. Steiger on 1 Pet. i. 5.

—ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν] points back, as observed, to τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν, ver. 7. Respecting the significance of Christ's resurrection for the justification and salvation of man, comp. on iv. 25, and Knapp, *ibid.* p. 567 sqq.

—σωθήσῃ] answers to ζήσεται, ver. 5. σωτηρία is ζωή conceived in the form of deliverance from θάνατος, comp. on i. 16.

Ver. 10 confirms (γάρ) the import of ver. 9. Confession with the mouth and faith in the heart lead to salvation, ver. 9; for the two must needs go together, because, while faith in the heart indeed mediates δικαιοσύνη, confession with the mouth must be added if σωτηρία is to be reached, ver. 10. Accordingly, Griesbach, Knapp, and others are wrong in enclosing this verse, which in no sense contains a mere parenthetical thought, in brackets. καρδιά γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην] “for with the heart (not, with Luther: *from the heart*, comp. ver. 9: ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ) men believe to the attainment of righteousness.” The dependence in form on the Mosaic dictum, ver. 8, being no longer preserved as in ver. 9, the apostle here follows the order, logically correct and absolutely required by the subject-matter of the verse, in making καρδιά πιστεύειν precede στόματι ὁμολογεῖν.

—στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν] We may say, that neither confessionless faith leads to δικαιοσύνη, nor faithless confession to σωτηρία. Thus, as πίστις and ὁμολογία are ever inseparably bound up together, so also are δικαιοσύνη and σωτηρία; and the separation found here is to be regarded less as a real one made on account of the subject-matter, than merely as a formal one made for the sake of the parallelism. But the thought here meant to be emphasized is just this, that while indeed faith in the heart justifies, it must prove itself justifying faith, actually leading to σωτηρία, by the fact that it makes confession, because a confessionless, dumb faith is not true faith. Since, therefore, only confession supplies security that justifying faith, leading to salvation, exists, and since only faith, not confession,—not even when it is conceived as believing confession,—of itself mediates righteousness, the assignment of δικαιοσύνη to πίστις καρδίας, of σωτηρία to ὁμολογία στόματος, as to the

matter seems sufficiently justified. "Paulus autem ideo sic loquitur, ore fit confessio ad salutem, ut testetur, se requirere non hypocrisin fidei, sed vivam et firmam fidem," Melancthon. "Caeterum viderint quid respondeant Paulo, qui nobis hodie imaginariam quandam fidem fastuose jactant, quae secreto cordis contenta, confessione oris, veluti re supervacanea et inani, supersedeat. Nimis enim nugatorium est, asserere ignem esse, ubi nihil sit flammae neque caloris," Calvin. For the rest, that confession—right not only in substance, but in form—is the clearest and most distinct evidence of faith, both as to its existence at all and its measure and degree, holds good not merely of the first ages of Christian persecution, but of all ages, since a confession of Jesus as Lord, without regard to consequences, furnishes the most conclusive proof possible that the man who makes it has already inwardly presented his whole life a sacrifice to the Lord. If faith does not pass into confession, it becomes extinct, and along with it salvation is lost. On this account not merely are good works in general, but also confession in particular, the *via regni*, although not the *causa regnandi*, Matt. x. 32; 2 Cor. iv. 13.

Vv. 11–13. Scripture proof that πίστις brings σωτηρία, and that to every one who believes, ver. 11. Next, this πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων is more precisely confirmed, ver. 12, and likewise supported by a testimony from Scripture, ver. 13. Thus vv. 11–13 corroborate the entire import of ver. 4, which has been demonstrated dogmatically vv. 5–10, while laying special stress on the πᾶς, on which Bengel observes: "Hoc monosyllabon, πᾶς, *omnis*, toto mundo pretiosius, propositum ver. 11, ita repetitur vv. 12 et 13, et ita confirmatur ulterius vv. 14, 15, ut non modo significet, quicumque invocarit, salvum fore; sed, Deum velle, se invocari ab omnibus salutariter."

Ver. 11. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή] Isa. xxviii. 16, comp. ix. 33 in this epistle.

—πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων] Paul here, to subserve his purpose, expressly adds πᾶς, which certainly is found neither in the Heb. nor the LXX., but as to meaning is included in the unrestricted ὁ πιστεύων.

—ἐπ' αὐτῷ] namely, upon *Christ*, as in ix. 33. πιστεύειν τιμ is *credere, confidere alicui*; πιστεύειν εἰς or ἐπὶ τινα (Acts ix. 42, xxii. 19) is to be taken in a pregnant sense: to close with one by faith, in faith to profess adherence to one, Winer,

p. 267; πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινι (Luke xxiv. 25; 1 Tim. i. 16) is: to rely by faith upon one, Winer, p. 292.

—οὐ καταίσχυνθῆσεται] “non frustrabitur salute, quam expectat,” Vatablus.

Ver. 12. The πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων] in opposition to Jewish particularism, is more precisely explained to the effect that it applies equally to Gentiles and Jews. And, indeed, as soon as it was laid down that not the ἔργα νόμου, but only πίστις works σωτηρία, therewith *co ipso* the abolition of all distinction between Jews and Gentiles in regard to salvation was settled. “Si sola fides requiritur, ubicunque reperta fuerit, illic se vicissim proferet Dei benevolentia in salutem: nullum ergo hic erit discrimen gentis aut nationis,” Calvin.

—οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνος] *for there is no distinction between Jew and Greek.* “Hic non additur *primum* *Judæis*, ut initio, c. i. 16,” Bengel. They are all equally saved, if they believe. And in truth it is self-evident, that not merely Greeks in general, just as much as Jews in general, but every individual Greek and every individual Jew without distinction has access to salvation, if he believes; so that in fact the πᾶς forms the most direct antithesis to all particularism in the doctrine of election. Otherwise it would be necessary to interpolate the arbitrary thought: every one, indeed, is saved who believes, but he only attains to faith whom God has predestinated. With οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ διαστολή, comp. iii. 22. There is one guilt upon all, and therefore one Mediator for all.

—ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων] comp. iii. 29, 30. *For one and the same is Lord of all.* ὁ αὐτός is subject; κύριος, predicate; πάντων, masculine, comp. Acts x. 36; Phil. ii. 11. If, therefore, there is no difference between Jew and Greek, because one and the same is Lord of all, for the same reason there will be no difference between all individual men. ὁ αὐτός refers, as the entire course of thought in the passage proves, especially ver. 11 ἐπ’ αὐτῷ, and vv. 13, 14, to Christ, not to God. As little as general faith in God could be denied to Jews, could calling upon the name of God be described as the specific characteristic of justifying, saving faith in a *Christian*. In general, ὁ κύριος, according to the Pauline doctrinal system, as well as according to usage, with the exception of O. T. citations, which explain themselves, is invariably *Christ*, Winer, p. 154.

—πλουτῶν] comp. Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, iii. 8. He is to be contem-

plated as *πλουτῶν χάριτι* or *χρηστότητι*, ii. 4, rich in grace, which manifests itself in the communication of *σωτηρία* (comp. ver. 11: *οὐ κατασχευθήσεται*; ver. 13: *σωθήσεται*), comp. v. 15, xi. 33.

—*εἰς πάντας*] *with respect to all, for the good of all, in behalf of all.*

—*τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν*] For invocation is an inevitable, immediate expression of *πίστις*. The *ἐπὶ κλήσις*, as directed to God, is not to be identified with the *ὁμολογία* that takes place before man, vv. 9, 10. As to the invocation of Christ, comp. Acts ii. 21, vii. 59, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22. Thus, because Christ is *Lord* of all, He has *the will*, because He is *rich* in behalf of all, He has *the ability* or *power* to render all—Jews or Gentiles, provided they call upon Him in faith—partakers of salvation. “*Dives et largus. Quem nulla quamvis magna credentium multitudo exhaustire potest; qui nunquam necesse habet restrictius agere,*” Bengel. “*Ubi notandum, Patris nostri (Christi) opulentiam largitate non minui: ideoque nihil nobis decrescere, quamlibet alios multiplici gratiae suae affluentia locupletet. Non est ergo cur invidcant alii aliorum bonis, perinde acsi quid ipsi propterea deperiret,*” Calvin.

Ver. 13 ratifies the words *πλουτῶν κτλ.*, ver. 12, by a testimony of Scripture. The passage is from Joel iii. 5 (LXX. ii. 32), verbatim after the LXX. Paul here, as is shown by the absence of the formula of quotation, and the *γάρ*, which is no part of the Scripture passage itself, adduces a well-known Scripture saying in his own name, so that the sense is somewhat = “for in agreement with the well-known saying of the Lord, I tell you that every one who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved,” comp. ver. 18, xi. 34, 35; 1 Cor. xv. 32; 2 Cor. ix. 7; Eph. v. 31. Since the passage in the prophet relates to the days of the Messiah (Hengstenberg, *Christology*, I. 349), Paul applies *κύριος* to Christ, whom he everywhere and without reserve identifies with the Jehovah of the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Meyer here again, in the interest of his Subordinationist views, observes: “The invocation of Christ is not such worship in the absolute sense as takes place only in respect of the Father, the absolute God, but rather worship in that relative apprehension of the worshipping consciousness which is conditioned by the relation of Christ to the Father (whose Son, fellow in authority, Mediator on behalf of men, etc., He is).” This Origenistic gloss certainly merits the epithet “arbitrarily imported,” which this expositor on his side is so ready to impute, especially to expositions of Scripture in the *dogmatic* sense.



The apostle, having in vv. 1–13 more fully developed the proposition laid down, ix. 32, that the guilt of Israel's exclusion from the Messianic salvation is found wholly in their work-righteous unbelief, now proceeds, vv. 14–21, to deprive them of the excuse that they had not heard the preaching of the gospel, and concludes with the proposition that even this unbelief of Israel was foretold by prophetic lips, on which account the occurrence of this fact furnished no ground for the assertion of an ἐκπεπτωκέναι of the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ix. 6.

Vv. 14, 15. Introduction to ver. 16 in the form of a sorites, the last member of which is corroborated by prophetic testimony. "The necessity of the evangelical ἀποστολή is first of all to be established, in order then to make the disobedience of the Jews stand forth with the force of contrast," Meyer. Only the ἐπικαλεῖσθαι leads to σωτηρία, ver. 13. But ἐπικαλεῖσθαι must be preceded by πιστεύειν, πιστεύειν by ἀκούειν, ἀκούειν by κηρύσσειν, κηρύσσειν by ἀποστέλλεσθαι, vv. 14, 15. Thus the necessity of the ἀποστολή is seen to be the fundamental condition of final σωτηρία. Accordingly, in vv. 14, 15 there is no special reference to the Jews, which occurs first in ver. 16. The object here is neither to cut off from the Jews every means of escape, which is first done in ver. 18, nor to refute a Jewish objection, which Paul himself first raises in ver. 18. "Climax retrograda: qua Paulus ab ulteriore quovis gradu ad citeriorem argumentatur, et hujus necessitatem, tum ex necessitate ipsam existentiam ejus infert. Qui vult finem, vult etiam media. Deus vult, ut homines invocent ipsum salutariter. Ergo vult, ut credant. Ergo vult, ut habeant prædicatores. Itaque prædicatores misit. Omnia fecit, quæ ad rem pertinerent. Voluntas ejus antecedens est universalis, et efficax," Bengel. "Diligentissime hic locus observandus, ut sciamus, quomodo Deus sit efficax in nobis, nec quaeramus alias illuminationes præter verbum," Melancthon. They call upon *υpon*, for by the word they are called to Him, comp. Hengstenberg, *Christology*, *ibid*.

—πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν] Attraction from πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται τοῦτον, εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν, vi. 17. *How then shall they call upon Him in whom they believed not?* οὖν draws an inference from ver. 13. How then can they call upon Him in accordance with the requirement of ἐπικαλεῖσθαι just laid down? Respecting the future of ethical

possibility, comp. Winer, p. 348. Important codices, A B D E F G, also Cod. Sinait., instead of the future, have here, as in vi. 1, the conjunctive ἐπικαλέσονται, which Lachmann and Tischendorf have received. Just so in the following πιστεύσωσιν, ἀκούσωσιν, κηρύξωσιν. This would be the *conjunctiv. deliberativ.* = "How then *should* they call," etc.? But as the testimony is so very conflicting that no one of the *majorities* has the conjunctive throughout (A not having it for πιστεύουσιν, D E F G, Cod. Sinait. not for ἀκούουσιν, F G not for κηρύξουσιν), any decision must be left in abeyance. The subject to ἐπικαλέσονται, etc., may be borrowed from ver. 13 = πῶς οὖν (οὔτοι, οὓς δεῖ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, ver. 13) ἐπικαλέσονται, etc., so that in ver. 15 οἱ κηρύσσοντες would have to be taken from κηρύσσοντες immediately preceding, and supplied in thought as subject to κηρύξουσιν. But the proposition in vv. 14, 15 being a general one, the plural is better taken impersonally = How shall *they*, *i.e.* how shall *one* call, etc., in whom *one* believed not, etc.? Comp. Luke xii. 20; John xv. 6. "Ergo qui Deum invocat, in eo praesidium sibi esse repositum confidat necesse est. Siquidem de ea invocatione hic loquitur Paulus, quae Deo approbatur. Nam hypocritae quoque invocant, sed non in salutem, quia sine ullo fidei sensu. . . . E converso autem collige, illam esse demum veram fidem, quae Dei invocationem ex se parit. Fieri enim nequit, ut qui Dei bonitatem gustavit, non etiam perpetuo ad eum votis omnibus aspiret," Calvin.

—πῶς δὲ πιστεύουσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν;] Attraction from πῶς δὲ πιστεύουσιν εἰς τοῦτον, οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; But how can they believe (in Him) of whom they heard not? οὗ refers of course, like εἰς ὃν, to the κύριος, ver. 13, *i.e.* to Christ. ἀκούειν τινός means not merely *audire aliquem*, but also, as here, *audire de aliquo*, in which signification ἀκούειν τινά also is found, Eph. iv. 21.

—πῶς δὲ ἀκούουσιν χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος;] The distinction between χωρὶς and ἄνευ is in general rightly defined by Tittmann, *de Synonym. in N. T.* p. 93 seq.: "χωρὶς ad subjectum, quod ab objecto sejunctum est, refertur, ἄνευ autem ad objectum, quod a subjecto abesse cogitatur." So Matt. x. 29: "ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, *i.e.* ne passer quidem moritur ita ut non adsit pater, *i.e.* inscio et invito patre." On

the other hand, John xv. 5: “χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν, *i.e.* a me *sejuncti*, ἐὰν μὴ μένητε ἐν ἐμοί,” vv. 4–6. But we look upon the distinction in many cases as purely formal, since it amounts really to the same thing whether the subject is considered as severed from the object, or the object from the subject. Thus the general strain of thought here forbids us to interpret, with Tittmann: οὐ πιστεύσαντες τῷ κηρύσσοντι. Rather *χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος*, which no doubt in itself = *sejuncti ab eo qui doccat*, is only different in mode of conception, not as regards the sense, from *ἄνευ κηρύσσοντος*, *absente doctore, si nullus adsit doctor*.

—πῶς δὲ κηρύξουσιν ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι;] Therefore the ἀποστολή is the first thing necessary, if we are to come to the κήρυγμα, to ἀκοή, to πίστις, to ἐπίκλησις, and thus to σωτηρία. The sending subject to be understood to ἀποσταλῶσι is *God*, comp. xv. 15 f.; 2 Cor. iii. 5 f.; Gal. i. 15 f.; Eph. iii. 2, 7. The sending of the prophets and apostles was direct; that of ministers of the church is indirect. The prophetic oracle, in picturing the lovely appearance of the ἀπόστολοι, illustrates the importance of the ἀποστολή.

—καθὼς γέγραπται] Isa. lii. 7. The Hebrew text, as far as it is employed by Paul, runs: מִהֲנֹאזְעוּ-עַל-הָהָרִים רִגְלֵי מַבְיָא מְשִׁיעַ טוֹב לְעוֹלָם. “How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of salvation, who publishes peace, brings good tidings!” The LXX., departing from the original: ὥς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρέων, ὥς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὥς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθὰ κτλ. Paul, omitting ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρέων, which is part of the poetical picture and does not serve his purpose, translates after the original text. He contracts רִגְלֵי מַבְיָא מְשִׁיעַ טוֹב לְעוֹלָם into רִגְלֵי מַבְיָא, and rightly takes מַבְיָא both times in the collective sense (Gesen. *Comm. über d. Jcs.* here), hence the plural τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων. The prominent mention of the feet graphically depicts the approach of the messengers, Nah. i. 15; Acts v. 9. “Pedes eminus (pulchri), quanto magis ora cominus,” Bengel. Since, in the second part of Isaiah, the deliverance from exile, seen in the perspective of prophecy, is beheld coincidentally with the advent of the Messianic kingdom, the apostle’s application of the prophet’s words to the N. T. messengers is amply justified. With τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, comp. Eph. ii. 17: καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην, where Christ Himself is represented as such

an ἀπόστολος εἰρήνης, and Eph. vi. 15 : ὑποδησάμενοι τοὺς πόδας ἐν ἑτοιμασίᾳ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς εἰρήνης. τὰ ἀγαθὰ here manifestly denoting the blessings of the Messianic kingdom (comp. Heb. ix. 11, x. 1), the article, which Lachmann and Tischendorf have omitted, certainly on weighty evidence, may still be deemed genuine, and the omission may have arisen from the reading of the LXX., or after the example of the anarthrous εἰρήνην. At all events, we can more easily account for its being omitted than added. The omission of εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην τῶν in A B C, Cod. Sinait.\* *al.*, as well as in several versions and Fathers, which authorities Lachmann and Tischendorf follow, is to be explained by the eye of the copyists straying from the first εὐαγγελιζομένων to the second.

Ver. 16. The despatch of the messengers has already taken place ("non defuere nuncii. Esaias in spiritu alacres eorum gressus vidit," Bengel), and therewith the condition on which all might come to believe and call upon the Lord is fulfilled: this is the thought to be gathered from vv. 14, 15, to which the present verse forms the antithesis. εἰ τοίνυν τὸ μὲν σωθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ ἐπικαλέσασθαι ἦν, τὸ δὲ ἐπικαλέσασθαι ἐκ τοῦ πιστεῦσαι, τὸ δὲ πιστεῦσαι ἐκ τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι, τὸ δὲ ἀκοῦσαι ἐκ τοῦ κηρύττειν, τὸ δὲ κηρύττειν ἐκ τοῦ ἀποσταλῆναι, ἀπεστάλησαν δὲ καὶ ἐκήρυξαν . . . εὐδελον ὅτι τὸ μὴ πιστεῦσαι ἐκείνων ἔγκλημα γέγονε μόνον· καὶ γὰρ τὰ παρὰ θεοῦ πάντα ἀπήρτισται, Chrysostom.

—ἀλλ'] nevertheless. — οὐ πάντες] *not all*, refers to the mass of the people of Israel which had not believed. πάντες, Jews like Gentiles, should have believed, vv. 12, 13; but οὐ πάντες believed, *i.e.* the Jews believed not. The application of οὐ πάντες to the Gentiles runs counter to the tenor of thought; for the apostle has here to do, not with particular individuals, but with entire peoples, with the Jewish *world* and Gentile *world*, and in ix.—xi. treats altogether of the unbelief of Israel, not of the unbelief of Gentiles. Rather, on the contrary, he speaks of the reception of the Gentile world in Israel's stead, ix. 30, x. 12. There was thus no occasion whatever here specially to mention the fact, that even among the Gentiles, whose conversion as a body the apostle sees in process of gradual accomplishment, xi. 25, many still remained unbelieving.

—ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ] *obeyed the gospel*. On themselves accordingly lies the guilt of their rejection. "Etiam ii debuerant

et potuerant obedire, qui non sunt obedientes facti," Bengel. With *ὑπακούειν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* = to submit oneself in the obedience of faith to the requirement of faith laid down in the gospel, comp. i. 5, x. 3, xvi. 26; Acts vi. 7; 2 Thess. i. 8, iii. 14; Heb. v. 9. The same Isaiah, who foretold the advent of the messengers of salvation, also predicted the unbelief of the people of Israel in their message; comp. a similar application of the same prophetic passage, John xii. 38.

—*Ἡσαίας γὰρ λέγει*] Isa. liii. 1. *For* Isaiah says, as to sense = for therefore it could not but come to pass, because it was predicted by Isaiah. The prophetic passage treats of the unbelief of the people of Israel in the *עֲבָרֵי־יְהוָה*, whose humiliation was a *σκάνδαλον* to the *Ἰουδαίοις*. Rightly observes Calvin on the same passage: "Neque sui temporis homines tantum comprehendit Jesaias, sed posteros omnes, usque ad finem mundi: nam quamdiu exstabit Christi regnum, hoc impleri necesse erit. Quamobrem fideles adversus tale scandalum, hoc testimonio muniri debent." Comp. also Hengstenberg, *Christology*, II. 275.

—*κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν;*] literally after the LXX. The Hebrew text without *κύριε*: *וְכִי הָאֵינִי לְעֹמֶד עֵץ*. Rightly, Phot. in Oecum.: *τὸ δὲ κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν ἀντὶ τοῦ . . . ὀλίγοι*, and Theophyl.: *τὸ τίς ἀντὶ τοῦ σπάνιος κεῖται ἐνταῦθα· τουτέστιν ὀλίγοι ἐπιστεύσαν*. With pain the prophet surveys the vast body of unbelievers, and similarly the apostle the small number of believers. The historic aorist *ἐπίστευσε* answers to the preceding *ὑπήκουσαν*. *ἀκοή*, answering to the Heb. *וְכִי הָאֵינִי*, properly, *the thing heard*, then *the report, proclamation, preaching, message*, Matt. iv. 24, xiv. 1, xxiv. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 13.

Ver. 17 infers (*ἄρα*) the correctness of the proposition laid down in ver. 14 from the import of the prophetic passage in ver. 16. If Isaiah requires *πίστις* in the *ἀκοή*, then the former supposes the presence of the latter as its originating cause.

—*ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ*] The most obvious supposition is, that *ἀκοή* is here to be taken in the same sense as in ver. 16. But if it signifies "the thing heard, the message, the proclamation," *ῥῆμα θεοῦ* can no longer signify "the word of God" as the form of God's revealed truth; for the proclamation does not come *through* God's word, but God's word forms the *substance* of the proclamation, or is identical therewith, 1 Pet. i. 25. It would then be necessary to explain

ῥῆμα θεοῦ by "command of God," which is the medium of the preaching, inasmuch as God by His command sends forth the preachers. In this case, in the words διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ allusion would be made to the necessity of the ἀποστολή, ver. 15. But in the first place, the reference to the Heb. דְּבַר יְהוָה, as the usual designation of the *substance* of the prophetic, here therefore of the apostolic proclamation, is so obvious, that to change the meaning into "command of God," which is not to be found anywhere else, could not but seem arbitrary. Respecting the fixed meaning of ῥῆμα θεοῦ = God's revealed word, comp. Luke iii. 2, iv. 4; John iii. 34, viii. 47; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, xi. 3; 1 Pet. i. 25; Rev. xvii. 17. Here, therefore, the back-reference of ῥῆμα θεοῦ to ῥῆμα, ver. 8, and the forward-reference to φθόγγος, ῥήματα, ver. 18, cannot be eluded. But, further, if ἀκοή denoted the proclamation, and ῥῆμα θεοῦ the commissioning order of God, ἀκοή must correspond to κήρυγμα, ver. 14, ῥῆμα θεοῦ to ἀποστολή, ver. 15, and ἀκοή, ver. 14, to which yet the ἀκοή of this present verse must correspond, seeing that both times πίστις is derived from it, will be passed over and ignored. Finally, it is impossible to perceive with what justice the apostle derives the proposition ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ from the preceding passage of the prophet. For it is a mere artificial, although certainly an ingenious makeshift, to appeal to the address κύριε, ver. 16, or even to the entire attitude of the prophet towards God, such as is expressed in κύριε . . . ἡμῶν, in which address or attitude the prophet figures as God's ambassador, and in accordance with which God appears as the One by whose *order* the ἀκοή is proclaimed; or still more is it a makeshift to go back to ver. 15 (πῶς δὲ κηρύξουσιν, εἰ μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι;), so that only ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς would be an inference from the passage of the prophet, while ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ, on the other hand, would simply repeat an assertion of the apostle already advanced once. All these inconveniences are avoided directly we understand ἀκοή in this verse, as in Gal. iii. 2, 5 (comp. 2 Pet. ii. 8), of the act of hearing, perceiving, which is countenanced both by the question, ver. 14: πῶς δὲ πιστεύουσιν οὐδ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν; and by the question, ver. 18: μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; which links on to the ἀκοή of the present verse. The change of meaning in ἀκοή in vv. 16, 17, considering the ambiguity of the word, is the more tolerable, since in reality the ἀκοή, ver. 16, *i.e.* the preaching = God's

word heard, is here simply analysed into its two elements, namely, into ἀκοή and the ῥῆμα θεοῦ, i.e. into hearing and the word of God (= the hearing of God's word preached). Thus the entire purport of ver. 17 might justly be derived from the prophetic passage, ver. 16, and then ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς answers exactly to πῶς δὲ πιστεύουσιν οὐ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; and ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ to πῶς δὲ ἀκούουσιν χωρὶς κηρίσσοντος, ver. 14. There was no occasion again to bring forward the necessity of the ἀποστολή, as this was demonstrated already in ver. 15 from Isa. lii. 7.<sup>1</sup> The reading Χριστοῦ instead of θεοῦ, received by Lachmann, is to be regarded simply as a later gloss (Beda has *Dei Christi*). It arose perhaps from wrongly referring ῥῆμα θεοῦ to ἀποστολή, ver. 15, and supplying παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ instead of παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ to εἰάν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι there. "*Igitur ex auditu verbi Dei fides*," remarks Calov here. "Non enim nisi ex verbo Dei haberi potest fides. Quod proinde audiendum est vel legendum. Relata sunt verbum et fides. Verbum prae-dicatur ob fidem: nec extra Verbum Dei locum habet fides ordinarie. Non enim ἐνθουσιαστικῶς et ἀμέσως fidem accipimus, sed ἀκουστικῶς et ἐμμέσως per *auditum verbi*, ubi tamen nominato *verbo* non excluditur *Sacramentum Baptismi*, quod etiam medium est *regenerationis et fidei*. Quia sacramenta sunt verbum quoddam Dei non quidem ἀκουστόν sed ὁρατόν, non tamen sunt sine verbo, imo verbo tum *mandati* tum *promissi* constant, nec sine illo Sacramenta sunt."

Ver. 18. If, then, it is settled that ἀκούειν is requisite for πιστεύειν, and κηρύσσειν for ἀκούειν, and that among the Jews ὑπακούειν or πιστεύειν is wanting, the question is, whether the κήρυγμα did not reach them, and so ἀκούειν and πιστεύειν were impossible. In the present verse this ground of excuse is precluded.

—ἀλλὰ λέγω] introduces a spontaneous objection, ver. 19. — μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν;] *did they not hear it? sc. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ*, or even indefinitely "it" = what was spoken of hitherto; comp. Tholuck here, and Krüger, § 60, 7.

<sup>1</sup> According to Hengstenberg, *Christol.* II. 275, שמעו, ἀκού, never signifies anything but, what is heard, or even report. Hence he explains, ver. 16: "Who believes our hearing," that which we hear, which is made known to us through God's word. So also Calov and Umbreit here. We need not then, vv. 16, 17, suppose a change in meaning, for we may take ἀκοή in ver. 17 also in the passive sense = faith comes from what is heard, from that which we hear; but what is heard comes from God's word (preached).

—*μενοῦνγε*] *imò vero*, introduces a reply to the objection, ix. 20. This reply is given in the words of Ps. xix. 5 after the LXX., which passage Paul does not *cite* directly, comp. ver. 13, but weaves into his own language. Comp. on this passage, which treats primarily of the revelation of nature, Hengstenberg, *Com. über d. Ps. I. 332*: “The universality of God’s manifestation of Himself in nature is a prophecy in fact of the universality of the proclamation of the gospel. If the former is not accidental, if it is grounded in the divine nature, then must the latter also spring from the same divine essence. The revelation of God in nature is for all His creatures; to them as such it is given: and it is a pledge that they shall also one day be made to share in the higher and more glorious revelation. It was a security to the Gentiles that the temporal limitation of salvation to Israel was not a *hindrance*, but a *means* towards the *removal* of the limitation.” But we are not on this account to suppose a reference to the Gentiles in the present passage. Rather the object is, by asserting the *universal* diffusion of the evangelical message, to repel the objection that it came not to Israel. To suppose that Paul applies *αὐτῶν*, which in the psalm relates to the heavens, to the gospel messengers, seems *unnecessary*. Rather the application of *αὐτῶν*, which has passed over into the Pauline quotation from the literally adopted text of the LXX., may be left indefinite, as all that is regarded is the principal thought of the passage, that the revelation of God, here the word of the gospel, has made its voice heard over the whole earth. The knowledge of Christ, disseminated in those days well-nigh throughout the civilised world, and extending from east to west, is viewed by the apostle, as in Col. i. 6, 23 (comp. Rom. i. 8), as the complete fulfilment of the commission which the Lord gave to His apostles, Mark xvi. 15.—The relative prolepsis in the present passage was the less open to exception, seeing that most certainly to the Israel of these days which remained unbelieving such preaching of the gospel as was essential had been least of all lacking. We must not then, with Löhe, *Drei Bücher von Kirche*, p. 34 ff. (in the train of the Roman Catholic expositors in Cornelius a Lapide<sup>1</sup> and older Lutheran expositors), and Pistorius, *Luth. Zeitschr.* 1846, 2, p. 40

<sup>1</sup> Tholuck remarks: “Of Roman Catholic expositors, a Lapide has been unjustly charged with this view by Philippi.” But I speak not of Cornelius a Lapide himself, but only of Roman Catholic expositors *in* Cornelius a Lapide.



(Besser here, on the other hand, uncertain), press such statements unduly, and infer from them that even in the apostles' days the gospel had been diffused, in the literal sense of the word, over the whole *οἰκουμένη* (even in China and America). With the statement of this verse, Herodian, ii. 11. 7, has been aptly compared: οὐδέ τι ἦν γῆς μέρος ἢ κλίμα οὐρανοῦ, ὅπου μὴ Ῥωμαῖοι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξέτειναν, and the well-known passage of Clement Rom. in 1st Ep. to Cor., where he says of Paul: δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον. That, at the time when the Roman epistle was written, the gospel had not yet been preached in *Spain*, xi. 20–24, 28 shows. Nevertheless, Paul says in the present passage: εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος. The doctrine, therefore, of the so-called *vocatio catholica* has no right to base itself upon such statements of Scripture literally taken.

Ver. 19. ἀλλὰ λέγω] introduces another spontaneously raised objection, ver. 18. A pretty wide-spread interpretation of these words is: *Did not Israel know?*—to wit, that the gospel shall pass over from the Jews to the Gentiles. To this some modern expositors add the more precise reference—necessary in this case—to the contents of ver. 18 = surely it was not unknown to Israel, that the knowledge of the gospel was destined to go abroad into all lands (and even to the Gentiles), ὅτι εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξελεύσεται ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν. This ignorance might serve as a ground of excuse, in so far as many Jews may have been kept from receiving the gospel by its universalistic tendency. But, in the first place, it cannot but appear *prima facie* an arbitrary course to assign to μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω; a different object from that of the parallel μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; ver. 18. Further, just as the apostle introduces the objection both times, vv. 18, 19, by the same formula, ἀλλὰ λέγω, so also he would have introduced the refutation lying, according to the interpretation in question, in the prophetic passages by a *μενούργε*, as in ver. 18. We may add that Paul would have quoted passages of the prophets far more suitable for rebutting the possible ground of excuse mentioned, passages directly and positively asserting the universalism of the gospel, and, as such, referring to the rejection of Israel and the reception of the Gentile world in Israel's stead. Moreover, this universalism itself was in reality sufficiently established even for Israel by the single passage quoted, ver. 18. But, finally, the

interpretation in question is not at all in keeping with the entire strain of thought from ver. 14 onward. For the purpose was, to cut off every excuse for Israel's disobedience to the gospel. Now, such an excuse might certainly be found in the fact that the knowledge of the gospel had not come to Israel, ver. 18, but not in the fact that Israel had not previously known that in case of their unbelief, or without this, the Gentiles would be summoned to participate in the gospel. If they were surprised and took offence at the latter fact, this would simply furnish a new ground of accusation against their arrogant particularism and exclusivism, not a ground of excuse for their unbelief. Add to this, that, as a rule, Israel's taking offence was not based so much on the reception of the Gentile world simply, as rather on the reception of the Gentile world into the Messianic kingdom without its being previously admitted into the O. T. theocracy. Thus in the last resort the *σκάνδαλον* invariably lay in this, that *πίστις* was to lead to *σωτηρία*, without the *νόμος* and *ἔργα*; and so far from there being any excuse for this *σκάνδαλον*, it was in this very *σκάνδαλον* that Israel's guilty unbelief consisted. Another series of expositors, as the object to *μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω*, have therefore rightly supplied *τὴν ἀκοήν* or *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, save that, by virtue of our exposition of ver. 17, it is more exact to supply, as is done to the question in ver. 18, *τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ*. But when these expositors interpret: *It was surely not unknown to Israel?* i.e. *Perhaps they did not comprehend the gospel?* in the first place, even then *μενούργε*, introducing the reply, is wanting; and again to this question the answer contained in the passages of the prophet, vv. 19–21, is not in the least appropriate, since these passages do not at all avail to prove a possible knowledge or apprehension of the *gospel* on the part of Israel. Rather, according to our view, the import and connection of thought in vv. 19–21 with what precedes is as follows: After the apostle has cut off from the Jews' disobedience to the gospel, ver. 16, its only possible excuse, namely, that the knowledge of the gospel has not come to them, ver. 18, he himself raises the objection of wondering inquiry: Did not *Israel* know? i.e. Is it conceivable that Israel above all, God's elect people, knew not the Messianic *σωτηρία* specially designed for them, or the preaching of the gospel, when even the Gentiles attained to this knowledge? Now the passages of the prophets quoted show that this fact is nowise

to be wondered at, since it was already actually foretold in the word of God that the Gentiles will accept, but Israel reject salvation. Thus we need no introductory *μενουσινγε*, for the passages of the prophets do not so much refute as corroborate the assertion implied in the question: *μή Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω*; that without doubt *Israel* also rejected the gospel of God.<sup>1</sup> Thus only does it become evident why the apostle, instead of saying here *μή οὐκ ἔγνωσαν*; in harmony with *μή οὐκ ἤκουσαν*; says in preference *μή Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω*; In this way, too, the precedence of the word *Ἰσραὴλ* (rightly endorsed in conformity with the most important modern interpreters, on far predominant evidence, by Mill, Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann, Scholz, Tischendorf, instead of the received *μή οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰσραὴλ*); by means of the emphasis given to it by our interpretation, now appears in its just significance and intrinsic necessity. From motives of forbearance, in vv. 16, 18, the apostle had merely supposed, not expressly named, Israel as the subject spoken of. The latter is first done here, where his language is less that of accusation than of wonder at Israel's apostasy, wonder in reality honourable to Israel. Further, upon our view, the question with which ch. xi. opens joins on in the most natural and direct way to the conclusion of the present chapter, and this conclusion in a certain sense itself falls back on the beginning. For there already (comp. the *οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν* and *ἀγνοοῦντες*, vv. 2, 3) was expressed the *Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω*, which is here merely represented as predicted in the language of prophets, and predicted as a guilty act of rejection on the part of the nation.

—*πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς*] in the first place Moses, afterwards Isaiah. *πρῶτος* does not here stand for *πρότερος* (John i. 15), but in a general sense begins the entire series of relevant prophetic sayings, the numbers of which the apostle did not at once set before him

<sup>1</sup> Meyer asserts that our view is inconsistent with the interrogative form with *μή*, which necessarily presupposes the negation of the *οὐκ ἔγνω*. We do not concede that this grammatical rule has no exceptions, comp. on iii. 3. But even if in the present passage we render: *Surely Israel* was not ignorant, the passages of the prophets might serve to prove that this in itself apparently incredible fact, nevertheless fell out according to the prediction. That in this case what follows *must necessarily* have been introduced by a strong *adversative particle*, is by no means self-evident, as Meyer, ed. 3 and 4, asserts. But when Tholuck, considering the emphasis which, according to our exposition, falls on Israel, desiderates a predicate describing it as God's people, it should be remembered that *Ἰσραὴλ* itself, without further addition, is the nation's title of *honour*.

in a determinate way. The expressive mention of the fact that Moses was the first among the prophets to predict Israel's apostasy, is an intimation that the latter is not to be wondered at, since it was foretold from the very beginning. "Moses, sub quo Israel formam populi accepit, jam tum dixit," Bengel. The passage here cited is found Deut. xxxii. 21. The whole verse runs, according to the LXX. : *αὐτοὶ παρεξήλωσάν με ἐπ' οὐ θεῶ, παρώξυνάν με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν. καὶ γὰρ παραζηλώσω αὐτοὺς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπὶ ἔθνει ἀσύνετῳ παροργιῶ αὐτούς.* Thus Paul, instead of *αὐτούς*, uses the *ὑμᾶς* of direct address. In the preference here promised to the Canaanites, by which Israel,—the spouse of the Lord,—rejected for her idolatry, is to be provoked to jealousy, even as she previously by her *idololatry* provoked to jealousy her husband, God Himself, is implied a prelude and foreshadowing of the relations existing between God and Israel subsequently in the days of Christ. Even at that time Israel provoked God by its unbelief, and by the idolatrous purposes to which it applied His own works. On this account it was cast off, and the heathen adopted in its stead, by which course Israel in its turn was provoked to jealousy and anger. But this sinful *ζῆλος* was meant to turn into a holy, divine *ζῆλος*, and thus to become the means of Israel's recovery to salvation, xi. 11, 14. As, therefore, in ix. 25, 26, Israel, so here Canaan is to be contemplated as the representative of the Gentile world. According to Baumgarten, *Theolog. Comm. zum Pentateuch*, Zweite Hälfte, p. 542, by *οὐκ ἔθνος* and *ἔθνος ἀσύνετον*, in reality every Gentile nation is meant to be indicated; "for inasmuch as all heathen stand solely upon the ground of nature, their distinctive nationality is perishable and unreal, and therefore, in the light of full, eternal truth, none at all, and all heathen are foolish, because they are without the knowledge of God, the fount of all wisdom (Ps. xiv. 1), because they are without the knowledge of the law of Israel" (iv. 6, 8). Comp. also Keil here. But still, even in this case, a particular Gentile nation would be meant in the original passage, even if it were left undetermined which. Consequently the passage in Deuteronomy, in its concrete individualization, lays down the abiding fundamental law of divine justice, even as this law is actually realized and illustrated with ever-increasing completeness in the entire course of Israel's historical development as a nation. But

the complete realization was only seen in the days of the apostles, when not *one* Gentile nation, but the entire Gentile *world* inherited the blessing in Israel's stead, and inherited not simply temporal, but eternal blessing.

—ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει] עַל־לֹא, comp. ix. 25 ; 1 Pet. ii. 10. "οὐ as the objective negation stands also in connection with nouns, the conception of which is meant to be negatived absolutely and as matter of fact," Winer, p. 597 ; also Heindorf on *Hor. Sat.* ii. 3. 106 : *Non sutor*. Therefore the people of God alone being a people proper, one answering to the idea of a people, every people that has not become a people of God, despite the most positive assertion of its nationality, is in point of fact merely a no-people. Only through the gospel is the special individuality of each nation, by being transformed into the genuine ideal of humanity, kept true to itself ; and, in like manner, the specific nationality, by its very transformation into a distinctive nationality in the ideal sense of the word, is restored to and preserved in its true condition. On ἐπί with the dative after verbs of emotion, properly of that *upon which* another thing rests as upon its basis, therefore here to render jealous and angry, as it were *on the ground*, i.e. *on account of*, a people, comp. Winer, p. 491.

—ἐπὶ ἔθνει ἄσυνέτῳ] לְפָנַי יִגָּד, of the perversity of idolatry, religious blindness. τί γὰρ Ἑλλήνων ἄσυνετώτερον ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις προσκεχηνότων, Theophylact.

Vv. 20, 21. Still more distinctly and directly than Moses, does Isaiah assert the reception of the Gentile world, and the rejection of Israel. "Quod Moses immuerat, Esajas audacter et plane eloquitur," Bengel.

—Ἡσαίας δέ] *But Esaias*. The δέ leads over to another subject.

—ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει] *makes bold and says*, is not = ἀποτολμῶν λέγει, audacter dicit, *says boldly out*, but = ἀποτολμᾷ λέγων, "takes courage and then says, shows his boldness in saying." Comp. John xii. 44 : Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξεν καὶ εἶπεν = ἔκραξεν εἰπών. The passage occurs in Isa. lxx. 1. It runs in the Hebrew : וַיִּזְרַב אֶלֶף יְהוֹנָדָה אֶלֶף יְהוֹרָדָה ; LXX. Cod. B : ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτώσιν, εὐρέθην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν. Paul, like the LXX. Cod. A, inverts the two parallel clauses, because the second asserts the reception of the Gentile world in *more distinct* terms than the first. In opposition to the opinion of most of

the modern expositors, that the passage in *Isaiah* refers to the Jews, and only in *Paul* to the Gentiles, comp. Vitringa on Isa. lxxv. 1, and Tholuck in the 4th ed. of his Com.

—*εὑρέθην*] *I was found*. *Aoristus propheticus*, which in Paul's days had already become the *aoristus historicus*.

—*τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν*] comp. Acts xvii. 27 : *ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἄρα ψηλαφήσειαν καὶ εὖροιεν*. But what is here meant is not a seeking with the intellectual powers, but a seeking with the soul, such as expresses itself in prayers and supplication. Comp. Matt. vii. 7 : *ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρήσετε*.

—*ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην*] *I became manifested*, i.e. as a Helper and Saviour.

—*τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσι*] *to those that inquired not of me*. Luther, as regards the *sense* rightly : "to those that inquired not after me." For only he that inquires of God inquires after God, and *vice versa*. *ἐπερωτᾶν τὸν θεόν*, *Dcum consulere* (LXX. Num. xxiii. 3; Josh. ix. 14; Isa. xix. 3), may therefore be used for *Dcum honorare, colere*.

—*πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραήλ*] *but in reference to Israel*, Luke xx. 19; Heb. i. 7; Winer, p. 505. That *πρὸς* here is not to be rendered *ad* with the Vulg., *to* with Luther, follows both from the fact that in the prophet no address to Israel is found, and because here we are less to suppose an opposition in the persons addressed, there being no address in ver. 20, than an opposition in the application of the prophetic passages, on one side to the Gentiles, on the other to the Jews.

—*λέγει*] namely *Isaiah*, and that in the subjoined second verse of the same 65th chapter. LXX. : *ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα*. Paul's placing *ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν* at the head makes the performance and faithfulness of God's love stand forth in yet stronger contrast with the permanent (also emphasized by the *part. pres.*) impenitence and unfaithfulness of the nation. With the thought, comp. Matt. xxiii. 37. "Vel hoc uno verbo refellit dogma de duplici voluntate divina, beneplaciti et signi," Bengel.

—*ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου*] "Ac valde emphatica loquutio est, eum manus expandere : quia salutem nostram per verbi sui ministros procurans non secus manus nobis porrigit, quam si pater filium gremio blande excipere paratus brachia etiam extenderet," Calvin. Save that the idea, latent in this dictum, of

a revealed and secret will, is to be rejected in accordance with the rule of Bengel's decision.

--καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα] explanatory addition of the LXX., synonymous with ἀπειθοῦντα. The latter denotes negative, the former positive disobedience, resistance, rebellion, John xix. 12; Heb. xii. 3. But, at the same time, ἀντιλέγειν may retain its primary meaning: *to contradict, gainsay*. To the God who offers them this salvation, they say: *We will not!*

## CHAPTER XI.

THE apostle has now shown, ch. ix. and x., how the rejection of Israel does not run counter to God's word, because the latter acknowledges no legal claim on the part of man, but ever reserves the right of admitting to salvation to God's spontaneous determination. He has shown also that the reason of Israel's exclusion from the Messianic kingdom lies in nothing but its own resistance. At this point he might have concluded his theodicy with respect to the fact now under discussion, namely, the rejection of Israel and the admission in its stead of the Gentile world that submitted in the obedience of faith to God's order of salvation. But his love for his nation was too heartfelt and strong, his grief for its present condition too earnest and profound, to allow a soul filled, as his was, with holy, loving sorrow, to rest satisfied with so comfortless a conclusion. On this account, like the prophets of the Old Covenant, he exchanges the language of rebuke and chiding over the present for that of hope and comfort respecting the future. Thither his longing, expectant eyes are directed, and in the far distance he sees burst forth the living fountains, from which his nation, now languishing at the point of death, will drink new vigour. From pointing to these fountains of life and comfort, it is impossible for him to refrain. But even his theodicy itself had come to a conclusion merely in appearance, or at least provisionally. With respect to carnal, work-righteous claims, and Israel's complaint founded thereupon, the Lord was completely justified in what He had done; but He was not yet justified with regard to His own purposes of grace and the destiny of the nation as made known in His word. The divinely-given privileges of the nation, mentioned ix. 4, 5, as well as many express prophetic predictions of the O. T., were no doubt only able to demonstrate their subjective power to bless and save in the believing portion of the nation, the true Israel; but still they were given to Israel as a whole, and so far in point of fact implied the promise of their future comprehensive realization.



Israel's destiny—guaranteed by the divine foreknowledge, and hence also attested by the predictions of prophets—was to be God's elect people, the light of the Gentiles, the centre of the new spiritual theocracy, or of the O. T. theocracy merged in the N. T. Christocracy. But this destiny would have failed altogether, and an ἐκπεπτωκέαι of the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ix. 6, taken place, if Israel's present apostasy was to be looked on as permanent, not as a mere point of transition to its future universal salvation. But in this the fulness and depth of the divine wisdom reveals itself, which achieves its purpose of holy love, not merely in spite, but by the very means of man's resistance, and thus attests the divine faithfulness, as well as the truthfulness of the divine prognosis and prophecy, that even Israel's temporary fall could do nothing but serve to convey to the Gentile world the blessing of the gospel, and thus—by the sight of this blessing departing and taken from it and given to strange children—to provoke and induce Israel to return and again lay hold of this its original possession. Thus only does the apostle's historical survey reach its conclusion and repose, while the end of his dogmatic exposition returns upon its beginning; for it is now established, that the historical realization will correspond with the universal design of the evangelical counsel of salvation, i. 16. Comp. *Intro.* The consideration of the way and manner of this realization—opposed to all human calculation—in which divine determination and human freedom are so wondrously interwoven that the former secures its end without the latter being infringed upon, leads the apostle in conclusion to adoring wonder at the unsearchable riches of the divine wisdom and knowledge which make themselves known in unfathomable judgments and ways beyond human ken.

Vv. 1–10. God did not cast off His people, but, in accordance with an election of grace, allowed a portion of them to attain salvation,—the portion which, itself chosen by grace, also in its turn chose grace instead of works, whilst no doubt He abandoned the rest to hardness of heart.

Ver. 1. λέγω οὖν] Comp. ἀλλὰ λέγω, x. 18, 19. οὖν introduces the inference that might be drawn from the statements of the prophets, x. 19 ff. For since the latter intimated that God would thenceforward enter into the same relations with the Gentile world in which He hitherto stood to the people of Israel, the question might certainly be deduced from them—μὴ ἀπόστατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν

λαὸν αὐτοῦ;] But the apostle, in choosing the designation τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ instead of τὸν Ἰσραήλ, intimates the impossibility and self-contradiction of the supposition implied in the question, which comes out still more distinctly in the expression τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν προέγνω, ver. 2. As little as man hates his own flesh, Eph. v. 29, can God cast off His own people. "*Ipsa populi ejus appellatio rationem negandi continet*," Bengel. The supposition involved in ἀπόσωτο shows that the word has the emphasis, although the emphasis may also be assigned to ἀπόσωτο and τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ in common as two mutually exclusive notions. On the form ὡσάμην instead of ἑωσάμην with the *augm. syllab.*, comp. the observation of Thomas M.: ἑωσάμην καὶ ἀπεωσάμην καὶ διεωσάμην· τὸ δὲ χωρὶς τοῦ εἰπεῖν ταῦτα ἀναττικόν, Winer, p. 83. With the sentiment, comp. LXX. Ps. xciv. 14: ὅτι οὐκ ἀπόσεται κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψει; xcv. 3 (only in LXX.).

— The indignant repudiation μὴ γένοιτο] is confirmed by καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλῆτης εἰμὶ] Had God rejected the people as such, not one of them could have been received. The reception of this single one proves that the rejection of the others depends not on God's arbitrary decree with respect to the whole nation, but has its ground in the guilt of these others, because they are unwilling to comply with the condition on which alone they can be received. Εἰ γὰρ ἀπόσωτο, οὐδένα ἂν ἐδέξατο. εἰ δὲ ἐδέξατό τινας, οὐκ ἀπόσωτο, Chrys., and: Οὐκ ἀπόσθητε ἀπὸ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐαυτοὺς ἀπωθεῖτε. The apostle does not mean that as an Israelitish patriot he cannot entertain such a thought as that God cast off His people; for μὴ γένοιτο negatives the fact itself, not merely his opinion about it, since otherwise, instead of the affirmative form λέγω οὖν, he must have chosen the interrogative: Do I say, then? Besides, his patriotism could not prevent him holding the opinion in question the instant there was real ground for it in the divine decree. It could only have prevented him wantonly publishing the sad fact without call of duty and sense of sorrow. καὶ γὰρ is here not = *et enim*, but = *nam etiam*, so that καὶ belongs to ἐγώ, and no καὶ γὰρ καὶ is necessary. Comp. Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part.* I. p. 137 f.

— ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς Βενιαμίν] Phil. iii. 5. "On the separation of the state into two kingdoms, they [the Benjamites] were attached to the tribe of Judah, and with it constituted the kingdom of Judah, 1 Kings xii. 21. After the exile, also,

these two tribes formed the kernel of the new Jewish colony in Palestine, comp. Ezra iv. 1, x. 9," Winer, *bibl. Realw.*, art. "Benjamin." The genealogical addition serves sharply to emphasize the notion of pure Israelitish race in its descent from the founder of the nation, as well as of genuine theocratic faith. What held good of such an Israelite held good of the people of God in general.

Ver. 2. The answer to the question: *μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*; already implied in *μὴ γένοιτο*, namely: *οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*, is here expressively and emphatically set forth, and still further strengthened by the appended *ὃν προέγνω*] Respecting *προέγνω*, comp. on viii. 29. The apostle says not: "which he *predestined*," this being implied already in *τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ*, "His people," = "His elect people." To cast off His elect people involves a self-contradiction. But the contradiction is enhanced by the circumstance that God from eternity *foreknew* this people *which* He Himself chose, *i.e.* foresaw that it would be and remain His people. Luther, in his marginal notes: "It is not all God's people that is called God's people. Wherefore, also, not all is rejected when the greater portion is rejected." On this view, therefore, *ὃν προέγνω* would be a *limiting* definition, and *τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ὃν προέγνω* merely the portion of God's people predestined to the Messianic salvation, the elect, spiritual Israel. So also Orig. August. Chryst. Calv. Calov, *et al.*, but plainly in opposition to the context, seeing that ver. 1, like the present chapter, treats of the *entire* nation.

—*ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε*] comp. vi. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 16, 19. Introduction of an analogous O. T. example in support of the assertion, *οὐκ ἀπώσατο κτλ.* The application follows in ver. 5. Comp. Meyer: "*ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε κτλ.*, down to ver. 4, adduces a proof for *οὐκ ἀπώσατο* from an historical example of Scripture, according to which a case analogous to the present, of the resistance of the people to God, once before occurred; but God made the declaration that He cast not off His people, but amid the depravity of the mass reserved to Himself a number of faithful ones. So (ver. 5) too, now, there has taken place not a rejection of the people, but a gracious election out of the people."

—*ἐν Ἡλίᾳ*] Luther: "of Elias." But *ἐν Ἡλίᾳ* is not de Elia, but = "in the section treating of Elias," comp. Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37: *ἐπὶ τῆς βύτου* = "in the passage where the bush is spoken of," Winer, p. 481.

— *ὥς ἐντυγχάνει κτλ.*] depends on *οὐκ οἶδατε*, like *ἐν Ἡλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή*, to which it stands in the relation of an illustrative parallel; comp. Luke vi. 4, xxii. 61; Acts x. 38, xi. 16, xx. 20. Respecting *ἐντυγχάνειν τινὶ κατὰ τινος*, comp. on viii. 26. The *lect. rec.* after *Ἰσραὴλ* has a *λέγων*, but it is in opposition to decisive critical evidence, and may be dispensed with.

Ver. 3. The passage quoted is found in 1 Kings xix. 10, 14. In the LXX., in harmony with the Heb., it runs: *ζηλῶν ἐξήλωκα τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι, ὅτι ἐγκατέλιπόν σε* (ver. 14: *τὴν διαθήκην σου*) *οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ. τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν* (ver. 14: *καθεῖλαν*), *καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου λαβεῖν αὐτήν*. Apart from insignificant alterations, which yet bear on the purpose in hand, the addition of *κύριε*, the omission of *ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ* and of *λαβεῖν αὐτήν*, as well as the substitution of *καὶ ἐγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος* for *καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι ἐγὼ μονώτατος* (Heb. *וְאֲנִי יְהוָה יְחִיד*), and the transposition of the two clauses: *τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν* and *τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν*, are especially to be noted. The slaying of the Lord's prophets formed the chief point, as the destruction of the altars does not of itself furnish quite so striking a sign of national ungodliness.

—*ἀπέκτειναν*] namely, the Israelites by the orders of Jezebel, 1 Kings xviii. 4, xiii. 22. — *καὶ*] erased by Lachmann and Tischendorf on weighty authority, and probably to be regarded as spurious.

—*τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου*] namely, the altars on the high places. The building of these was indeed forbidden in the law (Lev. xvii. 8 f.; Deut. xii. 13 f.), but it found palliation in the exigencies of the devout worshippers of Jehovah in the kingdom of Israel, as they were not allowed to resort to the central temple in Jerusalem. Rightly Estius: "Verisimile est, Eliam loqui de altaribus, quae passim in excelsis studio quodam pietatis Deo vero erecta fuerunt; maxime postquam decem tribus regum suorum tyrannide prohibita fuerant, ne Jerosolymam ascenderent sacrificii causa. Quamvis enim id lege vetitum esset, ac recte fecerint Ezechias et Josias, reges Judae, etiam ejusmodi aras evertendo, tamen impium erat eas subvertere odio cultus Dei Israel."

—*κατέσκαψαν*] "they have razed to the ground" [*aorist* = they razed to the ground].

—*ὑπελείφθην μόνος*] according to Elijah's meaning = "I am left alone of all Thy prophets;" but according to Paul's meaning: "I am left alone of all Thy true worshippers." That this is really the thought derived by the apostle from the declaration, follows from ver. 4 (*κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας*), comp. ver. 5; for the 7000 faithful worshippers of Jehovah form no antithesis to the one prophet, but only to the one worshipper of Jehovah. It is probable also that this acceptance of the *μόνος* led to the clause *τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν* being placed first, seeing that, if these words had immediately preceded the *καὶ γὰρ ὑπελείφθην μόνος*, the explanation of the *μόνος* by "alone of the prophets" was certainly very natural. Moreover, *indirectly*, Paul's meaning was in fact involved in the original passage; for having, in the words immediately preceding this quotation, described the whole people of Israel as apostate, the prophet Elijah was at once the only prophet and the only worshipper of Jehovah left.

*καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου*] comp. Matt. ii. 20, Fritzsche and Meyer there. *ζητεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν*, *נִשְׁכַּחְתָּהּ נַפְשָׁא*, 1 Sam. xxii. 23, *to seek the life*.

Ver. 4. *ἀλλά*] introduces the antithesis to the complaint of Elijah.

—*ὁ χρηματισμός*] *the divine response*, comp. on vii. 3. The substantive occurs only here in the N. T., 2 Macc. ii. 4, xi. 17. The passage, taken from 1 Kings xix. 18, runs in the Heb.: *לְעַבְדְּךָ אֱלֹהִים וְשָׂאֵם בְּיָדָם לֹא יִשְׁכַּחְתָּהּ נַפְשָׁא*; LXX.: *καταλείψεις* (ed. Complut., in agreement with the Heb. *καταλείψω*) *ἐν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν, πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ὠκλασαν γόνυ τῷ Βαάλ*. The passage refers to the punitive judgments to be executed by Hazael, Jehu, and Elisha (comp. vv. 15–17), from which 7000 (the covenant number seven formed part of the number of the holy multitude, Besser, comp. Tholuck) are to be spared and kept alive. The apostle renders the meaning of the original passage freely, while partially adhering to the translation of the LXX. For the future *καταλείψω* (which is also found in the Heb. according to the accents), he substitutes the aorist *κατέλιπον*, and adds *ἑμαυτῷ*.

—*κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας*] Antithesis to *ὑπελείφθην μόνος*. Both the change of tense and the addition of the pronoun indicate that we are to interpret: "I preserved

for myself (as my true worshippers)." Were we, following the sense of the original, to interpret: "I reserved for my service from the punitive judgments," the reason for altering *καταλείψω* into *κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ*, as well as the manifestly intended antithesis to *ὑπελείφθην μόνος*, would fall to the ground. In that case the latter, in conformity with the original, would need to be interpreted: "I am the only one of the *prophets* left," and the antithesis in vv. 3, 4 would be between the supposed apostasy of the *whole* of Israel, such as made itself known in their ungodly deeds, and the sparing of 7000 who in reality had not fallen victims to idolatry. Further, the apostle here, as in ver. 3, was justified in finding *his* meaning indirectly in the original passage. For the 7000, whom the Lord amid His punitive judgments chose to spare, were spared for this very reason—because He had preserved them as His true worshippers. If thus *κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ* is not essentially different from *ἐξελ-εξάμην ἑμαυτῷ*, we see the warrant there is for deducing from this, in the application, ver. 5, the *λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος*. Otherwise, while *λεῖμμα* might indeed, in allusion to *κατέλιπον*, be interpreted: "remnant from the punitive judgment," the qualification *κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος* would not merely not be grounded in the divine oracle, ver. 4, but would even stand in opposition thereto, since the fact of abstinence from Baal-worship would then appear rather as the meritorious cause of their being spared from punishment than as the effect of God's electing, preserving grace. On the *singular γόνυ*, to denote a collective number considered as a single conception, comp. Bernhardt, *Syntax*, p. 60.

—τῇ Βάαλ] Respecting Baal, the principal deity of the Phœnician tribes (the Bel of the Babylonians), comp. Gesen. *über d. Jesaja*, II. p. 335, and in the *Allg. Encyc.* of Ersch and Gruber, art. "Bel," VIII. p. 397 ff.; Winer, *bibl. Realw.*, art. "Baal;" Movers, *Die Phönizier*, I., Bonn 1841, pp. 169–190; and in the *Allg. Encyc.* of Ersch and Gruber, art. "Phönizien," sec. III. 24, p. 384 ff.; J. G. Müller in Herzog's *Encyc.* I. p. 639 f. In opposition to the view of Gesenius, with which Winer agrees, that this nature-god of Hither Asia was the planet Jupiter, Movers afresh maintains the theory that it is rather to be regarded as the sun-god. Baal is not merely the creating and preserving, but also the destroying principle in nature, whose

vehicle is the sun. Over against this active nature stands in Baaltis the passive power or the receptive, generative and productive principle. But the two deities also coalesce in a third as in a higher unity, without, however, having a separate existence from it, whereupon the twofold androgynous nature assumes now a masculine, now a feminine form, Baal Adonis (*i.e.* Baal as the creating element or the spring-sun), for example, being represented androgynously, comp. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, p. 149, and p. 233 f. Accordingly, we think that the singular phenomenon of the feminine article being used before *Βάαλ* both by the LXX. frequently and by Paul here may be most easily explained on the supposition of an androgynous character in this deity. The otherwise probable hypothesis of Gesenius (comp. also Gesenius in Rosenmüller's *bibl. exeget. Repertor.* I. p. 139), that *Βάαλ* was called *ἡ Βάαλ* in contempt, somewhat as in the Rabbinic *הַבַּלִּים* denotes idol, receives too little support from the import of the passages in which the feminine article appears instead of the masculine. The supposition of Fritzsche, that the LXX. had inferred from the passages in which *בַּעַל* occurs along with *הַבַּלִּים*, that *בַּעַל* also must denote some female deity, cannot be established; comp. against it Tholuck here. The opinion that Baal denotes also the moon-goddess Astarte is unproved, comp. against it 1 Sam. vii. 4 (where the LXX. have *τὰς Βααλὶμ καὶ τὰ ἄλση Ἀσταρώθ*, and therefore distinguish the feminine Baal from Astarte). But most arbitrary of all is the supplying of *εἰκόνι*, *στήλῃ*, and the like to *τῇ Βάαλ* here, for this would at least be *τῇ τοῦ Βάαλ*. The LXX. in the present passage have the masculine article, from which it follows that Paul, quoting from *memory*, substituted the *feminine* article from *other* passages familiar to him.

Ver. 5. *οὕτως*] *thus, in correspondence with this*, introduces the application.

—*οὖν*] *then, i.e.* to apply the example adduced to present circumstances.

—*καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ*] as at that time, in the age of Elijah.

—*λείμμα*] ix. 27. The remnant (*i.e.* the portion of the nation excepted from the hardening of the mass) furnishes proof that God did not harden the nation as such, and therefore not the Jew because he is a Jew. The old theocratic particularism certainly consisted in believing that Israel was God's people as

such, and that the Gentile nations as such were excluded from fellowship with God's people, Eph. ii. 12. Now, therefore, when all distinction between Gentiles and Jews is abolished, we must not suppose that the opposite relation obtains; but God simply leads believers to salvation—whether from among Jews or Gentiles makes no difference. Although in themselves a great multitude (Acts ii. 41, xxi. 20, *πόσαι μυριάδες*), the Jews who had believed, in comparison with the total number of the people, could only be called a *λεῖμμα*.

—*κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος*] in harmony with *κατέλιπον ἐμαυτῶ*, ver. 4, forms, as ver. 6 expressly sets forth, an antithesis to the presumptuous claims made on the part of the Jewish righteousness of works. In this, therefore, not in an absolute divine decree, lay the reason of the rejection of the mass. Respecting the notion of *ἐκλογή*, comp. on ix. 11. It is an *ἐκλογὴ χάριτος*, inasmuch as it proceeds from grace, comp. *εἰ δὲ χάριτι*, ver. 6. *γέγονεν* = has come into existence and exists, hence the perfect.

Ver. 6 emphatically sets forth once more the idea of the *χάρις*, upon which, throughout the whole course of this exposition, it is the apostle's chief business to lay stress, in opposition to and exclusive of *ἔργα*, iv. 4, 5. *εἰ δὲ χάριτι*] *sc.* *λεῖμμα γέγονεν*. Joins on to *χάριτος*, ver. 5.

—*οὐκέτι*] comp. on vii. 17.

—*ἐξ ἔργων*] *sc.* *γέγονεν*.

—*ἐπεὶ*] *for*, supposing it were so, *else*, comp. iii. 6.

—*ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις*] “grace ceases to be grace,” namely, *ἐξ ἔργων λεῖμμα γέγονεν*; for “*gratia nisi gratis sit, gratia non est*,” and “*non est gratia ullo modo, si non sit gratuita omni modo*,” says Augustine. *γίνεται* (not equivalent to *ἐστὶ*): “it ceases, in its concrete manifestation, to become, i.e. to show itself as, that (comp. on Luke x. 18, *et al.*) which according to its nature it is. Positively expressed: it *becomes* what according to its essence it is not; it gives up its specific character,” Meyer. The addition of the *text. recept.*: *εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι ἐστὶ χάρις· ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἐστὶν ἔργον*, certainly in accordance with very numerous and weighty authorities—especially A C D E F G, Cod. Sinait.\* It. Vulg. all. and all Latin Fathers—has been rejected as spurious by most editors (but not by Tischendorf) and interpreters since Erasmus and Wetstein. But it has also important, though not numerous witnesses in its



favour, especially Cod. B and the Syriac. A later addition would indeed have been more precisely conformed to the first clause, perhaps εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι χάριτι ἐπεὶ τὰ ἔργα οὐκέτι γίνεται ἔργα. The omission might arise first of all through the eye of the copyist being led astray by the double εἰ δέ, the sentence introduced by the second εἰ δέ then dropping out, because supposed to be already written. This might be done the more easily, since another ancient clerical error, occurring in Cod. B, has ἐστὶ χάρις instead of ἐστὶν ἔργον, in which case the Homoioteleuton with the first half of the verse helped the mistake. The omission once made, other copyists probably did not supply it, because to them the words dropped out seemed superfluous. While certainly not necessary, they serve to give full and expressive completeness to the proof; for, that an ἐκλογὴ χάριτος does not come to pass ἐξ ἔργων is in this case shown not merely by the circumstance that χάρις excludes and nullifies ἔργα, but also by the consideration that χάρις and ἔργα are mutually exclusive. Accordingly, as Beza, Wolf, Bengel, Heumann, Matthiä, Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 126, Fritzsche, Tholuck (but no longer in ed. 5), Baumgarten-Crusius and Reiche in *d. Comm. crit.* I. p. 68 sqq. have decided, the reasons in favour of retaining the clause in question may perhaps be regarded as preponderating.

—εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων] *sc. λείμμα γέγονεν.*

—τὸ ἔργον] collective = τὰ ἔργα, comp. xiii. 3.

—οὐκέτι] “hoc, quater positum, ostendit vim consequentiae. Absolutum decretum est hoc, quod Deus decrevit: *Justos faciam non nisi ex fide, neminem ex operibus.* Hoc nemo perumpet,” Bengel.

Ver. 7. τί οὖν ;] asks what inference follows from the exposition vv. 1–6. The answer is given in the words subjoined.

—ὁ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ] The preposition ἐπὶ serves to enhance the import of ζητεῖν. ἐπιζητεῖν = to seek zealously, *valde desiderare, summo studio expetere*, comp. Matt. vi. 32; Acts xiii. 7; Phil. iv. 17; Heb. xi. 14, xiii. 14; and Fritzsche on Matt. xii. 39. The present tense emphasizes the continuance of the effort. But its object and aim is δικαιοσύνη, ix. 31. Ἰσραὴλ denotes the people as a whole in contrast with the ἐκλογή.

—τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν] The *lect. rec. τούτου* is not adequately attested. Certainly ἐπιτυγχάνειν τινός is the more usual construction (Heb. vi. 15, xi. 33), but we also say τυγχάνειν (there-

fore also ἐπιτυγχάνειν) τι *rem consequi*, when the object is a pronoun or adjunct. neut. gen., or an infinitive with the article τό, Matthiæ, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 637; Herm. *ad Vig.* p. 762. But the reason why they obtained not δικαιοσύνη is, that they sought it ἐξ ἔργων, ver. 6, ix. 31, 32.

—ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν] The abstr. ἡ ἐκλογὴ stands with forcible effect for the concr. οἱ ἐκλεκτοί, comp. ἡ ἀκροβυστία, ii. 26, 27, and περιτομή, iii. 30, iv. 9, 12. But they obtained it, because it is simply an ἐκλογὴ χάριτος, and on this account received it also χάριτι, i.e. ἐκ πίστεως. “Reliquiae illius populi, quas per gratiam suam Deus elegit,” interprets Estius.

—οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν] namely, τὴν καρδίαν (Mark iii. 5, vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40; Eph. iv. 18, or τὰ νοήματα, 2 Cor. iii. 14). πωροῦν from πῶρος, “to make hard as stone,” or *callo obducere*, translated like *obdurare*, “to render callous, unsusceptible,” namely, in understanding and will with regard to accepting salvation in Christ. God is to be conceived as the hardening subject, ix. 18. But the exposition from ix. 30 onward shows that the judicial penalty of hardening on God's part presupposes self-induced hardening as its condition. The reason of the apostle here again taking his stand at the objective point of view, and contemplating man's freely-willed act historically in the light of a divinely-ordained occurrence, is simply this—that from ver. 11 onward he would explain at length how divine wisdom took up this act of man into its providential plan, and linked thereto certain higher purposes. Just as the assertion, that God cast off the people of Israel as such, is refuted already by the fact that an elect number of them attained salvation, while those who perish fall on the rock of their own work-righteousness; so again it finds a still more satisfactory refutation in the fact that God ordained this very fall, in order by its means both to open to others a way of salvation, and to the lost ones themselves a way for returning. As to the relation between the freedom and voluntary guilt of sin on one side, and its divinely-ordained necessity on the other, comp. Matt. xviii. 7; Acts ii. 23, iv. 28.

Ver. 8. καθὼς γέγραπται] Some early expositors have referred to Isa. vi. 9, 10. As matter of fact, this passage may be regarded as the classical O. T. proof-passages in the N. T. in reference to the hardening of Israel against the Messianic salvation. It is so

employed by Christ, Matt. xiii. 14; by John, John xii. 40; and by Paul himself, Acts xxviii. 26. It is also specially appropriate, because it recounts the initiation to his office of the prophet whose chief function it was to make those announcements of a Messiah, against which, even in those days, the people were hardened. Moreover, the Heb. text, in contradistinction from the LXX., describes the hardening as a positive divine act carried out by means of what the prophet does, John xii. 40. For these reasons, we believe that the passage in Isaiah certainly supplies the material basis of the apostle's citation. But the form in which the thought is clothed he borrows from the parallel passage, Deut. xxix. 4, LXX.: *καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκε κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι, καὶ ὀφθαλμοὺς βλέπειν, καὶ ὦτα ἀκούειν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης*. His conversion of the negative expression *οὐκ ἔδωκε κτλ.* into the positive *ἔδωκε κτλ.*, in harmony with his purpose, is justified by Isa. vi. 10 and xxix. 10 (LXX.: *ὅτι πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς κύριος πνεύματι κατανύξεως*). From the latter passage, moreover, he borrows *πνεῦμα κατανύξεως* instead of *καρδία τοῦ μὴ εἰδέναι*, which in its turn serves to prove that the whole body of O. T. declarations bearing on the same subject was present to his mind, and was regarded by him as, so to speak, a collective prediction of the hardening of Israel. Just as the character of the O. T. covenant people, is the meaning, was one and the same in the different epochs of its development, in the age of Moses as in that of Isaiah, and already in those days the judicial punishment of divine hardening was to be seen at work among them, so has it continued up to the present day. But we are not on this account, with Beza, Griesbach, Knapp, to sever the words *ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας* from the citation, and join them with *οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν* as the words of the apostle, so that the words *καθὼς γέγραπται* up to *τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν* would have to be enclosed in brackets. Rather, as the original text and LXX. Deut. xxix. 4 show, *ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας* belongs to the citation itself. Nay, in all probability it furnished the reason for this passage being selected to express the thought intended. *ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας* has its application, as formerly, so now. The passage in the prophet describes a characteristic of the Jewish nation in the mass, even as, to pass by all reference to each particular epoch of its course, it remains perfectly valid with respect to each, and therefore with respect to the present, moment of its

history. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 15 : ἕως σήμερον, ἡνίκα ἀναγινώσκειται Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κείται.

—πνεῦμα κατανύξεως] comp. on viii. 15. Luther: "an embittered spirit." Certainly κατανύσσειν is = to pierce, cause acute pain, *compungere, instigare*, Acts ii. 37. But in the present passage the Heb. has רִיחַ רָחֵק, *spirit of stupefaction or torpor*; and that the LXX. also took κατανύξις in the sense of torpor, *stupefaction*, is shown by Ps. lx. 3, where they render יַיִן רִיחַ רָחֵק, *wine of reeling*, by οἶνον κατανύξεως. The highest state of pain is a state of torpor, of spiritual insensibility. Thus the meaning of κατανύξις passes into the meaning: torpor, and the πνεῦμα κατανύξεως accordingly answers to πώρωσις, ver. 7. Isidorus, *Probusior*, l. iv. ep. 101, early compares κατανύττεσθαι and ἡ κατανύξις with καταπλησσεσθαι and ἡ κατάπληξις, and says: εἶτα ἐρμηνεύων αὐτὸς (ὁ Παῦλος) τὸ κατένυξεν ὅτι κατέπληξεν ἐστὶν ἔφη ὁφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν. Τοῦτο γὰρ συμβαίνειν εἶωθε τοῖς καταπληττομένοις· ἅτε γὰρ τοῦ νοῦ παραχθέντος αἱ αἰσθήσεις τὰς οἰκείας ἐνεργείας ἀρνοῦνται. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* tom. ii. Excurs., who accepts the meaning assigned by Isidorus to the word κατανύξις, but rejects the mediating explanation, without, as it seems to us, sufficient reasons. Tholuck, in a similar way to Isidorus, compares *frappé*, struck, *betroffen*.

—τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν] not: *that they might not see*, depending on ἔδωκεν, but = τῆς ἀβλεψίας, eyes of not-seeing, *i.e.* which lack the power to see; comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* Excurs. II. p. 844. The oxymoron: "to give one eyes to the end that he may not see," seems too strong, and too near an approach to a contradiction. There is here no necessity to accept it, seeing that the phrase: "to give one eyes of not-seeing, or blind eyes," yields the requisite sense: "to blind the eyes (of the spirit)."

Vv. 9, 10. Fresh evidence of the πώρωσις of Israel from O. T. Scripture. καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει] Ps. lxi. 22, 23. See the Davidic authorship of the psalm vindicated in Hengstenberg, *Comm. on Ps.* vol. II. p. 366, and Hävernicks, *Handb. d. hist. krit. Einl. ins O. T.*, 3ter Theil. ausgearb. von Keil, p. 202 f. Of all the Psalms, Ps. lxi. is most frequently quoted in the N. T. along with Ps. xxii. as a prediction of Christ's sufferings (John ii. 17; Acts i. 20). The subject of both Psalms is not the ideal figure of the perfectly Just One, but His concrete personality, Keil, *ibid.*

p. 176. The latter having appeared in Christ, what is said in this psalm of the enemies of this Just One the apostle rightly applies to the Jews of his age, who had rejected and crucified the Messiah, and still constantly opposed and persecuted Him in His believing followers, and in the word of the gospel that testified to His righteousness.

—γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα] *let their table become a snare.* τράπεζα, table, well-furnished table (Ps. xxiii. 5), an image of prosperity which is to prove to them a means of destruction.

—καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς] LXX.: καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον. Paul has added εἰς θήραν, in order, by the accumulation of synonyms, to give greater force to the mention of the means of temptation (snare, bait, trap — a comprehensive description of various modes of capture). But at the end he puts εἰς ἀνταπόδομα, to intimate that all the instruments of their downfall just named serve in common the purpose of *retribution*. Therefore = “and thus a retribution.” “Culpa igitur eorum intercesserat, non absolutum Dei decretum,” Bengel. Θήρα, capture, chase by which they are captured; here, in juxtaposition with παγίς and σκάνδαλον, as to *meaning* not essentially different from means of capture, instrument of capture, comp. Ps. xxxv. 8: σκάνδαλον = σκανδάληθρον, Heb. עֶרֶב, bird-trap, snare. εἰς ἀνταπόδομα, Heb. עִבְדָּוָה, to those who are all ease, the secure, the careless. The LXX., therefore, whom Paul follows, read עִבְדָּוָה. The apostle having strangely included in his citation, apparently without reason, the detailed description found in this 9th verse, whereas the proof he has in view occurs only in the 10th verse, the supposition is probable, that in τράπεζα he meant to allude to the law and its works, which formed Israel’s food, in which it sought its happiness and salvation, and which instead proved its destruction. So Melancthon: “Mensa significat doctrinam ipsorum, in qua quaerunt consolationem.”

—τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν] *that they may not see.*

—καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον] literally after the LXX. According to the Heb. text properly: “and make their loins always tremble.” The bending of the back may also be here an image of the spiritual bondage of the nation under the law,—a bondage which it chose for itself spontaneously, and to

which at the same time God gave it up as a punishment, Acts xv. 10, 28; Gal. iv. 24; 2 Cor. iii. 16, 17. Rightly Moeris: *νῶτα καὶ τὸ νῶτον ἀπτικῶς· νῶτος καὶ τοὺς νῶτους ἐλληνικῶς.*

Vv. 11–15. But the *πώρωσις* of Israel is not to be regarded as God's ultimate purpose. It is rather merely a mediate purpose of God's love, primarily with respect to the Gentile world, but in the next place with respect to Israel itself.

Ver. 11. *λέγω οὖν*] The import of the question introduced by *λέγω οὖν* might be inferred from *οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν*, ver. 7, supported by Scripture texts, vv. 8–10.

—*μὴ ἔπταισαν, ἵνα πέσωσι;*] *Did they stumble in order to fall?* As *πταίειν*, *to strike against, to slip*, elsewhere (Jas. ii. 10, iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 10, where it is used metaphorically), in the nature of the case, like the German *straucheln*, *to stumble*, involves in it its consequence, *πίπτειν*, *to fall* (ver. 22, xiv. 4; 1 Cor. x. 12; Rev. ii. 5), since a *false step* in the moral sphere is only a milder term for *fall*, in the present passage the interpretation is obviously suggested: “Did they stumble merely to fall?” *i.e.* has God no other end in their fall than that they should fall? So already Augustine: “non deliquerunt, ut tantummodo caderent, quasi ad suam poenam solum.” But as *πταίειν* and *πίπτειν* in the present passage are expressly distinguished, several modern expositors, in the train of the Greek exegetes,<sup>1</sup> have rightly supposed here a climactic relation between *πταίειν*, *to stumble*, and *πίπτειν*, *to fall prostrate*. In this way the apostle intimates by anticipation the closing thought of the subsequent exposition, namely, that Israel's rejection is not to be accounted final and permanent, but merely temporary, as a fall from which there is the prospect of rising again, or as a mere stumble, not a real fall. The expression *πταίειν* is perhaps chosen in allusion to *σκάνδαλον*, ver. 9, which certainly stands there in another meaning than in ix. 32, 33. The stone of offence at which they stumbled was not laid in their path by God for the end that (*ἵνα*, particle of intention) they should fall prostrate. Rather, as is at once remarked, God's mediate end is the *σωτηρία τῶν ἐθνῶν*, His ultimate end *παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς*.

<sup>1</sup> Orig.: “observandum est, quod aliud ponit P. offendere et delinquere *πταίειν*, et aliud *cadere*; et offensioni quidem et delicto remedium ponit, cecidisse autem eos, quasi desperatio in hoc sit aliqua, non recipit.” Photius: “τὸ *πταίσμα* αὐτῶν οὐχὶ εἰς κατὰπτωσιν τιλείται γίγνεται, ἀλλὰ μόνον οἷον ὑπισκιάσθηναι.”

—τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι] therefore refers not to πέσωσι, for they have not fallen, but to ἔπταισαν, as they have merely stumbled. Their πταῖσμα, ethically considered, is a παράπτωμα, a *delictum*, a transgression (comp. on v. 15), consisting in ἡπιστία, vv. 20, 23, which, according to John xvi. 9, is ἁμαρτία. Of themselves, indeed, πταίνειν and πίπτειν are just as much metaphors for the act of sin as for an unhappy condition; but here perhaps they may serve to denote the unhappy state induced by Israel's hardness, such as was described in vv. 8–10. At all events, πταίνειν and πίπτειν must contain the same metaphor, and we are not to take πταίνειν for *peccare* and πίπτειν for *perire*.

—ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] *sc. γέγονεν*, comp. Matt. xxi. 43; Acts xiii. 46, xxviii. 28. The apostolic praxis corresponded with the divine design, the gospel being preached first of all to the Jews, then only to the Gentiles. But the result also of this preaching, namely, that the Jews rejected it, and the Gentiles, to whom in consequence of this rejection it was offered, accepted it, is regarded by the apostle, under a teleological aspect, as a divine ordination and design. But we are not from this to conclude that without Israel's fall the Gentiles would not in any case have attained to salvation. This erroneous inference is already precluded by the import of ver. 12. On the contrary, the actual result of the operation of man's freedom is everywhere assumed into God's all-conditioning world-plan, and, as it were, interwoven with it. In the case before us, God, *per voluntatem consequentem*, ordained the foreseen apostasy of Israel to be the means by which the recovery of the Gentile world was to be brought about. The believing reception of the Messiah on the part of Israel would have made no change in the final purpose of His world-plan, but only in the *modus* of its historical realization. The sole effect which man's inversion of the original, God-willed order upon God's unchanging purpose was to invert the means of its accomplishment. And although they who were the first in order of rank became, through their unbelief, the last in order of time, still, even as the last, they are to maintain and vindicate their divinely-appointed dignity as first-fruit, ver. 15.

—εἰς τὸ παραζηλῶσαι αὐτούς] Opposite of ἵνα πέσωσι. Theophyl.: ἵνα ἡ τῶν ἐθνῶν τιμὴ δάκνουσα . . . πείσῃ προσελθεῖν. Thus the prediction, quoted x. 19, is to be fulfilled with *saving* results. Wrongly Luther, after the Vulg.: "that they (the

Gentiles) should emulate them (the Jews).” Rather: “to provoke them (the Jews) to emulation.” “*Assumptio novi populi directa fuit ad veteris provocationem ad aemulationem: ut nempe Israelitae cernentes confertam gentiliuum ad Deum conversionem seria aemulatione irritati et ipsi doctrinae Evangelii animos suos submitterent,*” Calov.

Ver. 12. Disclosure of a more joyous prospect for the future, depending upon Israel’s coming restoration. The apostle concludes, as Meyer says, “a felici effectu causae peioris ad feliciorum effectum causae melioris.” Strikingly remarked Thomas Aq.: “ponit talem rationem: bonum est potentius ad utilitatem inferendam, quam malum, sed malum Judaeorum gentibus magnam utilitatem contulit, ergo multo majorem confert mundo eorum bonum.” If even Israel’s apostasy has borne happy issues, how much more happy will be the issues springing from its future recovery!

—εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμος] *sc. ἐγένετο.* The δέ is δὲ μεταβατικόν. The sentence resumes the statement, τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ver. 11. The πλοῦτος (x. 12), *the riches*, here in the sense of cause of riches, means of enrichment, is therefore a riches of salvation, and the κόσμος, as is shown by the subjoined πλοῦτος ἔθνων, corresponding with πλοῦτος κόσμου, a general expression for the *Gentile* world.

—καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἔθνων, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν] *sc. πλοῦτος κόσμος* or *ἔθνων γενήσεται.* Fully expressed, the antithesis to the protasis would have run: πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ δικαίωμα αὐτῶν (or ἡ ἀνάστασις αὐτῶν, as the opposite of τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν) καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν. The manifestly intended antithesis of ἥττημα and πλήρωμα has led the majority of expositors, since Chrysostom, to interpret τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν of the *paucitas Judaeorum credentium = their minority*; τὸ πλήρωμα, on the other hand, comparing τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων, ver. 25, of the *entire body, plenitudo, universitas.* But in opposition to this, it has been justly observed, especially by modern expositors, first, that in this case αὐτῶν would refer to different objects, *παράπτωμα* applying to the *unbelieving*, ἥττημα to the *believing* Jews; and again, that according to ver. 15 we cannot help perceiving the apostle’s chief point to be the different effects of the nation’s apostasy and conversion, therefore not merely the



conversion of a smaller and a greater number; but, finally and chiefly, that ἡττημα does not at all mean *minority*, *smaller number*, but only *overthrow*, *injury*, *hurt*, *loss*, *clades*, *detrimentum*. So in the Greek (see Lexicons), and also in the Hellenistic dialect, comp. LXX. Isa. xxxi. 8, 9; 1 Cor. vi. 7, and 2 Cor. xii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20. If, then, we are unwilling to give up the antithesis of ἡττημα and πλήρωμα (so Luther: "for if their fall is the riches of the world, and their *injury* the riches of the Gentiles, how much more if their number were full, *i.e.* their *full number*!"), and yet hold fast by the only demonstrable meaning of ἡττημα, we must adopt another meaning of πλήρωμα than *plenitudo*, *universitas*. But this leads to a wider inquiry into the sense and employment of πλήρωμα in the N. T. in general. In opposition to the assertion (put forth by Storr, *Opusc.* I. p. 144 sqq., and accepted by Bähr on *Col.* p. 162 f., and Harless on *Eph.* p. 122) that πλήρωμα in the N. T. always stands in the *active* sense, and means *id quod complet*, Fritzsche, with whom Meyer on *Eph.* i. 10 agrees, has here shown that the *passive* meaning is the most common. πλήρωμα signifies (1) *id quo res impletur*; (2) *id quod completur*; and (3), used actively, denotes *implendi actionem*. But we believe that, as regards the N. T., the passive meaning is perfectly sufficient; for the single passage which Fritzsche adduces for the active sense, Rom. xiii. 10: πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη, may just as well be explained: love is that by which the law (conceived as a bare outline) is filled up, as: love is the act of fulfilling the law. But further, in our opinion, considering the passive acceptation of πλήρωμα, the *first* meaning given by Fritzsche, *i.e.* *id quo aliquid completur*, suffices for *all* N. T. passages (see afterwards). No doubt, as regards the sense expressed, it amounts to the same, whether we explain πλήρωμα: that which fills something, or: that by which something is filled, the difference only being, that in the first case we have to take the genitive depending on πλήρωμα as *genit. object.*, in the second case as *genit. subject.*, *e.g.* 1 Cor. x. 26: τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς γῆς, *id quod terram implet*, or *id quo terra impletur*. But still, as regards the N. T. passages, the analogy of substantives in μα, which invariably follow the passive signification (see the examples instanced by Fritzsche), is decisive for the *passive* analysis, comp. Buttmann, *Ausf. gr. Sprachl.* Bd. II. § 119, II. p. 314, 23. Now as πλήρωμα is properly = τὸ πεπληρωμένον = *id quo aliqua res*

*completur*, i.e. not so much "the filling up" as "the filling in," *πλήρωμα* has also been taken in several passages of the N. T. in the sense of "fulness," *abundantia*, synonymously with *πλήθος* or *πλοῦτος*. On this view, accordingly, several modern exegetes have wished to interpret *τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν* in this verse of the fulness, the superabundance of salvation (= *ὁ πλοῦτος*, sc. *τῆς σωτηρίας*) that lies before the Jews in the future and will compensate their present *ἡττημα*, their *jactura*, or their *inopia*, which arose through their loss of salvation. But it has not been proved that *πλήρωμα* is anywhere in the N. T. identical with *πλοῦτος*, or even with *πλήθος*. Rather *πλήρωμα* everywhere, in harmony with the notion of its root-verb, supposes a vessel in which a filling in takes place according to design and nature, or of necessity; whereas *πλοῦτος* denotes accidental fulness without subordinate reference, riches absolutely; *πλήθος*, a casual crowd or quantity. Hence, in Mark vi. 43, viii. 20 : *κοφίνων, σπυρίδων πληρώματα*, that with which the baskets are filled, the baskets being designed to receive the filling; in 1 Cor. x. 26 : *τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς γῆς*, that by which the earth is filled up in a natural way; in Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21, *rec.*: *τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ (τοῦ ἱματίου)*, since the rent of itself craves to be filled up. In John i. 16, Eph. iii. 19, iv. 13, Col. i. 19, ii. 9, *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is that with which God or Christ is filled, the fulness of divine perfections immanent in them. So also, in Eph. i. 23, the church is *τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου, i.e. Χριστοῦ*, the fulness immanent in Christ, which is conceived as dwelling in the church, comp. Harless here.<sup>1</sup> Finally, in Rom. xiii. 10 : *πλήρωμα νόμου*; xv. 29 : *πλήρωμα εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ*; Gal. iv. 4, Eph. i. 10 : *πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, τῶν καιρῶν*, the law, the blessing, the time is conceived as an abstract idea, a bare outline that will be realized and filled up.

We see, therefore, that in the N. T., in the nature of the case, the subject to *πλήρωμα* is always mentioned by name, only Col. i. 19 forming an exception, and that merely in appearance. For there it follows, of course, both from the matter and the con-

<sup>1</sup> We should then be compelled to suppose here an exception to the prevailing usage, and to interpret *πλήρωμα* not *id quo* (*Christus*) *completur*, but *id quod* (*a Christo*) *completur* (comp. Meyer here), in which case the church would be conceived, so to speak, as a vessel, empty of itself, filled by Christ, inasmuch as it belongs to the idea of Christ's church to be filled by Christ, seeing that a church empty of Christ ceases to be Christ's church.

text, as well as from the prevalent usage in the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, that the *πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ* is meant. Accordingly it seems arbitrary, in the present passage, to interpret *τὸ πλήρωμα*, "the fulness, the riches," *i.e.* of salvation, for this must necessarily have been expressed by *τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς σωτηρίας* (comp. *πλήρωμα εὐλογίας*), *i.e.* that by which the idea of salvation is perfected or realized. Moreover, it is certainly most natural to take *τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν* (*sc.* *τῶν Ἰουδαίων*) and *τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν*, ver. 25, in the same sense. Now the usual explanation of *τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν* is "that which completes the Gentiles," better, "that by which the Gentiles are completed," *i.e.* "the entire body of the Gentiles." However, abstract ideas, like *ἡ εὐλογία*, *ὁ νόμος*, *ὁ χρόνος*, may be conceived as an empty vessel which is to be filled = an idea which is to be realized, but not concrete persons. Moreover, on this view in the present passage, as observed, the antithesis of *ἡττημα* and *πλήρωμα* would be lost. The interpretation—possible according to our argument—of *τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τῶν ἐθνῶν* = the fulness immanent in the Jews or Gentiles, the *summa* of attributes filling them up, would here of course be quite out of the question. We accordingly interpret *τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν*, ver. 25, as other expositors have done, by *complementum ethnicorum*. The subject to be filled, understood spontaneously from the entire strain of the preceding exposition, is *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, which, by the apostasy of the Jews, has sustained an injury that is to be repaired by the accession of the believing Gentiles. The Gentiles are the *pleroma* of God's kingdom—that, so to speak, by which the gap made in it is to be stopped, Matt. ix. 16. The assertion that the genitive is decisive against this view, because with *πλήρωμα* it always denotes that which is made full, is refuted by Mark vi. 43, viii. 20, where, in *σπυρίδων πληρώματα κλασμάτων*, by *κλασμάτων* is denoted that by which something else is made full. Also, in Cant. v. 12, *πληρώματα ὑδάτων* is not = fulness of waters, *coriæ aquarium*, but the waters are conceived as the filling up of their bed. By applying this meaning—which according to our exposition is the only one remaining—to the present passage, we gain this advantage, that the linguistically demonstrable signification of *ἡττημα* can be retained, a strict antithesis between *ἡττημα* and *πλήρωμα* admitted, and, finally, the identity of meaning in *πλήρωμα* held fast in ver. 11 and ver. 25. We accordingly interpret

τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν, *their loss*, of the loss or damage sustained by the kingdom of God in their case; and τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν, of the repair of this loss, which takes place by their means, namely, at the time when they again become believers. Thus τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν answers exactly to ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν, ver. 15, and just so ἡ πρόσληψις, ver. 15, to the present τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν. Therefore τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν = *jactura eorum*, τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν = *complementum eorum*. Moreover, upon our exposition τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν, as to the fact, may possibly be the *universitas gentium*. But not necessarily so, as it is not said that all the Gentiles as a body are destined by God to serve as the complement of the Jews who fell away. Still further, as it is said in vv. 12, 15 that the conversion of Israel, following, according to vv. 25, 26, first upon the conversion of the *pleroma* of the Gentiles, will exert a powerful saving influence upon the Gentile world itself, it is still more in the spirit of the apostle's thoughts to suppose that when the number of the Gentiles destined by God to replace apostate Israel has entered into the kingdom of God, then all Israel shall be converted, and from their conversion shall go forth over the Gentile world not merely a wave of spiritual revival in an intensive respect, but also, *extensively*, a still more powerful converting influence. Thus also this crisis may be thought of as at hand in any age, just because the size of the Gentile *pleroma* is unknown, and therefore may be actually present in any age.

Vv. 13, 14. ὑμῖν γὰρ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] *for to you I speak, to the Gentiles*, you who might fancy that to me, as Gentile apostle, the salvation of Israel is a matter of no concern and need give no anxiety. On the contrary, I bid you observe, in support of what has just been said,—namely, that out of Israel's fall the salvation of the Gentile world is to proceed, that Israel may be provoked to jealousy, and that from Israel's restoration a still brighter prospect may expand before the Gentile world itself, vv. 11, 12,—in support of this I say to you, that in consequence, as Gentile apostle, I certainly glorify my office, but still with express regard and reference to my own people. The reading ὑμῖν δέ instead of ὑμῖν γάρ, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, especially in accordance with A B, Syr. Copt., so also Cod. Sinait., is yet not to be regarded as having the greater weight of evidence. τὰ ἔθνη is not to be explained: "those formerly ἔθνη;" for as to their nationality, they are still ἔθνη, not Ἰουδαῖοι, although certainly

they are ἔθνη who have become believers; comp. Acts x. 45; Rom. xv. 27, xvi. 4; Gal. ii. 12, 14; Eph. iii. 1, 6.

—ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος] *inasmuch, certainly, as I am apostle of the Gentiles.* ἐφ' ὅσον means just as well *quatenus* (comp. Matt. xxv. 40, 45, and καθ' ὅσον, Heb. iii. 3, vii. 20, ix. 27) as *quamdium*, Matt. ix. 15; 2 Pet. i. 13. Here, in harmony both with the thought and the qualifying μὲν, the former μὲν, indeed, is wanting in D E F G, but is supported by A B C. The οὖν appended in the latter manuscripts, as well as in Cod. Sinait., to μὲν, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, merely arose from the awkward supposition that ὑμῖν γὰρ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσι refers to what precedes, and that with ἐφ' ὅσον a new sentence begins. As to the absence of δέ after μὲν, comp. on vii. 12, x. 1, and Winer, p. 720: "Here the δέ clause is included in εἴπως παραζηλώσω; had Paul continued the sentence regularly, the words would run: *Inasmuch as I am apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify my office* (preaching to the Gentiles zealously), *but in this I have in view the benefit of the Jews* (I would by this means provoke the Jews to jealousy); as to my sphere of labour, I am apostle of the Gentiles, but in purpose I am also apostle of the Jews."

—τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω] *I glorify my office*, namely, in deeds, by carrying out its duties, not merely in word, Acts xx. 24. By striving zealously to turn the Gentiles in great numbers to Christ, the apostle glorifies his office,—labours, rich in results, tending to the δόξα of an office. δοξάζειν here therefore not = "to boast, praise, magnify in words" (so Luther: "I will praise my office"), which would have been far more likely to repel the Jews than provoke them to emulation.

—εἴπως] *if perchance*, states the aim of the δοξάζειν, i. 10; Acts xxvii. 12; Phil. iii. 11. εἰ, *si*, stands in Greek and Latin after verbs signifying *to muse, watch, try*, but also, as here, after such verbs as denote an action which *attempts* the accomplishment of a purpose, comp. Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 206, 5. 6. Therefore τ. δ. μ. δοξάζω εἴπως = τ. δ. μ. δοξάζω σκοπῶν, πειρώμενος εἴ πως.

—παραζηλώσω] ver. 11. παραζηλώσω, like the subjoined σώσω, is indic. fut., i. 10; Acts viii. 22.

—μου τὴν σάρκα] = τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου κατὰ σάρκα, ix. 3. Not, as Theodoret thinks, for the purpose of denying *spiritual*

fellowship with them. Rightly Theophyl.: *σάρκα δὲ εἰπὼν γνησιότητα καὶ φιλοστοργίαν ἐνέφηνε*; and Oecumen.: *πλέον αὐτοὺς οἰκειούμενος*. Comp. Gen. xxix. 14, xxxvii. 27; Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 13; Isa. lviii. 7.

—*καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν*] “and may save *some* of them.” Seeing that the recovery of the whole nation, certainly lying as yet in the future, is the purpose aimed at in the conversion of the Gentiles, it seems to me a matter of prime importance on my part to contribute even at present as far as lies in my power to the preparatory realization of this purpose. *ἐξ αὐτῶν*, *construct. ad sensum*, because by *μου τὴν σάρκα* the Israelites were meant. Paul ascribes the *σώζειν* to himself, inasmuch as the gospel preached by him is a *δύναμις εἰς σωτηρίαν*, i. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 16, ix. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 16.

Ver. 15. A parallel thought to the one contained in ver. 12, assigning the motive of the apostolic endeavour stated in ver. 14. *εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν*] Vulg.: “*si enim amissio eorum*.” Luther: “for if their *loss*.” This signification of *ἀποβολή* answers perfectly to our interpretation of *ἡττημα*, ver. 12. It has good linguistic authority, comp. Acts xxvii. 22: *ἀποβολὴ γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν*, and the required antithesis to *πρόσληψις* remains thus untouched. For *ἀποβολή* is the loss sustained in their case by God’s kingdom (Herväus: *quod Deus propter infidelitatem amisit eos*), *πρόσληψις* their restoration to God’s kingdom. Finally, the gentler designation: “their loss,” in relation to the entire tenor of the present exposition, is more appropriate than the harsher: “their casting off, rejection;” comp. *ἔπταισαν*, ver. 11. On the latter meaning of *ἀποβολή*, comp. LXX. Prov. xxviii. 24; Mark x. 50; Heb. x. 35; 1 Tim. iv. 4.

—*καταλλαγὴ κόσμου*] comp. *πλοῦτος κόσμος*, ver. 12. [The *κόσμος* refers here also to the Gentile world, of whose reconciliation with God (comp. *καταλλαγὴ*, v. 11) Israel’s apostasy was the medium; comp. *σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*, ver. 11. Thus *καταλλαγὴ* = cause, means of reconciliation.

—*τίς*] *i.e. ποία, sc. ἔσται*.

—*ἡ πρόσληψις*] *sc. αὐτῶν, i.e. τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. Luther: “What else were this but bringing life from the dead?” On this the marginal note: “Bringing life from the dead is nothing. For how should life come to the *Gentiles* from the fact that the Jews are fallen and dead? Rather are the dead Jews to be excited to life by the example of the *Gentiles*.” But apart from the considera-

tion that Luther makes the apostle here combat what he expressly asserted vv. 11, 12, he must, if the reader were meant to refer ἡ πρόσληψις to the admission of the Gentiles, of necessity have added ὑμῶν. πρόσληψις, *receptio, reception*, xiv. 1, 3, xv. 7; Philem. 12, 17; LXX. Ps. xxvii. 10.

—εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν] Orig. Chrysost. and Theodor. early interpret ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν as identical with ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν, and they are followed by the majority of modern expositors. The apostle is said to conceive the advent of the resurrection of the dead, which follows at the end of the world, as conditioned by the precedence of the universal conversion of the Jews. Just as the ἀποβολὴ Ἰουδαίων has for its result the καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, so the happy opposite of the ἀποβολή, namely the πρόσληψις Ἰουδαίων, must needs have as its happy consequence the final outcome of the καταλλαγή, i.e. the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν. But why in this case did not the apostle directly employ the unambiguous and familiar phrase ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν or ἐκ νεκρῶν? Nowhere else instead of this is the phrase ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν found in the N. T., and in the present passage no motive of any sort can be given for such an altogether unique deviation from the common usage.<sup>1</sup> On the other side, in favour of the *metaphorical* use of the phrase adopted in this passage, although in various shades of meaning, by Theophyl. (who explains ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν by ἄπειρα ἀγαθά) Phot. Oecum., as well as by the most considerable expositors of the Lutheran ("si abjectio Judaeorum profuit, quam gloriosa erit restitutio, quae est futura *quasi* resurrectio ex mortuis," Melancthon) and Reformed Churches and several modern interpreters, many analogous examples may be adduced, comp. vi. 13: ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας; Luke xv. 24: οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησε; ver. 32; Eph. ii. 5; Col. ii. 13; Rev. iii. 1, and the instances quoted by Fritzsche and Tholuck here from classical and Oriental sources. The choice of the phrase ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν in the present passage is no doubt conditioned and occasioned by the fact that the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν is the natural consequence

<sup>1</sup> Lechler, *Apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter*, 2 Aufl. p. 128 f., observes that "against the interpretation a twofold objection may be raised: (a) with respect to grammar, that, if the expression contemplated the resurrection of the dead as a well-known event, it could not have been left without the article; (b) with respect to the matter, that hereby the parallelism of thought between 'reconciliation of the world,' i.e. of the Gentiles who are far away from God's kingdom, and 'resurrection of the dead,' would utterly break down, whereas the context absolutely requires it."

and completion of the *καταλλαγή*. But the exchange of the formula *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν* for *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν* at the same time intimates that here merely a metaphorical sense is meant. *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν* is the consummated salvation following upon the *καταλλαγὴ κόσμου*. We are not on this account to say that *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν* is a proverbial phrase descriptive of *summum gaudium*, *summa felicitas*; for this specific meaning only arises in the present passage from the context, and the antithesis of *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν* to *καταλλαγή*. If salvation in its initial stage consisted in *καταλλαγὴ*, then the consummated salvation which transcends *καταλλαγὴ* can only further be described as *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν*. Comp. on *ζωή* in the sense of *felicitas*, 1 Thess. iii. 8; LXX. 1 Sam. ii. 6. Respecting the nature and contents of this *summa felicitas* nothing is here said. We have the less authority, as in the N. T. passages first cited, for supposing the ethical acceptance of *novitas vitæ ex morte peccati* to be directly and exclusively meant, as this *ἀνακαίνωσις* is already involved in the *καταλλαγὴ* itself. Rather, following out our acceptance of *πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν*, ver. 25, and comparing the historical development so far of the Christian church with the prophetic contents of this chapter, we shall have to seek the consummation of salvation, which Israel's final conversion has for its consequence, in the fact that then there shall take place both an extensive diffusion of God's kingdom thus reaching its completion in the Gentile world,<sup>1</sup> and no doubt at the same time a subjective revivification of Christendom, then again sunk in death; and thus a glorious period of prosperity shall open for the church of Jesus Christ upon earth.

Vv. 16-24. The apostle has now shown that God did not arbitrarily cast off His people as such, but saved an election of grace, while He hardened the rest on account of their righteousness of works, vv. 1-10. But even in this act of hardening He cherished purposes of love; for while its proximate design is the conversion of the Gentile world, its final aim is Israel's restoration, vv. 11-15. Before proceeding to expound and proclaim the future realization of this final aim, he makes clear that this realization follows both by nature and destiny from the divinely ordained character of the people of Israel, and thereto annexes a warning to the Gentiles not to allow themselves to be led astray

<sup>1</sup> "Sermo est de vivificatione totius; ut non sit residua massa mortua. Totius generis humani sive mundi conversio comitatibus conversionem Israelis," Bengel.



to self-exaltation and scorn for Israel by the temporary rejection of a portion of God's people and their own substitution instead. They should rather always bear in mind that they are not proper children in God's family, but merely guests in God's house; that the fate of disobedient children will far more certainly fall on unworthy guests; and that the prior right of children over strangers, despite their momentary expulsion from the house, is merely suspended, but its time will again return in full vigour. This is the import of vv. 16-24, set forth under the figure of the noble and wild olive-tree and the branches hewn off and grafted in.

Ver. 16 contains a corroboration—introduced by the metabatic δέ—and objective confirmation of the hope of Israel's πρόσληψις expressed in ver. 15, whereby at the same time a basis is laid for the warning to be addressed to the Gentiles. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα] *but if the first-fruit is holy, so also is the lump*. The ἀπαρχή here is manifestly the ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ φυράματος, as in what is subjoined the ῥίζα is the ῥίζα τῶν κλάδων. But φύραμα, both in the LXX. and in the apostle (ix. 21; 1 Cor. v. 6 f.; Gal. v. 9), is invariably = *dough*, *flour-dough*, not = *corn*. Consequently ἀπαρχή here is not, as in LXX. Deut. xviii. 4, xxvi. 2, the first-fruits of corn, but the first piece of the dough. Num. xv. 19-21 may serve for illustration, where ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ φυράματος denotes the first-fruit bread, which, when the dough was kneaded, was baked for the priests from the piece taken away first. Comp. Philo, *de praeconiis sacerdotum*: κελεύει γὰρ (ὁ νόμος) τοὺς σιτοποιούντας ἀπὸ παντὸς στεατός τε καὶ φυράματος ἄρτον ἀφαιρεῖν ἀπαρχὴν εἰς ἱερέων χρῆσιν. Thus the first piece, as representing the whole, being hallowed to the Lord, in this way the entire mass was considered as sacred, comp. Lund, *Die alten jüdischen Heilighthümer*, IV. 39, §§ 1-5. As concerns the explanation of the figure, it seems natural, in allusion to the preceding exposition, to interpret the ἀπαρχή of the ἐκλογή χάριτος, vv. 5, 7, *i.e.* of the Jews who became believers; the φύραμα, on the other hand, of the remaining body of the people. In the former, the entire nation is as it were hallowed; since, as the first-fruits of Israel, they are a pledge, and furnish security that hereafter the entire people shall attain to salvation. But to suppose such a solidarity in faith, seems a course as unapostolic as it is opposed to the nature of the case and to experience; for faith is invariably a peculiar act and peculiar quality of the individual, and there-

fore does not allow a conclusion to be drawn as to the faith of other individuals belonging by nature to the same national whole. But if we wish to suppose a reference, not so much to the *faith* of those first-fruits of Israel, as rather to the act of *God*, by which by means of faith they were adopted into the fellowship of salvation, and which as such involves a promise for the entire people, still this, where no express divine promise of the kind is forthcoming, can only be regarded as a subjective human expectation. Moreover, the parallelism obliges us to explain the first figure (εἰ δὲ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα) in the same sense as the second (καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι), and this the more since the apostle, in what follows, lets the first figure drop, and only proceeds with the exposition of the second, a proof that both figures express the same idea, but in a different form. We must therefore first of all pass on to expound the words

—καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι] That in these words the explanation just rejected can have no place, is evident. For those Jews who first became believers can in no sense be regarded as standing to the rest in the relation of the ῥίζα to the κλάδοι, seeing that the latter grew not from them as the branches from the root, not even descending from them in race, but merely along with them deriving their origin from the same patriarchs, and therefore related to them merely as unholy to holy branches, not as branches to the root. Moreover, hitherto the unbelieving had not even stood in relations of spiritual fellowship with the believing Jews; they had not even been branches of the first Christian root or mother church, and therefore could not be described—as, however, is done in ver. 17—as branches *broken off* from *this* root. But if we wish to refer ῥίζα in a more general sense to the so-called ideal theocracy, *i.e.* to the *spiritual* Israel of the O. T., of which even carnal Israel was a fellow-branch on the same stem, and from which it was severed only when the O. T. theocracy was absorbed in the N. T. Christocracy, even then the first difficulty remains, namely, that the spiritual cannot well be called the *root* of the natural Israel. To this is to be added, that in vv. 17, 24 the true theocracy is designated by εἰσαία, and distinguished from the ῥίζα. For these reasons we are compelled to rest satisfied with the exposition most widely accepted literally in every age, according to which ἡ ἀπαρχή as well as ἡ ῥίζα denotes the patriarchs, τὸ φύραμα and οἱ κλάδοι the people

collectively, which grew from the patriarchs and with them formed one united mass. The patriarchs were sanctified by the covenant made with them on God's part, and the promises given to them. But then, inasmuch as this covenant and these promises referred not merely to them alone, but to their descendants, and in them were given to their entire seed (Gen. xxii. 16 ff.; Deut. vii. 8, ix. 4 f.; Luke i. 54 f., 72 f.), all Israel in its entirety was a people consecrated to God, Ex. xix. 6. Just, then, as patriarchs and people form *one* mass, while the people form the dough hallowed by the holy first-fruit, so the patriarchs are the root, the people the branches, and in the sanctification of the root that of the branches is involved, 1 Cor. vii. 14. This interpretation is corroborated by ver. 28, where the Israelites in mass are called *κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς πατέρας*, xv. 8. But the expression *κ. τ. ἐκλ. ἀγαπητοί* also confirms the *objective* view of the notion of *ἀγιότης* in this passage. Not upon this are Israel's dignity and hope based, that the patriarchs were sanctified through faith, but that they were sanctified through God's covenant and promise. The faith of the patriarchs is the element *severing* their unbelieving posterity from them. On the very ground of their unbelief had these been cut off, ver. 20. What *connects* them with the patriarchs is simply God's objective word of grace by which they are sanctified (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5), and God's indefectible covenant of grace, in which they from the beginning are included. Wherever Abraham is honoured on account of his faith (ch. iv.), there he is placed in contrast with his natural posterity, and he is the father, not of Israel after the flesh, but of believers indiscriminately, whether from the Gentiles or from Israel. Only, the objective privileges of grace, given him on behalf of all his posterity, are such (ix. 4, 5) that they form an indissoluble bond of holy communion between him and the people of Israel, and as *χαρίσματα ἀμεταμέλητα*, xi. 29, although for a time suspended and restrained in their action through the people's unbelief, are nevertheless in themselves indefeasible, and ultimately must needs again even subjectively demonstrate their converting energy. Rightly Calov: "*De illa agitur hic sanctitate, vi cujus posteritati Patriarcharum auditus ad gratiam eandem patebat, secundum divina promissa, quorum vero actu participes Israëlita fieri non poterant, nisi per fidem. Non enim cum Patribus tantum, sed cum tota gente*

Deus *pactum fœderis* iniit, unde non erat ἐκ τῶν ἀδυνάτων posteritatem ad salutem adspirare, modo non reprobet Christum per infidelitatem, sed Evangelium ejus suscipiat. Similitudo Apostoli de *primitiis et massa* satis docet, de interna sanctitate non agi. Nam oblatio primitiarum nihil intrinsece conferebat massae, sed σχετικῶς tantum ob mandatum divinum reddebat eandem vescibilem, vel ad vescendum licitam, non vero aptam: hanc enim internam aptitudinem et bonitatem non consequeretur per primitiarum oblationem; ita et posterius non a primitiis suis Patriarchis Deo consecratis habent, quod spirituali et interna sanctitate polleant, sed σχετικῶς tantum et extrinsece sancti sunt, quod juribus Ecclesiae et promissis Dei frui possint."

Vv. 17, 18. εἰ δέ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν] seems to contradict the purport of ver. 16; for if all the branches are hallowed by the root, then apparently none of them can be broken off. But we must keep in view the twofold, *i.e.* the objective and subjective side of the actual circumstances. On the side of the divine design Israel remains in every age God's elect people; but on the side of its own believing appropriation, Israel may for a time hinder the full accomplishment of this design, although in the end, precisely because it relates to the people collectively, this design must needs reach its goal and purpose with respect to them. The first element, or the purely ideal representation, is set forth in the figure of the uninjured tree, with its holy root and holy branches. In accordance with the second element, in which the discrepancy between the idea and the momentary reality is intimated, a portion of the branches appears cut off. But the opposition of these two elements finds its adjustment and essential reconciliation in the third element, which comes forth under the figure of the ultimate grafting in again of the branches broken off. As well from delicate forbearing regard for his people, as for the purpose of checking arrogant self-exaltation in the Gentiles, the apostle makes use of the qualifying expression τινὲς τῶν κλάδων, comp. ver. 25, although in reality the people had apostatized in mass, and merely a λεῖμμα, ver. 5, was left. In presence of the proud tree of the theocracy, hallowed by promise and faith, and made up of the patriarchs and all believers of the O. T., as well as of the believing Jews of his own days, the number of the apostate Jews as it were vanishes from before his vision, and he is the less inclined to

lay stress on the greatness of their number, as even these were destined to vanish, *i.e.* to be reinstated in the kingdom of God.

—σὺ δὲ ἀγρίελαος ὧν ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς] By σὺ each and every Gentile Christian is individualized and addressed, ii. 17, but not in so far as he is a Christian, but in so far as he is a *Gentile* Christian, and in him the Gentile world in general, which from this time onward is destined to enter into the Christian church. The contrast with which the apostle has here to do is that of entire peoples. The Gentile Christian was in danger of looking down with scorn upon Israel, which he saw rejected as an entire nation, and of priding himself upon the community from which he sprung, because in being received into the Messianic kingdom the latter was preferred before Israel. From this point of view also the use of the expression ἀγρίελαος is justified. Inasmuch as the apostle by σὺ meant the entire Gentile world, he speaks not merely of single branches of the wild olive tree, but of the olive tree itself.<sup>1</sup> This is contemplated as already grafted as a whole, *i.e.* in all its branches, in the noble olive tree; whereas in ver. 24 the real state of the case finds expression, according to which hitherto merely the first-fruits of the Gentiles were actually severed from the Gentile community, and received into the community of the Christian faith. But we may very well say that the whole tree is engrafted when all its branches are engrafted; for the branches are the only part of the tree that comes into consideration in the matter of grafting. And even if we conceived, which is here needless, the trunk as included in the whole tree, still the description should not seem strange in the apostle, seeing that he does not give himself anxious concern about the artistic and regular elaboration of his figures, but often, as presently in this verse, adapts the figure to the thought to be expressed, and passes suddenly from the figure to the thing itself. We have no need, therefore, of the artificial and untenable modes of interpretation which have been adopted. Neither does oleaster stand for *sarculus oleastri*; nor can the phrase "thou art an olive tree" for

<sup>1</sup> When Fritzsche objects: "σὺ means tu, homo gentilis, quicquid sis, sive Cyprius sive Sampronius voceris. Qui igitur Sampronius, qui Christo fidem habuisset, cum oleastro recte contenderit?" the reply is, that neither does Paul say "*thou Sampronius*." Moreover, the individual Gentile addressed by his *proper name* could not be adduced as a representative of the entire race, but merely as an individual in *contradistinction* from others.

"thou art of the olive tree" be justified by the colloquial phrase "the table is nut tree;" nor is a *young* olive tree to be thought of, which might, perhaps, be understood as a graft: nor yet is ἀγριέλαιος used here adjectivally = ἐκ τῆς ἀγριελαιίου ὄν, being of the wild olive tree. For ver. 24 rather proves the opposite, namely, that Paul here also used ἀγριέλαιος as a *substantive*; and ἀγριέλαιος as an adjective would denote, not so much what (like a branch) springs from the olive tree, as rather what carries in it the nature of the olive tree, or is made out of it, i.e. out of its wood, comp. *homo ferreus*. Quite rightly, therefore, Luther: "And thou who wert a wild olive tree." Striking is the description, as suggested in this passage, of heathenism as "religion growing wild." And as originally all trees grew wild, and their ennobling came about, not through grafting, but through care and culture, so Judaism may be regarded as the ennobling, in one of its trunks, of humanity—that had run wild religiously—through the care and culture of divine revelation. What Theodoret denies to the Gentiles he concedes to the Jews, when he says of the former: οὐ γὰρ ἔσχατος γεωργοῦντα τὸν νόμον, οὐδὲ τοῖς προφῆταις ἄρδοντας καὶ καθαίροντας καὶ τὴν προσήκουσάν σοι ἐπιμέλειαν ποιουμένους. ἐν αὐτοῖς may refer merely to τοῖς κλάδους, i.e. the branches of the noble olive tree in general, not to τινὰς τῶν κλάδων, i.e. the branches broken off; for it signifies neither *loco eorum*, ἀντ' αὐτῶν, nor *in locum*,—better than this, *in loco eorum*. But the reference to the branches generally is specially favoured by the following συγκοινωνός, for only along with (σύν) them, not with the branches *broken off*, are those engrafted made partakers of the fatness of the root. Also in ver. 18, οἱ κλάδοι are not the branches broken off, but the branches in general.

—καὶ συγκοινωνός τῆς ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πιότητος τῆς ἐλαίας ἐγένου] "and becamest joint-partaker of the root and fatness of the olive tree." The root here can mean nothing else but what it does in ver. 16; therefore the patriarchs, with whom they have now coalesced, as branches with root, and stand in intimate communion. The *πιότης* is the blessing of the promises, which, from the patriarchs and the theocracy, has streamed forth upon the Gentile world at large. Comp. as to the reception of the Gentile world into the theocratic divine community, Matt. viii. 11; John x. 16; Eph. ii. 12, 13, 19, 20. "Saepe σύν dicit Paulus

de gentibus, Eph. ii. 19, 22, iii. 6; comp. μετά, Rom. xv. 10," Bengel. The choice of the figure of the *olive* tree may perhaps be explained, not merely by the circumstance of its being looked on as the noblest of trees, but also by the fact that the olive, the *πιότης τῆς ἐλαίας*, is everywhere in Scripture a symbol of the Spirit of God and His gracious gifts. Hence the theocracy, as the vehicle of the Divine Spirit, of His promises and operations, is the olive tree. So, in a similar way, although with a somewhat different turn of the figure, in Zech. iv. the two olive trees are emblems of the high-priestly and kingly offices, which found their fulfilment in Christ, and through which the oil of divine grace flows into the lamp of the church; comp. Hengstenberg, *Christ.* III. 337, and on Rev. xi. 4 in his *Exposition of Revelation*. Now it is strange that whereas, as is well known, in the usual grafting process the wild tree is enriched by the insertion of a rich graft, the apostle here reverses the process, and makes the wild graft enriched by insertion into a rich tree. The reference to the Oriental custom of inserting wild olive branches into the olive tree is nothing to the point. For, as is evident from the passages alleged for this practice from the ancients (Columella, *de re rust.* v. 9; Palladius, *de insitione*, xiv. 53, 54: "*Fecundat sterilis pingues oleaster olivas, et quae non novit munera ferre docet*"), and from accounts of modern travellers, the object in this, as follows, indeed, from the nature of the case, is not to enrich the wild graftlings by inserting them in the rich tree (which were an aimless proceeding, since without this the olive tree already bears perfect fruit), but by the infusion of the fresh sap of the wild branches to recruit the failing powers of the rich tree. Now we decline to say that the apostle, in ignorance, mistook the facts of the case. We might just as well assert that he did not know that branches, once hewn off, are not usually re-inserted, ver. 24. Rather, in harmony with his purpose, he holds fast, as *tertium comparationis*, merely the notion of improvement by grafting, as well as the fact that the graftlings coalesce with and are borne by the root of the grafted tree, and that the sap streams from root and tree into the engrafted branches. Elsewhere he modifies the figure in conformity with the thing to be represented, because, even when working out the figure, he always adheres in thought to the thing itself, and therefore easily glides away from the figure to the object represented, ver. 20; Eph. ii.

21, iv. 16. Rightly, therefore, Origen: "ordine commutato res magis causis, quam causas rebus aptavit." The supposition of Paul's thought being that in this case there takes place by special grace what otherwise is contrary to nature, is just as needless as it is far-fetched. Under the figure of grafting itself, not of a mode of grafting contrary to nature, is set forth the opposition to nature (*παρὰ φύσιν*, ver. 24) of the grace received by the Gentiles.

—*μή κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων*] The *κλάδοι* here are not the branches broken off, but those of the olive tree in general (of which *some* were broken off), without figure therefore: the *people of Israel*, comp. Meyer. Else, in what follows, the apostle must have said: "for it is *their* (that of the branches broken off) root which bears thee." But he says: "for thou bearest not the root, but the root thee," *i.e.* it belongs only to the root to boast against the branches; not to engrafted branches, which are themselves mere branches, not the root. *κατακαυχᾶσθαι τινος*, to boast against one, Jas. ii. 13, iii. 14. "Videant, ne gloriantur contra, qui negant conversionem Judaeorum," Bengel.

—*εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι*] to be supplied: *ἴσθ' ὅτι*: "then reflect." Respecting this brachylogy comp. Winer, p. 773.

—*οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάξεις, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σέ*] *i.e.* thou art received into the fellowship of the patriarchs, not they into thine. Wert thou the foundation on which God's kingdom is erected, thou hadst reason to glory over the stones of the building, *i.e.* to despise the people of Israel. But, as it is, "thou standest in the mere relation of a *branch* to the root,—a branch borne by the root, not the converse,—which therefore ought not to magnify itself against its fellow-branches, as if it were something better."

Vv. 19-21. *ἐπεὶς οὖν*] (comp. ix. 19) introduces an objection which is inferred from the surmising of the Gentile Christian. If he has no right to boast against the branches, because he himself is merely a branch borne by the root, not one bearing the root, he still fancies that he has a right to do this, because the branches were broken off from the trunk for the purpose of making room for him.

—*ἐξεκλάσθησαν οἱ κλάδοι*] Chiefly on the authority of A C F G I, Knapp, Scholz, and Lachmann read *κλάδοι* without the article. So, too, Cod. Sinait. But the subsequent omission of the article is more easily explicable than its subsequent



addition. The transcribers supposed that the apostle might have merely written κλάδοι, *branches*, indefinitely in allusion to τινὲς τῶν κλάδων, ver. 17, but not οἱ κλάδοι, "the branches in general." But in this very point is brought out the difference between Paul's mode of view and that of the Gentile Christians. Whereas the apostle, having regard to the divine election of the whole, speaks only of some branches broken off, the proud opponent of the people of Israel, having regard to the actual fact of its universal apostasy, maintains that all the branches are broken off, *i.e.* the entire Jewish nation rejected, comp. τῶν κλάδων, ver. 18.

—ἵνα ἐγὼ ἐγκεντρισθῶ] ἐγὼ has the emphasis, and marks the conceit and arrogant self-esteem of the Gentile Christian.

—καλῶς] *Right!* Luther: "Well said!" Concession of the fact.

—τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν] specifies the true *reason* of the fact, which consists not in an arbitrary preference of God for the Gentiles and an arbitrary hatred of Israel, but in the unbelief of Israel and its conceit of its own superiority. τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, dative of cause = "on account of unbelief," Winer, p. 270.

—σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας] "but thou standest by faith," not: as a branch upon the tree; but ἔστηκας is here the opposite of πίπτειν, vv. 11, 22; comp. xiv. 4. The apostle quits the figure, and passes over to the thing itself. Whoever stands by faith stands by divine grace, not by his own merit. "*Fides, Dei donum, demissos faciens,*" Bengel.

—μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει] 1 Tim. vi. 17. The reading received by Lachmann, only on the authority of A B, so also Cod. Sinait., ὑψηλὰ φρόνει, instead of ὑψηλοφρόνει, is merely to be regarded as a gloss, xii. 16. It is characteristic of the difference between the ethics of the ancient world and of Christianity, that a Greek uses ὑψηλόφρων, *high-minded, sensu bono*; ταπεινόφρων, *low-minded, sensu malo*. For Christianity, on the other hand, ὑψηλοφροσύνη, *haughtiness*, is the greatest sin; ταπεινοφροσύνη, *humility*, the highest virtue.

—ἀλλὰ φοβῶ] "Timor opponitur non fiducia, sed supercilio et securitati," Bengel. "Timorem Deum offendendi non excludit fides," Grotius. Comp. Phil. ii. 12, 13. Be not high-minded, but fear; for pride comes before a fall. Proud contempt of others springs from conceit of one's own merit. It is therefore the opposite of faith in free, unmerited grace, and is consequently followed by loss of this grace and faith. Fear the loss of God's grace,

—εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο κτλ.] Motive to show the necessity of the φοβεῖσθαι. οἱ κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι, the branches according to nature, i.e. the natural branches, Winer, p. 241, opposite of παρὰ φύσιν ἐγκεντρισθέντες, ver. 24. Dionys. *Halic.* iv. 46. 15, has been aptly compared: πολλῆς τε μωρίας ἔφη καὶ θεοβλαβείας εἶναι . . . νομίζειν ὡς ὁ τῶν συγγενεσμάτων καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτων μὴ φεισάμενος (*Tarquinius*) τῶν ἄλλοτρίων φείσεται.

—μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται] *so possibly He might not spare thee also.* μήπως depends on a φοβέσθαι to be understood; *verecor, ne tibi quoque non parciturus sit.* The indicative futuri φείσεται is more definite than the conjunctive aoristi φείσῃται (so the *lect. rec.* as a correction), and expresses apprehension of the actual occurrence of what is feared = so I fear and apprehend, Winer, p. 632. The reading οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται without μήπως, received by Lachmann, is less attested than the reading μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται, advocated by nearly all modern expositors. Moreover, a positive menace appears less in place than a simple warning. Chrysost.: καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται, ἀλλὰ μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται, ὑποτεμνόμενος τοῦ λόγου τὸ φορτικὸν καὶ ποιῶν ἐναγώνιον τὸν πιστὸν εἶναι.

Vv. 22-24. After the apostle, by μὴ κατακαυχῶ, ver. 18, and μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ, ver. 20, has warned the Gentiles, he then, in the form of an inference from the previous intimations, unfolds the real facts and state of the case both present and future, and seeks thus to put the Gentiles in a position for gaining an accurate and comprehensive, and not merely one-sided view of the case. Ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν θεοῦ] *See then the goodness and the severity of God.* ἀποτομία is an ἁπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T. But the expression is not on this account to be explained by reference to its derivation from ἀποτέμνειν, for the following ἐπὶ τοὺς πεσόντας points not to those who fell through *being cut off*, but to those who sinned through unbelief; comp. ver. 20: σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας. Only with the words ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ does the apostle recur to the figure of the cutting off of the branches. With ἀποτομία comp. ἀποτόμως, 2 Cor. xiii. 10, Tit. i. 13, which Hesych. explains by σκληρῶς, ἀπαραιτήτως.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In ἀποτομία, *severity*, there can merely be at most an *allusion* to the root-meaning of *cutting off*. In no case, therefore, can there be more in ἔστηκας, ver. 20, and τοὺς πισόντας, ver. 22, which = to stand and fall, not *as*, but *like* a branch.

—ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομίαν, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητα] Chiefly in accordance with A B, Lachmann and Tischendorf have received the reading ἀποτομία and χρηστότης θεοῦ (Cod. Sinait. has ἀποτομία and χρηστότητος θεοῦ). Decision is difficult. For while the nominative, on account of the break it makes in the construction, might easily lead copyists to substitute the accusative, on the other hand the accusative is better confirmed by evidence, and similar changes of construction (ii. 8) have elsewhere remained untouched by the copyists. And while the adjunct θεοῦ on one side looks very like a gloss, yet, in addition to the witnesses cited, it is supported by C D, Copt. Arm. Vulg., and might have been dropped out subsequently as unnecessary. If we decide in favour of Lachmann's reading, to the nominative an ἐστίν is to be supplied. Having no motive here to soften the expression, the apostle chooses πίπτειν to describe the occurrence which in ver. 11 he had described by πταίειν in contradistinction from πίπτειν.

—ἐὰν ἐπιμένῃς τῇ χρηστότητι] *If thou shalt abide by the goodness.* This cannot mean his own χρηστότης, but, as is evinced by the like twice-repeated reference of the same word and the matter itself, only the χρηστότης θεοῦ. If χρηστότης be explained of *honestas morum* (iii. 12), we get the notion—as well anti-Pauline as precluded by the general strain of the present course of thought—that perseverance in morality of life is the cause of the preservation of a state of grace. This holds good even if, with Clem. Al., we interpret χρηστότης of πίστις εἰς Χριστόν. For, apart from the fact that πίστις is not elsewhere described as χρηστότης, the aspect under which πίστις is viewed is not that of χρηστότης, but simply that of ὄργανον ληπτικὸν χάριτος, a means just as much of apprehending as of preserving salvation. The appeal to the following ἐπιμένειν τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ is futile, for it is a thoroughly Pauline antithesis to ascribe rejection to man's unbelief, but reception to God's goodness. With ἐπιμένειν τῇ χρηστότητι τοῦ θεοῦ, to abide by the divine goodness, *i.e.* not to lose it by apostasy from the faith, comp. Acts xiii. 43 : προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ. “Non permausit Romanus in bonitate, invecta operum justitia,” Bengel. Melancthon, in addition, alludes to the extermination of Oriental Gentile churches by Mohammedanism.

ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ] Ind. fut. sec. after ἐπεί, ver. 6. For

thou also wilt be cut off, *i.e.* ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι = *else* thou also wilt, etc. A *dictum probans* for the so-called *amissibilitas gratiae*. The assumption of absolute predestinarianism that only *fides ficta, hypocritica* can be lost, is shown to be a mere makeshift; for clearly what is spoken of here is a true faith, whose fruit was an actual grafting into the spiritual olive tree. After ἐκκοπήσῃ a period is to be placed, not a comma, as if καὶ σύ and καὶ ἐκεῖνοι answered one to the other = "for both thou shalt be cut off and they shall be grafted in." But καὶ σύ means "*thou also*," in contrast with the unbelieving Jews; comp. οὐδὲ σοῦ, ver. 21. The menace against the Gentiles concludes with ἐκκοπήσῃ (on the very ground of the *menacing* language, a *stronger* expression than ἐκκλᾶν, ἐκκλάζειν, vv. 17, 19, 20), and with καὶ ἐκεῖνοι opens a joyous outlook as to the future destiny of Israel. Otherwise it must have run: ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητα. Ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμείνης τῇ χρηστότητι, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δὲ κτλ.

—καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δέ] *but they also* (comp. Matt. xvi. 18), like the engrafted branches of the wild olive, ver. 17. The reading attested by preponderant evidence is *καὶ ἐκεῖνοι* instead of καὶ ἐκεῖνοι.

—ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμεινωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ] "Ergo conversio eorum non erit irresistibilis," Bengel. Unbelief being the ground of their rejection, non-continuance in unbelief is the condition of their reception. But the faith which is the means of their reception or engrafting is not on this account to be viewed, like unbelief,—the ground of their rejection,—merely as an act of human freedom. It is such a means simply as a consequence of the operation of God's almighty power, on which account the apostle expressly adds

—δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θεός] comp. iv. 21, xiv. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 8; 2 Tim. i. 12; Heb. xi. 19.

—εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπης ἀγριελαίου κτλ.] The majority of expositors take this sentence, linked on by γάρ, as a confirmation of δυνατὸς ἐστιν ὁ θεός, ver. 23. If the thought supposed to be expressed in ver. 24 be, that it is more *probable* that the proper branches will be grafted in than strange branches, it is impossible to see how this greater probability is to confirm faith in the divine omnipotence; for that which the divine righteousness and love will bring to pass is not at all on that

account an object easier of accomplishment for the divine omnipotence. We should then be compelled to fix our thoughts not so much on the greater probability, as on the greater easiness of carrying out the thing referred to. But it is impossible to see in what respect it is *easier* in the literal sense to engraft the proper branches than strange ones; and as concerns the metaphorical sense, or the application of the figure, that it is easier to convert the *rebellious* people of Israel than the Gentile world. *πόσῳ μᾶλλον* also does not so much suggest what is done more easily than something else, as introduce the thought, that if one thing is done, by logical sequence and in course of nature another thing will the more surely or the more probably be done, comp. v. 12; Matt. vii. 11, x. 25; Luke xii. 24, 28; Philem. 16; Heb. ix. 14; and *πολλῷ μᾶλλον*, Matt. vi. 30; Rom. v. 9, 10, 15, 17; 1 Cor. xii. 22; 2 Cor. iii. 9, 11; Phil. ii. 12; as well as on v. 15. In that case, instead of *ἐγκεντρισθήσονται*, at all events *ἐγκεντρίσαι δυνήσεται* (*sc. ὁ θεός*) must have been said.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we must suppose that the proposition meant to be confirmed is not so much *δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς* (which, moreover, is a subordinate thought confirmatory of the immediately preceding principal thought, and itself needs no confirmation), as rather the principal one *κἀκεῖνοι δὲ . . . ἐγκεντρισθήσονται* itself, ver. 23, so that *γάρ*, ver. 24, is not subordinate to but co-ordinate with the *γάρ*, ver. 23. Thus the grafting in again of the people of Israel is meant to be rendered more probable by the fact that by their original nature they are branches appertaining to the noble olive tree itself. If the strange branches—those, therefore, farther removed from God—are by His loving care inserted in the noble tree, how much more will this care watch over the interests of the proper branches of the tree—those standing nearer to Him! We see how the apostle here again does not strictly discriminate between figure and thing, and represents that which can only be understood as care for the persons meant under the figure as care for the branches themselves. But, stripped of figure, the thought is this—that the Jews, as national descendants of the patriarchs, have a

<sup>1</sup> Meyer rightly observes that “the power of God is the correlative, not of that which is easy, but precisely of that which is difficult, or which humanly speaking appears impossible (iv. 21, xiv. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 8; Rom. ix. 22; Matt. xix. 26; Luke i. 37, *al.*).”

prior right, confirmed by divine choice and promise, to share in the Messianic kingdom and salvation, just because their forefathers received the promise on behalf of them—their posterity—as well as on their own account. If God in this way placed Himself in a closer relation to Israel, He will the more certainly maintain this relation, and make Israel partaker in the blessing pertaining to it, since He Himself endowed with this blessing the Gentiles who are farther removed from Him. Thus *κατὰ φύσιν* and *παρὰ φύσιν* do not so much refer to the antithesis between natural growth on the trunk and the artificial process of grafting, as express what is according to nature and what is against nature in the circumstances of the case. It is according to nature for the branch to remain on its own stem; it is against nature for it to be cut off in order to be grafted on another stem. If, then, what is against nature takes place in the case of the Gentiles, certainly in the case of the Jews what is according to their original nature will again assert its right and receive a fresh fulfilment. In opposition to Grotius, who explains *πόσῳ μᾶλλον quanto facilius*, Calov remarks: “*Illud πόσῳ μᾶλλον est quanto magis*, intuitu nempe promissorum Patriarchis factorum et radicis sanctae, sed ea qua diximus ratione, non vero *quanto facilius*.” The present verse contains withal a *dictum probans* for the possibility of the restoration of those once fallen, or for the so-called *reiterabilitas gratiae* (as ver. 22 for the *amissibilitas gratiae*, ver. 23 for *conversio resistibilis*). It may indeed be alleged that the apostle is here dealing not so much with particular individuals as with the people collectively. But at all events he expected in his own day to see a partial fulfilment of his hopes in the case of fallen individuals, ver. 14; and, besides, we are warranted in drawing inferences from the course of history in a nation collectively to that of particular individuals.

Vv. 25-32. Upon the delineation of the hope of Israel's entire conversion, founded upon the nature of the case, follows now the express prophetic announcement of its future occurrence at the time appointed by God, which promise in turn is again confirmed partly by Scripture testimony, partly by the faithfulness, the manifold resources and universal character of the divine compassion.

Vv. 25-27. So soon as the Gentile *plcroma* has come in, all Israel will be converted, which fact of Israel's conversion is also

foretold by Scripture. οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν] Corroboration (γάρ) of the hope expressed by ἐγκεντρισθήσονται, ver. 24. As to the form of notification: οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, comp. on i. 13. Here also it serves to introduce something specially important and worthy of note.

—ἀδελφοί] Address to the Gentile Christians, as in vii. 1 to the Jewish Christians.

—τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο] Chrysostom observes: Μυστήριον ἐνταῦθα ἀγνοούμενον καὶ ἀπόρρητον λέγων καὶ πολὺ μὲν τὸ θαῦμα πολὺ δὲ τὸ παράδοξον ἔχον. In the N. T. μυστήριον is always a sacred matter having reference to the relations and development of God's kingdom, which, either on account of the form in which it appears, or as regards its import, remains hidden to man, until it is explained or communicated to him. The mystery consists either in the parabolic (Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10) or symbolic (Rev. i. 20, xvii. 5, 7), or generally in the strange, unintelligible (1 Cor. xiv. 2) *form* of the utterance. In this aspect the notion of μυστήριον is allied with that of αἴνigma, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. The thing, as to itself, is communicated, but in enigmatical form. For those to whom the solution is unknown, the import of the unsolved enigma remains a mystery. But for the most part the expression μυστήριον applies to the *thing* itself, and denotes either the saving, redeeming purpose itself hidden in God (Rom. xvi. 25; Eph. i. 9, iii. 4, vi. 19; Col. i. 26, ii. 2, iv. 3), or the special kind and manner of its historical accomplishment and ultimate consummation (comp. Rom. xi. 25, 1 Cor. xv. 51, Eph. iii. 3, Col. i. 27, 2 Thess. ii. 7, the mystery of the development, not of Christ, but of *Anti*-Christ among mankind, Rev. x. 7). The purpose of salvation has been realized through Christ's advent and work, and, revealed through the gospel, has ceased to be a μυστήριον; and in the same way, the chief elements in the future development of the Christocracy have been revealed to the apostles by the Spirit, and by them communicated to the churches. Other elements in this development remain concealed, and are therefore still to be described as μυστήρια, which may be disclosed as the particular occasion arises, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. But even the revealed mystery of redemption accomplished by Christ can only be known through the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit, and for the unenlightened and unbelieving remains ever a mystery, like an uncomprehended

parable or a strange *glossolalia*, 1 Cor. ii. 7. Thus the chief fundamental mystery of God has ceased to be a mystery, and yet withal remains a mystery. It has ceased to be a mystery, because in the gospel it is revealed to all the world. It remains a mystery for the individual so long as the gospel does not reach him, or he does not receive it in faith, and by this believing reception attain to the spiritual comprehension of its import. Hence the heralds of the gospel are still *οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων θεοῦ*, 1 Cor. iv. 1 (1 Cor. ii. 1, where A C, Cod. Sinait.\* also have τὸ μυστήριον instead of τὸ μαρτύριον), and the gospel is a *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας*, 1 Tim. iii. 16, a *μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως*, 1 Tim. iii. 9. From this it follows that *μυστήριον* in the N. T. never denotes mystery in the dogmatic sense of the word, *i.e.* a supernatural fact which, although revealed by God to man, and received by man in faith, yet, as regards the *how* of its nature or realization, involves an element not comprehended and not to be comprehended by man's finite and limited intelligence. Rather, according to the N. T. mode of definition, for *πίστις* the *μυστήριον* ceases to be a *μυστήριον*, an *ἀποκεκρυμμένον*. For *πίστις*, it has become an *ἀποκεκαλυμμένον*, a *φανερὸν*. In accordance with this view, in the only other passage to be cited from the N. T., Eph. v. 32, τὸ μυστήριον should perhaps be referred to the typical signification of the O. T. passage cited in ver. 31, not to the incomprehensibility of the mode of Christ's union with the church in the holy eucharist (so Harless here). Not that we wish to deny either that the apostle in this passage views marriage as a type of the *corporal* union of Christ with the church in the eucharistic sacrament, or that this kind of union—a union existing in fact, revealed in the gospel, and believed by the church—is effectuated *modo nobis incomprehensibili*, and in so far to unenlightened human reason is, and, from the standpoint of earthly experience, will remain a *sublime mysterium*. The apostle therefore speaks in the present passage, as in 1 Cor. xv. 51, in the character of a prophet *ἐν ἀποκαλύψει* (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 30); and this *ἀποκάλυψις*, respecting the mode of the historical evolution of the Christocracy, has been imparted to him by the mediation of the Divine Spirit, *ἐν πνεύματι*, Eph. iii. 5; comp. Tholuck here.

—*ἵνα μὴ ᾗτε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι*] lest you be wise with yourselves, *i.e.* in your own opinion = lest you seem wise to yourselves. Doubtless an interpolated, but not on this account



parenthetical clause expressing design, ix. 11. On *παρά*, with the dative of *opinion*, comp. xii. 17; LXX. Prov. iii. 7; Winer, p. 493. The Gentiles might easily be led, from the facts lying before them, wrongly to infer the permanent rejection of Israel. This conclusion is guarded against by the apostle disclosing the very opposite. They could not help in this way becoming conscious of their ignorance with respect to the divine ways, and were saved from the danger of thinking themselves wise. The apostle expresses himself with forbearance; for as the Gentile conclusion proceeded from haughty self-assumption, and led to haughty contempt for Israel, so this *haughtiness* of theirs must be humbled by the perception of the false conclusion they had drawn. But *φρόνιμοι* in itself is not on this account = *ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες*. So Luther: "lest ye be *proud*." Better Theodoret: *ἵνα μὴ σφόδρα ἡγούμενοι ἑαυτοὺς συνετοὺς ὑψηλὸν ἐντεῦθεν εἰσδέξησθε φρόνημα*. Lachmann and Tischendorf, in accordance with A B, Damasc., have received *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* instead of *παρ' ἑαυτοῖς*. The sense remains the same; comp. LXX. Isa. v. 21: *οὐαὶ οἱ συνετοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*; 1 Cor. xiv. 11. The same meaning is conveyed by the dative *ἑαυτοῖς*, without preposition (*ne sitis vobis prudentes*), contained in F G, *al. Vulg. Hil. Hier. al.*; comp. Acts vii. 20; Winer, p. 265. This latter reading, received by Tischendorf, may possibly be genuine, inasmuch as from it, as the rarer form of expression, the rise of the glossarial reading *παρ' ἑαυτοῖς* and *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* is most easily explained.

—*ὅτι πῶρως ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν*] *ὅτι* introduces the contents of the *μυστήριον*, contained not in the words *πῶρως . . . γέγονεν*, but in the words *πῶρως . . . σωθήσεται*. As to *πῶρως*, comp. on ver. 7. *ἀπὸ μέρους*, *in part, partially* (xv. 15, 24; 2 Cor. i. 14, ii. 5), softening like *τινές*, ver. 17 (*οὐ πάντες ἠπίστευσαν*, πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐπίστευσαν, Theodoret), is to be connected with *γέγονεν*. "Hardening has *happened partially* to Israel." But *ἀπὸ μέρους* is to be taken extensively (not intensively = *quodammodo*, in opposition to a total hardening), and is therefore to be applied to the number of the hardened, not to the degree of hardness, the sense thus being = *ὅτι πῶρως μέρος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* (opposite of *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ*, ver. 26) *γέγονεν*. With *γίγνεσθαι* *τινι*, to befall one, comp. Mark ix. 21. That this event of Israel's hardening against the gospel is to be regarded as a divine infliction of punishment, is known from ver. 8. The

hardness has happened to Israel from the hand of God. ἄχρις οὗ, with the conjunctive aorist (*donec, usque dum intraverit*), always introduces a future event, with the occurrence of which a fact hitherto existing is to cease, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 26, xv. 25; Gal. iii. 19, iv. 19; Rev. ii. 25, vii. 3. Therefore, after the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma*, the hardness of Israel is to cease. In order to avoid the doctrine of a final conversion of Israel, clearly contained in the apostle's words, many unidiomatic interpretations have been attempted. The only one of these deserving notice is the acceptance of ἄχρις οὗ in the sense of *quamdum, while that*. On this view, the partial hardness of Israel is to continue during the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma*; so that in ἄχρις οὗ, not the limit, but the continuous permanence of the hardness would be marked. But this would be expressed by ἄχρις οὗ with the indicative, Heb. iii. 13; Acts xxvii. 33.

—τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν] *supplementum Gentilium, the supplement from the Gentiles* instead of the unbelieving Jews, see on ver. 12. Therefore neither *universitas, plenitudo*, nor *multitudo, caterva, ingens concursus ethnicorum* (although the supplement in itself may be an *ingens multitudo*), since it is to be conceived neither as corresponding exactly with the number of the apostate Jews, nor yet in general, as fixed by the divine reason *a priori*, to complete a number in harmony with a law of reason. Rather might it be said, that the lost μέρος of Israel was deemed so precious by the apostle that a *magna caterva* of Gentiles is requisite to fill its place. That the genitive τῶν ἐθνῶν is not inconsistent with our acceptance of πλήρωμα, we have already seen above. Rather might it be said, that when once the rent made in God's kingdom by Israel's apostasy is repaired by the supplement from the Gentiles, there will then be no room for all Israel, ver. 26, and that, too, as a supplement, to enter. But here also we must not press the figure too strictly, in contradistinction from the thing. The thing is this, that in one aspect the Gentiles are admitted to Israel's place, and in the other Israel itself in the end returns to its former place. Hence both one and the other, especially in the course of a different order of thought, may be described as the filling up of the gap caused by the apostasy.

—εἰσέλθῃ] *sc. εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τῶν οὐρανῶν*, comp. Matt. v. 20, vii. 21, xviii. 3, xix. 23, 24; Mark ix. 47, x. 15, 23, 24, 25; Luke xviii. 17, 24, 25; John iii. 5; Acts xiv. 22. With

the absolute use of εἰσέρχεσθαι in the present passage, comp. Matt. vii. 13; Luke xi. 52, xiii. 24. The kingdom of God or kingdom of heaven, while certainly future, has also a present existence in the Christian church (Col. i. 13; Luke xvii. 21), on which account entrance into it at once is possible. But the O. T. theocracy and N. T. Christocracy form one connected whole. The kingdom of God already existing upon earth consists in the church of the O. and N. T., whose members are encircled by the same promises and the same faith. Inasmuch as Israel was separated from the theocracy, which in the Christocracy had assumed a more glorious form, it was separated from the communion of the Christian church. And inasmuch as the Gentiles were admitted into the Christian church, they were admitted into the O. T. theocracy (εἰς καλλιέλαιον, ver. 24), of which the Christocracy was a more glorious form. It is one and the same trunk, despite the various metamorphoses it has undergone in course of growth.

—καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται] *and thus all Israel shall be saved.* καὶ οὕτω, *and thus, i.e. if this take place, namely, the Gentile pleroma enter in, comp. v. 12; Acts vii. 8, xx. 11; 1 Cor. xi. 28, xiv. 25; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Heb. vi. 15.* There is no need therefore to explain, *and in this way, namely, so that Israel's partial hardness continued up to the entrance of the Gentile pleroma.* πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ, in contrast with ἐκ μέρους, ver. 25, as well as in connection with the entire exposition of ch. ix.—xi., which, as this chapter shows in particular, treats only of the leading of entire peoples to the Messianic salvation, can be understood of nothing else than the entire sum of the people of Israel, comp. also vv. 28–32. Its application to the spiritual Israel, the Ἰσραὴλ θεοῦ, Gal. vi. 16, according to which, by the entry of the elect Gentiles and withal of the ἐκλογή of unhardened Israel, all true children of Abraham and children of God are to be saved, is just as arbitrary as its application merely to the believing elect portion of the Jews, who in all ages belonged to the λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος. Such explanations merely show to what violent exegetical shifts interpreters can be led by preconceived opinions. For example, the unjust prejudice of the *later* Luther against the Jewish people, as well as his apprehension—right in itself—of chiliastic fanaticism, up to the time of Calixtus and Spener obscured the true meaning of the present passage for the greater number

of theologians within the Lutheran church.<sup>1</sup> The wavering of modern expositors in their answers to the question, whether πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ is to be understood with or without limitation,—of the entire people in all its separate individuals, or merely of the people in general without taking notice of particular individuals who remain in unbelief,—seems to us to spring from the too subjective interpretation given to the apostle's thought. σωτηρία here consists in the objective divine act that restores the people of Israel to its place in the theocracy. This act extends to the entire people without exception. As regards power, this implies the provision for all particular individuals admitted into God's kingdom of the means and forces of subjective conversion, which means presumably will prove effectual in the case of by far the greater portion of the people, the love that hopes the best refusing to set limits to the number of the converted. Elsewhere the apostle describes all Christian churches as ἁγίους, and so it might be said to-day, considering the calls of the Word and the powers of grace imparted in the baptismal sacrament, that entire Christian Europe, in distinction from the still unbelieving people of Israel in its midst, has been made partaker in σωτηρία. As concerns the near or remote fulfilment of the prediction here uttered, on this the apostle decides nothing. Just as little is it said that immediately upon the entrance of the Gentile pleroma and the salvation of all Israel the τέλος will follow. This conclusion could only be drawn from a mistaken explanation of ζῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, ver. 15. According to our view of this expression, it is rather to be assumed that after the σωτηρία παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ has taken place, a new course of development will commence in the kingdom of God as to its earthly condition.<sup>2</sup> When it is asserted that Paul supposed the parousia of the Lord and the end of the world to be near, and consequently viewed the conversion of the

<sup>1</sup> On the history of the exposition, comp. especially Calov, *dissert. de conversione Judaeorum*, Viteb. 1679; and *in der Bibl. N. T. illustr.* 1676, II. p. 190 seq.; also Reiche, II. p. 400; Fritzsche, II. p. 528 sq.; Tholuck, 5te Aufl. 629 ff.; Luthardt, *Lehre v. d. letzten Dingen*, p. 109 f. On the present passage, as well as on the contents of this whole chapter, comp. also Alexander von Oettingen, *Die synagogale Elegik des Volkes Israel*, Dorpat 1853, Zweiter Abschnitt; *Die Hoffnung des Volkes Israel im Lichte der heiligen Schrift*, pp. 133-210.

<sup>2</sup> "Ad zelum christianum Paulus provocat Israëlitas: idque praesupponit gentes ante Israëlém conversas et tamen potest per plenam Israëlís conversionem deinde reliqua copia gentium lucrificari, vv. 11, 12, 15, 31; Ezek. xxxix. 7, 21 ss., 27," Bengel.

Jews which precedes these events as near at hand, at least this error of his, which history has refuted, cannot be got rid of, and its consequences for the substance of his eschatological teaching rendered innocuous, by alleging that a distinction is commonly made between a definition of the time and the fact itself, the first being the accidental, the second the substantial element in apostolic prophecy. The appeal to 1 Pet. i. 11 is not to the point. On the contrary, this passage would lead us to demand of the apostles the same circumspect conduct that is there predicated of the prophets. In this case the apostles had done better to make inquiry about the time unrevealed to them by God, than, as is imputed to them, to propound erroneous conclusions respecting it. The result of the latter course could only be to throw suspicion on the substance of their predictions, on the very fact announced in these predictions. But it is not at all a matter of such *à priori* certainty that the apostles viewed the parousia of the Lord as near at hand. They simply viewed it as *possibly* at hand, and that rightly. A prediction of its *actual* nearness would place them in the same class with all chiliastic fanatics. The expectation of its possible nearness stamps them as meek disciples of that Lord, who had decided nothing as to the time, and who therefore by this very omission left the door open for belief equally in its nearness as in its remoteness, and forbade to no time the Christian longing for and hope of the speedy occurrence of His return, Matt. xxiv. 36; Acts i. 7. Beyond the expression of such desire, hope, and looking for the possibility of a speedy advent of the parousia, even the contents of Rom. xiii. 11, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff., comp. 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff., 1 Thess. v. 1 ff., 2 Pet. iii. 10, Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15, do not go.<sup>1</sup> That a complete picture of the final development of God's kingdom upon earth, arranged in chronological order,

<sup>1</sup> Or perhaps we may distinguish between what was absolutely certain to the apostles on the ground of objective divine revelation, and what was to them matter of subjective human hope and expectation, *i.e.* the not merely ideal, but also empirical nearness of this parousia. Even this hope and expectation, if it retained the consciousness of its merely subjective human character, was of itself in no sense evidence of error. If, in 1 Cor. xv. 51, we find an expression of the apostle's expectation that he himself will live to see the parousia, 2 Cor. v. 1 ff. on the other hand shows at least that he did not cherish this expectation with absolute divine certainty. Comp. on xiii. 11. This remark is meant as a more definite explanation, not, as Meyer seems to have taken it, as a revocation of what is said above

stood before the gaze of the apostles, is not to be supposed. The Spirit disclosed to them now this, now that feature of the picture, as circumstances made necessary. To combine these separate features and form them into one harmonious whole, was for them, as still for us, a work of study. This task is rendered easy to us, in the first place, by our view of the notion *πλήρωμα*. For if this does not mean the entire mass of the Gentile world, the Lord's return may rightly be viewed as *possibly* near at any time, since the precedent condition, the entrance of the *pleroma* of the Gentile world, may be fulfilled at any time. The fact that we on our part further regard as probable a more comprehensive development of the church upon earth before the approach of the end, need not prevent our holding fast by the thought of the Lord being near; for in prophetic perspective the separate revealed elements of this nearness converge together. In the time of the Old Covenant the manifestation of the glory of the Son of God was still distant, because there must first intervene His incarnation, His passion and death, or His manifestation in a state of humiliation as the revealed element in God's kingdom then near at hand. In the time of the New Covenant the revelation of the glory of Christ is near at hand, because this is the element standing next in order of occurrence after the resurrection and ascension, an element which no doubt again is realized and revealed in successive degrees. A first revelation of this element was the destruction of the holy city of Jerusalem, and along with this the complete absorption into the N. T. Christocracy of the O. T. theocracy. A second main point in the realization of Christ's coming will be the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma*, the conversion of Israel, and the consequent efflorescence and dominion of the Lord's church over the nations of the earth. The third and last main element in the realization of the *parousia* consists in the visible return of

in the text. But Meyer remarks strikingly: "Observe, further, how the present passage is in diametrical opposition to the opinion now revived in many quarters (Chr. A. Crusius, Delitzsch, Baumg., Ebrard, Auberl. and several others), of an actual restoration of Israel to its theocratic royalty in Canaan, which is to be looked for on the ground of prophetic predictions (Hos. ii. 2, 16 ff., iii. 4 f.; Isa. xi. 11, xxiv. 16, lx.; Jer. xxxiv. 33, *al.*). Israel does not take in the church, but the church takes in Israel; and wherever this takes place, Israel has its royalty and its Canaan in the true sense. Comp. Tholuck on ver. 25; Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 576 f.; Hengstenb. *Christol.* II. 409; and see especially, Bertheau in *d. Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 353 ff."

Christ Himself, and in the end to which that return is the introduction. All these are elements of His parousia, which are now prophetically seen in unity, now presented by the Spirit to the prophets of the N. T., and by them to the churches of Jesus Christ, as distinct and separate elements. That the apostles, in their inquiries respecting the nearness or remoteness of the Lord's coming, already indicate a similar mode of reconciliation between its nearness predicted and longed for on one side, and its distance, intimated by the advancing experience of the church, as well as by the separate features of the eschatological pictures drawn for them by the Spirit, on the other, is shown by 2 Pet. iii. 1-10. Comp. especially, Steiger on 1 Pet. iv. 7.

—*καθὼς γέγραπται*] Harmony of the apostolic prediction with the predictive language of the O. T. The apostle did not deduce the *μυστήριον* just communicated as an inference from the quotation here given. The latter merely serves here, as everywhere, to ratify the preceding independent representation. Moreover, the words quoted merely support the *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται*, not this in addition, that the hardness of a portion of Israel is to continue until the Gentile *pleroma* shall have entered. Again, the passage cited evidently appears at first sight to be combined out of Isa. lix. 20, 21 and xxvii. 9. In the first passage the LXX. have: ver. 20, *καὶ ἦξει ἕνεκεν Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ*; ver. 21, *καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, εἶπε κύριος· τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμόν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ σοὶ καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου, ἃ ἔδωκα εἰς τὸ στόμα σου, οὐ μὴ ἐκλιπῇ ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου κτλ.* The second passage runs: *διὰ τοῦτο ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀνομία Ἰακώβ, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ κτλ.* Thus Paul has made use of the first of the two related passages as far as *διαθήκη*, but in the second of the words: *ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ* (he says *ἁμαρτίας* on account of the preceding *ἀσεβείας*, and *αὐτῶν* on account of *αὐτοῖς*). That even in the prophet the passages have a Messianic character, and that therefore their application to the Messiah's saving work in Israel is warranted, is certain, and all but universally conceded. The words: *καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ*, which Paul has in harmony with the LXX., run in the Hebrew: *וְהָיָה בְּעֵצְי וְהָיָה בְּעֵצְי* ("a deliverer shall come for Sion), and for those turning from apostasy in Jacob." Even if we are not willing to allow that those converted in Jacob may

possibly embrace all Israel, in so far as it is converted, the apostle was still justified in retaining the words of the LXX. expressive of a *universal* deliverance, because not only in the second passage employed by him, but also in other passages of the prophets (Jer. xxxi. ; Ezek. xxxvii., xxxix. 25 ; Hos. iii. 5), the universal salvation of Israel was announced. But it is a general practice with the apostle to gather up the Messianic prophecy of the O. T. in a single view, and to deal with the particular Messianic passage cited merely as a substratum and point of connection for the exhibition of the O. T. idea of salvation, and therefore to modify it freely and combine it with other similar passages. Thus, while we do not believe, with Calvin, that the present citation is expressly formed out of Isa. lix. 20 f. and Jer. xxxi. 31-34, we do believe that in it the *contents* of the Jeremiah-passage floated before the apostle's mind, nay, that the latter is perhaps to be regarded as the material groundwork of his citation, which he merely clothed in the form—brief, and for his purpose appropriate—of Isaiah's words. For the Jeremiah-passage is certainly to be regarded as the O. T. classical passage for the *καινή διαθήκη* to be made hereafter with Israel ; comp. also Heb. viii. 8 ff., x. 16 f. Thus we should have here a citation formed exactly like the one in ver. 8 of this chapter. Again, this principle of a free employment of the O. T., allying itself more with the whole body of prophetic passages than with the special prophetic passage adduced, explains and justifies the other important deviation from the original text and the text of the LXX. Instead of the *ἐνεκεν Σιών* of the LXX. (Heb. *בְּשֵׁם יְרוּשָׁלַיִם*, for Sion), Paul has written

—*ἐκ Σιών*] That the salvation (comp. Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 6, LXX. : *τίς δώσει ἐκ Σιών τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* ;), like the Saviour (comp. Ps. cx. 2, LXX. : *ῥάβδον δυνάμεως ἐξαποστελεῖ σοι κύριος ἐκ Σιών*), should come not merely *for*, but also *out of* Sion, was evidenced in other O. T. passages. But the apostle seems to have made the alteration here, both in order the more sharply to distinguish the claim of Israel to its own Messiah,—the Messiah who proceeded from its midst,—and in order to lay special stress on this prior right of Israel in contrast with the Gentiles.

—*ὁ ῥυόμενος*] comp. 1 Thess. i. 10. Heb. *הַמְּוֹדֵם*, a Deliverer ; but hereby is to be understood the Messiah, not, with several of the Fathers, Elijah or Enoch.



—*αὕτη*] points *forward* to *ὅταν*, like the pron. demonstr. in the two Isaiah-passages of the LXX. Comp. 1 John v. 2 : *ἐν τούτῳ . . . ὅταν* ; also John xvii. 3 : *αὕτη . . . ἵνα*, and 1 John ii. 3 : *ἐν τούτῳ . . . ἐάν*. This is my covenant, when I = in this consists my covenant, that I.

—*ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη*] *the covenant proceeding from me*. Comp. Mark v. 26 : *δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα*, and Fritzsche there : “Nimirum observandum est, *παρά* ita interdum cum Genitivo conjungi, ut ad *sensum* a nudo Genitivo non discrepet.”

Vv. 28–32. Further reasons, deduced chiefly from the unchangeableness and universality of divine grace, for the future conversion of all Israel.

Ver. 28. *κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*] *in reference to the gospel*, inasmuch, namely, as they rejected it, ver. 30. This is more in accordance with the context than “inasmuch as they have been excluded from it.”

—*ἐχθροί*] *sc. εἰσίν*. The *subject* spoken of is the unbelieving Jews, comp. *αὐτοῖς* and *αὐτῶν*, ver. 27. Luther : “I look on them as enemies = *mihi inveniuntur*.” Bengel : “*me oderunt*.” But to *ἐχθροί* we are not to supply *μου*, nor yet *εὐαγγελίου* (Morus : “*inimici sunt evangelio*”). Rather the opposition to *ἀγαπητοί* shows that *ἐχθροί* is to be taken in the passive sense, and *θεοῦ* or *θεῶ* to be supplied = *Deo inveniuntur*. Comp. v. 10, ix. 13, and Horace, *Satir.* ii. 3, v. 123 : “*Dis inimice senex. O old man, hated of the gods, abandoned by all the gods!*” See the examples quoted there by Heindorf on the like meaning of *θεοῖς ἐχθροί* from Demosthenes, *de corona*. Therefore : “In respect to the gospel rejected by them, God has assumed to them an attitude of hostility.”

—*δι' ὑμᾶς*] comp. ver. 11 : *τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*. Therefore = that salvation might come to you—Gentiles, for the benefit of you—Gentile Christians.

—*κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν*] *but in reference to the election, i.e. of the people of Israel to be the covenant-people*, ver. 2. Therefore not : “but considered in regard to the fact that among them is *that elect remnant*,” vv. 5, 7. To this also is opposed the explanatory *διὰ τοὺς πατέρας*.

—*ἀγαπητοί*] *sc. θεοῦ εἰσι*.

—*διὰ τοὺς πατέρας*] a mere *formal* opposition to *δι' ὑμᾶς*. The meaning of the words is explained by ver. 16. “*Propter*

*Patres* dicit, non quod dilectioni causam dederint, sed quoniam ab illis propagata fuerat Dei gratia ad posteros, secundum pacti formam : Deus tuus et seminis tui," Calvin. Comp. Luke i. 54 f.

Ver. 29 confirms (γάρ) the second half of ver. 28. ἀμεταμέλητα] comp. 2 Cor. vii. 10 ; Heb. vii. 21 : καὶ οὐ μεταμεληθήσεται, Heb.  $\text{וְלֹא יִתְנַחֵם}$ , Bleek there. "Deum non poenitet, sicut hominem. Ubi enim legitur, quod poeniteat eum, mutatio rerum significatur, immutabili praescientia manente divina. Ubi ergo non poenitere dicitur, non mutare intelligitur," August. *de civ. Dei*, l. xvii. c. vii.

—τὰ χαρίσματα] *the manifestations of the grace* of God in general, ix. 4, 5.

—καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ] *and the calling of God* in particular, comp. Mark xvi. 7 : εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, Fritzsche there. In connection with what immediately precedes, the κλήσις θεοῦ here can only refer to the calling, in the person of the patriarchs, of the people of Israel to the Messianic salvation that formed the main purport of the divine covenant-promise. This call, as incapable of retraction, must needs even yet one day be realized. Here, therefore, is not meant the call, issuing from the heralds of the gospel, and for a time despised by Israel, to salvation actually realized in Christ. The *former* κλήσις must necessarily prove itself effectual, because it is made dependent on no condition, but is identical with the unconditional destination of the people of Israel to be the covenant-people. The latter κλήσις, on the contrary, may remain ineffectual, because it is conditional, and its efficacy is dependent on believing reception by individuals. But the divine destination always refers merely to the nation as a whole. Individual Israelites might permanently fall away, because with them God made no covenant.

Vv. 30, 31. Corroboration (γάρ) of the position advanced in ver. 29 by an appeal to the actual change which is to take place hereafter in the attitude of Israel to the kingdom of grace. An inference from the less to the more probable would be introduced by εἰ γὰρ . . . πόσω μᾶλλον (ver. 24), and therefore is not here to be supposed. Rather by ὥσπερ γὰρ . . . οὕτω καὶ something which is yet to take place is placed in contrast with something of the same kind that has already taken place. ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ ὑμεῖς] Knapp, Lachmann, Tischendorf read ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς without καί. Apart from evidence, it is more reasonable to suspect that,

from ignorance of Greek usage, it was omitted by transcribers as superfluous on account of the following *καί* in *οὕτω καί*, than that, from more accurate knowledge of usage, it was added in an effort after elegance of expression. Nevertheless, so many and such important witnesses (A B C D\* E F G, several minuskels, versions, and Fathers) are opposed to its retention, that we must perforce decide for the latter view. Against the supposition of a later omission, moreover, tells i. 13, *καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καί*, where, among the manuscripts quoted, only Cod. G omits the first *καί*, a proof that the—in fact not rare—reduplication of the comparative *καί* was well known to those transcribers. In the present passage, consequently, *ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑμεῖς* is to be read. *ποτέ*] namely, in the days before Christ.

—*ἡπειθήσατε τῷ θεῷ*] *ἀπειθεῖν* and *ἀπειθεια* always refer in the N. T. (see *clavis*) to disobedience to God's word and revelation, *i.e.* God's truth in general or the gospel in particular,—therefore to refusal to believe, unbelief, not to moral disobedience. So therefore here, as *ἡπειθήσαν*, ver. 31, especially shows, the Gentile *ἀπειθεια* consisted in *κατέχειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ*, i. 18 (comp. *ἀπειθεῖν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*, ii. 8), of which their disobedience to God's moral law (i. 24 ff.) was merely the consequence. "*Incredulitas* cadit etiam in eos, qui ipsi non audire verbum Dei; quia tamen primitus id in Patriarchis, Adamo, Noacho susceperant," Bengel. But here perhaps, in allusion to i. 18 ff., may rather be meant the revelation of creation, which no doubt was originally accompanied by the explanatory and educative *word* of divine revelation.

—*νῦν δέ*] antithesis to *ποτέ*, comp. on iii. 21.

—*ἡλείθητε*] Paul here makes the reception of the Gentile world into the Christian church dependent, not on their *πίστις*, but on the divine *ἔλεος*; just as in general his line of treatment in this chapter points chiefly to God's objective acts, to which in the last resort man's subjective acts are subservient, yet without on this account being in themselves necessitated. Estius: "*nota Ap. non dicere: credidistis sed misericordiam consecuti estis, ut intelligant, quod crediderint esse misericordiae Dei fidem largientis.*" Bengel: "*miserecordia ejus ab iis agnita.*"

—*τῇ τοῦτων ἀπειθείᾳ*] *through the disobedience of these*, namely, of the Jews, and that to the gospel, x. 3. With the sentiment, comp. vv. 11, 12, 15, 19, 20, 28.

—οὕτω καὶ] Introduction of the parallel thought.

—οὗτοι] the Jews, antithesis to ὑμεῖς.

—νῦν] parallel with the foregoing νῦν, antithesis to ποτέ. *Now*, at the time that the preaching of the gospel has reached you.

—ἡπείθησαν] *sc.* τῷ θεῷ, by their rejection of the gospel preached to them by the apostles.

—τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει] *Vulg.*: “ita et isti nunc non crediderunt in vestram misericordiam.” *Luther*: “Thus they also now have refused to believe in the mercy which you experienced.” *Lachmann*, too, places the comma not after ἡπείθησαν, but after ἐλέει. But the parallelism of thought compels us to attach τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει, which answers to τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ, not to the preceding ἡπείθησαν, but to the following

—ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεθῶσι] with the emphatic prefixing of τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει, *comp.* 1 Cor. ix. 15 ; 2 Cor. ii. 4, xii. 7 ; Gal. ii. 10. The dative indicates not *the kind* (“with the same ἔλεος that you experienced”), but, in conformity with the datival sense of τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ, the *mediating agency* of the ἐλεεῖσθαι = “that through your obtaining grace they also may obtain grace.” Only this acceptation corresponds with the thought expressed in x. 19, xi. 11, 14. God would show mercy to the Jews through the Gentiles finding mercy, by the latter act provoking them to faith, which becomes the means of their own finding mercy. Not permanent destruction, but ultimate restoration was the *end* (ἵνα) proposed by God in the temporary ἀπειθεία of Israel. The *pron. poss.* ὑμέτερον corresponds with the *genit. object.*, Luke xxii. 19 ; 1 Cor. xi. 24, xv. 31.

Ver. 32. The fact, already come to pass, of the mercy shown to the Gentiles after their previous ἀπειθεία, as well as the fact, still future, of the conversion of Israel despite its present ἀπειθεία, —in both which facts, along with the various agencies employed in bringing them about, are proclaimed the manifold resources of God's saving dealings with the human race,—is traced back to its divine source, namely, to the universality of the mercy of God, who ordained the ἀπειθεία of all, Gentiles as well as Jews, merely for the purpose of making all, Gentiles as well as Jews, partakers in His ἔλεος. Thus then has God in concrete fact realized the design of the gospel, to lead all to σωτηρία. But herewith also the dogmatic exposition of the epistle has found its natural resting-place and conclusion. συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας

εἰς ἀπίθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλείψῃ] “for God shut up all under unbelief, that He might have mercy on all.” Luther’s gloss: “Note this prime saying, which condemns all work and righteousness of man, and exalts God’s mercy alone, which is to be obtained through faith.” “Hanc particulam universalem (τοὺς πάντας) opponamus tentationi de particularitate,” Melancthon. *συγκλείειν*, *concludere*, to shut up, not: to shut up together, 1 Sam. xxiv. 18; Ps. xxxi. 8, lxxviii. 48, 50, 62; 1 Macc. v. 5; Luke v. 6. Then, like the Heb. יִצְרֶה with י and יִצַּע = to give up to (εἰς τι) or to the power of (ὑπό τι, Gal. iii. 22), to subject to. Here it is contrary to the context, appealing to iii. 9, 19 and Gal. iii. 22, to impute to *συγκλείειν* a declarative signification: “God by means of the Scripture proved all to be sinners.” But just as little is the mere *permissive* acceptation sufficient, for the purpose here is to set forth God as Himself bringing to pass the fact, which He freely applied to His own ends. Without doubt, then, the *operative* sense must be held fast. But in the sphere of human freedom the divine energy is to be conceived not as a creative, but as an assuming, controlling, and determining energy. God assumes into His eternal world-plan the evil which originally no doubt He merely permits, and applies it to His own ends. In so far He even *wills* the disobedience and affirms the ἀπίθεια of man; but He wills it merely as something given in His act of foresight, in order by its means to manifest His mercy. In the religious development of humanity the divine ordination is the warp, human freedom the woof of the web. The direction of the latter is determined by the former, but the web itself only comes into existence by the interlacing of the two. The less attested reading τὰ πάντα for the first τοὺς πάντας (other authorities have πάντα) is to be regarded as having arisen from Gal. iii. 22. The article before πάντας nowise compels us, in opposition to the connection and entire tendency of the chapter, which deals merely with the antithesis of peoples collectively, to think of all specific individuals (all and every Gentile and Jew). Rather by the article are indicated simply the well-known πάντες, who are treated of in what immediately precedes; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 22; 2 Cor. v. 14; Phil. ii. 21, where οἱ πάντες likewise = “they all.” God shut up all, of whom I just spoke (Jews as well as Gentiles), under unbelief, in order to have mercy on them all. As little, then, as the doctrine of absolute predestina-

tion can be deduced from the first half of the verse, can that of apokatastasis<sup>1</sup> be deduced from the second half. Moreover, the apostle here says not a word respecting the specific individuals who died in unbelief previous to that period of the conversion of the whole people of Israel. For the rest, if we wished to refer τοὺς πάντας to all specific individuals, it would be necessary to say that still God's universal *purpose* of grace does not on this account *realize* itself in the case of all individuals, namely, not in the case of those who by their own fault resist it.

Vv. 33-36. Wondering adoration of God's unsearchable wisdom, comp. the animated conclusion of the first main section, viii. 38, 39. "Postquam enim ex verbo ac Spiritu Domini disputavit, tanti demum arcani sublimitate victus nihil potest quam obstupescere et exclamare, divitias istas sapientiae Dei profundiores esse, quam ut ad eas nostra ratio penetrare queat. Si quando igitur ingredimur in sermonem de aeternis Dei consiliis, frenum istud et ingenio et linguae semper injectum sit, ut quum sobrie et intra verbi Dei fines loquuti fuerimus, disputatio tandem nostra exeat in stuporem. Neque enim pudere nos debet, si non sapimus supra eum, qui in tertium usque coelum raptus viderat mysteria homini ineffabilia: neque tamen alium hic finem reperire poterat, quam ut se ita humiliaret," Calvin.

Ver. 33. ὁ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ] "O depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God!" βάθος may be a figure either for *inexhaustibleness*, the inexhaustible fulness, or for *unfathomableness*, unsearchableness, 1 Cor. ii. 10; Judith viii. 14. Here clearly the latter, as follows from the explanatory ἀνεξέρευν. and ἀνεξιχνίαστ., and from ver. 34. When πλούτος, *riches*, *fulness*, is ascribed to God, for the most part the appended genitival definition indicates the property in which He is rich. So ii. 4, πλούτος τῆς χρηστότητος κτλ., ix. 23; comp. Col. i. 27, τῆς δόξης; Eph. i. 7, ii. 7, τῆς χάριτος. On the other hand, πλούτος without addition signifies the divine fulness, the divine riches absolutely. So Rev. v. 12, Phil. iv. 19, in opposition to human *χρεία*, Eph. iii. 8, comp. Harless there. On this principle, we are not here to think specially of the πλούτος τῆς χρηστότητος, τῆς χάριτος, the divine fulness of *grace*. In preference to this, we might make the genitives σοφίας and γνώσεως

<sup>1</sup> So e.g. Kern, "Die christliche Eschatologie," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, Jahrg. 1840, IIeft III. p. 38.

dependent on *πλούτου* = O depth of the riches, both in wisdom and knowledge, of God! comp. Luther. But the notions *σοφία* and *γνώσις* do not lie far enough apart to be distinguished from each other by *καὶ . . . καί*, *tum sapientiae, tum scientiae*, and it is altogether more natural to co-ordinate the three genitives and make them depend alike on *βάθος*. But even in this case,—not indeed grammatically, but logically,—by means of the two following genitives, *πλούτος* as matter of course receives its more precise definition as riches of wisdom and of knowledge, save that the grammatical co-ordination takes the element of riches, which—as he considered the manifold variety of God's ways of salvation—presented itself to the apostle's thoughts, and expresses it independently in so many words; comp. ii. 5: *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ*. The apostrophe of this verse serves therefore to make prominent, not chiefly the goodness of God, but exclusively His wisdom, and refers specifically not to ver. 32, but to the contents of the entire exposition in ch. ix.–xi., especially in ch. xi., as these contents were resumed in vv. 30–32. Not the universality of divine grace in itself, but the manifold variety of the means used by divine wisdom to realize this grace in actual fact and despite all obstacles, nay, by their very means, conduct it to its goal, hurries away the apostle to adoring praise of this wondrous *σοφία*. This interpretation is favoured both by the main thought of vv. 33, 34 involuntarily suggesting itself to the mind, and by the copiousness of this entire epiphonema, vv. 33–36, which—joining on to the conclusion of the dogmatic exposition of the epistle—is far better adapted to express the feelings excited in the apostle by a survey of the entire series of God's historical dealings with nations and the world, than those excited by such a brief and subordinate thought as is found in ver. 32. As here, so also in Eph. iii. 10, the apostle emphasizes with wonder the *πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ*, which manifested itself in the historical realization of the divine plan of salvation; comp. also 1 Pet. i. 12 and Steiger there. The *σοφία*, *wisdom* of God, is meant to be conceived as the activity of the divine intellect proposing the end and choosing the means; *γνώσις*, *knowledge*, *full knowledge*, as that activity cognisant of the contents of the *σοφία*. "*Sapientia dirigit omnia ad finem optimum: cognitio novit finem illum et exitum*," Bengel.

—ὥς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ] *how unsearchable are His judgments.* Only in an arbitrary way is τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ explained by *His decisions, counsels.* κρίματα are *judicial decrees*, Ps. xix. 10, cxix. 137, or *judicial sentences, judgments*, Ps. xxxvi. 6; Wisd. xii. 12. In the N. T. also the very commonly occurring κρίμα (see *clavis*) is never *decision*, but always *judgment*. Here by κρίματα are meant the hardening judgments mentioned in what precedes. ἀνεξερεύνητος here only in the N. T.

—καὶ ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ] *and untraversable his ways.* αἱ ὁδοί more general than τὰ κρίματα, therefore = *His ways generally.* But in contrast with κρίματα we are especially to think of the ways of grace, which form the ultimate goal of His κρίματα. ἀνεξιχνίαστος, in its exact sense especially appropriate to ὁδός (οὐ μὴδ' ἔχνος ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν, Suidas), is found in the N. T. only again in Eph. iii. 8.

Vv. 34, 35. Confirmation of the unsearchableness of the divine wisdom and knowledge by passages from Isa. xl. 13 and Job xli. 11, which Paul adopts as his own. τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου;] “For who hath known [aor. literally, *knew*] the mind of the Lord?” Whoever knows the mind of the Lord, in the very act scrutinizes the plans and measures of divine wisdom.

—ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;] “Or who has become [became] His counsellor?” “Et tamen multi in disceptationibus perinde se jactant, ac si non modo consilarii Domini, sed etiam quaesitores, patroni, vel judices essent. Scriptura ubique subsistit in eo, quod dominus voluit et dixit et fecit; rationes rerum universalium singulariumve non pandit; de iis, quae nostram superant infantiam, ad aeternitatem remittit fidelis 1 Cor. xiii. 9 ss. Ceteros, importunos scrutatores, torquebit et uret sciendi sitis, in aeternum,” Bengel. Only one who had given God counsel, would without special revelation, by force of nature, be privy to the contents of the divine wisdom and knowledge. For him alone would there be no μυστήριον standing in need of ἀποκάλυψις. Nay, the divine σοφία and γνῶσις would be a σοφία and γνῶσις derived from him. This passage, taken as observed from Isa. xl. 13, Paul cites here (1 Cor. ii. 16) after the text of the LXX., who are in substantial agreement with the original text (τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου καὶ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, ὃς συμβιβάζει αὐτόν;). Comp. Judith viii. 13, 14; Wisd. ix. 16, 17; Ecclus. xviii. 2-6.



—ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;] “Or who has first given [gave] to him, and it shall be repaid him?” Job xli. 11, Heb. מִי הָיָה לְפָנַי וְיִשְׁכַּחַנִּי, “Who has first done aught to me, that I should be bound to make recompense?” Paul here, then, has corrected the mistranslation of the LXX. (ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται μοι καὶ ὑπομενεῖ;) in conformity with the original text. The apostle’s words, indeed, are found in the LXX. Isa. xl 14, but only in the Cod. Alex., and are there manifestly interpolated from the passage in the Romans. Respecting the form of construction: τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ; = τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ τίνι ἔπειτα ἀνταποδοθήσεται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ; or τίνι προδόντι ἑαυτῷ ἀνταποδώσει, comp. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* II. p. 525 f., and 1 Cor. viii. 6. Had man first given God something for which he was able to claim recompense, then the ways of divine wisdom would not be free and uncalculable, but determined and limited from without, and therefore within the reach and cognizance of human calculation. We thus see how this dictum also may refer to the unsearchableness of the divine σοφία and γνώσις, and need not be used as a proof of the unconditioned *goodness* of God,—a view which is meant to support the position that πλοῦτος, ver. 33, is to be understood of the πλοῦτος τῆς χρηστότητος, the riches of *grace*. In accordance with this view, τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; is said to point back to the divine γνώσις, which penetrates the depths of the Godhead, τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο; to the σοφία which carries into effect the divine plans, and τίς προέδωκεν κτλ. to the πλοῦτος of God, which is not derived, but independent, and to which *all* owe whatever they have. So already Theodoret: τὰ τρία ταῦτα πρὸς τὰ τρία τέθεικε, τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ τὴν γνώσιν· τὸ μὲν τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου πρὸς τὴν γνώσιν, τὸ δὲ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο πρὸς τὴν σοφίαν, τὸ δὲ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν πλοῦτον. This interpretation can the less be regarded as essential, as the apostle here has merely appropriated words of Scripture, by the whole of which together he makes good in various forms the same idea. On this account the reduplication of the proof cannot seem strange; whereas, if vv. 34, 35 were his own words, it would certainly be more natural to assume that by each one of the three clauses he means to make good a different idea. Moreover, the interpretation in question is refuted by the fact that in the words inter-

polated, *ὡς ἀνεξηρεύν . . . αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ*, ver. 33, the reference is confessedly to *σοφία* and *γνώσις*, not to *πλοῦτος χρηστότητος*, on which account the distinction of *goodness*, wisdom, and knowledge is not at all probable, and recurrence to goodness in ver. 35 is rendered more difficult. Finally, *νοῦς κυρίου* refers rather to the *σοφία* than to the *γνώσις θεοῦ*, so that the latter element also, severed from the rest and standing alone, falls out of the required triple distribution.

Ver. 36. Confirmation of the import of ver. 35. None has first given God ought for which God owes him thanks in return; for God is the self-subsistent and absolutely independent One, from whom all originates, and to whom all flows back and therefore stands in the relation of absolute dependence. Consequently His ways in leading nations along their historical course are free, conditioned by no natural claims of right on the part of men, governed by nothing but His own wisdom, righteousness, and love, and therefore unfathomable and unsearchable. Thus even here, when all suspicion of countenance given to predestinarianism in the ninth chapter has long ago been dissipated and scattered by the consecutive reasoning of the subsequent exposition in the tenth and eleventh chapters, the apostle again adduces, in terms quite as strong as at the beginning, the same fact of the exclusively self-conditioned nature of the divine operations, which first awakened the suspicion. Only, now we are taught by the apostle himself that this absolute self-conditionedness of God does not preclude His being conditioned by *ἔλεος*, *δικαιοσύνη*, and *σοφία*. *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, from Him as the ultimate ground and prime source; *δι' αὐτοῦ*, through Him as the efficient cause; *εἰς αὐτόν*, to Him as the determining aim and end. God is beginning, middle and end, prime cause, mediating agent and goal of all. In *ἐκ* we are not merely to think of the work of creation, in *διὰ* of that of preservation or universal government; for *τὰ πάντα* are not merely created things, the universe, but everything absolutely, whatever name it bear, self-evidently excepting that which is *κατ' αὐτοῦ*, namely sin, and even this is merely excepted in so far as it is *κατ' αὐτοῦ*, not in so far as it subserves His purposes, and is therefore *εἰς αὐτόν*. *τὰ πάντα* (the article serves here to emphasize the unrestricted universality, comp. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr.* II. p. 134) embraces therefore just as much all concrete existence as all divine ordinances and institutions,

creation like redemption, as well as the ways in which the latter is subjectively realized,—therefore all that *is* and *is done*. Every divine operation is to be regarded as included under the threefold point of view of *ἐκ*, *διὰ*, and *εἰς*. The so-called *particulæ diagnosticæ* (comp. Twisten, *Dogmatik*, II. 1, p. 286) for the divine works elsewhere, it is well known, are *ἐκ*, *διὰ*, and *ἐν* (on which account Luther here, with the Vulg., has wrongly translated *εἰς αὐτόν*, *in him*), 1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. iv. 6, Harless there. Even apart from such instances of juxtaposition, the designation *ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς*, *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* occurs commonly, and therefore the application of *ἐκ* to the Father, of *διὰ* to the Son, of *ἐν* to the Spirit. Therefore the idea of this trinitarian distinction appears to us here not so much remote as very near and obvious, nay, all but unquestionable for interpreters who expound Scripture not *merely* by grammatical rules and possibly by rationalistic prejudice, but also by Scripture itself and biblical theology, as the orthodox exegesis of all ages shows. Comp. Tholuck, 4te Aufl., here.<sup>1</sup> The single plausible objection, to the effect that elsewhere the relation of things to God as *Pneuma* is indicated not by *εἰς* but by *ἐν*, is more specious than real. For, in the first place, everything that has its life-element in the Spirit has also the Spirit for its goal, and our being in the Spirit is the initial realization of our destination for the Spirit—a destination that will only reach its goal when the Spirit shall be in us not merely as a gift by way of first-fruit, but without measure, and we wholly in Him. But, again, it was absolutely essential here to make prominent the *teleological* destination of all things *for* God; for not so much by *ἐν αὐτῷ*, as

<sup>1</sup> Whereas Tholuck, as above, p. 628, upon Olshausen's assertion to the effect that here the relation of Father, Son, and Spirit is expressed, observes: "And who can dispute this, when the apostle elsewhere describes the Father as the causal principle, the Son as the Mediator, the Spirit as the principle immanent and still more designed to be immanent in the church?" he himself now in the 5th ed. disputes it. And whereas he formerly said: "Nothing but dogmatic bias can blind to the fact that the doctrine of the Trinity, although not expressed in Paul in a definite formula, was vividly present in his consciousness," he now himself denies the trinitarian reference of the present passage. Tholuck disputes the position that *ὁ θεός* ever denotes the three immanent hypostases. But besides Eph. iv. 6, where just as much as here *athuc sub judice lis est*, he only quotes passages in which *ὁ θεός* (*πατήρ*), in distinction from *ὁ κύριος* (*Ἰησοῦς*) and from *τὸ πνεῦμα*, is a designation of the first hypostasis in the Godhead, which no one questions. But it by no means follows from this that in other passages *ὁ θεός* as a substantial, not hypostatical, designation of the Godhead does not include the fulness of the Trinity.

rather by εἰς αὐτόν, both in itself and in its combination with ἐξ αὐτοῦ, is adequate expression given to the divine independence and absolute power of determination, and to that, so to speak, circular march of the divine decrees and works which returns upon itself, and which can be turned aside from its self-chosen path by no obstacle from without. But finally, εἰς may just as well be substituted for ἐν in relation to the Spirit, as εἰς for ἐκ in relation to the Father (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 6; Eph. i. 5; and the equivalent δι' ὧν, Heb. ii. 10), and εἰς for διὰ in relation to the Son (Col. i. 16). All is *from* the Father, *through* the Son, *in* the Spirit, but equally *to* the one God—Father, Son, and Spirit.<sup>1</sup>

—αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα] *sc.* εἴη (Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21), and that for this very reason—because ἐξ αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ, and εἰς αὐτόν τὰ πάντα. Well Limborch: “quia itaque Deus in hoc admirabili opere, quo gratiam suam tam circa gentes quam circa Judaeos sapientissime administrat, misericordiam et justitiam, atque imprimis sapientiam suam illustri modo ostendit, hinc est quod apostolus illi gloriam tribuit.” Respecting the article (ἡ δόξα), comp. Winer, p. 134. To Him be the glory, *i.e.* the glory due to Him, and, indeed, to Him alone.

---

## APPENDIX TO THE THIRD EDITION.

The only theory fully discussed in the foregoing exposition of the eleventh chapter is that which supposes the apostle expressly to foretell an ultimate conversion of Israel as an entire nation after the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma*. As is well known, this interpretation has at all times found its opponents. Especially among the exegetes of the Lutheran church has the controversy respecting it never been fully brought to a conclusion. Not only Luther, but Brentius subsequently retracted his formerly-expressed hope of a salvation awaiting the elect nation at last. Until the time of Spener, Lutheran theologians were divided in

<sup>1</sup> It sounds like Gnostic sarcasm when Meyer observes, “With the same right, *i.e.* with the same arbitrariness, as in ver. 36, the Trinity might have been found in ver. 33, πλάστου referred to the Father, σοφίας to the Son, and γνώσις to the Holy Spirit, while βάθους would remind us of the *mystery* of the Trinity.”

their exegesis of the eleventh of the Romans, and the highest authorities may be quoted for the two opposing interpretations. Only after Spenser's days has the theory advocated by us, partly, no doubt, in the interest of chiliastic inclinations and tendencies, won its way to general acceptance. Still, isolated voices in opposition were not wanting, and in these days a strong reaction begins to make itself felt, even Besser standing forth as its advocate very decidedly in his *Bibelstunden* on this epistle. It therefore becomes a duty fully to discuss the opposite theory, and, passing by much that has been brought forward of an untenable character, to give in a consecutive view the main arguments which, although not always adduced, may actually be adduced for it.

The entire drift of the ninth chapter is directly opposed to the idea of a promise of salvation given to natural Israel as an entire nation. For after the apostle has bewailed the apostasy of the nation, he forthwith declares (ver. 6 ff.) that the word of God from the very beginning does not concern Israel as such—descending from Abraham, but that it related as matter of course to an election of grace in Israel, and that not the natural but the spiritual seed of Abraham is destined to inherit the promise. This agrees perfectly with the exposition given in the fourth chapter, and at the close of the ninth chapter is supported by prophetic passages which foretold the calling and reception of the Gentile world that turns to God, and the rejection, with the exception of a believing remnant, of Israel that hardens itself against God. Thus all depends upon faith, and the believing Jews, along with the believing Gentiles, form the *one* great family of God, the true seed of Abraham, the spiritual Israel, which was always meant, pointed at, and included in God's word of election and promise. Consequently this word of God, rightly understood, has already received its perfect fulfilment in spite of the apostasy of Israel after the flesh. It cannot be denied that it would be very strange for an exposition of this character to run at last into its very opposite, namely, that the word of God at the end of the days is yet to receive a fulfilment in the case of the entire Israelitish nation. In this case it would be fulfilled at the beginning, and yet not fulfilled; and fulfilled only at the end, would previously remain unfulfilled not only at the beginning, but also in the middle period.

Then, after the apostle in the tenth chapter has testified his ardent desire for Israel's salvation, he explains further how their rejection is simply the fault of their refusal to believe, which is all the more sinful as God on His part has done everything to render their believing possible and certain. But even Isaiah foretold that God would stretch forth His hands all day long to a disobedient and gainsaying people. Thus, therefore, the tenth chapter closes with the assurance that already in the present state of things God's word has been realized. The eleventh chapter then opens with an inquiry arising out of the foregoing exposition. As the Jews hitherto had nursed the erroneous notion that they, as natural Abrahamites, are God's elect people, destined to salvation, and that therefore the Jew absolutely as a Jew stands above the Gentile in favour with God; so now, after the rejection in mass of the Israelitish nation in consequence of its apostasy, the opposite error might naturally arise, especially among the Gentiles, namely, that God has now so cast off the people of Israel that henceforth He will have nothing at all to do with them as such, and that therefore the Jew, absolutely as a Jew, stands above the Gentile in disfavour with God, and has forfeited all hope of salvation. This possible misunderstanding and obvious perversion of the word of the Lord, that God's kingdom is to be taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, the apostle then confronts with the assurance: God has not cast off His people which He foreknew. No doubt by *ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ, ὃν προέγνω*, ver. 2, the spiritual Israel is not meant immediately and directly; but, as in *ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ*, ver. 1, the natural Israel as an entire nation is meant, which was chosen objectively in the person of Abraham, its first founder, to be God's people. But, on the other hand, from *ὃν προέγνω* the inference must not be drawn, that God foresaw this people as one which will also, as a whole, attain to salvation subjectively. Not only would such a thought, after what has just gone before in ix. and x., be startling and abrupt, but, moreover, in what directly follows it finds no support. That God has left for Himself a *λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος* or an *ἐκλογή*, vv. 5, 7, cannot prove that all Israel will be partakers in this *χάρις*, but merely this, that God has not so absolutely abandoned this people that He will utterly refuse henceforth to draw His spiritual children from them as from the Gentile world. With this, too, the meaning of *ὃν προέγνω*, ver. 2, will agree. But

the question then is, in what character God foresaw His people? God foresaw His people (objectively chosen) as one in which He will always preserve a subjective *ἐκλογὴ χάριτος*. He foresaw it as a *seminarium* of the true spiritual seed to be formed from it, and on this account He has not cast off the nation as one utterly and hopelessly lost, good for nothing but to be swept out of existence once for all. That from *ὃν προέγνω* the reception of all Israel to salvation is not to be inferred, is intimated also in vv. 7-10, where again we read immediately of the *πάρωσις* of all Israel save the *λεῖμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν*.

But vv. 1-10 form a complete whole, and with ver. 11 begins a new section of the exposition. The apostle asks whether the *πάρωσις* of Israel as a whole people was the ultimate purpose of God independently of external reasons? Far be it, he answers. Rather, the salvation despised by them was to pass over to the Gentiles, in order to provoke them (the Jews) to emulation and repentance. God's arms of love still remain ever stretched out towards the rebellious nation, and instead of, on His part, meeting Israel's carnal particularism to the absolute loss of the Gentiles with the converse carnal particularism to the absolute loss of the Jews, He meets it with the true spiritual and divine universalism, which is ever willing to embrace in its mercy just as well Israel as the Gentile world, if only, instead of rejecting that mercy in unbelief, they will receive it in faith. Nay, He is continually calling and alluring *all* Israel to salvation, for He stood in no need of Israel's fall in order thence to educe salvation for the Gentiles. On the contrary, if even Israel's *fall* brought salvation to the Gentiles, how much more abundant the salvation that would accrue to the Gentiles from Israel's *reception* and completion! This and no more is affirmed in vv. 12, 15. There what is spoken of is a *possible*, not an *actual* *πρόσληψις* of Israel. Supposing us to be unwilling, with Calvin, to refer the questions *πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν*; and *τίς ἢ πρόσληψις*; to the past, and to interpret: "What would have been its completion and reception?" *i.e.* if it had taken place, still even the future reference affirms no definite fact taking place in the future, but is simply to be interpreted: "How much more will its completion, namely, if it should come to pass (therefore = how much more would its completion), be the riches of the Gentile world," and: "What will its restoration, supposing it takes place (= what would its

restoration), be, comp. 2 Cor. iii. 16, except life from the dead ?" But that the apostle neither hopes for nor expects such a general or entire conversion of Israel, the abstract possibility of which, of course, he does not question, is shown by vv. 13, 14, where, though describing the purpose of his labour as apostle of the Gentiles to be the provocation of Israel to repentance, he does not propose as his goal to save all, but only *τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν*.

Next, in vv. 16-24 the apostle shows how impossible and inconsistent is the notion of an absolute and universal rejection of all Israel as such, since, on the contrary, the covenant of grace made with the patriarchs embraces their posterity as well. Even the Gentiles have found admission into this covenant. How much more then to the children of the covenant (Acts ii. 39, iii. 25, 26) will the way remain open to return to it! But the reason of their rejection was unbelief, the condition of their restoration is faith, even as the Gentiles also were grafted in through faith, and on account of unbelief may again be cut off. Thus, therefore, God's elect people is nothing but the holy church, composed of God's children justified and called to the inheritance of life,—the church admitted subjectively through faith into the covenant made objectively with Abraham; and the exposition in the eleventh chapter harmonizes perfectly with that in the ninth, and with the fundamental thought of the entire Roman epistle.

In conclusion, the apostle raises a question as to the further actual relation of Israel to the salvation continually offered them, and answers it in vv. 25-27. Antecedently it is not to be expected that, in opposition to all that has been taught hitherto in ch. ix.-xi., the apostle should suddenly announce the conversion of the whole nation of Israel at the end of the days. Apart from the extraordinary divine miracle—running counter to all missionary experience—which this would presuppose, it would lead us back, at least with respect to the last surviving Israelitish generation, to the doctrine of predestination already renounced by Paul. Further, seeing that, according to ver. 29, Israel's final conversion is to be the necessary consequence of its original call to be the covenant people, there would be no means of evading the inference of the chiliastic fanatic Petersen, who taught a resurrection from the dead of the Israel that died in unbelief in order to its subsequent conversion.



Otherwise, indeed, the irrevocable call of the Abrahamic posterity to salvation would remain without its full accomplishment. But then all arbitrary particularism having been negatived once for all by the apostle, what holds good of Israel must perforce hold good of the Gentiles, and we must consequently assume the conversion and salvation not merely of the final Gentile *pleroma*, consisting of the whole number of individuals then living, but also of the entire Gentile world that went before. Thus unscriptural particularism passes at last into unscriptural apokatastasis. On this account the older Lutheran theologians, who recognise in ver. 26 of the eleventh chapter an extraordinary promise given to the people of Israel with reference to the time of the end, referred *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται* merely to a *notabilis quaedam et insignis Judaeorum conversio sub finem mundi*, i.e. to the conversion not of the whole nation, but only of a greater proportion of the Jews. So, too, some others, and some modern expositors as well. Such a conversion would not be in itself impossible, nor inconsistent with the scriptural and specifically Pauline *analogia fidei*, and might therefore have been predicted by the apostle through the Spirit of prophecy. Only, the limitation in question is arbitrarily imported into *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ*. Abstractly, such a limitation would not be impossible (comp. *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*, v. 18b; *ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν*, Col. i. 23; and *ὁ κόσμος* (ὅλος) *ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν*, John xii. 19). Only in the present passage it is impossible, for here the *πᾶς*, ver. 26, stands in opposition to *ἀπὸ μέρους*, ver. 25. If then already, up to the present point, hardness has happened merely in part to Israel, if therefore already, up to the present point, as to the greater portion Israel has attained to salvation, it is impossible that *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται* should denote merely a great portion of Israel, but it must of necessity denote the whole of Israel in unrestricted universality. If we would avoid the crass dogmatic consequences previously indicated, the only way of escape left is to assign to *σωθήσεται* a more external, objective meaning. On this view, merely an admission of Israel as an entire people into the church of Christ would be meant, so that the means of grace embracing the entire body would prove subjectively effectual in the case of a greater or smaller portion of the body. But to give such an objective and external meaning to the notion of *σωτηρία* is arbitrary. Then, instead of *σωθήσεται*, at least *εἰσελεύσεται*

would have been used by the apostle. Everywhere in Scripture *σώζειν*, *σωτηρία* denotes subjective salvation. So, too, with the Apostle Paul, and especially in the Roman epistle, comp. with *σώζειν*, v. 9, 10, viii. 24, ix. 27, x. 9, 13, and *σωτηρία*, i. 16, x. 1, 10, xi. 11, xiii. 11. But the whole epistle from beginning to end makes *σωτηρία* depend on *πίστις* (comp. also Eph. ii. 8 : *τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως*), which is also done throughout these very chs. ix.–xi. How is it conceivable that *σωθήσεται*, xi. 26, is used in a different sense from *σώσω*, xi. 14, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 22?

Consequently, *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ* cannot be applied to the entire body of the people of Israel descending in course of nature from Abraham, but must be understood either of the *spiritual* Israel in general, consisting of believing Gentiles and Jews,<sup>1</sup> or of the entire Israelitish *λείμμα κατ' ἐκλογὴν*, the *elect portion* of the Jews.<sup>2</sup> The latter interpretation deserves the preference, having regard both to *Ἰσραὴλ*, ver. 25, and to the subjoined prophetic passage referring to the actual Israel. The same holds good of *ἐχθροί* and *ἀγαπητοί*, ver. 28, and of *οὔτοι*, ver. 31, which loses its point of connection if *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ* be applied to the *spiritual* Israel. Moreover, the apostle would surely have distinguished the *entire* church of believers more clearly by *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ θεοῦ*, comp. Gal. vi. 16. Thus, *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ* is all Israel meant by the word of prophecy and embraced in the divine word of promise, to whom alone it belongs to wear the name Israel properly and of right, according to the O. T. word of God rightly understood, *i.e.* the natural descendants of Abraham who walk in the footsteps of his faith, iv. 12; the Jews, who are such not merely outwardly in the flesh, but inwardly in the spirit through circumcision of the heart, comp. ii. 28, 29. "*Πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ*," remarks Calov, "a quibusdam explicatur de *Israele Dei*, Gal. vi. 16, quem constare dicunt ex *plenitudine gentium* et *Israelitis fidelibus* omnium temporum: sed præstat nostro iudicio, ut intelligatur *Israel secundum carnem*, quod *tum* vocis istius usus in antecedentibus, *tum* appositio *πληρώματος gentium* postulat: non autem qua carnali generatione gaudet, sed qua vere simul est Israel."

<sup>1</sup> So Augustine, Theodoret, Luther, a number of the older Lutheran exegetes, and others.

<sup>2</sup> So according to another body of older Lutheran exegetes; among the moderns, Olshausen also.

With this view alone agrees the subjoined prophetic passage, which, according to the original text, expressly promises salvation only to those turning from apostasy in Jacob. Had the apostle promised the salvation of the whole people of Israel, he would not directly have quoted a passage limiting salvation to those who repent, but would have quoted other passages unrestrictedly universal in their tenor, such as Hos. iii., Ezek. xxxvii., Zech. xiv. καὶ οὕτω also, in ver. 26, leans to the side of this exposition; for this does not simply sum up what has been said before in the sense of *so then*, not even in the passages quoted by Meyer from the classics,<sup>1</sup> but always emphatically calls attention to the *particular mode*—indicated in what precedes—in which the occurrence of what follows takes place or has taken place, comes or is to come into existence. So, too, in the N. T. passages, Acts vii. 8, xvii. 33, xx. 11, xxvii. 44, xxviii. 14; Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 36, xi. 28, xiv. 25; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Heb. vi. 15. Now, in the present passage there is emphatically resumed, not the secondary ἄχρῃς οὐ κτλ., but the primary πῶρσις ἀπὸ μέρους κτλ., in which ἀπὸ μέρους is placed first and emphasized. In part has hardness befallen Israel until the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma*, and *in this way* all Israel will be saved. Now, were it the final conversion of the entire Israelitish nation that is here predicted, it would be strange for the particular mode in which this is to ensue to be so strongly emphasized, instead of the new, incredible, miraculous fact itself being put prominently forward, and by a καὶ τότε made to stand out by itself and attached to what precedes. On the other hand, καὶ οὕτω falls in admirably with the application of πᾶς Ἰσραήλ to the elect, believing Jews. *In part* is Israel hardened until the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma*, and *in this way*, namely, that out of the people but partially hardened a great gathering of believers continually goes on until the end of the days,—in this way the whole Israel really meant by the O. T. word of God, as the prophetic passage directly quoted proves, shall be saved. Before the very face of the Gentiles, who were inclined to be arrogant in regard to Israel, stands the strongly emphasized ἀπὸ μέρους, intended to soften Israel's apostasy, and which, remembering Acts xx. 21, might truthfully be said.

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. iii. 96. 2; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 5. 6; comp. also Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 1. 1, *Hell.* ii. 3. 6.

But the fact made known by the apostle might even then be called a *μυστήριον*. For if the calling and reception of the Gentile world, despite the fact that it was predicted by the O. T. word of prophecy, is according to Eph. iii. 3 ff. a *μυστήριον* made known to the apostle by *ἀποκάλυψις*, far more does such a *μυστήριον* appear, when on one side the objectively elected people of God only attains to salvation subjectively by means of a successive selection, and on the other, in spite of the obvious hardening of Israel, God's mercy has not departed from it, but at all times an *ἐκλογή χάριτος* is being gathered out of it until the full number of the elect from Israel is completed, and the latter was what the apostle would especially impress on the Gentile Christians. In this sense Calov early says: "Si mysterium insigne erat, quod *gentiles συγκληρόνομοι καὶ σύσσωμοι καὶ συμμετέχοι* sint promissionis in Christo in Evangelio, Eph. iii. 5 sqq., tametsi omnibus nationibus terrae promissio facta fuerit, jam olim in semine Abrahæ benedicto, quidni mysterium singulare habendum, quod Israelitica natione per summam *ἀπιστίαν indurata, πώρωσις* tamen illi tantum ἀπὸ μέρους acciderit, et spes adhuc tribuatur de reliquis non exiguo numero salvandis, ex infinita Dei misericordia?" Nor does *ἄχρις οὗ*, ver. 25, compel us in *καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται* to find the occurrence of an entirely new fact indicated. *ἄχρις οὗ* of itself simply denotes the limit up to which an action or event is to continue. That this as a rule ceases subsequently, is just as little implied in *ἄχρις οὗ* of itself as in *ἕως οὗ*, Matt. i. 25, John ix. 18, but is implied for the most part in the actual circumstances of the case. Here also the partial hardening of Israel until the entrance of the Gentile *plenitudo* will only continue until this entrance is completed, and will then cease, because then will come to pass the parousia of the Lord, which brings *αἰὼν οὗτος* to an end, and makes the entire elect host of believers partakers in *ζωῇ αἰώνιος* in the *αἰὼν μέλλον*. We might then wish to refer *σωθήσεται* in ver. 26 (comp. xiii. 11) to this *future σωτηρία*, which will only reach its full manifestation after the parousia, in order thus to obtain a fact lying in the actual future. But this is nowise essential, and not even probable, after what precedes and follows, where the subject is the *σωτηρία* of Israel falling within the present life. Rather the meaning is this—that the salvation of Israel, predicted in the word of prophecy (*καθὼς γέγραπται*,

ver. 26), will be so carried into effect, that until the entrance of the Gentile *pleroma* a continuous gathering of believing Israel will take place and be completed, and then the salvation of Israel, predicted in the word of prophecy, will stand forth as a completed fact. Comp. *ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι*, 2 Pet. ii. 1, *i.e.* as also among you, in accordance with prophetic prediction, false teachers shall arise.

Finally, as concerns the conclusion of the eleventh chapter, the apostle in vv. 28–32 maintains, that on account of its rejection of the gospel, Israel is hated of God, but for the sake of the covenant made with the fathers it is beloved of God, the gracious gifts (ix. 4, 5) and calling of God being without repentance. Therefore He has not utterly abrogated His covenant made with the nation, but is ever waiting graciously to receive back into that covenant those who on their part believingly return to Him. As through Israel's fall salvation came to the Gentile world, so by this very means Israel is to be stirred up to return to the path of faith, in order that it may come into the actual enjoyment of the mercy of God that is ever waiting for it. For God has shut up all under unbelief, not to have mercy on one and not on another, but, as far as He can, to include all in His mercy, if only on their part they reject not such inclusion. Then at last the apostle in vv. 33–36 breaks out in wondering praise of the divine wisdom, which in the way unfolded in chs. ix.–xi. conducts its elective counsel, so full of mystery, to its appointed goal.

When, therefore, Calov maintains: "*Quod ergo ad mentem Apostoli, non loqui eundem de conversione Israelitarum simultanea seu universali, seu magnae multitudinis, sub novissima mundi tempora futura et adhuc expectanda;*" and then proceeds: "*B. Luthero aliisque nostratibus jam laudatis facile assensum praebeamus, et oraculum hoc de successiva potius conversione usque ad finem mundi subinde ventura, ita ut ex illo Apostoli tempore non exiguus, sed omnino magnus adhuc Israelitarum numerus ad fidem et salutem aeternam perventurus sit, accipiendum censem;*" this mode of interpretation now appears to us, for the reasons stated in this appendix, to deserve the preference over the theory advocated by us hitherto, and defended in the exposition of ch. xi. That compassion for the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and missionary zeal on behalf of Israel, is not

diminished by this is self-evident, just as little as it was diminished in the apostle, although he only hoped to save *τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν*. The conversion of a greater proportion of the Jewish people of itself is by no means impossible. Only, this is not expressly taught in the present passage, as Osiander (in Calov, p. 194 sq.) early said: "Non negamus (quod tamen ex h. l. ἀποδεικτικῶς evinci non potest, sed soli Deo cognitum est), fieri adhuc posse, ex singulari Dei misericordia, ut insignis aliquis Judaeorum numerus ad Messiae regnum, ante gloriosum ejus reditum, accedat: quod ut certo fiat, *ὀλοκαρδίως* precamur."

## CHAPTER XII.

UPON the first theoretical or dogmatic main division of the epistle follows now the practical or parainetic division, the contents of which are unfolded ch. xii. 1–xv. 13. This outward succession—regularly occurring in the apostolic epistles—of the dogmatic and practical elements proves at once, that according to the Scripture mode of view holiness of life is the fruit of justifying faith. In this way, again, the principle of the Kantian rationalism, according to which religion is based upon morality,—the fruit thus becoming the root,—just as much as the attempt naturally associated therewith to give to man's moral training a position of false independence, and to divorce the school from the church, is repudiated and condemned as an anti-Christian principle and enterprise. “Frustra enim componendae vitae studium ostendas, nisi prius omnis justitiae originem hominibus in Deo et Christo esse ostenderis: quod est ipsos a mortuis excitare. Atque hoc praeceptum est Evangelii et Philosophiae discrimen. Quamvis enim splendide et cum magna ingenii laude Philosophi de moribus disserant, quicquid tamen ornatus refulget in eorum praeceptis perinde est ac praeclara superficies aedificii sine fundamento: quia omissis principiis mutilam doctrinam non secus ac corpus capite truncatum proponunt,” Calvin. But as upon saving faith a holy life, so upon *general* exhortations to God-pleasing conduct, such as are given in ch. xii., follows, in the order of nature and experience, more specific reference and allusion to the *particular* circumstances and needs of the Roman church, such as begins with ch. xiii.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Melancthon indicates the connection of ch. xii.–xiv. in the following way: “Nec Paulus hoc loco temere congescit praecepta, id quod ordo ostendit. Primum enim tradit praecepta privatae vitae in capite duodecimo. In 13, tradit praecepta vitae politicae; in 14, docet de usu ceremoniarum. Quare cap. 12, τὰ ἡθικά Christianorum continet; cap. 13, πολιτικά; cap. 14, ἱερατικά. Facile autem intellectu est, haec tria summa esse operum genera, ad quae actiones omnes in vita referri possunt.” But Bengel observes strikingly: “In tanto officiorum catalogo P. nihil earum rerum habet, quae hodie apud Romanenses fere utramque paginam faciunt.”

Vv. 1, 2. The apostle lays a basis for the summons, beginning with ver. 3, to put into practice the many-sided and many-branching virtue of a Christian life, by first of all exhorting to a full personal surrender to the Lord, and to a general walk in consistency with this act of self-sacrifice.

Ver. 1. *Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς*] The question is, to what the inferential particle *οὖν* is to be referred. As a quite new and perfectly independent section of the exposition opens with this chapter, the most probable reference antecedently is to the essential sum and substance of the entire train of reasoning contained in ch. i.-xi. Comp. the perfectly analogous *παρακαλῶ οὖν*, Eph. iv. 1, also 1 Thess. iv. 1. The connection with the final proposition of this reasoning, xi. 32, which in any case must be called more probable than the one with the import of xi. 35, 36, and is supported by *διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ* = *διὰ τοῦ ἐλέους τοῦ θεοῦ* (comp. *ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ*, xi. 32), may be reconciled with our acceptation, in so far as in that final proposition was concentrated and wrapped up, as it were, *in nuce*, the pith not merely of ch. ix.-xi., but also of ch. i.-viii. *παρακαλῶ, hortor*. "Moses jubet: apostolus hortatur," Bengel.

—*διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ*] The apostle exhorts *through* the mercy of God, because, in reminding of it, he points it out as a *motive* to thankfulness, which could not but impel his readers to a willing and dutiful compliance with his exhortation (xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1). The *οἰκτιρμοί* (the usual translation of the Heb. *רַחֲמִים* in the LXX., comp. 2 Cor. i. 3; Phil. ii. 1; Col. iii. 12, *rec.*; Heb. x. 28) are the compassionate feelings or the compassionings as the concrete acts or proofs of compassion.

—*παραστήσαι*] *to present*, in the classics also a common phrase for presenting the sacrificial victims or laying them on the altar, comp. Luke ii. 22. Expositors quote Lucian, *Deor. conc.* c. 13: *κὰν μυρίας ἐκατόμβας παραστήσῃ*; Polyb. xvi. 25. 7: *θύματα τοῖς βωμοῖς παραστήσαντες*; Virgil, *Aen.* xii. 171: *admonitque piceus flagrantibus aris*. That here also this specific meaning is to be retained, is shown by what is subjoined. As to the other general signification of *παριστάναι*, comp. on vi. 13. As here the infinitive follows *παρακαλεῖν*, comp. xvi. 17, so in 1 Cor. i. 10, Mark v. 10, *ἵνα*; in Matt. viii. 34, *ὅπως*; in Heb. xiii. 22, 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, the imperative.



—τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν] in accordance with the usual, thoroughly established interpretation = ὑμᾶς αὐτούς. σῶμα therefore serves here to denote the entire human personality as to soul and body, by which our exposition of this notion, given on vi. 12, receives its confirmation. The choice of the expression in the present passage is no doubt occasioned by the metaphor of sacrifice. But the σῶμα here is not viewed, in direct opposition to the πνεῦμα, as σῶμα σαρκικόν. Rather is the rational and physical personality of man, which is to be given as a sacrifice to God, viewed as morally indifferent. In the former case the summons could not run, to present the σῶμα σαρκικόν as a θυσία ἁγία to God, but only to mortify it, *i.e.* to destroy the σὰρξ utterly. Those expositors who refer σῶμα exclusively to the body, find in ver. 1 merely an exhortation to sanctification of the body in contrast with the renewal of the νοῦς, to which we are not summoned until ver. 2. But against this view tells, first, the apposition τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν, which plainly refers to the entire act of the Christian's presentation of spirit and body, even as the O. T. sacrifice itself symbolized not merely the believer's corporeal sanctification, but his entire personal self-surrender as to spirit and body (1 Pet. ii. 5); and secondly, the relation and progress of thought in ver. 1 and ver. 2. As ver. 1 challenges believers to complete self-sacrifice as to both aspects of their human and personal being, so ver. 2 challenges them to a walk consistent with this act of self-surrender done once for all. Hence, in place of the aorist in ver. 1, the present appears in ver. 2. The former self-surrender to God is to be conceived as a momentary act concluded at once and for ever, which reveals its effects continuously in a walk well-pleasing to God.

—θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ] as a sacrifice living, holy, well-pleasing to God. The sacrificial victim is brought to the altar to be slain; but in the spiritual sacrifice, the Christian dies in order to be made partaker in true ζωή, vi. 4, 11, 13; Luke xvii. 33. Here, as in John vi. 51, 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5 (ἄρτος, λίθος ζῶν), the spiritual, not merely the natural life is meant (in which latter case *hostia viva* were merely = *actuosa, quae spirit et aliquid molitur*), from which it likewise follows that σῶμα cannot be applied exclusively to the body. "Abominabile est, cadaver offerre," Bengel. Even the O. T. θυσία was ἁγία and εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ. But what held good of the material sacrifice rather in a

typical and external way, holds good of the spiritual sacrifice of the N. T. in the most real and internal sense of the word. With *εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ*, comp. Phil. iv. 18; Eph. v. 2; Heb. xiii. 16. It follows from these passages, which also the order of words indicates, that *τῷ θεῷ* is to be joined with *εὐάρεστος*, not with *παραστήσαι*. Moreover, *τῷ θεῷ* is understood to *παραστήσαι* quite as matter of course. "Unico sacrificio per Christum Deo reconciliati, ipsius gratia facti sumus omnes sacerdotes ad nos nostraque omnia Dei gloriæ dedicanda. Sacrificium expiationis nullum relinquitur, neque erigi potest sine insigni crucis Christi contumelia," Calvin. Comp. also Melanchthon's fine exposition of the distinction between *sacramentum* and *sacrificium*, as well as between *sacrificium propitiatorium* and *sacrificium laudis* or *εὐχαριστικόν*, on this passage, and Umbreit, p. 343 ff.

—*τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*] Apposition not to *θυσίαν*, but to the entire sentence *παραστήσαι . . . τῷ θεῷ*; for not the *θυσία*, *victimæ*, but only the *παραστήσαι . . . τὴν θυσίαν* can be called a *λατρεία*, a *cultus*. *τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν* therefore is to be resolved ὅ (sc. τὸ παραστήσαι τ. σ. ὑμ. θυσίαν ζῶσαν κτλ.) ἔστιν, or, better, ἔστω (comp. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς παραστήσαι κτλ.) ἡ λογικὴ λατρεία ὑμῶν, Winer, p. 669. The accusative (= accusative of *epexegetis*) is an appositional sentence, expressing a judgment about what was said before (what it is, or is said to be), Kühner, II. § 500, 3. On his rendering: "which is your rational service to God," Luther has the marginal note: "St. Paul here calls all sacrifices, works and service irrational, if they are done without faith and right knowledge of God." But such a contrast between rational and irrational cultus, and such an invective against the latter, are here out of place. Nor is there any reference to the *ἄλογα ζῶα* (Wisd. xi. 16); for the offering of the latter was of itself no *ἄλογος λατρεία*, and the Christian's personal self-sacrifice, in contrast with the O. T. sacrificial victims, might indeed be called a *λογικὴ θυσία*, but not a *λογικὴ λατρεία*. Rather the contrast in *λογικός*, as in *νοερός*, *πνευματικός*, is with *σωματικός*. The *λογικὴ λατρεία*, therefore, is the Christian's *rational* service to God, which consists not, like the divinely-ordained—and therefore in itself by no means blameworthy—theocratic cultus, in *material* oblations and outward offerings, but in inward, rational self-consecration to God's service both as to

soul and body. Comp. in John iv. 23, 24, 1 Pet. ii. 5,<sup>1</sup> Heb. vii.—x., the contrast between the O. T. and N. T. priesthood and sacrifice, especially vii. 16, where the νόμος ἐντολῆς σαρκικῆς is mentioned; finally, Rom. i. 9, and in 1 Pet. ii. 2, λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα, Steiger there. Chrysostom remarks on the passage: ταῦτα γὰρ ποιῶν ἀναφέρεις λογικὴν λατρείαν, τουτέστιν οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν σωματικόν, οὐδὲν παχύ, οὐδὲν αἰσθητόν; and Oecumenius interprets: διὰ λογικῆς λατρείας, τουτέστι τῆς ἀναιμάκτου. So, too, the *Testam. XII. Patr.* says of the angels: προσφέρουσι δὲ κυρίῳ ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναιμάκτου προσφοράν; and Athenagoras, in the *Legatio pro Christianis*, calls true knowledge of God and sincere prayers an ἀναιμάκτος θυσία and a λογικὴ λατρεία. Finally, the *Const. Apost.* vi. 23 observe, that in the N. T. Christ has instituted ἀντὶ θυσίας τῆς δι' αἱμάτων λογικὴν καὶ ἀναιμάκτου.

Ver. 2. With the Christian's inward consecration and surrender to God, made once for all, his constant walk, conformed not to the fashion of the world, but to the will of God, is to correspond. Ὑποτίθεται ἡμῖν τρόπον, δι' οὗ δύνησώμεθα τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν κατορθῶσαι, ὅς ἐστιν, ἐὰν μὴ συσχηματιζώμεθα τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, Theophylact. The preponderantly attested (by A B<sup>\*\*\*</sup> D E F G, *al.*) reading, approved by Griesbach, received by Lachmann, is συσχηματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφοῦσθαι, instead of the imperative συσχηματίξεσθε and μεταμορφοῦσθε. It is more probable that the disposition to make ver. 2 the beginning of an independent sentence inserted the imperative in place of the original infinitive, than that a change of construction so easy and frequent (comp. xvi. 17, and on the *oratio variata* in general, Winer, p. 722) caused difficulty, and led the copyists to substitute infinitives in order to restore uniformity of construction. Thus external authority and internal reasons coincide in favour of restoring the infinitives συσχηματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφοῦσθαι, which then, like the infinitive παραστήσαι, ver. 1, depend on παρακαλῶ.

—καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθαι τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ] συσχηματίζεσθαι is properly passive, with a reflexive meaning, Buttmann, *Ausf. gr. Sprachl.* I. 360, ed. 2. Therefore = *conformari, in eandem formam redigi = se conformari, se in eandem formam redigere, to fashion oneself like.* συσχηματίζεσθαι τινι, comp. 1 Pet. i. 14 (elsewhere

<sup>1</sup> The λογικὴ λατρεία is withal to be πνευματικὴ, the rational service of God is to be spiritual, in so far as the human πνεῦμα, νοῦς, λόγος performs it ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

συσχηματίζεσθαι πρὸς τινα or πρὸς τι), "to assume a like σχῆμα to one, to be fashioned like one," or "to fashion oneself like." The primary distinction between σχῆμα and μορφή may perhaps be this, that the latter denotes more the organic form, the former the mechanical shape, the outward, casual *habitus* (σχῆμα from ἔχω, σchein), 1 Cor. vii. 31. Hence σχῆμα is also outward show, γοητρία, and συσχηματίζεσθαι synonymous with "to assume a form, an apparent form, to affect, play a part" (comp. the passages cited by Wetstein); while μορφή is also lovely form, *forma* (comp. *formosus*). In this way μορφή is suited to denote more the essential, *inner* form; σχῆμα, the *outward*, casual appearance. This distinction may perhaps be specially retained where, as in this passage (comp. Phil. ii. 6-8), σχῆμα and μορφή appear side by side. The apostle would not with equal fitness have described a transformation to an outward, world-shaped walk by συμμορφοῦσθαι (Phil. iii. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 18); inner, spiritual transformation by μετασχηματίζεσθαι (2 Cor. xi. 13 ff.; Phil. iii. 21). Rightly then Bengel: "*μορφή forma penetius et perfectius quidam notat, quam σχῆμα habitus, conf. Phil. ii. 6, 8, iii. 21. A forma interna non debet abludere habitus sanctorum externus.*" As to αἰών, comp. Harless on Eph. ii. 2. ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος or ὁ νῦν αἰὼν, 2 Tim. iv. 10, ὁ ἐνεστὼς αἰὼν, Gal. i. 4, answers to the Rabbinical formula הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה, and stands in opposition to ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων, Matt. xii. 32; ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Luke xviii. 30; ὁ αἰὼν ἐκείνος, Luke xx. 35, הַיּוֹם הַבָּא. These phrases denote the present and future world-periods, and with the Rabbins mark the antithesis between the pre-Messianic and Messianic days. Even after the commencement of the latter under the N. T. this distinction remains, in so far as the completion and visible realization of the Messianic age will only commence with the transformed and glorified state of the world of which the parousia is the medium. But, inwardly, believers no longer form part of αἰὼν οὗτος, in so far as the latter phrase, like the biblical notion of κόσμος, has acquired an *ethical* application, but through Christ are redeemed ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ, Gal. i. 4. They are therefore exhorted in the present passage not to conform themselves in their walk to the present age, which bears in it the character of immorality (*i.e.* not to conform themselves to this corrupt world-life), but to live a life well-pleasing to God. "*αἰῶνι saeculo quod totum, neglecta Dei voluntate, suitatem sequitur,*"

Bengel. But in his positive exhortation the apostle only emphasizes the renewal of the mind as the source of a walk opposed to αἰὼν οὗτος; and as the aim of this renewal, which is to be continually striven after, proposes study of the perfect will of God, which in truth contains the only true standard of a walk not after the fashion of the world, but after the mind of God.

—ἀλλὰ μεταμορφοῦσθαι] “but that ye transform yourselves.” The preposition μετά stands in pregnant opposition to the σύν in συσχηματίζεσθαι. The present tense marks the continuous act, in so far as the spiritual self-surrender, made once for all, ver. 1, is still perpetuated in the spiritual renewal which is ever repeating itself. Comp. the present ἀνανεοῦσθαι, Eph. iv. 23, and τὸν νέον (ἄνθρωπον) τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον, Col. iii. 10. With the metaphorical use of μεταμορφοῦσθαι, comp. Seneca, Epist. 6: “Sentio non emendari me tantum, sed transfigurari;” Quintilian, vi. 2: “Movendi judicium animos, atque in eum, quem volumus, habitum formandi ac velut transfigurandi.”

—τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς ὑμῶν] The dative is to be taken as *dativ. instrum.* = *through* renewal of your mind or heart (comp. νοῦς, vii. 23, 25), not as *dativ. modi* = *with* renewal of your mind, i.e. by renewing your mind, what is meant being, not the metamorphosis of the outer walk as a consequence of spiritual renewal, but the metamorphosis of the inner nature as the immediate effect of—nay, identical with—anakainosis. ὑμῶν is erased by Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of A B D\* gr. F G gr. al. But merely the superfluity of the word seems to have led to its omission. Moreover, the N. T. writers are fond of using pronouns not absolutely necessary; and certainly in the present case after the preceding ὑμᾶς . . . ὑμῶν . . . ὑμῶν the omission seems to make the language too bare and disjointed. The following ὑμᾶς also after δοκιμάζειν is wanting in one codex.

—εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς] Aim of the exhortation: *that you may prove*, not: *that you may be able to prove*, for it is not said εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς δοκιμάζειν. No doubt only the regenerate man is able to distinguish between what pleases and displeases God; but he alone does it as well, and it is this doing that is the aim of regeneration. Besides, the security for a walk in harmony with the result of the proof lies, not so much in the ability to study God's will, as simply in the actual study. But this act of proving of course is not barely intellectual and literal, such as

that described in ii. 18, but one that flows from the spirit of regeneration, and therefore is itself spiritual, Eph. v. 10 ; Phil. i. 10 ; Heb. v. 14.

—τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον] Luther: "what is the good, the well-pleasing, and the perfect will of God." So, too, the Vulg. and many, especially older expositors, who understand τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ of the subjective will of God, the action of divine willing, and then take τὸ ἀγαθὸν κτλ. as an adjectival definition of this will. But seeing that to εὐάρεστον we have to supply not τοῖς ἀνθρώποις = προσφιλές, Phil. iv. 8, but clearly τῷ θεῷ (comp. εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, ver. 1), it is incongruous to define God's own will as well-pleasing to God Himself. Thus here τὸ θέλημα must perforce be interpreted of God's objective will, *i.e.* of the import or object of God's subjective will = that which God wills, ii. 18 ; 1 Thess. iv. 3. τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον, "that which is good and well-pleasing and perfect," are in this case substantivized adjectives, forming an explanatory apposition to τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ; for God wills nothing but that which is good, etc. τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ indicates the formal principle of obligation that binds man's will, and puts a theonomy in place of the pretended autonomy of the latter. And as τὸ θέλημα τ. θ. traces out for man's will its form and rule, so τὸ ἀγαθὸν κτλ. traces out its import and aim. But according to Scripture ideas, τὸ ἀγαθὸν κτλ. is *love* in all its various modes of expression and manifestation. The article is not repeated before εὐάρ. and τέλ., because the connected nouns are regarded merely as parts of *one* whole, Winer, p. 159, and serve to set forth exhaustively the single idea of moral perfection. With τὸ ἀγαθόν, comp. ii. 10, vii. 18 f., xii. 9, 21, xiii. 4 ; with τὸ εὐάρεστον, Heb. xiii. 21 ; with τὸ τέλειον, Matt. v. 48, 1 Cor. xiii. 10.

Vv. 3-8. After the general summons to renewal of mind and holiness of walk, the apostle subjoins special exhortations. But just as his solicitude is never directed merely to individuals, but always to the whole church, or ever withal to individuals as to an integral constituent of the whole, as to a member of the body of Jesus Christ, so here he begins with inculcating the Christian virtue which is the fundamental condition of cohesion in that great spiritual organism, the church of the Lord, as well as of the harmonious action of all its members and the orderly progress of all its functions,—namely *humility*, which demeans itself after

the measure of its divinely-conferred gifts, and is just as far from undue self-esteem as it is singly and solely occupied with the faithful and acceptable discharge of the vocation invariably associated with its gifts.

Ver. 3. λέγω γάρ] *I say, that is.* λέγω, as often = *edico, jubco*, I command, comp. Matt. v. 34, 39, 44, xxiii. 39. γάρ is explicative, and introduces the specialization of the exhortation contained in ver. 2. καὶ φησὶ μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ), ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν κτλ., Chrysostom.

—διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι] The χάρις is the grace that conferred on him the apostolic office, i. 5, xv. 15; Eph. iii. 7, 8; 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10; Gal. i. 15, 16; 1 Tim. i. 12. He commands through or by virtue of, *i.e.* in the authority of this grace, so that the phrase is equivalent in force to λέγω ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, 1 Thess. iv. 15; for the word of apostles is to have the same weight as the word of the Lord, Luke x. 16. Very enfeebling is the reference of χάρις to the grace of God in general, of which even Paul as a Christian was made partaker.

—παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν] *τοντέστι πᾶσι λέγω, πᾶσι, παραινῶ*, Photius in Oecumen. But the apostle chooses the expression of set purpose, in order distinctly to emphasize the address of his exhortation to every individual without exception. Only by this exhortation being followed on the part of every individual could its aim, the establishment of the organic unity of Christ's body and the prevention of all fracture and dislocation, be accomplished. The explanation of παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν, "every one that is among you," by "not only to the ordinary Christian, but also to the one among you to whom God has vouchsafed special gifts, and who fills a special office," suits neither the general import of the present verse, nor that of the following verse. Even ver. 4 ff. assumes that to *each* separate member of the Christian church without distinction a special χάρισμα has been given, with which he is called to serve the common good.

—μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν] See similar instances of paronomasia in 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32, xiii. 6, 7, 13. Comp. the classical parallels quoted by Wetstein, who also rightly observes: "Paronomasia ὑπερφρονεῖν, φρονεῖν, σωφρονεῖν. Illud peccat in excessu per superbiam: Istud est justum de se et aliis iudicium: Hoc vero significat modestiam."

Comp., too, Chrysostom's explanation : καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο (sc. τὸ νήφειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν κατὰ διάνοιαν) σωφροσύνη λέγεται ἀπὸ τοῦ σώας τὰς φρένας ἔχειν. Hence σωφρονεῖν stands in opposition to μαίνεσθαι, Mark v. 15 ; 2 Cor. v. 13. Next, σωφροσύνη, soundness of mind, denotes now abstinence, now chastity, now modesty. Here σωφρονεῖν is synonymous with μετριοφρονεῖν, ταπεινοφρονεῖν. παρά is = *ultra*, εἰς = *usque ad*. With the infinitives depending on λέγω, comp. Matt. v. 39 ; Acts xv. 24. Thus the apostle commands us not to be high-minded beyond the measure of the right frame of mind that it becomes us to cherish, but to cherish this frame of mind as far as the measure of humility permits. Comp. Luther.

—ἐκάστω ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως] with the transposition ἐκάστω ὡς for ὡς ἐκάστω, comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5, vii. 17, and on Rom. xi. 31. The emphatic prefixing of ἐκάστω answers to the emphatic παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν. The former, therefore, is neither dependent on λέγω, nor does it stand by attraction for ἕκαστον, either an attraction through the preceding dative, or instead of φρονεῖν ἕκαστον ὡς ὁ θ. ἐμέρ. αὐτῷ μέτρ. πίστ. With μερίζειν τινί τι, to distribute something to one, comp. Mark vi. 41 ; 1 Cor. vii. 17 ; 2 Cor. x. 13 ; Heb. vii. 2. ὡς serves to indicate the standard of self-estimation. This standard is furnished by the measure of faith distributed by God to every one. But πίστις cannot well be taken here without qualification in the usual Pauline sense : *faith in Christ, fides salvifica*. In the first place, the measure of this does not depend so much on the gift of God (comp. ἐμέρ. ὁ θεός), who by the uniformly efficacious means of grace is willing to impart to all an equal amount of it, as rather on the conduct of man. Hence from every one μὴ διακρίνεσθαι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι τῇ πίστει, and πληροφορία τῆς πίστεως (iv. 20) are required. The smaller measure of *this* faith, therefore, is to be attributed less to the smaller measure of God's gift than to the greater measure of man's resistance. And in the second place, the degree of Christian saving faith cannot suitably furnish to its possessor a standard for correct self-judgment ; for the very Christian who is strong in faith will be both disposed and bound, in considering the comparative strength of his faith, humbly to fix his gaze rather on his comparative lack of faith than on his comparative possession of faith. The opposite frame of mind would itself deserve to be held equivalent to ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν. But finally, while the strength of this saving faith does indeed deter-



mine in general the strength of its various workings outwardly, it nowise determines the distinctive peculiarities of the workings mentioned directly afterwards. Although, for example, *προφητεία* is to be ranked higher than *διακονία*, on account of the higher purposes in church life to which it is subservient, still it nowise follows on this account that the *προφήτης* necessarily possesses a stronger degree of saving faith than the *διάκονος*. Rather, the distinctive charismatic endowment depends on distinctive peculiarities of human character. But still *πίστις* in this passage is not in itself identical with *χάρισμα*, ver. 6. So *c.g.* Schol. Matth.: *πίστιν ἐνταῦθα τὸ χάρισμά φησιν*. Rather, it is the objective *χάρις* of God which, in becoming wedded to the individual spirit of man through the communication of the *πνεῦμα*, generates the *χάρισμα* peculiar to each one. But *χάρις* and the *πνεῦμα* being also, and indeed in a primary sense, the generative principle of *πίστις*, the matter on its subjective side may no doubt be so viewed, that the charismatic endowment of each one is identical with the human individuality transformed and glorified by faith. Consequently it is in this limited human individuality that *πίστις* has its peculiar *μέτρον*; for only One ever possessed the *πνεῦμα οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου*, John iii. 34, and He therefore is also the source of all spiritual gifts. In the case of others, the Spirit and faith enter into human limits, and in them the very strongest faith is not of universal efficacy, but only efficacious according to the measure of their distinctive character. In the gift of *προφητεία* consists the *μέτρον πίστεως* of the *προφήτης*, in capacity for the *διακονία* the *μέτρον πίστεως* of the *διάκονος*, in *διδασκαλία* the *μέτρ. πίστ.* of the *διδάσκαλος*. By *πίστις* therefore is to be understood here practical faith, faith engaged in active work, corresponding with the idea of faith running through Heb. xi., analogous to the *ἔργον* of Jas. ii., comp. 1 Cor. xii. 9; Gal. v. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 11. Its *ὅρος* or specific limitation is determined by the natural human individuality, in which is given also its *μέτρον*, inasmuch as in its charismatic workings a definite scale of degrees is to be supposed, even as *προφητεία* is to be ranked higher than *διδασκαλία*, *διδασκ.* higher than *διακονία*, and so on. Comp. *μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς*, Eph. iv. 7, and *ἐνέργεια ἐν μέτρῳ τοῦ ἐκάστου μέρους*, Eph. iv. 16. The measure of faith bestowed by God is therefore the standard of correct self-judgment, inasmuch as the knowledge that even the highest measure is God's gift

(1 Cor. iv. 7) preserves in humility. In the same way, the perception that it is still always no more than a measure individually defined and limited, begets the modesty, which cheerfully recognises the measure imparted to others as supplying its own deficiencies and equally essential to the edification of Christ's kingdom, and at the same time honours the gifts of others in practice by limiting itself to the vocation suited to its own gifts, as well as by abstaining from unwarranted, presumptuous encroachment on another's vocation transcending its own power. Comp. also 2 Cor. x. 13. "Arrogantes autem sunt, tum qui in alienas vocationes irrumpunt, tum qui modum sui doni non vident, sed arrogant sibi iudicium de his quae non intelligunt. Utrumque igitur hic complexus est Vocationem, et usum doni," Melancthon. With our acceptation of *μέτρον πίστεως*, Matt. xvii. 20 is not inconsistent (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 2), for in the present passage the reference is merely to the natural and ordinary, not to the supernatural and extraordinary workings of faith, and even the latter themselves, according to the saying of the Lord, are not absolutely certain evidences of a higher measure of faith, but require merely *πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως*.

Vv. 4, 5. The Christian community is pictured under the figure of an organized body, in order from this to deduce in vv. 6-8 without figure the exhortation corresponding with the import of ver. 3, that every member of this community should simply exercise the function belonging to him in a right manner, a course by which without doubt all arrogant self-esteem and conceited encroachment on another's office and work will be most effectually obviated. — *Καθόπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλὰ ἔχομεν*] Among the ancients, also, the parallel between a human body and a social community is frequently found. Grotius, and especially Wetstein here have collected the instances. But the apostle compares with the *corpus humanum*, not the *corpus sociale* formed by the natural human community, but the *corpus mysticum* (comp. ἐν Χριστῷ, ver. 5) formed by the church of believers. The more specific working out of the figure, appearing in the N. T. only in Paul, is found in 1 Cor. xii. 12 ff.

— *τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν*] "but all members have not the same function," *i.e.* but every member has a different function. But the expression is purposely made negative, in order by anticipation to *prevent* the supposition that

every one is able to discharge every office indiscriminately. *πρᾶξις* here is not *res gesta*, deed, action, but *res gerenda*, business, function, comp. on viii. 13.

—οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ] οἱ πολλοί, the many, in opposition to the ἐν σῶμα (v. 15, 19). We, being many, form still but one body (1 Cor. x. 17). As to ἐν Χριστῷ, comp. on viii. 1. Only ἐν Χριστῷ, standing in real life-fellowship with Him, do we form one body. Out of Him, this living, spiritual organism has no existence. Not kept together by His πνεῦμα, it is torn asunder by selfishness and dissolved into its separate members, regardless and careless of each other. These *disjecta membra*, forsaken of the uniting, vivifying *Spiritus Christi*, have again ceased to be one *corpus*, and sink into death and corruption. But Christ is not here viewed as Himself the spiritual principle permeating the organism of the church. Rather it is we who, being in Him, ἐν Χριστῷ form the σῶμα animated by His πνεῦμα, 1 Cor. xii. 13; Eph. iv. 4. Formed by Him and belonging to Him, this σῶμα is a σῶμα Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. xii. 27, not a natural or world-shaped, but a spiritual, a *Christian* church-organism. In so far as this body is filled with the fulness of Christ's life, Eph. i. 23, is it an image of Christ, the mystical Christ, and the very name ὁ Χριστός is assigned it, 1 Cor. xii. 12. This body has its different members, honourable or mean, head, eye, ear, hand, foot, etc., 1 Cor. xii. 15-21. By a slight change in the figure, the church that is in Christ is considered as an organism perfectly complete in itself, not so much taken alone, but only in association with Christ. In this case Christ is ἡ κεφαλὴ, the church τὸ σῶμα of Christ the head, Eph. i. 22, iv. 15, 16, v. 23; Col. i. 18, ii. 19. In the present passage, also, some expositors would interpret ἐν Χριστῷ, in Christ, as in the head. But, in the first place, there is no necessity for deviating from the otherwise perfectly established meaning of ἐν Χριστῷ. And again, both here and in the Corinthian passage quoted, the point in question is simply the relation of the members of the body to one another, not their relation to Christ the head, whereas in the Ephesian and Colossian epistles the thought that Christ is the head, governing and controlling the entire body, as well of the upper, heavenly (Col. ii. 10) as of the lower, earthly church, forms the central thought of the exposition.

—ὁ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη] ὁ καθ' εἰς, in the sense *cū*;

*ἕκαστος*, is a solecism not uncommon in later Greek. The regular form occurs in 1 Cor. xiv. 31 : *καθ' ἓνα πάντες*, and Eph. v. 33 : *ὁμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα*. Thus we read also in Mark xiv. 19, John viii. 9 : *εἰς καθ' εἷς*, and in Rev. xxi. 21 : *ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος*. The transition to the formula *εἰς καθ' εἷς* and the like, in which the *κατά* has lost its government and serves merely as an adverb, may have arisen from the—in itself correct—formula *ἐν καθ' ἓν*, Rev. iv. 8. The formula, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, chiefly on the authority of A B D \* F G, *τὸ δὲ καθ' εἷς* for *ὁ δὲ καθ' εἷς*, suits neither the preceding *οἱ πολλοί*, nor the following masculines : *ἔχοντες*, *ὁ διδάσκων*, etc. Moreover, *ὁ καθ' εἷς*, *ὁ καθ' ἓνα* is indeed a phrase otherwise demonstrable and yielding a correct meaning, but not *τὸ καθ' εἷς*, *τὸ καθ' ἓνα*. Comp. generally, Fritzsche here, III. p. 44 sq.; *ad Marcum*, p. 613 sqq., and Winer, p. 312. With *ἀλλήλων μέλη*, comp. Eph. iv. 25. In the first instance, it was meant simply to say, that we are all members of this mystical body of Christ's church. Instead of this the apostle says, that we are all members one of another, in which expression, no doubt, he partially departs from the figure and plays over into the thing itself. But by *ἀλλήλων μέλη* the *ὑπερφρονεῖν* is precluded, as it enjoins upon every one an attitude in relation to others of service, not of command.

Vv. 6-8. We have first of all to deal with the construction, and the punctuation connected therewith. Tischendorf (Lachmann also in the main) and some modern expositors punctuate the whole passage, vv. 5-8, as follows : *οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, τὸ (ὁ) δὲ καθ' εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη, ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διύφορα, εἴτε προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, εἴτε διακονίαν ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει, ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότητι, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότητι*. In this case, then, *ἔχοντες* is a participial definition of *ἔσμεν*, ver. 5 ; *εἴτε προφητείαν*, *εἴτε διακονίαν* depends on *ἔχοντες*, and serves to specify the *χαρίσματα* in detail, and *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*, *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ*, *ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*, etc., are limiting definitions to indicate the measure and sphere in which the *χαρίσματα* are bestowed. Vv. 6-8 are then to be understood merely as descriptive, not parainetic ; and vv. 4-8, taken together, describe the Christian church-organism under the image of an

organized body, in order by this means to enforce indirectly on each separate member the duty of following the exhortation in ver. 3 to *φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ὡς ἐμ. ὁ θ. μέτρ. πίστεως*. But *ἐν ἀπλότητι, ἐν σπουδῇ, ἐν ἰλαρότητι* specify neither the measure, like *κατὰ τ. ἀναλογίαν τ. πίστεως* perhaps, nor the sphere, like *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, διδασκαλίᾳ, παρακλήσει*, for which the charisma is given, and in which it is exercised, but the way and manner in which it *should* be exercised. The former definitions thus are of a decidedly parainetic nature, and in this way by reflex influence the character of hortatory sentences is impressed on the quite parallel definitions: *ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*, even as parainesis is the prevailing character of the present chapter, and the exhortations contained in ver. 9 ff. are manifestly as concerns form to be regarded as direct continuations of preceding exhortations. Moreover, on the mode of construction controverted by us, *εἴτε διακονίαν ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ* must be interpreted: "if it be that we possess the diaconal *gift*, in the diaconal *function*." But now *διακονία* denotes indeed diaconal *function*, but not diaconal *gift*, and besides, every gift is possessed not merely within, but also without the field of its exercise. We should then at least have expected *εἰς τὴν διακονίαν* instead of *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ*. Just as little does *διδασκαλία* denote *διδασχῇ*, 1 Cor. xiv 26, teaching *function*, or *παρακλήσις* exhorting *function*.<sup>1</sup> For these reasons preference seems due to the interpretation followed by the majority of expositors since Erasmus, according to which *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ*, etc., are to be taken as elliptical hortatory sentences. In this case (so already Theodoret, Erasmus, Calvin), still joining *ἔχοντες* to what precedes, we may punctuate and supply as follows: *οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη, ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα· εἴτε προφητείαν (sc. ἔχοντες), κατὰ τὴν ἀν. τῆς πίστεως (sc. προφητεύωμεν), εἴτε διακονίαν*

<sup>1</sup> Meyer, to wit, translates, vv. 6-8: "But having gifts of grace, which differ according to the grace given us; be it that (we have) the prophetic gift according to the proportion of faith, or the diaconal gift in the diaconal function, or that the teacher (has his gift) in the teaching function, or the exhorter in the exhorting function, he that imparts in simplicity, he that rules in diligence, he that has mercy in cheerfulness." [First edition. Philippi proceeds.] But now this expositor, in the second as well as in the third and fourth edition of his commentary, agrees with our view of the construction

(ἔχοντες), ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ (sc. ὦμεν, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 15), εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων (sc. ἐστίν, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 11; 2 Cor. viii. 23), ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ (ἔστω), εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν (ἐστίν), ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει (ἔστω), ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότῃ (sc. μεταδιδότω), ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ (sc. προϊστάσθω), ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότῃ (sc. ἐλεείτω). But as the apostle only holds by the figure of the human body up to the words ὁ δὲ . . . μέλη, forsaking it in ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα, we prefer, along with Beza, Griesbach, and several of the most recent expositors (comp. Olshausen, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius), to begin a new sentence with ἔχοντες, which also seems to us more natural on account of the dependence of the accusatives προφητείαν, διακονίαν on ἔχοντες. We therefore punctuate: οὕτω καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ καθ' εἰς ἀλλήλων μέλη. "Ἐχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα, εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει, ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότῃ, ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ, ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότῃ. The verbal supplements mentioned before remain also on this mode of construction. A similar brachylogy is found in 1 Pet. iv. 11: Εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ (sc. λαλείτω), εἴ τις διακονεῖ, ὡς ἐξ ἰσχύος ἧς χορηγεῖ ὁ θεὸς (sc. διακονεῖτω), ἢ α κτλ. Comp. the parallels quoted here by Fritzsche after Raphelius and Elsner from Epictetus. With a view to break the monotony after the abstracts προφητείαν, διακονίαν, the apostle employs the concretes ὁ διδάσκων, ὁ παρακαλῶν, and then before ὁ μεταδιδούς drops εἴτε. Comp. on this *oratio variata*, Winer, p. 722. After the sentence ἔχοντες . . . διάφορα, "but having received charisms differing according to the grace given us," instead of adding the general thought: "every one among us should exercise it in harmony with its design," the apostle in the words εἴτε προφητείαν begins at once to specialize these gifts of grace, and accordingly exhorts to the correspondent exercise of each special gift.

—ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα] answers to τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, ver. 4; χάρισμα is = *gift of grace*, δωρεὰ τῆς χάριτος, comp. Rom. v. 15. We must first of all distinguish between objective and subjective χάρισμα. The objective one is either of a physical nature (so in 2 Cor. i. 11, where the mention is of ῥύεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου) or of a spiritual character (so in Rom. v. 15, 16, vi. 23,

where the gift of grace consists in the *ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, in the bestowal of *δικαιοσύνη*, of *ζωὴ αἰώνιος*). This objective conception of *χάρισμα* is uppermost also in Rom. xi. 29, where the collective prerogatives vouchsafed to the people of Israel are meant, comp. Rom. ix. 4, 5. But *χάρισμα* stands also in the subjective sense, and then denotes either the gift of regeneration and sanctification common to all Christians, of *πίστις*, *ἀγάπη*, *ἐλπίς*, etc. (so in Rom. i. 11), or the special gift blending with the peculiar character of the individual, the *ἴδιον χάρισμα*, which is either of a physical (so in 1 Cor. vii. 7, the *donum continentiae*), or charitable and ethical (comp. in the present passage *ὁ παρακαλῶν*, *ὁ ἐλεῶν*), or intellectual (comp. *ὁ διδάσκων*), or practical nature (comp. *διακονία*, *ὁ μεταδιδούς*, *ὁ προϊστάμενος*). Comp., too, 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; 1 Pet. iv. 10. God is the bestower of the objective, as of the subjective *χάρισμα*, general and special. The efficient principle of the latter is the Spirit. But there is, in addition, a *χάρισμα* in the most special sense of the word, which finds no point of connection whatever in the natural individuality of man, or at least but a comparatively slight one, and therefore stands out as a specifically supernatural gift of the Spirit, so the *χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων*, 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30, the *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*, the *προφητεία* κτλ., comp. 1 Cor. xii. 10. The general subjective charisma, in relation to the objective one, is given chiefly for one's own salvation and edification; the special and most special of all for the edification of the church, and its significance is then to be measured not so much by its miraculous form as by its purpose, 1 Cor. xiv. 1–5. On account of this purpose common to charisms, as well as on account of the efficient principle of the *pneuma* common to them all, 1 Cor. xii. 11, they are all, particularly the special and most special forms, without regard to the more natural or more supernatural kind and manner of their manifestation, placed on an equality and reckoned as one class, 1 Cor. xii. 4, 7–10, 28–31, i. 7. It was in the Corinthian church especially that a great abundance and variety of the manifold gifts of the Spirit was found. The Roman church seems to have been more sparingly endowed, especially in extraordinary or miraculous charisms in the strictest sense of the word. On this account, indeed, the apostle in the present passage, beside *προφητεία* adduces no *χαρίσματα* of the same kind, and even prophecy rather stood simply in the middle, and

formed in a certain sense a point of transition from the ordinary to the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. The source of all *χαρίσματα* is the divine *χάρις*. They are *διάφορα*, greater or smaller, more or less fruitful, 1 Cor. xii. 31, according to the different measure of grace imparted to every one, *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν*, which *χάρις*, on this account, is itself called a *ποικίλη χάρις*, 1 Pet. iv. 10.

—*εἴτε προφητεῖαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*] The N. T. idea of the prophetic office is essentially identical with that of the O. T. Prophets are men who, inspired by the Spirit of God, and impelled to theopneustic discourse, partly remove the veil from the future (Rev. i. 3, xxii. 7, 10; John xi. 51; Acts xi. 27, 28, xxi. 10, 11, comp. 1 Pet. i. 10),—partly make known concealed facts of the present, either in discovering the secret counsel and will of God (Luke i. 67 ff.; Acts xiii. 1 f.; Eph. iii. 5), or in disclosing the hidden thoughts of man (1 Cor. xiv. 24, 25), and dragging into light his unknown deeds (Matt. xxvi. 68; Mark xiv. 65; Luke xxii. 64; John iv. 19),—partly dispense to their hearers instruction, comfort, exhortation in animated, powerfully impassioned language going far beyond the wonted limits of the capacity for teaching which, although spiritual, still confines itself within the forms of reason (Matt. vii. 28, 29; Luke xxiv. 19; John vii. 40; Acts xv. 32; 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 4, 31). The O. T. prophet had to legitimate his mission by miracles (Mark vi. 15; Luke vii. 16, xxiv. 19; John vi. 14, ix. 17). On the other hand, since the termination of the O. T. prophetic office by Christ, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh (Acts ii. 17, 18), while on one side the prophetic authority and affluence of gifts passed over to the apostles, on the other the latter at least passed over in the form of charismatic endowment to the entire church as well, whereupon prediction and miracle-working, *προφητεία* and *ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων*, 1 Cor. xii. 10, were separated and assigned to different individuals. Hence it is apparent why all apostles indeed are called prophets, Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, but all prophets are not apostles or men endowed with other charisms than *προφητεία*, Eph. iv. 11. The interpretation, followed by Zwingli, Calvin, and nearly all older Lutheran expositors, which made *προφητεία* to consist in the gift of expounding the O. T. books, especially the prophetic writings, has since Baumgarten been rightly aban-



doned, and at present may be regarded as obsolete. It may, indeed, appeal to the classical use of *προφητεύειν* (comp. Valcken. on *Herodotus*, vii. 111), according to which οἱ προφητεύοντες τοῦ θεοῦ are those “qui Dei responsa per mulierem ut Delphis edita fatidicam interpretarentur.” *προφήτης* is therefore = *interpres sc. oraculorum divinorum*. But this interpretation finds no support in the N. T., where the prophets appear, in harmony with the nature of the case, as interpreters of divine revelations given to themselves by direct inspiration, although, no doubt, these revelations, as the case may be, might join on to the Holy Scriptures. But even in the latter case the prophets employed the power of independent *prophetic* exposition, not that of mere exposition of *the prophets*. Comp. the relation of the Apocalypse to the O. T. prophets. Respecting the χάρισμα προφητείας, see Neander, *History of Planting*, etc., I. 38. 133; Löhe, *Aphorismen über die N. T. Aemter*. V. p. 34 ff.—κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως is explained by the most considerable modern expositors as a mathematical expression = κατὰ μέτρον πίστεως, *secundum proportionem fidei*, namely, of the subjective *measure of faith*, by which the different degrees of prophetic inspiration and the capacity for theopneustic discourse are conditioned. But, in the first place, this cannot be said of the prophetic gift, in so far as it is a purely supernatural charisma of prediction, for this takes place indeed κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως, but not κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. And even in so far as the prophetic gift appears as a gift of inspired teaching, comfort, and exhortation, still the prophetic instinct that raises it above ordinary διδασκαλία and παράκλησις is not to be viewed as absolutely dependent on the individual's measure of faith, but even here a miraculous access of pneumatic elevation may take place, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. In any case, it must be maintained that the more or less energetic exercise of the other gifts mentioned by the apostle in the present passage is conditioned by the measure of faith of the individual possessing them in a far higher degree than the greater or less power of prophetic utterance, so that it is impossible to see why the apostle specially makes prophecy dependent on the μέτρον πίστεως. Moreover, there is no room at all for this explanation, if we take the sentences: κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ κτλ., not as specifying the measure and sphere, but as honorary

sentences. I may, indeed, say that one possesses his *χάρισμα* in the measure of his *πίστις*. But I cannot require him to exercise it in the measure of his *πίστις*, partly because it is self-evident that he will be able to exercise and will exercise it only in the measure of this *πίστις*; and because, on the other hand, he is even bound to strive not merely after an ever-increasing measure of faith, but also after a more and more energetic exercise of his charismatic talents. It would then be necessary to suppose that the *προφήτης* is here exhorted not so much to the employment of his measure of faith in prophecy, but merely to keep himself within the limits of his *πίστις*, lest his elevated mood of feeling mingle with the impulses of carnal excitement, and fly beyond the mark. But, in fact, subjective *πίστις*, precisely as invariably imperfect, furnishes no sure safeguard against such confusion and commingling of the spiritual and carnal elements in prophecy. This can only be said of objective *πίστις*, i.e. not of the *fides qua creditur*, but only of the *fides quae creditur*. We must revert, therefore, to the older interpretation, maintained in modern days by Flatt, Klee, Glöckler, Schrader, Köllner, O. v. Gerlach, Umbreit, Bisping, Besser, according to which *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως* is to be explained by *pro congruentia cum doctrina fidei*, and the prophets are admonished to remain subject in their theopneustic discourses to the *norma et regula fidei Christianae*.<sup>1</sup> How necessary such an exhortation was, especially as regards prophecy, passages like Matt. xxiv. 11, 24, 1 Thess. v. 19-21, 1 Tim. iv. 1, 1 John iv. 1, may be enough to evince. In reality, the only argument of weight brought against this interpretation is drawn from the expression *μέτρον πίστεως*, ver. 3. But to pass by the consideration that the ordinary explanation of this phrase does not seem to us at all correct, it is impossible to see why the apostle must necessarily have used *ἀναλογία πίστεως* in the same sense. The very substitution of *ἀναλογία* for *μέτρον* might far rather at once suggest a different idea, and the notion of *πίστις* is in fact qualified differently, once by the notion of *μέτρον*, again by that of *ἀναλογία*. Rightly, therefore, Luther: "If one has prophecy,

<sup>1</sup> Respecting this objective sense of *πίστις* in the N. T., comp. Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* I. p. 17. If we would retain the subjective meaning in the present passage, it would then be necessary at least to think of the faith of the Christian church *in abstracto*, which precisely as a collective faith is also the normal faith.

let it be like (*i.e.* in harmony, congruent with) the faith." "Omnino in fide, quae creditur (sic enim vocant Theologi), mirabili analogia congruunt inter se omnia capita; et quivis articulus, de quo quaestio incidit, ad articulos jam firmiter cognitos dijudicari, ad Dictum scripturae liquido explicatum interpretatio ceterorum exigi debet. Estque haec analogia ipsius scripturae et fidei, quae creditur," Bengel.

—εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ] Luther, after Chrysostom: "Has one any office, let him wait on it." In this signification of any official function, any ecclesiastical office in general, *διακονία* stands in 1 Cor. xii. 5; Eph. iv. 12. But, in the first place, *specific* administrations and functions are mentioned here in every other case, and again *διακονία* in this general sense would especially embrace the directly following *διδασκαλία*. Just as little is *διακονία* to be referred to the office of evangelical teaching. So Theodoret: *διακονίαν δὲ (sc. καλεῖ ὁ Παῦλος) τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος λειτουργίαν*. No doubt the apostles as preachers of the gospel are called *διάκονοι* or *ὑπηρέται Χριστοῦ*, 1 Cor. iii. 5, iv. 1, comp. Rom. xi. 13; Acts xx. 24. Still the idea of the *διακονία τοῦ Χριστοῦ* of itself is more comprehensive than that of the office of Christian teaching, Acts xii. 25, Rom. xv. 31, on which account in that narrow sense Paul must at least have described the *διακονία* as a *διακονία τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, Eph. iii. 7, Col. i. 23; *τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης*, 2 Cor. iii. 6; *τοῦ λόγου*, Acts vi. 4, or the like. The *διακονία*, therefore, here is to be referred to the specific office of the *διάκονοι* (Acts vi. 1 ff.; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11), which had to do with the management of the external affairs of the church, bodily care for the poor, sick, etc. Comp. *ἀντιλήψεις*, 1 Cor. xii. 28. The apostle here adduces definite church-offices alongside free, indefinite charisms, because the point in hand here is not the antithesis of office and church, but simply the wealth of charismatic gifts bestowed on the members of the church itself for purposes of church-service. For this reason, while he indeed mentions the office of the diaconate, he really means thereby simply the special gift included in the office and designed for it, the gift which he assumes every one to possess who has entered on the corresponding office. Comp. a similar juxtaposition of offices and gifts in 1 Cor. xii. 28. As therefore from these passages it is certainly impossible to gather directly the divinely-

ordained jurisdiction of office over church (not even from Eph. iv. 11, 12, comp. ver. 16, and the parallel passage, 1 Cor. xii. 28), so also inversely it cannot be inferred from them that office is to be regarded merely as a creation and outcome of church-life, so that merely the charisms themselves would have to be viewed as of divine gift and appointment, but the fixed church-organization founded upon them as a mere human arrangement, and especially the occupants of ecclesiastical office as mere casual agents of the church. The divinely-willed jurisdiction of office over church follows rather as matter of course, even to say nothing of the divine institution of the apostolate, from the divinely-fixed subordination of the church to the divinely-given Word and Sacrament, as the necessary means, by divine order, of its birth, growth, and preservation. The church, thus subordinated to the office of the Word, is therefore just as much under obligation, as it is authorized by divine command, to send forth from its midst bearers of the various offices in the way prescribed, especially having due regard to the charisms bestowed by God. But the humble limitation of every one's labour to the special sphere corresponding with his peculiar charisma, to which in *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει* the apostle exhorts, will of necessity preserve from the *ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν*, and reduce to practice the *φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστω ὡς ὃ θεὸς ἐμέρισε μέτρον πίστεως*; for one of the most characteristic and wide-spread manifestations of human pride is unwarranted *ἄλλοτριοεπισκοπεῖν*, 1 Pet. iv. 15. When the apostle, on the other hand, in *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ἐν ἀπλότητι, ἐν σπουδῇ, ἐν ἡλαρότητι*, exhorts to the carrying on of every kind of church labour in the right *spirit* and *disposition*, the qualifications appended, arising from the peculiar form of the labour, are such that the exhortation, to limit oneself to the labour corresponding with one's gift, is always implied as their basis = "let the prophet wait on the prophetic office, and let him do so indeed *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*," etc.

—*εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ*] As here, so also in 1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. iv. 11 (comp. Acts xiii. 1), the *διδάσκαλος* is distinguished from the *προφήτης*. In the first place, *διδάσκειν* does not exhaust the entire sphere of prophecy, but forms merely one element in it; and again the calm, rational exposition of the *διδάσκαλος*, in which he speaks, as Chrysostom on 1 Cor. xii. 28

describes it, ἐξ οἰκείας διανοίας, is to be distinguished from the state of rapture of the προφήτης, which determined as well the form of his διδασκαλία. A further distinction lay in this, that for διδασκαλία, but not for προφητεία, a definite church-office existed,—that of the ἐπίσκοπος, ποιμήν, or πρεσβύτερος, who, although not always (comp. ver. 8), yet commonly (comp. Eph. iv. 11), and especially later in the apostolic age (comp. 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 9), was likewise διδάσκαλος.

—εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει] Didaskalia addresses itself to the understanding, exhortation παράκλησις to the heart and will. Both charisms might, of course, be united in one person (comp. Tit. i. 9). But a predominant talent was found in different individuals for the one or the other form of communication. Further, as the προφήτης might exercise didaskalia, so he might exercise paraklesis (1 Cor. xiv. 31); but in this case both one and the other was done in a manner characteristic of a prophet. As the apostle is here only concerned with the charisma and its exercise, not with ordained offices, and as alongside the ordained teaching and exhorting presbyters there were others within and without the church-congregation who taught or exhorted, in harmony with his purpose he here adduces διδασκαλία and παράκλησις as two distinct gifts. Moreover, the gift of paraklesis seems often to have been attached to the public reading of portions of O. T. Scripture, comp. Luke iv. 20, 21, and especially Acts xiii. 15.<sup>1</sup>

—ὁ μεταδιδούς ἐν ἀπλότητι] Some expositors would apply ὁ μεταδιδούς, like ὁ προϊστάμενος, ὁ ἐλεῶν, to different branches of the diaconate. But μεταδιδόναι is to communicate of one's own, comp. Luke iii. 11, Eph. iv. 28, and εὐμετάδοτος, 1 Tim. vi. 18. On the other hand, to dispense, distribute of another's means, entrusted to one for this purpose, is διαδιδόναι, Acts iv. 35. Had Paul, therefore, been thinking of almsgiving by the deacons from the church-chest, he would have written ὁ διαδιδούς. Moreover, the exhortation to simplicity clearly agrees far better with the idea of private than official beneficence. But that even for

Comp., too, Justin, *M. Apol.* i. c. 67: καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λειτουργίᾳ ἡμῖν πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μινόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεσθαι καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκονται, μέχρις ἰγχωρίῃ. Εἴτα παυσανεύου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προϊστάμενος διὰ λόγου τὴν νοουσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται.

the efficient exercise of the former a special practical charisma is requisite is certain. Seeing that the diaconate was not confined to care for the poor, and that the practice of *μεταδιδόναι* is distinct from that of mere *διαδιδόναι*, the charisma of private beneficence might very well be mentioned alongside that of the diaconate, whereas the division of the diaconate itself, already mentioned, into its different departments, which even then are not exhausted, seems little relevant. *ἐν ἀπλότῃ* = *ἀπλῶς*, *candide*, *in simplicity of heart, sincerity*, which thinks only of fulfilling a brother's duty and hastening to the succour of the needy, while excluding all ambitious effort, all ostentation, mercenariness, and regard to recompense or other advantage. As to *ἀπλοῦς* meaning only simplex, and being used therefore in *bonam partem*, *probus*, *ἀκακος*; *εὐήθης*, on the other hand, in *malam partem* = *stultus*, *sensu malo*, comp. Fritzsche here, III. p. 62 sqq.; *ἀπλότης*, therefore, is not to be interpreted by *liberalitas*, *liberality*. Well, therefore, Luther: "Does any one give, let him give simply." Comp. Matt. vi. 2 f.

—ὁ προϊστάμενος ἐν σπουδῇ] In the train of Bengel ("ὁ προϊστάμενος, qui alios curat et in clientela habet") and Vitranga, *Synag.* p. 503, and appealing to the meaning of *προϊσταμαι*, *προστάτης* in Greek = "legal patron of the *μέτοικοι*, the appointed guardian,"<sup>1</sup> Meyer (so, too, Borger) has advanced the opinion<sup>2</sup> that ὁ προϊστάμενος in the present passage = *patron of strangers*, i.e. he whose charge it is to care for strangers. The proof of this meaning—one quite undemonstrable in the N. T.—is supposed to be furnished by Rom. xvi. 2, *προστάτις* there being = *patroness of strangers*, and it being evident from the present passage that this function belonged to the diaconate. But *προστάτις* there (comp. Fritzsche), as the appended genitives and the verb *ἐγενήθη* indicate, denotes not a standing office, but a spontaneous service of love = *patrona*, *fautrix*, *protectress*. According to others, ὁ προϊστάμενος is to be understood of any one in authority in any relation whatever. But the *church*-reference, along with the mention of charismatic gifts, being the most probable, and ὁ προϊστάμενος occurring elsewhere in the N. T. (1 Thess. v. 12, comp. 1 Tim. v. 17, iii. 4, 5) and in ecclesiastical antiquity (comp. Justin, *M. Apol.* i. c. 67, ὁ προεστώς) as a standing designation

<sup>1</sup> Passow, *sub voce*.

<sup>2</sup> But he has retracted it in the second and following editions.

of church authority, otherwise called ἐπίσκοπος, πρεσβύτερος, ποιμήν, it is preferable in the present passage to interpret ὁ προϊστάμενος, with most expositors, of the definite office of *church overseers*, comp. Rothe, *Anfänge der christlichen Kirche*, pp. 167, 189 f. The charism requisite for this office is the χάρισμα κυβερνήσεως, 1 Cor. xii. 28. At all events, the apostle here treats it exclusively from this point of view, *didaskalia* having been just spoken of, and both προϊστασθαι and σπουδή alluding to a form of practical activity. This element of practical activity is the one common to the προϊστάμενος with the μεταδιδούς and the ἐλεῶν, and explains the juxtaposition of the three forms of labour. The fact of the highest church-office being here placed among spontaneous and comparatively subordinate forms of church-activity cannot be accepted as decisive against our interpretation, the apostle here being concerned neither with the distinction of office and charisma, nor yet with an exhaustive enumeration and definite classification of the latter, which classification does not seem to be strictly carried out even in 1 Cor. xii. 28, Eph. iv. 11. Rather in the present passage there was reason for adducing the various charisms promiscuously, despite the difference of value among them, in order by this very means to afford no countenance whatever to ὑπερφρονεῖν.

—ὁ ἐλεῶν ἐν ἰλαρότητι] In the train of Grotius ("ἐλεοῦντας, hic vocat, qui aegrotis aderant, quos posterior aetas parabolanos vocavit"), Meyer explains (in the first, not in the second and following editions) ὁ ἐλεῶν of the definite office of *sick-attendant*, as a branch of the diaconate. The evidence for this opinion consists merely in the opinion, itself without evidence, that the two preceding appellations, ὁ μεταδιδούς, ὁ προϊστάμενος, are *official* appellations, and indeed distinct branches of the diaconal office. Rather the reference is to the activity of the *merciful* man generally, manifesting itself in diversified spheres, and the field of the ἐλεῶν is wider and more comprehensive than that of the μεταδιδούς, comp. e.g. Luke x. 33 ff., especially ver. 37. Perhaps in ὁ ἐλεῶν, in contradistinction from ὁ μεταδιδούς, a predominant reference may be intended, not to the poor, but to the sick, wounded, prisoners, etc. With the exhortation to ἰλαρότης, *cheerfulness*, which, as an evidence of spontaneousness, alone imparts real value to the work of mercy both in itself and as concerns the recipient, comp. 2 Cor. ix. 7, Phil. 14. "Ut enim aegrum vel

alio quovis modo afflictum nihil magis solatur, quam ubi videt alacres ac promptos ad opem sibi ferendam animos: ita si tristitiam cernat in eorum vultu a quibus juvatur, id in contumeliam suam accipiet," Calvin.

Vv. 9–21. Upon the exhortation: *μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν*, elaborated by the apostle in vv. 3–8, follow now other exhortations to various Christian virtues, which, on the whole of a mixed nature, are only connected with one another in particulars by the inner affinity of their subject-matter. At the head stands *ἀγάπη* as the *πλήρωμα νόμου*, xiii. 10, the *σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος*, Col. iii. 14. *ἀγάπη* also most easily joins on to the last-mentioned special charisma of *ἔλεος* in the preceding verse, as the invariable and essential basis of the latter.

Ver. 9. *ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος*] *sc. ἔστω*. See the same ellipsis in Heb. xiii. 4, 5. The ellipsis of the imperative of *εἰμί* in Greek is certainly very rare, but not unknown, comp. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. der gr. Spr.* II. p. 41, and the examples quoted by him from Hom. *Il.* xiii. 5. 95, *αἰδώς, Ἀργεῖοι* (*sc. ἔστω*); Sophocl. *Oed. Col.* v. 1480, *Ἰλαος, ὦ δαίμων, Ἰλαος* (*sc. ἴσθι*). *ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος* appears also in 2 Cor. vi. 6, as in 1 Pet. i. 22 *φιλαδελφία ἀνυπόκριτος*, where this qualification withal finds its explanation in the following *ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν*: "Est enim dictu difficile, quam sint ingeniosi omnes fere homines ad fingendam quam vere non habent caritatem. Neque enim aliis modo mentiuntur, sed sibi met quoque imponunt, dum sibi persuadent, non male abs se amari quos non modo negligunt, sed re ipsa abjiciunt. Itaque Paulus non aliam esse caritatem hic pronuntiat, quam quæ sit omni simulatione vacua: sibi vero facile quilibet testis esse potest, an nihil habeat in recessu cordis, quod caritati adversetur," Calvin. Like *ἀγάπη*, so also, according to 1 Tim. i. 5, 2 Tim. i. 5, its root, *πίστις*, is to be *ἀνυπόκριτος*.

—*ἀποστύγοντες τὸ πονηρόν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ*] The apostle continues with an anacoluthon, as if in what precedes, instead of *ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος*, he had written *ἀγαπᾶτε ἀνυπόκριτος*, which, indeed, as to the sense is implied in the words. Comp. 2 Cor. i. 7: *καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* (= *καὶ ἐλπίζομεν βεβαίως ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*) *εἰδότες, ὅτι κτλ.*, Heb. xiii. 5: *ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος* (*ἀφιλάργυροι περιπατεῖτε*) *ἀρκούμενοι τοῖς παροῦσιν*, comp. Winer, p. 733. But we may also, and this



indeed more in keeping with the character of the language, by supplying ἔστε take the participles and adjectives as distinct precepts, so that after ἀνυπόκρ. a period would be put, and after διώκοντες, ver. 13, another period. So *usually* Meyer, and Lachmann, ed. maj. On the other hand, in the ed. min. Lachmann punctuates vv. 9–14: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. ἀποστυγούντες τὸ πονηρὸν . . . τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς. Thus he connects the participles and adjectives in vv. 9–13 with εὐλογεῖτε. But, in the first place, these cannot in the main as to their substance be suitably and naturally regarded as mere preliminary definitions of εὐλογεῖτε. And again, it was manifestly the expression τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες, ver. 13, that called forth the exhortation εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, ver. 14, which therefore cannot have been already present to the apostle's mind in ἀποστυγούντες τὸ πονηρὸν. According to Chrysostom, ἀποστυγεῖν is meant to be stronger than στυγεῖν = σφόδρα μισεῖν; according to Theodor. = ἄγαν μισεῖν; according to Theophyl. = ἐκ ψυχῆς μισεῖν. So, too, many modern expositors and lexicographers. But the examples adduced by Fritzsche here show at least so much, that this intensive meaning of the preposition is not necessarily to be accepted,<sup>1</sup> and that it is simpler to suppose that ἀπό in ἀποστυγεῖν merely expressly brings forward the aversative force already lying in στυγεῖν, like *horrere aliquid* and *abhorrere aliquid* in Latin. Then, to the notion of turning away implied in ἀποστυγεῖν, answers that of turning to contained in κολλᾶσθαι = *abhorrere* and *adhaerescere*, comp. LXX. Ps. cxix. 31. Without universal turning from what is morally evil and to what is morally good, *unfeigned* love is inconceivable. τὸ πονηρὸν therefore = *turpitude*, τὸ ἀγαθόν = *honestas* in general. Limiting explanations, such as what is *hurtful* or *useful* to a neighbour, *malignity* or *benignity* of disposition, or the evil and good that usually shows itself *in the same man* simultaneously, are out of place.

Ver. 10. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι] “*in regard to brotherly love, (be ye) affectionate one to another.*” Respecting this dative of reference, comp. on iv. 19. φιλαδελφία, Christian brotherly love, forms a subordinate notion to ἀγάπη, love in general, 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7. φιλόστοργος, properly = ὃς φιλεῖ τὴν στοργήν, hence *tenorously*

<sup>1</sup> In opposition to Fritzsche, Meyer again declares for the *intensive* meaning.

*loving, affectionate*, used especially of parental and filial love, here in regard to *φιλαδελφία* as a designation of the love of brothers and sisters. “*στοργή, amor spiritualis fratrum*,” Bengel.

—*τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι*] “in showing honour preceding one another.” *φιλαδελφία* has its inevitable expression in the anticipatory *τιμῇ* to be shown to an *ἀδελφός*. It is usually said elsewhere, *προηγείσθαι τινι* or *τινος*. Here it is construed with the *accusative* of the person, comp. Luke xxii. 47: *προήρχετο αὐτούς*. So, too, *προπορεύεσθαι, προθεῖν τινά*; Lat. *antecedere, antecire, praecire aliquem*. But it is not to be explained: *se ipso potiores ducere alios*. This would be: *τῇ τιμῇ ἡγούμενοι ἀλλήλους ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν* (comp. Phil. ii. 3), or even: *τῇ τιμῇ ἡγούμενοι (ἄγοντες) ἀλλήλους πρὸ ἑαυτῶν*. *Προηγείσθαι*, in opposition to *ἔπεσθαι*, is rather: “to precede as a guide, to guide, to precede,” 2 Macc. iv. 40. If the notion “to precede as a guide” be pressed, it is to be explained: “giving to one another an *example* in showing honour.” But if merely the element of *preceding* generally be emphasized, it may be said that in preceding another one anticipates him, in which case Theophylact’s interpretation by *προφθάνειν ἕτερον τὸν ἕτερον* or *προλαμβάνειν ἀλλήλους ἐν τῷ ἀλλήλους τιμᾶν*, that of the It. and Vulg.: “honore invicem praevenientes,” and Luther’s: “let one anticipate another in showing honour,” which is especially appropriate to the context, seems to be justified. Chrysostom’s interpretation by *τῇ τιμῇ νικᾶν* is more unlikely.

Ver. 11. *τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί*] “in regard to zeal not sluggish.” No reason exists for explaining *σπουδή* in any limited sense of zeal in preaching and disseminating the gospel, or of zeal in Christian devotion. Rather it is zeal in the discharge of any Christian duty whatever. Hence strikingly, though not literally, Luther: “Be not lazy as to what you ought to do.”

—*τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες*] “burning in spirit,” opposite of *τῇ σπουδῇ ὀκνηροί*, and climax of *τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί*. The zeal is to be a glowing zeal. Here also (comp. on viii. 4) *πνεῦμα* signifies neither man’s spirit simply, nor God’s Spirit simply, but man’s spirit penetrated by God’s Spirit. Comp. *ζέων τῷ πνεύματι*, Acts xviii. 25, also 1 Thess. v. 19. On the regular, uncontracted form *ζέοντες*, with *lesser verbs* in *έω*, comp. Buttmann, *Ausf. gr. Sprachl.* I. p. 497. *ζέω* is also found of *mental actuation* in the classics.

—*τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες*] This *lect. rec.*, preponderantly authen-

ticated by A B, Cod. Sinait. D<sup>\*\*</sup> E L, most of the minuskels, as well as by nearly all versions and Fathers (comp. Reiche, *Comm. crit.* p. 70 ff.), is rightly retained in modern days by Matthiæ, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 128 sq., and defended by most expositors. The difficulty arising from the occurrence of such a *general* sentiment in the midst of *specific* precepts, may be removed by the consideration that τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες is taken as the scope and limitation of the two preceding exhortations. Glowing zeal is to stand at the service, not of the *ego*, but of the Lord, by which it is guarded against all fanatical excess. As the δούλος Χριστοῦ is to act and labour not as ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, Eph. vi. 6, Col. iii. 22, so, conversely, he is to act and labour in every relation of life not in *fleshly* zeal, but μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου, 1 Pet. iii. 15. Moreover, on the surface the conjunction of πνεῦμα and κύριος was one that readily suggested itself. Luther in the present passage, after the less authenticated reading τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες (so chiefly D<sup>\*</sup> F G, Griesbach), translates: "Accommodate yourselves to the time." This reading, defended by Olshausen, Meyer, and Fritzsche, even for its own sake appears less appropriate. For a certain ambiguity always clings to the expression δουλεύειν τῷ καιρῷ; and in accordance with a distinctly expressed, specifically Pauline idea, the Christian is an ἐλεύθερος in every respect, and merely a δούλος θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ, or even δικαιοσύνης, Rom. vi. 18, but not a δούλος ἀνθρώπων, 1 Cor. vii. 23, nor a δούλος καιροῦ. The applications, without danger even for Christians, which the apostle might have given to the ordinary maxim of natural worldly policy, *i.e.* to δουλεύειν, λατρεύειν τῷ καιρῷ, consisted either in the precept: to bear patiently the afflictions of the time,—but this were ὑπομένειν τὰς θλίψεις (see the following verse, τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, viii. 18); or, to await prudently the right moment for action,—but this were τηρεῖν τὸν καιρόν; or, instead of letting it slip by, to seize it eagerly,—but this were ἐξαγοράζεσθαι τὸν καιρόν, Eph. v. 16, Col. iv. 5, in which passages Luther, led astray by the reading in question in the present passage, in violation of idiom, likewise translated: "Accommodate yourselves to the time." That τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες suits the present passage very well, Meyer concedes. Only he supposes that copyists would more readily stumble at δουλεύειν τῷ καιρῷ than at the very common δουλεύειν τῷ κυρίῳ, comp.

Acts xx. 19 ; Eph. vi. 7 ; Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 18 ; Col. iii. 24, *al.* But an alteration made by design and upon reflection should on no account be supposed, as the confounding of κύριος and καιρός occurs elsewhere in manuscripts ; comp. Fritzsche here.

Ver. 12. Like the three exhortations of the preceding verse, the three exhortations of this verse are internally connected ; and as τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύειν indicates the limit and scope of fervent zeal, so τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖν indicates the source of strength for hopeful endurance. τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες] No doubt we say just as well χαίρειν τινί, *lactari re* (comp. LXX. Prov. xvii. 19), as χαίρειν ἐπὶ τινι, *lactari de re*, Luke i. 14 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 6. But here the summons meant is not to joy *at* hope present amid afflictions, the dative thus denoting the object of the joy, but to joy *by means* or *in virtue of* hope. The dative is therefore either to be taken simply instrumentally, or serves to indicate the ground, comp. on xi. 20, and Kühner, *Ausf. gr. d. gr. Spr.* II. p. 252 f. Christian hope is the ground of Christian joy, just as heathen despair is the ground of heathen sorrow, 1 Thess. iv. 13. But the sure, abiding ground of this hope is not the promise of earthly help, but the promise of heavenly salvation, of the bestowal of future δόξα, v. 2, viii. 24. "Gaudium non modo est affectus, sed etiam officium christianorum," Bengel.

—τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες] not indeed = *enduring tribulation*, after the analogy of the phrases ὑποστῆναί τινι and μένειν τινι, but = *steadfast in, or, amid tribulation*. Luther: "patient in tribulation." The dative indicates the state in which one does something, Winer, p. 271, and stands without the preposition ἐν for the sake of parallelism with the preceding and following datives. ἐλπίς begets ὑπομονή, viii. 25 ; although conversely also, in harmony with the uniform experience of the inner life, by means of ὑπομονή tested and approved, ἐλπίς itself is perfected, comp. v. 4.

—τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες] comp. Luke xviii. 7 ; Acts i. 14 ; Eph. vi. 18 ; Col. iv. 2 ; 1 Thess. v. 17. "Caeterum ne fatigemur, optimum est remedium precandi assiduitas," Calvin.

Ver. 13. After the general exhortation to aspire after unfeigned love and after what is good, while avoiding what is evil, ver. 9, there followed a self-contained series of specific precepts, shown to be such by the external symmetry of the construction. For upon the parainesis, with two clauses, ver. 10, followed two with three clauses, vv. 11, 12, which are again, in ver. 13, concluded

by one with two clauses. Then with ver. 14 the participial construction ceases, and with the following imperative a new form of construction and course of exhortation begins. *ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες*] Thomas M. remarks rightly: *Οὐ μόνον κοινωνῶ σοι τοῦ δέινος ἀντὶ τοῦ συμμετέχω σοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ κοινωνῶ σοι ὧν ἔχω ἀντὶ τοῦ μεταδίδωμι*. For *κοινωνεῖν* has both an intransitive and transitive meaning = *to partake*, or = *to impart*. Now in all other N. T. passages the intransitive meaning prevails, comp. Rom. xv. 27; Phil. iv. 15; 1 Tim. v. 22; Heb. ii. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 John 11; and *συγκοινωνεῖν*, Eph. v. 11; Phil. iv. 14; Rev. xviii. 4. Only as to Gal. vi. 6 and the present passage can there be any doubt. But even as to the Galatian passage, comp. Meyer in Com. here. Thus even in the present verse the intransitive meaning has strong presumption in its favour, and we should thus have to explain: "having fellowship," or "partaking in the necessities of the saints," *i.e.* behaving as if they were your own, *i.e.* remedying them. On its own account, also, this explanation is more natural and simple than the active sense of the verb, which would rather have led us to expect the phrase *τοῖς χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἁγίοις κοινωνοῦντες*, because we impart indeed to the needy, but not to needs. No doubt in Acts xx. 34 we read *αὐτοὶ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ταῖς χρείαις μου καὶ τοῖς οὖσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ὑπηρέτησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐταί*. But when, with Winer, p. 722, and Fritzsche there, it is wished to take *καὶ τοῖς μετ' ἐμοῦ* as identical with *καὶ ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ὄντων μετ' ἐμοῦ*, it is to be observed that there the verb *ὑπηρετεῖν* is used, not *κοινωνεῖν*; and we say, indeed, "*to serve* a necessity," or "remedy it," but not "*impart* to a necessity." Charity to poor saints, as we know from other passages, lay very near the apostle's heart, Acts xxiv. 17; 1 Cor. xvi.; 2 Cor. viii, ix.; Gal. ii. 10. "Sanctos autem specialiter juvare praecepit: nam tametsi ad universum hominum genus extendere se debeat caritas nostra, singulari tamen affectu debet amplecti domesticos fidei, qui arctiori nobiscum vinculo conjuncti sunt," Calvin. And in this he followed the pattern of the living God, *ὃς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν*, 1 Tim. iv. 10. The reading *μνείαις* instead of *χρείαις*, supplied by D<sup>ss</sup> F G, *al.* Clar. Boern. Codd. lat. in Rufinus and several Fathers, and which is refuted at once by the following *τὴν φιλοξορίαν διώκοντες*, manifestly owes its intentional or unintentional origin to the later reverence for martyrs. For the yearly anniversaries of the

martyrs were called αἱ μνῆται or αἱ μνήμαι τῶν ἁγίων (μαρτύρων) (comp. τὰ γενέσια τῶν μαρτύρων); and τὰς μνείας τῶν μαρτύρων τελεῖν, ταῖς μνήμαις (μνείαις) τῶν ἁγίων (μαρτύρων), *memoriis sanctorum communicare*, are modes of expression often occurring in the Fathers, comp. Matthiä, ed. min., Fritzsche here, and Suicer, *Thes. eccles.* II. 372. "Memorable est, Paulum, ubi expresse de officiis e communione sanctorum fluentibus agit, nil tamen de defunctis usquam ponere," Bengel.

—τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες] An exhortation frequently met with in the N. T. (Heb. xiii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 9; also 1 Tim. v. 10; Tit. i. 8), which was readily suggested by the circumstances of those days, especially by the absence of public places of entertainment in ancient times. φιλοξενία, as the outcome of φιλαδελφία, ver. 10, consisted in the hospitable reception and entertainment of brethren on a journey. "διώκοντες, *sectantes*, ut hospites non modo admittatis, sed quaeratis," Bengel.

Ver. 14. The saying of this verse reminds of Matt. v. 44 (comp. Luke vi. 28), which word of the Lord may here have been floating before the apostle's mind. It is said, indeed, in the gospel: εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς. But, in the first place, Paul was led to choose διώκειν by the διώκειν immediately preceding; again, καταρᾶσθαι itself is simply a species of διώκειν, and εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς therefore includes εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς (comp. the subjoined εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε); and finally, in converse order, in Matthew upon εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς follows the allied προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν . . . διωκόντων ὑμᾶς. Moreover, the idea of a reference to such an express saying of the Lord is supported by other corresponding references in the apostolic epistles, alluding for the most part to the Sermon on the Mount, comp. Rom. ii. 19; 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13, vii. 10; Jas. iv. 9, v. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 9, 14, iv. 14. "διώκοντας, *persequentes*, Christi causa, καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε, *neque maledicite*, ne animo quidem," Bengel. Comp., too, Luke xxiii. 34; Acts vii. 60.

Ver. 15. The infinitives χαίρειν, κλαίειν are used (= χαίρειν, κλαίειν ὑμᾶς δεῖ), as elsewhere frequently in language of precise command, instead of the imperatives χαίρετε, κλαίετε, Phil. iii. 16; Winer, p. 397. The contrast of χαίρειν and κλαίειν is found elsewhere frequently, John xvi. 30; 1 Cor. vii. 30. With the sentiment, comp. Eccclus. vii. 34: μὴ ὑστέρει ἀπὸ κλαίωντων καὶ

μετὰ πενθοῦντων πένθησον. Very truly and strikingly Chrysostom early observed: καίτοιγε ἐκείνο φιλοσοφωτέρας δέεται ψυχῆς, τὸ χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἡ φύσις αὐτῇ κατορθοῖ, καὶ οὐδεὶς οὕτω λίθινος, ὅς οὐ κλαίει τὸν ἐν συμφοραῖς ὄντα· ἐκείνο δὲ γεναίας σφόδρα δέεται ψυχῆς, ὥστε τῷ εὐδοκιοῦντι μὴ μόνον μὴ φθονεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνήδεσθαι. Well, also, Bengel: "Fletui proprie opponitur risus: sed hoc loco (uti 1 Cor. vii. 30) *gaudium* dicitur, non *risus*, qui Christianis in mundo minus convenit."

Ver. 16. The question is, how the participles *φρονούντες* and *συναπαγόμενοι* are to be construed? We may make them depend on the preceding infinitives *χαίρειν*, *κλαίειν*, used instead of imperatives. But with ver. 16 begins a new sentence, not merely one more exactly defining and illustrating the import of ver. 15. Or we may construe them with the following *μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς*. So Lachmann, Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 2 sqq., and Meyer (in the first, not in the second and subsequent editions). But this construction seems forced, both in itself, and especially, because then the participles in vv. 17-19 also must be made to depend on *γίνεσθε*. It is therefore better to supply an *ἔστε*, and understand the participles here *φρονούντες* (comp. on ver. 9) imperatively. So also Meyer in the second and subsequent editions. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους *φρονούντες*] The love from which rejoicing with the joy and suffering with the suffering of others springs, is withal the source of mutual brotherly concord. With τὸ αὐτὸ *φρονεῖν* = to be of one mind, like-minded, comp. xv. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2. It is true that in these passages is found either simply τὸ αὐτὸ *φρονεῖν* or τὸ αὐτὸ *φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις*, to be of the same mind *one with another*. But εἰς ἀλλήλους, *towards one another*, i.e. in such a relation to one another that one, looking at the other, endeavours to be in sympathy with him, says essentially the same thing. There is therefore no reason to depart from the invariable meaning of the formula τὸ αὐτὸ *φρονεῖν*, and to take τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους *φρονεῖν* as enjoining not *concord* but *modesty*, in the sense: "so minded towards one another, that the one places himself on a level with the other, and ascribes no more to himself than to him." Nor does the following *μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες* make this acceptance necessary. These words do not so much contain a more precise explanation of what immediately precedes. Rather their occasion

is partly outward in the expression *φρονεῖν*, partly inward in the fact that upon the injunction of concord the prohibition of arrogance follows pertinently, inasmuch as arrogance is a main source of dissension.

—*μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες*] *not aspiring after high things*, comp. xi. 20. *τὰ ὑψηλά* are riches, honour, high position, etc.

—*ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι*] *συναπάγεσθαι*, *to be drawn away with*. The evil meaning of the word, “to be led away with, seduced to evil,” is neither implied in the word itself, nor finds place here, but follows occasionally from the context, Gal. ii. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 17. *συναπάγεσθαι*, with the dative of the *person*, means: “to be drawn away along with some one;” with the dative of the *thing*, “to be drawn away along with another by something,” so in the passages cited. If, then, we take *τοῖς ταπεινοῖς* as masculine (Luther: “*haltet euch herunter zu den Niedrigen*,” *keep down among the lowly*), we must interpret: “let yourselves be drawn away along with the lowly, namely, *εἰς τὴν ταπεινῶσιν αὐτῶν*, Jas. i. 10, to their lowliness.” But it yields the same sense, while linguistically more probable on account of the opposition to *τὰ ὑψηλά*, to take *τοῖς ταπεινοῖς* as neuter. The interpretation then is: “let yourselves be drawn away by lowliness, namely, *εἰς τὰ ταπεινά*, to what is lowly.” *τὰ ταπεινά* are the lower circumstances, conditions, and occupations of life, which like a strong force seize on men, and, as it were, draw them into their vortex, or carry them away along with themselves (*συν*). Now, humility lets this be done willingly, and instead of withdrawing, like the haughty disposition, from participation in what is lowly, is rather drawn away to it spontaneously.

—*μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς*] comp. on xi. 25. As arrogance makes itself known in *τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν*, so does it also in *φρόνιμον εἶναι παρ' ἑαυτῷ* as its most characteristic species. This self-conceit, scorning the opinion of others, is a special obstacle to *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*.

Ver. 17. Hitherto the apostle has chiefly (but comp. ver. 14) inculcated on believers, along with their duties to themselves, their duties as brethren one to another. Now, his glance is directed chiefly to those without, and he regulates the conduct of Christians in several points bearing specially on this relation, insisting mainly on the prohibition of self-revenge, and the precept to maintain peace and charity. *μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντι*



κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες] *sc. ἔστε.* *Repaying to no one*, be he Christian or non-Christian, Jew or Gentile, *evil with evil*. This specifically Christian exhortation (1 Thess. v. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 23, iii. 9; Matt. v. 39) stands in direct opposition to the precepts, just as much of Gentile<sup>1</sup> as of Pharisaic (Matt. v. 38, 43) morals.

—προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων] LXX. Prov. iii. 4, differing, it is true, from the original text: καὶ προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Polycarp. *ep. ad Philippi*. c. 6: προνοοῦντες αἰεὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ἐνώπιον θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 21: προνοούμενοι καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον κυρίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον ἀνθρώπων. Hence is explained the origin in the present passage of the readings προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων and προνοούμενοι καλὰ οὐ μόνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, which certainly contain a gloss appropriate of itself. "Gemma non solum debet esse gemma, sed etiam bene sedere in annulo, ut splendor occurrat in oculos," Bengel. But Theophylact also rightly observes that Paul's exhortation has in view not *κενοδοξία*, but *ἀσκανδάλιστον καὶ ἀπρόσκοπον*, namely, *ἵνα μὴ παρέχωμεν καθ' ἡμῶν ἀφορμὰς τοῖς βουλομένοις*, comp. 1 Cor. x. 32. The apostle exhorts the church to be mindful of what is good, *i.e.* of an upright, honourable walk before the eyes or in the opinion of all men, *i.e.* not merely before Christians, but also before Jews and Gentiles. Whilst he is so concerned for their own reputation, he is withal in the last resort equally concerned for the honour of their God, who by the evil walk of His people is scandalized before unbelievers (Rom. ii. 24), and for their neighbours' salvation, which is furthered by the sight of their good walk, Matt. v. 16; 1 Cor. x. 33. Verbs expressing care for, like ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, προνοεῖσθαι, are construed not only with the genitive (1 Tim. v. 8), but also occasionally, as here, LXX. Prov. iii. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 21, with the accusative, comp. Kühner, *Ausf. Gr. der Spr.* II. p. 190. As to the reciprocal use of the deponent προνοεῖσθαι and the active form προνοεῖν (so 1 Tim. v. 8), comp. Passow, *s.v.*

Ver. 18. εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες] comp. Phil. iv. 5. Well Grotius: "Omnium amici

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Hermann on *Sophocl. Philoct.* v. 679: "Nec laudant Graeci, si quis iniquis aequus est, sed virtutem esse censent, aequis aequum, iniquum autem iniquis esse."

este, si fieri potest, si non potest utrimque, certe ex vestra parte amici este." By εἰ δυνατόν it is conceded that a case of the *objective* impossibility of εἰρηνεύειν may arise, chiefly where truth, right, and duty command resistance. But even in this case the guilt of violating the peace would lie not on our side, but on that of the opponent. τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν rejects all *subjective* limitation of εἰρηνεύειν, and therefore enjoins not so much an absolute keeping of the peace, as rather merely an absolute seeking of peace. Consequently, the apostolic utterance in this verse cannot be thrown in the teeth of the witnesses to truth who stand prepared for conflict. As that utterance, on the one side (τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν), certainly smites those who, instead of setting true peace, *i.e.* peace on the basis of truth, as the goal of their strife, find their happiness in discord for its own sake; so, on the other hand (εἰ δυνατόν), it smites just as heavily those who labour to preserve peace at any price, even that of truth. By the side of ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ must ever stand ἀγαπᾶν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, and the *ecclesia Christi* is not without reason here upon earth called an *ecclesia militans*. "Neque enim fieri potest, ut Christi militibus aeterna sit pax cum mundo, cujus princeps est Satan," Calvin. The formula: τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, *quantum ex vobis fieri potest*, "as regards what is done by you," is rare. More frequent are the phrases: τό γε ἐπ' ἐμοί, τοῦπ' ἐμέ, τὸ εἰς ἐμέ, τὸ κατ' ἐμέ, comp. i. 15, in Latin: *quantum in me est*.

Ver. 19. μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί] The harder man finds it to submit to the prohibition of self-revenge, the more easily he transgresses it, with so much the more appropriateness does the apostle here seek, by the urgent, winning address ἀγαπητοί, to impress it on his readers. "Et quoniam non facile frenum admittunt qui semel correpti sunt hoc impotenti affectu, blanda appellatione quasi manum injicit ut nos retineat, dum nomine appellat *Dilectos*," Calvin. Comp. the same commentator as to the distinction between ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικεῖν and κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ὑποδιδόναι, ver. 17.

—ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ] On the change of construction, for ἀλλὰ δόντες τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ, comp. Winer, p. 720. The appearance of the imperative makes the duty inculcated stand forth more strongly and independently. Rightly Chrysostom: . . . ποία ὀργή; τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.—Συγχώρησον οὖν αὐτῷ, φησίν, ἐπεξελεῖν. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι Δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ. So, too, most expositors. That the ὀργή τοῦ θεοῦ is meant is shown both by the contrast

with *μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες*, *i.e.* the contrast between *self*-revenge and *God's* vengeance, and also by the import of the confirmatory citation subjoined. We are to give place to *God's* wrath, because He has reserved vengeance to *Himself*. There was no need, therefore, expressly to append the addition *τοῦ θεοῦ*, understood as matter of course. In the same way it is wanting in 1 Thess. i. 10, ii. 16; Rom. v. 9. "*Irae illi*," remarks Bengel, "de qua in scripturis tam multa dicuntur; id est, irae Dei, quae sola justa est, et sola meretur ira dici. Ellipsis religiosa, 2 Chron. xxiv. 18." *τόπον* (or *χώραν*) *διδόναι τῇ ὀργῇ τινος* means to make room for the wrath of some one, to allow his wrath to take vengeance on its enemy, since every power craves the granting of *scope* for its exercise. Comp. Eph. iv. 27: *μηδὲ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ*. We are to give no room to Satan, but to forbid him all access, lest from this he take advantage to gain the victory. Ecclus. xxxviii. 12: *καὶ ἱατρῷ δὸς τόπον*. We give room to the physician, grant him scope, that he may be able to effect a cure. So we are to allow room to the wrath of God, give it scope and sway, that it may be able to punish; for by rash and premature self-revenge we cut off from it all means of action. Expositors quote as a parallel *Synop. Soluar.* p. 95: "Homo non debet properare, ut vindictamumat" (comp. *μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες*); "melius est, si vindictam committit alii" (Deo, comp. *ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ*). Personal injury, so far as it is merely injury to his own person, the Christian is unconditionally to forgive. But so far as it is injury to the divine holiness as well, to the right that God has willed and the ordinance that God has established, he is to desire the recompense due to it, *i.e.* its punishment, in order to make reparation to these holy, inviolable ordinances and unquestionable blessings. But the execution of this punishment, so far as the judicial office does not belong to him, or he is not bound to lay claim to the judicial authority ordained of God, he is willingly and gladly to commit to the Lord God Himself. Comp. Melancthon here. But he is not merely to commit to God, but also to beseech from God the revelation of His judicial righteousness to the glory of His holy name in presence of wanton dishonour done to that name, whether the dishonour be done in his own person or in the person of another, or otherwise. But as regards the person of the transgressors, the Christian is ever to do this with the sole design of leading him,

where possible, to repentance, conversion, and salvation. Thus the apostolic dictum in the present passage does not set aside, but confirm the prayers against enemies in the O. T. imprecatory or vindictive psalms, so called. Nor is the Lord's intercession on the cross, *πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς*, Luke xxiii. 34, inconsistent with this. For as holy imprecation ever conceals and includes in the background as an ultimate aim the substance of Christian intercession, so also Christian intercession invariably presupposes the substance of holy imprecation as its basis, although in one case, in harmony with the character of the O. T. economy, imprecation—in the other, in harmony with that of the N. T., intercession—stands in the foreground. Comp. Luke ix. 5; 2 Thess. i. 6; 2 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 23; Rev. vi. 10, and the striking remarks of Hengstenberg in his *Commentary on the Psalms*, III. app. p. lxx. Other expositors apply *ὀργή* in the present passage to the sufferer's *own* wrath, and explain *διδόναι τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ*, "to give room to wrath," by "to allow it time to subside, to prevent its outburst, until it is dissipated internally." They appeal to the usage of the Romans, especially Liv. ii. 56: *Darent irac spatium*, viii. 32; Seneca, *de ira*, iii. 39; Lactant. *de ira*, 18: "Ego vero laudarem, si, quum fuisset iratus, dedisset irae suae spatium, ut residente per intervallum temporis animi tumore haberet modum castigatio." But in all these passages *spatium* = *temporis spatium* = *temporal* space, a meaning which *τόπος* in Greek has not. As *διδόναι τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ* signifies not: "to allow time to wrath internally," but: "to afford full play to wrath internally or externally," the only possible reference here is to the *divine* wrath. In the last place, others explain *ὀργή* of the *adversary's* wrath, the *ὀργή τοῦ ἐχθροῦ*, to which we are to give place, *i.e.* to give way. This acceptance might be justified idiomatically. So it is said, Luke xiv. 9: *δὲς τοῦτῳ τόπον*, *i.e.* make room for him, give place to him. Comp. LXX. Judg. xx. 36: *καὶ ἔδωκεν ἀνὴρ Ἰσραὴλ τῷ Βενιαμὴν τόπον*. But, in the first place, were *human* wrath meant, our thoughts would not readily turn to the *offender's* wrath, seeing that the injury is not necessarily inflicted in *wrath*, but to the *sufferer's* wrath, which is usually inflamed by the injury sustained. And again, the exhortation to give way to the wrath of an opponent, and allow him, so to speak, to vent his rage, because, forsooth, we may rest assured that God's punishment will overtake him, and thus we shall be

avenged on him, wears the look of a rule of policy neither very noble in itself nor in unison with apostolic teaching.

—*γέγραπται γάρ*] Deut. xxxii. 35. — *ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει κύριος*] The Heb. text runs: *עָלַי עָלַי יְיָ*, "to me belongs vengeance and recompense." The LXX. have *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω*. Paul, appending *λέγει κύριος*, by which the import of the citation is marked out as a saying of God (xiv. 11; 1 Cor. xiv. 21; 2 Cor. vi. 17), and employing the phraseology of the LXX., has translated in agreement with the Hebrew text. The *ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω*, instead of *ἀνταπόδοις* (the paraphrase of Onkelos also has *עָלַי עָלַי*), in harmony with the *ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις*, forcibly precludes the self-revenge of the sufferer. The same form in this citation in Heb. x. 30, can scarcely be regarded as a mere accidental coincidence, comp. Bleek there.

Ver. 20 is taken from Prov. xxv. 21, 22, in exact accordance with the LXX., who agree substantially with the original text. The apostle makes these words his own, on which account they are introduced without the formula of quotation, comp. on x. 13. The inferential particle *οὖν* he added himself. It is wanting in D\* F G *al.* Goth. *al.*, and was omitted by Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 2 sqq. The omission was either for the sake of conformity with the text of the LXX., or is to be explained by the supposition that to the copyists the present passage seemed to contain not so much an inference (*οὖν*) as an antithesis to *μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες*, ver. 19. Hence, too, A B, Cod. Sinait. Vulg. Ruf. *al.* read: *ἀλλ' εἰὰν πεινᾷ κτλ.*, which Lachmann has received. That this reading arose merely as a consequence of the omission of *οὖν*, is intimated by the further *van. lect.* occurring: *ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰὰν πεινᾷ κτλ.*, *εἰὰν γὰρ πεινᾷ κτλ.*, *εἰὰν δὲ πεινᾷ κτλ.* But the *οὖν* contains, in point of logic not inaccurately, a climacteric inference from the prohibition of self-revenge in ver. 19. If we are to leave revenge with God, it follows that we are not to revenge ourselves, but to do good even to an enemy. And in point of fact by psychological necessity internal abstinence from self-revenge will have practical kindness as its consequence, whereas to withhold such kindness may be regarded as a species of indirect self-revenge. On the forms of later Greek *πεινᾷ* and *διψᾷ* instead of *πεινῇ* and *διψῇ*, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 61; Winer, p. 92.

—*τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν ἀνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ*] indicates the motive for showing kindness to an enemy.

Most of the older, as of the modern expositors, rightly take the expression "glowing coals" as an Oriental figure for penetrating, clinging pain,<sup>1</sup> in reference, as here, to the remorse excited by magnanimous kindness. So Augustine, *de doctr. christ.* iii. 16, explains of the *urentes poenitentiae gemitus*, and says, *de catechiz. rudib.* c. 4: "nulla est enim major invitatio ad amorem quam praevenire amando. Et nimis durus est animus, qui dilectionem si nolebat impendere, nolit rependere." The coals are viewed as laid on the head, as on a specially sensitive part of the body. Other expositors, in the train of Chrysostom, take the burning of hot coals on the head as a figure for grievous divine punishment which the benefactor will draw down on a persistently hardened adversary. Against this explanation it cannot be objected that the context<sup>2</sup> merely permits the application of burning coals as an image of acute pain, to divine punishment by way of exception; for the very question is, whether here the words: ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ. Γέγραπται γάρ· Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις κτλ., ver. 19, do not suggest this acceptance. Nor is the condition *nisi resipiscat adversarius*, which certainly is not found indicated in the text, necessarily to be supplied; for the *adversarius* may be conceived absolutely as such, so that the possibility of his conversion does not further come into notice. Nor could such a motive to Christian charity to an enemy be called un-Christian, for it is not merely an O. but a N. T. principle that a Christian, in his conduct, gives himself up as a willing organ just as much of divine retribution as of divine mercy. And not merely did Isaiah receive the divine *charge*, by means of his preaching, to harden the people (Isa. vi. 9, 10), but the Lord Himself actually exercised this office (comp. the statement of the purpose of His *parabolic* discourses, Matt. xiii. 10–15; Mark iv. 11, 12; Luke viii. 10; John xii. 40, 41). And Paul is conscious that his gospel is just as much a savour of death unto death as of life unto life (Acts xxviii. 25–28; 2 Cor. ii. 15, 16). The only question is, whether the sense in question is justified, or—still more—required in the first instance by the original O. T. passage, and again by the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the parallels in Arabic proverbial speech, like *coals in the heart, fire in the liver*, also the Latin *urere for to torture* in Gesenius in Rosenmüller's *Biblisch-exegetischen Repertorium*, I. p. 140 f.

<sup>2</sup> As in 4 Esdr. xvi. 53: "Non dicat peccator se non peccasse, quoniam carbones ignis comburet (Deus, comp. vv. 49, 55, 68) super caput ejus, qui dicit: non peccavi coram domino Deo et gloriâ ipsius."

context in the present passage. In modern days this has been specially maintained by Hengstenberg (comp. *die Authentie des Pentateuchs*, II. p. 406 f.). He translates Prov. xxv. 21, 22: "If thy enemy hunger, feed him," etc., "for thou heapest burning coals on his head, *and the Lord will requite him.*" That: "thou wilt heap coals of fire on his head," is equivalent to: "thou wilt prepare grievous punishment for him" (namely, at the hands of God), he maintains, follows undeniably from the parallelism. But it is specially to be observed that Hengstenberg here has rendered the Heb.:  $\text{וְהָיָה לְךָ בְּרָכָה}$ , "and the Lord will requite *thee*" (LXX.:  $\acute{o} \delta\epsilon \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota \sigma\omicron\iota \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}$ ), by a slip manifestly due to haste, "and the Lord will requite *him.*" The parallelism of the original text thus rather suggests the meaning: "By kindness thou wilt shame and win thy enemy, and thus"—or also: "and furthermore—the Lord will requite thy kindness," comp. Prov. xix. 17. But just as little does the relation of ver. 20 to ver. 19 in the present passage, as Hengstenberg supposes, necessarily require  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha\varsigma \pi\upsilon\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \sigma\omega\rho\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma \kappa\tau\lambda.$  to be referred to divine punishments. In that case, just as  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu \omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu} \dots \pi\acute{o}\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  corresponds with  $\mu\grave{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\acute{o}\nu\varsigma \dots \tau\grave{\eta} \acute{o}\rho\gamma\grave{\eta}$  (at the bottom of which, moreover, lies the wrong reference of  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha} \delta\acute{o}\tau\epsilon \tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu \tau\grave{\eta} \acute{o}\rho\gamma\grave{\eta}$  to their own wrath), so does  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \dots \kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\acute{\eta}\nu \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  with  $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \dots \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ . "Avenge not thyself on thy enemy; for, according to Scripture, *God* has reserved vengeance to Himself. Therefore do him good; for if thou avenge not thyself, thou wilt set in motion the divine vengeance." But then, according to this interpretation,  $\tau\acute{o} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$  in ver. 21, by which we are to overcome  $\tau\acute{o} \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\nu$  of the enemy, must of necessity be a designation of divine punishment, which can only be described as very forced. The connection of vv. 19–21 will rather be as follows: We are not to avenge ourselves, but to leave vengeance with God, ver. 19, and meanwhile, by kindness, to prove to the adversary that our mind is free from personal irritation and rancour, in order to shame and move him to repentance and conversion, ver. 20. So shall we achieve the most glorious success in overcoming his evil by our good, ver. 21.

Ver. 21.  $\mu\grave{\eta} \nu\iota\kappa\acute{\omega} \acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\delta \tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\upsilon$ ] Suffer not thyself to be overcome by evil, which would be the case if thou wert to permit thyself to be carried away by the enemy's wickedness to wickedness, *i.e.* to vindictive retribution.

ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν] but overcome evil by good, in dispersing his wickedness by thy goodness, and bringing him by kindness to penitent shame and conversion. Expositors quote Seneca, *de benef.* vii. 31: "Vincit malos pertinax bonitas;" *De ira*, ii. 32: "Non enim ut in beneficiis honestum est merita meritis repensare, ita injurias injuriis: illic vinci turpe est, hic vincere." Comp. also Wetstein here. For the rest, that when the result aimed at is not reached, divine punishment in an enhanced degree will burst over the transgressor on account of his aggravated guilt, is certainly true in itself; but *it is not said here*, and still less is it said that in the kindness we show we are to make it our aim to bring on such punishment.



## CHAPTER XIII.

AFTER the apostle, in xii. 14, 17–21, has laid down principles for the conduct of Christians in presence of the world hostile to Christianity, he proceeds in the present chapter, vv. 1–7, to lay down principles for their conduct in presence of worldly authorities, which in those days were pagan. But the connection between the opening of the present and the close of the former chapter is not, as supposed by Flatt, Olshausen, Tholuck, that the apostle exhorts Christians to submit patiently and quietly to hostile pagan authorities in the same way as to the hostile acts of non-Christian private individuals; for here he is dealing merely with the right, not with the injustice of divinely-ordained although pagan governments, and speaks indeed of the sin of rebellion against the former right, but not of the duty—no doubt a fact in itself—of submission to the latter injustice. Still less to the point is the mode of connection between xii. 19 and xiii. 1 ff. supposed by Borger,<sup>1</sup> according to which the divine *ὁργή* and *ἐκδίκησις*, xii. 19, are to be executed by means of this very official authority, which is *θεοῦ διάκονος ἑκδικος εἰς ὁργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πρᾶσσοντι*, xiii. 4. For the subject treated of in the present section is not the punishment of evil-doers guilty of outrage against Christians, but the punishment of evil-doers generally, and that not merely among non-Christians, but among Christians; and not merely the punishment of evil-doers, but the reward of well-doers. The transition from ch. xii. to ch. xiii. is therefore more general than this, from *οἱ ἔξω* in general to the *ἐξουσία* consisting in those days of *οἱ ἔξω*. Comp. in 1 Cor. v., vi., the transition from *judging* those without to *going to law* before those without. But, rightly, expositors have insisted pretty unanimously, that Paul does not without reason treat at comparative length, in the Roman epistle, *de professo* of the *locus de magistratu*. On this point Calvin

<sup>1</sup> *Dissert. Theol. Exeget. Mor. de parte ep. Pauli ad Romanos paraenetica.* Lugd. Bat. 1840, 8.

strikingly remarks: "Quod locum hunc tam diligenter in Christianae vitae institutione tractat, inde apparet majori aliqua necessitate ad id coactum: quam quum perpetuo secum ferat Evangelii praedicatio, illo maxime saeculo afferre potuit. Sunt enim semper tumultuosi spiritus, qui regnum Christi non bene extolli credunt, nisi aboleantur omnes terrenae potestates: nec libertate per ipsum data se frui, nisi quodvis humanae servitutis jugum excusserint. Judaeos tamen prae aliis hic error tenuit, quibus indignum videbatur, ut progenies Abrahae, cujus florentissimum ante adventum Redemptoris regnum fuerat, ipso jam manifestato maneret in servitute. Erat etiam aliud quod non Judaeos magis quam Gentes a suis principibus alienaret: quod non modo a pietate omnes abhorrebant, sed infestissimis animis religionem persequerantur. Eos ergo agnoscere pro legitimis dominis ac principibus absurdum videbatur, qui regnum Christo unico coeli et terrae Domino moliebantur eripere. His causis verisimile est inductum fuisse Paulum, ut intentiore cura magistratuum potestatem confirmaret." Not only under Judas Gaulonites (Acts v. 37; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 1), but only a short time previously, in the days of the Emperor Claudius, the seditious spirit of the Jews had broken out into open rebellion in Rome itself;<sup>1</sup> and not merely the Jews, but also the Jewish Christians, for the reasons intimated by Calvin, were easily liable to infection by this spirit. How dangerous, moreover, for the cause of the gospel itself must have been the charge of revolutionary tendency, always in readiness to be urged against it (comp. Acts xvii. 6, 7), if any encouragement had been given to it by the conduct of Christians, especially in Rome, the imperial metropolis, the seat of universal government, where the Christians—identified, moreover, by the Gentiles with the restless Jewish sect, and exposed to the full view of the pagan authorities, and a watchful, suspicious pagan state—were under a double obligation, by the strictest civil obedience and sense of order, to keep Christianity clear of a charge so unfounded and unjust! And how readily the doctrine of evangelical freedom, just as much on the part of its pretended friends as on the part of its open enemies, is understood in a material sense, and, by a *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*, transferred to the political sphere, is shown not merely by the Anabaptist and similar movements in

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Suet. *Claud.* c. 25, also Dio Cass. *Hist. Rom.* 1. 60, c. 6; and see our Introduction.

the age of the Reformation, but also by many phenomena of modern days—among others, by the widespread, thoroughly perverse identification of the Reformation with revolution, and the derivation of the latter from the principles of the former. “Ac prudentia maxime necessaria est homini Christiano, intelligere quod Evangelium non constituat novas politias, sed jubeat praesentes politias et magistratus venerari, ac maxime prohibeat illam πολυπραγμοσύνην impiorum hominum, qui praetextu Evangelii civilem statum mutare aut corrigere conantur.—Hoc est igitur politia Evangelii, scire quod Evangelium approbet praesentes magistratus et politias et horum auctoritatem confirmet, nec constituat novas politias,” Melancthon.

Ver. 1. Πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω] *Let every one be subject to the supreme authorities.* As to πᾶσα ψυχή, comp. on ii. 9. Here, also, the object is not to describe man by his *rational* nature—as that with which the ὑποτάσσεσθαι, an act of freedom, is done. But πᾶσα ψυχή, as to meaning, is in no respect different from πᾶς ἄνθρωπος, comp. Ex. i. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 20. Every human being has *one* ψυχή, *one* σῶμα, *one* κεφαλὴ. As many ψυχαί, *mentes*, σώματα, *corpora*, and κεφαλαί, *capita*, so many ἄνθρωποι. Hence the former expressions, especially in enumerating human beings (comp. our “*souls*”), stand for human beings themselves. Chrysostom remarks: πᾶσα ψυχή, καὶ ἀπόστολος ἦς, καὶ εὐαγγελιστής, καὶ προφήτης, καὶ ὅστισοῦν. But it was reserved for abstract dialectics of the most modern type under this ὅστισοῦν to include even the ψυχαί of the ἄρχοντες, who also are said to be subject to ἐξουσία as the divinely-established order higher even than themselves,—a proposition obtained only, despite its relative dogmatic truth, by exegesis of the most thoroughly imported character. From the context, as matter of course, there is understood to πᾶσα ψυχή the natural qualification: “every soul not itself belonging to the ἐξουσία ὑπερέχουσα.” Moreover, the ἐξουσία is not described as ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμένη till afterwards,—the word of itself is not identical with τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ, ver. 2, but is simply an expression for the power actually existing; and that not merely these powers *in abstracto* are meant, but also, in inseparable association, their concrete, personal possessors, is shown by ver. 3, where the concrete οἱ ἄρχοντες itself appears (comp. vv. 6, 7, and the use of ἐξουσία, Eph. i. 21, vi. 12; Col. i. 16, ii. 15). But the plural οἱ

ἐξουσίαι in the present passage comprehends the entire governing authority in its manifold combinations and organizations, 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14; Tit. iii. 1. Luther translates ἐξουσίαι *ὑπερέχουσαι* paraphrastically: "the authority *having power over him*." These are *potestates supereminentes, magistratus precellentes*. Bengel alludes to the French *souverain*. Comp. 1 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Pet. ii. 13; Wisd. vi. 6; 2 Macc. iii. 11. It indicates the attitude of superiority assumed by government, which the Christian on his part is to recognise by submission. The reason of this obligation to submit is stated in what is subjoined. ὑποτασσέσθω, reflexively, *let him submit himself, obey*, not by constraint, but free-will, comp. on x. 3, also Luke ii. 51; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; Eph. v. 22 ff.; Tit. ii. 5.

—οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ] Statement of the reason why the Christian is to obey authority. εἶναι ἀπό, like εἶναι παρά, εἶναι ἐκ, denotes the source from which something springs. This divine origin here affirmed of authority in general is more exactly defined in what directly follows as the subsistence of authority in virtue of divine institution; so that the familiar predicate of authority, "by the grace of God,"—challenged in these days by the non-Christian, revolutionary spirit of the age, not merely in its perverted, but also in its true meaning,—is able to show for itself the most decisive and positive biblical warrant. What subsists *jure divino* certainly subsists not simply *gratia humana* or *voluntate populi*. The reading approved by Bengel and Griesbach, received by Lachmann, and well authenticated indeed by external evidence, ὑπό instead of ἀπό, has merely arisen from the following ὑπό. Had Paul both times written ὑπό, a pure tautology would be the consequence, as even the first time grammar would require a τεταγμένη to be supplied to ὑπὸ θεοῦ.

—αἱ δὲ οὐσαι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσιν] The *lect. rec.* αἱ δὲ οὐσαι ἐξουσίαι is rightly disapproved by all moderns, along with Griesbach, on far preponderant evidence. ἐξουσίαι is a grammatical supplement, understood as matter of course. In the same way the reading ὑπὸ θεοῦ, in correspondence with ἀπὸ θεοῦ, is to be received instead of the less authenticated *lect. rec.* ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. αἱ οὐσαι, "the existing, extant, the actually (not merely rightfully) subsisting." Every ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, 1 Pet. ii. 13, is therefore to be regarded as a θεία τάξις, or, still more properly, every ἀνθρωπίνη τάξις as a θεία κτίσις. The human

ordinance, based upon a course of historical development, has withal divine sanction. Thus, all that is requisite to constitute the obligation of obedience to the *ἐξουσία*, is that it is *οὐσα*. Its form, organization, and composition may be variously arranged. Christianity gives its sanction not exclusively to *one* definite form of government, but to the form of government actually subsisting at any time, and guards it against the attempts of revolutionary subversiveness. In presence of the admittedly legal standing of the imperial government of that age, the apostle had no motive to discuss the casuistical question,—in what case an *ἐξουσία* is to be regarded as *οὐσα*,—but merely to inculcate the duty of obedience to this *οὐσα ἐξουσία*, which, although tyrannical, still merely as *οὐσα* was to be regarded as one *ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμένη*. The apostle is not writing a systematic compendium of Christian ethics, but laying down moral precepts as practical occasion suggested. But no doubt, with respect to a purely usurped government, dilemmas may often present themselves which are hard to solve; and the question may arise, at what point, and when, such a government is to be regarded as one really *existing*? The Christian may and should submit to its perhaps merely temporary existence as to a divine ordinance. Only he should never permit himself, by active recognition, to be seduced to perjury and treason against the previous government still subsisting as to divine right, and merely overthrown by man's injustice. That by the voluntary abdication or demise of the properly authorized government, its authority, and therewith the obligation of obedience on the part of subjects, are abolished, is understood as matter of course. But a far more difficult question, and one indeed scarcely to be settled by a formula applying in every case, is that as to the point at which a government, originally illegitimate, acquires a prescriptive right. The different stages of transition here from non-existence—right through the process of becoming—to existence, may be hard to define and fix intelligibly at every moment; but the completed, proper, and actual state of existence will ever carry in itself the characteristic marks by which it is recognised.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Rightly observes Meyer here: "By no means, however, are we to think only of the magisterial *office* as instituted by God (Chrysostom, Occumenius, and others), but rather of the magistracy in its concrete persons and members as the bearers of the divinely-ordained office. Comp. *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς*, ver. 3, and vv. 4, 6, 7." See, above, our observation on *ἐξουσία*.

Ver. 2. ὥστε] *itaque, accordingly* (vii. 4, 12), namely, because the authorities are ordained by God, ver. 1.

—ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἐξ.] Opposite of ὑποτασσέσθω, ver. 1. ἀντιτάσσεσθαι, originally a military phrase used of drawing up a battle in hostile array, then generally = “to oppose oneself, make resistance, resist,” comp. Acts xviii. 6 ; Jas. iv. 6.

—τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγῇ] in allusion to ὑπὸ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν, ver. 1. διαταγή = *constitutio*, arrangement, institution. In authority, therefore, we are to recognise not a human, but a divine constitution.

—ἀνθέστηκεν] = ἀντιτίσσεται, comp. on ix. 19. In *Bereschith* R. xciv. 8, it is said : “quicumque faciem suam obfirmat contra regem, idem est ac si illam obfirmaret contra majestatem divinam.”

—ἐαυτοῖς] Dativ. *incommodi*, comp. ii. 5, 2 Pet. ii. 1 = “to their own destruction.”

—κρίμα λήφονται] namely, ὑπὸ θεοῦ, whose διαταγῇ they resist. The κρίμα, as the context of itself proves, is to be thought of as a penal judgment, as κρίμα εἰς κατάκριμα, comp. v. 16, ii. 2, 3 ; Matt. xxiii. 14. But ver. 3 nowise proves, as several expositors maintain, that the ἄρχοντες themselves are to be thought of as the sole executors of the divine penal judgment ; for by τὰ κακὰ ἔργα, ver. 3, and τὸ κακόν, ver. 4, is not meant exclusively the sin of rebellion against rightful authority, but misconduct of any kind. Moreover, the meaning of vv. 3–5 is not : “Withstand not the authority, for God has committed to it authority to punish those who resist it ;” but these verses enjoin the duty of subjection to divinely-ordained authority by indicating the purpose of this divine ordination, which purpose consists not merely in punishing rebels, but in punishing evil-doers of every kind ; and not merely in *punishing* evil-doers, but also in *praising* those who do well. The divine κρίμα spoken of in this verse may therefore be executed just as well through the organ of authority as in any other way ; and just as little is affirmed respecting the mode exclusively as directly respecting the time of its execution. Only for this very reason we are not to think of it directly and exclusively as κρίμα αἰώνιον.

Ver. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν] either = “for rulers are not formidable (οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος, a *metonymia rei pro rei causa* = οὐκ εἰσὶ φοβεροί) on account of good, but on account of evil works,” or = “for rulers

are not formidable *to* good, but to evil works." But instead of the *lect. rec.* τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν, Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of A B D\* F G (so also Cod. Sinait.), Copt. It. Vulg. Clem. *al.* Iren. Tert., have received the preferable reading recommended before by Griesbach: τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ. τὸ ἀγαθὸν (κακὸν) ἔργον is personified = ὁ τὸ ἀγαθὸν (κακὸν) ἔργον ἐργαζόμενος. But the particle γάρ (οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες) confirms not the proposition immediately preceding: οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήψονται, but the entire leading thought contained in vv. 1, 2, namely, the requirement of obedience and the prohibition of disobedience to existing, divinely-ordained authority, by means of the axiom that only he that does evil, not he that does good, has reason for fear, and therefore for rebellion against authority, which is instituted by God for no other end than to punish evil and reward good. Therefore is the subjection due to authority not merely a duty absolutely claiming obedience on account of the divine right on which authority rests, but also a duty morally binding on the conscience on account of the beneficial end at which authority aims.

—θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν] The particle δέ is metabatic, annexing a further idea. Comp. Hartung, *Lehre von d. Part. d. gr. Spr.* I. p. 165, 3, and the passage there quoted from Bekker, *Anecd.*: καλεῖται δὲ καὶ μεταβατικός· ἀπὸ προσώπου γὰρ εἰς πρόσωπον ἢ ἀπὸ πράγματος εἰς πρᾶγμα μεταβαίνοντες κέχρηται αὐτῷ πάντες, but especially p. 166, 5a. But "wouldst thou not be afraid of the authority" is not an interrogatory, but a hypothetical sentence = "Thou wishest not to be afraid of the authority. I put the case. Then it follows that thou must do good," comp. xiv. 22; 1 Cor. vii. 18, 27; 2 Cor. xi. 22, 23; Jas. v. 13, 14; Winer, p. 552. Thus we must not, with Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann, Tischendorf, *et al.*, after τὴν ἐξουσίαν place a sign of interrogation, and just as little suppose an ellipsis of the conjunction εἰ.

—καὶ ἔξεις ἔπαινον] As to this consecutive καὶ so called, comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* p. 187 sq. ἔπαινος is *praise*, not *reward* (ii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 5, Meyer there; 1 Pet. ii. 14). The praise received from the authority by the well-doer, is the praise of a good citizen and subject. Such praise may certainly find its actual expression in reward. Grotius remarks: "Cum haec scriberet Paulus, non saeviebatur Romae in Christianos." It is true

that those were the best days of the Neronian government, but even afterwards Paul would have made no change in the principle and precept here laid down. Moreover, what he here says was said in an ideal sense even for those times, and, in deference to the weakness and frailty of human nature and circumstances, is so said more or less for all times. But in addition, in the present passage he distinctly proposed to himself to delineate and establish the Christian idea of authority in contrast with the pseudo-Christian idea of freedom. Hence he had no direct occasion to discuss more minutely the question how the Christian is to conduct himself in presence of the authority that has more or less fallen away from its idea. But without doubt his answer would have amounted to this, that in the concrete possessors of magisterial power the Christian on his part is ever to have regard to the idea itself proposed by God, and always partially at least embodied in actual fact. For Paul makes the duty of obedience to authority depend not on the character of the latter, but on its divinely-ordained existence. It is true that the end of its existence is the maintenance of right. But, in the first place, this end is always on the whole realized, even under the most tyrannical government, in spite of ever so many unjust acts in detail; and no tyrant has ever formally proclaimed injustice in the abstract as a principle of government. Rather he has sought to cloak the manifold injustice, of which he was actually guilty, under the forms and semblance of justice. And again, a Christian has no right to take the law into his own hands, *i.e.* to requite wrong with wrong, even with respect to equals (xii. 19), to say nothing of superiors (1 Pet. ii. 18). Rather his duty is to suffer wrong (1 Pet. ii. 19),—a doctrine no doubt as intolerable and despicable in the eyes of ancient as of modern pagan pride. But the characteristic note of Christian morality still remains *humility*. It might then be objected, that as the apostle here binds the existence and the end of authority inseparably together, it follows, of course, that authority, when it fails in or perverts its divinely-appointed end, loses also its divinely-bestowed right, and that consequently a plea of justification may be urged for rebellion against authority, whose only aim is to restore the divinely-ordained condition of right, and which is therefore able to show for itself not only an objective justification in the wrong done by the ruler, but also a subjective justification in the express



effort of the ruled to restore the right. But this sophistry obliterates the limits fixed by God, as well as the distinction established by Him between rulers and ruled, and in the very act of endeavouring to adhere to the abstract idea of authority, with the concrete existence dissolves into air the very idea of such authority. For by his divinely-ordained position the subject is never placed in authority over authority, and even in the most favourable case along with the crime of rebellion commits that of the *ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοποι*, 1 Pet. iv. 15, of invading another's office not committed by God to *him*. But then he not merely has the right, but is under obligation, according to his position, capacity, and the measure allowed by public conditions, to protest in word, although in a spirit of humility and obedience, still with frankness and fidelity, against all wrong, whether committed by rulers or ruled, and, as far as in him lies, to co-operate not only for the divinely-sanctioned, unquestionable continuance of authority, but also for the fulfilment of its divinely-willed purpose, and the preservation and ever-advancing realization of its idea. At the same time, it is self-evident that a Christian is never at liberty actively to co-operate in wrong, even on the demand of authority; but here comes in the command, Acts iv. 19, v. 29. If he obeys authority for God's sake, he cannot obey it in opposition to God.<sup>1</sup> Only in such cases let him earnestly beware of a false, artificial conscience; and even when he is compelled to refuse the act of obedience, let him never actively rebel, but, when called upon, cheerfully submit to suffering. Comp. Harless, *Christian Ethics*, § 54b; Schleiermacher, *Die christliche Sitte*, pp. 264–273; Sartorius, *Die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe*, III. 1, 1851, pp. 290–316.

Ver. 4. *θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστι*] *sc. ἡ ἐξουσία*, comp. ver. 6; Wisd. vi. 5. As to the derivation of the word *διάκονος* from *διώκειν*, *to run* = *runner, messenger, servant*, comp. Buttmann, *Lexilogus*, I. p. 218 ff.

—*σοί*] *sc. τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιοῦντι* or *ἐὰν τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιῇς*, as follows from ver. 3, and from the antithesis *ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς*, ver. 4.

—*εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν*] for good, profit, advantage (viii. 28), partly

<sup>1</sup> Strikingly Augustine, Serm. VI. *de verb. Dom.* c. 8: "Si quid jusserit Curator, numquid tibi faciendum, si contra Proconsulem jusserit? Rursum si quid Proconsul jusserit, et aliud Imperator. Ergo si aliud imperator, aliud Deus jubeat, contempto illo obtemperandum est Deo."

in according thee praise, partly in protecting and defending thee (1 Tim. ii. 2). The proposition in ver. 3, that whoever does good has nothing to fear, but praise to expect from authority, is first of all confirmed (γάρ) in this verse by the consideration that authority is God's servant appointed to minister to the happiness of its subjects.

—ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ] Opposite of θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν, τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖ, ver. 3.

—οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ] Antithesis to καὶ ἔξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς, ver. 3. It bears not the sword without cause, not in vain, but to use it against evil-doers when occasion calls. In classical usage, *μάχαιρα* signifies *spear* and *sword*. Accordingly we may here think either of the *spear* which the emperors (and their *praefecti pretorio* as well) usually carried as the *insignia* of the *jus vitae et necis* belonging to them (comp. Grotius and Wetstein here), or of the *sword* which the Roman magistrates either bore or had carried before them in solemn processions as a symbol of their power over life and death.<sup>1</sup> The prevailing N. T. usage is decisive for the latter meaning. This better suits the context in the present passage, which treats not of the imperial power in particular, but of the governing power in general. Respecting *φορεῖν*, *gestare*, and *φέρειν*, *gerere*, comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* xi. 8, p. 399: "Sic enim differt *φορεῖν* a *φέρειν*, ut hoc sit *ferre*, illud *ferre solere* (cf. Hermann, *ad. Soph. El.* v. 715: *Φορεῖν* verbum est continuativum, *φέρειν* inceptivum)." But this passage certainly contains a *dictum probans* for the position that even the N. T., instead of abolishing, expressly ratifies the right of governors to inflict the penalty of death; for while the sword stands here as a symbol of government, punitive authority in general, it describes that authority precisely in its uttermost expression as *jus gladii* in the proper sense of the word. It is therefore perfectly absurd, when the apostle applies to the culminating form of the punitive authority of rulers an expression whose historically and juridically fixed signification cannot for a moment be called in question, to wish to assert that he denied to authority the right of exercising that which the sword *properly* symbolizes; comp. Matt. xxvi. 52; Rev. xiii. 10; and respecting the actual exercise of the *jus gladii*, Acts xii. 2.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Wolf, *Curae*, p. 257, and the remark of Grotius here: "In Talmudicis frequens illud est de rege Hebraeo, *rex qui portat gladium*."

"Insignis locus," observes Calvin here, "ad jus gladii comprobandum. Nam si Dominus magistratum armando gladii quoque usum illi mandavit, quoties sotes capitali poena vindicat, exercendo Dei ultionem, ejus mandatis obsequitur. Contendant igitur cum Deo qui sanguinem nocentium hominum effundi nefas esse putant."<sup>1</sup>

—θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργήν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι] Confirmation of οὐκ εἰκὴ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ, and antithesis to θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστι σοὶ (*sc.* τῷ τὸ ἀγαθὸν πράσσοντι) εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. Not till this point is the twofold vocation of authority, with respect both to well-doers and evil-doers, fully illustrated. εἰς ὀργήν, which is either omitted or placed before ἔκδικος on insufficient authority, is to be regarded as fully certified both in itself and as regards its usual position after ἔκδικος. ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργήν = ἔκδικος εἰς τὸ ἐπιφέρειν ὀργήν (*comp.* iii. 5; and as to this breviloquence, i. 5, xvi. 26; Gal. ii. 8) does not stand pleonastically for ἔκδικος alone, since the ἔκδικος, *vindex*, may do his part not only in punishing, but in defending. τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι depends on ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργήν, *sc.* ὦν, not on εἰς ὀργήν. The comparison of ver. 4 with xii. 19 teaches that μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικεῖν, ἀλλὰ δοῦναι τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ τοῦ θεοῦ may very well consist with recourse to authority as θεοῦ διάκονος ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργήν. 1 Cor. vi. 1 ff. does not contradict this, for there the reference is not to the established authority in criminal cases, but to spontaneously-chosen arbitrators in civil matters; *comp.* Meyer there.

Ver. 5. The apostle argues not from the last words contained in ver. 4, but from the entire doctrine enforced in vv. 1–4. If the ruling authority is established by God to reward the good and punish the bad, vv. 1–4, it follows (διό, ver. 5) that we must obey it (ver. 1), not merely from fear of punishment, ver. 4, which even the wicked do, but also in order, by obedience to God's ordinance, of our own accord to satisfy a sacred obligation of conscience,—a course by which the obedience of a Christian subject is distinguished alike from pseudo-Christian servilism on

<sup>1</sup> Rightly observes Meyer: "Our passage proves (*comp.* Acts xxv. 11) that the abolition of the *right* of capital punishment deprives the magistracy of a power which is not merely given to it in the O. T., but is also decisively confirmed in the N. T., and which it (herein lies the sacred limitation and responsibility of this power) possesses as God's minister."

the one hand and un-Christian liberalism on the other. — διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι] *Wherefore it is necessary* (ἀνάγκη, sc. ἐστίν, Heb. ix. 16, 23) *to submit yourselves*. Here, as in 1 Cor. ix. 16, ἀνάγκη denotes moral necessity. With the Vulgate (*ideo necessitate subditi estote*) Luther translates: "So then be subject by necessity" = διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθε. This reading, very little confirmed by evidence, arose from the *lectio* διὸ ὑποτάσσεσθε, supplied by D E F G, several versions, and Fathers, which is to be regarded as originally a mere appended interpretation of διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι.

—οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργήν] *sc. τῆς ἐξουσίας*, comp. ver. 4.

—ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν] *but also for conscience' sake*, namely, for your *own* conscience' sake, not *propter conscientiam eorum, qui nondum credunt*, as in 1 Cor. x. 27–29. Comp. rather 1 Pet. ii. 13: ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει διὰ τὸν κύριον, also Eph. vi. 6, 7. Theodoret: διὰ τὸ πληροῦν τὰ προσήκοντα. "Nulla potentia humana, nulli exercitus magis muniunt imperia, quam haec severissima lex Dei: necesse est obedire propter conscientiam," Melancthon. The apostle does not forbid obedience διὰ τὴν ὀργήν (for he says not οὐκ . . . ἀλλὰ, but οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ καί), but merely describes it as not being the last and highest motive for a Christian. Even a Christian, so far as he is still flesh, is to obey διὰ τὴν ὀργήν; but so far as he is spirit he obeys διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν.

Ver. 6. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε] *On this account indeed you also* (καί, also, beside other acts of obedience) *pay taxes*. Several expositors refer these words to the maxim contained in ver. 5 in the sense: "for on this account, namely, because you yourselves know that authority should be obeyed not only from fear, but also for conscience' sake, ver. 5, you also pay taxes, which amounts to a practical acknowledgment on your part of this duty of obedience." But that the apostle did not in this off-hand manner assume such acknowledgment on the part of the Roman church, is shown by his entire course of argument, vv. 1–5, in which he proves and enforces the duty of obedience on the part of subjects, plainly on the assumption that this duty might not be so absolutely apparent to his readers. It seems better, therefore, to refer διὰ τοῦτο, like διὸ in ver. 5, with other expositors, to the substance of vv. 1–4. But then not in the sense: "that authority is a servant appointed by God for the

praise of the good and the punishment of the bad, you yourselves acknowledge, in fact, by your payment of taxes;" for this view would give rise to the same difficulty as the former one. Rather we must interpret: "The actually existing payment of taxes is founded upon the fact that authority is a servant of God, ordained for a beneficial purpose, and the exercise of its office is rendered possible only by payment of taxes." For to refuse taxes, as a crippling of the state-power, is equivalent to the annihilation and abolition of the state-power itself.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, when the apostle describes the actually existing tax-paying<sup>2</sup> as founded on the divine institution and beneficial purpose of government, he therewith describes it as itself having legal authority, and thus indirectly ratifies the *duty* of tax-paying. For this reason Luther gives the sense not inaptly when he renders: "On this account you *ought* also to pay tax." Furthermore, the same meaning may be obtained indirectly by joining διὰ τοῦτο . . . τελεῖτε, not to the entire substance of ver. 5, but to its first words, διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι. "It is necessary that you be subject to authority, ver. 5. On this account you pay taxes, which fact does not depend on your own will, but has its ground in the duty of obedience that you owe to authority." But then, inasmuch as διό, ver. 5, glances back at the substance of vv. 1-4, it may also be said—and this, perhaps, is the most correct view—that διὰ τοῦτο, ver. 6, refers back to διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, ver. 5, in such a way that a reference to the substance of vv. 1-4 is, at the same time, included as follows: "Because you (on account of the divine institution and beneficial purpose of authority, vv. 1-4) are bound to render obedience to authority, the payment of taxes exists, which, for this very reason, is to be regarded as legally binding." Paul's enforcing here and in the next verse the duty of tax-paying may perhaps have its reason in the fact that the Jewish Christians, possibly in accordance with the principles of Judas Gaulonites, might be inclined to consider it unlawful to pay tribute to Gentiles (Matt. xxii. 17), and the Gentile Christians, from a misconception of evangelical freedom (Matt. xvii. 24-27; Luke xxiii. 2), might

<sup>1</sup> Tacit. *Hist.* iv. 74: "Nam neque quies gentium sine armis, neque arma sine stipendiis, neque stipendia sine tributis haberi queunt."

<sup>2</sup> τελεῖτε is indicative, not imperative. Against the latter view tell both the γάρ and the express command, which does not occur till ver. 7.

suppose themselves at least *released* from this duty. But we may perhaps say that, as it were with prophetic instinct, the apostle in the present passage wrote with a view to the refusers of taxers ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, 2 Tim. iii. 1-5. Things were different in this respect in the early days of Christianity from what they are in these last times. Comp. Tertullian, *Apol. adv. gentes*, c. 42 in fin.: "Vectigalia gratias Christianis agent ex fide dependentibus debitum, qua alieno frandando abstinemus."<sup>1</sup>

—Λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν] *for they are God's servants.* λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ is predicate. The subject understood spontaneously from the context is: *they*, namely οἱ ἄρχοντες, ver. 3, *the persons in authority.* λειτουργός, xv. 16; Heb. i. 7, viii. 2; λειτουργεῖν, Acts xiii. 2; Rom. xv. 27; Heb. x. 11; λειτουργία, Luke i. 23; 2 Cor. ix. 12; Phil. ii. 17, 30; Heb. viii. 6, ix. 21; λειτουργικός, Heb. i. 14, denotes *practical* service coming under observation in acts obvious to the senses, especially the temple-service of the priests.<sup>2</sup> διάκονος, on the other hand, often denotes a servant, in so far as he is in the service of a particular *principle*, especially of the preaching of evangelical truth, 1 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6, vi. 4, xi. 15, 23; Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 7, 23; 1 Thess. iii. 2. Hence Paul describes authority as διάκονος θεοῦ, ver. 4, in so far as it is an administrator of divine justice, as λειτουργός θεοῦ, ver. 6, in so far as it is entrusted by God with the collection of legal taxes. Moreover, in the first case Paul appropriately uses the abstract ἡ ἐξουσία in the singular, in the latter the concrete οἱ ἄρχοντες; for the administration of justice suggests more the notion of a single governing power, the raising of taxes the plurality of the governing individuals.

—εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες] *persevering, i.e. constantly active, for this very thing.* εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, *for this very purpose*, namely *tax-paying*, the εἰσπραξίς τῶν φόρων, the φόρους τελεῖν, or better, ἵνα τελῶνται οἱ φόροι. This is the most obvious meaning, since in λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσιν the persons in authority were thought of as employed in collecting taxes, which εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες expressly emphasizes. Paral-

<sup>1</sup> "At the basis of the argument lies the view that the existing relation of tax-paying is a result of the necessity indicated in ver. 5, and consequently the confirmation of it. . . . It follows, moreover, from this passage that the refusal of taxes is the practical rejection of the necessity stated in ver. 5," Meyer.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. on the word *Liturgie*, Nitzsch, *Praktische Theologie*, II. p. 150.

lism with what precedes suggests the same view. Do good, for the ἐξουσία is θεοῦ διάκονος σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, vv. 3, 4. Avoid evil, for the ἐξουσία is θεοῦ διάκονος ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργήν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι, ver. 4. You are also bound to pay taxes, for the ἄρχοντες are λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκατεροῦντες. We thus see that in every instance by εἰς a new specific definition of authority is introduced, by which a reason is assigned for the specific precept immediately preceding. If, on the other hand, we refer εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο in a general sense to a λειτουργεῖν τῷ θεῷ to be extracted from λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν, we really obtain a somewhat awkward, tautological course of reasoning in a circle: "You ought to obey the authority established by God for a beneficial purpose. On this account also you pay taxes. And this rightly, for the authority is God's servant attending zealously, by administering its governing office, to this very service, on which account you are to manifest your obedience by paying taxes."

Ver. 7. In a parainetic application of vv. 1-6 the apostle summarizes duties to all persons in authority, bringing forward, first of all, in allusion to ver. 6, the obligation of taxes. ἀπόδοτε οὖν πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς] οὖν quia quum ita sint (vv. 1-6) is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf on weighty authority, especially A B D\* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.\*) Cypr. Ruf. But the asyndeton is harsh and awkward, and arose, perhaps, from the fact that the *general* exhortations were made to begin with ver. 7, even as several modern expositors wrongly refer πᾶσι to *all men*, instead of to *all persons in authority*. Comp., however, the *asyndeton*, xii. 21. *Render therefore to all their dues. τὰς ὀφειλάς, the respective dues.* In classical Greek the word does not occur. Comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 90; Meyer on 1 Cor. vii. 3.

—τῷ τὸν φόρον] *sc. ἀπαιτοῦντι* not αἰτοῦντι, only the former denoting an *authorized* demand, as ἀποδιδόναι does a payment *due*. But ἀπαιτοῦντι = ἀποδιδόναι κελεύοντι is understood spontaneously as the correlative of ἀπόδοτε, comp. Winer, p. 737, and 2 Cor. viii. 15. Luther: "tribute to whom tribute is due." But this would be ᾧ τὸν φόρον, *sc. ὀφείλετε*, or ᾧ ὁ φόρος, *sc. ὀφείλεται*.

—τὸν φόρον] *sc. ἀπόδοτε*.

—τῷ τὸ τέλος] Rightly Grotius: "*Vectigalia* (τὰ τέλη, toll,

*custom*) pro mercibus dantur, *tributa* (οἱ φόροι, *direct taxes*) pro solo aut capite." As ὁ φόρος and τὸ τέλος are due to tax and custom officers, so ὁ φόβος especially to judges or judicial authorities and the higher magistracies, ἡ τιμή to government authorities generally. "Et hic honos vel maxime necessarius est paci publicae, non cavillari leges, non odiose interpretari. Deinde huc pertinet etiam, errata legum et magistratuum tegere, excusare et mitigare . . . Noë pater maledixit filio Cham a quo nudatus et irrisus est. Ita sciant illi, qui cavillantur leges, qui magistratuum errata odiose traducunt, maledici sibi a Deo, et poenas se hujus peccati daturos esse, quod non habent debitum honorem legibus et magistratibus. Et haec calumniosa reprehensio legum ideo magis vitari debet, quia parit horribiles motus in rebus publicis," Melanchthon.

There follow now general exhortations, and, first of all, an exhortation to love, vv. 8-10.

Ver. 8. Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε] joins on to ἀπόδοτε οὖν πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς, ver. 7. Discharge your duty to the state, ver. 7. To no one leave your duty undischarged, ver. 8. ὀφείλετε is imperative, not, as some expositors would have, indicative. In the latter case οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν ὀφείλετε must have been written, comp. Winer, p. 629.

—εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν] A Pauline *argute dictum* or *acumen*. But this consists not simply in the somewhat tame word-play of ὀφείλειν standing the first time (μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε) for *to be indebted*, the second time (where ὀφείλετε is to be repeated in thought after εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν) for *to deem indebted* = "Owe no one anything; owe one another nothing but love, *i.e.* only deem yourselves bound to love one another." So Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Krehl. This meaning would have been far more simply and forcibly expressed by μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε, μάλιστα μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, "Remain indebted to no one; above all, remain indebted to no one with respect to love." It is best, however, to abide by the oldest and most popular acceptance, thoroughly in harmony with the spirit and delicacy of a Paul (Acts xxvi. 29), which makes the apostle here enjoin love as a never-ceasing debt. By its very nature, love is a duty which, when discharged, is never discharged, since he loves not truly who loves for the purpose of ceasing from loving, *i.e.* in order to relieve himself once for all from the duty of love;



but by loving love is intensified, the more it is exercised the less can it be satisfied. Very finely Chrysostom: *καί φησι καὶ αὐτὴν* (*sc. τὴν ἀγάπην*) *ὀφείλημα εἶναι, οὐ μὴν τοιοῦτον, οἷον τὸν φόρον, οἷον τὸ τέλος, ἀλλὰ διηνεκές. Οὐδέποτε γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀποδίδοσθαι βούλεται· μάλλον δὲ ἀποδίδοσθαι μὲν αἰεὶ βούλεται, οὐ μὴν πληροῦσθαι, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ὀφείλεσθαι. Τοιοῦτον γάρ ἐστι τὸ χρέος, ὡς καὶ διδόναι καὶ ὀφείλειν αἰεὶ, Theodoret: οὐχ ἵνα μὴ ἐκτίνωμεν τῆς ἀγάπης τὸ χρέος (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκτίνειν προσήκει πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ὑπάντων), ἀλλὰ ἵνα αὐξώμεν τῇ ἐκτίσει· ἡ γὰρ ἀπόδοσις πολυπλασιάζει τὸ χρέος· θερμότεραν γὰρ τὴν ἀγάπην ποιεῖ; and Augustine: "Redditur enim (caritas), cum impenditur, debetur autem etiam si reddita fuerit, quia nullum erit tempus, quando impendenda jam non sit, nec cum redditur, amittitur, sed potius reddendo multiplicatur." Strikingly Grotius: "Est autem argute dictum. Cetera debitum solvuntur nec manent; dilectionis debitum semper et solvitur et manet." But Bengel observes: "*ἀγαπᾶν, amare, debitum immortale. Cant. viii. 7, fin.*" In *μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε* the apostle refers to *all* men, in *εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν* to *Christians* only, because only to the latter can the precept of *mutual* love be given. But it is evident both from the preceding *μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε* and the following *ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον*, with its exposition in vv. 9, 10, that in the precept of *mutual* Christian love Paul includes that of universal human love, save that in the nature of the case the latter can only be *one-sided*.*

—*ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον, νόμον πεπλήρωκε*] *for he that loves the other has fulfilled the law.* But whoever has fulfilled the law has therewith fulfilled all the obligation lying upon him, and is therefore no longer in any one's debt (*οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν ὀφείλει*). On this view, the course of thought in the present verse would be as follows: "Owe no one anything; owe one another nothing but love: for if you acknowledge and discharge this debt of love, therewith you have fulfilled the first precept to be in no one's debt, because therewith you have fulfilled the whole law, and therefore all obligation." "Si amabitis, nil debebitis, nam amor implet legem. Amare, libertas est," Bengel. Or *ὁ γὰρ . . . πεπλήρωκε* may be taken merely as an impelling motive to the duty of love last enjoined: "Fulfil the duty of love; for love is the fulfilling of the law, and therefore the chief of all duties." Whoever loves his neighbour, *by this very means* has fulfilled the

whole law, *i.e.* in so far as the latter defines duties to one's neighbour, seeing that from love, as the active principle of all moral conduct, springs by an intrinsic necessity the fulfilment of the moral commandments themselves as an actual phenomenon of life. On this account the particular moral commands of the law are involved in the one command of love as in their all-comprehensive sum, vv. 9, 10. With the perfect of immediate completion, comp. xiv. 23, John iii. 18. With the sentiment, comp. Matt. xxii. 37-40. "Non quod detur, qui legem vel quoad secundam tantum tabulam impleat; sed quod *hypotheticæ* illa dicta, et quoad perfectionem legis intelligenda, quæ a nobis expectenda modisque omnibus ambienda est, sed obtineri in hac imperfectione non potest," Calov. "Dilectio est impletio legis, item est justitia, si id intelligatur de *idea*, non de tali dilectione, qualis est in hominibus in hac vita," Melancthon. On this account, also, our love cannot be the ground of our righteousness availing before God.

Ver. 9. In this and the following verses the apostle confirms the position advanced in ver. 8, that whoever loves his neighbour has fulfilled the law, by showing how all particular precepts relating to neighbours are summed up in the precept to love one's neighbour, and by loving one's neighbour are fulfilled. τὸ γάρ] γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ is not to be supplied. Respecting this introductory article in the neuter before entire sentences, in use in Greek, comp. Matthiä, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 568.

—οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις] In the critical authorities various transpositions and omissions occur with respect to these clauses, explicable by means of ὁμοίωρακτον and ὁμοιοτέλετον. But the *lect. rec.* is to be regarded as perfectly authenticated, with the exception of οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, which is to be viewed, with just as certain and general consent, upon far preponderant testimony, as a later interpolation taken from Ex. xx. 16, Deut. v. 20; comp. Matt. xix. 18. The transposition found here and there (Syr. Clem. *al.* Orig. Raf.), οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, is a mere correction in accordance with Ex. xx. 13 f., Deut. v. 17 f., Matt. xix. 18. The seventh commandment is placed before the sixth also in Mark x. 19, Luke xviii. 20, and often in Philo, *de decalogo*, §§ 12, 32, 24, 25, and *de special. legg.* §§ 10, 15. Whether this transposition refers to a theory of the Rabbins respecting the prime

importance of the sixth commandment, or merely depends on an accidental confusion occurring in several MSS. of the Alexandrine version, may be left undecided.

—καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή] *sc.* ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἐστίν. But those commands are meant which in the same way enjoin duties to one's neighbour, like οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, τίμα τὸν πατέρα κτλ., comp. Matt. xix. 18; Mark x. 19; Luke xviii. 20.

—ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ] Lachmann and Tischendorf, after B D E F G, Orig., read ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ. λόγος, like the Heb. דָּבָר, as a designation of a command.

—ἀνακεφαλαιούται] Comp. Harless on Eph. i. 10. ἀνακεφαλαιούσθαι is either = *summam comprehendere*, i.e. *partes disjectas in unum corpus*, κεφάλαιον, *colligere*, to unite under one head, one total, or one principle, i.e. *to comprehend*, or, retaining the force of ἀνά = *summam repetere*, to comprehend *again* under one head. In the latter case there would be an allusion to the local position of the law, Lev. xix. 11–18, the command to love one's neighbour, in which the other commands are said to be involved, standing there after the other commands, which it therefore *recapitulates*, repeats in summary form. But the apostle's point here is not so much to observe that *Moses* in the command of love recapitulates the commands relating to one's neighbour, as rather, that by its very nature the command of love embodies in summary form the commands relating to one's neighbour. συντόμως καὶ ἐν βραχεὶ τὸ πᾶν ἀπαρτίζεται τῶν ἐντολῶν τὸ ἔργον, Chrysostom.

—ἐν τῷ] wanting in authorities of no great weight. The omission is explained by the fact of its being easily dispensed with. In the same way it is wanting in the parallel passage, Gal. v. 14, in several codices. Here, too, the command is introduced by the neuter article, and thus made into a substantive.

—ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν] comp. Lev. xix. 18. The reading ὡς σεαυτόν, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, so also Cod. Sinait., is probably to be regarded as a mere grammatical interpretation of ὡς ἑαυτόν. Respecting this ἑαυτόν used of the *second* person, comp. Winer, p. 187. ὁ πλησίον, like ὁ ἕτερος, ver. 8, is *neighbour in general*, not merely *Christian brother*.

Ver. 10. ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται] sums up the import of the collective negative precepts, ver. 9. Rightly Bengel: "Pleraque autem officia in negativo consistunt, aut

certe, ubi nemo laeditur, officia positiva sua sponte et cum voluptate peraguntur." The apostle was no doubt first of all led to choose the negative form of expression by the negative import of the O. T. commands quoted in ver. 9. But as these, even in their negative form, always involve withal the opposite precept (comp. Luther's exposition in his Catechism), so ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται includes ἡ ἀγάπη χρηστεύεται, 1 Cor. xiii. 4. From the outward legal standpoint, ἡ τῶν κακῶν ἀποχή is not identical with ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐργασία. But where the avoiding of evil springs from love, there is no doubt always at the same time a doing of the opposite good. The one is the negative, the other the positive manifestation of love. But where one is there the other will be, for the very reason that the power of love, manifesting itself in a twofold direction, is itself present. The Greeks construe ἐργάζεσθαι τινά τι; Paul here ἐργάζεσθαι τινί τι; comp. Luke vi. 27: καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς.

—πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη] If the commands of the law, forbidding to do evil to a neighbour, are summed up in the injunction of love, ver. 9, because love does no evil to a neighbour, it follows that love is the fulfilling of the law. Thus is established: ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον νόμον πεπλήρωκε, ver. 8. It is indeed true that the apostle here, in harmony with the context, has only in view the second table, so called, of the Decalogue, *i.e.* the precepts of the law, positive as well as negative (comp. εἴ τις ἐτέρα ἐντολή, ver. 9), referring to conduct towards a neighbour. But at the same time it follows, of course, that with the commands of the second those of the first table also are fulfilled, because love to a neighbour, as a manifestation of love to God, points back by an inner necessity to the existence of the latter as its source, 1 John iv. 11, 12, 16, 20, 21, v. 1, 2. Love to God and man is instanced in Matt. xxii. 40 as the principle of perfect fulfilment of the whole law. Respecting πλήρωμα, comp. on xi. 12.

The exhortation to fulfil the law of love the apostle strengthens by pointing to the approaching day of the Lord, and joins thereto new exhortations to walk in the light of this already dawning day, vv. 12–14.

Ver. 11. καὶ τοῦτο] *idque, et quidem, et præsertim, and this, and moreover, and that*, namely, μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, ver. 8, so that no further special supplement,

such as *ποιῶμεν, ποιεῖτε*, or the like, is required. Comp. Winer, p. 717, and 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8; Eph. ii. 8; Phil. i. 28; Heb. xi. 12; 3 John 5 (where Griesb. in marg., Lachm. and Tischend. read *καὶ τοῦτο ξένους*). *καὶ ταῦτα*, found in some of these passages (1 Cor. vi. 8, *lect. rec.*; Heb. xi. 12), is the usual form in the classics. Theodoret interprets: *καὶ μάλιστα, also especially*. Comp. the analogous *καὶ τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον*, Heb. x. 25. *καί* strengthens (Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part. d. gr. Spr.* I. p. 145 f.), *τοῦτο* points back. *καὶ τοῦτο* serves to add a new integral element, a chief motive to what precedes, comp. Viger, ed. Herm. p. 176 sq.; Matthiä, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 872 f. Here it introduces the motive contained in *εἰδότες κτλ.* Luther takes vv. 11, 12 as *one* connected sentence, and translates: "And because we know this, namely the time, that the hour has come to arise from sleep (seeing that our salvation is now nearer than when we believed it; the night is past, the day has arrived), let us put off the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light." He therefore connects together, by a harsh and involved mode of construction, *καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες*, takes *τὸν καιρόν* as apposition to *τοῦτο*, the words *ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι* as explaining the apposition, *νῦν γὰρ . . . ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν* as a parenthesis, and *ἀποθώμεθα κτλ.* as the principal clause belonging to *εἰδότες*. Similarly Carpzovius, Benecke, Glöckler.

—*εἰδότες τὸν καιρόν*] *since you know the season*, since you know what time it is (namely, in the kingdom of God). This time is more precisely defined by the subjoined

—*ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι*] namely, that it is time to arise from sleep. *ἤδη* is not = *jam, already*,—this would be *ὅτι ἤδη ὥρα κτλ.*, not *ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη κτλ.*,—but = *tandem aliquando, at last, now at length*, comp. *ἤδη ποτέ*, i. 10; Hartung, *Lehre v. d. Part.* I. p. 238, 4.<sup>1</sup> With this acceptation what follows is not inconsistent. It might be objected that no one could even be expected to awake before break of day. But, in the first place, this might certainly be required as regards a long winter night; and again, a Christian is to be awake in a spiritual sense night and day. How much more, then, is he to awake at least on the dawn of the decisive day itself! *ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγείρειν*,

<sup>1</sup> In the case also of the reading *ὅτι ὥρα ἤδη ἡμᾶς κτλ.*, received by Lachmann, Tischendorf in ed. 1, not in ed. 2, Fritzsche, *ἤδη* belongs to *ἡμᾶς κτλ.*, not to *ὅτι ὥρα* (*sc. ἰστίῳ*).

to raise from sleep; *ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγείρεσθαι*, to awake from sleep. The infinitive aorist denotes an action passing rapidly, completed all at once, Winer, p. 416. With the construction *ώρα ἐγερθῆναι*, comp. LXX. Gen. xxix. 7: *ἔτι ἐστὶν ἡμέρα πολλή, οὐπω ὥρα συναχθῆναι τὰ κτήνη*. See the like figure in Eph. v. 14; 1 Thess. v. 4 ff. What holds good of the first moment of conversion holds good also of its course of continuous progressive development, and especially of the characteristic, incisive epochs of that course. As the converted man has already arisen from the sleep of sin, so is he still continually to arise therefrom, to shake off and overcome the slumber and sloth perpetually cleaving to him, and stand ready equipped for the war with sin. Here upon earth he finds himself always in a mixed condition of comparative wakefulness and comparative slumber, and may therefore be equally addressed as awake and asleep, and equally summoned to continue awake and to arise from sleep. And as the light of Christ has already shone forth, so does it still continue to shine forth until its complete rise *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κυρίου*, 1 Thess. v. 2. Thus we already live in the light, Col. i. 12, 13, and nevertheless in darkness, in comparison with the light of that day which will bring us full *σωτηρία*. In proportion, therefore, as that day draws near, the call becomes more urgent to arise from sleep, in order that, like the wise virgins, we may be found watching for the Lord's coming, Matt. xxiv. 42, xxv. 13. No real objection, therefore, can be raised with respect to the words *ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι*, and the less so as by *ἡμᾶς* the apostle includes himself in the number. "Paraclesis evangelica semper *Plus Ultra* tendit: et praesentis status vetustatem praesupponit in comparatione ad ea, quae sequi debent noviora, salutis propinquitati respondentia," Bengel.

*νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία*] Confirmation of *ὅτι ὥρα . . . ἐγερθῆναι*. For this reason, neither the words *νῦν γὰρ . . . ἐπιστεύσαμεν*, nor yet the words *νῦν γὰρ . . . ἡγγικεν*, are to be enclosed in brackets. Only the last words, taken in their connection, expressly state the reason why the readers are to rise from sleep, to be vigilant; and *ἀποθώμεθα . . . φωτός* draws an inference from *ἡ νῦξ . . . ἡγγικεν*. Vulg.: *nostra salus*; Luther: *our salvation*. They therefore connect together *ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία*, comp. xiv. 16. But more probable is the connection *ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν*, comp. x. 8. *ἡ σωτηρία* is salvation viewed in its consummation, such as commences with the return of the Lord. While

Christians already possess *σωτηρία*, they still await it (comp. viii. 24, 25), because they possess it merely as to its beginnings (comp. viii. 23). Only the parousia of the Lord, not their own death, can be thought of as the medium of their complete attainment of salvation; for it is not said that they have come subjectively nearer *σωτηρία*, but that *σωτηρία* has objectively come nearer them. *ἐπὶ θύραις γὰρ, φησὶν, ὁ τῆς κρίσεως ἔστηκε καιρός*, Chrysostom. But no doubt, as respects the individual, death is equivalent to his coming to *σωτηρία*, the resurrection from the dead equivalent to *σωτηρία* coming to him.

—*ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν*] Not to be rendered, with Luther: "than when we believed *it*," but: "than when we became believers," comp. Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 5. As to the expectation here given utterance to by the apostle of the approaching return of the Lord, comp. on xi. 26. In the abstract and objectively, it is perfectly correct that the Lord's return was then nearer than when the gospel began to be preached. When, moreover, the apostle directed his gaze to the rapidly and mightily growing influence of the gospel, the preaching of Christ, in the quarter of a century that had elapsed since the founding of the Christian church, having already filled Asia and Europe (comp. x. 18), and along with this reflected that, after the completion of all the essential preliminary elements in the economy of salvation, the Lord's return might be indicated as the *next* epoch and as always *at hand*, as well as that the developments of God's kingdom conceived by him as necessarily preceding the parousia (comp. xi. 25, 26 with xi. 15) might possibly transpire with the same rapidity as the first diffusion of the gospel, he was justified not merely in accepting the ideal proximity, but also in hoping for the empirical and real proximity of the day of the Lord. Only he would not lose the consciousness that this expectation was grounded merely in human hope, not in divine certainty. If, then, the ideal proximity of the day of the Lord is a fact at all times, and therefore was so at any time, if, after the lapse of the first quarter of the first Christian *sæculum*, it had actually come nearer its realization, and there was reason for supposing that the actual occurrence of the expected consummation of salvation would not delay so much longer, there was reason for saying what the apostle here says. The appearance of the times was just such as if the Lord would speedily come (comp. 1 Tim. iv. 1 ff.;

2 Tim. iii. 1 ff.; 1 John ii. 18)—reason enough for the earnest admonition to wake up from the sleep of sin. The parousia, known as objectively near in divine certainty, must also to human expectation have seemed to have come subjectively near. The error would only have lain in absolutely identifying the former divine certainty with the latter human expectation. But no sooner did this error appear than the apostles at once withstood it, 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff.; 2 Pet. iii. 1 ff. Certainly, had Paul been asked whether he knew if he or any of his contemporaries would survive till the return of Christ with the same divine precision with which he knew the general fact of that return, he would have replied in the negative.

Ver. 12. ἡ νύξ προέκοψεν] *nox processit, the night is advanced.* Not exactly Vulgate: “nox praecessit,” and Luther: “the night is gone.”

—ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν] *but the day has drawn near*, Heb. x. 25. The night is the time for sleep and walking in darkness; the day, for wakefulness and walking in light. If the day is at hand, it is time to arise from the sleep of sin and walk in righteousness, which has no need to shun the light of day; for the day with its light brings salvation (τὴν σωτηρίαν), and whoever walks unworthily of the light of day will not be illumined by the light of salvation.

—ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους] *Let us therefore* (namely, because the approaching day of the Lord requires that we not only awake from sleep, but walk honestly) *put off the works of darkness.* ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, in accordance with the general spirit of the passage, is more aptly explained by: “works in keeping, in harmony with darkness, done in darkness,” than by: “works which darkness brings to pass.” As darkness conceals evil works, they are done in darkness, and are therefore works bearing in themselves the nature of darkness. In itself, indeed, ἀποτίθεσθαι is used of laying aside anything in actual possession; but here, as in Eph. iv. 22 (comp. Harless, *ibid.*), the opposition to ἐνδύεσθαι suggests the figure of laying aside a garment. The works of darkness are thought of, so to speak, as a night-garment, of which they are to divest themselves on the approach of day.

—καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός] A B C\* D\* E, Copt. Sahid. Clem. Al. Damasc. read ἐνδυσώμεθα δέ instead of καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα, which Griesbach approves, Lachmann and Tischendorf



received. Decision depends entirely on external grounds, and these are in favour of the *lect. rec.* Cod. Sinait.\* has merely *ἐνδυσώμεθα*. As to τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός, comp. on vi. 13. Here, too, τὰ ὅπλα are not *the instruments*, for one puts not on instruments, but *the weapons*. But τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός in contrast with τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους are not = "weapons provided by the light," but = "weapons in keeping with the light, which one carries in the day," which therefore bear in themselves the characteristics of light, are weapons of light. "*Opera tenebrarum pro turpibus et flagitiosis: quia nox (ut inquit ille) pudore vacat. Arma lucis pro honestis actionibus et sobriis et castis, quibus solet dies destinari. At Arma potius quam Opera: quoniam Domino militandum est,*" Calvin. What these weapons denote, see in Isa. lix. 17; Wisd. v. 19; Eph. vi. 13 ff.; 1 Thess. v. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 7, x. 4 f.; 1 Tim. i. 18 f.

Vv. 13, 14 illustrate the precept given in ver. 12: ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός. As is well known, these verses have acquired renown in the annals of ecclesiastical history through the conversion of Augustine, which was connected with them, comp. Aug. *Conf.* l. viii. c. 12. ὥς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ] *sc. περιπατοῦντες*. "As if walking in the day." Really, indeed, they walk not in the day, but in the dim twilight of morning. Still they are so to walk as if it were already full day. ὥς therefore refers to the *subjective conception*, comp. on ix. 32, and 1 Cor. iv. 18.

—εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν] *let us walk becomingly*. Comp. Ovid, *Amor.* l. i. eleg. 5, v. 59, 60: "*Nox et Amor vinumque nihil moderabile suadent. Illa pudore vacat, Liber Amorque metu.*" Moreover, that the demeanour which befits one walking in the clear light of day, and which the apostle here requires, is required not merely on account of the observant eyes of men, but above all, on account of the all-seeing eye of God, is understood spontaneously, and is intimated in what precedes (comp. νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία, ver. 11) and in what follows (comp. ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύρ. Ἰησ. Χρ., ver. 14). With εὐσχημόνως, comp. 1 Cor. vii. 35, xiv. 40; 1 Thess. iv. 12.

—μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις] *not in night-revellings and carousals*. The dative is no doubt most simply taken as *dativus loci*; for we say not only ἐν ὁδῷ πορεύεσθαι, but also ὁδῷ πορεύεσθαι; comp. Tob. iv. 5: καὶ μὴ πορευθῆς ταῖς ὁδοῖς τῆς ἀδικίας; Jude

11: ὅτι τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν; Acts xiv. 16. So it is said in 1 Pet. iv. 3: πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἀσελγείαις (= ἐν ὁδοῖς ἀσελγειῶν, comp. Matt. xxi. 32), and Acts ix. 31: πορεύεσθαι τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου (= τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ φόβου τ. κ.). Comp., too, 2 Cor. xii. 18: οὐ τᾷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι περιεπατήσαμεν; οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔχνεσι; and on iv. 12. But the dative here may also be taken as *dativus modi*, comp. Meyer here = not *with* revellings, etc. Respecting *κῶμος*, *commissatio*, comp. Passow, Wahl Clavis, s.v. In the N. T. it occurs again in Gal. v. 21: μέθαι, κῶμοι, and in 1 Pet. iv. 3: κῶμοι, πότοι. Here and in Gal. v. 21, μέθη is *cbrictas*, *vinolentia*, *temulentia*, comp. Luke xxi. 34, in the plural and in conjunction with κῶμοι nocturnal banquetings = "drinkings, carousals;" Luther: "not in gluttony and drunkenness."

—μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις] As to κοίτη, *concubitus*, *congressus* *venercus*, comp. on ix. 10. Here, of course, *unchaste* intercourse is meant. ἀσέλγεια, *lascivia*, *petulantia*. Comp. Tittmann, *de Synonym. in N. T.* p. 151: "Est enim ἀσελγής proprie petulans, procax, *protervus*, qui nullam verecundiae pudorisque rationem habet, sed immoderate et petulanter se gerit, rebusque utitur. Itaque ἀσέλγεια est proprie protervitas et impudens petulantia hominis ἀσελγοῦς." Here the conjunction with κοίται (Luther: "not in chambering and unchastity") indicates that unbridled wantonness is meant, showing itself in unchaste gestures, words, and acts. "Abstract nouns in the plural denote the various expressions, evidences, outbreaks, concrete manifestations generally of the quality expressed by the singular," Winer, p. 220.

—μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ] *not in strife and wrath*. κοίται and ἀσέλγεια are just as much as ἔρις and ζήλος the natural and ordinary consequences of κῶμοι and μέθαι. The conjunction of ἔρις and ζήλος is found also in 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 3. Strife begets wrath, or inversely. Both are invariably found together. The meaning *envy* instead of *wrath* (comp. Luther), therefore, here suits not the connection, and still less the meaning *jealousy*. In κῶμοι, μέθαι, κοίται, ἀσέλγεια, ἔρις, ζήλος, the specific and characteristic, so to speak, the visible and palpable ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, ver. 12, are instanced, such as are usually perpetrated in the night-time.

ἀλλ' ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν] *but put on the Lord Jesus Christ*, a figure for entrance into most intimate union and

life-fellowship with Him. As to this use of ἐνδύεσθαι, comp. beside Gal. iii. 27, Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10, also Luke xxiv. 49; 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54; 2 Cor. v. 3; Col. iii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 8; also the Homeric δύσσο δ' ἀλκὴν, *Il.* xix. 36,<sup>1</sup> and the Heb. שָׂרַף; Job xxix. 14; Ezek. xxvi. 16; Isa. li. 9. Christ, indeed, is already put on once for all in baptism, Gal. iii. 27; but He is, moreover, continually put on by faith, and in and with Him the new man, Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10, and the fruits of regeneration, the ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός, comp. Calov. here.

—καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιείσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας] The meaning is correctly elucidated by Chrysostom: ὥσπερ γὰρ οὐ τὸ πίνειν ἐκώλυσεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ μεθύειν, οὐδὲ τὸ γαμεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀσελγεῖν, οὕτως οὐδὲ τὸ προνοεῖν τῆς σαρκὸς, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἰς ἐπιθυμίας, οἷον τὸ τὴν χρεῖαν ὑπερβαίνειν, Theodoret: οὐ γὰρ ἀπηγόρευσε τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἐπιμέλειαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τρυφήν καὶ τὴν ἄκρασίαν ἐξέβαλεν. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, μὴ ποιείσθε, τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐπιθυμίας μὴ ποιείσθε, ἀντὶ τοῦ, μὴ σκιρτᾶν αὐτὴν παρασκευάζετε διὰ τῆς τρυφῆς, and Theophyl.: Οὐ τὸ προνοεῖσθαι τῆς σαρκὸς κωλύει, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἰς ἐπιθυμίας. Πρὸς ὑγίειάν, φησιν, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς ἀσέλγειαν ἐπιμελοῦ τῆς σαρκός. By εἰς ἐπιθυμίας (expressing result = “so that lusts arise, are excited”) the prohibition τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιείσθε is limited and reduced to its true measure. This interpretation of the Greek and many other exegetes would not require μὴ to stand before εἰς ἐπιθυμίας; for, as already observed, we may either take εἰς ἐπιθυμίας as a supplementary limitation, or even join μὴ ποιείσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας closely together, so that τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν coming first would have to be regarded in the light of a concession: “And as to care for the flesh, which of itself is no doubt natural and right, let it not become of a lustful character, cherish it not in a lustful way.” To this Luther’s rendering comes very near: “and attend to the body, but so that it become not wanton.” Only then πρόνοια τῆς σαρκός would not be concessive, but imperative, which, taken precisely, would run: καὶ πρόνοιαν μὲν ποιείσθε τῆς σαρκός, ἀλλὰ μὴ εἰς ἐπιθυμίας. That according to our interpretation σῶμα must have been used instead of σάρξ, is an untenable objection; for σάρξ stands here in the purely physiological sense for the gross material substratum of the human σῶμα, comp.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the classical parallels in Wetstein here.

1 Cor. xv. 39; Eph. v. 29; or it denotes pure sensuousness, the external aspect of human existence, perceptible by sense (comp. ii. 28, 1 Cor. v. 5, vii. 28, x. 18, 2 Cor. iv. 11 with ver. 10, vii. 5, xii. 7, but especially 2 Cor. vii. 1: *μολυσμὸς σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος*, with 1 Cor. vii. 34: *ἀγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι*). If, on the other hand, we take *σάρξ* in the present passage in the ethical sense = *caro libidinosa*, or even of corrupt human nature generally, we should have an unconditional prohibition, and must interpret with Fritzsche: “et libidinosae carnis *providentiam* agere nolite, quae pravas cupiditates irritat.” But against this explanation tells the phrase *πρόνοιαν ποιῆσθαι*. This would rather be *ζῆν, περιπατεῖν κατὰ σάρκα, δουλεύειν τῇ σαρκί*; for we do not cherish care (which is always used *sensu bono*, comp. Acts xxiv. 2; Rom. xii. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 21; 1 Tim. v. 8) for sensual inclination, but live after it, are servants and slaves to it. “Quamdiu carnem nostram circumferimus, ejus curam non possumus in totum abjicere, sic enim in coelis est conversatio nostra, ut in terra peregrinemur. Curanda sunt igitur quae ad corpus pertinent, sed non aliter quam peregrinationis adminicula, non autem ut patriae nos oblivisci faciant,” Calvin.

## CHAPTER XIV.

THE difficult question, usually discussed in the introduction to this chapter, is that as to the peculiar standpoint of the ἀσθεν-  
οῦντες, whom the apostle in ver. 2 characterizes as λάχανα  
ἐσθίοντας. Several expositors supposed, which a first glance  
certainly seems to suggest, that here ascetics were pointed at,  
who abstained entirely from the use of animal food, ver. 2, and  
wine, ver. 21. But as the reason alleged for this abstinence is  
that they regarded those objects as κοινόν, ἀκάθαρτον, we should  
be led to suppose that they were influenced in their ascetic course  
by a dualistic theory of the world in a similar way to the later  
Manichaeans, Encratites, and other Gnostic sects, the germs and  
outlines of whose principles are discernible already in the apostolic  
epistles. But assuredly Paul would not have described persons  
of this class merely as weak, and exhorted others to treat them  
with brotherly affection and forbearance, not to despise them or  
offend their conscientious scruples, vv. 1, 3, 13, 15. Rather,  
just as the church in later days with the utmost earnestness  
resisted and condemned the fully developed Gnostic tendency, so  
did the apostle its primitive beginnings. In Col. ii. 18 (comp.  
vv. 16–23) Paul calls such men εἰκὴ φυσιομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ νοῦς  
τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν, who walk ἐν ἐβελοθησκειᾷ and introduce  
ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and in 1 Tim. iv. 1  
(comp. vv. 2–5) describes them as προσέχοντες πνεύμασι πλάνοις  
καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων.

Further, the asceticism meant to be described in this chapter  
might possibly be regarded as one pure in form, not based upon  
errors so fundamentally subversive. The purest form undoubtedly  
is the one in which it appears simply as ἀσκησις, as a means of  
discipline by which piety is trained through abstinence more  
easily to attain and more stedfastly to preserve the predominance  
of spirit over flesh, without thereby means being made an end,  
or attributing to the discipline any meritorious worth, and thus  
infringing upon the fundamental evangelical doctrine of justifica-

tion by faith alone. The kind, form, and degree of asceticism (here *μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον*, ver. 21) would then differ, and proceed on different grounds in different individuals. But such asceticism cannot be meant in the present passage, for it knows nothing of the distinction of *κοινόν* and *καθαρόν*, vv. 14, 20, or of *κρίνειν τὸν ἀδελφόν*, vv. 3, 10, and its general characteristic is not that of *ἀσθένεια*, ver. 2. But just as little can the reference be to the asceticism—not indeed positively dualistic, but still not altogether free from danger, rather unevangelical and arrogant in character—that, adopting the standpoint of extra legality, hopes by means of its disciplinary exercises to rise to a higher degree of holiness than ordinary Christians, who merely observe the laws of God binding upon all; for this form of asceticism, like the other, does not so much recognise an antithesis of pure and impure, as rather merely a perfection of good and better or extra good. Its representatives neither regard themselves nor are regarded by others as weak, but as strong. And in this case the apostle must have admonished them, as those who deemed themselves strong, not to avoid judging others, but to avoid despising others, and conversely must have called upon the others as those deemed weak, and deeming themselves weak, not to avoid despising the apparently strong, but to avoid honouring them too highly. Speaking generally also, the apostle would certainly have treated such an extra-legal theory with far less forbearance than he usually accorded to the legal one, because both one and the other in different degrees disturbed and altered the evangelical doctrine of faith and justification. But he would not have required from others, as he does here, the forbearance which he himself did not exercise. Finally, it is not easy to see how to such ascetics the non-ascetics could prove a *πρόσκομμα* and *σκάνδαλον*, ver. 13, which is contrary alike to the nature of the case and the testimony of history. Comp. Neander, *Hist. of Planting of Christianity*, I. 471.

The abstinence from animal food and the use of wine, spoken of in this chapter, manifestly proceeded not from the conceit of ascetic pride, but from religious scrupulosity of weak faith, whose motive was a strict conscientiousness which in the abstract has good foundation. If we glance at ver. 5, where *κρίνειν ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν* is spoken of, we are led to infer the observance of Jewish feasts on the part of the *ἀσθενεῖς*, and therewith a Jewish-

Christian tendency generally. This tendency, were only it does not come into direct collision with the evangelical doctrine of salvation, the apostle is wont to treat elsewhere with the most tender regard, as one rooted in O. T. divine revelation and based upon the historical development of the people of Israel, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 20; Acts xvi. 3, xviii. 18, 21, xxi. 20–26. We might here, therefore, possibly be led to think of an anxious observance of the Mosaic precepts respecting food (Lev. xi., Deut. xiv.) on the part of the weaker Jewish-Christian portion of the church, comp. Acts x. 14; 1 Macc. i. 47 f. 62, 63. Nevertheless by the law all flesh and wine was by no means forbidden, so that, upon this view, vv. 2, 21 of the chapter could not be explained without violence. For it does not seem a simple and natural course to reduce the total abstinence from flesh and wine, which according to these verses seems to have been practised by the ἀσθενοῦντες, to a mere hypothetical or hyperbolical phrase of the apostle; and in accordance with the Mosaic law of meats, no sufficient reason can be given for such total abstinence. We should then be compelled to refer to the consideration that the Rabbins forbade all flesh killed by the Goyim, as well as wine of the Goyim,<sup>1</sup> and that the scrupulous Jewish Christians of their own accord confined themselves entirely to vegetable diet in order not to expose themselves to the danger of contamination in their unavoidable intercourse with Gentiles, and especially with Gentile Christians. But persons of such strict Judaizing principles would not in any case have been stricter than the Jews themselves. The latter, of their own accord, entirely avoid eating along with the ἔθνη, without on this account foregoing the use of flesh and wine altogether. The same course was followed even by the stricter, especially Palestinian Jewish Christians (Gal. ii. 12 ff.), a number of whom were probably found in the Roman church. The latter withdrew entirely from social intercourse with Gentiles and Gentile Christians, and had no reason for abstaining from eating flesh and drinking wine, since they had means, like the Jews of to-day in the diaspora, of procuring the so-called kosher flesh and kosher wine.

We are therefore driven to think here of a comparatively free party of Jewish Christians, who, indeed, came so near to the Pauline position as not to suppose themselves bound to abstain

<sup>1</sup> See the vouchers in Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, II. pp. 616 f., 620 ff.

from ordinary intercourse with Gentiles and Gentile Christians, but, nevertheless, still held captive by their Jewish-Christian tendencies, entertained scruples, in their daily intercourse with the ἔθνη, about directly partaking of flesh and wine. But the reason of these scruples can have been nothing else than the apprehension of being contaminated by the use—not easily to be avoided—of sacrificial flesh on sale in the Gentile meat-market, and of libation-wine, and of entering into unholy fellowship with idols; comp. Dan. i. 8, 12, 16; Hävernicks, *Comm.* pp. 26–29, and Augustine, *de mor. Manich.* ii. 14: “Eo enim tempore, quo hæc scribebat Apostolus, multa immolatitia caro in macello vendebatur. Et quia vino etiam libabatur diis gentium, multi fratres infirmiores, qui etiam rebus his venalibus utebantur, penitus se a carnibus et vino cohibere maluerunt, quam vel nescientes incidere in eam quam putabant cum idolis communicationem.” It was this very eating of the so-called *חֲבֵי מַחֲוֹת* which to the Jews was an object of the deepest abhorrence; comp. the tractate in the Mishna *Pirke Avoth*. c. iii. § 3, and in the Clementines, *Hom.* xi. § 15. Peter says to the Gentiles: *προφάσει τῶν λεγομένων ἱεροθύτων χαλεπῶν δαιμόνων ἐμπίπλασθε*. As to the Gentile libation wine, comp. Mishna in the tractate *Arota Sarah*, c. ii. § 3. With this view agrees perfectly the elaborate discussion in 1 Cor. viii. (comp. x. 23 ff.), supplying so many points of analogy with the present chapter. Thus only is it possible to explain how the apostle could warn the *ἐσθίοντας* against an *ἐξουθενεῖν*, and those *μὴ ἐσθίοντας* against a *κρίνειν* of others, vv. 3, 10, and yet permit the various tendencies themselves to continue, and exhort those who manifested them to mutual forbearance and recognition. On the other hand, had the *ἀσθενοῦντες*, from a purely legal standpoint, demanded of others a like abstinence, not for the purpose of avoiding idolatry, but on the ground of the Mosaic or rabbinical prohibitions of food, instead of gently exhorting, he would have censured them with the utmost severity, and in the same way would have called upon the stronger ones, not to avoid giving offence, but to assert their evangelical freedom regardless of consequences; for such a *κρίνειν* as this would have implied nothing less than a call to observe the *νόμος* in order to the attainment of *δικαιοσύνη* and *σωτηρία*. On the other hand, the special apprehensions of Jewish Christians in respect to *εἰδωλόθυτα* had been commended by the apostolic conference at Jeru-



salem to the special forbearance and regard of the Gentile Christians, Acts xv. 20, 29, xxi. 25. It is true that in the present passage we find indicated, as the characteristic note of the ἀσθενοῦντες, not merely *λάχανα ἐσθίειν*, ver. 2, but also *κρίνειν ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν*, ver. 5; and from the entire context (comp. especially ver. 6) it follows that in this respect also the weaker permitted themselves a *κρίνειν* of the stronger. This is a point not taken into account by expositors, who otherwise follow the correct interpretation of the chapter. If the *λάχανα ἐσθίοντες* were at the same time *κρίνοντες ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν*, then they must have belonged in every other respect to the stricter party of Jewish Christians; and if they were *κρίνοντες τοὺς κρίνοντας πᾶσαν ἡμέραν*, then they themselves relapsed into the fatal error of the nomistic Pharisaic Jewish Christians, who wished to impose on the ἔθνη the burden of the νόμος Μωϋσέως, and therefore came within the range of the apostle's severe sentence of condemnation. For these reasons we think that those *κρίνοντες ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν*, ver. 5, are to be distinguished from the *λάχανα ἐσθίοντες*, ver. 2. The former were the stricter, probably Palestinian, Jewish Christians, who were inclined to judge, not the Gentile Christians, but merely the freer, ethnicizing Jewish Christians for their non-observance of the Mosaic nomos, comp. Acts xxi. 20–26. The latter, on the other hand, were the freer, probably Hellenistic, Jewish Christians, to whom a portion of the more prejudiced Gentile Christians may have attached themselves, who in their turn were inclined to judge the freer Gentile Christians, to whom some of the freest Jewish Christians may have adhered, for their indiscriminate use of *κρέα* and *οἶνος*, even of sacrificial flesh and libation-wine, and conversely on this account were despised by the latter for their narrow prejudices. That the controversy in the Roman church turned more on the use of sacrificial flesh than on preference of days, seems to be suggested by the more cursory mention of the latter, vv. 5, 6, whereas the former is the principal subject of the apostolic exhortation. Only few Palestinian Jewish Christians comparatively were probably settled in Rome; and that the Roman church was not only in general composed of Gentile Christians, but that the number of the latter was preponderant in it, we may conclude from the fact that the exhortation is chiefly addressed to them not merely in the beginning, ver. 1, but throughout the entire chapter, comp. xv. 7–9

and Introduction. In the present passage the apostle contents himself with describing *πάν βρώμα* as *καθαρόν*, without, as in the first Corinthian epistle, giving further reasons for this position, and relieving more definitely the anxiety of timorous spirits in reference to the *εἰδωλόθυτον*. Moreover, in the Corinthian epistle his principal theme is *ἀγάπη*, not *γνώσις*. On this account he had special reason there to discuss more in detail the question respecting the *εἰδωλόθυτον* itself, because the Corinthians, in their pride of wisdom, boasted of their *γνώσις* of the uselessness of idols, and because in Corinth those who manifested the freer tendency might even let themselves be carried away to the extreme of participating to some extent in the Gentile feasts held in the Gentile temples in honour of the gods, which even the apostle disapproves in the most positive manner as an actual participation in the worship of idols and demons, 1 Cor. viii. 10, x. 19, 21; Ex. xxxiv. 15.

Vv. 1–12. The strong are to receive the weak, not to despise them, and the weak are not to judge the strong; for every one stands or falls to his own master. Let every one be persuaded of his own opinion before the Lord, for this Lord alone is judge, and to Him alone is every one bound to give account.

Ver. 1. In xiii. 14, in the words *καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιήσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας*, the apostle had concluded with the injunction of temperance. Now this was construed by some in the Roman church with, in some respects, too great strictness. But as this strictness sprang from religious scruples of conscience, which did not directly infringe upon the evangelical essentials of salvation, the apostle wishes the great law of love, advanced in xiii. 8–10, and ratified in xiii. 11 ff. by the allusion to the approaching day of the Lord (comp. xiv. 11, 12), to be applied even to the weak in faith, comp. xiv. 15. *τὸν δὲ ἀσθενούντα τῇ πίστει*] The *δέ*, subjoining something further, passes on to another subject. The question is, what meaning must here be assigned to the word *πίστις*. By some expositors it is inappositely explained in the objective sense, *doctrina Christiana*. Clearly the reference here is to *πίστις* in the subjective sense, vv. 2, 14, 22, 23. But this is not, as to the meaning of the word, identical with *γνώσις*, the *verum divinarum cognitio*, which expression, if he had associated this meaning with the word *πίστις*, the apostle would have used here just as well as in 1 Cor. viii. 1, 10. It

is more natural, in accordance with vv. 2, 14, 22, 23 of the present chapter, to understand *πίστις* in this verse of *ethical faith, moral conviction*. Only, this idea must first of all be defined in the specific biblical and Pauline sense; for, in the scriptural sense of the word, genuine *πίστις* is invariably equivalent to implicit acceptance of a divine promise, implicit adhesion to divinely-revealed truth. Mere subjective moral conviction, without this objective basis, however steadfast in character, is still to be designated *ἀπιστία*, not *πίστις*. Further, here comes in the former confident assurance, *ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ*, spoken of in the verses just quoted, *ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ*, ver. 14; for in its last resort this is based upon saving faith in Christ, which, where it is strong and powerful, releases man from all anxious perturbation of conscience in relation to the use of external things, and imparts to him the joyous assurance that *πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν*, 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23. As to form, *πίστις* is always the subjective mental affection of trust. Only, as to matter, faith varies accordingly as its object varies, *saving* faith ever remaining the root of every kind of faith, as of fruit springing from this root. Here, then, where *πίστις* occurs for the first time absolutely, *i.e.* without more precise definition, may possibly be meant justifying faith itself, *πίστις κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the weakness of which shows itself in scrupulosity in respect to *εἰδωλόθυτα*. But we shall do best to leave to the expression its indefinite and general latitude, according to which *ἀσθενεῖν τῇ πίστει* denotes weakness in the matter of faith generally, weak saving faith along with every kind of weak faith implied therein and springing therefrom, of which ver. 2 next introduces the particular species to be treated of in the present chapter.

—*προσλαμβάνεσθε*] not = *opitulamini*, interest yourselves in him. This would be *προσλαμβάνεσθαί τινος* (also *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαί τινος*, Heb. ii. 16; *συλλαμβάνεσθαί τινι*, Luke v. 7; *συναντιλαμβάνεσθαί τινι*, Rom. viii. 26), not *προσλαμβάνεσθαί τινα*, which = *ad se recipere*, to receive one, to take to oneself, Acts xviii. 26, xxviii. 2; Rom. xi. 15, xiv. 3, xv. 7; Philem. 12, 17. Here is meant a loving reception into the fellowship of Christian brethren, which to the one received is an act as full of forbearance as it is of help.

—*μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν*] As *διακρίνειν* denotes *to pass judgment*, Matt. xvi. 3, or *to decide*, 1 Cor. vi. 5, so *διάκρισις*

denotes *judgment*, Heb. v. 14, 1 Cor. xii. 10 (comp. 1 John iv. 1), or *decision*. Hence some expositors interpret *μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν* by: *not to judgments of thoughts*, i.e. without delivering judicial decisions respecting thoughts. Grotius: "non sumentes vobis dijudicandas ipsorum cogitationes." On this view, therefore, the strong would be exhorted not to judge the principles and dispositions of the weak in faith. But in no respect does this interpretation seem to us quite appropriate. In the first place, throughout this chapter the apostle ascribes *κρίνειν* to the *weak*, *ἐξουθενεῖν* to the *strong* (vv. 3, 4, 10). Even if in ver. 13 he includes both these lines of conduct under the expression *κρίνειν ἀλλήλους*, he does so in such a way as at once to define the nature of the *κρίνειν* on the part of the strong, thus: *ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον*. Here, therefore, he would self-evidently have warned the strong not so much against a *διακρίνειν*, as rather against an *ἐξουθενεῖν* or *σκανδαλίζειν* of the weak. But, again, *διαλογίζεσθαι* refers,<sup>1</sup> in the N. T. at least, always to thoughts of a hesitating, doubting, futile, perverse kind and character. Here, therefore, this meaning must be assigned to the word. But hesitating, doubting thoughts were not really entertained by the weak in the first instance (vv. 5, 6), but were excited in them by the strong (ver. 23). And as to futile, perverse thoughts, the apostle does not here ascribe these to them, because neither would he have required forbearance to be shown to such thoughts, nor could such a description of their thoughts tend to induce forbearance. It is therefore preferable to recur to the meaning, usual in the passive, of *διακρίνειν*, *haesitare, dubitare*, to *hesitate, doubt* (Matt. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; Acts x. 20, xi. 12; Rom. iv. 20, xiv. 23; Jas. i. 6), and to assign to the substantive the meaning *hesitation, doubt*, which certainly is not found in classical Greek, but undoubtedly occurs in Theodoret on Rom. xiv. 22, 23, and Oecum. on Rom. xiv. 20. The sense then is: "Receive the weak in faith affectionately, so that doubts of thought (=doubting thoughts) arise not or are not

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Matt. xvi. 7, 8, xxi. 25; Mark ii. 6, 8, viii. 16, 17, ix. 33, xi. 31, Lachm.; Luke i. 29, iii. 15, v. 21, 22, xii. 17, xx. 14; John xi. 50, where, with Lachm., *λογίζεσθε* is to be read, and *διαλογισμός*, Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21; Luke ii. 35, v. 22, vi. 8, ix. 46, 47, xxiv. 38; Rom. i. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20; Phil. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Jas. ii. 4.

excited in them." Luther gives the sense freely, but strikingly: "and perplex not their conscience." *μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν* contains therefore the result of *προσλαμβάνεσθαι*; for this is the necessary consequence of loving reception into brotherly fellowship, which, of course, implies forbearing regard for the foreign standpoint itself. *μὴ εἰς διακρ. διαλογ.* would less aptly be taken as a caution = "but so that no doubts of thought arise." In this case we should have to interpret *προσλαμβάνεσθαι* merely of external reception into fellowship generally, along with which a course of conduct might be pursued, from which *διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν* would spring. But to this meaning of *προσλαμβάνεσθαι* are opposed both ver. 3, xv. 7, and the case itself; for neither would the apostle have enjoined a reception so utterly meaningless in a moral aspect, nor was it necessary to enjoin it, as it was never refused. But, according to the meaning of *διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν* advocated by us, it is evident at once how very pertinent is the injunction to which the apostle constantly reverts in this chapter, and with which he concludes his argument (vv. 13, 15, 21, 22, 23), namely, that they are to avoid putting a *πρόσκομμα* or *σκάνδαλον* in the way of the weak. For as the weak look upon eating flesh as wrong, and are led to the opposite practice by the example and pressure of the strong, in this way hesitation and doubt arise in their minds as to the right course to pursue; and, eating with a condemning because doubtful conscience, they are guilty of sin. Further, the same meaning may be extracted from the passage if to *διάκρισις* we assign the meaning, ratified not only by etymology (comp. *διακρίνεσθαι* = to strive, quarrel, Acts xi. 2; Jude 9) but by usage: *strife* = "so that no strife, dissension arise in their thoughts." To this meaning of *διάκρισις*, *strife*, finally, a third class of expositors adheres, and with the Vulg. interprets: "non in disceptationibus cogitationum," i.e. "not in such a way that conflicts of thoughts arise" (namely, those which one entertains respecting others), or "not in such a way that contentions and altercations arise therefrom" (like *διαλογισμοί*, Phil. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8). The strife and altercation is said to arise from the fault-finding of the strong, which provokes the weak to reply. But, to pass by the fact that the apostle would not forbid mere reciprocal strife of thoughts, the meaning *διαλογισμοί*, *altercations*, is without proof in the N. T., and neither does the entire argument

of this chapter intimate any prohibition of strife and altercation ; nor, as is self-evident, is the present verse meant to regulate the conduct of two parties to each other, but only that of the strong to the weak.

Ver. 2. Preliminary statement of the first and most material point of difference. *ὅς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα*] not = "the one is persuaded that he is permitted to eat all things," so that the notion of *ἐξείναι* is implied in the connection of the verb with the infinitive (comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 753 f.; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 167), but = *πίστιν ἔχει τοῦ φαγεῖν πάντα*, Acts xiv. 9, or *ὥστε φαγεῖν πάντα*, "has confidence to eat all things," comp. Winer, p. 405.

—*ὁ δὲ ἀσθενὼν λάχανα ἐσθίει*] *Τὸ ὅς μὲν* no *ὅς δέ* corresponds (comp. on. ix. 21), but forthwith the definite *ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν*, "but he that is weak." No doubt *λάχανα ἐσθίειν* in the abstract excludes all use of flesh, not merely that of sacrificial flesh. But therewith it may very well consist that this *λάχανα ἐσθίειν* was only observed by the *ἀσθενοῦντες*, for the reason that they wished thus the more certainly to avoid the eating of *εἰδωλόθυστα*, which Paul needed not to add expressly, as without this it was known to his readers. Some, then, may have abstained totally from the use of flesh, in order the more certainly to ensure victory over temptation thereto in particular instances;—others only in these particular instances, especially at common meals, a course that would make their conduct in the church seem the more strange;—others, finally, even at common meals only on occasions when they were certain that the flesh served up was sacrificial flesh, or at least were uncertain whether it was not so. But all these might very well be described as *λαχανοφάγοι*.

Ver. 3. Laying down of a rule of conduct on both sides. *ὁ ἐσθίων τὸν μὴ ἐσθίουτα μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτω*] *ὁ ἐσθίων* and *ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων* might here be taken in an absolute sense, so that "he that eats and he that eats not" would stand for "he that does not live abstemiously and he that does," comp. Matt. xi. 18, 19, and Fritzsche there. But it is more natural in the present passage, from what precedes, to supply *πάντα* both times, especially as here the reference is not to an ascetic life absolutely, but to abstinence from certain kinds of food for particular reasons. The danger of the strong was contempt, disdain (*ἐξουθενεῖν*) for the weak brother as narrow and super-

stitious, without correct γνώσις, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 1, 7, 10, 11. Oecumenius: μὴ ἐξουθενείτω, δεικνὺς ὅτι καταγέλαστα πράττει.

—καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων τὸν ἐσθίοντα μὴ κρίνέτω] Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of A C D\* (so also Cod. Sinait.\*) Clem., have received ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐσθίων, a reading which might easily be adopted in conformity with ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει, ver. 2. Comp. for the *recepta*, ver. 6. The danger of the weak was that of judging (κρίνειν) the strong brother as one destitute of conscience, deficient in true Christian earnestness.

—ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο] Confirmation of μὴ κρίνέτω. With the position of γάρ in ὁ θεὸς γάρ, comp. i. 19; 1 Cor. i. 18. αὐτόν, of course, can only refer to τὸν ἐσθίοντα, not to τὸν ἐσθίοντα and τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα together. In direct contrast with human judgment, the divine reception and welcome is pertinently adduced, so that the man who judges appears as contending with God Himself, comp. viii. 33, 34. προσελάβετο, not as a servant into His house, as in ver. 4, but as a child to His paternal love and gracious fellowship in Christ, by which means, being delivered from the divine, he is delivered from all human judgment.

Ver. 4. σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην;] refers to μὴ κρίνέτω, ver. 3, therefore to the weak in faith who passes judgment, not to both parties, and to ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο adds a new argument. Judgment upon a servant pertains to his master only. Hence, to judge another's servant is sinful presumption. With σὺ τίς εἶ; comp. ix. 20; Jas. iv. 12. But the κύριος of this οἰκέτης, spoken of presently, is Christ, not God, vv. 6, 8, 9, 10. Calvin remarks: "Vult hic Paulus nos ab omni judicandi temeritate arcere, in quam incidunt, qui de hominum factis audent pronuntiare *extra verbum Dei*." Certainly, passing judgment on a servant pertains without exception to the Lord only (Matt. vii. 1), whether the Lord has revealed His will in His word or not. But one who merely declares to another's servant the revealed will of his Lord, for the purpose of saving him from the judgment of his own Lord, does not by so doing himself without warrant set up as his judge. Whereas, no doubt, such presumption does lie at the door of one who rules and governs another by laws of his own making; for such conduct can spring neither from obedience to the word of the Lord, nor from love to

the soul of the brother, but only from desire to play the judge in his own person.

—τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει] “he stands or falls to his own master” (no other’s, viii. 32), by which fact the incompetence of every other judgment is established. The most obvious meaning of these words, both in the abstract and in connection with what immediately precedes, is plainly this: “Why judgest thou another’s servant, seeing that his master alone has the right to judge him, *i.e.* to acquit or condemn him?” *στήκειν*, in this case, like the Latin *consistere* (comp. Cicero, *pro A. Caccina*, xxi. 59) = *causâ vincere*, to stand in judgment (comp. *נִסָּךְ*, Ps. i. 5, and Luke xxi. 36; Rev. vi. 17); *πίπτειν*, *causâ cadere*, to be condemned in judgment. He stands or falls to his own master, who is the only one interested in his standing or falling, and to whom alone he is bound to give account. In favour of this interpretation tells the subsequent course of reasoning (comp. especially vv. 10-12, and Jas. iv. 12: εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης καὶ κριτὴς, ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι· σὺ τίς εἶ ὃς κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον;). Nor, in the first place, is what precedes opposed to it. Some expositors suppose, because the weak in faith denied to those who lived more freely a Christian character, that it follows that here *στήκειν* and *πίπτειν* are to be interpreted of continuance and non-continuance in a true Christian course of life = “to abide firm in what is good,” and: “to yield to temptation, to sin.” But when we interpret: “Why judgest thou another’s servant? He stands or does not stand in the judgment of his own master,” it is self-evident that he stands in the judgment in so far as he continues in what is good, and the contrary. Rather, the following

—σταθίῃσεται δὲ δυνατὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς στήσαι αὐτόν] seems to tell against our interpretation, inasmuch as to make to stand in the judgment (to absolve) is a work not of divine *power*, but of divine *grace*. However, in the first place, considering the twofold sense of the expressions *στήκειν* and *πίπτειν*, the apostle may very well have substituted one meaning for the other, and the second time assigned to the word the sense: “but he will stand in what is good; God is able to uphold him,” to which then is understood spontaneously: “and therefore he will stand also in the divine judgment.” But, in the second place, we do not even need this expedient. For God’s power upholds in the *judgment*, in so far as it is this which upholds in what is good, which



alone stands in the judgment. That God's *grace* will uphold in the judgment could not be said here, because then the apostle would concede to the weak believer his assumption that the freer brother has fallen through his freedom; whereas he merely concedes that this freedom *may* prove a stumbling-block to him, at the same time in love expressing the hope that God will *preserve* him from falling, which loving hope he would inspire into the judging believer, whom he here addresses. Instead of *δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν*, Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of A F G, have received *δυνατεῖ γάρ* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.). It must then be supposed that copyists commented on the rarer *δυνατεῖ*, occurring again in the N. T. only in 2 Cor. xiii. 3, by *δυνατός ἐστιν* (B C D E have *δύνανται γάρ*). But we incline more to the contrary opinion of Fritzsche, that the *lect. rec.* is genuine. Only, perhaps, it ran: *δυνατὸς γάρ ὁ θεός* without *ἐστίν*, which Bas., Chrys., Joh. Damasc. do not read, in which case the remark of Matthiä (ed. min.) would come in: *omissum ἐστὶ perperit δυνατεῖ et δύνανται*. Just so *δυνατὸς ὁ θεός* with dependent infinitive, Heb. xi. 19, is commented on in Cod. A by *δύνανται*, and 2 Cor. ix. 8 in B C D\* F G by *δυνατεῖ*. The reading *ὁ κύριος* instead of *ὁ θεός*, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf on the authority of A B C\* Copt. *al.* Aug., is likewise to be regarded as a gloss, because *ὁ κύριος* was named previously. But compare the like interchange, vv. 6, 10–12. Certainly *ὁ κύριος* *might* be named here, but *ὁ θεός* just as well, Paul thus reverting to *ὁ θεός γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο*, ver. 3. By this means our interpretation of the meaning of the present verse receives confirmation. God will uphold in the judgment (ver. 4) him whom He received into His favour once for all (ver. 3).

Ver. 5. Intimation of the second point of difference (comp. ver. 2), which is not to be erected into a real point of controversy. *ὃς μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν*] *the one judges day above day*, i.e. *κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν εἶναι*, he judges that one day is above another, he prefers one day to another, esteems one as more holy than another. *παρά*, therefore, here has a comparative or prerogative force, comp. i. 25; Luke xiii. 2; Heb. i. 4; LXX. Ps. xlv. 7. The meaning of *ἡμέρα παρ' ἡμέραν* = *alternis diebus* (comp. the adjective *παρήμερος*), current in classical Greek, does not apply here. Clearly in the present passage the apostle is speaking (comp. Gal. iv. 10; Col. ii. 16) of the ordinary Jewish

feast-days; whereas the notion that there were persons in the Roman church who selected days alternately for the feasts is altogether uncertain, and receives no semblance of support even from Luke xviii. 12.

—ὅς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν] *the other judges every day*, namely, as a day, *i.e.* κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν εἶναι ἡμέραν. As to *meaning* this is no doubt equivalent to κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ἴσην or ἰσότημον εἶναι. Luther: “but the other esteems all days alike.” But κρίνειν in itself does not on this account *mean*: *to deem equal*. Rather, one might accept the meaning *probare, to approve, sanction* (Meyer: *to declare oneself for something*), comp. Passow, *s.v.*, and Isocrates, *Paneg.* § 46. Only, no instance can be quoted elsewhere in the N. T.

—ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῷ πληροφορεῖσθω] “let every one be firmly convinced in his own mind.” Luther: “let every one be assured in his opinion.” Thus, the apostle gives no objective decision, because in the case of a moral adiaphoron, without doubt, the most important point is the subjective relation, the inner personal attitude to the thing. Certainly the more correct standpoint objectively is the freer one; but subjectively this may be more incorrect than the limited one, provided the latter avoids judging others, while the former proudly boasts of its freedom. Whether one consider himself bound to a particular mode of life, in itself indifferent, or free from it, the chief matter is, as regards others, to avoid judging and despising them; as regards himself, to be confident with respect to the case in hand. For if the weaker one permits himself to be led away with a doubtful conscience to a freer mode of life, he commits sin, vv. 20, 23; and the same if the freer one is not confident as to the case in hand before the Lord who has set him free, but merely gives himself to a freer course of life from carnal wantonness, and with a guilty conscience; for the πληροφορία spoken of here (comp. iv. 21), as ver. 6 shows, is to be a πληροφορία ἐν κυρίῳ, comp. Col. ii. 2; 1 Thess. i. 5; Heb. vi. 11, x. 22. Further, the present verse proves indirectly that the theory of the direct *divine* institution of the Christian Sunday is decidedly unevangelical. The Sabbath-festival, abrogated in the N. T., cannot be transferred to Sunday.

Ver. 6. The plerophory of subjective persuasion, ver. 5, as regards the adiaphora mentioned in vv. 2, 5, is of a right kind,

in so far as every one is persuaded that by his peculiar course of conduct he is serving the Lord. The imperative form, vv. 3, 5, passes in the present verse into the indicative. The apostle in love assumes, respecting each of the two parties, what he wishes one to assume respecting the other. Thus, the indicative form of phraseology itself implies an indirect summons to mutual recognition and toleration, and at the same time an indirect exhortation to each individual to examine himself, whether his thoughts and acts are in harmony with the apostle's confident assumption. *ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν*] *he that considers the day* = *ὁ παρατηρούμενος τὴν ἡμέραν*, Gal. iv. 10. *φρονεῖν τι*, *aliquid curare*, to make something an object of religious regard, comp. on viii. 5. *ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν* is the same that was described in ver. 5 as *ὁ κρίνων ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν*. By *ἡ ἡμέρα* with the article is here to be understood the day held specially sacred, to be kept as a feast. Luther: "he that regards *the days*." No doubt *ἡ ἡμέρα* stands for the entire category.

—*κυρίῳ φρονεῖ*] *to the Lord or for the Lord, i.e. in His interest, to His service and honour.* Description of the spirit in which he does it. "Quod is qui tenetur ea superstitione, violare diei solennitatem non audet illud approbatur Deo: propterea quod nihil audet dubia conscientia suscipere. Quid enim faceret Judaeus, qui nondum adeo profecit, ut dierum religione sit liberatus? habet verbum Domini, quo commendatur dierum observatio. Necessitas illi imponitur per Legem: abrogatio nondum illi perspecta est. Nihil ergo superest, nisi ut ampliorem revelationem expectans contineat se inter modum captus sui: nec ante beneficio libertatis fruatur, quam fide illud amplexus sit," Calvin. In point of fact, he serves and pleases the Lord, not by his narrow conscience, but by his fidelity. The *κύριος* is Christ (ver. 9), not God. As to the absence of the article, comp. Winer, p. 154; Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 573.

—*καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ*] "and he that considers not the day, to the Lord he considers it not," *i.e.* he observes not the day, he holds all days alike (comp. *ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν ἡμέραν*, ver. 5) in the Lord's service and to His honour. Luther: "and he that pays no regard to it, does so to the Lord also." The one keeps it in the Lord's service, because he is persuaded that the Lord has so commanded *him*; and the other keeps it not to the Lord's honour, because he is persuaded that

the Lord has set him free from such service. The words *καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ* are wanting in A B C<sup>2</sup> D E F G, Cod. Sinait. al. It. Vulg. al. Aug. al., and are therefore condemned by Erasmus and Mill, erased by Lachmann and Tischendorf. However, they are quite essential both in allusion to ver. 5, where *both* parties are referred to, and to preserve the uniformity of the language (comp. *καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει* in the present verse), and, moreover, are supported by Syr. al. and most of the minuskel codices. Their omission is explained by the *ὁμοιοτέλευτον* (*κυρίῳ φρονεῖ . . . κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ*). Again, if the *καί* before the subjoined *ὁ ἐσθίων* be genuine, which must be admitted, as it is not only found in the authorities which omit the preceding sentence, but also in many others, the erroneous omission of the sentence in question is further explained by the *ὁμοιούαρκτον* (*καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν . . . καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων*).

—*καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ ἐσθίει*] reverts to ver. 2. *καί* is simply connective. Otherwise it might also have run: *ὡσαύτως ὁ ἐσθίων*. With *ὁ ἐσθίων*, comp. ver. 3.

—*εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ*] Evidence from fact that the *ἐσθίειν* takes place to the Lord's honour. The thanksgiving at table (comp. Deut. viii. 10; Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 36, xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. x. 30; 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5) is addressed to God the Father, the Creator and Preserver, the Author of all good gifts, Matt. vi. 11; Jas. i. 17. But he that honours the Father honours the Son as well; and he cannot thank God for anything by which he dishonours Christ.

—*καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει*] Even he that eats not, by his non-eating, especially of animal food, renders the Lord service.

*καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ θεῷ*] and thanks God, namely by not eating; therefore = and thereby thanks God. Evidence from fact that even the *μὴ ἐσθίειν* is done in the Lord's service. But the thanks are given neither for *what* he eats not, which were absurd, nor *that* he eats not, which were Pharisaic (Luke xviii. 11), but for *what* he eats, namely vegetable food. But if he thanks God for this, then eating it—which in this case is withal an intentional eating of nothing else—cannot be done to Christ's dishonour.

Vv. 7, 8. He that observes the day, like him that observes not, he that eats, like him that eats not, does so in the Lord's service, ver. 6; for our whole life, like our death, is not at our own service,

ver. 7, but at the Lord's service, ver. 8. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἑμῶν ἑαυτῷ ζῇ καὶ οὐδεὶς ἑαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει] As the apostle in ver. 6 assumes that the φρονεῖν and the μὴ φρονεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν, the ἐσθίειν and the μὴ ἐσθίειν, are done to the Lord's service and honour, so here he assumes that, generally, no Christian lives and dies to himself, but every one to the Lord, ver. 8, by which means the correctness of the former assumption is verified. Whoever has devoted himself to the Lord wholly and completely, has devoted himself to Him in the several details and particulars. But the assumption implied in vv. 7, 8, just as much as the one expressed in ver. 6, involves an indirect summons to self-examination and the actual fulfilment of what was assumed. *Living* and *dying* serve to denote man's entire earthly existence, which the Christian has devoted in its entire course up to its uttermost conclusion, not to himself, but to the Lord. The datives ἑαυτῷ and κυρίῳ, vv. 7, 8, have the same ethical meaning as the dative κυρίῳ, ver. 6. Not in our own service and to our own honour, but in the Lord's service and to His honour our life is spent, like our death. Here, therefore, is meant, not our objective, but our subjective dependence on Christ. To say that life and death are in the Lord's hand, would be simply to give expression to a universal human, not a specific Christian relation. And if this universal human relation, to which of course even Christians are subject, were meant here to be indicated, for the purpose of declaring that the service rendered by Christians to the Lord, ver. 6, is grounded in Christ's objective relation to them as Lord, and is demanded by it, in this case we should be compelled, between ver. 6 and ver. 7, to interpolate an "and he is right in this," or an "and thus also should it be;" and that in order to obtain a course of reasoning which, however correct and important of itself, still is not necessary in the present connection, but rather, by its detailed character, confuses and severs the main thread of the exposition. Moreover, ἑαυτῷ and τῷ κυρίῳ ζῇν and ἀποθνήσκειν plainly serve far more naturally to express a subjective than an objective relation, comp. 2 Cor. v. 15. When it is objected that ἀποθνήσκειν ἑαυτῷ and τῷ κυρίῳ is inconsistent with our view, because dying is not a spontaneous act, the reply is, that without doubt not only life, but death, in the order of nature, may assume the form of a morally free, God-pleasing act, not merely when by voluntary surrender life is sacrificed in the service and to the

honour of the Lord, but also when death is borne with cheerful submission in obedience to the divine decree; whereas, on the other hand, he lives to himself and dies to himself who lives at his own pleasure or unwillingly, and dies unwillingly or at his own pleasure. Comp. Rev. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. x. 31: *εἴτε οὖν ἐσθίετε, εἴτε πίνετε, εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε* (= *εἴτε ζητε εἴτε ἀποθνήσκετε*), *πάντα εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ ποιεῖτε*; Phil. i. 20; Rom. viii. 38 f. Bengel observes: "*ζῇ, ἀποθνήσκει, vivit, moritur. Eadem ars moriendi, quae vivendi.*"

—*ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν τῷ κυρίῳ ζῶμεν*] Proof of the negative contents of ver. 7 by their positive opposite. *ἐάν τε γὰρ, —ἐάν τε*, for both *if*,—*and if*, comp. Hartung, I. p. 88, II. p. 155, 5. Respecting *τῷ κυρίῳ ζῇ*, comp. on vi. 11.

—*ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκωμεν*] The reference here is not to a living to the Lord after death, but to a dying to the Lord in the present life.

—*ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν, ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν*] The reading *ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν*, received by Lachmann on the authority of A D F G *al.*, here and in what immediately precedes, is perhaps merely to be regarded as a clerical error arising from *τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκωμεν*. But comp. Winer, p. 369.

—*τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν*] we belong to the Lord; comp. *οὐχ ἐαυτῶν*, 1 Cor. vi. 19. Here, too, an inner, subjective belonging to another is meant, comp. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Respecting *εἶναι τινος*, see on iii. 29. We belong to Him, because we have given ourselves up to His service. And for the very reason that we have devoted ourselves to the Lord in life as in death, and acknowledge that we belong to Him, we serve the Lord in observing as in not observing feasts, in eating as in not eating. "In the threefold emphatic *τῷ κυρίῳ* (*τοῦ κυρίου*), observe the *divina Christi majestas et potestas*, to which the Christian knows himself to be completely surrendered," Meyer.

Ver. 9. In death, as in life, we belong to Christ as master, ver. 8; for by His death and life He acquired a master's right over us, ver. 9. The obligation of our subjective attitude as servants in relation to Him is therefore based upon the right of His objective attitude as master in relation to us. *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἔζησεν*] This is the reading comparatively best authenticated, received by Griesbach, Knapp (*καὶ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἔζησεν*), Lachmann, Tischendorf, and approved by most of the

modern expositors. Upon the unusual ἔζησεν arose the gloss ἀνέστη and ἀνέζησεν, from which were formed the readings ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη,—ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέζησεν,—ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέζησεν, the latter the *lect. rec.*, to say nothing of other still less authenticated variants. Moreover, ἀπέθανε καὶ ἔζησεν answers best to the following καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων. The less attested καὶ before ἀπέθανε, retained by Knapp, seems to have been adopted in conformity with the following καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων. But it may also have been omitted in several codices on account of the doubt that arose respecting the number and order of the following words. If genuine, it must be rendered by *etiam*, *also* (comp. Luther), and would aptly mark the correspondence of our subjective dependence on Christ to His objective right as Lord, comp. 2 Tim. i. 12; Heb. vi. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 8. ἔζησεν, *became alive*, Rev. ii. 8. The life which He lived after death was a resurrection-life. Respecting the aorist to denote the beginning of this state, comp. Bernhardy, *Wissenschaftl. Synt.* p. 382. For the notion of a *hysteron proteron*, so that by ἔζησε is meant Christ's earthly life before His death, no adequate occasion is given in the following ζώντων. Moreover, elsewhere it is the standing doctrine of Scripture that Christ acquired κυριότης, not by His life and death, but by His death and resurrection, comp. viii. 34, vi. 9, 10; Phil. ii. 8 f.; Luke xxiv. 26; Matt. xxviii. 18.

—ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ] Christ has not acquired lordship over the dead by His death, over the living by His coming to life, but by death and life (resurrection) together He acquired lordship over dead and living in common. The parallelism, therefore, between ἀπέθανε καὶ ἔζησεν and νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων is merely a formal one; and in addition, this formal parallelism alone is the reason of νεκροί coming before ζώντες, as well as of the expression καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων being chosen instead of ἡμῶν ἕαν τε ζῶμεν ἕαν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν. But if Christ is Lord not only of the living, but of the dead, it follows that we are under obligation to be His servants not only in *life*, but in *death*. The apostle here, as often, glances only at believers, not at unbelievers as well; and is therefore treating not of Christ's future universal dominion, but of His present dominion over the living and the dead in His kingdom. "Dominium Christi in mortuos tollit psychopannychiam," Bengel.

Ver. 10. Because Christ is the κύριος, He is the sole κριτής of

His οἰκέται, ver. 4, on which account no ἀδελφός is to judge his ἀδελφός and σύνδουλος. σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου;] Here it is ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων who is addressed, ver. 3, on which account D E F G, 45, It. Ambrst. append ἐν τῷ μὴ ἐσθίειν as a gloss. σὺ δὲ stands in opposition to Christ the sole κύριος, ἀδελφός in opposition to οἰκέτης.

—ἡ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου;] Here it is ὁ ἐσθίων who is addressed, ver. 3, on which account Boern. Ambrst. append in *condendo* (ἐν τῷ ἐσθίειν) as a gloss. Theophylact: σὺ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου ὡς λαίμαργον (? rather: ὡς ἀσεβῆ, εἰδωλολάτρη, ἀκάθαρτον) διὰ τὸ ἐσθίειν αὐτόν; καὶ σὺ ὁ ἐσθίων τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου ὡς ὀλιγόπιστον (δεισιδαίμονα); No doubt the apostle's main point here is the κρίνειν on the part of the weak, and he appends the ἐξουθενεῖν on the part of the strong simply because it is naturally suggested (comp. the καί in ἡ καὶ σύ). Still, even this ἐξουθενεῖν is regarded by him as a form of κρίνειν (comp. μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν, ver. 13), as a sitting in judgment on the alleged superstition of the weak.

—πάντες γάρ] as well ὁ κρινόμενος as ὁ ἐξουθενούμενος. γάρ serves to confirm and justify the reproach contained in the preceding question.

—παραστησόμεθα] “*stare solent quorum causa tractatur*,” Grotius. Comp. Matt. xxv. 33; Acts xxvi. 6; also στήκειν and πίπτειν, to stand and fall in judgment, ver. 4.

—τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ] comp. 2 Cor. v. 10; Matt. xxv. 31–33. Instead of the *rec. τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Lachmann and Tischendorf, chiefly on the authority of A B C\* D E F G (so also Cod. Sinait.\*), It. Vulg., have received into the text the reading τοῦ θεοῦ, approved by Mill and Griesbach. But, in the first place, the *recepta* is supported by C\*\* I, all minuskels, most of the versions, Polycarp,<sup>1</sup> Ambrst., and also Orig. Chrys. Theodoret, Theod. Mops. In the second place, it is required by what precedes ver. 9, the design here, as in ver. 4, being to affirm that the judicial office belongs only to Christ as κύριος. Lastly, it is probable that the copyists here confounded τοῦ Χριστοῦ with τοῦ θεοῦ, because in the quotation, ver. 11, and therefore in the application of the quotation, ver. 12, ὁ θεός appears as κριτής. For this very reason the contrary supposition is much more im-

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. ad Philipp.* c. 6: ἀπὶ πάντων γὰρ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ θεοῦ ἰσμεν ἰφθαλμῶν, καὶ πάντας διὸ παραστήναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἵκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ δοῦναι λόγον.



probable, namely, that the copyists wrote τοῦ Χριστοῦ instead of τοῦ θεοῦ, whether by a course of reasoning derived from ver. 9, or in conformity with 2 Cor. v. 10. In favour of the originality of the reading τοῦ Χριστοῦ, tell also the attempts to omit τῷ θεῷ, vv. 11, 12, or to change τῷ θεῷ, ver. 11, into τῷ κυρίῳ. Finally, the βῆμα, as the seat of the κριτής engaged in judicial functions, seems appropriate only to Christ, not to God Himself, comp. also de Wette and Tholuck here.

Ver. 11. γέγραπται γάρ] Isa. xlv. 23. The Hebrew text runs: כִּי בַיָּדִי נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בְּלִבִּי וְנִשְׁבַּעְתִּי בְּלִבִּי הָרֶגַע בְּלִבִּי הָרֶגַע בְּלִבִּי הָרֶגַע בְּלִבִּי "By myself I swear, truth goes forth from my mouth, a word (or: a word goes forth as truth from my mouth) that returns not, that to me every knee shall bow, every tongue swear." LXX.: κατ' ἑμαυτοῦ ὁμνῶ, ἡ μὴν ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου δικαιοσύνη, οἱ λόγοι μου οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κίμψει πᾶν γόνυ, καὶ ὁμείται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τὸν θεόν. In the first place, Paul has abbreviated the declaration, omitting the confirmation of the oath: ἡ μὴν . . . ἀποστραφήσονται, as unnecessary for his purpose. Further, instead of κατ' ἑμαυτοῦ ὁμνῶ he puts the more forcible ζῶ ἐγώ itself, Heb. אֲנִי חַי (Num. xiv. 21, 28; Deut. xxxii. 40; and see Dan. xii. 7; Ruth iii. 13; Judith ii. 12). Respecting the addition of λέγει κύριος, comp. on xii. 19. Instead of the more exact rendering of the LXX. καὶ ὁμείται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τὸν θεόν, since swearing is merely a specific form of *confession*,<sup>1</sup> and even in the O. T. passage this more specific designation is merely chosen as a more concrete and forcible expression of the general idea, the apostle has the more general καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ. So, too, in Phil. ii. 11. When the Cod. Alex. of the LXX. Isa. xlv. 23 likewise reads καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ, this perhaps is merely to be regarded as a correction in accordance with the text of the Pauline passage. At all events this supposition is more probable than the contrary one (comp. Fritzsche here), to the effect that Paul borrowed his translation from the Cod. Alex. of the LXX., since manifestly he had greater reason to translate more freely and generally than the author of the reading in the Cod. Alex. That the latter found in his Hebrew codex שֶׁבַח (*shall praise, glorify, ἐξομολογήσεται*) instead of נִשְׁבַּח, is an arbitrary, artificial supposition. Lachmann and Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 2, on the authority of B D E F G,

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Harless, *Christian Ethics*, p. 333.

Goth. It. Ruf. Ambrst., have received the arrangement *ἐξομολογήσεται πάντα γλώσσα* (perhaps merely an adaptation to Cod. Alex. LXX. Isa. xlv. 23) instead of *πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται*.

—ζῶ ἐγὼ, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ] The ὅτι here does not serve merely to introduce the direct form of speech = “I live: to me shall bow,” *i.e.* “by my life I asseverate: to me shall bow;” but, as in the LXX. it depends on *κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμνύω*, so here on *ζῶ ἐγὼ* = “by my life I asseverate, that to me shall bow,” etc. Comp. ix. 2; LXX. 1 Sam. xiv. 44: *τάδε ποιῆσαι μοι ὁ θεὸς καὶ τάδε προσθείη, ὅτι θανάτῳ ὑποθάνη σήμερον*; 2 Chron. xviii. 13: *ζῇ κύριος, ὅτι ὃ ἐὰν εἶπῃ ὁ θεὸς πρὸς με, αὐτὸ λαλήσω*; 2 Cor. i. 18; Judith xii. 4.

*καὶ πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ*] Chrys.: *ἐξομολογήσεται, τούτέστιν εὐθύνας δώσει τῶν πεπραγμένων*, Theophyl.: *ἀντὶ τοῦ λόγου δώσει τῶν πεπραγμένων*, Occum.: *πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται τὰς οἰκείας ἁμαρτίας ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ συνειδότος ἅτε κριτῆ*. So, too, several modern expositors. However, this interpretation, at variance with the sense of the Hebrew text, is the less justifiable, as, where *ἐξομολόγησις* refers to confession of sin, *τὰς ἁμαρτίας, τὰ παραπτώματα, τὰς πράξεις* is always added elsewhere, comp. Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5; Acts xix. 18; Jas. v. 16. On the other hand, *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι* without accusative of object, connected with the dative of the person, always means “to confess by praising, to praise,” comp. xv. 9; Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; and Schleusner, *Lex. in LXX. sub vocibus*: *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι* and *ἐξομολόγησις*. That Paul in the present passage uses *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ θεῷ* in the sense: “to praise God, confess Him as Lord,” follows, moreover, from Phil. ii. 11. The original O. T. passage declares that in Messianic days all (Gentiles like Jews) shall bow before Jehovah and confess Him as Lord. The same meaning is expressed in the apostolic citation. Only, the latter rightly refers the complete fulfilment of the prophet’s prediction to the final period or perfect consummation of the Messianic kingdom. If God is Judge, because He is Lord (vv. 4, 9, 10), then all acknowledge Him as Judge who acknowledge Him as Lord; and this the more, when this act of confession coincides with the final exercise of His judicial office, and refers to it. Thus Paul does not here speak *directly* of the *ἐξομολόγησις* of God as *κριτῆς*, but of the *ἐξομολ.* of God as *κύριος*, and therewith of course *indirectly* as *κριτῆς*.

If all without exception<sup>1</sup> shall confess Him as Lord, then His own people will do so, whom the apostle has specially in view in the application, ver. 12. Luther, in his notes on the passage, observes: "Then must Christ be true God, because this is to take place before His judgment-seat." And Calvin: "Est etiam insignis locus ad stabiliendam fidem nostram de aeterna Christi Divinitate." In the same way Bengel: "Christus est Deus. Nam dicitur *Dominus* et *Deus*: Ipse est, cui vivimus et morimur: Ipse jurat per se ipsum." So Theodoret, Theod. Mops., Occum. Gennadius rightly observes that Paul applies the prophetic passage, treating of Jehovah, to Christ, οὐποτ' ἂν τοῦτο ποιήσας, εἰ μὴ θεὸν εἶναι ἀληθινὸν καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἠπίστατο, ὡς τὸν πατέρα. The apostle's intention certainly is not to demonstrate the divinity of Christ, but to prove that we shall stand before no human, but before *Christ's* judgment-seat, on which account also in the citation the emphasis perhaps rests on ἐμοί and τῷ θεῷ. But then, as he derives his proof from a passage in which κύριος, ὁ θεός appears as Lord and Judge, it of course follows indirectly that by this designation: κύριος, ὁ θεός, *Christ* is meant. Elsewhere also with the apostle κύριος (in the LXX. = יהוה), as a predicate of Christ, marks Him out as Jehovah of the Old Covenant. But that the Isaiah-passage here quoted is directly applied to Christ, is shown by Phil. ii. 10, 11. On the other hand, it is a far-fetched and artificial device to say that because God judges *through* Christ (Acts xvii. 31; Rom. ii. 16), the proof that *Christ* will judge us, ver. 10, is here given in its being proved that *God* will judge us, ver. 11.

Ver. 12. Inference from the quotation, ver. 11. ἄρα οὖν] comp. on v. 18, *accordingly then*, namely, since every one shall acknowledge *Him* as Lord.

—ἐκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ θεῷ] The emphasis probably rests not, as some expositors think, on περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, for the purpose of establishing his incompetence to judge and despise *others* (vv. 10, 13). This were rather αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, whereas the accentuated περὶ ἑαυτοῦ would suggest the antithesis, inappropriate here, οὐ περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. In harmony with the tenor of thought, the emphasis seems to us to lie rather upon τῷ θεῷ. Every one owes account to *God*, not *man*, and therefore will not

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Phil. ii. 10, from which passage several minuskels have in the present verse after πᾶν γένου added ἰπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγίων καὶ καταχθονίων.

be judged by man, vv. 4, 10, 11. Not only does the apostle say here τῷ θεῷ, not τῷ Χριστῷ, on the suggestion of τῷ θεῷ, ver. 11; but, in addition, it was fitting in itself, that at the conclusion of his exposition he should emphasize the *divine* judgment as the sole one possessing authority in opposition to all human judgment. This does not prevent the application of ver. 11 to Christ; for the God who holds judgment, ver. 12, is not a different being from the God manifested in Christ, ver. 11, but the Father and the Son are one and the same God. The reading ἀποδώσει instead of δώσει, received by Lachmann, is merely to be regarded as a substitution of the more usual formula λόγον ἀποδιδόναι (Luke xvi. 2; Heb. xiii. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 5; LXX. Dan. vi. 2) in place of the rarer λόγον διδόναι. In what sense we may speak of a judgment, not only of unbelievers, but of believers, to whom special reference is here made, in accordance with their works, without contradicting the Pauline doctrine of justification and salvation by faith alone, see on ii. 6.

Vv. 13--25. Exhortation to strong believers, while admitting the correctness of their distinctive principle, not, by a reckless assertion of that principle, to put a stumbling-block in the way of weak believers.

Vv. 13. μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν] "Let us therefore no longer judge one another." μηκέτι, *no longer*, as hitherto. οὖν, *therefore*, draws an inference from vv. 10-12, seeing that *God* and *Christ* is the sole Judge. ἀλλήλους, *one another*, the strong the weak, and conversely, vv. 3, 10.

—ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον] Luther: "but judge this rather." Respecting this rhetorical figure of *Antanaclasis*, see *Index term. techn.* to Bengel's *Gnomon*, s.v.<sup>1</sup> By this means the contrast of the false and true κρίνειν is meant to be sharply emphasized. The meaning is so modified, that the first time it is = "to pass a judicial decision," the second time = "to form a moral judgment, to prescribe to oneself an ethical maxim." Comp. κρίνειν, in the meaning: *apud antiquum suum constituere, to decide, settle*, 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 37; 2 Cor. ii. 1.

—τὸ μὴ τιθεῖνai πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον] The sentence, made substantive by the neuter of the article, expounds the preceding τοῦτο. Just so in 2 Cor. ii. 1: ἔκρινα δὲ ἐμὰντῷ

<sup>1</sup> "Antanaclasis est, cum eadem vox in vicinia bis, sed duplici sensu ponitur." So here κρίνωμεν . . . κρίναι, comp. Jas. ii. 4.

τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. In classical Greek, after the preliminary τοῦτο the infinitive *without* the article usually stands, comp. Kühner, p. 330. Between πρόσκομμα and σκάνδαλον, when used metaphorically, as here, no essential distinction can be established. Both denote *moral stumbling-block, an occasion of sinful conduct*. *Everything* is to be shunned, which can be so much as called πρόσκομμα or σκάνδαλον. "Twofold designation for the sake of the matter," Meyer. The verb τιθεῖναι is chosen in harmony with the *primary* meaning of these words: *hindrance, trap*. Comp. LXX. Lev. xix. 14: ἀπέναντι τυφλοῦ οὐ προθήσεις σκάνδαλον; Judith v. 1: καὶ ἔθηκαν ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις σκάνδαλα; Rev. ii. 14: βαλεῖν σκάνδαλα ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ. Respecting ἡ, *aut*, in negative sentences, comp. ver. 21; Acts i. 7, x. 14, xi. 8; Winer, p. 549. The apostle passes on specially to exhort the strong (comp. ver. 1), whose numbers were perhaps preponderant in the Roman church, and whose seductive and pernicious influence on the weak was here, as always, more to be feared than conversely the influence of the latter on the former.

Ver. 14 serves to elucidate the prohibition of πρόσκομμα τιθεῖναι, ver. 13. The principle, under the influence of which the strong believer acts, is no doubt right in itself, although it will not admit of unrestricted application to the weak believer; for that which objectively is an adiaphoron may cease to be so for a particular individual, ver. 14. Therewith is next conjoined the admonition, ver. 15, not, by a reckless carrying out of a principle right in itself and a thoughtless disregard of necessary exceptions, to sin against the weaker brother. οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ] "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus." οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι expresses assured conviction of the truth of the knowledge which, as existing in fellowship with the Lord Jesus, has its seal ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, this fellowship being one that enlightens and imparts certitude to the conscience. Rightly Chrys.: ἐν κυρίῳ τουτέστιν ἐκεῖθεν μαθὼν καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ πληροφορηθεῖς. Οὐκ ἄρα ἀνθρωπίνης διανοίας ἢ ψῆφος. "Simul tamen voluit opponere libertatem a Christo datam Legis servituti, ne teneri se putarent ea observatione, a qua Christus ipsos liberasset," Calvin.

—ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' αὐτοῦ] Matt. xv. 11; Acts x. 14, 15, 28. The reading αὐτοῦ (so Griesbach, Knapp, Tischendorf, ed. 1), as

against the *recepta* *ἐαυτοῦ*, is confirmed by far preponderant authorities. Matthiæ, ed. min. Lachmann, Tischendorf [ed. 8: *δι' ἐαυτοῦ*] have received *δι' αὐτοῦ*, as read by several minuskel codices, versions, and Fathers (It. Vulg. August. Ambrst. Pelag. *al.*: *per ipsum*, i.e. *δι' αὐτοῦ*). But the reflexive pronoun, to denote what holds good in itself in contrast with subjective opinion, is here imperatively required (rightly Chrys.: *τῇ φύσει, φησίν, οὐδὲν ἀκάθαρτον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς προαιρέσεως γίνεται τοῦ μετιόντος, i.e. τῷ λογιζομένῳ κοινόν ἐστιν*). Comp. Winer, p. 189, and Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* Excurs. V. p. 858 sqq. *δι' αὐτοῦ* would need to be applied to Christ, as is done by several of the Fathers. Comp. Schol. Matth.: *δι' αὐτοῦ*] *ἦτοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὡς τὰς νομικὰς παρατηρήσεις παύσαντος, ἣ δι' ἐαυτοῦ, τουτέστιν οὐδὲν αὐτὸ καθ' ἐαυτὸ ἀκάθαρτον, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει πάντα καθαρὰ*. But, in the first place, the antithesis manifestly designed between what is pure *objectively* (ver. 20) and what is *subjectively* deemed pure is thereby abolished, or at least weakened; again, the idea referred to above of the abolition of the *nomos* must have been more distinctly and definitely expressed; and lastly, this interpretation assumes the reference of the present passage to the Mosaic precepts about food, which we hold to be incorrect; comp. *Introd.* to this chapter. We should rather say that, as an idol is nothing (1 Cor. viii. 4), it is unable to pollute even the flesh offered in sacrifice to it, which in itself is a pure creature and gift of God (1 Cor. x. 26; 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5), but that everything, even flesh sacrificed to idols, is in itself pure.

—*εἰ μὴ*] not = *ἀλλά*, but = *nisi*, and to be referred back not to *οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' αὐτοῦ*, but to *ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινόν*; comp. Fritzsche, *ad Matt.* xii. 4, p. 421, and Winer on Gal. i. 7 and i. 19.

—*ἐκείνῳ*] with emphasis; comp. John vi. 46; 1 Cor. vi. 4.

—*κοινόν*] *sc. ἐστίν*. But to him it is impure, in so far as partaking of it renders his conscience impure; comp. 1 Cor. viii. 7; Tit. i. 15.

Ver. 15. *εἰ δέ*] Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of the more ancient codices (so, too, Cod. Sinait.) and several versions and Fathers, have received *εἰ γάρ*. But this reading can be proved to be absolutely untenable. Either (*tertium non datur*) *εἰ γάρ* must be meant to confirm ver. 13, which is impossible, as ver. 14 cannot be regarded as a parenthetical sentence, or it must be meant to confirm the exception *εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι*

κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν, ver. 14, which is also impossible, as the sentence governed by εἰ γάρ would confirm, not so much the substance of the exception itself, as rather merely the purpose of its being added.<sup>1</sup> If the present sentence in ver. 15 were intended to refer to the exception in ver. 14, it must have been introduced by an inferential οὖν, not by a confirmatory γάρ. On the other hand, δέ stands with perfect propriety in opposition to the principle admitted to be correct, ver. 14: “ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι’ αὐτοῦ.” “Everything is pure in itself. *But* it is wrong to act recklessly on a principle true in itself, since it stands good in the abstract, but not as regards thy weak brother.” “δέ, *scd*, Antitheton. Non solum fides, ver. 14, *scd* etiam amor adesse debet,” Bengel. Respecting the interchange of δέ and γάρ, so common with copyists, comp. Fritzsche on xi. 13, II. p. 476.

—διὰ βρῶμα] *on account of food*, which thou eatest, although thy brother looks on it as impure. “διὰ βρῶμα· μείωσις, *conf*. Heb. ix. 10, xii. 16, xiii. 9,” remarks Bengel.

—ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπείται] It seems to us that the most obvious explanation of these words: *thy brother is grieved*, cannot be maintained. For the weak brother might be grieved merely on account of the ἐσθίειν of the strong one, which he looks on as sin. But grief of such kind would be the first germ of the very course of judging forbidden by the apostle, which therefore he would not commend to special regard. For the weak one ought not to grieve over what the strong one does, but leave him to be assured of his own opinion and pursue his own course, vv. 5, 6. Nor can μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε be regarded as a consequence of the λυπεῖν. For grief on the part of the weak one over the supposed sin of the strong is the very surest safeguard against his being led to ruin by thoughtless imitation of such a course of conduct. The explanation: “*moral* infirmity, injury to conscience, which comes about through a σκάνδαλον given ver. 13,” does not harmonize with the notion of λυπεῖσθαι. Nor does Eph. iv. 30 supply an analogous case. Consequently, we should perhaps here adhere to the meaning of λυπεῖν = *to wrong, injure*, often occurring in the classics (*comp.* Greek

<sup>1</sup> In point of fact, Meyer supposes that Paul states the *reason why* he adds the exception: “Not without reason do I say εἰ μὴ . . . κοινόν; for it indicates a want of love, when the stronger does not regard this relation to the weaker brethren.” Manifestly too far-fetched!

lexicons, *s.v.*). In what is subjoined the injury is explained as consisting in ἀπόλλυσθαι. Comp., too, τύπτειν τὴν συνείδησιν, 1 Cor. viii. 12.

—μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκείνον ἀπόλλυε] The ἀπώλεια is the eternal ruin from which Christ by His death saved him, and into which, by seducing him to a course of conduct against his own conscience, thou wilt hurl him back. “Perire potest etiam verus frater, pro quo Christus mortuus est amantissime,” Bengel. Certainly a *dictum probans* for the possibility of apostasy.

—ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε] comp. 1 Cor. viii. 11. Strikingly Bengel: “Ne pluris feceris tuum cibum, quam Christus vitam suam.” Thou wilt not give up *food* for thy brother’s life, for which Christ gave up His *life*.

Ver. 16. μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν] Several expositors apply τὸ ἀγαθόν to the Christian freedom, of which the stronger availed himself, and which was looked on and condemned by the weaker as reckless licence. But, as already observed, to such unwarranted judging on the part of the weaker the apostle would make no concession. The passage, 1 Cor. x. 29, 30, to which appeal might be made for the interpretation in question, rather favours the direct opposite. In the first place, the designation there used is not the general one τὸ ἀγαθόν, but the specific, definite one ἐλευθερία expressly; and again, the freedom of the stronger is there directly vindicated against the βλασφημία of the weaker; comp. Bengel, de Wette, Osiander, Meyer there. Still further, the transition from the singular (ver. 15, comp. vv. 20, 21, 22) to the plural ὑμῶν (ver. 16, comp. ver. 19) proves that the apostle in the present verse turns from the party of the stronger just addressed to the entire church, to whom what is said in vv. 16–19 has reference; whereas in ver. 20, with the singular, he turns back to the party of the strong in faith. But, finally, the equal reference to both parties is confirmed as well by τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους, ver. 19, as by δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (not τοῖς πιστοῖς), ver. 18. For the latter sentence suggests the supposition, necessary also for the other reasons given, that the βλασφημία, ver. 16, must be referred to the *blasphemia*, not of the weak against the strong in faith, but of unbelievers against believers generally. Thus all believers are exhorted by the apostle, not, through their own fault, *i.e.* through the uncharitable disputes one with another caused by their mutual judging and contempt,



to give occasion to the reproaches of unbelievers against them. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 32: ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἑλλήσι; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Tit. ii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 2, also Rom. ii. 24. τὸ ἀγαθόν would in this case denote a common possession of the whole church, not of a particular party in it. Then, considering the general nature of the expression, nothing is more natural than to understand thereby that good which may self-evidently be taken as the good of the Christian absolutely, his highest and most precious possession. But this is the Christian πίστις or the gospel, not the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 17. For, in the first place, the latter is less suitably described as the *summum bonum* of Christians, since they rather form this kingdom as its *members*; and again, the calumny of unbelievers was directed chiefly against the πίστις of Christians, not against the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Rightly Melancthon: "Tertia ratio sumta est a dignitate Evangelii. Laedunt autem utrique Evangelium cum rixantur de rebus non necessariis. Ita fit ut imperiti abhorreant ab Evangelio cum videtur parere discordias." The reading ἡμῶν, instead of ὑμῶν, supplied by D E G, several versions, and Fathers, makes the transition from the party of the strong in faith to the entire church stand out still more clearly, and also well suits διώκωμεν, ver. 19. But for these very reasons it ought perhaps to be set aside, as a correction, in favour of the better authenticated reading ὑμῶν. ὑμῶν is put first with emphasis. *Your* good (that of believers) is to be guarded from *others'* calumny (that of unbelievers).

Ver. 17. Motive for avoiding the βλασφημία τῶν ἔξω. — οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις] *for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, i.e. it consists not in eating and drinking*, John xvii. 3. Therefore it is not, by a *metonymia rei pro rei causa*, to be explained: "it is not obtained by eating and drinking;" for neither is it obtained by righteousness, peace, and joy, but its essence consists therein. Its existence depends upon the fact of its joint-members being found in the latter condition, even as, conversely, its existence does not depend upon the partners in the kingdom discharging the former functions pertaining to the support of this earthly life. Thus the kingdom of God, in harmony with the general strain of thought (ver. 18), is here to be thought of as already actually existing upon earth (1 Cor. iv. 20; Col. i. 13, iv. 11); whereas other passages allude

to its future consummation (1 Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; 2 Thess. i. 5). If it consist not in eating and drinking, neither have the strong any ground for finding in their indiscriminate use of meat and drink a special proof of their pre-eminent participation in the kingdom of God, nor the weak in their timid abstinence from meat and drink, and for provoking by such conduct the calumny of unbelievers. *βρῶμα*, *food, esca*; *πόμα*, *drink*; *βρῶσις*, *eating, actus edendi*; *πόσις*, *drinking, potio, actus bibendi*. Comp. Tittmann, *de Synon. in N. T.* p. 159. No doubt *βρῶσις* and *πόσις* are often used, like our *eating* and *drinking*, in the sense of *food* and *drink*; comp. John iv. 32, vi. 27. But, as in the other Pauline passages, according to the *most* probable exposition, the primary meaning of *βρῶσις* and *πόσις*, which is also the case here, is to be retained (comp. 1 Cor. viii. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 10; Col. ii. 16; comp., too, Heb. xii. 16); and as, moreover, in the present chapter the expression *βρῶμα* is twice specially used for *food* (vv. 15, 20), it is most natural here to explain *βρῶσις* in distinction from *βρῶμα* by *eating*, and therefore *πόσις* by *drinking* (comp. Luther). With the sentiment, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 8, also Luke xvii. 20, 21.

—ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ] Several expositors interpret *δικαιοσύνη*, *εἰρήνη*, *χαρὰ* of moral virtues and their effects. *δικαιοσύνη* would then be = righteousness, i.e. moral uprightness of character; *εἰρήνη* = peace, namely, with men; and *χαρὰ* = joy, as the mother and companion of peaceful concord. But here, where the object is to state in what the *essence* of God's kingdom consists, no derivative and accidental characteristics can be meant, but only those which are primary and essential. The *δικαιοσύνη*, therefore, must be the *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως*, the *εἰρήνη*, the *εἰρήνη πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, v. 1, and the *χαρὰ*, the joy springing from *this εἰρήνη*. Ver. 19 is not decisive against this, the peace of men one with another being the fruit of peace with God. But the *χαρὰ* is defined as a *χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, because this particular affection, instead of moving in the element of the Holy Spirit, having its principle in Him and being produced by Him, may easily rest upon worldly motives. Comp. the *χαρὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου*, 1 Thess. i. 6, and *χαίρειν ἐν κυρίῳ*, Phil. iii. 1, as well as the contrast of *ἡ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη* and *ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη*, 2 Cor. vii. 10.

Ver. 18. ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ] Lachmann

and Tischendorf, on the authority of A B C D\* F G, *al.* (so also Cod. Sinait.\*), several versions, and Fathers, have received, instead of ἐν τούτοις, the reading ἐν τούτῳ, approved by Mill and Griesbach. But ἐν τούτῳ would most inappropriately point back to the subordinate definition ἐν πνεύματι ἀγάπῃ (ver. 17), belonging to χαρά only. We should then be compelled, with Meyer (former editions), to take ἐν τούτῳ *collectively* = *in conformity with this* (namely, that the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness, etc.), *in accordance with this circumstance*. But this use of ἐν τούτῳ is not confirmed, at least by N. T. authority. On this account we should abide by the *lect. recept.*, which is supported by Syr. Tert. Theodor. and most of the minuskels, defended and retained by Bengel,<sup>1</sup> Matthiä, and Scholz. ἐν τούτοις, then, refers back to δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη, and χαρά, ver. 17, in common, and denotes the life-element, the spiritual condition in which the believer lives and serves Christ. But whoever serves Christ in righteousness, peace, and joy, whether he eats or does not eat, keeps feast-days or does not keep them, remains ever — εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ] *well-pleasing to God*, and therefore a joint-member of God's kingdom, ver. 17.

—καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις] *and approved by men*, so that he gives them no occasion for calumny, ver. 16. "Hunc probatum hominibus testatur, quia non possunt non reddere testimonium virtuti, quam oculis cernunt. Non quod semper filii Dei parcant improbi.—Sed Paulus hic de sincero iudicio loquitur, cui nulla est admista morositas, nullum odium, nulla superstitio," Calvin. But on εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ, Melancthon observes: "Testimonium, quod expresse adfirmat, bona opera renatorum placere Deo."

Ver. 19. Exhortation in the form of an inference from vv. 17, 18, to attain the end proposed in ver. 16. ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν] Lachmann (ed. min., not ed. maj.) reads διώκομεν on insufficient evidence. He takes the entire sentence as a question: ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους; He does the same in Gal. vi. 10, after receiving the reading ἐργαζόμεθα. But even apart from the insufficient diplomatic evidence for the indicative, and the unsuitableness of the interrogatory form in the present passage,

<sup>1</sup> Non habet singularis τούτῳ, quo referatur. Ortus esse potest ex alliteratione ad τῷ subsequens.

the invariable Pauline employment of ἄρα οὖν as particles of *inference* is opposed to it. τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης, what belongs to peace, comp. Bernhardt, *Wissenschaftl. Synt.* p. 325, and Winer, p. 172, not essentially different from τὴν εἰρήνην. The peace is the peace of believers one with another, which he will strive after who serves Christ in δικαιοσύνη, εἰρήνη, and χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, and by the attainment of which the βλασφημία τῶν ἔξω, ver. 16, is avoided.

—καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους] The addition φυλάξωμεν in D E F G, *al.* It. Vulg. is a mere addition of the copyists. οἰκοδομή, *edification*,<sup>1</sup> is a figure to express growth, establishment, perfection in the Christian life. The θεμέλιος is Christ, 1 Cor. iii. 11, or the testimony concerning Him, Eph. ii. 20. The edification, therefore, consists not in subjective, self-induced emotions, but rests upon the objective, divinely-laid foundation. The structure, raised upon this foundation, is either the entire church, the individual forming merely one stone in this building, Eph. ii. 21, or even, as in the present passage (comp. ver. 20, 1 Thess. v. 11), the individual (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 4). But growth in the Christian life consists simply in constant advance in laying the foundation, or rather in perpetual upbuilding on the foundation laid once for all. ἡ οἰκοδομή is either passive = τὸ οἰκοδομεῖσθαι (xv. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 19), or active = τὸ οἰκοδομεῖν (2 Cor. x. 8, xiii. 10), or it denotes the effect of the act, comp. our *building*, *i.e.* the structure itself (1 Cor. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 21). Here it stands in the sense of active edification, as the addition τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους (not ἐν ἀλλήλοις) shows; comp. οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἕνα, 1 Thess. v. 11. This *mutual* edification takes place especially on the part of the strong in relation to the weak brother, when the former, accommodating himself to the latter's standpoint by a loving act of voluntary self-restraint in the way in which it is matter of conscience with him to serve the Lord, firmly establishes him in the faith, and thus gradually leads him forward instead of tempting him to act against his conscience, and thus casting him down from Christ the foundation, 1 Cor. viii. 10 f., x. 23 f. To this aspect of οἰκοδομή joins on the following verse, which specially reverts to the chief aim of the chapter, the warning of the strong in faith.

<sup>1</sup> Respecting the *Attic* forms οἰκοδομία, οἰκιδέμεσις, οἰκοδόμημα, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 487 sqq.

Ver. 20. Prohibition, addressed to the strong in faith, of the opposite of *διώκειν τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἁλλήλους*, ver. 19. *μὴ ἔνεκεν βρώματος κατέλνε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ*] “for the sake of food, pull not down the building of God.” *λύειν*, John ii. 19, and *καταλύειν*, Matt. xxvi. 61, 2 Cor. v. 1, Gal. ii. 18, used of pulling down a building. Thus the apostle adheres to the figure contained in the words: *τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς*, ver. 19. Consequently *τὸ ἔργον* here is = the work of the builder, the building, *ἡ οἰκοδομή*, 1 Cor. iii. 9; Eph. ii. 21. Under the *ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ* we are not specially to think of *πίστις* or *σωτηρία*, but the Christian is himself God’s building, in so far as in his entire being and essence he is based upon Christ the foundation and corner-stone. “Fratrem, quem Deus fecit fidelem,” Estius. Comp. the same idea without figure, ver. 15, also viii. 29, 30; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10. “Non levis est culpa, sed horribilis *θεομαχία*, opus Dei destruere,” Calov.

—*πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ*] Repetition of the concession already made to the strong believer in the words *οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι’ αὐτοῦ*. The object of the repetition is to repel the justification that might be derived from the concession for a licence of conduct that gave offence to the weak believer, = “I concede to thee, indeed, that everything (*i.e.* every kind of food) is pure (namely, in itself), but reflect,” etc. Respecting *μὲν* with *ἀλλά* following, comp. Viger, ed. Herm. p. 536, and especially Hartung, p. 402 ff.; Acts iv. 16, 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 17.

—*ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι*] “but it is evil to the man who eats with offence,” = “but reflect that the weak believer sins if he eats with offence; and if thou, by thy example, temptest him thereto, thou hast destroyed in him God’s work.” This interpretation, namely, that by the *ἐσθίων* here is to be understood the *weak believer*, is unmistakeably indicated by the parallelism with ver. 14. As there to *οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι’ αὐτοῦ* corresponds *πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ*, so here to *εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκεῖνῳ κοινόν* corresponds *ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίουσι*. The ruling idea in the chapter is, that to act in opposition to conscience leads to ruin, ver. 23. The apostle, indeed, warns the free Christian against want of charity for the unfree, but the motive by which this is enforced is always to avoid leading the latter to ruin

thereby, not to avoid falling into ruin himself, which idea of ἀπώλεια is indirectly implied in κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ; for whatever is sin to man (κακόν, ἁμαρτία, ver. 23) proves ἀπώλεια to him, ver. 15. Were the ἐσθίων here the strong believer, and the πρόσκομμα the offence *given* by him, not that *taken* by the weak, the apostle would have written more directly: ἀλλὰ κακόν σοι τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι, just as previously he said explicitly μὴ κατάλνε, and everywhere directly addressed the strong believer, vv. 13, 15, 21, 22; while, on the other hand, he describes the position of the weak believer, which is to be respected, *in abstracto* and from a general point of view, comp. τῷ λογιζομένῳ . . . ἐκείνῳ, ver. 14, τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ in the present verse, and ὁ διακρινόμενος ver. 23. Besides, it is more natural by διὰ προσκόμματος to understand the condition in which the one who eats is found, not that in which the other is found, or in which he places the former. This would be διὰ προσκόμματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. (Comp. as to this use of διὰ with the genitive, on ii. 27.) Finally, the statement that everything is pure of itself, but that it is wrong to eat so as to give offence to a brother, would no doubt indicate in what respect such eating may prove ruin *to him*, the strong believer, but not—which is the chief point here (comp. μὴ ἔνεκεν βρώματος κατάλνε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ)—in what respect it damages the soul of the *weak believer*. A subject to κακόν is found most simply by understanding a τὸ πάντα φαγεῖν to be taken from the context; for the preceding words πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ are as to sense = πάντα μὲν ἔξεστι φαγεῖν, comp. Kühner, p. 36 f. κακόν, in opposition to the following καλόν, is here better taken as *inhonestum*, *sinful*, than as *pestiferum*, *hurtful*. With the dative of accounting τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, comp. Jas. iv. 17.

Ver. 21. Fundamental rule for the strong in faith, in self-denying love to avoid the πρόσκομμα which the weak in faith takes at the reckless use of his freedom, and through which he is led into sin and destruction, ver. 20. καλόν] *sc.* σοί ἐστι (1 Cor. ix. 15). Comp. ὁ ἀδελφός σου and κατάλνε, ver. 20. καλόν = morally fair, excellent, *praeclarum*, *honestum*. Luther: "it is better." So, too, several expositors. But such a positive form must have been followed by an ἢ in the comparative sense, comp. Matt. xviii. 8, Fritzsche there, and Winer, p. 300. To suppose that Paul intended to write: καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον μηδὲ ἄλλο ὃ τι οὖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃς τὸν ἀδελφόν

σου, but after the second *μηδέ* with *ἐν ᾧ* fell into an anacoluthon, is in any case an altogether needless makeshift.

—*τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον*] In the abstract *μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον* might be taken hypothetically just as well as the following *μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ κτλ.*, so that it would merely express the *supposed* case that wine-drinking may give offence. But as ver. 2 shows that the weak believers in part actually abstained from all eating of meat, the view is more probable that in the same way they abstained from the use of wine, and indeed for the same reason, namely, to avoid flesh sacrificed to idols and wine used in libation.

—*μηδέ*] Supply *ποιεῖν* or *πράσσειν τοῦτο*, comp. Winer, p. 729, and 1 Cor. x. 31: *εἴτε ἐσθίετε, εἴτε πίνετε, εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε*.

—*ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκώπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ*] The omission of *ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ* (comp. Tischendorf) is not sufficiently authenticated. It is more likely that the omission arose from the apparently cumbrous accumulation of synonyms, than that conversely there was any need to add *ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ* as a note. *πίστις* in ver. 22 aptly stands in antithesis to *ἀσθένεια*, comp. in ver. 2 the antithesis of *πιστεύειν* and *ἀσθενεῖν*. With *προσκώπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται*, comp. *πρόσκομμα ἢ σκάνδαλον*, ver. 13. As to substance, the third synonym, *ἢ ἀσθενεῖ*, or *is weak*, *i.e.* is hesitating, loses the power to follow his conviction, does not differ from these figurative expressions. "The threefold designation of the same thing is explained by the *urgency* of the sorrowful thought," Meyer. With the sentiment of the verse, comp. 1 Cor. viii. 13.

Ver. 22. *σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις*] Objection of the strong believer, the truth of which the apostle concedes, for the purpose of repelling the inference drawn therefrom = "Thou hast faith, thou art no *ἀσθενῶν*. This I concede. But it follows not from this that thou art to give effect to thy faith in thy conduct." Moreover, it is more in consonance with the animated style of the Pauline diction, with more ancient and most of the modern expositors to take *σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις* as an interrogative than as a concessive sentence: "Thou hast faith." Supply: "Sayest thou?" The reading *σὺ πίστιν ἦν ἔχεις κτλ.*, received by Lachmann after A B C (so also Cod. Sinait.), Tol. Ruf. Aug. Pel., is merely to be regarded as a paraphrastic gloss. Bengel interprets the *πίστις* of *fulcs de puritate cibi*, comp. in ver. 2: *ὃς μὲν πιστεύει*

φαγεῖν πάντα, and in ver. 14: οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ κτλ.

—κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ] *have it with thyself before God.* The κατὰ σεαυτόν, put first emphatically, *apud te met ipsisum, apud tuum ipsius animum*, suggests as antithesis μὴ δείκνυε τῷ ἑτέρῳ. Comp. Gal. vi. 4: εἰς ἑαυτὸν μόνον τὸ καύχημα ἔξει καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον, and with the sentiment 1 Cor. xiv. 28: ἑαυτῷ δὲ λαλεῖτω καὶ τῷ θεῷ. Well Chrysostom: ἀρκεῖτω σοι τὸ συνειδός. Be satisfied with thy own consciousness and God's testimony. Wear not thy faith as a show so as to give offence to thy weak brother. In saying this, of course, the apostle's purpose is to enjoin the discontinuance of acts, lawful of themselves, from considerations of charity (comp. ver. 21), not to sanction their performance where these considerations are wanting. So Grotius: "tunc utere, quum alium non habes testem, quem offendas," comp. Reiche here. No doubt in the abstract this permission is a fact, and Paul himself acted in accordance with it. But it is not involved either in the words or in the general tenor of thought.

—μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει] "Happy is he that judges not himself in that which he approves." He sits not in judgment on himself, because he is certain that he is acting rightly in what he does, comp. ver. 5: ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῷ πληροφορεῖσθω. The maxim might perhaps be applied exclusively to the strong believer, who is pronounced happy on account of his assured conviction. But apart from the use of the third person instead of the second (comp. with ver. 20), the apostle has no intention to deny such happiness to the weak believer, who, according to ver. 5, just as much as the other, should be certain and confident in his own conviction. Conversely, we might perhaps apply the maxim exclusively to the weak believer, so that it would contain a warning to strong believers, not by their seductive example to disturb the former in the certainty of his conviction, but rather to remember that his salvation is bound up in the closest way with such certainty. But, in harmony with its form, the maxim is best taken quite generally. Every one, the strong like the weak believer, is happy, if he reproach not himself concerning what he chooses to do, whether it be to eat or not to eat, but is confident that he acts rightly in what he does, comp. ver. 5. Therefore let every one act in accordance with his conviction. But if the



weak believer, the 23d verse then continues, loses this assurance, and yet acts with a doubting conscience, he loses salvation. And thou, the strong believer, we are to add in thought, art guilty in this matter for leading him into this doubting state. δοκιμάζειν, *agendum eligere*, to deem right, approve. Luther: "in that which he accepts." Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

Ver. 23. ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος] *but he that doubts*. The doubter is the weak believer, in so far as he debates with himself whether eating is really lawful or not. Originally he is an ἀσθενῶν, ver. 2, but no διακρινόμενος, but a πληροφορηθεῖς. It is only by the example of the πίστιν ἔχων that he is transferred into the condition of the διακρινόμενος. His weakness of faith consists in his holding as obligatory certain precepts and ordinances not springing immediately from justifying faith in Christ. Thus he is afraid of neglecting feasts, or partaking of flesh offered to idols. As long as he continues at this standpoint, he is right in his firm conviction that both the one and the other are forbidden him. Only, he is not to judge the opposite conviction. If he confines himself within these limits, he thereby, no doubt, concedes implicitly the possibility of the correctness of the opposite conviction, and may consequently be called a διακρινόμενος as regards the absolute objective validity of his own opinion; but he is no διακρινόμενος as regards the unconditional correctness of his conduct. His uncertainty is therefore at first more of a theoretical than practical nature. He doubts whether sacrificial flesh and libation-wine are pure or impure, but he does not doubt that, on account of this very doubt, it is unlawful for him to partake. It is only when he sees the other eat, that the thought arises in his mind whether the like is not lawful for him as well. But this thought amounting to no more than a doubt, he becomes, in respect to practical conduct, from a πληροφορηθεῖς, ver. 5, a διακρινόμενος, ver. 23.

—ἐὰν φάγη] *if (i.e. despite his doubt) he eat*.

—κατακέκριται] *is condemned, i.e. by the very fact of his having eaten*, John iii. 18. The κατακρίνων is not here directly specified. The act of eating itself condemns him, of course in conformity with *divine* ordination, the righteousness of the judgment thus being apparent not only before God, but before men and to his own mind.

—ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως] *sc. ἔφαγε*. Ground of the κατέκριμα.

The weak in faith in his eating possesses not the *πίστις* of the strong in faith, vv. 2, 14, 22. But this *πίστις* is not identical with abstract truthfulness of conviction, for this is not wanting even to the weak, although *πίστις* is wanting to him. But it is the firm assurance proceeding from justifying faith in Christ (ver. 1), that this faith is the source and principle of all conduct well-pleasing in God's sight, that beside it there is no binding command or prohibition coming from without, that he is justified in using freely all God's creatures. "Innuitur ergo ipsa fides, qua fideles censentur, conscientiam informans et confirmans; partim fundamentum, partim norma rectae actionis," Bengel. "Fidei vocabulum hic ponitur pro constanti animi persuasione, et firma (ut ita loquar) certitudine, nec ea qualibet, sed quae ex Dei veritate concepta sit," Calvin.

—*πάν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν*] General rule, introduced by the metabatic *δέ*, to which the proposition just advanced is traced back. "In the conclusion that proves the *κατακέκριται*, *πάν δέ* up to *ἁμαρτ. ἐστίν* is the major, *οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως*, *sc. ἔφαγε*, the minor proposition," Meyer. The *πίστις* here is not justifying faith directly, but the assurance, springing therefrom, that all conduct proceeding from and consistent with it is well-pleasing to God. The Augustinian proposition: "omnis infidelium vita peccatum est," finds therefore in the present dictum not indeed its direct, but its indirect confirmation. For if every action is sin, which proceeds not from the assurance that it is well-pleasing to God, and such assurance itself can only be the result of evangelical saving faith, it follows that every action is sin that has not such evangelical saving faith as its ultimate source and basis.<sup>1</sup> Of course the matter in question here is not the apparent form of the act, which may possibly be normal and legal, and so far good, but its inner root, which, in the case of unbelievers, is never the *πίστις δι' ἀγαπῆς ἐνεργουμένη*, Gal. v. 6. Further, the present chapter lays down in a specific case the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Balduin in Calvin here: "Si ea quae absque ista fide fiunt, qua credimus aliquid esse concessum in rebus adiaphoris, peccatum sunt; multo magis peccata erunt, quaecunque fiunt absque certa fiducia cordis in Christum. Atque sic dictum hoc Apostoli ab hypothesis ad thesin, vel etiam ab inferiore specie fidei ad superiorem recte accommodare possumus. Est enim generalis Aphorismus de omni fide verus: Quicquid absque fide fit, peccatum est: sive intelligatur fides historica, sive fides conscientiae, sive fides in Christum, etc. Nihil igitur obstat, quominus etiam de fide justificante hoc dictum explicari queat, licet hic ad aliam speciem applicetur."

most important rule for the discussion of the doctrine of ethical adiaphora generally. *πάντα ἔξεστιν*, 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23, is the objective point of departure, of course merely all that is not expressly pointed out as sin by God's word, and which therefore is not of itself demonstrably at variance with faith and love. Hence the recognition of this *πάντα ἔξεστιν* is the higher, because specifically evangelical, standpoint. Still this *πάντα ἔξεστιν* has no universal subjective validity. Whoever has not yet penetrated so far as to reach the firm assurance of its objective truth, for him it does not yet hold good. Only let him beware of judging the freer Christian, just as the freer one should beware of despising and tempting him. But this reciprocal brotherly toleration holds good as far as concerns the sphere of the moral adiaphoron, not as concerns the sphere of divinely-revealed truth. There every one is not to follow his own conviction, but to be convinced of the truth of divine revelation, and only upon the basis of this universally required plerophory of faith does there emerge the requirement to tolerate different convictions as respects the ethical adiaphoron.

## CHAPTER XV.

Vv. 1-13. Continuation of the subject discussed in the previous chapter, but in such a way that the exhortation to concord and tolerance, vv. 1-6, and mutual recognition, vv. 7-13, receives a general application, and is enforced by the example of Christ. No doubt, considering the affinity in matter, ch. xiv. might be prolonged to xv. 13; but, on the other hand, the distinctive import of ch. xiv. and of xv. 1-13, as well as the specific references occurring there, and the thoroughly general tone predominant here, may be alleged in defence of the ordinary division of the chapters. In any case, if ch. xiv. were prolonged into ch. xv., xv. 1 must begin a new paragraph.

Ver. 1. Ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν] The metabatic δέ serves to attach the exposition now beginning to the one just concluded. If the weak in faith eats against his conscience, he falls into sin and condemnation, xiv. 23; but we that are strong are to guard well our duty towards weak brethren exposed to such a danger. The apostle says ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοί, and thus reckons himself among the strong, whose principles he certainly shared, xiv. 14, 20. As to the way in which he himself observed the injunction here given to the strong in faith to treat the weak with loving condescension, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 20 ff. The δυνατοί and ἀδύνατοι are the δυνατοί and ἀδύνατοι τῇ πίστει, xiv. 1. The ἀσθενήματα, *infirmities*, no doubt denote the prejudices mentioned in the previous chapter, but are to be taken more generally; for the weak in faith may show their weakness not merely in abstinence from flesh sacrificed to idols and libation-wine and observance of days, but in a variety of other ways. βαστάζειν (Gal. vi. 2, 5; Rev. ii. 2, 3), as elsewhere φέρειν, *ferre*, to bear, tolerate, to forbear and have patience. "The ἀσθενήματα are thought of as a *burden* which the strong bear for the weak by having patience with them."

—καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν] Theophylact: εἰπὼν ὅτι ὁφείλομεν

βαστάζειν, διδίσκει, πῶς ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν μόνον ζητῶμεν. Self-pleasing, a branch of self-love (φιλαυτία), is the root of intolerance and impatience, because he that pleases himself in his conduct seeks not to please another, and therefore pays no regard to him.

Ver. 2. ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω] The γάρ, read by the *recepta* after ἕκαστος, is rightly condemned and erased by most editors and interpreters, on far preponderant authority, as a connective interpolation. The active meaning to be here ascribed to ἀρεσκέτω, "let him seek to please," need not be implied in the word in itself, but may be found in its imperative form. "Let him please" = "let him act so as to please, let him endeavour to please." Elsewhere, no doubt, is found the meaning of ἀρέσκειν = "to seek to be pleasing, to please," not, indeed, in Gal. i. 10, comp. Meyer, but perhaps in 1 Cor. x. 33; 1 Thess. ii. 4; perhaps also in iv. 1.<sup>1</sup> With the idea, comp. 1 Cor. x. 24.

—εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν] Therefore not from interested motives, but for *his* (the neighbour's) benefit (εἰς τὸ συμφέρον, 1 Cor. x. 33), unto edification, xiv. 19. πρὸς οἰκοδομήν is to be regarded as a more precise definition of εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. The object of the endeavour to please another is not one's own advantage, but a neighbour's advantage consisting in his edification. Wherein this edification itself consists, and by what means it is effected, see on xiv. 19. Rightly Bengel: "*bonum* genus, *aedificatio* species."

Ver. 3. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν] "for Christ also pleased not Himself," i.e. was not a self-pleaser, lived not to please Himself. Respecting καὶ γάρ, comp. on xi. 1. As here, so in 2 Cor. viii. 9, Eph. v. 25, Phil. ii. 5, 1 Pet. ii. 21, Heb. xii. 2, Christ is set forth as a pattern.

—ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται] After ἀλλά neither συνέβη αὐτῷ, nor ἐγένετο, nor, far less, ἐποίησεν is to be supplied; but instead of saying ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, οἱ οὐνειδισμοὶ τῶν οὐνειδιζόντων τὸν θεὸν ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' αὐτόν (τὸν Χριστόν), the apostle, in direct, animated language at once introduces Christ Himself, speaking

<sup>1</sup> But comp. Fritzsche here, who puts forward the assertion that the active meaning never lies in the word in itself, but always in the verbal form only, chiefly in the present and imperfect, which tenses are often used elsewhere *de conatu*, and that in 1 Cor. x. 33, ἀρίσκειν τινί τι has the transitive meaning, so that πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρίσκω = omnia omnibus probō. Comp., however, against this assertion, Wieseler on Gal. i. 10.

in the words of the Psalm; comp. on ix. 7, and Winer, pp. 719, 749.

—οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ] Ps. lxi. 9, literally, after the LXX. The 22d and 23d verses of the same Psalm were quoted in xi. 9, 10. As to the Messianic character of the Psalm, comp. on xi. 9, 10. If, to please God, Christ took on Himself, in self-denying devotion to God's cause, the worst revilings of God's enemies, it follows that He lived not to please Himself. In this way, then, merely the negative οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἠρεσεν, not the positive τῷ πλησίον ἀρέσκειν, would be verified. But the former is quite sufficient; for he that lives not to please himself, but, to please God, endures ignominy, will also, seeing that God's service always necessarily includes service to our brethren, *eo ipso* seek to please his neighbour, εἰς τὸν ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. There is no need, therefore, to suppose that the apostle here conceived the ignominy that fell upon Christ directly as an element of His redeeming work, and represented His self-devotion as rendered on behalf of man's salvation. Respecting ὀνειδισμός as belonging to later Greek, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryn.* p. 512. Respecting the Alexandrian form ἐπέπεσαν, which Lachmann and Tischendorf have here perhaps rightly received on the authority of A B C D E F G, *al.* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.), comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 639; Winer, p. 87.

Ver. 4 justifies the quotation of the O. T. passage. ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη] “for all that was written previously.” Not without reason have I cited that saying of Scripture, for (γάρ) every saying of Scripture serves for our instruction. The *προ* in *προεγράφη* receives its definition from the following *ἡμετέραν* put emphatically first. All that has been written *before us, before our days*, is written for *our* instruction, that of *us Christians now living*. It is therefore the entire O. T. Scripture that is meant, not merely the Messianic prophecy in it, in which case ὅσα *προεγράφη* would be = “what was recorded *before its fulfilment*.” Such a limitation of the notion of *προγεγραμμένον* is all the more untenable, as both the O. T. itself is full of instruction for Christians, and that not merely in its prophetic portion (2 Tim. ii. 16), and also the passage of the Psalms quoted here in ver. 3 is not so much designed to present to us a prediction now fulfilled in Christ as to set Christ Himself before us in His God-pleasing walk as a pattern.

—εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη] Instead of προεγράφη, B C D E F G, also Cod. Sinait.<sup>2</sup>, most versions, and several Fathers have the simple ἐγράφη. This reading, recommended by Griesbach, Lachmann and Tischendorf have rightly received. The compound προεγράφη has probably only crept into the text through mechanical, thoughtless, perhaps also through designed repetition of the former προεγράφη. διδασκαλία = teaching, instruction, practical admonition.

—ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν] The διὰ before τῆς παρακλήσεως, certainly authenticated by A B C (Cod. Sinait.), and received by Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, may yet be an easily repeated addition of transcribers. The genitive τῶν γραφῶν depends on τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως in common, not on τῆς παρακλήσεως only. In the latter case τῆς ὑπομονῆς would stand quite alone and unsupported. As ἵνα defines the end for which God caused the word of Scripture, with its instruction, to be recorded, it follows that ὑπομονή and παράκλησις are to be thought of as actually supplied in common by this word. And for the very reason that God's word inspires ὑπομονήν and παράκλησιν, God Himself, who caused it to be written, is called ὁ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως, ver. 5. Therefore ἡ ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν is = ἡ ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ παράκλησις, ἣν αἱ γραφαὶ παρέχουσιν. According to Melancthon, the γραφαὶ are contemplated as *ministerium spiritus*. That ὑπομονή here, as in v. 3, denotes ὑπομονή ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι, steadfastness, perseverance in suffering, and therefore παράκλησις, comfort, from which ὑπομονή proceeds (comp. v. 4, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ κτλ.), as well as ἡ ἐλπίς, hope, which latter, in its turn, is the result of ὑπομονή (v. 4), is shown, in the first place, by the intimate union of ὑπομονή, παράκλησις, and ἐλπίς in their own nature (2 Cor. i. 6), and again by the verse immediately preceding. For there the very subject spoken of was Christ's exemplary sufferings, which, with unflinching fortitude, He took on Himself in God's service. Moreover, it follows from this that in ver. 3 Christ's sufferings were not considered in the light of *expiatory* sufferings *on behalf of* brethren, but were viewed as the ordinary universal sufferings of God's faithful servant, into the fellowship of which we have entered, John xv. 20; Matt. v. 11 f.; 1 Pet. iv. 13. Thus neither is ὑπομονή here = constancy in the faith, or = patience in bearing with the weak (ver. 1), nor is παράκλησις = exhortation.

—τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν] *sperem habeamus*. It is ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δοξῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 2, the hope of future blessedness and glory in eternal life, therefore the specific hope of Christians (hence the article τὴν ἐλπίδα), that is meant. This is the invariable meaning of ἐλπίδα ἔχειν = *to have hope* subjectively, Acts xxiv. 15; 2 Cor. x. 15; Eph. ii. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 13; 1 John iii. 3. Therefore neither is ἔχειν to be interpreted by *tendere, to hold fast* (although doubtless Christians ought to be established in the possession of the hope which they already have, comp. on v. 4, therefore: *to have hope in a higher and higher degree*), nor ἐλπίς by *object of hope*, comp. Col. i. 5.

V. 5, 6. Recurrence to the subject in the form of a prayer for oneness of mind, as well as for its manifestation in oneness in God's praise. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως] Rightly Theophylact: διὰ καὶ θεὸν αὐτὸν ὑπομονῆς καὶ παρακλήσεως ὀνομάζει ὡς δοτῆρα καὶ αἵτιον; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5 f., vii. 7, and ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος, Rom. xv. 13; ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, Rom. xv. 33; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20. God is here called the author of constancy and comfort, in allusion to ὑπομονὴ καὶ παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν, ver. 4. Luther: "Scriptura quidem docet, sed gratia donat, quod illa docet." God gives constancy and comfort through the teaching of Scripture, by impressing this teaching on man's heart by His Spirit. "Solus sane Deus patientiæ et consolationis auctor est, quia utramque cordibus nostris inculcat per Spiritum suum: verbo tamen suo, velut instrumento, ad id utitur. Docet enim primum, quæ sit vera consolatio et quæ sit vera patientia: deinde illam doctrinam animis nostris inspirat et inserit," Calvin. Still, both these—the operation of the word and that of the Spirit—are carried into effect, not beside and after, but in and through one another.

—δῶν ὑμῖν] δῶν is the Hellenistic form instead of the Attic δόν, comp. 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. Moeris: δοίμεν, δοίητε, ἀττικῶς, δώμεν, δώητε, ἑλληνικῶς. Comp. Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 346 sq.; Buttmann, *Ausf. gr. Sprachl.* I. p. 526.

—τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις] comp. xii. 16; Phil. ii. 1, 2. Common patience and common consolation in common tribulations are the source and cement of unity, especially when the tribulation consists in reviling and persecution on the part of God's enemies (ver. 3), which is a summons to God's friends to stand together all the more firmly. Like Christianity in every age, the Roman



church of those days was certainly exposed to such tribulation even before the outbreak of sanguinary persecution proper. Thus the transition here made from constancy and comfort to unity of spirit is no mere accidental one. But just as every good gift comes down from above, so does unity and concord. It must therefore be bestowed, like constancy and comfort, by God, and consequently sought and entreated from Him in prayer. But where concord is established, there the summons given in vv. 1, 2 has met its response, and neither a *κρίνειν* of the strong on the part of the weak, nor an *ἐξουθενεῖν* of the weak on the part of the strong finds room, xiv. 3, 10, but a *βαστάζειν* of his *ἀσθενήματα*, xv. 1.

—*κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν*] *i.e.* according to the will of Christ Jesus, comp. *κατὰ θεόν*, viii. 27. How near Christ's heart lay the oneness of His people, see in John xvii. 21. Through His atoning death He himself established this unity objectively (Eph. ii. 14 ff.). By His Spirit it is also subjectively carried into effect. The interpretation of *κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν* by: "according to the example of Christ Jesus," appealing to vv. 3, 7 (Gal. iv. 28), is out of the question, because Christ was not proposed in ver. 3 as a pattern of concord, but of resolute endurance. Moreover, an individual cannot be adduced as an example of concord, a plurality of persons being necessary to this, but only of endeavour after concord. We should in that case be compelled to refer *κατὰ Χρ. Ἰησ.* not to *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν*, but to *τὸ φρονεῖν* (God grant you to be like-minded, so that you may answer to the mind of Christ), which seems unnatural and inappropriate, because what Paul wishes for his readers is not endeavour after concord, but concord itself.

—*ἵνα*] The end of concord is its highest form of manifestation, God's consentaneous praise, God's praise being the highest aim of the individual's, as of the church's life. And as strife and party spirit are the worst hindrance to its exercise, so, on the contrary, the best means to secure it is to keep dissension at a distance.

—*ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι*] *unanimously with one mouth.* *ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι* is the outward expression of *ὁμοθυμαδόν*, which denotes the inner source of unity. Oneness of mind has oneness of speech as its consequence. Thus *ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι* is not a mere explanation of *ὁμοθυμαδόν*, as in Demosth. *Phil.* iv. p. 147: *ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης*; for *ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι* (instrumentally), or

which among the Greeks ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος is often found, is not identical with ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης. Respecting adverbs in δόν, see Buttmann, II. p. 342; comp. with ὁμοθυμαδόν, c.g. ροιζηδόν, 2 Pet. iii. 10, ἀνασταδόν, σχεδόν, γνωμηδόν. But where praise ὁμοθυμαδόν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι takes place, there all faction vanishes.

—δοξάζετε τὸν θεόν] As to this common praise of God in the Christian church, comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16.

—καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] comp. 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3. In all these passages τοῦ κυρίου belongs merely to πατήρ, not to θεός as well, as follows from the passages in which God is described as ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ without addition of the genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20; Col. iii. 17; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9. The praise is first of all defined as to its nature as a δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν, a standing designation;<sup>1</sup> and this God is then more precisely defined as Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, because He is praised first of all as God in the abstract, and then as Father of Jesus Christ, in which character He has bestowed on men all benefits that call for praise. So Theodoret: ἡμῶν θεὸν ἐκάλεσε τὸν θεόν, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου πατέρα. On the other hand, the application of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησ. Χριστ. to θεόν and πατέρα together appears utterly without reason, because it is not easy to see why God should be praised directly and exclusively as God of Jesus Christ (comp. John xx. 17; Eph. i. 17; Heb. i. 9).<sup>2</sup> But when the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ is praised, indirectly the Son, this Lord Jesus Christ Himself, is praised as well, and that with one mind, even as He is the one Lord of all, x. 12, xiv. 6-9.

Ver. 7. διό] *On which account*, namely, that this end of unanimous praise may be attained.

—προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους] As to προσλαμβάνεσθαι, comp. xiv. 1, 3, xi. 15. That here both parties are addressed, therefore the readers collectively, not exclusively or predominantly the party of strong believers or Gentile Christians, follows from

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Matt. ix. 8; Mark ii. 12; Luke ii. 20, v. 25, 26, vii. 16, xiii. 13, xvii. 15, xviii. 43, xxiii. 47; Acts iv. 21, xi. 18, xxi. 20; Rom. i. 21, xv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Gal. i. 24; 1 Pet. ii. 12, iv. 11, 16.

<sup>2</sup> Meyer, who agrees with our interpretation, observes: "It ought not to have been objected that the form of expression must either have been τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν κ. πατέρα Ἰ. Χ. or τὸν θεὸν τὸν πατ. Ἰ. Χ. Either of these would be the expression of another idea. But as Paul has expressed himself, τὸν binds the conceptions of *God* and *Father of Christ* into unity." It is just = He who is God and Father of Christ.

ἀλλήλους, from vv. 8, 9, and from the case itself, as the *common* unanimous praise of God is only possible on condition of *mutual* affectionate recognition and reception.

—καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστός] whose example you are to follow, comp. ver. 3.

—προσελάβετο] “sibi sociavit,” Grotius.

—ὑμᾶς] This reading has been rightly restored, as against the *rec.* ἡμᾶς, by most versions and several Fathers, on the authority of A C D<sup>\*\*\*</sup> E F G I, *al.*, also Cod. Sinait., comp. vv. 5–7. ἡμᾶς is either a correct gloss, since no doubt ὑμᾶς is to be referred to the entire church, as well to Jewish as Gentile Christians; or the origin of ἡμᾶς is explained by the confusion of ἡμᾶς and ὑμᾶς, very common elsewhere in manuscripts.

—εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ] is to be joined not with διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, but with καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς, as follows from vv. 8, 9. Christ received you in order to glorify God, ver. 7, namely, to glorify His truthfulness, ver. 8, and to glorify His goodness, ver. 9. On this account the δόξα θεοῦ is not to be applied to the future glory of believers (“ut aliquando divinae gloriae cum ipso simus (sitis) participes,” Grotius; comp. John xvii. 24; Rom. v. 2, viii. 18). To this also is opposed the necessary reference to the foregoing ἵνα δοξάζητε τὸν θεόν, ver. 6 = that you may with one mind *glorify* God, receive one another, even as Christ received you, that by this means *He might glorify* God. Finally, the glory which God possesses and bestows on His people would not be δόξα θεοῦ, but ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 2, viii. 18. Instead of εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ, Lachmann and Tischendorf have received εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, with A B C D E F G (so, too, Cod. Sinait.).

Vv. 8, 9. More detailed exposition of καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ, ver. 7. The reception of the Jews took place εἰς δόξαν τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 8, the reception of the Gentiles εἰς δόξαν τοῦ ἐλέους τοῦ θεοῦ, ver. 9. And just in so far as the former might take their stand upon a theoretical right, the latter merely upon spontaneous compassion, arises a special obligation on the part of Gentile Christians, who are strong in faith, to treat with affectionate regard and gentleness Jewish Christians who are weak in faith. λέγω δέ] *but I say, i.e.* but I wish to say, comp. Gal. iv. 1, iii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 12, vii. 29, xv. 50. The reading λέγω γάρ, approved by Mill and Griesbach, and perfectly apposite in the connection, Lach-

mann and Tischendorf have received certainly on the authority of numerous and important witnesses, A B C D E F G, *al.* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.) Goth. It. Vulg. Cyr. Ruf. Ambrosiast. Nevertheless, considering the very common interchange of *δέ* and *γάρ* in the codices, decision between the readings remains doubtful, comp. xi. 13, xiv. 15.

—*Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς*] The *περιτομή* stands in opposition to *τὰ ἔθνη* in ver. 9, the same therefore here, comp. iii. 30, iv. 12; Gal. ii. 7 ff.; Eph. ii. 11; Phil. iii. 3; Col. iii. 11, *abstr. pro concr., circumcision for circumcised*. But Christ became *διάκονος περιτομῆς*, a *servant* of the circumcised, for the Son of man came not *διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι*, Matt. xx. 28. And this service of His consisted simply in *δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν* (comp. *ibid.*), and according to promise was expressly designed for the *περιτομή* (comp. Matt. xv. 24: *οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ*). “*διάκονος* has emphasis in order to bring out the original theocratic dignity of the Jewish Christians. Christ has become *minister* of the *circumcised*; for to devote His activity to the welfare of the Jewish nation was, according to promise, the duty of His Messianic office,” Meyer. The word *Ἰησοῦν*, rejected by Griesbach, erased by Lachmann and Tischendorf, after A B C (so also Cod. Sinait.), several versions, and Fathers, especially as in other authorities it is found placed *after Χριστόν*, is to be regarded suspiciously as an interpolation. The variant *γενέσθαι*, instead of *γεγενῆσθαι*, received by Lachmann, is not sufficiently attested. The interchange is found frequently elsewhere.

—*ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ*] *on account of God's truthfulness*, i.e. firmly to establish His truthfulness, comp. *ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ*, John xi. 4, which is more precisely explained by the following

—*εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων*] comp. ix. 4; Gal. iii. 8 f.; Acts iii. 25. In the ratification, fulfilment of the promise made to the fathers, God's truthfulness was demonstrated and made good, 2 Cor. i. 20. The right of the Jews, therefore, was a right to the fulfilment of the promise once made, but the promise itself was the outcome of God's free grace, not the meritorious fruit of their deserts.

—*τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν*] is dependent on *λέγω δέ*, ver. 8. “But that the Gentiles *have to praise* God on account of *mercy*.” *ὑπέρ*, *pro, on account of*, as a requiring

recompense, so to speak. So in the Greek *χάριν ἀποδοῦναι ὑπὲρ εὐεργεσίας*, comp. Eph. v. 20. Uniformity with *γεγενῆσθαι* seems to require the exposition: "that the Gentiles *praised* God," namely, by their *πρόσληψις*, comp. Winer, p. 417. But although the *form* of language seems to favour this view, the *substance* of thought rather points to the opposite one. For as to *Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ*, we have to supply *ἵνα ἡ περιτομή δοξάσῃ τὸν θεόν* as *consequence*, so in *τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν* this *consequence* is expressed, and the *basis* of this, namely, *Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι ἀκροβυστίας*, is presupposed. As, therefore, *τὰ δὲ ἔθνη κτλ.* describes the purpose of what Christ did on behalf of the Gentile world, so it expresses what the Gentile world itself is under obligation to do in consequence of what Christ did. Rightly, therefore, Calvin: "*Gentes autem pro misericordia glorificare debent (debere) Deum.*" Comp. as to this infinitive of *obligation*, 2 Cor. ii. 7, and Lobeck, *ad Phryg.* p. 753 sq. This interpretation seems to us countenanced by the following citations, especially those contained in vv. 9–11; for these do not make known what the Gentiles *will* do, but enjoin on the Gentiles what they *ought* to do.<sup>1</sup> *ὑπὲρ ἐλέους* stands in contrast with *ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ*; for God had not bound Himself to the Gentiles by promise, but simply foretold their *πρόσληψις* through the prophets to the people of Israel.

—*καθὼς γέγραπται*] namely, in Ps. xviii. 49. The quotation is made literally after the LXX., who are in agreement with the Heb. text, only omitting *κύριε* after *ἐν ἔθνεσι*. *ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι* = *laudabo te*, comp. xiv. 11. In the psalm (comp. Hengstenberg) David makes known his resolve to publish and glorify among the Gentiles the salvation vouchsafed him by God. He thus figures here as a messenger of God's salvation to the Gentile world. At the close, consequently, the psalm assumes a Messianic character, and in this Paul rightly finds an intimation that the saving message is to go forth in the form of praise of God's deeds among the Gentiles, that they on their part may

<sup>1</sup> Otherwise we might certainly also interpret with Fritzsche on the present passage: *paganos autem Deum celebrare*, so that the infin. aor. *δοξάσαι* would indicate the idea of the momentary character of the act, without any allusion to the relation of time, comp. Kühner, p. 80. We must say in this case that the command to the Gentiles to offer praise, vv. 10, 11, includes an invitation to such praise, and the prediction of its realization, ver. 12.

respond to the praise of God's name proclaimed among them by like praise, vv. 10, 11. The person offering the praise whom the apostle has here in view is not David, nor yet Christ, but indefinitely any messenger of salvation to the Gentile world (x. 15; Isa. lii. 7), but not on this account any individual Gentile converted to Christ, nor the Gentile apostles collectively. But the fact that God's praise is to go forth among the Gentile world, and by it to be echoed back, is proved by the circumstance of a messenger of salvation offering in the psalm to undertake this office. The praise of God that David wishes to celebrate among the Gentiles on account of a comparatively inferior divine act will, of course, and by necessity, be celebrated in the Gentile world on account of the highest divine act.

Ver. 10. *καὶ πάλιν*] *and again*, i.e. in another passage, comp. Matt. iv. 7: *πάλιν γέγραπται*.

—*λέγει*] *sc. ἡ γραφή*, which may with ease be understood from *γέγραπται*, ver. 9 (comp. ix. 17); or even to be taken impersonally = *it is said*, Winer, p. 326. The passage is found Deut. xxxii. 43, Heb. *הַרְבֵּי נֹיִם עָמוֹ*, LXX., with whom Paul verbally agrees.

—*εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*] The supposition that the LXX. found in their codex *עָם עָמוֹ*, or *עָמוֹ*, or *נֹיִם-עָמוֹ* (the latter reading certainly in Kennicott, Cod. 146, perhaps also 507), is needless; for even in the ordinary Heb. text they might find the meaning to which they gave expression in their translation when, in thought, they repeated the imperative before *עָמוֹ* = Exult ye Gentiles, (let) His people (exult) = *with* His people, comp. Hengstenberg on Ps. xviii. 49. In any case, this interpretation is the best justified grammatically. To refer *נֹיִם* to the Israelitish tribes instead of to the Gentiles (exult ye tribes, His people), is certainly out of the question. Better than this, *הַרְבֵּי* might be taken transitively, and *עָמוֹ* as object = Bless, by exulting, His people, ye nations, for: bless its good fortune, comp. Gesenius, *s.v.* *בָּרַךְ*. But though the Piel *בָּרַךְ* occurs with the accus. of the person or thing in the sense: *to bless by exulting* (Ps. li. 15, lix. 16), the Hiphil *הַרְבֵּי*, in the *transitive* (causative) meaning, elsewhere means only: *to make to shout for joy* (Ps. lxxv. 8; Job xxix. 13). If, however, we wished, for which there is no sufficient reason, in the present passage to take the Hiphil transitively in the sense of the Piel, the principal idea, on which

the apostle lays most stress, would still remain, namely, that the Gentiles are summoned to bless God's acts in Israel; and although the summons is to blessing *concerning* His people, still without doubt indirectly it is to blessing *with* His people; since if even the Gentile world has matter for praise, Israel has much more. εὐφραίνεσθαι, to rejoice, here = to make known its joy with the voice, to exult, comp. LXX. Isa. liv. 1; Gal. iv. 27: εὐφράνθητι (?) στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουςα. μετά, cum. "Gentes non erant populus; haec misericordia est, quod tamen admittuntur," Bengel.

Ver. 11. καὶ πάλιν] Lachmann, after B D E F G, 1, Hier. and several versions, καὶ πάλιν λέγει. But λέγει is clearly a supplement in conformity with ver. 10. The passage is found Ps. cxvii. 1. Paul cites it verbally after the LXX., who agree with the Heb. text, only adding καί before ἐπαινέσατε. Respecting the summons to the Gentiles to praise the Lord for His great deeds on behalf of Israel, comp. Hengstenberg on Ps. xlvii. 1, lvi. 8, xcviii. 4.

—αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] Lachmann and Tischendorf, after A B D E, *al.* (so also Cod. Sinait.), several versions, and Fathers, αἰνεῖτε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὸν κύριον. But the emphasis lies not on πάντα τὰ ἔθνη and πάντες οἱ λαοί, but on αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον and ἐπαινέσατε αὐτόν.

—καὶ ἐπαινέσατε αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί] Lachmann and Tischendorf, principally on the authority of A B C (so also Cod. Sinait.), instead of ἐπαινέσατε, read ἐπαινεσάτωσαν. But this reading probably arose merely from the codices of the LXX., which, especially like Cod. Alex., there read ἐπαινεσάτωσαν. ἐπαινέσατε is stronger than the preceding αἰνεῖτε. The assertion that the psalm contained a summons to all *nations* to praise God generally, not to all *Gentiles*, is just as arbitrary as the assertion that it has no reference whatever to the *conversion* of the Gentiles. The better view is that the psalmist calls upon the *Goyim* in the name of the Lord's people to bless Jehovah for His great deeds to Israel, and only the Gentiles *converted* to the Lord are able to bless the Lord.

Ver. 12. καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει] namely, in xi. 10. The Heb. text runs: וְהָיָה בְיוֹם הַהוּא שֹׁרֵשׁ יֵשׁוּעַ אֲשֶׁר עֵמֶד לְנֶס עַמִּים אֲלֵי גוֹיִם וְיִרְשֵׁי: "And on the same day arises the root-stem of Jesse, which stands as a banner of the nations,—to it shall the

Gentiles turn." LXX.: καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν. Paul, shortening καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ into ἔσται, reads word for word after the LXX. The deviation of the LXX. from the original text is irrelevant for his purpose. In the original text also the Messiah is throughout pictured as *King*. Comp. Drechsler, *der Prophet Jesias*, I. p. 482, and Delitzsch, *Comm.* I. p. 288; and turning to the Messiah to do Him homage and seek His favour (comp. Gesenius, Maurer, and Drechsler), implies *trusting* in Him. "There shall be the root of Jesse, and one that is exalted to rule over the nations; in Him shall the Gentiles trust."

—ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ] Rev. v. 5, xxii. 16, comp. Ecclus. xlvii. 22, ἡ ῥίζα Δαβὶδ. As to the meaning of the phrase, comp. Drechsler and Delitzsch on Isa. xi. 10; and as to the distinction between *radix Jessae* and *radix Davidis*, the—in any case ingenious—observations of Bengel here.

—καὶ] is to be taken explicatively.

—ἐπ' αὐτῷ] denotes the reposing of trust upon Him, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17, and πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ix. 33, x. 11. As in the preceding quotations the praise of the Gentiles is indicated in general, so in the present verse the ground and import of the Gentiles' *trust*, and therewith of the Gentiles' *praise*.

—ἐλπιούσιν] "Caeterum spes in Christum, testimonium est eius Divinitatis," Calvin. "Divinus cultus debitus Christo etiam secundum humanam naturam. Gentes antea nullam spem habuerant, Eph. ii. 12," Bengel.

Ver. 13. Invocation of blessing, concluding the entire section from ch. xiv. onward, comp. ver. 5. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος] joining on to ἐλπιούσιν, ver. 12. God is the author of ἐλπίς, as of ὑπομονή and παράκλησις, ver. 5. And as (ver. 4) perseverance and comfort produce hope, and yet themselves proceed from hope already in existence, so here God, as ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος, is said to bestow χαρά and εἰρήνη, inasmuch as both proceed from ἐλπίς, which again follows as effect in enhanced measure (εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι) from them. Representing the true *Deus spei* and false *dea Spes*, comp. Bengel here.

—πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πασῆς χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης] comp. xiv. 17. πάσα χαρὰ καὶ εἰρήνη, "all possible joy and all possible peace,



all joy there is and all peace there is," serves exhaustively to present the idea of *χαρά* and *εἰρήνη*. Comp. Harless on Eph. i. 8.

—*ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν*] *πίστις* is the source of *χαρά* and *εἰρήνη*, and therefore *in believing* (*ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν*) the fruit of faith, namely, joy and peace, becomes object of hope.

—*εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι*] With *περισσεύειν ἐν τινι*, "to superabound in a thing," i.e. to possess it in the highest degree, to be rich in it beyond measure, comp. 1 Cor. xv. 58; 2 Cor. iii. 9, viii. 7; Phil. i. 9; Col. ii. 7. *εἰς* serves to specify the *effect* or *aim*. Here probably the latter. As to the article *ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι*, see on ver. 4.

—*ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου*] As in xiv. 17, *εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, so here *περισσεύειν ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου* is said to come to pass, i.e. by virtue of the power of the Holy Spirit at work in us. *πίστις* is the subjective, the *πνεῦμα* the objective means. Hence *χαρὰ καὶ εἰρήνη* come to pass, both *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* and *ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν*, and conversely *ἐλπίς*, not only *ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου*, but also *ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν*, v. 1, ii. 8, 24; Gal. v. 5.

Vv. 14–33. *Epilogue*. The opinion, improbable in itself, that an epilogue so copious in detail refers back not to the entire epistle, but merely to the section xiv. 1–xv. 13, can only be defended on insufficient grounds. For it is not correct to say that Paul's justification of himself by his Gentile apostleship, ver. 15 f., can only be appositely referred to what immediately precedes, where the apostle pre-eminently exhorted the strong in faith (xiv. 1, xv. 1), not to the entire epistle, since the majority of the Roman church, forsooth, consisted of Jewish Christians. Comp. against this the Introd. to the epistle. Nor does the expression *νοθετεῖν*, ver. 14, in any way justify a limitation of the epilogue to the exposition beginning with ch. xiv. In that case we must at least keep in view the entire parainetic portion of the epistle from ch. xii. onward. But even the dogmatic didaskalia indirectly implies ethical parainesis, namely, the exhortation to believing reception and practice of the evangelical doctrine, even as such exhortation expressly appeared in the last portion of the epistle, vi. 12–14, 19, viii. 9, 12, 13, xi. 17 ff. Such an observation as this—that the apostle, in the introduction in this chapter (*ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης κτλ.*, ver. 33), alludes to

the section mentioned—must appear in the highest degree precarious, especially as it rests upon a mistaken application of *εἰρήνη* to human peacefulness and concord. The opinion in question is all the more improbable, as Paul really, from ver. 17 onward, but in any case and admittedly from ver. 22, drops out of sight the supposed specific and limited reference to xiv. 1–xv. 13; and consequently, beyond question, the greater portion of the epilogue would have to be regarded as the epilogue of the *entire* epistle. We must therefore (in opposition to Melancthon, Grotius, and Meyer in the first, no longer in subsequent editions) abide by the current reference of the epilogue to the *entire* import of the epistle. All that can be admitted as tenable is the mediatory view, that the words introducing the epilogue, vv. 14, 15, may have been specially suggested by the import of ch. xii.–xv. 13, and in particular of ch. xiv.–xv. 13.

Vv. 14–16. Vindication of his writing generally, as well as of the manner of his writing, to the Roman church consisting chiefly of Gentile Christians, by an appeal to his office as Gentile apostle.

Ver. 14. “*Ut ex magna urbe egredientes una saepe via per plures portas ducit: sic hujus epistolae multiplex est conclusio, prima ab hoc versu: secunda, c. xvi. 1: tertia, ibid. ver. 17; quarta, ibid. ver. 21; quinta, ibid. ver. 25,*” Bengel. *πέπεισμαι δέ]* *i.e.* despite my hortatory style of writing hitherto, which might possibly seem to have arisen from the opposite conviction.

—*ἀδελφοί μου]* Not a special address to Jewish, nor yet to Gentile Christians, but to the entire church, which certainly consisted in the main of Gentile Christians, vv. 15, 16.

—*καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγώ]* *I myself also*, despite my exhortations hitherto. “I also, who hitherto exhorted you so unreservedly.” More improbable, although as to sense amounting pretty much to the same: *I myself also*, like others (i. 8), although my exhortations seem to bespeak the opposite. In this sense the order: *καὶ γὰρ αὐτός*, would have been more suitably chosen, Acts x. 26. Comp. as to *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* on vii. 25.

—*περὶ ἑμῶν]* Insufficient authorities put *ἀδελφοί μου* or even *ἀδελφοί* simply after *περὶ ἑμῶν*.

—*ὅτι καὶ αὐτοί]* *that you yourselves also*, *i.e.* even spontaneously, without being exhorted by me. The logically essential words: *καὶ αὐτοί*, are hastily omitted in several authorities. Beza compared the Homeric *τί με σπεύδοντα καὶ αὐτὸν ὀτρύνεις*;

—*μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης*] *ἀγαθωσύνη*, like *ἀγαθότης*, an expression of earlier formation, in frequent use with the LXX. (comp. Schleusner, *s.v.*), in the N. T. (comp. Gal. v. 22; Eph. v. 9; 2 Thess. i. 11), and with the Fathers (comp. Suicer, *Thes. eccles.* I. p. 15 sq.). It signifies *bonitas*, *goodness*, *excellence*, so here,—or *benignitas*, *kindness*, *goodwill*, which meaning the note of Cod. G, *ὅτι . . . μεστοί ἐστε ἀγάπης*, and the rendering of the It. Vulg.: “*quoniam pleni estis dilectione*,” wrongly attributed to it here.

—*πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως*] Where, in addition to religious and moral excellence, correct apprehension and *full knowledge* of divine truth is present, there is no need of foreign instruction and *exhortation*.

—*δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν*] *able also to exhort one another*. “*καὶ ἀλλήλους*, etiam vos invicem, non modo quisque se ipsum, conf. 2 Tim. ii. 2,” Bengel. Still more in unison with the general spirit, Meyer: “so that you have no need of a *third* exhorter.” But this perhaps would be *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀλλήλους*, comp. *καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοί ἐστε*. If we still wished to give *καὶ αὐτοὶ* this application = *καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοί . . . πεπληρωμένοι . . . δυνάμενοι*, we must at least accept the reading without *καὶ* = *ἀλλήλους δυνάμενοι*. The insufficiently authenticated readings: *ἀλλήλους δυνάμενοι*, instead of *δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους*, and: *καὶ ἄλλους*, strengthening the meaning, instead of *καὶ ἀλλήλους*, are to be regarded as mere alterations of the transcribers. *νουθετεῖν*, to admonish with friendly intent, but earnestly, comp. Acts xx. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 14; Col. i. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 15, and Harless on Eph. vi. 4. That no mere policy, but, along with affectionate delicacy, sincere humility and real confidence in the Roman church as a whole suggested the language of this verse to the apostle, follows both from i. 8, 12 and from the matter itself, because in the opposite case he could not have escaped the charge of untruthfulness. But, at the same time, the words are doubtless to be regarded as a manifestation of pedagogic wisdom, which more readily trains man to and confirms him in that which it assumes him to possess.

Vv. 15, 16. *τολμηρότερον δέ*] *more boldly however, more confidently nevertheless*, namely, than was to be expected considering this strong confidence of mine in you, or than considering your high excellence and insight. “*Quasi dicat: σπεύδοντα καὶ αὐτὸν ὀτρύνω*,” Grotius. *τολμηρότερον* is to be taken adverbially. The

reading *τολμηροτέρως*, received by Lachmann after A B, is therefore to be regarded as an interpretation. Respecting the necessary supply to the comparative of the thing compared from the context, comp. Winer, p. 303.

— *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί*] Lachmann and Tischendorf have omitted *ἀδελφοί*, which Griesbach noted as suspicious, on the authority of A B C (so, too, Cod. Sinait.<sup>2</sup>), Copt. Aeth. Cyr. Chrys. Ruf. But just as no reason can be shown for its subsequent addition, especially when the same address was used in ver. 14, so the omission is easily explained from the effort to push back *ἀπὸ μέρους* nearer to *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν*, for which reason in Codd. 3, 108, *ἀδελφοί* is placed after *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἀπὸ μέρους*. "The repetition of *ἀδελφοί* flows from urgency of feeling, comp. 1 Cor. i. 10, 11; Gal. v. 11, 13; Jas. v. 7, 9, 10," Meyer.

— *ἀπὸ μέρους*] belongs not merely to *τολμηρότερον* ("paulo liberius," Grotius; this would be *τολμηρότερον* absolutely, not *τολμηρότερον ἀπὸ μέρους*), but, as the order of words shows, to *τολμηρότερον ἔγραψα ὑμῖν*. *ἀπὸ μέρους*, *in part*, i.e. *in some places*, here and there in my epistle I wrote more boldly. Comp., in addition to the passages already quoted from the dogmatic portion of the epistle, xii. 2, xiii. 11 ff., xiv.

— *ὥς ἐπαναμνησκων ὑμᾶς*] *as again reminding you*, i.e. after the manner (*ὥς*) of one (*ritu ejus*), who you, etc. The contrast to be supplied in thought is *οὐχ ὥς διδάσκων ὑμᾶς*, comp. 2 Pet. i. 12. *ἐπὶ* in *ἐπαναμνησκω* serves to indicate repetition, comp. *ἐπανορθόω*, *ἐπαναπολέω*, *ἐπανανέομαι*. *ἀναμνησκειν* (2 Pet. i. 12, *ὑπομνησκειν*) *τινά τι*, 1 Cor. iv. 17 = to recall something to one's recollection, *ἐπαναμνησκειν*, to recall *again* to recollection, *rursus in memoriam revocare*. The modification of meaning is therefore slight. By *ἐπὶ* in *ἐπαναμνησκων* in the present passage it is merely emphasized more distinctly, that what the apostle has written is simply an iteration of what the Romans already knew. Theod. Mops.: *εἰς ὑπόμνησιν ἄγειν ὧν μεμαθήκατε*. Comp. Demosthenes, p. 74, 7. Reisk: *ἕκαστον ὑμῶν, καίπερ ἀκριβῶς εἰδόντα, ὅμως ἐπαναμνήσαι βούλομαι*, with 74, 22: *ταῦτ' οὖν, ὡς μὲν ὑπομνήσαι, νῦν ἱκανῶς εἴρηται*. Consequently we are not here to assign to *ἐπὶ* the idea of *addition*, by which the act of reminding would be distinguished as still further supplementing the amount of their own knowledge.

— *διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*] belongs to the

entire preceding sentence : *τολμηρότερον . . . ὑμᾶς*. That *χάρις* here, as in xii. 3 (comp. i. 5), is to be understood of the grace of the apostolate, and indeed of the *Gentile* apostolate, ver. 16 shows. *διὰ* with the accus. (otherwise xii. 3 with the genitive) serves to indicate the reason. *On account of* the grace given me by God, *i.e.* to respond to this gracious gift.

—*εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη*] depends on *τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*, and serves to specify the purpose for which the grace of the apostolate is given him by God. As to *λειτουργός*, see on xiii. 6. Here, as is shown by what follows at once, the sacrificial meaning of the term priest is to be retained. Just as xii. 1 is a proof passage for the N. T. doctrine of the *universal priesthood* of believers, so does the present verse justify the description of the ministry of the word as a *priestly* office. But Paul calls himself a priest of *Jesus Christ*,<sup>1</sup> inasmuch as it was Jesus Christ who appointed him to the priestly office, Eph. iv. 11. Christ is therefore to be thought of here, not as High Priest, but as King and Lord of the church. For, to say nothing of the fact that He is expressly described as High Priest only in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the high priest did not appoint the priests, but along with them was appointed by God ; and the N. T. official priesthood does not suggest the thought of the high-priesthood of Christ, inasmuch as the latter, and the latter only, had an *expiatory* character, and is contemplated in the Epistle to the Hebrews solely from this point of view. But still less is Jesus Christ to be thought of as the one to whom the *sacrifice* is presented, God alone appearing elsewhere as the recipient of the sacrifice, while Christ, on the other hand, is Himself the sacrifice, comp. xii. 1 ; Eph. v. 2. To *εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* we are not to supply *ἀποσταλείς* = to the Gentiles, but it is = *for* the Gentiles, or *in reference to* the Gentiles, *as respects* the Gentiles, comp. Winer, p. 495.

—*ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ*] Luther : “to offer up the gospel of God.” No doubt the preaching of the gospel may be regarded as an offering of sacrifice, and consequently as belonging to the *sacrificial* portion of the Christian cultus ; but the Gentiles themselves being here described (comp. *προσφορὰ τῶν ἔθνων*) as the sacrifice, *ἱεουργεῖν* is perhaps to be taken in a

<sup>1</sup> Lachmann and Tischendorf, instead of Ἰησ. Χριστ., have received Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, on the authority of A B C F G, Vulg. Aug. *al.*

wider sense = *to administer as a priest*, comp. 4 Macc. vii. 8, *ἱεουργεῖν τὸν νόμον*. "Administrans evangelium a Deo missum hominibus, eoque ministerio velut sacerdotio fungens," Estius. The gospel may be conceived as, so to speak, the sacrificial instrument or sacrificial vessel by means of which the Gentiles are prepared and presented as a sacrifice to God. So Theophylact: *Μὴ τοῖνυν μοι μέμψεσθε, ἐὰν ὑμῶν ὁμιλῶ. Αὕτη γάρ μοι ἱερὸς σὺνὴ τὸ καταγγέλλειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Μάχαιραν* (Eph. vi. 17) *ἔχω τὸν λόγον θυσία ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς· τίς δ' ἂν μέμφοιτο τῷ ἱερεῖ τὴν μάχαιραν ἐπάγοντι τοῖς πρὸς θυσίαν ἀφωρισμένοις;* comp. also Calvin. But perhaps it will be a simpler course, without such special explication, by *ἱεουργεῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* to understand priestly service in general consisting in the preaching of the gospel, inasmuch as through the preaching of the gospel the Gentiles are made ready and presented as a sacrifice well-pleasing to God, *i.e.* to be converted to Christ, Acts xxvi. 17, 18. As to the transitive use of *ἱεουργεῖν*, see Winer, p. 279.

—*ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος*] comp. Isa. lxvi. 20. *The sacrifice* (opposed to the context: *the bringing near*) of the Gentiles = the sacrifice which the Gentiles are. The genitive *τῶν ἐθνῶν* is therefore the genitive of apposition. "Et sane hoc est Christiani pastoris sacerdotium, homines in Evangelii obedientiam subigendo veluti Deo immolare: non autem, quod superciliose hactenus Papistae jactarunt, oblatione Christi homines reconciliare Deo," Calvin. With *εὐπρόσδεκτος*, comp. 2 Cor. viii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 5: *θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους τῷ θεῷ*. But the *θυσία* here is not the sacrifice which the Gentiles themselves offer, the service of rational sacrifice on the part of the Gentiles, xii. 1. So Theodoret: *καὶ τὸ μὲν κήρυγμα ἱεουργίαν ἐκάλεσε, τὴν δὲ γνησίαν πίστιν εὐπρόσδεκτον προσφοράν*.

—*ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ*] forms an antithesis to the external consecration of the O. T. sacrifices, xii. 1.

Vv. 17-21. In virtue of the office of Gentile apostle entrusted to him, ver. 16, the apostle glories in his official labours in the discharge of the office, relying on their success in a widely-extended sphere, and mentioning at the same time the principle upon which he acted, namely, to preach the gospel only where Christ's name has not yet been named. Just as, with respect to the past, in the seal impressed by God Himself, by means of the success vouchsafed, on his official labours, his defence of the freedom

with which he admonished the Gentile-Christian church at Rome receives its confirmation, so with respect to the future by the same means (ver. 22 ff.) the way is prepared for his apologetic statement that he has not hitherto visited this church, as well as for the intimation of his purpose to greet it soon in person. Considering the apologetic tone of the present passage, as well as the affinity of its contents with the account in 2 Cor. x.-xii. (comp. especially 2 Cor. x. 12, 13, xii. 11, 12), it is probable that recollection of his recent experience in the Corinthian church, and a fear that similar hindrances might be placed in the way of his intended preaching of the gospel in Rome (Rom. xvi. 17-20), co-operated to determine the form and contents of the present passage.

Ver. 17. ἔχω οὖν καύχῃσιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν] "I have therefore glorying in Christ Jesus as respects the cause of God." οὖν draws an inference from vv. 15, 16. Being appointed by God as apostle of the Gentiles, in order by priestly ministration of the gospel to offer them in sacrifice to God, I have consequently, etc. As to the distinction between καύχῃσις and καύχημα, comp. on iii. 27. Instead of καύχῃσιν, Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of B [C] D E F G, 37, have received τὴν καύχῃσιν = *my* glorifying, *the* glory which I have, comp. John v. 34, 36; Rom. iii. 27. In this case ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ would have to be specially emphasized, so that the apostle's glorying would be described as taking place only in Christ, not in himself. But the reading τὴν καύχῃσιν must be described as not preponderantly authenticated, and the meaning based upon it is not strongly supported by the position of ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, beside which it evidently places the antithetical apologetic reference too prominently in the foreground. But ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is not to be strictly connected with καύχῃσιν = *καυχᾶσθαι* ἐν Χρ. Ἰησ. (1 Cor. i. 31; Phil. iii. 3), to glory in Christ, *i.e.* in His assistance, but with ἔχω καύχῃσιν = I have glorying in my fellowship with Christ (viii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 31). As all the apostle's action, so also his glorying takes place in Christ Jesus. The article τὸν before θεόν is attested by preponderant evidence. τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν (Heb. ii. 17, v. 1), as concerns the things relating to God, *i.e.* in respect of the administration of my priestly office. τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is not = πρὸς τὸν θεόν, and the article cannot be taken as a *limitation* = *at least* before God. Otherwise, ix. 5, xii. 18.

Vv. 18, 19. The aim of the apostle's official labour is the acceptable offering up, *i.e.* conversion of the Gentile world, ver. 16. He can only glory in the administration of this office, ver. 17, in so far as its aim is actually attained. But that it was actually realized, and that within a wide circle, is testified by vv. 18, 19. οὐ γὰρ πολμήσω λαλεῖν τι ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ] "for I will not venture to say anything which Christ did not work through me," *i.e.* put affirmatively: "for I glory only in that which Christ actually wrought through me." The chief thought is, that the glorying in his official labours has good grounds, being attended by real success. At the same time, the turn and form of expression is perhaps in part determined by the secondary allusion to the false apostles, who gave themselves up to empty boasting, without being able to point to any real, divinely-wrought results of their labours. The emphasis therefore rests not upon Χριστός, *i.e.* what *Christ* did not work through me = what I did not do as *Christ's organ*, whereby glorying in personal privileges, πεποιθήσις ἐν σαρκί, Phil. iii. 4 ff., is meant to be excluded. The stress is rather to be laid on κατειργάσατο, in order to emphasize the real success of his toil. But perhaps Χριστός and δι' ἐμοῦ as well may not be without emphasis, although a feebler one. The apostle glories in his vocation as Gentile apostle, because in it, through him, Christ worked successfully; whereas the pseudo-apostles neither had real success to show, nor could they appeal to Christ, nor even did they aim at this, but instead sought to appropriate the results of the labours of others. Chrysostom: Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν, φησὶν, ὅτι κόμπος μου τὰ ῥήματα . . . Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἐνεχειρίσθη μὲν, οὐκ ἐποίησα δὲ τὸ ἐπιταχθέν, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ἐποίησα, ἀλλὰ ὁ Χριστός. Theophylact: Ἐπειδὴ εἶπεν ὅτι λειτουργός εἰμι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, φησὶν ὅτι οὐ κομπᾶζω οὐδὲ ἀλαζονεύομαι τι ὧν οὐκ ἐποίησα, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἐγὼ κατειργασάμην, ἀλλ' ὁ Χριστὸς κατειργάσατο ἐμοὶ ὀργάνῳ χρησάμενος. πολμήσω, *sustinebo*, I will venture, embolden myself (v. 7), namely, if necessity arise. Hence the future. Instead of λαλεῖν τι, Lachmann and Tischendorf have rightly received τι λαλεῖν on preponderant testimony. λαλεῖν in itself is not = *garrère*, to make a talk, gossip, representing *καυχᾶσθαι*; but here, as always (iii. 19) = to say, to state, so that it is defined by the context only as a *boasting statement*. ὧν = τούτων *ā*, comp. Winer, p. 206.



—*εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν*] *unto the obedience of the Gentiles, i.e.* that I may bring to pass the obedience of the Gentiles due to Christ, that I may allure the Gentiles to the obedience of faith (i. 5), referring to *τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, ver. 17, and specifying the purpose of *κατεργάσατο δι' ἐμοῦ*.

—*λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ*] *by word and deed* (comp. Acts vii. 22 ; 2 Cor. x. 11 ; and Luke xxiv. 19), specifies the means of the apostle's labours.

—*ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων*] *in power of signs and wonders*. The genitive serves to indicate *emanation*. But by the *power* going forth from the signs and wonders is to be understood the awakening impression made by the signs and wonders on the minds of men. *ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων* refers back to *ἔργῳ*, ver. 18. The *ἔργον* by which Paul converts the Gentiles is just the *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* that he performs, which in a preparatory (John ii. 23, iv. 48, vi. 2) and evidential way exercise upon them a converting influence. Respecting the miracles of Paul to which he appeals, as here, also in 2 Cor. xii. 12, comp. Acts xiv. 3, xv. 12, xvi. 16 ff., xix. 11 ff., xx. 10 f. Nothing but marvellous caprice can desire to refer *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* (comp. Mark xiii. 22 ; John iv. 48 ; Acts ii. 22, vi. 8) to the so-called spiritual miracles of conversion, instead of to external miraculous facts. According to Lücke on John iv. 48 (I. p. 620 f., ed. 3), in the conjunction of *σημεῖα* and *τέρατα* the proper *conception of miracle* is meant to lie in the word *τέρατα*, which, where it follows, may be regarded as a more precise definition of *σημεῖα*, which has a wider range of signification. Where it precedes, it perhaps represents the place of the adjectival definition of the wider conception *σημεῖα*, *miraculous signs*. No doubt *σημεῖον* denotes primarily any sign, even a natural sign of a natural thing (2 Thess. iii. 17), or even a natural sign of a supernatural thing (Luke ii. 12 ; Rom. iv. 11). In the latter sense the entire universe has a significant symbolic import, and all individual phenomena of nature may be regarded as *σημεῖα* of supernatural things, even as in the sacraments definite natural elements are set apart as such *signa*. But since in the sphere of revelation the nature of things is such that, apart from the standing sacramental signs which are only such for the faith that receives them, the divinely-wrought signs given for the conversion of unbelievers are, and in harmony with the object must necessarily be, super-

natural, divine acts, it follows that the ordinary meaning of *σημεῖον* in the very numerous N. T. passages (comp. Schmid, *ταμείον*, ed. Bruder, s.v.) is in and of itself that of *miraculous sign*. Accordingly the observation of Lücke (comp. against him Fritzsche's note here), quoted at first, would need to be qualified. On this account in the N. T. the miracles of Christ and the apostles are so frequently designated by *σημεῖα* without adding *τέρατα*, but never, which must seem strange upon the Lückeian supposition, by *τέρατα* simply. *τέρας*, not, with Reiche, to be derived from *terrere*, but perhaps, with Fritzsche and others, to be placed in connection with *τηρεῖν*, is a sign claiming the *observation*, the *wonder* of men. As such it may likewise be a natural, merely unusual event, comp. Hom. *Il.* xii. 209; Herod. vi. 98. But in the sphere of revelation, just like *σημεῖον*, in the nature of things it will commonly be a supernatural event, even as in the N. T. the word occurs in this latter meaning *only*. Thus *σημεῖον* includes more an objective, *τέρας* more a subjective reference. *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* are miraculous, divine operations in the world of external phenomena, appointed by *God* as *signs* of higher relations, in order to excite the *attention* of men. "Et sane sunt testimonia, divinae potentiae ad homines expergefaciendos, ut percussi Dei virtute eum mirentur simul atque adorent: nec significatione carent, sed excitant nos ad aliquid de Deo intelligendum," Calvin. This explains why, where only one of the two expressions is used, in the N. T. *σημεῖον* appears, not *τέρας*, which in a certain sense is merely the consequence of the *σημεῖον*, as well as that, when the two expressions are conjoined, the usual and certainly the original order is *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*, in exact harmony with the Heb. *אֲמוּנָה וּמִוִּזְמוּת* (Ex. vii. 3; Deut. vi. 22, xxix. 3; Jer. xxxiii. 20, etc.),<sup>1</sup> far more rarely the converse *τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα* (Acts ii. 19, comp. Joel ii. 30, Acts ii. 22, 43, vi. 8, vii. 36), for the very reason that the cause precedes the effect, and on this account is usually mentioned first.

—*ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος θεοῦ*] *in power of the Spirit of God*, is co-ordinate with, not subordinate to, *ἐν δυνάμει σημεῶν καὶ τεράτων*. In the latter case would be indicated the power by which the signs and wonders are performed. Moreover, this interpretation, unlikely in the abstract and forced, impairs the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark xiii. 22; John iv. 48; Acts iv. 30, v. 12, xiv. 3, xv. 12; Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Heb. ii. 4.

weight of the words *ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος θεοῦ*. These words refer back either to *λόγῳ*, or, better, to *λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ* in common. The power meant is that which went forth from the Spirit of God, imparted by Christ to the apostle, upon the hearts of men. While this Spirit was the real source of the apostle's *λόγος*, by whose mediation it exercised its converting influence, He was also the source of the apostle's *ἔργον*, of the *σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*, and of the *δυνάμεις* (Acts viii. 13 ; 2 Cor. xii. 12 ; 1 Cor. xii. 10), which prepared the way for conversion in the hearts of men. But in proportion as the *λόγος* was more efficacious for this purpose than the *ἔργον*, is the *predominant* reference of the *δύναμις πνεύματος θεοῦ* to the *λόγος* to be held fast. The *lect. recepta ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος θεοῦ*, which Matthiä has retained and defended, is found in Cod. Sinait. D\*\* L, most minuskels, several translations, and Fathers. It is true that the *var. lect. ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου* is very well attested, namely, by A C D E F G, *al.*, and most of the versions and Fathers, on which account it has been received by Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, ed. 1. From this wavering is explained perhaps both the combination of *θεοῦ* and *ἁγίου* in the reading *ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος θεοῦ ἁγίου* in Cod. 90, and the omission of both words in the reading *ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος* in B, with Pelag. Vigil. Taps., which Mill approved, and Tischendorf, ed. 2 (ed. 8 : *θεοῦ*), received. But the disturbance of the rhythm thus arising, *λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ . . . ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων . . . ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος* requires the supplement *θεοῦ* or *ἁγίου*. According to external authority, then, *ἁγίου* would certainly have to be acknowledged as genuine, but *θεοῦ* is well attested, and *ἁγίου* might easily be substituted in the present passage from ver. 16.

—*ὥστε με κτλ.*] Specification of the *result*. This working of Christ through me for the conversion of the Gentiles has had the result that I, etc.

—*ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ*] It is true that three years previously, before he appeared in Jerusalem, Acts ix. 28, Paul had laboured in Damascus, Acts ix. 20 ff., and Arabia, Gal. i. 17 f. But apart from the consideration that these labours may perhaps be rather described as preparatory, and that according to the statements of the Acts and the Galatian epistle it was only in Jerusalem that he entered the apostolic band, here, where his main concern is to fix the south-east starting-point of his apostolic labours, he per-

tinently names Jerusalem as the place in that region best known even in Rome, the seat of the Christian mother-church, and the starting-point of the gospel, Luke xxiv. 47. Moreover, in the subjoined addition

—καὶ κύκλῳ] *et circumcirca, and round about*, he himself describes Jerusalem as merely the centre of that, his initiatory, sphere of toil. By the circuit of Jerusalem we must therefore understand Arabia and Syria, even Cilicia (Acts ix. 30; Gal. i. 21), not merely the immediate neighbourhood of the holy city, which by itself would be a trivial thing to mention. The apostle here manifestly glances at that first period of ministry in the gospel which preceded his labours as *Gentile* apostle, Acts xiii., and formed the commencement of his missionary toil. This was occupied *in Jerusalem and round about* in the sense indicated. With κύκλῳ, *sc. τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, comp. Mark iii. 34, vi. 36; Luke ix. 12; Rev. iv. 6. On account of this fixed adverbial use καὶ κύκλῳ cannot be translated, "*and that in an arc*," and joined with μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ, so that the arc is indicated, which Paul described, starting from Jerusalem, across Syria, Asia, Troas, Macedonia, and Greece,<sup>1</sup> as far as Illyria. This delineation of his route of travel, as bald as it is ostentatious, even borders on the ridiculous, as one by no means sees how Paul could go from Jerusalem to Illyria otherwise than in an arc, unless, indeed, he had positively determined, the *direct* road from Jerusalem to Illyria lying, for the most part, through water, to preach the gospel principally upon the sea.

—μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ] Upon the south-east *terminus a quo* ἀπὸ Ἱερ. κ. κύκλ., follows the north-west *terminus ad quem* μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ. Illyria is here probably mentioned as the dividing line of the east and west, even as in the later division of the empire the *praefectura Illyrici* belonged with the *praefectura Orientis* to the eastern Roman empire. The apostle speaks inclusively, not exclusively. For, first of all, it is only natural that, as in the starting-point, so also in the final goal, he should name not merely the exclusive limits, but the inclusive, actual scenes of his labours. And again, if he had not himself preached in Illyricum, seeing that Illyria belonged to the east, he would not even have completed the preaching of the gospel

<sup>1</sup> Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Joh. Damasc. Schol. Matth. would even draw the Saracens, Persians, and Armenians into this arc.

in the east, and would still, in opposition to ver. 23, have had room *ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις*. For the same reason it cannot be said that he merely included Illyria hyperbolically, which apart from such reason seems out of place, in the circle of his labours hitherto completed. Hence we are compelled to suppose that Paul, during his missionary journeys, once actually made an excursion into Illyria, which is not enumerated in the Acts. This probably happened<sup>1</sup> during the journey mentioned in Acts xx. 1–3, so that this stay in Illyria fell a short time before the present epistle was written, comp. the Introd. If, with Wieseler (*Chronologic des apostolischen Zeitalters*), we make the Epistle to Titus to have been written *before* the Roman epistle, in Tit. iii. 12 we should have a confirmation of this supposition, the Nicopolis there mentioned being undoubtedly Nicopolis in Epirus, comp. Wieseler, pp. 335, 352 ff. The apostle then having wintered in Nicopolis, and that probably during the winter months, December and January, of the three months' stay in Hellas or Achaia,<sup>2</sup> mentioned in Acts xx. 2, 3, the probability becomes the greater that about this time he made an excursion into Illyria from the neighbouring Epirus. But of course the latter source of support for the hypothesis in question falls to the ground with the theory of a *second* Roman imprisonment of the Apostle Paul, as on this theory the writing of the Epistle to Titus, and therefore the stay in Nicopolis in Epirus, would have to be inserted between the two imprisonments, and therefore in any case *after* the writing of the Roman epistle. But even then it might still be said that the apostle's intention, expressed in Tit. iii. 12, to winter in Nicopolis assumes the fact of the existence there of a Christian church founded by him, and therefore the fact of a former stay on his part in these regions.

—πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ] Luther: "so that from Jerusalem and around as far as Illyricum I *have filled everything with the gospel of Christ*." But this would be ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πάντα πεπληρωκέναι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ, comp. Acts v. 28. As a decided parallel to the expression: πληροῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Col. i. 25, πληροῦν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ may be

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Anger, *de temporum in actis Apostolorum ratione*, p. 84 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. Pausan. vii. 16. 7: καλοῦσι οὐχ Ἑλλάδος, ἀλλ' Ἀχαιῶν ἡγεμόνα οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, διότι ἐχειμώσαντο Ἑλλήνας δι' Ἀχαιῶν τότε τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ πριστοκτότων.

quoted. Several expositors, then, would interpret πληροῦν in both passages according to Hebrew idiom, after Vitringa, *Olss. Sacr.* I. p. 198 sq.: “Verbum πληρῶσαι hic significat docere, per hebraismum, ad imitationem verbi רגל apud Hebræos, quod significat *implere*, sed saepe usurpatur pro *docere*.” Comp. Buxtorf, *Lxx. Talm. s.v. רגל*. But such an idiom cannot be shown either in Greek or in the Hellenistic dialect. The meaning also: πληροῦν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, “to preach the gospel, the word of God, *completely*” (so Schol. Matth.: ἀνελλιπῶς καὶ τελείως κηρύξαι), is undemonstrable and out of place, because, according to the context, an *incomplete* preaching is not to be thought of for a moment. The same holds good of the meaning *supplere*, to *supplement*; for neither does the apostle, which would have to be supposed in the present passage, in other places regard his evangelical preaching as a mere *supplement* to the evangelical preaching of others, nor in the Colossian passage does he intend to represent himself as merely *continuing* the teaching-labours of Epaphras, since there he is speaking of his work not merely among the Colossians, but among Gentile Christians in general. We might better interpret: *ad finem perduxisse laetum de Christo nuntium*, “so that I have carried through the joyous proclamation of Christ, have completed it,” ver. 23. But εὐαγγέλιον is not the glad news of Christ viewed as the *act* of preaching, and one may bring an act, a ministry, a course of action to an end,<sup>1</sup> but not the gospel, and still less the word of God, Col. i. 25. In that case εὐαγγέλιον, λόγος θεοῦ must perforce be taken metonymically for ἀποστολή, κήρυγμα, *nuntius praedicandi evangelium*, or *Verbum Dei*, an interpretation, the precarious character of which, especially as to λόγος θεοῦ being = “preaching of the word of God,” is at once evident.<sup>2</sup> Nothing, consequently, is left but to take πληροῦν in its original signification *to fulfil, to fill*. Comp. Steiger on Col. i. 25. The gospel, God’s word, seems *empty* until it is learnt, accepted, understood.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Acts xii. 25: πληροῦν τὴν διακονίαν; xiv. 26: πληρ. τὸ ἔργον; xiii. 25: πληρ. τὸν δρόμον.

<sup>2</sup> Meyer rejects this interpretation, but, at least as it seems to us, arbitrarily returns to it. He interprets: “so that I have brought to completion the gospel of Christ. This πληροῦν has taken place in an *extensive* sense through the fact that the gospel is spread abroad everywhere from Jerusalem to Illyria, and has met with acceptance.” The gospel is completed, in an *extensive* sense is nothing but a *metonymical* phrase for: the *preaching* of the gospel is completed.

Even the revelation of God requires to be realized, introduced into the life, and so *fulfilled*. Comp. Rom. xiii. 8 : *πληροῦν τὸν νόμον*, and Tholuck, *Comm. on Sermon on the Mount*, on Matt. v. 17. This mode of interpretation also aptly suits the context. The apostle would prove that he has actually fulfilled his task to present the Gentiles as a *προσφορά εὐπρόσδεκτος* to God, ver. 16 ; comp. *κατειργάσατο*, ver. 18. This is now done in the lands of the orient, in which he has fulfilled the gospel by *successful* preaching among the Gentiles. Therewith certainly he has *fully discharged* the office of evangelical preaching in these regions (comp. ver. 23), so that he has nothing more to do as apostle in the districts of country indicated. But, notwithstanding, it would be wrong to say that there was nothing more for the gospel to do in those regions at all. The mission of the apostle was only completed because its function was limited to the work of laying the foundation everywhere. That mission then being under obligation, as it were, by an intrinsic necessity to extend itself from the chief places in which he had established Christian churches in ever-widening circles, he synecdochically contemplated the relative realization of the gospel in the east, accomplished by him, as an absolute one.

Vv. 20, 21. Statement of the principle by which he was guided in his apostolic official labours. The mission, which he proposed to himself everywhere, first, to lay the foundation of the gospel, and not to build on another's foundation, answered exactly to the idea and definition of an *apostle* (Acts xxvi. 17, 18), in contradistinction to the ordinary church-teacher, who had not to lay foundations but to continue building on the foundation laid, and to the pseudo-apostle, who, shrinking from the toil of working himself, entered upon and spoilt the work of others. As this difficult, comprehensive, and protracted work of laying the foundation of the Christian church in the regions of the east explains the postponement of his long-projected journey to Rome, ver. 22, so the completion of this work explains his resolve, and his hope of being able now, to accomplish his old cherished plan, vv. 23, 24, seeing that he could commit the continuation of his work to others, not being obliged to regard this as his specific apostolic work. *οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*] "but striving zealously in this way to preach the gospel." *οὕτω δέ, ita autem, and indeed* (comp. *δέ*, iii. 22), *so*.

*φιλοτιμουμενον* depends on *ὥστε με . . . πεπληρωκέναί.* The reading *φιλοτιμοῦμαι*, received by Lachmann, after B D\* F G, is therefore merely to be regarded as a needless effort to relieve the construction. *φιλοτιμείσθαι* = *φιλότιμον εἶναι*, "so to pursue something as to seek one's own honour therein," then generally, "to pursue something zealously, to strive zealously, to apply oneself," comp. 2 Cor. v. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 11. But no doubt the principle stated in what follows was an apostolic *point of honour* with Paul, 2 Cor. x. 5 f.

—*οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός*] interprets *οὕτω* in the first place negatively. *Not where Christ was already named, i.e.* His name was already declared, and therefore is already known. *ὠνομάσθη* thus is neither to be explained by *was celebrated*, nor by *was called upon*.

—*ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἑτερότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ*] comp. 2 Cor. x. 15. Paul will not build upon strange ground, *i.e.* upon ground laid by others, *i.e.* he will not merely continue the preaching of the gospel begun by others. The apostolic mission, as observed, was simply to carry on everywhere the work of laying the foundation. The assertion that he held by this principle, because he sought to avoid controversy, especially with the Judaizing teachers, is just as unworthy of Paul as it is untrue in itself, and is refuted at once by the apostle's character and the history of his labours. Moreover, neither were the false teachers accustomed themselves to lay the foundation, but to build wood, hay, and stubble on the foundation laid by others, nor for this very reason would Paul have recognised their work as a real *θεμέλιος*. But the apostle is here treating of the *principle* of his *oral* preaching. This, therefore, is neither inconsistent with the writing of a Roman and Colossian *epistle* (comp. also the *Introd.*), nor with his communicating, as occasion was given by his accidental presence in churches not founded by him, the same *χάρισμά τι πνευματικόν* by personal exhortation. But that he everywhere kept in view the chief aim of his apostolic toil is shown also by ver. 24. For even in the west he makes for Spain as the real goal of his preaching, *ὅπου οὐκ ὠνομάσθη Χριστός*, and will only visit the Romans by the way.

—*ἀλλὰ*] introduces the positive specification of *οὕτω*. We are not, with Grotius, to supply *ἐποίησα*. As to the interweaving of quotations with the apostle's language, comp. ix. 7, xv. 3.



—*καθὼς γέγραπται*] namely, in Isa. lii. 15. The Hebrew text runs: *כִּי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־רָאָה לָהֶם וְאֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ הִתְבַּרְּנוּ*, “For what was never proclaimed to them they shall see, and what they never heard, perceive.” The subject is the Gentile nations, or the Gentile nations and kings, not the kings alone, comp. Hengstenberg, *Christology*, II. 274. LXX.: *ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν, συνήσουσιν*, “for they to whom it was not proclaimed shall see it,” etc. Paul therefore cites verbally after the LXX., whose translation may be justified by the original text. This meaning of their translation, especially pertinent for his object, follows also spontaneously from the meaning of the original text indicated by us; for a thing unheard (astounding) is only proclaimed to one who has not hitherto heard the proclamation. But this was the specific task pertaining to the office of *Gentile apostle*, to proclaim a thing unheard to those who as yet had not heard it, *i.e.* the gospel to the Gentiles, namely, to *the Gentiles* who are still *Gentiles*, among whom therefore Christ’s name is not yet named.

—*περὶ αὐτοῦ*] An addition of the LXX., referring to the *παῖς θεοῦ*, the Messiah, Christ, who is the subject spoken of in the entire context.

—*ὄψονται*] *sc. αὐτόν*, namely, in spirit by faith.

—*καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν*] *sc. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, as follows both from *οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμ. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* and from *οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ*.

—*συνήσουσιν*] shall understand *it*, namely, this news heard.

Vv. 22, 23. Description of the plan of his present journey, vv. 22–29, with a request annexed for the intercession of the Roman church, vv. 30–32, and concluding invocation, ver. 33. *Διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτέμην*] “For this reason also I was hindered.” *διὸ* is not to be explained: “for this reason, because in Rome the foundation was laid by others.” For even if this had not been the case he would not have come to Rome before, because he had first to complete his labour as founder of the churches in the countries of the east, before passing over to the west. In ver. 23, he expressly tells us that this was the cause of his hindrance hitherto. *διὸ* is therefore = “for this reason, because hitherto I had enough to do in those regions.” The apostle’s preaching advanced by regular steps. Like a bold, cautious general, he has formed a certain, orderly plan of attack, from which he does

not rashly and arbitrarily depart. Only now, when from the most easterly position, Jerusalem, he has subdued the entire orient as far as Illyria by means of the gospel, or at least has seized for the gospel the chief points and bulwarks of heathenism, does he pass over to the west, in order then from the most westerly point—from Spain—to work in the opposite direction. At the same time, no doubt, Rome remains a mere point of transition, just because the foundation was there already laid; but even this passing visit and brief stay in Rome had hitherto been impossible to him, because previously his apostolic mission in the east was not fully accomplished. Calvin's observation in the abstract is correct: "*Ex hoc autem loco infirmum argumentum ducitur profectionis Hispanicae: neque enim protinus sequitur, ipsum fuisse perfunctum, quia sic animo concepisset. De spe enim tantum loquitur, qua frustrari, quemadmodum alii fideles, nonnunquam potuit.*" Although, for our part, we are of opinion that subsequently he actually carried out this plan between the first and second Roman imprisonments.

*τὰ πολλά*] is not equivalent to *πολλάκις*, which Lachmann has received in conformity with B D E F G. That this is a false *gloss* in accordance with i. 13, the remark of Oecumenius shows: *τὰ πολλά οἶον πολλάκις*. We should be rather inclined to explain *τὰ πολλά*, so often, i.e. the many times mentioned, i. 13. But this meaning also is not demonstrable. It is accordingly safest to abide by the only established and common meaning of *τὰ πολλά* = *plerumque*, so also Vulg., *in most cases, for the most part*, comp. Kühner, p. 220. *Sometimes*, therefore, we must supply in thought, other reasons detained the apostle, such as want of ship-accommodation, sickness, and the like. When he wished *πολλάκις* to come to Rome, he was *τὰ πολλά* prevented by the duties of his apostolic calling, *ἐνίοτε* by other reasons. For example, from Corinth he might otherwise have once made a brief excursion to Rome, without being really unfaithful to his principal mission.

—*τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*] The genitive depends on *ἐνεκοπτόμην* as a verb expressing the idea of hindrance (*ἐγκόπτειν*, to check in running, Gal. v. 7, to hinder, 1 Thess. ii. 18), comp. Winer, p. 245, and Fritzsche, *ad Matth.* p. 845.

Vv. 23, 24. The *lect. rec.* runs: *Νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς*

ὡς ἐὰν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν, ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεύσασθαι ὑμᾶς καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ. Just so Tischendorf, ed. 2 (not 8th edition). In accordance with Erasmus's suspicion and Mill's judgment, Griesbach, Knapp, *et al.*, have omitted ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, which is wanting in A B C D E F G, also Cod. Sinait.\* many versions, and several Fathers, and γάρ after ἐλπίζω, which is not found in (D E) F G, several versions, and Fathers, and read: *Νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν, ὡς ἐὰν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν, ἐλπίζω διαπορευόμενος θεύσασθαι ὑμᾶς κτλ.* Both readings, as well the Elzevir as the Griesbachian, yield a sentence appropriate in itself. But the Griesbachian deserves the preference, because of the great consensus of external evidence, and because the interpolation is explained by the opposition to ver. 22, and as an effort to relieve the construction. A B C (D E), also Cod. Sinait., indeed have the γάρ, which as an explication presupposes the ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and the originality of which seems to be certified, comp. Rinck, *Lucubr. crit.* p. 133. Still those codices may present to us either a restoration of the genuine text but half accomplished, or the first step in its corruption, since in retaining or adding the γάρ they supplied in thought an ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς of which γάρ introduced the explication. Lachmann, who, in harmony with his critical principles, retained γάρ but omitted ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς,<sup>1</sup> would therefore in any case have done better after ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν (with the assumed supplement of ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς) to put a full stop, and with ἐλπίζω γάρ begin a new sentence, than to enclose ἐλπίζω γάρ up to ἐμπλησθῶ in brackets, so that *νυνὶ δέ*, ver. 23, is supposed to be resumed by *νυνὶ δέ*, ver. 25, as if, in entire opposition to the general sense and logical connection, already in ver. 23 the sentence referred to the journey to Jerusalem. *νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων]* *sc. τοῦ κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, vv. 20, 21. *τύπος* = *opportunitas*, *opportunity*, *scope*, comp. on xii. 19.

<sup>1</sup> This, in fact, is probably the original reading. It is the one best authenticated, and the anacoluthon thus arising would most readily explain the correction of the language partly by adding ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, partly by omitting γάρ.

—ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις] in these *regions*, districts, Gal. i. 21, 2 Cor. xi. 10, namely, from Jerusalem to Illyria, ver. 19. Bengel observes on κλίματα: “Hæc appellatio præscindit a politica distributione orbis terræ. Nam hæc non solet sequi evangelium. Etiam Reformationis fructus primo tempore extra Germaniam quoque exstitit.”

—ἐπιποθίαν] “summum desiderium,” Beza.

—τοῦ ἐλθεῖν] dependent on ἐπιποθίαν.

—ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν] *for many years*. The many years are viewed as one connected period, from the beginning of which Paul cherished this desire, comp. ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, Luke viii. 43. *When* this desire arose in Paul cannot be fixed historically with certainty, probably when he first set foot on European soil.

—ὡς ἑάν] *quandocunque, simulatque*. The point of time is left *indefinite*, inasmuch as the execution of his intention to go to Spain direct from Jerusalem (ver. 28) might to some extent be delayed. Respecting ἑάν instead of ἄν after relatives, comp. Winer, p. 390. Lachmann and Tischendorf, on the authority of A B (C) D E F G, Chrys., read ὡς ἄν in the present passage.

—Σπανίαν] later Greek appellation (the Roman form was Ἰσπανία, 1 Macc. viii. 3) for Ἰβηρία, which embraced the *entire* Pyrenean peninsula. Spain was at that time a Roman province, numerous peopled by Jews, and on that account well adapted for the preaching of the gospel. That Paul actually executed his plan to journey to Spain is maintained by those who accept a second Roman imprisonment of the apostle, denied by those who accept only *one*.<sup>1</sup> Directly after writing this, Paul himself probably no longer expected to be able to accomplish his Spanish journey, Acts xx. 23–25.

—διαπορευόμενος] “quia Romæ jam fundata est fides,” Bengel.

—ὑφ’ ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι] Lachmann and Tischendorf, in conformity with B D E F G, *al.*, read ὑφ’ ὑμῶν, *i.e.* *from you*, from your city, instead of ὑφ’ ὑμῶν. But, in the first place, ὑπό and

<sup>1</sup> The most thorough and acute defence of the latter theory is found in Wieseler (*Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters*), where also (*Erster Excurs. ueber den römischen Aufenthalt des Apostels Paulus*, p. 521) the most important of the more elaborate authors on this subject, who have declared *for* or *against* a second Roman imprisonment of the Apostle Paul, are grouped together. For our part, we still adhere to a twofold Roman imprisonment, on the ground of tradition and of then pastoral epistles.

ἀπό are very frequently confounded by transcribers; and, again, the reference to the *persons* by whom Paul hoped to be escorted is expressly required, comp. Acts xv. 3; 2 Cor. i. 16.

—ἐκεῖ] instead of ἐκεῖσε, *thither*, comp. John xi. 8: καὶ πάλιν ὑπάγεις ἐκεῖ. After verbs of motion the adverb of rest anticipates the *object* of the motion. To be escorted *thither*, in order then to be *there*. As to whether Paul had already formed a definite plan for his journey from Rome to Spain, whether to travel by land or by water, and therefore, in the latter case, expected, of course, to be accompanied by his Roman attendants not merely part of the way, but all the way to Spain, nothing can be stated with certainty.

—ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ] “if previously I shall have been in some measure satisfied in you,” comp. i. 12. ἀπὸ μέρους *aliquatenus*, *in some measure*. Grotius: “non quantum vellem, sed quantum licebit.” Chrysostom: “οὐδεὶς γὰρ με χρόνος ἐμπλῆσαι δύναται οὐδὲ ἐμποιῆσαι μοι κόρον τῆς συνουσίας ὑμῶν.”

Ver. 25. But before his journey to Spain, during which he hoped to pay a visit to Rome, he must first go to Jerusalem, in order to hand over to the church there the proceeds of a collection made among the Gentile Christians in Macedonia and Achaia. The Romans, therefore, are not to wonder at his not coming forthwith. νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι] “but now I am about to go.” νυνὶ and the present πορεύομαι note the future as quite near at hand, as it were already present, and therefore certain. Comp. νῦν of the past just elapsed, as it were still present, John xi. 8, and the present ἔρχομαι, 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

—εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ] This was Paul's fifth journey to Jerusalem, the last in the Acts. The first, Acts ix.; the second, xi. 30; the third, xv.; the fourth, xviii. 22; the fifth, xxi. 15, 17.

—διακονῶν] The *participium praesentis* marks the journey itself as a part of his service. With the πορεύεσθαι the διακονία begins already to be fulfilled, comp. Winer, p. 429. The *participium futuri* διακονήσων would only exhibit the service as a consequence of the completed journey, comp. Acts xxiv. 17, xxv. 13. The service consists in handing over the contribution of money collected. Hence

—τοῖς ἁγίοις] refers not to the Christians in Macedonia and Achaia, whom he serves by being the bearer of their help, but

to the *πτωχοὶ τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερ.*, to whom the collection was to be made over, comp. vv. 26, 28, 31.

Ver. 26 explains how it came to pass that he has service to render to the saints in Jerusalem. *εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα*] “for Macedonia and Achaia saw good,” *placuit enim Macedonibus et Achaëis*. With *εὐδοκεῖν*, comp. Luke xii. 32; 1 Cor. i. 21; Gal. i. 15; Col. i. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 8; and on Rom. x. 1.

—*κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι*] “to bring about a participation.” As to *κοινωνεῖν*, comp. on xii. 13. Here also (2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 16) the intransitive sense of *κοινωνία* may be retained, inasmuch as he who communicates by the very act of communication puts himself in relations of *fellowship* with the receiver, and participates in his necessities. *κοινωνία*, therefore, is not to be directly taken in the active sense, *communication, distribution, assistance, collatio*, although, as to substance, no doubt the *participation* which one brings about may consist in the *communication, fellowship*, which one sets on foot, in *assistance*; on which account “to bring about a participation in respect to the poor” is here as to meaning = “to make a collection for them.” The apostle says disparagingly *κοινωνίαν τινά*, although the assistance, as may be inferred from 1 Cor. xvi. 4, may not be insignificant in itself, because to him even the greatest material gift appears insignificant in comparison with the spiritual gifts which Macedonia and Achaia had previously received from Jerusalem, ver. 27.

—*εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ*] As is well known, the Christian church at Jerusalem was in a state of poverty. The *πτωχοὶ τῶν ἁγίων* are therefore here the poor saints in general. “*Talia sunt nigrae lanarum, ovorum oblonga*,” remarks Grotius. Comp. Matthiæ, *Ausf. gr. Gr.* p. 627. Respecting the collection mentioned here of the Macedonians and Achaïans for the poor saints in Jerusalem, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff.; 2 Cor. viii., ix.

Ver. 27. *εὐδόκησαν γὰρ καὶ ὀφειλέται αὐτῶν εἶσιν*] “*Est egregia ἀναφορά simul cum ἐπανορθώσει*,” Grotius. The *εὐδόκησαν* is no doubt resumed in order to add the remark that this voluntary resolve may be regarded as the fulfilment of an obligation due. “For they were so pleased, and they are their debtors.”

—*εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινωνήσαν τὰ ἔθνη*] “for if the Gentiles participated in their spiritual blessings.” We say *κοινωνεῖν τινος*, Heb. ii. 14, and, as here and elsewhere

always in the N. T., *κοινωνεῖν τινι*, comp. xii. 13; Gal. vi. 6; Phil. iv. 15; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 John 11. τὰ πνευματικά are not, with Theodoret, expressly τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος δῶρα, but, in opposition to τὰ σαρκικά, the blessings of Christians, which, as proceeding from the πνεῦμα, are themselves of a spiritual nature, such as faith, love, hope, forgiveness of sins, peace, etc. These, originally belonging to the mother-church in Jerusalem, passed over from them to the Gentile churches.

—ὁφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς] “they also are under obligation to do service to them with material blessings.” The higher gift at least demands the smaller gift in return, 1 Cor. ix. 11. τὰ σαρκικά forms here not a moral but a physical antithesis to τὰ πνευματικά, like the earthly to the heavenly. They are blessings of a physical, *i.e.* material, earthly character. Most expositors suppose that in vv. 26, 27 Paul wished indirectly and covertly to call upon the Roman Christians also to assist the poor Jewish Christians in Jerusalem. But, in the first place, if this had been his intention, he would probably have done it directly and openly; and, again, he regarded the collection as brought to an end. We might rather suppose the Gentile Christians to be again reminded in general terms of the right course of conduct for them to pursue toward their Jewish brethren. But the apostle may also have said what he says in vv. 26, 27 without any special subsidiary intention.

Ver. 28. τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας] “when, therefore, I have accomplished this.” τοῦτο, *this*, *i.e.* this business, this ministering journey to Jerusalem.

—καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον] “and when I have sealed to them this fruit.” σφραγίζεσθε, *to seal*, ratify, John iii. 33, vi. 27, *i.e.* to hand surely over ἀσφαλῶς παραδίδόναι, or: to make over as their property, to ratify as their possession. σφραγίζεσθαι is therefore to be taken in a figurative, not literal sense; neither = “when I have carried over to them the money sealed” [Eras., Corn. a Lap., Estius], which σφραγίζεσθαι does not mean, nor = “when I have assured them with letter and seal as to the correct delivery of their collection” [Glöckler, Michaelis], in which latter case αὐτοῖς, in opposition to αὐτῶν and αὐτοῖς, ver. 27, will refer, not to the ἄγιοι, vv. 25, 26, but to the Macedonian and Achaian Christians. Both interpretations yield a meaning little worthy of the apostle, and almost

bordering on the ridiculous. But just as inappropriate is the explanation: "when I shall have ratified to them this fruit by my authority," *i.e.* when I give account to them respecting the contributing churches and the amount of the contributions, and faithfully hand over the collection. τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, this fruit, *i.e.* this product, namely τῆς κοινωνίας, ver. 26, or even τῆς φιλαδελφίας, not τῆς ἀποστολῆς, of my apostolic assiduity. The material charity might rather be described as the fruit of the spiritual charity received. Still the interpretation given is perhaps the simpler and more natural one.

—ἀπελεύσομαι] I will go away, John vi. 68, namely, away from Jerusalem = I will take my journey.

—δι' ὑμῶν] *i.e.* through your city, 2 Cor. i. 16.

—εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν] Lachmann and Tischendorf, on not quite sufficient evidence, εἰς Σπανίαν, comp. ver. 24.

Ver. 29. οἶδα δέ] But Paul *knows*, is persuaded, that he will come to the Romans in the fulness of the blessing of Christ, because neither will the riches of the grace and gifts implied in the apostolic office be wanting to him, nor the right disposition for their reception to them.

ὅτι ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς . . . ἐλεύσομαι] Respecting this connection of the participle with the finite form of the same verb, comp. Matthiæ, p. 1103; Kühlner, p. 376. Just so 1 Cor. ii. 1: ἐλθὼν . . . ἦλθον.

—ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ] "in the fulness of the blessing of Christ," *i.e.* so that I shall bring with me rich blessing from Christ. Comp. i. 10: ἐν, *with*, *i.e.* *endowed with*, or *proffering*, πλήρωμα εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ παρέχων ὑμῖν. Comp. 2 Cor. ii. 1: ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν = λύπην ὑμῖν παρέχων; comp. ver. 2: εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς. As to πλήρωμα εὐλογίας, comp. on xi. 12. The *lect. rec.* is: ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Mill early marked τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ as a gloss from ver. 19. These words were then omitted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, *et al.* Certainly they are wanting in A B C D E F G, *al.*, also Cod. Sinait.\* It. *al.* Clem. *al.*, and are therefore most probably spurious.

Vv. 30-32. Paul entreats the intercession of the Roman church on behalf of this impending journey to Jerusalem, 2 Cor. i. 11; Phil. i. 19; Philem. 22. Already is he filled with forebodings of the troubles awaiting him in Judæa at the hands of



unbelievers (Acts xx. 22 f., xxi. 10 f.), as well as with apprehension lest even the believers of the circumcision, under the influence of mistrust toward him as the anti-Judaistic apostle (Acts xxi. 21), might not cordially receive the gifts of the Gentile Christians. With παρακαλεῖν διὰ, comp. xii. 1. But the apostle exhorts not only by Christ, but also—διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος] *i.e.* the love which the Spirit instils into us, which φιλαδελφία Paul here lays claim to on his own behalf, Gal. v. 22. In any case, it is more natural here to think of the love wrought in us by the Spirit as a motive to brotherly intercession, than, with Chrys. Theophyl. *et al.*, of the love of the Spirit to us.

—συναγωνίσασθαί μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν] comp. Col. iv. 12, also ii. 1 and i. 29. In many respects prayer may be spoken of as an ἀγών. For one thing, there are inner spiritual foes against whom we have to fight, the σάρξ with its desire and fear, the κόσμος with its allurements and threatening, the διάβολος assaulting the soul either directly or by means of the σάρξ and the κόσμος. Again, there are external foes, particular sufferings, dangers and reverses, against which the struggle of prayer is to be directed. But prayer is a struggle, not merely in so far as it is the appointed means by which the *foes* of the soul are to be beaten back, but also in so far as it is the appointed means for prevailing upon the friend of the soul,—the God who delays hearing, and for purposes of trial wears the guise of a foe (comp. Jacob's conflict, Gen. xxxii.). In the present passage, then, the generality of the expression is to be retained, and in the ἀγωνίζεσθαι of the apostle and the συναγωνίζεσθαι of the Roman church we are merely to think of the persistent zeal and wrestling earnestness by which all prayer is accompanied if of a right kind, and instead of beating the air, never gives up until its object is reached, without the specific obstacles to be overcome in every such prayer being expressly thought of and indicated. The reading of several authorities, ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμῶν, is to be regarded as a correct *gloss*; for, of course, the prayers of the church are meant, not those of the apostle, as the reading of Vigil. Taps. ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς μου assumes. ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν is to be attached to ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς. The repetition of the article (ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ταῖς κτλ.) is not on this account necessary, because we say προσεύχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τινος, Col. i. 9, etc. The connection of ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν with

*συναγωνίσασθαι μοι* is impracticable, because *ἀγωνίζεσθαι πρὸς τινα* = to fight *against* some one. Thus the apostle calls upon his readers in the prayers which they address to God for his welfare to contend on his behalf as he himself contends.

—*ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ*] Purpose of the *συναγωνίσασθαι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς*. With the matter, comp. Acts xxi. 27 ff.; with the expression: *ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι*, Acts xiv. 2. They are *ἀπειθοῦντες*, *inobedientes*, xi. 31, because they refuse obedience to God (*ὑπακοὴν πίστεως*, i. 5), who requires faith in Christ.

—*καὶ ἵνα*] With the repetition of *ἵνα*, comp. *e.g.* 2 Thess. iii. 1, 2. But *ἵνα* is wanting, in the present passage, in A (B) C D\* F G, *al.*, also Cod. Sinait.\*, several translations and Fathers, and for this reason is expunged by Lachmann and Tischendorf. In fact, it may easily have been a later interpolation of the transcribers, comp. *e.g.* xv. 32, xvi. 2; Col. iv. 8.

—*ἡ διακονία μου*] In conformity with B D\* F G, Lachmann and Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 8, have received *δωροφορία* (Ambrst.: "munerum meorum oblatio") instead of *διακονία*. But the attestation is too slight, the designation *δωροφορία* somewhat wanting in delicacy, and *διακονία* is supported by ver. 25 (*διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις*). *δωροφορία* is therefore to be regarded as an interpretation, the *διακονία* in this case consisting in the *δωροφορία*.

—*ἡ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*] Comp. *τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους*, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1. It is the rendering of service destined for Jerusalem. Lachmann and Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 8, on inadequate authority, read *ἡ ἐν* instead of *ἡ εἰς*. Some witnesses have *εἰς* or *ἐν* without the article *ἡ*.

—*εὐπρόσδεκτος γένηται τοῖς ἁγίοις*] "may be acceptable to the saints," may find good acceptance with the saints, *i.e.* the saints there, at Jerusalem. With *εὐπρόσδεκτος*, comp. xv. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 2, viii. 12.

—*ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς*] indicates the purpose of ver. 31, therefore the *ultimate* purpose of ver. 30. Comp. Gal. iv. 5. This ultimate aim was not accomplished because of Paul coming to Rome as a prisoner, Acts xxiii. 11, xxviii. 14, 16. Lachmann, on the authority of A C 67\*\* 71 (so, too, Cod. Sinait.\*), Ruf., reads *ἐλθών*, omitting the following *καί*, which is to be regarded merely as an elegant change in the construction on the part of copyists.

—*διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ*] comp. i. 10 ; Heb. vi. 3 ; 1 Cor. iv. 19. The will of God is the divine will assenting to their common prayers, granting them. Lachmann and Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 8, after B only, read *κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* instead of *θεοῦ*. D\* E F G, It. have *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ* ; Cod. Sinait.\* Ambrst., *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

—*καὶ συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν*] “and I may be refreshed with you,” *i.e.* that we may rejoice one with another in our mutual intercourse in the faith, i. 11, 12 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 18 ; 2 Cor. vii. 13. Here, therefore, is no specific reference to the *recovery* of the apostle from his struggles in Judaea, of the church from its struggles in prayer. The words: *καὶ συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν*, Tischendorf altogether omitted in ed. 1, because they are wanting in B, and vary in other critical testimonies, but restored in ed. 2.

Ver. 33. Concluding prayer. Very inappositely Grotius observes : “ Hoc dicit, ut hoc magis Romanos a rixis avertat.” On this view, the invocation is meant to allude to the substance of the last section of ch. xiv. xv. preceding the epilogue. But the exhortation to *concord*, xiv. 1—xv. 13, was already concluded by an appropriate prayer ; such an idea is here out of place ; and the invocation is manifestly only the conclusion of the epilogue, xv. 14—32. Rather the mention of the discord which he expected in Judaea may have suggested to the apostle the thought of the God of peace. But *such* discord was by no means to be found in Rome. Moreover, the formula employed here by the apostle is common elsewhere ;<sup>1</sup> and therefore by *εἰρήνη* is to be understood not earthly, human, but divine, heavenly peace, *εἰρήνη πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, v. 1, for the invocation of which no special occasion and reference was necessary.

—*Ἀμήν*] which is wanting in A F G 80, Boern., may *possibly* be a liturgical addition.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. xvi. 20 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 11 ; Phil. iv. 9 ; 1 Thess. v. 23 ; 2 Thess. iii. 16 ; see also Heb. xiii. 20.

# CHAPTER XVI.

Vv. 1, 2. Recommendation of Phoebe. *Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν*] "But I recommend to you." With *συνίστημι*, in the sense *to recommend*, comp. 2 Cor. v. 12, x. 12, 18.

—*Φοίβην*] According to the very probable opinion of most expositors, the bearer of the epistle. So already the subscription to the epistle. The proper name *Phoebe* is found in Mart. *Epigr.* iii. 89; *Phoebe*, in Sueton. *Aug.* c. 65. When Bengel observes, "Nomina ex diis gentium sumta retinere Christiani in memoriam gentilismi relictī," it may be replied that the reason why names of heathen deities were retained may simply be that their original religious meaning and reference had entirely vanished in common usage.

—*τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν*] First motive for complying with the apostle's recommendation, namely, that she is a Christian sister.

—*οὖσαν διάκονον*] Second motive. It is not to be explained *ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο οὖσαν διάκονον*, or *ἥτις ἦν διάκονος μέχρι τοῦ νῦν*, as if, as a deaconess, Phoebe would not have been able to undertake a journey to Rome, but: *who is deaconess*. Respecting the *deaconesses* (*αἱ διάκονοι*, *ministrae* in Pliny, *ep.* x. 97) as attendants on the poor, sick, and strangers in the church, comp. Bingham, *Orig.* I. p. 344 sqq.; Suicer, *Thes. eccles.* I. p. 866; Ziegler, *de diac. et diaconiss. vet. eccles.* Viteb. 1678; and Neander, *Hist. of Planting of Chr. Ch.* I. 153.

—*τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς*] Cenchrea, as is well known, was the eastern port of Corinth on the Saronic Gulf, distant about seventy stadia from Corinth, comp. Acts xviii. 18, and Wetstein here.<sup>1</sup> Paul had probably founded the church in Cenchrea, as in Corinth.

—*ἵνα αὐτὴν προσδέξησθε*] Purpose of the recommendation.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo, viii. p. 582 C, says: ἀρχὴ δὲ τῆς παραλίας ἐκατέρως τῆς μὲν τὸ Λίχαιον, τῆς δὲ Κεγχρεαὶ κόμη καὶ λιμὴν, ἀπέχων τῆς πόλεως ὅσον ὁ. στάδια· τοῦτω μὲν οὖν χρώνται πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας τῷ Λεχαιῷ; and viii. p. 567 B: Κεγχρεαὶ τὸ πῶν Κορινθίων ἐπὶ τὰ πρὸς ἡμῶν μέρη ναύσταθμον.

—ἐν κυρίῳ] characterizes the προσδέχεσθαι as done in fellowship with the Lord, in the Lord, *i.e.* in a Christian spirit. Just so Phil. ii. 29. “Hodie dicimus *Christiano more*,” Bengel. Comp. Harless on Eph. iv. 1.

—ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων] The saints may either be the saints *receiving* or those *received*. In the first case we must interpret: “As it becomes saints,” namely, to receive brethren and sisters; in the second case: “sicut sanctos excipi oportet,” Grotius. The first interpretation is more probable, ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων referring to the active προσδέξ., and more exactly defining ἐν κυρίῳ. With ἀξίως with the genitive, comp. Phil. i. 27; Col. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 3 John 6; Matthiä, p. 677.

—καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρήξῃ πράγματι] “and assist her in whatever matter she has need of you.” παραστήναι τινι, to stand beside one, Acts i. 10, ix. 39, xxvii. 23; to assist, help him, 2 Tim. iv. 17.

—καὶ γὰρ αὕτη] *for she also*. Bengel, Knapp, Lachmann, Tischendorf, *et al.*, have received καὶ γὰρ αὐτή, *for she herself also*, manifestly with greater appropriateness. It suggests the motive for the assistance to be given her, 1 Cor. xvi. 10; Phil. ii. 29 f.

—προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη] We are not in *προστάτις* to find a reference to the fixed office of a *patroness of strangers* so called (comp. on xii. 8), to which are opposed both the genitive appended and the verb ἐγενήθη. Rather is *προστάτις*, *patrona*, *protectress*, *patroness*, *succourer*, namely, of strangers, the poor, the sick, for which her office as deaconess furnished abundant opportunity. In παραστήτε and *προστάτις* a *paronomasia* seems to obtain. Respecting ἐγενήθη, the later (Doric) form instead of ἐγένετο, comp. Lobeck, *ad Phrygn.* p. 108 f.

—καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐμοῦ] *and of myself*, which implies a stronger reason for his recommending her, and for the church to regard the recommendation. When and in what way Phoebe assisted the apostle, we know not.

Vv. 3–16. *Salutations.*

Vv. 3, 4. Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν] On far preponderant testimony the form Πρίσκαν (2 Tim. iv. 19) instead of Πρίσκιλλαν (Acts xviii. 2, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19) has been rightly received by Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann and Tischendorf, *et al.* Πρίσκιλλα is the ὄνομα ὑποκοριστικόν (diminutive) of Πρίσκα, comp. Livia and Livilla, Drusa and Drusilla, Quinta

and Quintilla, Secunda and Secundilla, and Grotius here. Respecting the tent-cloth maker Aquila and his wife Priscilla, comp. beside Acts xviii. 2 ff. (where we learn that he was born in Pontus, and under the persecution of the Jews by Claudius was driven from Rome to Corinth), Acts xviii. 18, 26, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, from which passages it appears that they emigrated from Corinth to Ephesus. Subsequently, as the present passage shows, they again returned to Rome,<sup>1</sup> and we come upon them again finally at Ephesus, 2 Tim. iv. 19.

—τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ] They are fellow-labourers *in Christ Jesus*, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is, as it were, the sphere in which their labour is carried on, the expression being thus equivalent to: "They laboured with me in the cause of Jesus Christ, they pursued with me the work of Jesus Christ." A proof of their toil is furnished in Acts xviii. 26.

—οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν] *sc. ὑπὸ τὸν σίδηρον*, under the executioner's axe. The expression is scarcely to be taken literally. Neither is it probable that a period in Paul's life in which he stood in imminent danger of execution would have remained entirely unknown to us, nor in such a case would the substitution of Aquila and Priscilla, or even that of one of them, have been *accepted* and *permitted* by the apostle himself. Rather is the phrase ὑποτιθέναι τὸν τράχηλον to be taken figuratively of voluntary exposure to the extremest deadly peril for the purpose of preserving the life of the apostle. Whether this took place at Corinth, Acts xviii. 12 ff., or at Ephesus, xix. 23 ff. (comp. also 1 Cor. xv. 32), or elsewhere, we know not. The explanation of Wetstein, ὑποτιθέναι, *pignori opponere, to pledge*, so that here would be meant a security undertaken on the part of Aquila and Priscilla for the apostle, is no doubt idiomatically possible, but, as matter of fact, improbable. οἵτινες, *quippe qui*, intimates the reason of his saluting Aquila and Priscilla his fellow-labourers in the Lord, ver. 3, on which account ver. 4 is not to be enclosed in brackets as if containing a mere passing, secondary remark.

—οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ] namely, I, who was preserved in life by their self-sacrificing love.

—ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν] *sc. εὐχαριστοῦσι*,

<sup>1</sup> "Discas hinc edictum Claudii contra Judaeos non diu viguisse, acribus, ut ferme talia, initiis, incurioso fine, ut loquitur Tacitus," Grotius.

*i.e.* for preserving me, the apostle of the *Gentiles*, xi. 13. Not: "because they also rendered service to the conversion of the *Gentiles*," or, as Chrysostom would have: "for their hospitality and bounty."

Ver. 5. καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν] comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2. In larger cities the meetings of Christians for worship were held in different places, because *one* house would not contain them. Aquila and Priscilla, who were probably well to do, and had therefore taken a larger dwelling, had not only at Rome but at Ephesus (comp. the Corinthian passage quoted) lent their house for such a meeting of a portion of the church in the city. — καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν means therefore: *and the church in their house*, not: *and their household*, which would be ὁ ἅγιος οἶκος, not ἡ κατ' οἶκον ἐκκλησία.

— Ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου] The name Epænetus is not uncommon among the Greeks. Eustathius observes: ἐπαινέτος τὸ ἐπίθετον καὶ Ἐπαίνετος κύριον. We know just as little of the Epænetus here mentioned as of the other persons mentioned, vv. 5–15. With the exception perhaps of Ῥοῦφος, ver. 13, none of the names occur elsewhere in the N. T. As Epænetus is here called ἀπαρχή, he was probably a Jewish Christian, because the apostle always addressed himself first to the Jews, Acts xviii. 6. According to the patristic tradition, most of those mentioned in vv. 5–15 are said to have belonged to the seventy disciples, and to have been bishops (Epænetus is described as Episcopus Carthaginiensis) and martyrs.

— ὃς ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν] "who is the first-fruit of Asia in reference to Christ," *i.e.* who was the first among the Asiatics to believe in Christ. Respecting ἀπαρχή, *cum genit. partit.*, comp. on viii. 23. Ἀσία is Asia cis Taurum, the Asia proconsularis of the Romans, *Lesser Asia*. The reading τῆς Ἀσίας, instead of the *recepta* τῆς Ἀχαΐας, has been rightly approved by Grotius, Mill, and Bengel, accepted by Griesbach, Knapp, Lachmann, Tischendorf, *et al.*, on the authority of A B C D\* E F G, *al.* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.), several versions, and Fathers. That the *var. lect.* Ἀχαΐας is ancient the Peshito shows. But it was either first written on the margin from 1 Cor. xvi. 15, and then slipped into the text, or arose from the copyist supposing that, as Paul wrote the Roman epistle in *Corinth*, he must needs mention the ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας. The opposite supposition,

namely, that *Ἀσίας* is a later correction, *Ἀχαΐας* seeming to clash with 1 Cor. xvi. 15, is improbable, because the Fathers, who read and interpreted *Ἀχαΐας* in the present passage, discovered and alleged no such discrepancy. But, in fact, this discrepancy remains with the reading *Ἀχαΐας*, and the attempted solution, that *ἀπαρχή* = *ἀπαρχή τις*, Jas. i. 18, who is *a first-fruit, one of the first converts*, or that Epænetus belonged to the house of Stephanas, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, wears the look of an intolerable makeshift. Thus, external testimony and internal reasons agree in favour of the reading *Ἀσίας*.

Ver. 6. *ἀσπάσασθε Μαριάμ*] Lachmann and Tischendorf, ed. 1, not ed. 8, read *Μαρίαν*, after A B C, *al.* Syr. The name points to a Jewish Christian.

—*ἦτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς*] “who toiled much on my behalf.” Comp. *ὁ κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης*, 1 Thess. i. 3. Lachmann and Tischendorf have received the reading *εἰς ὑμᾶς* instead of *εἰς ἡμᾶς*, after A C\* *al.* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.), Syr. *utr. al.* Chrys., approved by Griesbach and Knapp. D E F G, Vulg. It. Ambrst. *al.* have *ἐν ἡμῖν*. But while gratitude for Mary’s labour on his account (*εἰς ἡμᾶς*), or even the recognition of her labour in general (comp. *τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ* and *ἦτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν κυρίῳ*, ver. 12), might well furnish to the apostle a motive (comp. *ἦτις, quippe quæ*) for a salutation, her labour directly *on behalf of the Romans* (*εἰς ὑμᾶς*) could not. This latter element would have yielded a motive rather for a *recommendation* than a *greeting*. Besides, a matter so well known to the Romans themselves stood in no need of being notified, so to speak, to them. If, then, *εἰς ἡμᾶς* is to be regarded as the preferable reading, the attempted reference of *ἐκοπίασεν*, to *labour in teaching*, falls of itself to the ground; for it becomes Mary to sit at the feet of Jesus, not to instruct *apostles*. But even with the reading *εἰς ὑμᾶς* this explanation appears as objectionable on grounds of idiom as of fact; for *κοπιᾶν* in itself denotes a form of practical activity and toil, Luke v. 5, xii. 27, Acts xx. 35, 1 Cor. iv. 12, and can only acquire a reference to activity in teaching from the context, Gal. iv. 11, Phil. ii. 16, or from the defining addition: *ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ*, 1 Tim. v. 17. Add to this, that as matter of fact there are indeed prophetesses in the N. T., Acts xxi. 9, and deaconesses, but no female teachers, and as matter of principle could not be, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35. In Tit.



ii. 3, indeed, we find *πρεσβύτιδας καλοδιδασκάλους*; but in ver. 4 their teaching work is at once limited to practical direction of the young women in a devout fulfilment of their duties as wives and mothers. But in the present passage *εἰς ὑμᾶς* would imply an unlimited reference to the entire church. Moreover, as three more *κοπιῶσαι* appear in ver. 12, such a great number of teaching females would present to us a real caricature of a genuine apostolic church constitution. For the rest, it is possible that the *κοπιᾶν* of these Christian women was not a spontaneous labour of love, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, 16, but an exercise of the office of deaconess, comp. Löhe, *Aphorismen über die N. T. Ämter*, p. 92 f.

Ver. 7. *ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον*] Andronicus was a name very common among the Romans.

—*καὶ Ἰουνίαν*] Some take *Ἰουνίαν* as the accusative of *Ἰουνία*. So already Chrysostom. Junia in that case would be the wife (ver. 3), or even the sister (ver. 15), of Andronicus. If it is to be taken as a man's name, it must be written *Ἰουνιᾶν*, because the Greeks contracted the name Junianus or Junianius into *Ἰουνιᾶς*.

—*τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου*] *my kinsmen*, not: *my tribesmen* or *countrymen*. *οἱ συγγενεῖς* always in itself means blood relations, Mark vi. 4; Luke i. 36, 58, ii. 44, xiv. 12, xxi. 16; John xviii. 26; Acts x. 24. The meaning "countrymen" follows only from the context or the more precise definition appended, Rom. ix. 3. Moreover, *τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου* contains here the motive for his salutation. But the apostle had without doubt several other fellow-countrymen in the Roman church, and Aquila and Priscilla and Mary, probably also Epacnetus, were Jewish Christians, so that there was the less reason for singling out Andronicus and Junias as such. That relatives of Paul occur also in vv. 11, 21 is no decisive reason on the other side; for we do not know how numerous, how widely ramified and far-spread Paul's family was.

—*καὶ συναιχμαλώτους μου*] When, where, and how long they were imprisoned with Paul, we know not. That the apostle was a prisoner at different times, 2 Cor. vi. 5 shows. Clement's *Epist. 1 ad Corinth.* c. 5 relates: *διὰ ζῆλον [ὁ] Παῦλος ὑπομονῆς βραβεῖον ὑ[πέσχ]εν, ἐπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας κτλ.*

—*οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*] Luther: "who are famous apostles." So Orig. Chrys. Theodor., also Calvin, Bengel, and several moderns. We must thus interpret: *distinguished among the apostles*, in the sense: *distinguished apostles*.

But Paul never elsewhere uses the expression *ἀπόστολος* in the wider meaning, and even in Acts xiv. 4, 14 the designation is applied in the proper sense to Paul, and only catachrestically to Barnabas, comp. Phil. i. 1. If here a woman Junia, not a man Junias, be meant, this interpretation falls to the ground of itself. In any case, therefore, the explanation is to be preferred: *distinguished*, i.e. *most honourably known among the apostles*, so that they must have stood in a relation of special nearness to the apostles. *ἐπίσημος*, like *insignis*, is a *vox media*, comp. Matt. xxvii. 16: *δέσμιος ἐπίσημος*. In the present passage, of course, in a *good* sense.

—οὐ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γεγόνασιν ἐν Χριστῷ] As Paul elsewhere emphasizes the fact of his being the last-called of the apostles (1 Cor. xv. 8), so here he humbly places himself below even his *kinsmen* who had become believers before him. The fact of Andronicus and Junia being such old Christians and kinsmen of Paul, may perhaps have contributed to make them *ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*. “Venerabilis facit aetas, in Christo maxime,” Bengel. It is possible that they were converted as early as Pentecost, and belonged to the number of those who carried the first germs of the gospel to Rome. Comp. *Introductio*. Lachmann and Tischendorf, after A B (so, too, Cod. Sinait.), have received the Alexandrine form *γέγοναν* instead of *γεγόνασιν*. Comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* p. 641. The reading in D E F G, *τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, instead of *οὐ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γεγόνασιν ἐν Χριστῷ*, is a wrong gloss of the copyists, who referred οἱ to τοῖς ἀποστόλοις instead of to Ἄνδρ. and Ἰουν.

Ver. 8. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀμπλίαν] This proper name also is to be accented Ἀμπλιᾶν, because it is a Greek contraction from *Ampliatas*. Several authorities actually supply the form Ἀμπλιάτων.

—τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου ἐν κυρίῳ] Estius observes: “ἐν κυρίῳ addit ut *Christianam* declaret *dilectionem*,” comp. on ver. 2.

Ver. 9. ἀσπάσασθε Οὐρβανόν] Urbanus is a Roman name.

—τὸν συνεργὸν ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ] comp. ver. 3.

—καὶ Στάχυν τὸν ἀγαπητὸν μου] comp. ver. 12. Στάχυς is a Greek name.

Ver. 10. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀπελλῆν] Comp. Horat. *Sat.* i. 5. 100: “Credat *Judaeus Apella*, non ego.” But the person here called Ἀπελλῆς must not be confounded with Ἀπολλῶς (Acts xviii. 24; 1 Cor. i. 12), as is done by Orig. Grotius, *et al.* In view of the

note of Bentley appended to Horat. *Sat. ibid.*,<sup>1</sup> we may perhaps gather that the present Apelles belonged to the class of *libertini*, a circumstance which would support the application of οἱ Ἀριστοβούλου, οἱ Ναρκίσσου, ver. 11, to the *slaves* of Aristobulus and Narcissus. In this case, in vv. 10, 11, Paul would group together the Roman Christians of the rank of slaves and freedmen. We must also then reckon Ἡρωδίων, ver. 11, in this class, and thus would be explained why he mentions this Herodion, his kinsman, here, not along with Andronicus and Junias, who were also his kinsmen, ver. 7.

—τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ] *proved in Christ = the proved, tested Christian.* Christ is contemplated as the sphere (ἐν) of his testing. He must have shown himself approved in Christ by his labours for Christ's cause.

—ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου] Ἀριστόβουλος is a proper name very widely spread among the Greeks. Respecting οἱ Ἀριστοβούλου, οἱ Ναρκίσσου, ver. 11, οἱ Χλόης, 1 Cor. i. 11, comp. Winer, p. 238. The genitive denotes the relation of dependence or belonging to generally. Thus children, kinsmen, domestics, slaves may be meant. A more definite explanation must be supplied by the case in hand. For the original readers the expression was clear. Why we think slaves to be meant here, see previously. But the apostle does not greet *all* the dependants of Aristobulus, not τοὺς Ἀριστοβούλου, but only τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου, *those of the dependants of Aristobulus.* Of course by these are meant *the Christians*, even as in ver. 11 in τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ is expressly added. Aristobulus himself receives no greeting. From this expositors draw the probable conclusion that either he was not a Christian or was already dead, in which latter case he *may* have been a Christian. But the supposition is still possible that he was a Christian and still alive, and was merely unknown personally to the apostle, and stood in no closer relation to him.

Ver. 11. ἀσπάσασθε Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενὴ μου] comp. ver. 7. Ἡρωδίων was formed from the Attic name Ἡρώδης, then in very common use, like Καισαρίων from Καίσαρ.

—ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου, τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ] In

<sup>1</sup> Judaei habitabant trans Tiberim, et multo maximam partem erant libertini, ut fatetur Philo in legat. ad Cajum. Appella autem libertinorum nomen, satis frequens in inscriptionibus vetustis Cic. epist. vii. 25: Ne Apellae quidem liberto tuo dixeris.

accordance with the observation of Grotius: "Puto intelligi Narcissum Claudii libertum (Suet. *Claud.* c. 28; Tac. *Ann.* xii. 57, xiii. 1), in cujus domo aliqui fuerint Christiani," Neander and others have taken Narcissus for the powerful favourite of Claudius, who at that time was already dead. As the name Narcissus was not uncommon, no certain decision can be given.

Ver. 12. ἀσπάσασθε Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν] The female names Τρύφαινα and Τρυφῶσα frequently occur. They are formed from τρυφᾶω, and therefore originally mean literally: *delicata, lasciva*.

—τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ] "who laboured in the Lord," *i.e.* in the Lord's cause, comp. on vv. 3, 6. "τὰς κοπιώσας, quae laborarunt, etsi nomen habent ἀπὸ τρυφῆς, a deliciis, ut Naëmi. Probabile est, fuisse has duas sorores secundum carnem," Bengel.

—ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα] Like Lydia, Mysa, Syrus, Davus, Geta, Andria, Persis is a name derived from a native country.

—τὴν ἀγαπητήν] comp. vv. 5, 8, 9, where μου is added, which was only seemly when referring to men.

—ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν κυρίῳ] To Τρύφαινα and Τρυφῶσα before, and now to Περσίς, as to Μαριάμ, ver. 6, the πολλὰ κοπιᾶν is ascribed. Certainly this was no *idle* addition. Just as little is the ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν κυρίῳ, repeated so often, to be regarded as a mere expletive. The love of the apostle, like the labour of those whom he salutes, is throughout no natural, human love, but Christian, sanctified in the Lord. As the apostle's humility is shown in the fact that for him every distinction of slave and free vanishes ἐν κυρίῳ (1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28), so, along with his humility, his wonderful delicacy and wealth of love is shown in his assigning to every one his specific epithet, and the recognition due to him in proportion to his gifts and work, thus fulfilling his own precept, xii. 3 ff., xii. 16. "Fides non facit morosos, sed affabiles. Paulum ne gravitas quidem apostolica impediit," Bengel. This salutation-chapter at once attests its genuineness by the fact that it really contains no *spurious* expressions.

Ver. 13. ἀσπάσασθε Ῥούφον] As Simon of Cyrene is called in Mark xv. 21 the father of Alexander and Rufus, from which it follows that this Rufus was held in special esteem in the apostolic age, while Paul in the present passage distinguishes the Rufus mentioned by special praise, since the Fathers' days many expositors have maintained the identity of Rufus in Mark

xv. 21 and Rom. xvi. 13. "Eximium inter Christianos filium Simonis Cyrenaei. Vide Marc. xv. 21," observes Grotius here. The combination is very probable, although not absolutely certain, the name Rufus being very widespread in those times.

—τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ] not: "who is elected to salvation in fellowship with the Lord," which would be a predicate in no sense distinctive of Rufus, but one common to all Christians, comp. i. 4. Here, as in the case of all saluted in this chapter, we expect a *distinctive* mark. ἐκλεκτός therefore = *delectus, eximius, elect, distinguished*, and "elect in the Lord" = *eximium Christianum*, "who is distinguished as a Christian." "ἐκλεκτόν, *electum*. Insignis appellatio, 2 John 1, 13, 1 Tim. v. 21," remarks Bengel.

—καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ] The apostle calls the beloved mother of Rufus his own mother, on account of the motherly love and care which she no doubt manifested to him, perhaps during his youthful stay in Jerusalem. Comp. John xix. 27, where the Lord calls his beloved mother the mother of John, on account of the love and care which *he* is to manifest to her as a *son*. Comp. too, 1 Cor. i. 2: αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν, Meyer there, and 1 Cor. xvi. 18; Philem. 11.

Vv. 14, 15. Those saluted in these two verses receive no special *epitheta ornantia*. They seem, therefore, to have been less distinguished and on less familiar terms with the apostle. "Paulus eos conjungit, quorum propria erat conjunctio necessitudinis, vicinia, etc. Nec potuit non valde exhilarare salutatio nominatim facta ad tenuiores, qui se fortasse ne notos quidem apostolo scirent," Bengel.<sup>1</sup> ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον] The *adjct. verbum* ἀσύγκριτος from συγκρίνω denotes *incomparabilis, incomparable*. As a *nomen proprium*, Ἀσύγκριτος is therefore a name of good omen. Otherwise ἀσύγκριτος means also "incompatible, unsociable."

<sup>1</sup> Comp. also the observation of Mylius in Calov here: "Notanda hic fidelium istorum conditio. Nemo hic nominatur consul, nemo quaestor aut dictator insignitur, minime omnium Episcopatum et Cardinalatum dignitates hic personant: sed operarum, laborum, captivitatis titulis plerique notantur. Ita verum etiam in Romana Ecclesia fuit olim, quod Apostolus scribit, Non multi potentes, non multi nobiles. Sed stulta mundi electa sunt a Deo. Papatus autem Caesaris, qualis adjuvante Diabolo, in perniciem religionis, posteris saeculis Romae invaluit, ne umbra quidem Apostolorum aetate istic fuit: tantum abest, ut ille originem ab Apostolis ipsis traxerit."

—*Φλέγοντα*] In later days, Phlegon the Trallian, Hadrian's freedman, was very well known under this name.

—*Ερμᾶν*] “Est nomen libertini hominis contractum ex ‘*Ερμόδωρος*,” Grotius. Orig. here, Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 3; Hieronym. *Catal. Script. Eccl.*, and others, took this Hermas for the author of the book *ὁ Ποιμὴν*, reckoned among the writings of the apostolical Fathers. But the author of the *Pastor* was the brother of the Roman bishop Pius I., and lived c. 150 A.D. Comp. the Canon Murat.; Hefele, *Patr. ap.* p. lxxxii.; Ritschl, *althath. Kirche*, ed. 2, p. 288 ff.

—*Πατροβᾶν*] a name contracted from *Πατρόβιος*. Martial, ii. 32. 3: “Vexat saepe meum *Patrobas* confinis agellum, Contra *libertum* Caesaris ire times.” Suet. *Galba*, c. 20: “*Patrobii Neroniani libertus*.”

—*Ερμῆν*] Comp. Pliny, *Ep.* vii. 11: “*Hermes, libertus meus*.” In conformity with A B C D\* F G, *al.* (so also Cod. Sinait.), Lachmann and Tischendorf have rightly received the order of names: ‘*Ερμῆν, Πατροβᾶν, Ερμᾶν*.’

—*καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφοὺς*] Not indeed those joining in a church-meeting in the house of those named. This would be *καὶ τὴν κατ’ οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν*, ver. 5. *οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς* points to a permanent association in life. But we are not, with Reiche, to think of a *mission-society*; for such private associations for the purpose of disseminating Christianity, which, moreover, must have been somewhat numerous (comp. ver. 15: *καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἀγίους*), alongside the office of apostles and evangelists, and alongside the collective church, are foreign to the character of the apostolic age, and cannot be demonstrated historically. Apparently, then, what are here meant are associations of Christians, who lived together for the purpose of carrying on common pursuits in life, trade, manufacture, and the like. Of these, perhaps, only the associations expressly mentioned were known to the apostle personally.

—*ἀσπάσασθε Φιλόλογον*] Comp. Suetonius, *de Illustr. Grammat.* c. 7, where an Attejus Philologus is mentioned, of whom it is said, c. 10: “Attejus Philologus libertinus Athenis natus est,” and again: “Philologi adpellationem adsumpsisse videtur, quia, sicut Eratosthenes, qui primus hoc cognomen sibi vindicavit, multiplici variaque doctrina censebatur.” The present Philologus perhaps derived his name from similar causes.

—καὶ Ἰουλίαν] not to be written Ἰουλιᾶν, as if a contraction from Julianus or Julianius, comp. on ver. 7. For Ἰουλία, to draw an inference from the following

—Νηρέα καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ] seems to have been *the wife* of Philologus. The reading of several codices Νηρέαν is a clerical error, Νηρέα, as τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ shows, being a *man's* name, from Νηρεὺς, originally a mythological name. Comp. ver. 1, and Passow, *s.v.*

καὶ Ὀλυμπᾶν] “Et hoc contractum pro Ὀλυμπιόδωρον,” Grotius.

—καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους] comp. καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς, ver. 14. It may be that we have before us here the first society of Christian scholars and copyists.<sup>1</sup>

Ver. 16. ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ] We are not to add in thought ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, *nomine meo*, Bengel, which must have been appended if it were meant to be understood. This interpretation is more probable in 1 Thess. v. 26 : ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἀδελφούς πάντας ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. See exactly the same form of salutation as in the present passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, where ver. 11 explains the meaning of the form. The loving fellowship that Paul testified to them by his greetings, they are to testify to one another *by a holy kiss*. The *φίλημα* is called ἅγιον, because it was, and was meant to be, an expression and seal not of natural, but of Christian fellowship in love. In 1 Pet. v. 14 it is said *φίλημα ἀγάπης*, *Const. apost.* ii. 57 : τὸ ἐν κυρίῳ φίλημα; Tertull. *de Orat.* 14 : “osculum pacis.” Comp. further, Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. c. 65 : ἀλλήλους φιλήματι ἀσπαζόμεθα πανσήμεροι τῶν εὐχῶν. It is possible that already in apostolic days it was the custom to give the *φίλημα ἅγιον* in church-meetings after prayer was ended, especially at the sacramental celebration. In this case the apostle would merely require this practice to be observed in a right disposition and spirit. Possibly also, the ecclesiastical usage indicated only grew up by degrees in conformity with the present and parallel apostolic passages. Several expositors suppose the meaning of the apostle to be, that after the public reading of his epistle, all the brethren were to greet each other with a holy kiss. But this would be a precept too external and ceremonial, bordering almost

<sup>1</sup> Rightly observes Calov : “In hoc tam prolixo catalogo mirum foret non nominatum S. Petrum si is Romae fuit : quem sine dubio prae aliis salutasset Apostolus.”

on the mere epideictic, and apparently little in harmony with the apostle's spirit and character. More appositely, perhaps, Calvin remarks: "Non tamen videtur Paulus ceremoniam hic praeiis exigere, sed tantum eos hortatur ad fovendum fraternum amorem." That this brotherly love, occasion arising, would and ought to express itself in the corresponding symbol of the *φίλημα ἁγίου*, is understood as matter of course. But then this outward expression is left to the spontaneous impulse of love, and to free development within the circle of private and public intercourse among Christians. Comp., however, Meyer here.

—*ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*] *αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι* may perhaps be taken in an unlimited sense. In the first place, very many churches, aware of the apostle's design to journey to Rome or write thither, may really have entrusted him with greetings for the Roman church. And, again, he might send greetings in conformity with the *mind* of all, as he partly knew, partly was justified in assuming, the interest of all in the Christians at Rome, and the love of all for them. In the *rec.* *πᾶσαι* is wanting. But it is authenticated by preponderant evidence, and, since the days of Mill and Griesbach, has been rightly received by editors and defended by interpreters. The needless difficulty, caused by the generality of the expression, was the cause of the omission. Rightly observed Erasmus: "Quoniam cognovit omnium erga Romanos studium, omnium nomine salutat." Just as the church was to testify to itself in all its members brotherly fellowship, so all other churches testify to it such brotherly fellowship, the loving unity of the whole body of Christ thus standing prominently forth. Thus the two clauses of ver. 16 fit aptly one into another, comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, so that no reason exists for transferring *ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς . . . Χριστοῦ* to a place after ver. 21, as is done in D E F G, It.

Vv. 17-20. *Warning against false teachers.* The fact of the Roman epistle being so free from all direct polemical allusions to such teachers, shows that hitherto they had found no entrance into the church. Comp. Introduction. The danger threatening the spiritual health of the church from them, according to the character ascribed to them in vv. 17, 18, was in all truth sufficiently grave and significant, so that if they had already gained and exerted any influence over any members of the church, the



apostle, who always acted upon the principle ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ, 1 Cor. v. 6, Gal. v. 9, would certainly have entered upon a more detailed examination of their teaching and practices. On the contrary, all he has to do is to commend the ὑπακοή of the Roman church, rejoice in it, and hope for the best, vv. 19, 20. Even for the future he seems not to fear much from the heretics. And if we suppose, as on every ground seems likely, that these sectaries belonged to the class of the well-known anti-Pauline, Judaizing false teachers, this strong confidence of the apostle as regards the Roman church may much better suggest that the latter consisted in a preponderant degree of *Gentile* Christians (comp. the Introduction), who were comparatively less exposed to the seductive attempts in question, than that, from the fact of the apostle deeming it necessary to append the warning occurring to him, we should be justified (with Baur and Meyer in the first, not in subsequent editions) in drawing the opposite conclusion, that the greater portion of the Roman Christians belonged to the class of *Jewish* Christians. Moreover, whether the apostle merely apprehended that these false-famed sectarian leaders, of whom, therefore, he might assume the Romans had already received some information, would next betake themselves to the imperial city and there begin to play their game, or whether they already lurked there, and only awaited a favourable opportunity for creating a faction for themselves, may remain in abeyance. Both cases are in themselves equally possible. From what has been said, it follows that the weak believers, spoken of ch. xiv., xv., whom Paul wished to be treated with such delicate forbearance, cannot have been under the influence of the heretics here so severely criticized. But that in point of fact by the latter are to be understood the universally-known Judaistic opponents of the apostle is evinced, first, by the article τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, which marks the divisions and scandals as well known; again, by the phrase: παρὰ τὴν διδασχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, ver. 17, which indicates a specifically anti-Pauline doctrine opposed to the one approved by Paul (comp. the Introduction and 1 Pet. v. 12); and, finally, by the description of their personal character, found in ver. 18, which harmonizes with what is said in the other Pauline epistles respecting these men. Comp. Phil. iii. 2 ff., 2 Cor. xi. 20, as to their selfishness and gluttony; 2 Cor. xi. 13-15, as to their

hypocritical piety or *χρηστολογία*. In Corinth they appear less to have attacked the apostolic teaching, as in the Galatian church, than merely the apostolic authority of Paul; and in the Philippian, as in the Roman epistle, is rather found a mere warning against a possible perversion than rebuke on account of one that has actually occurred.

Ver. 17. *παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς*] *But I exhort you*. The metabatic δέ leading over to another subject.

—*ἀδελφοί*] Affectionate address, as in every case where an earnest exhortation or warning occurs.

—*σκοπεῖν*] *to keep an eye on, to have in view*. *σκοπεῖν τινα*, to observe one, to direct the gaze at one. This may be done either in order to imitate, so Phil. iii. 17, or, as here (comp. *βλέπειν*, Phil. iii. 2, also Gal. vi. 1), to guard against him.

—*τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα*] *those who excite the (well-known) divisions and offences*. *διχοστασία*, mutual separation, dissension, *seditio, discordia*; comp. 1 Cor. iii. 3, *lect. rec.*; Gal. v. 20; 1 Macc. iii. 29. *σκάνδαλον*, offence, stumbling-block, namely, by seducing to a departure from the true evangelical ground of doctrine and faith. That such *σκάνδαλα* are here meant is shown by the subjoined

—*παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε*] “contrary to the doctrine which you learned.” A similar approval of the doctrine delivered to them was expressed already in vi. 17. “Clare demonstrat Paulus, se non quaelibet dissidia sine exceptione dammare, sed quae orthodoxae fidei consensum dissipant,” Calvin.

—*καὶ ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ’ αὐτῶν*] literally: “and turn away from them” (comp. 1 Pet. iii. 11), *i.e.* avoid their company, beware of their society. Comp. 2 Thess. iii. 6, also Tit. iii. 10; 1 Cor. v. 11; 2 John 10. The observation of Grotius: “non fuisse tunc conventus communes aut presbyterium Romae; alioquin voluisset tales excommunicari,” is beside the mark; for excommunication could not be mentioned, inasmuch as these false teachers did not even belong to the church, but merely approached from without, and sought to force their way in. Here no other precept was appropriate than by avoiding to deprive them of all access and opportunity. But to Bengel’s observation: “Nondum Romae erat forma ecclesiae,” xii. 6–8 is opposed.

Ver. 18 confirms the precept given in ver. 17, by pointing out the selfish tendencies and ruinous course of action of these men.

—οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ οὐ δουλεύουσιν] On preponderant authority, Knapp, Lachmann, and Tischendorf read Χριστῷ instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. The negation, as its position shows, denies the idea of δουλεύειν. οὐ δουλεύειν = “not to serve, to refuse service.” Our Lord Christ they serve not, as it behoved them to do. Otherwise, οὐ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ δουλεύουσιν = they serve not the Lord Christ, namely, as they pretend to do.

—ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ] *sc.* δουλεύουσιν, *but their own belly*, namely, by seeking through the establishment of parties to gratify their love of gain (2 Cor. xi. 7 ff., 20), in order to be able to indulge in good living. Respecting the difference between κοιλία and σῶμα, comp. 1 Cor. vi. 13, 14; and with τῇ κοιλίᾳ δουλεύειν, Phil. iii. 19: ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία, and Seneca, *de beneficiis*, vii. 26: *abdomini servire*.

—καὶ διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας] On χρηστολογία, a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον in the N. T., comp. Wetstein here, and the parallels adduced by him. So Jul. Capitolin. in *Vit. Pertinac.* c. 13: “Omnes, qui libere fabulas conferebant male Pertinaci loquebantur, *Chrestologium* eum appellantes, qui bene loqueretur et male faceret,” and Pallad. Alexandr. *epigr.* ci.: μισῶ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν διπλοῦν πεφυκότα,—χρηστὸν λόγοισι, πολέμιον δὲ τοῖς τρόποις. Accordingly, χρηστολογία is = language of a good man, good, fair speech, in contrast with their conduct, *i.e.* *dissembling language*, which agrees well with 2 Cor. xi. 13–15. The meaning *blandiloquentia*, *flattery*, as Theophyl. interprets, is here less suitable, because this would make a tautology with εὐλογία, which must next be interpreted in the same sense. Now εὐλογία, according to the classical and invariable N. T. usage, is here to be taken in the sense of *praise*, *commendation*, *blessing*, therefore = *laudatory language*, *flattery*. For the meaning: *well-arranged language*, Cod. 109 reading εὐγλωττίας instead of εὐλογίας as a gloss, only one passage can be adduced from Plato, *de Republ.* iii. p. 400 D. In this case χρηστολογία would refer to the matter, εὐλογία to the form (*bene composita*, *ornata oratio*). For this meaning of εὐλογία, 2 Cor. xi. 6 might be appealed to, and an inference drawn from that passage to the eloquence of the sectaries. But apart from the fact that this meaning is not perfectly certified, and in any case is exceedingly rare, and in the N. T. unheard of, in this case the repetition of the article (καὶ διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ τῆς εὐλογίας) might have been expected. For hypocritical language

and eloquent speech are two different categories, whereas *dissembling and flattering language* belong to one genus, the element of misrepresentation being common to both,<sup>1</sup> and therefore may be connected together by *one* article; comp. Winer, p. 158. The article here marks the language as the language held by them.

—ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων] *they deceive the hearts of the guileless*, who, having no guile in their own hearts, do not expect to find it in others. With this also agrees better the accepted meaning of εὐλογία. For the guileless readily take flattering language as really meant, whereas eloquence in the end may carry away just as well the experienced as the inexperienced. ἄκακος is found in the N. T. again in Heb. vii. 26. Comp. the passages from the classics in Wetstein. “Verbum μέσον, per euphemiam ἡβ LXX. in Prov. ἄκακος non semel. ἄκακοι dicuntur, qui tantum carent malitia, cum deberent etiam pollere prudentia, et alienam κακίαν cavere,” Bengel.

Ver. 19. ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο] Origen interprets this of the universally-known, ready complaisance of the Romans, which therefore exhibits them as ἀκάκους, easily led away by temptation. But by ὑπακοή without explanatory adjunct can manifestly only be understood the ὑπακοὴ τῆς πίστεως (i. 5, 8), obedience to the gospel, even as to ἀπειθοῦντες κατ’ ἐξοχήν, xv. 31, τῷ θεῷ, τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, is spontaneously understood. But just as little can γάρ here introduce the proof that the Romans also are to be classed among the guileless described in ver. 18, namely, because they are obedient to God and Christ. For that guilelessness in any case is a relative defect, a simplicity of the dove without the *required* wisdom of the serpent. ὑπακοί, on the other hand, is an absolute excellence, and of itself the surest safeguard against going astray. The confirmatory γάρ is rather to be referred back to the exhortation, καὶ ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, ver. 17.<sup>2</sup> It expresses the strong confidence entertained

<sup>1</sup> “*χρηστολογίας*, de se, pollicendo, *εὐλογίας*, de vobis, laudando et assentando,” observes Bengel.

<sup>2</sup> Or we may interpret with Meyer: “‘Not without reason do I say: the hearts of the guileless; for you they will not lead astray, because you do not belong to the mere ἀκάκοις’ (the ὑμῶν in this case is placed emphatically first in antithetical correlation with τῶν ἀκάκων), ‘but distinguish yourselves so much by obedience (to the gospel), that this has become universally known. Over you therefore (here, too, ἐπ’ ὑμῖν stands first emphatically) I rejoice, yet desire that you may be wise and pure,’—a delicate combination of warning with the expression of firm confidence.”

by the apostle that he and his exhortation will find audience at their hands. With *εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο*, comp. *καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ*, i. 8.

—*χαίρω οὖν τὸ ἐφ' ὑμῖν*] As the emphasizing and strengthening *τό* is wanting in A B C D E F G, *al.*, also Cod. Sinait.\* Vulg. It., *χαίρω οὖν ἐφ' ὑμῖν* appears to be the original reading. And even the reading: *ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω*, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, in accordance with A B C I, *al.* (so also Cod. Sinait.\*) Arm. Ruf., seems merely to have arisen from the effort to give special emphasis to *ἐφ' ὑμῖν*. The opposition to be supplied in thought would then be fear of the false teachers, whereas otherwise the apostle would simply express his joy over them, a joy of which their *ὑπακοή* is the ground.

—*θέλω δέ*] intimates the reason why, in spite of his joy over them and confidence in them, he nevertheless uttered the warning against false teachers; for, despite his confidence, he was not altogether free from apprehension. With *ἔλεω*, to wish, desire, compare 1 Cor. vii. 7, 32, xiv. 5.

—*ὑμᾶς σοφοὺς μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν*] “that you indeed be wise in respect to the good,” *i.e.* which it is your duty to do, here above all the holding fast of pure doctrine. *μὲν*, wanting in B D E F G I, *al.* Vulg. It. *al.* Clem. *al.*, is marked by Griesbach as suspicious, omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf; comp. Harless on Eph. v. 8, also Fritzsche, *ad Rom.* p. 423.

—*ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν*] “but innocent in reference to the evil,” *i.e.* the corrupt doctrines of the heretics. With *ἀκέρατοι*, from *κεράννυμι*, *integer*, unmixed, clear, pure, comp. Matt. x. 16; Phil. ii. 15. If, then, guilelessness is not to be blameworthy, it must be blended with wisdom; but if wisdom is to be of the right kind, it must stand in alliance with purity.

Ver. 20. *ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*] In the train of Origen, Chrysostom, and Bengel, expositors, especially modern ones, with the exception of de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius (doubtfully ed. 4, no longer ed. 5, Tholuck and Rasmus Nielsen), have interpreted *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης*, in contrast with *διχوستασίαι*, ver. 17, *Deus pacificus*, concordiae auctor. Comp., however, on xv. 33. There is nothing in the context to necessitate a deviation from the ordinary meaning, and the latter is still further suggested by the conjunction of *εἰρήνη* with *χάρις* immediately following; comp. the *χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη* in the beginning of all the

Pauline epistles. By means of legal teaching Satan sought to rob the church of the gospel of peace, to disturb its peace with God, which only has its subsistence in justifying faith in God's free grace in Christ. This was the ultimate aim of his machinations. On this account the apostle appeals to the God who gives and preserves saving peace, and who will soon put to shame the crafty devices of His adversary.

—*συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει*] “will crush Satan under your feet shortly.” A *constructio preegnans* for ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης *συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑποταγέντα ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν*, comp. Fritzsche, *ad Marc.* viii. 19, p. 322, and Winer, p. 776. The false teachers are not δούλοι of Christ, ver. 18, but Satan's διάκονοι, 2 Cor. xi. 15. Therefore the conflict against them is not a conflict πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, but πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, Eph. vi. 12. As, then, the human seducers are merely organs of the diabolical tempter, and therefore victory over them is a victory over Satan himself, in whose spirit and power they speak and act, so also can their subjugation on the part of believers only be achieved by the spirit and power of God, in whose complete panoply believers are to meet the arch-enemy of their souls and maintain their ground, Eph. vi. 11, 13 ff. For this reason the apostle describes the victory which the church will win over the seducers as a victory of God over Satan. But, to enhearten them to a more vigorous resistance, he promises them, in reliance upon the steadfastness of their ὑπακοή, that they shall complete the subjugation of the enemy ἐν τάχει; for *συντρίψει*, *conteret, he will crush*, is to be taken as purely future, not, which would be ungrammatical (Winer, p. 350), as optative. But the inadequately-attested reading *συντρίψαι*, whether we take it for a clerical error, correction, or gloss, is in any case to be marked as spurious. The promise is also far more energetic, animating, and comforting than the mere desire. Further, the present passage contains without doubt a reference, acknowledged by most expositors, to Gen. iii. 15, comp. Hengstenberg, *Christology*, I. p. 20. The promise of the *protevangelium*, indeed, is fulfilled objectively once for all in the crucifixion of Christ; but it also receives its continuous subjective realization within the church of Christ in every believing victory of the church over

Satan, who was really judged and vanquished by Christ's atoning death. "Quaevīs victoria fidei, novum dolorem affert Satanae," Bengel.

—*ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μεθ' ὑμῶν*] Usual concluding benediction, agreeing word for word, amplified or abbreviated, at the end of all the Pauline epistles. The apostle had, in the first instance, concluded the parainetic portion of the epistle in general with a prayer, xv. 13 ; next, the epilogue, xv. 33 ; now, the salutation and exhortation of this chapter by the regular and finally conclusive formula. But the following salutations on the part of certain friends of his circle of acquaintance need not on this account be regarded as having only just now been entrusted to him, or as having only just now occurred to him. With perfect appropriateness they assume the position of a postscript, such as one may reserve in any letter consciously and of set purpose, either from the beginning or in the course of writing. Here it would have to be supposed that after ver. 16 his plan assumed for the apostle the form of a postscript. In point of fact, the present order is more agreeable than if, upon the unusually numerous greetings, vv. 3–16,—which, moreover, had found in ver. 16 their *general* conclusion,—there had been forthwith accumulated the *individual* greetings found in vv. 21–23. Again, the difference in contents led to difference in arrangement; for vv. 3–15 contain Paul's greetings, vv. 21–23 greetings of his friends and companions.

—*ἀμήν*] wanting in the most ancient and most numerous authorities, and therefore to be regarded as a liturgical addition, which since Bengel's days has been rightly condemned by nearly all editors and expositors.

Vv. 21–24. Greetings of the apostle's companions, kinsmen, and friends, addressed to the church, and repetition of the concluding prayer.

Ver. 21. *Ἀσπάζονται ἡμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου*] The reading *ἀσπάζεταιται*, recommended by Griesbach, received by Lachmann and Tischendorf after A B C D\* F G, *al.* (so also Cod. Sinait.) Vulg. *al.* Chrys. *al.*, is to be deemed the original one. The plural is a later grammatical improvement, occasioned by the plurality of persons. The Timotheus mentioned here is, of course, the apostle's well-known helper, in which character he is expressly described. In all the Pauline epistles, except in

those to the Galatians, the Ephesians, and Titus, mention of him occurs, comp. also Heb. xiii. 23, and Acts xvi. 1 ff., xvii. 14 f., xviii. 5, xix. 22, xx. 4.

—καὶ Λούκιος] Not to be confounded with the Evangelist Luke, as was early done by Origen and others. But perhaps identical with Lucius of Cyrene, Acts xiii. 1.

—καὶ Ἰάσων] Perhaps identical with Jason of Thessalonica, Acts xvii. 5 ff. However, the names Lucius and Jason were then common.

—καὶ Σωσίπατρος] Probably identical with Σώπατρος of Beroea, Acts xx. 4, comp. Σωκράτης and Σωσικράτης, Σωκλείδης and Σωσικλείδης, Σώστρατος and Σωσίστρατος.

—οἱ συγγενεῖς μου] comp. vv. 7, 11.

Ver. 22. ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος] Respecting Tertius and Quartus, ver. 23, Grotius rightly observes: "Romani hi fuerunt negotiantes Corinthi." The name Tertius was very common among the Romans, comp. Tac. *Hist.* ii. 85; Macrobi. *Saturn.* iii. 11. The supposition that Tertius is the Latin rendering of the Hebrew תְּרִיז, and that the latter = Σίλας, Acts xv. 22, xviii. 5, etc., is altogether untenable; for the Hebrew תְּרִיז is no *nom. propr.*, and the Greek Σίλας is contracted from Σιλουανός.

—ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν] Without doubt Paul had dictated the letter to Tertius, and permitted him to gratify his fitting and natural wish to salute the Roman church in his own name. To the point Carpzovius: "Sine dubio Tertius, ὑπογραφεὺς et exceptor Pauli, hunc versum de suo adjecit suadente et permittente Apostolo." It would have been altogether unseemly for Paul to send the salutation from Tertius as from a third person, while the latter himself wrote it down. This would only have been suitable if Paul had added it with his own hand, which is not the case, ver. 21 ff. Elsewhere, as we know, Paul was wont to dictate his epistles, 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Gal. vi. 11; Col. iv. 18; 2 Thess. iii. 17, comp. 1 Pet. v. 12. The assertion that Tertius merely made a fair copy of Paul's rough draught, is thus as imaginary as it is needless. Wrongly, therefore, Grotius: "Hoc (versum 22) ad marginein adscripserat Tertius, dum hanc epistolam ex Pauli archetypo describit." Strikingly Bengel: "Hoc Pauli vel hortatu vel concessu facili interposuit Tertius. Paulus dictavit: ex quo patet, quam prompti fuerint apostoli in libris suis fundendis, sine commentandi molestia."



—ἐν κυρίῳ] to be joined with ἀσπάζομαι, and distinguishing the salutation as *Christian*, 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

Ver. 23. The apostle proceeds again to dictate. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γάϊος] As the epistle is written from Corinth, probably the Gaius mentioned 1 Cor. i. 14, whom Paul had himself baptized. In addition to this Γάϊος Κορίνθιος there also occurs in the N. T. a Γάϊος Μακεδόν, Acts xix. 29, a Γάϊος Δερβαῖος, Acts xx. 4, and the Γάϊος to whom the third Epistle of John is addressed. Elsewhere also the name, as is well known, was an exceedingly common one. Respecting the present Gaius, Origen comments: "Fertur traditione majorum, quod hic Gaius fuit episcopus Thessalonicensis ecclesiae."

—ὁ ξένος μου] During his first abode in Corinth, Paul lodged with Aquila and Priscilla, Acts xviii. 1 ff., then with Justus, Acts xviii. 7, unless, perhaps, he merely preached the gospel in the house of the latter (see Fritzsche there), comp. Acts xviii. 7 with xviii. 4.

—καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅλης] comp. ver. 13: καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ. Gaius is here called ξένος τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅλης only in an improper sense, either because he accommodated the church meetings in his house, or, which agrees still more aptly with ξένος μου, because his house stood hospitably open to all members of the church. "Nam permulti adibant Paulum," Bengel. Lachmann and Tischendorf, in conformity with A B C D, *al.* (so, too, Cod. Sinait.), have received the verbal order: καὶ ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

—ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἐραστος] Different from the Erastus named Acts xix. 22 and 2 Tim. iv. 20, the attendant of Paul. Else Paul must here have described him according to his *former* office. Nor is the present Erastus different only from the one mentioned Acts xix. 22, but identical with the one alluded to 2 Tim. iv. 20. Else he must at least *subsequently* have given up his office. But both hypotheses are to be regarded as a mere playing with possibilities not intrinsically probable.

—ὁ οἰκόνομος τῆς πόλεως] Rightly Wetstein: ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς δημοσίας τραπέζης, *arcarius civitatis*. He was therefore public *quaestor*, guardian of the treasury in Corinth. He belonged consequently to the οὐ πολλοῖς δυνατοῖς, called in Corinth. "Vides jam ab initio, quamquam paucos, aliquos tamen fuisse Christianos in dignitate positos," Bengel. Had he at that time no longer

occupied this office, the title would here be added either from mere empty ostentation, which no one will suppose, or for the purpose of distinguishing him from another Erastus. But in the latter case it is rather like distinguishing him from the one alluded to in Acts xix. 22 and 2 Tim. iv. 20, instead of identifying him therewith, in order then to distinguish him from another unknown Erastus.

—καὶ Κούαρτος] As the name evinces, a converted *Italian*. All ordinal numbers from *primus* to *decimus*, with the exception of *nonus* (but perhaps Nonius, like Quintius, Sextius, Septinius, Octavius, as a *nomen gentile*), are used in Latin as *names*. Comp. the *index nominum* to *Gruteri Corpus Inscriptionum*.

—ὁ ἀδελφός] *i.e.* the *Christian* brother, not the brother *in blood* of Erastus. The latter would be ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ.

Ver. 24. Repetition of the concluding benediction, ver. 20, with πάντων strengthening and ἀμήν ratifying. Rightly Wolf: "Apostoli mos ita fert, ut eandem salutandi formulam aliquoties repetat. Vide 2 Thess. iii. 16 et 18. Ita hodiernum, ubi epistola *vale* dicto consummata est, et alia paucis commemoranda menti se adhuc afferunt, scribere solemus: *vale iterum*." The critical authorities are neither sufficient for the *omission* of the entire verse (so Lachmann and Tischendorf), nor for its *transference* to a position after ver. 27. The omission was adopted in order to avoid either the repetition of the benediction or the conclusion of the epistle with a benediction *and* doxology,—the transposition, in order to conclude the epistle with the usual invocation, not with the unusual doxology.

Vv. 25–27. *Concluding doxology*. "Doxologia claudit, uti tractationem, ch. xi. 36, sic jam totam epistolam, sic. 2 Pet. iii. 18; Jude 25. Extrema hujus epistolae verba plane respondent primis: ch. i. 1–5, praesertim de Potentia Dei, Evangelio, Jesu Christo, Scripturis, obedientia fidei, gentibus omnibus," Bengel.

Ver. 25. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι] comp. on i. 11. The increased vigour which the apostle desired to bring the Romans by his personal presence, his writing was for a while to supply. But just as from the very beginning, by the passive στηριχθῆναι, i. 11, he intimated that he ascribes the active στηρίζειν not to himself, but to God, so here he traces it back to God in express terms. As, then, it is God alone who is able to strengthen and

confirm them, while his letter to them aimed at the same object, he cannot more fitly conclude this letter than by blessing the God from whom all *στηριγμός* really proceeds. *στηρίζειν*, comp. Luke ix. 51, xvi. 26, xxii. 32; 1 Thess. iii. 2, 13 (*ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας*); 2 Thess. ii. 17, iii. 3; Jas. v. 8 (*τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν*); 1 Pet. v. 10 (*στηρίξει, σθενώσει*); 2 Pet. i. 12; Rev. iii. 2, *to render firm, render steadfast, strengthen*. With *τῷ δυναμένῳ στηρίξαι*, comp. Acts xx. 32: *τῷ δυναμένῳ ἐποικοδομῆσαι*, and Jude 24.

—*κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου*] to be closely connected with *στηρίξαι*. *κατά* = *quod attinet ad*, xi. 28; Heb. ix. 9. "He is able to establish you *in regard to* my gospel," not substantially different from "He is able to establish you *in* my gospel," so that you depart not from the gospel, but abide faithfully in it. Comp. *στηρίζειν ἐν*, 2 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Pet. i. 12. Luther: "*according to the tenor of my gospel*," so that the *δύνασθαι στηρίζειν* on God's part is supposed to form the purport of his gospel. But a point so well known and specific would have been very inaptly described by the apostle as the characteristic chief purport of his gospel. But if the Romans are to be *confirmed* in *his* gospel, they must already be standing in it, which supplies a proof that the church in Rome was originally founded by disciples of the apostle upon the Pauline gospel. Comp. the Introd. It was the same gospel that he had expounded in the epistle before us.

—*καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*] The *genit.* Ἰησ. Χρ. may be taken as *genit. subjecti*. In this case it must be interpreted either: "the preaching committed to Paul by Christ," or, which reference the genitive rather suggests: "the preaching which Christ Himself sends forth through him, Paul, as His organ," xv. 18. But in the latter case we should have expected an explanatory *δι' ἐμοῦ*, or the like. In both cases, moreover, *τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου* and *τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησ. Χρ.* are somewhat tautological. For to suppose that the latter is an epanorthotical exegesis of the former, proceeding from the apostle's humility of spirit, is foreign to Paul's character and style of thought. Humble as he is in regard to his own deserts and his occupancy of the apostolic office (Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 8 ff.; Eph. iii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 15 f.), in regard to the truth and divinity of the gospel with which he is entrusted, and to his fidelity and sincerity in administering the office committed to him, he is just as bold and confident (1 Cor.

iii. 10; Gal. i. 8, 9, 11, 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13). τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησ. Χρ., therefore, might better be taken as an expression of the apostle's bold confidence than of his humble modesty. Besides, in Rom. ii. 16, he regards such an addition to κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, whether for the purpose of pointing away from himself to Christ, or of ratifying the divinity of his gospel, as superfluous. If we wish to take Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as *genit. subject.*, the interpretation most naturally suggested by the genitival connection in itself is: "the preaching of Christ Himself during His earthly life." But apart from the unbecoming conjunction thus arising of *his* gospel with *Christ's* preaching, this interpretation is less appropriate, because the churches were founded not so much upon the preparatory word of Christ as upon Christ Himself, and upon the word of the apostles consummated by the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost,—not upon the *word* of Christ, but upon the *work* of Christ, and upon the word *concerning* Christ, 1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20. For these reasons we must still abide by the older interpretation,<sup>1</sup> according to which Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is taken as *genit. object.*, and τὸ κήρυγμά μου Ἰησ. Χρ. interpreted by: "the preaching *concerning* Jesus Christ." That in this way the genitive Ἰησ. Χρ. does not correspond with the genit. μου is a mechanical objection. It lies in the nature of the circumstances that in τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, τὸ κήρυγμά μου, the genitive is taken subjectively (ii. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 4); on the other hand, in τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as always in τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, objectively (Mark i. 14; Rom. xv. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 18, etc.). καί stands in the explicative sense: "my gospel, namely, the preaching concerning Jesus Christ." To say that the latter is a rather needless supplement is wrong. How much it behoved the apostle to insist on the truth that his gospel has no other purport than *Jesus Christ*, that it is a κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, is evident as well from the entire strain of thought in the doxology as from its conclusion, comp. διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 27.

—κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου] is not to be co-ordinated with the foregoing κατὰ . . . Χριστοῦ, and conceived as depending likewise on στηρίζαι, so that the gospel itself would be called the ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίου, and the μυστήριον consist in the

<sup>1</sup> Comp. Luther, Calvin: "Praeconium Jesu Christi appellat Evangelium, ut certe Christi cognitione tota ejus summa continetur;" Tholuck, and others.

divine counsel of the entire work of redemption through Christ. First, in this case we should have expected, in the form of direct apposition to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ μυστηρίου, instead of κατὰ ἀποκάλ. μυστ., which perspicuity the more demanded, since ἀποκάλυψις as the *act* of revelation in the abstract cannot with propriety be referred to εὐαγγέλιον, which is the revealed mystery itself. Again, precisely for the latter reason Paul would not even have written τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ μυστηρίου, but τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκαλυμμένον, or rather τὸ μυστήριον χρόνοις αἰώνιους σεσυνημένον, νῦν δὲ φανερωθέν κτλ., comp. Col. i. 26; Eph. iii. 5, 9 f. But, finally, by this accumulation of predicates of the gospel the language is made to wear a needless appearance of cumbrousness and bombast, and gives the impression that the apostle was unable to refrain from adding current *epitheta ornantia ad vocem evangelii*. Some expositors, therefore, would supply τὸ γεγενημένον, or simply the article τό before κατὰ ἀποκάλ. μυστ. = "which preaching has ensued through revelation of a mystery" (comp. Luther),—a makeshift which cannot be justified philologically, and with which the last difficulty of the first interpretation still remains. We must consequently make κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου dependent not simply on στηρίζαι, but on τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίζαι in common, and take κατὰ in the meaning: *in consequence of*, but not in the sense of bare temporal sequence = *secundum patefactionem arcani h. e. postquam facta est patefactio arcani, i. q. ἐπεὶ ἀπεκαλύφθη μυστήριον*, by which course the uselessness of the entire addition is further aggravated, since, without doubt, the thought lies on the surface, that it is self-evident that *before* the revelation of the gospel, confirmation in it was out of the question. Rather is κατὰ, *in consequence of*, to be taken in the sense: *conformably to, in correspondence with*, and the ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίου to be referred not to the revelation of the counsel of salvation and redemption in general, but to the particular element in it, in accordance with which the Gentiles are included therein, and jointly elected to participation in God's kingdom. Rightly Bengel: "μυστηρίου, mysterii, de gentibus incorporatis." Comp. εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, ver. 26. This interpretation receives its decisive corroboration from the quite parallel expressions, Eph. iii. 3–6, 9–11; Col. i. 25–27. The apostle regards the Roman church *a parte potiori* as a church

of Gentile Christians. The mystery, therefore, of the joint calling of the Gentiles having been revealed, and in virtue of the same mystery God having received them in Christ, it follows in harmony with this revelation that God is able continuously to strengthen and establish them in the gospel; for the divine ability is in correspondence with His revealed will. This interpretation is so far from being heterogeneous to the context and collective import of the epistle, that, on the contrary, it is the only one that contains a satisfactory explanation and justification of the doxology, which otherwise wears an appearance of strangeness. In ver. 24 the apostle had concluded his epistle with a benediction addressed to the *entire* church (comp. *μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν*) of Jewish and Gentile Christians. But this was the church of the *Gentile* metropolis, Rome, consisting mainly of *Gentile* Christians,—a church the very existence of which in and of itself stamped the seal of truth on his preaching respecting the joint destiny of the *Gentiles* to incorporation and fellowship in the body of Christ, and implied the promise of its continuous realization. As, then, from the very beginning, in presence of such a church, the thought of his *Gentile* apostolate and of the joint calling of the *Gentiles* to the gospel had powerfully moved him (i. 5, 6, 13–15), and he recurs to it again and again in the course of the epistle (iii. 29, iv. 10, 11, ix. 24–26, 30, x. 11–13, xi. 11, 13, 30, xv. 9, 12, 15–21, comp. too, xv. 22 ff. with i. 10, 13 ff., xvi. 4), so that it constantly emerges as the thought ever accompanying him in his writing; so now, at the end, he turns back, as it were, to this beginning of the epistle, and thus gives the epistle a perfectly rounded conclusion. Thus only do the preceding words: *στηρίξαι, τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, and τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, acquire their specific and thoroughly intelligible application. *His* gospel in a pregnant sense was this—that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs of the promise. But this was already implied in the statement that his preaching had no other purport than *Jesus* Christ (1 Cor. ii. 2), in whom neither Jew nor Greek, neither circumcision nor uncircumcision, avails (1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28, v. 6, vi. 15; Col. iii. 11), as the Judaistic gospel maintained, which co-ordinated with the preaching of *Jesus* Christ a legal teaching, and wished to conduct the Gentiles first to circumcision, and therefore only as Jews to Christ. That even the Roman Gentile Christians were threatened with an attack

by this Judaistic gospel, the apostle had only just declared, xvi. 17 ff. They needed, therefore, above all *confirmation in his gospel*, namely, in the preaching of *Jesus Christ*. And therefore he blesses the God who is able to confirm them in this gospel, by which course he at the same time desires for them this needed confirmation.

—*χρόνοις αἰώνιους σεσιγημένον*] “which through eternal ages has been kept secret.” As to this dative of the time, in which something takes place, comp. Luke viii. 29; Acts viii. 11; Kühner, p. 237. These *χρόνοι αἰώνιοι* reach up to the time of the revelation of the mystery in question, and are a popular designation of eternity. All God’s action is a temporal coming into existence of His eternal counsel, God’s stepping forth, as it were, from eternity into time, the publication of a mystery hitherto kept secret. That this mystery was already contained in the prophetic Scriptures of the O. T., the apostle himself says in what follows immediately (*διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κτλ.*). But in them it was merely pre-intimated, not itself revealed. Even O. T. prophecy only pictured the reception of the Gentile world to salvation under the figure of its admission into the O. T. theocracy. For this reason, even to Peter, it was necessary to reveal by special vision that the right of the Gentiles in Christ is of a direct nature, Acts x., xv. Only in the light of the N. T. did the veil resting upon the predictions of the O. T. prophets fall off. Up to the days of Christ the mystery was already revealed and yet kept secret, which certainly, as often (v. 13), justifies us in transforming the absolute into a relative expression, namely, that formerly the mystery was not revealed in the same way as now. Excellently Bengel: “Vetus Testamentum est tanquam horologium in suo cursu tacito: Novum Testamentum est sonitus et pulsus aeris. In Scripturis propheticiis praedicta erat vocatio gentium: sed Judaei non intellexerunt.”

Ver. 26. *φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν*] “but which has now been made manifest,” namely, *τοῖς ἀγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφηταῖς ἐν πνεύματι*, Eph. iii. 5; Col. i. 26. *νῦν* stands in antithesis to *χρόνοις αἰώνιους*, like *φανερωθέντος* to *σεσιγημένον*.

—*διὰ τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος*] “and by means of the prophetic Scriptures in consequence of the command of the eternal God, in order to establish obedience to faith, has

been made known among all Gentiles." In what way the prophetic Scriptures were used as a mediating agency in making known the mystery in question, xv. 9-12 shows. If the mystery consists merely in the counsel of redemption in general, διὰ γραφῶν προφητικῶν appears just as strange as it is without reason; for in preaching the gospel the prophetic Scripture was only employed with respect to the Jews, not to the Gentiles; comp. Paul's address at Athens, Acts xvii. 22 ff. On the other hand, that the Gentiles were summoned to salvation in Christ of spontaneous mercy, without intervention of the *nomos*, needed to be proved from the prophetic Scriptures, to them as a comfort and defence, to the gainsaying Jews as a means of conviction and refutation. For this reason the allusion to the γραφαὶ προφητικαί is here specially fitting. But the publication of the counsel, *eternally* kept secret, but *now* revealed, took place in consequence of the appointment of the *eternal* God, who in this very character issues commands respecting eternity and time, and ordains the eternal concealing and the temporal revealing of His mystery. With ἐπιταγὴ θεοῦ, comp. κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφορισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ, i. 1, and δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν, i. 5; also 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3. He therefore carries on his Gentile apostolate by divine authority and command. On εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως, comp. on i. 5. γνωρίζειν εἰς, not = γνωρίζειν πρὸς, Phil. iv. 6, but of the going forth of the publication among a multitude, Mark xiv. 9; John viii. 26. But πάντα τὰ ἔθνη are all *Gentiles*, not all *nations*, comp. on i. 5, 13.

Ver. 27. μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] is to be closely joined together, and hence no comma to be placed after θεῷ. "To the, through Jesus Christ, only wise God" = "to the God who through Jesus Christ appears as alone wise." Just as Jesus Christ Himself is the σοφία θεοῦ, so also through Him has the wisdom of God revealed itself in its highest potency, so that the revelation of God's wisdom in creation is thrown into the background by the revelation of wisdom in redemption, 1 Cor. i. 21, ii. 6 f. But the σοφία θεοῦ, manifested through Jesus Christ, receives its special definition from the context. It has revealed itself, just in so far as in Jesus Christ circumcision and uncircumcision, Jew and Greek, no longer form a ground of distinction, as through Him the dividing wall of separation has fallen down, and both are reconciled with God in one body; and thus the lost Gentile



world, which hitherto, without God and hope in the world, strayed in paths of error of its own, now won back in Jesus Christ, is restored to the right way and incorporated in the kingdom of God. It is to these ways of redemption which God takes with mankind that the apostle refers the σοφία θεοῦ, also in xi. 33, and just so, as here, in Eph. iii 10 : ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. τῷ δυναμένῳ, ver. 25, is here resumed by μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ. The change in the predicate attributed to God is the consequence of the intervening thought: κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου . . . γνωρισθέντος. Μόνος σοφὸς θεός is = οὐδεὶς σοφὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός, comp. Luke xviii. 19. Since the advent of Christ it has become manifest that to no one does the predicate of wisdom pertain, save to God only.

—ὃ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν] “to whom be the (due, xi. 36) glory for ever and ever. Amen.” The supposition that Paul, not observing that τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ and the resumptive μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ are still without their government, annexed, as if they had it already, the expression—still wanting—of the praise itself *by means of the relative*, so that the above datives are now left in an anacoluthic form, is all the more precarious, as the very resumption of the τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ by μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ proves that the apostle was conscious that to the τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ the governing verb was still wanting. The anacoluthon is raised to a degree of harshness the more intolerable, as διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is to be strictly connected with μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ, and therefore no reason whatever exists to account for the sudden break in the construction. Such a break is indeed presented in Acts xxiv. 5, 6, but there ὃν καὶ ἐκρατήσαμεν arose instead of ἐκρατήσαμεν αὐτόν through the preceding ὃς καὶ κτλ., so that this anacoluthon in no way forms a sufficient analogy. Nothing therefore remains but to join ὃ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας with διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and to refer the doxology to Christ; comp. Tholuck and Baumgarten-Crusius here (although the latter wrongly supplies an αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα to μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ). The apostle meant to utter a doxology to the power and wisdom of God the Father; but inasmuch as this wisdom is manifested in *Jesus Christ*, and Jesus Christ was thus the medium by which the divine wisdom was revealed, he transfers the doxology to Him, and thus, in blessing the mediator and revealer of the divine wisdom, blesses indirectly this God of wisdom Himself manifested in Christ. Thus the

significance and emphasis which the apostle attributes from the beginning to the name of Jesus Christ (comp. τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 25) is conspicuous again at the end; for as Jesus Christ is the salvation of the world in general, so is He in a special sense the salvation of the *Gentile* world, inasmuch as through Him the νόμος has been abolished, and thus the σωτηρία of the Gentile world accomplished and the σοφία of God made manifest. Comp. with the present passage, 2 Tim. iv. 18: ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν. Here, too, the doxology refers without doubt to Christ, for no other than He is meant by ὁ κύριος, vv. 17, 18. Comp. further, Heb. xiii. 20, 21, where the equivalent doxology is likewise most naturally joined to the immediately preceding διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which yields a parallel especially apposite to the present passage. Comp. too, 1 Pet. iv. 11.

As to the genuineness of the present doxology and its original position at the end of the entire epistle, comp. especially Fritzsche, *Prolegomena*, I. p. xxviii. sqq.; Meyer, II. p. 363; de Wette, p. 200 ff. Its authenticity is certified by far preponderant testimony. Only few authorities omit it. The internal counter-arguments disappear of themselves before the correct exposition, which shows clearly that the doxology is just as Pauline in character as it is in harmony with the import of the Roman epistle, and as its position at the end is pertinent. Its transposition to a place after xiv. 23, which—especially if the witnesses are weighed, not counted—seems insufficiently attested, is explained by the circumstance that to some copyists a final doxology, contrary to Paul's usual practice, so extended, did not seem in place after the concluding benediction in xvi. 24, on which account, in some codices which have the doxology at the close, ver. 24 was placed after ver. 27, or omitted. The transposition bodily to the end of ch. xiv. owes its origin to the idea that τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι, xvi. 25, has reference to the *weak* in faith, ch. xiv. But the doxology, as to its entire import, can just as little, on the one hand, be regarded as a fitting conclusion of ch. xiv. as, on the other, it would be in the highest degree disturbing and fatal to the close connection between ch. xiv. and xv. 1 ff. In several manuscripts the doxology is found in both places, after ch. xiv. and also at the close of the whole epistle, which points to doubtfulness in the copyists, caused by

the transposition, in respect to the original position, but bears testimony for, not against its genuineness. The entire omission in several codices partly rested on the same grounds as the transposition, partly arose from the double insertion.

Heumann's hypothesis, according to which, with ch. xii. a *new* Epistle to the Romans, written somewhat later, is supposed to begin, but ch. xvi. to consist of two postscripts (namely, vv. 1-24 and vv. 25-27) to the *first* epistle, may be regarded in these days as exploded, just as much as the theory, variously stated since Semler's time, that at least ch. xv. and xvi.<sup>1</sup> did not originally form one epistle with ch. i.-xiv. It finds no support either in the manuscripts, which all contain these chapters, notwithstanding the transposition of the doxology in some of them, or in historical tradition, or, again, in the contents of the chapters in question, and has therefore been abandoned by all modern expositors (comp., however, Olshausen, *Introd.*). But this method of parcelling out the epistle, however senseless, at least acknowledged the *Pauline* authorship of the *disjecta membra epistolae*. The genuineness of ch. xv. and xvi. has only been contested in the most primitive age by Marcion, who cut it off altogether, and again by the most modern Marcionite criticism of the Tübingen school. Even with respect to the Marcion of the ancient church, the ground of his arbitrary criticism was probably the supposition of the hyper-Pauline attitude which Paul was supposed to have assumed to Judaism and Jewish Christianity, with which historical theory, in respect to the character of the Gentile apostle, such statements, *e.g.* as those found in xv. 4-8, which have also been challenged by Dr. Baur, would be little in harmony. According to Baur in the *Tübinger Zeitschrift*, 1836, Heft 3: "A follower of Paul of the next age is supposed to have attempted a reconciliation between his and the Petrine-Judaistic party in Rome, and for this purpose to have modified everything in the apostle's letter that offended and grieved the latter, by adding these chapters in which important concessions are made to the Jewish Christians in contrast with the Gentile Christians, and the apostle on one side apologises as well as he can for writing to the latter Christians who do not belong to his sphere of operation, and represents his influence upon them as merely cursory, not directly encroaching, while on the other his

<sup>1</sup> Ammon, Dav. Schulz, and Schott merely separate ch. xvi. from ch. i.-xv.

zealous labour for the benefit of the mother-church of Jewish Christianity in Jerusalem, and his intimate association with the oldest notabilities of the Jewish-Christian church in Rome (ch. xvi.), are emphasized. By all these means he was meant to be placed as high as possible in the opinion of the Jewish Christians, and thus their approximation to the Pauline Gentile Christians would be promoted." This criticism stands therefore in the closest association with the Baurian mode of view, characterized by us in the Introd., as to the character of the Roman church and primitive Christianity generally. Comp. on the other side, Kling, *in den theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1837, Heft 2. Substantially the same assertions respecting the purpose and arguments, and against the genuineness of these chapters, are repeated by Baur in his *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, I. p. 369. (Comp. there the concluding words [not in English edition]: "How great would be the contrast between these two last chapters of the Roman epistle, if they were genuine, with their complaisance to the Jewish Christians, and the two first chapters of the Galatian epistle and the apostle's principle therein enunciated, not to take even the slightest step towards an approximation to the *δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι*!") Comp. too, Schwegler, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, I. p. 296; and Volkmar, *Die röm. Kirche*, 1857, p. 3; and for a vindication of the genuineness of ch. xv. and xvi., as well as of its forming part of the Roman epistle, Meyer's observations on ch. xv., and Th. Schott, *Der Römerbr.* 1858, p. 118 ff.

On the subscription to the epistle, *πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐγράφη κτλ.*, Grotius observes: "Annotationes istae quae Paulinis Epistolis adjungi solent, nullius sunt auctoritatis. — Hoc tamen quod hic dicitur, verum esse credo, non ob istam annotationem, sed quia ex epistola idem colligitur." And thereupon Calov: "Annuimus hic Grotio: et *Apostolicam δοξολογίαν* ob gratiam, etiam in hac qualicunque opera nobis praestitam, repetentes, in nomine Jesu, auream hanc Epistolam ita finimus:

*Soli sapienti Deo per Jesum Christum, ipsi,  
inquam, sit gloria in saecula,  
Amen!*

Et omnis lector fidelis dicat: *Amen!*"

## CORRECTIONS.

- Vol. I. p. 19, line 5, *instead of* "one among many common forms," *read* "mere  
matter of common form."  
,, p. 64, line 1, *after* "is," *insert* "not."