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PRELATORY NOTE.

The work of translating Dr. Meyer's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans was, for reasons of practical convenience, divided between the Rev. John C. Moore, B.A., Hamburg (now of Galway), and the Rev. Edwin Johnson, B.A., Boston, Lincolnshire. The first portion of the present volume—down to the close of the eighth chapter—has been translated by the former, and the remainder (nearly three-fourths of the volume) by the latter. I have bestowed considerable care on the revision of the translation, and have carried it through the press.

With a view to expedite the progress of this undertaking, in which my interest deepens as it advances, but which I find to involve a greater expenditure of time and labour than I had anticipated, I have, with the consent of the Publishers, asked Professor Crombie of St. Andrews to join me in the editorship; and I am glad that a volume of the Commentary on the Gospel of John, edited by him, is ready to be issued along with this one on my part.

W. P. D.

Glasgow College, August 1874.
Vv. 7–13. How easily might the Jewish Christian, in his reverence for the law of his fathers, take offence at ver. 5 (τὰ διὰ τ. νόμου) and 6, and draw the obnoxious inference, that the law must therefore be itself of immoral nature, since it is the means of calling forth the sin-affections, and since emancipation from it is the condition of the new moral life! Paul therefore proposes to himself this possible inference in ver. 7, rejects it, and then on to ver. 13 shows that the law, while in itself good, is that which leads to acquaintance with sin, and which is misused by the principle of sin to the destruction of men.

Paul conducts the refutation, speaking throughout in the first person singular (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 12, xiii. 11). This mode of expression, differing from the μετασχηματισμός (see on 1 Cor. iv. 6), is an ἰδιώσις; comp. Theodore of Mopsuestia on ver. 8: τὰ ἐν ἑμοὶ δὲ λέγει, τὸ κοινὸν λέγει τῶν ἄνθρωπων, and Theophy- lact on ver. 9: ἐν τῷ οἶκεῖ ὡς δὲ προσώπῳ τὴν ἄνθρωπιννην φύσιν λέγει. Thus he declares concerning himself what is meant to apply to every man placed under the Mosaic law generally, in respect of his relation to that law—before the turning-point in his inner life brought about through his connection with that law, and after it. The apostle’s own personal experience, so far from being thereby excluded, everywhere gleams through with peculiarly vivid and deep truth, and represents concretely the universal experience in the matter. The subject presenting itself through the ἔγω is therefore man in general, in his natural state under
the law, to which he is bound, as not yet redeemed through Christ and sanctified through the Spirit (for which see chap. viii.); without, however, having been unnaturally hardened by legal righteousness or rendered callous and intractable through despising the law, and so estranged from the moral earnestness of legal Judaism. Into this earlier state, in which Paul himself had been before his conversion, he transports himself back, and realizes it to himself with all the vividness and truth of an experience that had made indelible impression upon him; and thus he becomes the type of the moral relation, in which the as yet unregenerate Israelite stands to the divine law. "He betakes himself once more down to those gloomy depths, and makes all his readers also traverse them with him, only in order at last to conclude with warmer gratitude that he is now indeed redeemed from them, and thereby to show what that better and eternal law of God is which endures even for the redeemed," Ewald. Augustine (prop. 45 in ep. ad Rom.; ad Simplic. i. 91; Conf. vii. 21), in his earlier days, acknowledged, in harmony with the Greek Fathers since Irenaeus, that the language here is that of the unregenerate man; though later, in opposition to Pelagianism (especially on account of vv. 17, 18, 22; see Retract. i. 23, 26, ii. 3; c. duas ep. Pel. i. 10; c. Faust. xv. 8), he gave currency to the view that the "I" is that of the regenerate. In this he was followed by Jerome, who likewise held a different opinion previously; and later by Luther, Melanchton, Calvin, Beza (not by Bucerus and Musculus), Chemnitz, Gerhard, Quenstedt and many others, more, however, among Protestant than among Catholic commentators (Erasmus says of him: "dure multa torquens;") and see especially Toletus). On the other hand, the Socinians and Arminians, as also the school of Spener, returned to the view of the Greek Fathers, which gradually became, and has down to the present day continued, the dominant one. See the historical elucidations in Tholuck and Reiche; also Knapp, Scr. var. arg. p. 400 ff. The theory that Paul is speaking simply of himself and exhibiting his own experiences (comp. Hofmann), must be set aside for the simple reason, that in that case the entire disquisition, as a mere individual psychological history (7-13) and delineation (ver. 14 ff.), could have
no general probative force whatever, which nevertheless, from
the connection with what goes before and follows (viii. 1), it is
intended to have. Others, like Grotius, who correctly referred it
to the state anterior to regeneration, and among them recently
Reiche in particular, represent Paul as speaking in the person
of the Jewish people as a people. But, so far as concerns vv. 7-13,
it is utterly untrue that the Jewish nation previous to the law
led a life of innocence unacquainted with sin and evil desire;
and as concerns ver. 14 ff., the explanation of the double char-
acter of the "I," if we are to carry out the idea of referring
it to the nation, entangles us in difficulties which can only force
us to strange caprices of exegesis, such as are most glaringly
apparent in Reiche. Fritzsche also has not consistently avoided
the reference of the "I" to the people as such, and the impos-
sibilities that necessarily accompany it, and, in opposition to the
Augustinian interpretation, has excluded, on quite insufficient
grounds, the apostle himself and his own experience. Paul,
who had himself been a Jew under the law, could not describe
at all otherwise than from personal recollection that unhappy
state, which indeed, with the lively and strong susceptibility of
his entire nature and temperament, he must have experienced
very deeply, in order to be able to depict it as he has done. Testi-
monies regarding himself, such as Phil. iii. 6, cannot be urged
in opposition to this, since they do not unveil the inward
struggle of impulses, etc. Similarly with Paul, Luther also
sighed most deeply just when under the distress of his legal
condition, before the light of the gospel dawned upon him, and
he afterwards lamented that distress most vividly and truly.
Philippi has rightly apprehended the "I" coming in at ver. 7 as
that of the unregenerate man; but on the other hand, following
the older expositors, has discovered from ver. 14 onwards the
delineation of the regenerate state of the same "I,"—a view

1 Jerome on Dan. had already remarked: "Peccata populi, quia unus e populo
est, enumerat persona sua, quod et apostolum in ep. ad Rom. fecisse legimus."

2 Comp. Calovius on ver. 14: "Postquom legem divinam vindicavit vel
pravae concupiscientiae omnem culpam transscribendum docuit, ejus vim sese
etiamum experiri ingemiscit apostolus, etiamem rematus jam eit et justificatus."
See also Calvin on ver. 14: "Exemplum proponit hominis regenerati, in quo sic
carnis reliquiae cum lege Domini dissident, ut spiritus ei libenter obstemperet."
inconsistent in itself, opposed to the context (since Paul does not pass on to the regenerate till viii. 1), and, when applied to the details, impossible (see the subsequent exposition). Hammond very truly observes: "Nihil potest esse magis contrarium affectioni animi hominis regenerati, quam quae hic in prima persona Ego exprimuntur." Still Umbreit, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1851, p. 633 ff., has substantially reverted, as regards the entire chapter, to the Augustinian view, for which he especially regards ver. 25 (ἀντίς ἐγὼ) as decisive; and no less have Delitzsch (see especially his Psychol. p. 387 ff.); Weber, v. Zorne Gottes, p. 86; Thomasius, Chr. Pers. u. Werk, I. p. 275 f.; Jatho; Krummacher in the Stud. u. Krit. 1862, p. 119 ff.; and also Luthardt, v. freien Willen, p. 404 f., adopted this view with reference to ver. 14 ff. Hofmann, who in his Schriftenw. I. p. 556 to all appearance, though he is somewhat obscure and at variance with himself (see Philippi, p. 285 f., and Glaubenslehre, III. p. 243), had returned to the pre-Augustinian interpretation, in his N. T., hampers a more clear and candid understanding of the passage by the fact that, while he decidedly rejects the theory that the "I" of ver. 7 is that of the unregenerate man, he at the same time justly says that what is related of that "I" (which is that of the apostle) belongs to the time which lay away beyond his state as a Christian; and further, by the fact, that he represents vv. 14–24 as spoken from the same present time as ver. 25, but at the same time leaves the enigma unsolved how the wretched condition described may comport with that present; and in general, as to the point in question about which expositors differ, he does not give any round and definite answer. For if Paul is to be supposed, according to Hofmann, in ver. 14 ff., not to treat of the natural man, and nevertheless to depict himself in the quality of his moral state apart from his life in Christ, we cannot get rid of the contradiction that the "I" is the regenerate man apart from his regeneration, and of the obscuring and muffling up of the meaning thereby occasioned. The view which takes it of the unregenerate is followed by Julius Müller, Neander, Nitzsch, Hahn, Baur, Tholuck, Krehl, Reithmayr, van Hengel, Ewald, Th. Schott, Ernesti, Lipsius, Mangold, Messner (Lehre der Ap. p. 220), and

Ver. 7. 'Ο νόμος ἠμαρτία;] Is the law sin? a something, whose ethical nature is immoral? Comp. Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 46; Winzer, *Progr.* 1832, p. 5; also Fritzche, Rückert, de Wette, Tholuck, and Philippi. For the contrast see ver. 12, from which it at once appears that the formerly current interpretation, still held by Reiche and Flatt, "originator of sin" (διάκονος ἠμαρτίας, *Gal.* ii. 17), is, from the connection, erroneous; as indeed it would have to be arbitrarily imported into the word, for the appeal to Mic. i. 5 overlooks the poetical mode of expression in that passage. The *substantive* predicate (comp. viii. 10; 2 Cor. v. 21, *al.*) is more significant than an adjectival expression (ἀμαρτωλός), and in keeping with the meaning of the remonstrant, whom Paul personates. The question is not to be supposed *preposterous, setting forth a proposition without real meaning* (Hofmann), since it is by no means absurd in itself and, as an objection, has sufficient apparent ground in what precedes — After ἀλλά we are no more to understand ἐποίησεν again (Hofmann) than before ὁ νόμος ἠμαρτ., for which there is no ground (it is otherwise at ix. 30). On the contrary, this ἀλλά, *but*, brings in the *real relation* to sin, as it occurs in contrast to that inference which has just

1 Who transfers the personal experience of the apostle, so far as it is expressed in ver. 14 ff., *to the last stage of his Pharisaism*, consequently to a period shortly before his conversion. But we have not sufficient data in the text and in the history for marking off, and that so accurately, a definite period in Paul's life. We may add that Achelis has aptly and clearly set aside the interpretation of the *regenerate* in the case of the several features of the picture sketched by Paul.
been rejected with horror: ἁμαρτία μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, φησὶν, γνωριμικῶς δὲ ἁμαρτίας, Theophylact. — τὴν ἁμ. οὐκ ἔγνων, εἰ μὴ δ. νόμου] Sin I have not become acquainted with, except through the law. The ἁμαρτία is sin as an active principle in man (see vv. 8, 9, 11, 13, 14), with which I have become experimentally acquainted only through the law (comp. the subsequent οὐκ ἰδειν), so that without the intervention of the law it would have remained for me an unknown power; because, in that case (see the following, and ver. 8), it would not have become active in me through the excitement of desires after what is forbidden in contrast to the law. The τὴν ἁμ. οὐκ ἔγνω, therefore, is not here to be confounded with the ἐπιγνώσωσιν ἁμ. in iii. 20, which in fact is only attained through comparison of the moral condition with the requirements of the law (in opposition to Krehl); nor yet is it to be understood of the theoretic knowledge of the essence of sin, namely, that the latter is opposition to the will of God (Tholuck, Philippi; comp. van Hengel and the older expositors), against which view ver. 8 (χερις νόμου ἁμαρτ. νεκρά) and ver. 9 are decisive. The view of Fritzscbe is, however, likewise erroneous (see the following, especially ver. 8): I should not have sinned, "cognoscit autem peccatum, qui peccat." — οὐκ ἔγνων is to be rendered simply, with the Vulgate: non cognovi. The sense: I should not have known, would anticipate the following clause, which assigns the reason.—The νόμος is nothing else than the Mosaic law, not the moral law generally in all forms of its revelation (Olshausen); for Paul is in fact declaring his own experimental consciousness, and by means of this, as it developed itself under Judaism, presenting to view the moral position (in its general human aspect) of those who are subject to the law of Moses. — τὴν τε γὰρ ἐπιθ. κ.τ.λ. for the desire (after the forbidden) would in fact be unknown to me, if the law did not say, Thou shalt not covet. The reason is here assigned for the foregoing: "with the dawning consciousness of desire conflicting with the precept of the law, I became aware also of the principle of sin within me, since the latter (see vv. 8, 9) made me

1 *sine fumo, I should not know, more definite and confident than *sine et fumo. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 175 f. Comp. also Stallb. ad Plat. Symp. p. 190 C.
experimentally aware of its presence and life by the excitement of desire in presence of the law.” What the law forbids us to covet (Ex. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21), was no concern of the apostle here, looking to the universality of his representation; he could only employ the prohibition of sinful desire generally and in itself, without particular reference to its object.—On τε... γὰρ, for... indeed, comp. i. 26; it is not to be taken climatically (van Hengel), as if Paul had written καὶ γὰρ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐπιθυμήσας. To the τε, however, corresponds the following δέ in ver. 8, which causes the chief stress of the sentence assigning the reason to fall upon ver. 8 (Stallb. ad Plut. Polit. p. 270 D); therefore ver. 8 is still included as dependent on γὰρ. Respecting the imperative future of the old language of legislation, see on Matt. i. 21.

Ver. 8. Δὲ] placing over against the negative declaration of ver. 7 the description of the positive process, by which the consciousness of desire of ver. 7 emerged: but indeed sin took occasion, etc. In this ἀφορμήν placed first emphatically, not in ἡ ἀμαρτία (Th. Schott), lies the point of the relation.—ἡ ἀμαρτία] as in ver. 7, not conceived as κακοδαμεν (Fritzsche); nor yet the sinful activity, as Reiche thinks; for that is the result of the ἐπιθυμία (Jas. i. 5), and the sin that first takes occasion from the law cannot be an action.—For examples of ἀφορμὴν λαμβ., to take occasion, see Wetstein and Kypke. The principle of sin took occasion, not, as Reiche thinks, received occasion; for it is conceived as something revived (ver. 9), which works.—διὰ τὴς ἐπιθυμίας] through the command, namely, the ὕποκρίσις of ver. 7. This interpretation is plainly necessary from the following κατευθύναστο κ.τ.λ. Reiche, following De Dieu and several others, erroneously (comp. Eph. ii. 15) takes ἐπιθυμία as equivalent to νόμος. We must connect διὰ τ. ἐντ. with κατεīρημ. (Rückert, Winzer, Benecke, de Wette, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Umbreit, van Hengel, and Hofmann), not with ἀφορμ. λαμβ. (Luther and many others, including Reiche, Kollner, Olshausen, Philipp, Maier, and Ewald), because ἀφορμ. λαμβάνειν is never construed with διὰ (frequently with ἐκ, as in Polyb. iii. 32. 7, iii. 7. 5), and because ver. 11 (διὰ αὐτῆς ἀπεκτ.) and ver. 13
confirm the connection with κατείγρυ. — κατείγρυ, ἐν ἑμοί
πᾶσαν ἐνθ.] it brought about in me all manner of desire.
Respecting κατείγραξ, see on i. 27. Even without the law
there is desire in man, but not yet in the ethical definite
character of desire after the forbidden, as ἐπιθυμία is conceived
of according to ver. 7; for as yet there is no prohibition, and
consequently no moral antithesis existing to the desire in
itself ("ignoti nulla cupido," Ovid, A. A. 397), through which
antithesis the inner conflict is first introduced. Every desire
is, in accordance with the quite general οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, to
be left without limitation. No desire (as respects category)
was excluded. A reference to the desires, which the state of
civilisation joined with a positive legislation calls forth (de
Wette), is foreign to the connection. Comp. Prov. ix. 17.
— χωρὶς γὰρ νόμον ἀμαρτία νέκρα] sc. ἐστι, not ἦν (Beza,
Reiche, Krummacher), just because the omission of the verb
betokens a general proposition: for without the law, i.e. if it do
not enter into relation with the law, sin, the sinful principle
in man, is dead, i.e. not active, because that is wanting, by
which it may take occasion to be alive. The potentiality of
the nītīmūr in vētītum is indeed there, but, lacking the vēto of
the νόμος (τοῦ τὸ πρακτέων ὑποδεικνύωτος καὶ τὸ οὐ πρακτέων ἀπαγορεύωντος,
Theodore), can exhibit no actual vital activity; it does not stir,
because the antithesis is wanting. Hence
the law becomes the δύναμις τῆς ἀμαρτίας, 1 Cor. xv. 56,
though it is not itself τοῦ παρανομεῖν παραβίωσ (Chrysippus
in Plut. de Stoic. Rep. 33). Erroneous is the view held by
Chrysostom, Calvin, Estius, Olshausen, and others, that νέκρα
implies the absence of knowledge of sin (οὐχ οὗτω γνώριμος).
The νόμος is here, as throughout in this connection, the
Mosaic law, which contains the ἐντολή (vv. 7, 9, 12). That
this may be and is misused by the principle of sin, in the way
indicated, arises from the fact, that it comes forward merely

1 According to Krummacher, indeed, the simple χωρὶς νόμον is held to mean:
without knowing and laying to heart the significance of the law, which ex-
tends to the most secret motions, and condemns them. The dawning of this
significance on the consciousness is then held to be ἤλθεν τῆς ἐντολῆς. In this
way people read between the lines whatever they conceive to be necessary.
with the outward command (thou shalt, thou shalt not), without giving the power of fulfilment; comp. Lipsius, Rechtfertigungsl. p. 63 ff. And the analogous application, which the general proposition admits of to the moral law of nature also, is indeed self-evident, but lies here aloof from the apostle's sphere of thought.

Ver. 9. But I was once alive without the law. ἐγὼ δὲ, the antithesis of ἁμαρτία; ἐξον,¹ antithesis of νεκρᾶ; νόμου, just as in ver. 8. — ἐξον] The sense is, on account of the foregoing (νεκρᾶ) and the following (ἀπέθανον, ver. 10) contrast, necessarily (in opposition to Reiche and van Hengel) to be taken as pregnant; but not with the arbitrary alteration, videbar mihi vivere (Augustine, Erasmus, Pareus, Estius), or securus eram (Luther, Melanchthon, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Calovius, Bengel, and others, including Krummacher), thus representing Paul as glancing at his Pharisaic state, in which the law had not yet alarmed him,—a view which is at variance with the words themselves and with the antitheses, and which is certainly quite inadmissible historically in the case of a character like Paul (Gal. i. 14, ii. 23; Phil. iii. 6), who could testify so truly and vividly of the power of sin and of the curse of the law. No, Paul means the death-free (ver. 10) life of childlike innocence (comp. Winzer, p. 11; de Wette and Ewald in loc.; Umbreit in the Stud. u. Krit. 1851, p. 637 f.; Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, I. p. 101; Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 287; also Delitzsch), where—as this state of life, resembling the condition of our first parents in Paradise, was the bright spot of his own earliest recollection²—the law has not yet come to conscious knowledge, the moral self-determination in respect to it has not yet taken place, and therefore the sin-principle is still lying in the slumber of death. Rightly explained already by

¹ On the forms ἐξον and ἐξον, which are both classical, see Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 738; Kühner, I. p. 829.
² Comp. Minnern. ii. 3: πάχυναι ἑαυτοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἔλθαι ἐπὶ πάχυνα τῷ ἑαυτῷ, ἴδε ἐντὸς μακρῶς ἑαυτῷ ἀγάπην. This recollection every one may have in looking back on the history of his own moral life; and even the realization of the moment, at which the life of childlike innocence took its end, is by no means inconceivable (as Hofmann objects). A dogmatic judgment cannot a priori be pronounced respecting such psychological experiences in the inner life. Hofmann himself
Origen: πάς γὰρ ἀνθρώπος ἔξω χωρὶς νόμου ποτὲ, ὀτε παιδιος ἦν, and by Augustine, c. duas cp. Pelag. i. 9. This is certainly a status securitatis, but one morally indifferent, not immoral, and not extending beyond the childhood unconscious of the ἐντολή. Hence, in the apostle's case, it is neither to be extended till the time of his conversion (Luther, Melancthon, etc.), nor even only till the time of his having perceived that the law demands not merely the outward act, but also the inward inclination (Philippi and Tholuck)—which is neither in harmony with the unlimited χωρὶς νόμου (Paul must at least have written χωρὶς τῆς ἐντολῆς), nor psychologically correct, since sin is not dead up to this stage of the moral development. From this very circumstance, it is clear also that the explanation of those is erroneous, who, making Paul speak in the name of his nation, are compelled to think of the purer and more blameless life of the patriarchs and Israelites before the giving of the law (so Grotius, Turretin, Locke, Wetstein, following several Fathers, and recently Reiche; comp. Fritzsche.) — The pregnant import of the ἐξω lies in the fact that, while the sin-principle is dead, man has not yet incurred eternal death (physical death has been incurred by every one through Adam's sin, v. 12); this being alive is therefore an analogue—though still unconscious and weak, yet pleasingly presenting itself in the subsequent retrospect—of the true and eternal ἐξω (comp. Matt, xviii. 3) which Christ (comp. ver. 24 f.) has procured through His atoning work. The theory of a pre-mundane life of the pre-existent soul (Hilgenfeld in his Zeitschr. 1871, p. 190 f.) is a Platonism forced on the apostle (comp. Wisd. viii. 20, and Grimm in loc.) in opposition to the entire N. T. — ἀθανάτης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς but when the command, namely, the ὁκ ἐπιθυμήσεις of the Mosaic law, had come, i.e. had become present to my consciousness. To the person living still in childhood inno-
declares that a living and dying of the personal Ego is meant: "so long as this Ego was not confronted by the command, it continued in the life given to it by God its Creator, which really deserved, as such, to be called a life." But how the looking back, which our passage expresses, to this former life differs essentially and materially from the recollection of that of childlike innocence, is not clear to me. That ἔξω is, at any rate, the lost paradise of the individual inner history.
cence the εἰρονή was absent; for him it was not yet issued; it
had not yet presented itself. Comp. on Gal. iii. 23. Reiche,
consistently with his view of the entire section, explains it, as
does also Fritzsche, of the historical Mosaic legislation.—
ἀνεξήγερσις is by most modern commentators rendered came to life.
So Tholuck, Rückert, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette,
Maier, and Hofmann. But quite contrary to the usus loquendi
(Luke xv. 24, 32; Rom. xiv. 9; Rev. xx. 5), in accordance
with which it means: came again to life. See also Nonnus, Joh.
v. 25: ἀνεξήγερσις ἀναζήτησαν, where (in opposition to the view of
Fritzsche) ἀνεξήγερσις is added according to a well-known pleonasm;
comp. ἀναζητῶσαι, reviviscet, Dial. Herm. de astrol. i. 10, 42;
respecting the case of ἀναβήσθησαν, usually cited as analogous,
see on John ix. 11.1 So, too, ἀναζητῶ in Aquila and Syn-
And also the frequent classical ἀναβιώ and ἀναβιώκομαι,
always mean to come to life again; Plat. Rep. p. 614 B;
Politi. p. 272; Lucian, Q. hist. 40: ἀναβίον ἀποθανόν, Gall. 18.
Comp. ἀναβιώκομαι, 2 Macc. vii. 9. It is therefore linguistically
correct to explain it, with the ancients, Bengel, and Philippi:
sin lived again (revivit, Vulgate); but this is not to be inter-
preted, with Bengel, following Augustine and others: “sicut
vixerat, cum per Adamum intrasset in mundum” (comp. Phi-
lippi), because that is foreign to the context, inasmuch as Paul
sets forth his experience as the expression of the experience of
every individual in his relation to the law, not speaking of
humanity as a whole. The ἀνεξήγερσις, which is not to be mis-
interpreted as pointing to a pre-mundane sin (Hilgenfeld), finds
its true explanation, analogously to the ἀναβήσθησαν in John
ix. 11, in the view that the ἀμαρτία, that potentiality of sin in
man, is originally and in its nature a living power, but is, before
the εἰρονή comes, without expression for its life, ἐνεργά; there-
upon it resumes its proper living nature, and thus becomes alive
again. Comp. van Hengel: “εὐαπόρησεν
1 Generally, the citation of other verbs compounded with ἀνεξήγερσις, in which the
latter means not again, but up, aloft (and that is, in fact, the case with very
many), has no probative force. Passages should be quoted in which ἀναβησθησάτω means merely to come to life, especially as the analogy of the classical ἀναβιώκομαι is
against it. This remark applies also against Hofmann's citations.
Ver. 10. ‘Απέθανον] correlative of ἀνέξησεν, antithesis of ἔζων. It is neither to be understood, however, of physical nor of spiritual death (Semler, Böhme, Rückert; comp. Hofmann and others), but, as the contrast εἰς ζωὴν requires, of eternal death. This was given with the actual sin brought about through the sin-principle that had become alive; the sinner had incurred it. Paul, full of the painful recollection, expresses this by the abrupt, deeply tragic ἀπέθανον.— ἦ εἰς ζωὴν] sc. οὐσα, aiming at life. For the promise of life (in the Messianic theocratic sense, Lev. xviii. 5; Deut. v. 33; Gal. iii. 12), which was attached to the obedience of the Mosaic law generally, applied also to the ἀντίλημ. — εὑρέθη] was found, proved and showed itself in the actual experimental result; comp. Gal. ii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 7. Chrysostom has well said: οὐκ εἰσεγένετο θάνατος, οὔτε ἔτεκε θάνατον, ἀλλ' εὑρέθη, τὸ καίνον καὶ παράδοξον τῆς ἀτοπίας οὕτως ἐρμηνεύων, καὶ τὸ πᾶν εἰς τῶν ἐκεῖνων (of men) περιτρέτων κεφαλῆς. — αὕτη] hæcé. To be written thus, and not αὐτή, ἵπτα (Bengel and Hofmann), after the analogy of ver. 15 f., 19 f. It has tragic emphasis. Comp. on Phil. i. 22.

Ver. 11. Illustration of this surprising result, in which ἡ ἀμαρτία, as the guilty element, is placed foremost, and its guilt is also made manifest by the διὰ τῆς ἐντολ. placed before εὐθυτάτ. Sin has by means of the commandment (which had for its direct aim my life) deceived me, inasmuch as it used it for the provocation of desire. An allusion to the serpent in Paradise is probable, both from the nature of the case, and also from the expression (LXX. Gen. iii. 13). Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 2. But such an allusion would be inappropriate, if it were “the struggle of the more earnest Pharisaism” (Philippi), and not the loss of childlike innocence, that is here described. As to the conception of the ἐξηπάτησε (sin held out to me something pernicious as being desirable), comp. Eph. iv. 22, Heb. iii. 13. — ἀπέκτεινεν] like ἀπέθανον in ver. 10.

Ver. 12. "Ωστε] The result of vv. 7–11. — ὃ μὲν νόμος] The contrast for which μὲν prepares the way was intended to be: “but sin has to me redounded unto death through the law, which in itself is good.” This follows in ver. 13 as regards
substance, but not as regards form. See on ver. 13. — The predicates—ἁγιός (holy, as God’s revelation of Himself, ver. 14; 2 Macc. vi. 23, 28), which is assigned to the Mosaic law generally, and ἁσία, δικαια (just, in respect to its requirements, which are only such as accord with the holiness), and ἀγαθή (excellent, on account of its salutary object), which are justly (comp. Acts vii. 38) attributed to the ἔντολή — exhaust the contents of the opposite of ἀμαρτία in ver. 7. They are accumulated on ἔντολή, because the latter had just been specially described in ver. 7 ff. as that which occasioned the activity of the sin-principle.

Ver. 13. Paul has hardly begun, in ver. 12, his exposition of the result of vv. 7–11, when his train of thought is again crossed by an inference that might possibly be drawn from what had just been said, and used against him (comp. ver. 7). He puts this inference as a question, and now gives in the form of a refutation of it what he had intended to give, according to the plan begun in ver. 12, not in polemical form, but in a sentence with δέ that should correspond to the sentence with μεν. — ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀμαρτία] sc. έμοι εγένετο θάνατος. Altogether involved is the construction adopted by Luther, Heumann, Carpzov, Ch. Schmidt, Böhme, and Flatt: ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζόμενη (ἡν) θάνατον, ἣν φανῇ ἀμαρτία. — ἢν φανῇ [κ.τ.λ.] in order that it might appear as sin thereby, that it wrought death for me by means of the good. ἢν introduces the aim, which was ordained by God for the ἡ ἀμ. έμοι εγένετο θάνατος. This purposed manifestation (φανῇ has the emphasis) of the principle of sin in its sinful character served as a necessary preparation for redemption,—a view, which represents the psychological history of salvation as a development of the divine μοῖρα. — ἀμαρτία is certainly shown to be the predicate by its want of the article and the parallel ἀμαρτολός in the second clause. The predicate attributed to the law in ver. 7 is appropriated to that power to which it belongs, namely, sin. Ewald: that it might be manifest, how sin, etc. But ἀμαρτία, because it would thus be the sin-principle, must have had the article, and the “how” is gratuitously imported. — ἢν γένηται [κ.τ.λ.] Climactic parallel (comp. on 2 Cor. ix. 3; Gal. iii. 14) to ἢν
THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

...in which γένηται is to be taken of the actual result; see on iii. 4. The repetition of the subject of γένηται (ἡ ἁμαρτία), and of the means employed by it (διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς), may indeed be superfluous, because both are self-evident from what goes before; but it conveys, especially when placed at the close, all the weightier emphasis of a solemnly painful, tragic effect. The less, therefore, is ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τ. ἐντολ. to be separated from γένηται, and regarded as the resumption and completion of ἡ ἁμαρτία (sc. ἐμοὶ ἐγ. θάνατος); in which view there is assigned to the two clauses of purpose a co-ordinate intervening position (Hofmann), that renders the discourse—running on so simply and emphatically—quite unnecessarily involved. καθ' ἵπτερα, in over-measure, beyond measure. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 13; 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 17; Gal. i. 13; and see Wetstein. — διὰ τῆς ἐντολ. by means of the commandment, which ἄγαθον it applied so perniciously; a pregnant contrast. — Observe the pithy, climactic, sharply and vividly compressed delineation of the gloomy picture.

Vv. 14—25. Proof not merely of the foregoing telic sentence (Th. Schott), but of the weighty main thought μὴ γένηται ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία. “For the law is spiritual, but man (in his natural situation under the law, out of Christ) is of flesh and placed under the power of sin; against the moral will of his better self, he is carried away to evil by the power of the sinful principle dwelling in him.”

Ver. 14. Ὑδαμεν] Ὑσανεὶ ἀλεγεν ὠμολογημένον τότῳ κ. δὲλόν ἐστι, Chrysostom. Comp. ii. 2, iii. 19. It is not to be written οἶδα μὲν (Jerome, Estius, Semler, Koppe, Flatt, Reiche, Hofmann, Th. Schott), since the following δὲ would only correspond logically with the μὲν, if Paul, with a view to contrast the character of the law with his own character (so Hofmann), had said: οἶδα γὰρ, δτι ὁ μὲν νόμος κ.τ.λ.; or, in case he had desired to contrast his character with his knowledge (so Schott): οἶδα μὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ., σάρκινος δὲ εἰμι, or εἰμι δὲ σάρκινος, omitting the ἐγώ, which is the antithesis of the νόμος. — πνευματικός] obtains its definition through the contrasted σάρκινος. Now σάρξ is the material phenomenal nature of man opposed to the divine πνεῦμα, animated and determined by the ὑπνή
(comp. on iv. 1, vi. 19), and consequently σάρκινος (of flesh) affirms of the ἐνός, that it is of such a non-pneumatic nature and quality. So πνευματικός must affirm regarding the law, that its essence (not the form in which it is given, according to which it appears as γράμμα) is divine = spiritual: its essential and characteristic quality is homogeneous with that of the Holy Spirit, who has made Himself known in the law. For believers no proof of this was needed (οἰδαμεν), because the νόμος, as νόμος Θεοῦ, must be a holy self-revelation of the Divine Spirit; comp. ver. 12; Acts vii. 38. In consequence of this pneumatic nature the law is certainly διδάσκαλος ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας πνεύματος (Chrysostom), and its tenor, rooting in the Divine Spirit, is only fulfilled by those who have the πνεύμα (Tholuck, with Calovius, joining together different references), as indeed the necessary presupposition is that it θεῖον ἄριστον θεότητος (Theodoret), and the consequence necessarily bound up with its spiritual nature is that there subsists no affinity between the law and death (Hofmann); but all this is not conveyed by the word itself, any more than is the impossibility of fulfilling the law's demands, based on its pneumatic nature (Calvin: "Lex coelestem quandam et angelicam justitiamrequirit"). Following Oecumenius 2, and Beza, others (including Reiche, Köllner, and de Wette) have taken πνεύμα of the higher spiritual nature of man (i. 9; Matt. xxvi. 41), and hence have, according to this reference, explained πνευματικός very variously. E.g. Reiche: "in so far as it does not hinder, but promotes, the development and expression of the πνεύμα;" de Wette: "of spiritual tenor and character, in virtue of which it puts forward demands which can only be understood and fulfilled by the spiritual nature of man." So too, substantially, Rückert. But vv. 22, 25 show that πνευματικός characterizes
the law as \( \nu \nu \mu \sigma \) \( \Theta \varepsilon \nu \); consequently the \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \mu \alpha \) is just the divine, which the natural man, who knows and has nothing of the Spirit of God, resists in virtue of the heterogeneous tendency of his \( \sigma \rho \varepsilon \). — \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \delta \varepsilon \) but \( I \), i.e. according to the \( \iota \delta \iota \mu \omega \sigma \nu \) pervading the entire section: the man, not yet regenerate by the Holy Spirit, in his relation to the Mosaic law given to him,—the still unredeemed \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \), who, in the deep distress that oppresses him in the presence of the law, ver. 24, sighs after redemption. For the subject is in vv. 14—25 necessarily the same—and that, indeed, in its unredeemed condition\(^1\)—as previously gave its psychological history prior to and under the law (hence the \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \tau \iota \� \tau \iota \) in vv. 7—13), and now depicts its position confronting (\( \delta \varepsilon \)) the pneumatic nature of the law (hence the \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \tau \iota \varepsilon \) in ver. 14 ff.), in order to convey the information (\( \gamma \rho \alpha \rho \), that not the law, but the principle of sin mighty in man himself, has prepared death for him. It is true the situation, which the apostle thus exhibits in his own representative \( \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \), was for himself as an individual one long since past; but he realizes it as present and places it before the eyes like a picture, in which the standpoint of the happier present in which he now finds himself renders possible the perspective that lends to every feature of his portrait the light of clearness and truth. — \( \sigma \rho \kappa \nu \omega \), made of flesh, consisting of flesh, 2 Cor. iii. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 1; comp. Plat. Leg. x. p. 906 C; Theocrit. xxi. 66; LXX. 2 Chron. xxxii. 8; Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26; Addit. Esth. iv. 8: \( \beta \alpha \nu \iota \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \rho \kappa \nu \omega \). The signification fleshy, corpulentus, Polyb. xxxix. 2. 7, is here out of place. It is not equivalent to the qualitative \( \sigma \rho \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \), fleshy, (see Tittmann's Synon. p. 23), that is, affected with the quality that is determined by the \( \sigma \rho \varepsilon \). The \( \sigma \rho \kappa \nu \omega \), as the expression of the substance,\(^2\) is far stronger; and while not including the negation of the moral will in man (see ver. 15 ff., 22, 25),

\(^1\) Ewald: "He speaks, if possible even more than previously, from the standpoint of one not yet redeemed, who finds himself face to face with the law merely as a simple man, and consequently as still lacking all higher light and heavenly aid."—In fact, if all that follows can be asserted of the regenerate person, "the regenerate man would thus be also the unregenerate;" Baur, in the theol. Jahrb. 1857, p. 192; neut. Theol. p. 148.

indicates the σάρξ—that unspiritual, material, phenomenal nature of man, serving by way of vehicle for sin—as the element of his being which so preponderates and renders the moral will fruitless, that the apostle, transporting himself into his pre-Christian state, cannot—in the mirror of this deeply earnest, and just as real as it was painful, self-contemplation—set forth the moral nature of the natural man otherwise than by the collective judgment, I am of flesh; the σάρξ, my substantial element of being, prevails on me to such an extent that the predicate made of flesh cleaves to me as if to a nature consisting of mere σάρξ. This is the Pauline τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστιν (John iii. 6). The Pauline τὸ γεγενν. ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεύμα ἐστιν follows in chap. viii. Since the σάρξ is the seat of the sin-principle (see ver. 18, comp. ver. 23), there is connected with the σάρκινος also the παραμένων ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμαρτ., sold, as a slave, under the (dominion of) sin, i.e. as completely dependent on the power of the sin-principle 1 as is a serf on the master to whom he is sold: ἦ παρὰς δοῦλον

1 These very predicates, as strong as possible, expressed without limitation, and in contrast to συνιστατική, should have precluded men from explaining it of the regenerate man, of the condition in the state of grace. Paul would have been speaking in defiance of his own consciousness (vi. 14, 22, viii. 2). See, moreover, Achelis, p. 681 ff. Theodoret has the true view: πᾶν πρὸ τοῦ χάριτος ἀνέβασαν εἰς κάθε χάριτος αὐτὸ τῶν πατέρων τοῖς πάλιν τῷ πατρὶ τῆς συνιστατικῆς ἐπισκευής τιγγυστίκης. It is true that there are, in the case of the regenerate man also, "in natura carnali reliquiae proriis morbi" (Melanchthon), and flesh and spirit are at warfare in him (viii. 5, Gal. v. 17); but he is not σάρκινος as opposed to συνιστατική, and not a slave sold to sin, else he must have fallen back again from his regenerate state. Very characteristic is the distinction, that in the case of the regenerate man the conflict is between flesh and spirit (i.e. the Holy Spirit received by him); but in that of the unregenerate man, between the flesh and his own moral reason or νοῦς, which latter succumbs, whilst in the regenerate the victory in the conflict may and must fall to the Spirit. Comp. on Gal. v. 17; also Baur, Paul. II. p. 158 f. All who have taken the subject in our passage to be the man already redeemed have necessarily fallen into the error (especially apparent in the case of Krummacher) of confounding the struggle between flesh and Spirit in the case of the regenerate person, with that described in our passage in the case of the still unregenerate man, who is not yet able to oppose the νοῦς, but only his own too weak νοῦς, to the power of sin in the flesh. From this error they should have been deterred by the very circumstance that in the entire passage (how wholly different in viii. 2 f. 1) Paul is quite silent regarding the νοῦς as a power opposed to the σάρξ and the ἀμαρτία.
Ver. 15 elucidates and assigns the reason of this relation of slavery. "For what I perform I know not," i.e. it takes place on my part without cognition of its ethical bearing, in the state of bondage of my moral reason. Analogous is the position of the slave, who acts as his master’s tool without perceiving the proper nature and the aim of what he does. Augustine, Beza, Grotius, Estius, and others, including Flatt, Glücker, Reiche, and Reithmayr, erroneously take γνώσκω as I approve, which it never means, not even in Matt. vii 23; John x. 14; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Rom. x. 19; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Ps. i. 6; Hosea viii. 4; Ecclus. xviii. 27. Hofmann’s view, however, is also incorrect, that the cognition is meant, "which includes the object in the subjectivity of the person knowing," so that the passage denies that the work and the inner life have anything in common. In this way the idea of the divine cognition, whose object is man (Gal. iv. 9; Matt. xii. 23), is extraneously imported into the passage. — οὗ γάρ δ’ θέλω κ.τ.λ.] The proof of the δ κατεργ. οὗ γνώσκω. For whosoever acts in the light of the moral cognition does not, of course, do that which is hateful to him following his practical reason (δ μοι), but, on the contrary, that towards which his moral desire is directed (δ θέλω). The person acting without that cognition, carried away by the power of sin in him, does not pursue as the aim of his activity (παράσει, comp. on i. 32) that which in the morally conscious state he would pursue, but, on the contrary, does (ποιεῖ) what in that state is abhorrent to him.¹ The ethical power of reso-

¹ The μετ’ must not be weakened, as e.g. by Th. Schott, who makes it equivalent to οὗ θέλω in ver. 16.
olution, which decides for the good, is inactive, and man does the evil that he abhors. Paul consequently ascribes to the unregenerate man also the moral wish,¹ which he has in rational self-determination; but he denies to him the action corresponding thereto, because his moral self-determination does not come into exercise in the state of his natural bondage, but he is, on the contrary, hurried away to the performance of the opposite. His θέλειν of the good and his μυστικόν of the evil are not, therefore, those of the regenerate man, because the new man, in virtue of the holy πνεῦμα, emerges from the conflict with the σάρξ as a conqueror (against Philippi); nor yet the weak velleitas of the schoolmen (Tholuck, Reithmayr, comp. Baumgarten-Crusius); but a real, decided wishing and hating (comp. ver. 16), which present, indeed, for the moral consciousness the theory of self-determination, but without the corresponding result in the issue. The "I" in θέλω and μυστικόν is conceived according to its moral self-consciousness, but in πράσσω and ποιοῖ, according to its empiric practice, which runs counter to the self-determination of that consciousness. Reiche, in consistency with his misconception of the entire representation, brings out as the pure thought of ver. 15: "the sinful Jew, as he appears in experience and history, does the evil which the Jew free from sin, as he might and should have been, does not approve." As profane analogies of the moral conflict meant by Paul, comp. Epict. Enchir. ii. 26. 4: ὁ μὲν θέλει (ὁ αμαρτών) οὐ ποιεῖ, καὶ ὁ μὴ θέλει ποιεῖ; Eur. Med. 1079: θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων (stronger) τῶν ἐμὸν βουλευμάτων, and the familiar "video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor" (Ovid, Met. vii. 19). See also Wetstein, and Spiess, Logos sperm. p. 228 f.

Ver. 16. Not an incidental inference (Rückert), but an essential carrying on of the argument, from which then ver. 17 is further inferred. For the relation of the ἐγώ to the law is in fact the very aim of the section (see ver. 25). — ὁ θέλω] where to I am unwilling, for in fact I hate it, ver. 15. By οὐ

¹ For the idea that this θέλειν has only come to exist through regeneration (Luthardt, v. freien Willen, p. 405), is perfectly foreign to the expression, especially in its close connection with ver. 14, and is a pure importation.
the \( \theta\delta\epsilon\nu\) is turned into its opposite. Comp. Baeuml. Partik. p. 278; Ameis on Homer, Odys. iii. 274. — \( \zeta\mu\nu\phi\varepsilon\mu\iota\tau\omega\ \nu\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\), \( \delta\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\omicron\) since indeed the law also desires not what I do. My conduct, therefore, so far as my desire is opposed to it, appears, according to this contradiction, as a proof that I concur with the law, that it is beautiful, i.e. morally good; the moral excellence which the law affirms of itself (e.g. Deut. iv. 8) I also agree with it in acknowledging; in point of fact, I say yes to it. Comp. also Philippi and Hofmann. The usual view: I grant to the law, that, etc., overlooks the \( \sigma\nu\nu\), and the reference of the \( \tau\phi \nu\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron \) to \( \sigma\nu\nu \) (I say with). Comp. Plat. Rep. p. 608 B, Theaet. p. 199 C, Phaed. p. 64 B; Soph. Aj. 271, Oed. R. 553; Eur. Hippol. 265; Sturz, Lex. Xen. IV. p. 153. We may add that Chrysostom, in loc., has appropriately directed attention to the \( \omicron\nu\kappa\epsilon\lambda\alpha \ \epsilon\omicron\gamma\nu\alpha\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha \) of the moral nature of man.

Ver. 17. \( N\nu\nu\ \delta\dot{\varepsilon} \) does not introduce a minor proposition attaching itself with a “but now” (Reithmayer and Hofmann)—a view which is unsuitable to the antithetical form of the expression; nor is to be taken, with Augustine, as “nunc in statu gratiae;” but it is the quite common and, in Paul's writings especially, very frequent as it is, however (see on iii. 21), that is, in this actual state of the case, however; namely, since my \( \theta\delta\epsilon\nu\omega \), notwithstanding my conduct, is not opposed to the law, but on the contrary confirms it. In connection with this view \( \omicron\nu\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota \) also is not, possibly, temporal, “pointing back to a time in which it was otherwise with the speaker” (Hofmann), namely, to what is related in vv. 7-11, but logical, as in ver. 20, xi. 6; Gal. iii. 18. What is indicated by \( N\nu\nu\ \delta\dot{\varepsilon} \) stands to \( \epsilon\gamma\omega \ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\gamma \). \( \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron \) in an excluding relation, so that after the former there can be no mention of the latter. It is the dialectic \( \textit{non jam, non item} \) (Bornemann ad Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 27; Winer, p. 547 f. [E. T. 772]; comp. Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 432). — \( \epsilon\gamma\nu\epsilon \) with emphasis: my personality proper, my self-consciousness, which is my real, morally wishing Ego. It is not this “I” that performs the evil (\( \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron \), i.e. \( \delta \omicron \ \theta\delta\epsilon\nu \), ver. 16), but the principle of sin, which has its dwelling-place in me (the phenomenal man),
enslaving my better—but against its power too weak—will, and not allowing it to attain accomplishment. That ἐν ἑμοὶ is not, like ἐγὼ, to be taken of the moral self-conscious "I," is affirmed by Paul himself in ver. 18. But it is erroneous to infer, from what he here says of the ἐγὼ, the necessity of the explanation in the sense of the regenerate person (see especially Calvin and Philippi); for if the power practising the evil be not the "I," but the potentiality of sin, this accords perfectly with the state of the σαρκικὸς, ψυχικός (1 Cor. ii. 14), ἵπτω τὴν ἀμαρτίαν πεπραμένος (ver. 14), consequently of the unregenerate, in whom sin rules, and not the grace and power of the Holy Spirit leading the moral Ego to victory. In the regenerate man dwells the Spirit (viii. 8; Gal. v. 16 f.; 1 Cor. iii. 16), who aids the "I" in conquering the sin-power of the flesh (viii. 13 ff.; Gal. v. 24).

Ver. 18. Basing of the ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκονομά ἐν ἑμοὶ ἀμαρτία in ver. 17 on the human (not: Christian) experimental consciousness of the ἐμφύτων κακόν (Wisd. xii. 10).— τοῦτ' ἐστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου] More precise definition to ἐν ἑμοὶ, by which it is designated, in order to make the meaning clear beyond all doubt, according to its aspect of self-verification here meant; and the latter is expressly distinguished from that of the moral self-consciousness, conveyed by the ἐγὼ in ver. 17.— That good, that is, moral willing and doing, consequently the opposite of ἀμαρτία, has its abode in the σάρξ of man, i.e. in his materio-physical phenomenal nature (comp. on ver. 14\(^1\)), is negatived by οὐκ ἐστὶ... ἡγαθόν, and this negation is then proved by τὸ γὰρ θέλειν κ.τ.λ. If the σάρξ, namely, were the seat of the moral nature, so that the will of the moral self-consciousness and that residing in the σάρξ harmonized, in that case there would be nothing opposed to the carrying out of that moral tendency of will; in that case, besides the willing, we should find also in man the performance of the morally beautiful (τὸ καλὸν, "quod candore moralinitet," van Hengel). On the identity of the καλὸν and the ἡγαθὸν, according to the Greek view of

morality, see Stallb. ad Plat. Sympos. p. 201 C. — παράκενται μου] lies before me (Plat. Tim. p. 69 A, Phil. p. 41 D; 2 Macc. iv. 4)—a plastic expression of the idea: there is present in me. Paul presents the matter, namely, as if he were looking around in his own person, as in a spacious sphere, to discover what might be present therein. There he sees the θέλειν (τὸ καλὸν) immediately confronting him, before his gaze; but his searching gaze fails to discover (οὐχ εὑρίσκω) the κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν. The performance of the good, therefore, is something not characteristic of the natural man, while that ἑξειν of the moral "I" is present with him. "Longe a me abest," says Grotius aptly in explanation of the reading οὐ sc. παράκενται, with which, however, οὐχ εὑρίσκω is perfectly equivalent in sense; so that to render the latter "I gain it not, i.e. I can not" (Estius, Kypke, Flatt, Tholuck, and Köllner), or, "it is to me unattainable" (Hofmann), is inconsistent with the correlative παράκενται μου, as well as the εὑρίσκω in ver. 21. Theodore has rightly noted the ground of the οὐχ εὑρίσκω: ἀσθενῶ . . . περὶ τὴν πράξιν, ἐτέραν ἑπικουρίαν (namely, that of the Holy Spirit) οὐκ ἔχων. But the ἑξιῶ, which has the willing, can not at all be the θέλειν κατεργάζεσθαι. The latter is the simple to bring about, to bring into execution (see on i. 27); and if, in order to interpret it appropriately of the regenerate person, it be made to mean, to live quite purely (Luther), or the "implere qua decet alacritate" (Calvin), or the act which is in harmony with the will sanctified by the Spirit of God (Philippi), these shades of meaning are purely imported.

Ver. 19. Proof of τὸ δὲ κατεργ. τὸ καλὸν οὐχ εὑρίσκω in ver. 18. For the good that I desire I do not; but the evil that I desire not, that I pursue. Respecting the interlocking of the relative and main clauses, see Winer, p. 155 [E. T. 205].

Ver. 20. From this follows, however, the very proposition to be proved, ver. 17, that it is not the moral self, but the sin-principle in man, that performs the evil. — οὐ θέλω] as in ver. 16.

Ver. 21. Among the numerous interpretations of this passage, which Chrysostom terms ἀσαφές εἰρημένων, and the exposition of which has been given up as hopeless by van Hengel and Rückert, the following fall to be considered:1—(1) τὸν νόμον taken generally as rule, necessity, and the like: "I find therefore for me, who am desirous of doing the good, the rule, the unavoidably determining element, that evil lies before me;" so that it is substantially the ἐπερος νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν, ver. 23, that is here meant. So, in the main, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, and others, including Ammon, Boehme, Flatt, Källner, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Nielsén, Winer, Baur, Philippi, Tholuck, Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 379, Umbreit, Krummacher, Jatho, and the latest Catholic expositors, Reithmayr, Maier, and Bisping. But it is fatal to this view, that ὁ νόμος, in accordance with the entire context, can be nothing else than the Mosaic law, since a definition altering this wonted reference of the meaning is not appended, but is only introduced in ver. 23 by the addition of ἐπερον; further, that ὅτι ἐμοί τὸ καλὸν παράκειται is not a relation that presents itself in idea as a νόμος, but, on the contrary, as something empirical, as a phenomenon of fact; and lastly, that we should have to expect τὸν νόμον, in that case, only before ὅτι. (2) τὸν νόμον understood of the Mosaic law: "I find therefore in me, who am desirous of doing the law, (namely) the good, that evil lies before me." According to this view, consequently, τὸ καλὸν is in apposition with τ. νόμον, and ὅτι κ.τ.λ. is the object of εἰρήσκω. So, in substance, Homberg, Bos, Knapp, *Sor. var. arg.* p. 389, Klee, Bornemann in *Luc.* p. lxvii, Olshausen, Fritzschc, and Krehl. But after what goes before (vv. 15–20), it is inconsistent with the context to separate ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν; and, besides, the appositional view of τὸ καλὸν is a forced expedient, feebly introducing something quite superfluous, especially after the τὸν νόμον prefixed with full emphasis. (3) τὸν νόμον likewise taken of the Mosaic law, and ὅτι taken as because: "I find therefore the law for me,

---

1 Leaving out of account Reiche's misinterpretation as to a double "I" of Jewish humanity.
who am disposed to do the good, because evil lies before me;” i.e. I find therefore that the law, so far as I have the will to do what is good, is by my side concurring with me, because evil is present with me (and therefore I need the law as συνήγορον and ἐπιτείνουτα τὸ βούλημα, see Chrysostom). So substantially the Peschito, Chrysostom, Theophylact (εὐρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον συνηγοροῦντά μοι, θέλοντι μὲν ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν, μὴ ποιοῦντι δὲ, διότι ἐμὸν παράκειται τὸ κακόν); comp. also Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Oecumenius (less clearly Theodoret), Hammond, Bengel, Semler, Morus, and my own second edition. But the idea, which according to this view would be conveyed by the dative τῷ θέλοντι ἐμὸι κ.τ.λ., must have been more definitely and expressly indicated than by the mere dativus commodi; moreover, this explanation does not harmonize with the apostle’s purpose of summing up now, as the result of his previous view, the whole misery, in which the natural man sees himself when confronted with the law; see vv. 22–25. Hofmann also, modifying his earlier similar view (Schriftbew. I. p. 549), now understands under τ. νόμον the Mosaic law, and takes ὅτι in the sense of because, but τὸ καλὸν as predicate to τ. νόμον, the dative as depending on τὸ καλὸν, and ποιεῖν, which is supposed to be without an object, as belonging to ἰδίᾳ. The speaker thus declares what he recognises the law as being, “namely, as that which to him, who is willing to do, is the good;” and he finds it so, “because the evil is at hand to him;” when he “comes to act,” the evil is there also, and presents itself to him to be done; which contradiction between the thing willed and the thing lying to his hand makes him perceive the harmony between his willing and the law, so that, namely, he “would be doing what he wills, if he were doing that which the law commands.” This extremely tortuous explanation, which first of all imports the nucleus of the thought which is supposed to be expressed so enigmatically, breaks down at the very outset by its assumption that ποιεῖν is meant to stand without object (when I come to act!), although the object (comp. vv. 15–20) stands beside it (τὸ καλὸν) and according to the entire preceding context necessarily belongs to it,—a statement as to which nothing but exegetical subjectivity can pronounce
the arbitrary verdict that it is "groundless prejudice." 

Ewald's attributive reference of τὸ κακὸν to the law is utterly erroneous: "I find therefore the law, when I desire to do what is beautiful, how it lies at hand to me as the evil." Paul assuredly could not, even in this connection, have said τὸ κακὸν of the divine law after vv. 12, 14; comp. ver. 22. (5) Abandoning all these views, I believe that τὸν νόμον is to be understood of the Mosaic law and joined with τὸ θέλοντι, that ποιεῖν is to be taken as infinitive of the purpose (Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 224), and ὅτι κ.τ.λ. as object of εὑρίσκω (comp. Esr. ii. 26): "it results to me, therefore, that, while my will is directed to the law in order to do the good, the evil lies before me." What deep wretchedness! My moral will points to the law in order to do the good, but the evil is present with me in my fleshly nature, to make the θέλειν void! What I will, that I cannot do. In connection with this view, observe: (a) That the position of the words τὸν νόμον τὸ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ serves, without any harshness, to set forth τὸν νόμον emphatically, just as often also in classical writers the substantive with the article is emphatically prefixed to the participle with the article, on which it depends (see Kühner ad Xen. Mem. i. 6. 13; Bornemann and Kühner ad Anab. v. 6, 7; Krüger, § 50, 10. 1; Bernhardy, p. 461);—

1 Th. Schott does not indeed commit the mistake of separating ςαίνοι from τί καλίν, but he introduces in another way what is not in the text: "I find the law for me, who am willing to do good, such an one as leaves the matter on the footing, that to me, etc."

2 The objections urged against my explanation are very unimportant. It is said, in particular, that the inversion νῶ ἔσωμεν τῷ θελοντι is harsh (Delitzsch), forced (Philippi), strange and meaningless (Hofmann). But it is not harsher than the numerous perfectly similar hyperbata found in all classic authors (comp. e.g. Xen. Mem. i. 6. 13, where the Sophists are termed τὴν σεβίσαι ὅλην καλίν, Plat. Apol. p. 39 C: ἐμαυτός ὅλην ἡλιξάμενος, Herod. vii. 184: τὰ καὶ κλέψεις τῶν ἱλαστήρων, Thuc. vi. 64. 5: καίτοι τῶν ἱλαστήρων, and Poppo in loc.; also Kühner, Gramm. II. 1, p. 532); and so far from being meaningless, the inverted arrangement, very appropriately to the sense, lays a great emphasis upon τί νῶμεν. For the νῶμεν, as the divine record of the καλίν, in contrast to the καλίν which lies in man, has the stress, which does not rest upon θελοντι (Hofmann). Observe how the idea of the law is prominent and pervading down to the end of the chapter, and then again in viii. 2 ff. Least of all in the case of such an extremely difficult passage should people suppose that they may dismiss a linguistically unassailable explanation by vague and merely dogmatical objections.
(b) That ἐλευθερία with the accusative as object of the willing, i.e. of the moral striving and longing, of desire and love, is particularly frequent in the LXX. (see also Matt. xxvii. 43 and the remark thereon); compare here, especially, Isa. v. 24: οὕτως ἡθελήσαν τῶν νόμων κυρίου. (c) Finally, how aptly the συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ κ.τ.λ. in the illustrative clause that follows, ver. 22, harmonizes with the τῶν νόμων τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ; while the subsequent μέτα τῇ ἐποίᾳ νόμῳ κ.τ.λ., in ver. 23, answers to the οὐκ ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται.— The dative τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ is that of the ethical reference: deprehendo mihi, experience proves it to me. Comp. εἰρῆθη μου, ver. 10; Hom. Od. xxii. 304: οὐδεὶς πρῶτο κακὸν εὑρέτω οἰνοβαρέλων. Soph. Ag. 1144: τὰ φθείρα τὰ ἀν οὐκ ἂν εὕρεσι. O. R. 546: ἐνυπνευμένη γὰρ καὶ βαρύν σ' εὑρετε ἐμοὶ. Oed. C. 970: οὐκ ἂν ἔξευρεν ἐμοὶ ἄμαρτίας δενδός συδέν. Plat. Rep. p. 421 E; Eur. Ion. 1407.

Vv. 22, 23. Antithetical illustration of ver. 21.— συνήδομαι τ. νόμῳ τ. Θεοῦ] The compound nature of the verb is neither to be overlooked (as by Beza and others, including Ruckert and Reiche), nor to be taken as a strengthening of it (Köllner), or as apud animum meum lactor (Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, Tholuck, and Philippi). It means: I rejoice with, which sense alone consists with linguistic usage (Plat. Rep. p. 462 E; Dem. 519. 10, 579. 19; Soph. Oed. C. 1398; Eur. Med. 136; Sturz, Lex. Xen. IV. p. 184; Reisig, Enarr. Soph. Oed. C. 1398). By this, however, we are not to understand the joy over the law, shared with others (van Hengel and others)—an idea here foreign to the connection; nor yet the joyful nature of taking part in the law (Hofmann), whereby the necessary conception of joy in common falls away; but rather: I rejoice with the law of God, so that its joy (the law being personified) is also mine. It is the agreement of moral sympathy in regard to what is good. Comp. on σύμφημι in ver. 16. So also συμπιέσεις τινι, συμαλγέως τινι, κ.τ.λ.; similarly συλλυπούμενος, Mark iii. 5. Rightly given in the Vulgate: "condelector legi (not lege) Dei." Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 6: συγκαρτέρει τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ. The Mosaic law is described as νόμος Θεοῦ (genit. auctoris) in contrast to the ἑτέρος νόμος,
which is the law opposed to God. — *κατὰ τὸ ἔσω ἄνθρωπον.\] The rational and moral nature of man, determined by conscience (ii. 15), is, as the inward man, distinguished from the outward man that appears in the body and its members.\] ς φωνή in its contrast to σάρξ designates the same thing a potiori; see on Eph. iii. 16, 2 Cor. iv. 16; also 1 Pet. iii. 4, and Huther in loc. Philo (p. 533, Mang.) terms it ἄνθρωπος εν ἄνθρωπω. — \[εὐθεία\] Here also Paul represents himself as a spectator of his own personality, and as such he sees, etc. — ἐργαζομαι a law of another nature, not ἀλλοι. Comp. ver. 4, and on Gal. i. 6. — ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μοι so. ἔνεργα, correlative, even by its posi-

1 It is erroneous to discover in the expression the designation of the regenerate man (Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Calovius, Krummacher, and others), or to say (as Delitzsch does) that Paul means the higher better self produced or liberated by the grace of the discipline of the law (Psychol. p. 380). The unregenerate man also, whether the law have already taken him into its training or not, has the ἐκκατοριομεα, and the connection alone must decide whether the ἐκκατοριομεα of the passage relates to the redeemed or the unredeemed. The inner man is that which receives the Spirit and grace (comp. 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16), and not the work of these. The latter is the new man (Eph. ii. 10, iv. 24). In our passage the entire connection decides that it is the ἐκκατοριομεα of the unregenerate man which is meant, in his relation to the law; to him also belongs, as respects his moral "I" (although this is quite arbitrarily denied by Philippi, following Melancthon, and many others), the συνεκκατοριομεα τί τίνι ὁ Θεός (comp. ii. 15), and it must belong to him, since the sinful nature has its seat and home in the ὁμοιόμενος, v. 18, 25, as the antithesis of the ἀτόμος. This does not indeed consist with the assumption that it is precisely the higher powers of the natural man that by nature are at diametrical variance with God and His law (Form. Conc. p. 640 f.), but it nevertheless rests on an exegetical basis. Comp. on Eph. iii. 16. The σάρξ, however, with the power of sin dwelling in it, overpowers the ἀνθρωπος, so that it becomes in bondage, darkened, and in the activity of its conscience blunt and perverted; hence it requires renewal (xii. 2): comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. § 95. There remains, therefore, the necessity for redemption of the whole natural man, as also his incapacity for self-attainment of salvation; and it is an error to see in that contradiction to the Formula Concordiae sought to shake the Pauline doctrine of atonement and justification by faith alone (Delitzsch). Delitzsch brings against me the charge of being un-Lutheran and unbiblical. The latter I must deny; the former does not affect me as exegete, since as such I have only to inquire what is exegetically right or wrong. Philippi, p. 307, ed. 3, note, quotes against me authorities (of very various kinds) which as such prove nothing; and reminds me of the position of investigation as to the idea of the σάρξ. I may be trusted to possess some acquaintance with the position of such investigations, including even those which the respected theologian has not embraced in his quotations and to some extent could not yet do so.
tion, with κατὰ τὸν ἐσω άνθρωπον. Fritzsche and Hofmann join ἐν τοῖς μέλ. μου ἀντιστρατ.,\(^1\) whereby, however, the importance of the added elements ἀντιστρατ. κ.τ.λ. is more subordinated to the ἐν τ. μέλ. μου, and the symmetry of the discourse unnecessarily disturbed; comp. below, τῷ ὑπὲρ ἐν τοῖς μέλ. μου. The members, as the instruments of activity of the σάρξ, are, seeing that the σάρξ itself is ruled by sin (vv. 18, 25), that in which the power of sin (the dictate of the sin-principle, ὁ νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτ.) pursues its doings. This activity in hand, eye, etc. (comp. vi. 13, 19), is directed against the dictate of the moral reason, and that with the result of victory; hence the figures drawn from war, ἀντιστρατ. and also αἰχμαλωτ. — The νόμος τοῦ νοῦ—in which the genitive is neither to be taken as that of the subject (Fritzsche: "quam mens mea constituit;") comp. Hofmann, "which man gives to himself"), nor exegetically (Th. Schott), but locally, corresponding to the ἐν τοῖς μέλ. μου—is not identical with the νόμος τ. Θεοῦ in ver. 22 (Usteri, Köllner, Olshausen, and others), just because the latter is the positive law of God, the law of Moses; but it is the regulator of the συνήθεσθαι τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (ver. 22), implied in the moral reason and immanent in the νοῦς. As to νοῦς, which is here, in accordance with the connection, the reason in its practical activity, the power of knowledge in its moral quality as operating to determine the moral will,\(^2\) see Stirm in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1834, 3, p. 46 ff.; Beck, bibl. Seelenl. p. 49 ff.; Delitzsch, p. 179; Kluge in the Jahrb. f. D. Th. 1871, p. 327. The form νοῦς belongs to the later Greek. See Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 453. — καὶ αἰχμαλ. κ.τ.λ.] and makes me prisoner-of-war to the law of sin (makes me subject to the power of the sin-principle) which is in my members. The με does not denote the inner man, the νοῦς (Olshausen), for it, regarded in itself, continues in the service of the law of God (ver. 25); but the apparent man, who would follow the leading of the νοῦς. He it is, for the control of whom the law of sin contends with the moral law. The former conquers, and

---

\(^1\) Compare Th. Schott, who however renders is: in the power of my members.

\(^2\) Consequently the morally willing faculty of the human νοῦς. Comp. (against Holsten) Pfleiderer in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1871, p. 165 f.; Kluge i.e.
thereby, while the moral law has lost its influence over him, makes him its prisoner-of-war (Luke xxii. 24; 2 Cor. x. 5); so that he is now — to express the same idea by another figure — πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τ. ἁμαρτίαν, ver. 14, — a trait of the gloomy picture, which likewise does not apply to the condition of the redeemed, viii. 2. — τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτ.] is identical with the νόμος that was previously, without more precise definition, called ἐτερος νόμος. Instead, namely, of saying: "and made me its prisoner," Paul characterizes—as he could not avoid doing in order to complete the antithesis—the victorious law, not previously characterized, as that which it is, and says: αἷμαλ. μὲ τ. νόμῳ ἁμαρτ. Here τ. ἁμαρτ. is the genitivus auctoris; τ. νόμῳ, however, is not instrumental (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact), but can only be taken as the dative of reference (commodi). The observation τῷ δυντ ἐν τοῖς μελετί μου, emphatically added to make the disgrace more palpably felt, obviates the misconception that a power different from the ἐτερος νόμος was meant. We must dismiss, therefore, the distinctions unsupported by evidence that (following Origen, Jerome, and Oecumenius, but not Ambrosiaster) have been attempted; e.g. recently by Köllner, who thinks that the ἐτερος νόμος means the demands of the sensuous nature, so far as they manifest themselves in individual cases as bodily lusts, while the νόμος τ. ἁμαρτ. is the sensuous nature itself conceived as a sinful principle; or by de Wette, who thinks that the former is the proneness to sin which expresses itself in the determinableness of the will by the sensuous nature, while the latter is the same proneness, so far as it conflicts with the law of God, and by the completed resolution actually enters into antagonism thereto (comp. Umbreit); or by Ewald (comp. also Grotius and van Hengel), who thinks that Paul here distinguishes two pairs of kindred laws: (1) the eternal law of God, and alongside of it, but too weak in itself, the law of reason; and (2) the law of desire, and along with it, as still mightier, the law of sin. Similarly also Delitzsch, Reimarus, and Hofmann. The latter distinguishes the law of sin from the law in the members, in such a way that the former is prescribed by sin, as the lawgiver, to all those who are subject
to it; the latter, on the contrary, rules in the bodily nature of the individual, as soon as the desire arises in him—
aixmawardeiwo belongs to the age of Diodorus, Josephus, etc. (aixmawardeiwo is still later). See Thom. Mag. p. 23; Lobeck ad Phryn. p. 442.

Ver. 24. The marks of parenthesis in which many include vv. 24, 25, down to 'hmuov, or (Grotius and Flatt) merely ver. 25 down to 'hmuov, should be expunged, since the flow of the discourse is not once logically interrupted.—tauairwvopos k.t.l. The oppressive feeling of the misery of that captivity finds utterance thus. Here also Paul by his "I" represents the still unredeemed man in his relation to the law. Only with the state of the latter, not with the consciousness of the regenerate man, as if he "as it were" were crying ever afresh for a new Redeemer from the power of the sin still remaining in him (Philippi), does this wail and cry for help accord. The regenerate man has that which is here sighed for, and his mood is that which is opposite to the feeling of wretchedness and death, v. 1 ff., viii. 1 ff.; being that of freedom, of overcoming, of life in Christ, and of Christ in him, of peace and joy in the Holy Spirit, of the new creature, to which old things have passed away. Comp. Jul. Müller, v. d. Sünde, I. p. 458 f., ed. 5. The objection of Reiche, that Paul would, according to this view, speak of himself while he was thinking of men of quite an opposite frame of mind, is not valid; for that longing, which he himself had certainly felt very deeply in his pre-Christian life, and into whose painful feelings he transports himself back all the more vividly from the standpoint of his blissful state of redemption, could not but, in the

1 Calovius gives the right view: "Lex membrorum et lex peccati idem sunt, ut e verbis apostoli (d) τῷ εἴμη τῷ ἁμάρτιος τῷ ἐν κατείς μιλεῖ μου λιγεί."
The clear words themselves do not convey, moreover, the distinction between the produced and the producer (Delitzsch); but, on the contrary, the law of sin coincides completely with the law of the members, as already Augustine perceived, de nupt. et concup. i. 30: "captivantem sub lege peccati, h. e. sub se ipsa."
Comp. also Theodore of Mopseustia, who declares himself expressly and decidedly against the interpretation of our passage as pointing to four laws.

2 This applies also against Delitzsch's assertion, that the very form of this lamentation shows that it proceeds from the breast of a converted person. How natural is it, rather, that Paul should represent the redemption, as he had him-
consistent continuation of the idiosis, be here individualized and realized as present through his ἔγώ. And this he could do the more unhesitatingly, since no doubt could thereby be raised in the minds of his readers regarding his present freedom from the ταλαντωρία over which he sighs. Reiche himself, curiously enough, regards ver. 24 as the cry for help of Jewish humanity, to which “a redeemed one replies” in viii. 1; ver. 25, standing in the way, being a gloss! — ταλαιπ. ἔγω ἄνθρ. ] Nominative of exclamation: O wretched man that I am! See Kühner, II. 1, p. 41; Winer, p. 172 [E.T. 228].— ταλαιπ., Rev. iii. 17, very frequent in the tragedians: Plat. Euthyd. p. 302 B; Dem. 548. 12, 425. 11. — μῦσται] Purely future. In the depth of his misery the longing after a deliverer as if in despair: who will it be? — ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τ. θανάτου τούτου] τούτου might indeed grammatically be joined to σώματος (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estins, and many others, including Olshausen, Philippi, Hofmann, and Th. Schott), since one may say, τὸ σῶμα τ. θ. τούτο; but the sense is against it. For that which weighs upon him, namely, the being dependent on the body as captive of the law of sin, lies in the fact that the body belongs to this death, i.e. to the death incurred by sin (which is not physical, but eternal death, comp. ver. 10 ff.), consequently to this shameful death, as its seat; not in the fact that this relation takes place in the present body, or in a present time posited with the quality of the earthly body. If the words of the person who exclaims should amount to no more than “the hopeless wish to get rid of the body, in which he is compelled to live,” without expressing, however, the desire to be dead (Hofmann), they would yield a very confused conception. Moreover, by postponing the pronoun, Paul would only have expressed himself very unintelligibly, had his self experienced it, and whose triumphant bliss he bore in his own bosom, as the object of the longing and sighing of the still unredeemed! And who can assert that he himself sighed otherwise, before Christ laid hold on him! Thus we here listen to the echo of what was once forced from his own breast. Where such sighing occurs, it is not the state of grace of the converted, but merely the operation of the so-called gratia praeveniens (comp. the Erlangen Zeitschrift, 1864, 6, p. 378 ff.).

1 Comp. Ex. x. 17: περιλίστο ἀν' ἵμαυ το ἡλίατον τούτον.
meaning been *hoc corpus mortis*, and not *corpus mortis hujus* (Vulgate). Comp. Acts v. 20, xiii. 26. The correct explanation therefore is: "Who shall deliver me, so that I be no longer dependent on the body, which serves as the seat of so shameful a death?" or, in other words: "Who shall deliver me out of bondage under the law of sin into moral freedom, in which my body shall no longer serve as the seat of this shameful death?" Comp. viii. 9, vi. 6, vii. 5, 10 ff.; Col. ii. 11. With what vivid and true plastic skill does the deeply-stirred emotion of the apostle convey this meaning! underneath which, no doubt, there likewise lies the longing "after a release from the sinful natural life" (Th. Schott). In detail, τίς μὲν ἐπέστησεν corresponds with the αἴχμαλωτίς με τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμ. in ver. 23; ἐκ τοῦ σώμ. with the τῷ ὑπό ἐν τοῖς μέλεσι μον in ver. 23; and τοῦτον denotes the death as occasioned by the tragic power of sin just described also in ver. 23; the genitive relation is the same as in vi. 6. The rendering "mortal body" is condemned by the close connection of τοῦτον with θανάτου, whether (inconsistently enough with the context, see vv. 23, 25, viii. 1, 2) there be discovered in the words the longing for death (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Erasmus, Pareus, Estius, Clericus, Balduin, Koppe, and others), or, with Olshausen (introducing what is foreign to the argument), the longing "only to be redeemed from the mortal body, i.e. from the body that through sin has become liable to perish, so that the Spirit may make it alive." Finally, as in vi. 6, so also here, those explanations are to be rejected which, in arbitrary and bold deviation from the Pauline usage, take σῶμα not of the human body, but as "mortifera peccati massa" (Calvin, Cappel, Homberg, Wolf); or: "the system of sensual propensities (σῶμα), which is the cause of death" (Flatt); or: "death conceived as a monster with a body, that threatens to devour the ἐγώ" (Reiche).

Ver. 25. Not Paul himself for himself alone, but, as is shown by the following ἄρα οὖν κ.τ.λ., the same collective "I" that the apostle has personated previously, speaks here also—expressing, after that anguish-cry of longing, its feeling of deep thankfulness toward God that the longed-for deliverance has
actually come to it through Christ. There is not change of person, but change of scene. Man, still unredeemed, has just been bewailing his wretchedness out of Christ; now the same man is in Christ, and gives thanks for the bliss that has come to him in the train of his cry for help. — εἰκαριστῶ τ. Θεοῦ] For what? is not expressed, quite after the manner of lively emotion; but the question itself, ver. 24, and the διὰ Η'. Χ., prevent any mistake regarding it. — διὰ Ἡ'. Χ. αἰτίου δόντος τῆς εἰκαριστίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτὸς γὰρ, φησὶ, κατώρθωσεν & ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἤπνηθή αὐτὸς με ἐρρύσατο ἐκ τῆς ἁθενείας τοῦ σώματος, ἐνδυναμώσας αὐτὸ, ὡστε μηκέτι παρανοεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. Thus, to the apostle Christ is the mediator of his thanks,—of the fact itself, however, that he gives thanks to God, not the mediator through whom he brings his thanks to God (Hofmann). Comp. on i. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 57; Col. iii. 17; similar is ἐν ὀνόματι, Eph. v. 20. — ἄρα οὖν] infers a concluding summary of the chief contents of vv. 14-24, from the immediately preceding εἰκαριστῶ . . . . ἡμῶν. Seeing, namely, that there lies in the foregoing expression of thanks the thought: "it is Jesus Christ, through whom God has saved me from the body of this death," it follows thence, and that indeed on a retrospective glance at the whole exposition, ver. 14 ff., that the man himself, out of Christ—his own personality, alone and confined to itself—achieves nothing further than that he serves, indeed, with his νοῦς the law of God, but with his ἁμρίξις is in the service of the law of sin. It has often been assumed that this recapitulation does not connect itself with the previous thanksgiving, but that the latter is rather to be regarded as a parenthetical interruption (see especially Rückert and Fritzsche); indeed, it has even been conjectured that ἄρα οὖν . . . . ἁμαρτίας originally stood immediately after ver. 23 (Venema, Wassenbergh, Keil, Lachmann, Praef. p. X, and van Hengel). But the right sense of ἀρδεῖ εἰγώ is thus misconceived. It has here no other meaning than I myself, in the sense, namely, I for my own person, without that higher saving intervention, which I owe to Christ.¹ The con-

¹ So also, substantially, Hofmann and Th. Schott; comp. Baur, Reithmayr, Bisping, Märcker, and Delitzsch, p. 383. Wrongly interpreted by Thomasius, Rom. II.
trast with others, which αὐτὸς with the personal pronoun indicates (comp. ix. 3, xv. 14; Herm. ad Vīg. p. 735; Ast, Lex. Plat. I. p. 317), results always from the context, and is here evident from the emphatic διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and, indeed, so that the accent falls on αὐτός.1 Overlooking this antithetic relation of the “I myself,” Pareus, Homberg, Estius, and Wolf conceived that Paul wished to obviate the misconception as if he were not speaking in the entire section, and from ver. 14 onwards in particular, as a regenerate man; Kölner thinks that his object now is to establish still more strongly, by his own feeling, the truth of what he has previously advanced in the name of humanity. Others explain: “just I,” who have been previously the subject of discourse (Grotius, Reiche, Tholuck, Krehl, Philippi, Maier, and van Hengel; comp. Fritzsche: “ipse ego, qui meam vicem deploravi,” and Ewald); which is indeed linguistically unobjectionable (Bernhardy, p. 290), but would furnish no adequate ground for the special emphasis which it would have. Others, again, taking αὐτός as equivalent to ὁ αὐτός (see Schaefer, Melet. p. 65; Herm. ad Soph. Antig. 920, Opusc. I. p. 332 f.; Dissen ad Pind. p. 412): ego idem: “cui convenit sequens distributio, qua viseris posset unus homo in duos veluti secari,” Beza. So also Erasmus, Castalio, and many others; Klee and Rückert. But in this view also the connection of ἀπα τῇ.. with the foregoing thanksgiving is arbitrarily abandoned; and the above use of αὐτός, as synonymous with ὁ αὐτός, is proper to Ionic poetry, and is not sanctioned by the N. T. Olshausen, indeed, takes αὐτός as ὁ, the one and the same (have in me a twofold element), but rejects the usual view, that ἄπα . . . ἀμαρτιάς is a recapitulation of ver. 14 ff., and makes the new section begin with ver. 25;2 so that, after the experience of

I. p. 278: according to my Ego proper. The αὐτός ἰδιός is, in fact, at the same time the subject of the second clause.

1 It is maintained without due reason by Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 91 A, that if αὐτός stand before the personal pronoun (as here), the latter has the emphasis, and vice versa. The striking vivacity of Greek discourse has not bound itself down so mechanically. Comp. Bremer ad Dem. Phil. I. 24, p. 128; Herm. Opusc. I. p. 322 ff. In the particular cases the connection must decide.

2 The section is also made to begin with ver. 25 by Th. Schott and Hofmann;
redemption has been indicated by ἐκαρποῦ κ.τ.λ., the completely altered inner state of the man is now described; in which new state the νοῦς appears as emancipated and serving the law of God, and only the lower sphere of the life as still remaining under the law of sin. But against this view we may urge, firstly, that Paul would have expressed himself inaccurately in point of logic, since in that case he must have written: ἄρα οὐν αὐτῶς ἐγὼ τῇ μὲν σαρκὶ δουλεύω νομῷ ἀμαρτίας, τῷ δὲ νοτ νομῷ Θεοῦ; secondly, that according to vv. 2, 3, 9 ff. the redeemed person is entirely liberated from the law of sin; and lastly, that if the redeemed person remained subject to the law of sin with the σάρξ, Paul could not have said οὐδὲν κατάκριμα κ.τ.λ. in ver. 1; for see vv. 7–9. Umbreit takes it as: even I; a climactic sense, which is neither suggested by the context, nor in keeping with the deep humility of the whole confession.— δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ] in so far as the desire and striving of my moral reason (see on ver. 23) are directed solely to the good, consequently submitted to the regulative standard of the divine law. At the same time, however, in accordance with the double character of my nature, I am subject with my σάρξ (see on ver. 18) to the power of sin, which preponderates (ver. 23), so that the direction of will in the νοῦς does not attain to the κατεργάζεσθαι.

Remark 1. The mode in which we interpret vv. 14–25 is of decisive importance for the relation between the Church-doctrine of original sin, as more exactly expressed in the Formula Concordiae, and the view of the apostle; inasmuch as if in ver. 14 ff. it is the unredeemed man under the law and its discipline, and not the regenerate man who is under grace, that is spoken of, then Paul affirms regarding the moral nature of the former and concedes to it what the Church-doctrine decidedly denies to the former with ἔμα εἰ, and the latter with ἑκαρποῦ. But it is only with οὐδὲν κατάκριμα that the new scene opens, of which the cry of thanksgiving, ver. 25, was only a previous glimpse broken off again by ἄρα οὐν αὐτῶς ἔγνω λέγ. κ.τ.λ.

1 It employs our passage (see p. 660) for the inference: "Si autem in beatæ ap. Paulus et alii rematae hominibus naturale vel carnale liberum arbitrium etiam post regenerationem legi divinae repugnat, quanto magis ante regenerationem legi et voluntati Dei rebellabit et inimicum erit."
it\(^1\)—comparing it (*Form. Conc.* p. 661 f.) with a stone, a block, a pillar of salt—in a way that cannot be justified (in opposition to Frank, *Theol. d. Concordienformel*, I. p. 138 f.). Paul clearly ascribes to the higher powers of man (his reason and moral will) the assent to the law of God; while just as clearly, moreover, he teaches the great disproportion in which these natural moral powers stand to the predominance of the sinful power in the flesh, so that the *liberum arbitrium in spiritualibus* is wanting to the natural man, and only emerges in the case of the converted person (viii. 2). And this want of moral freedom proceeds from the power of sin, which is, according to ver. 8 ff., posited even with birth, and which asserts itself in opposition to the divine law.

*Remark 2.* How many a Jew in the present day, earnestly concerned about his salvation, may, in relation to his law, feel and sigh just as Paul has here done; only with this difference, that unlike Paul he cannot add the *ἐκαστήρ τῷ Θεῷ* x.r.x. I

Chapter VIII.

Ver. 1. After Ἰησοῦ Elz. has μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα, which, following Mill, Griesb. and subsequent critics have expunged. The words are wanting either entirely, or at least as to the second half, in a preponderance of codd., vss., and Fathers, and are an old inapposite gloss from ver. 4.—Ver. 2. μὲ] B F G N, Syr. Tert. Chrys. have σ, which Tisch. 8. has adopted. Repetition in copying of the preceding syllable.—Ver. 11. διὰ τὸ ἵνα καὶ διὰ τὸ πνεῦμα] So Griesb., Matth., Scholz, Fritzsche, Lachm. and Tisch. 7., following Erasmus, Mill, and Bengel. The Recepta, again adopted by Tisch. 8., is διὰ τοῦ ἰνοκοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεῦματος. The witnesses (for an accurate examination of which see Reiche, Commentar. crit. I. p. 54 ff.) are so divided, that there is on neither side a decisive preponderance, although, besides A and C, N also supports the genitive. The thought of itself, also, equally admits either reading. A decision between them can only be arrived at through the circumstance that the passage came to be discussed in the Macedonian controversy, wherein the Macedonians accused the orthodox of having falsified the ancient codices, when the latter appealed to the Recepta and asserted that it stood in all the ancient codd. See Maxim. Dial c. Maced. 3. in Athanas. Opp. II. p. 452. This charge, though retorted by the orthodox on the Macedonians, is worthy of credit, because διὰ τὸ ἤ. already predominates in Origen and the oldest vss. (also Syr. Vulg.); consequently that assertion of the orthodox appears erroneous. The Recepta, indeed, is found in Clem. Strom. III. p. 344, CommeL 545. Pott.; but this single trace of its high antiquity loses its weight in opposition to the here specially important vss. and Origen (also Tert. and Iren.), and in the face of these bears the suspicion of orthodox alteration having been wrought on the text of Clement. It is possible, however, that even long previous to the Macedonian controversy the questions and disputes respecting the Holy Spirit may have occasioned now and again the changing of διὰ τὸ x. r. λ. into διὰ τοῦ x. r. λ. At all events, the dogmatic interest attached to both readings is too great and too well attested to admit of διὰ τοῦ x. r. λ. being referred, with
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Bengel and Fritzsche, to a mere error in copying. In the controversy the genitive only (as introducing a relation different from that obtaining with the previous abstracts δι' ἀμαρτίαν and διὰ δικαιοσύνην) must have been welcome to the orthodox in defending the personality of the σωτὴρ. Among modern commentators, Rückert, Reiche, Philippi, van Hengel, and Hofmann have declared for the accusative; whilst de Wette, Krehl, Tholuck, and also Ewald, adopt the genitive.—Ver. 13. τοῦ σώμ.

DEFG, Vulg. It. Or. (who, however, gives both readings) all read τῆς σαρκός, which Griesb. recommended. An interpretation in the sense of the preceding.—Ver. 14. σιῶν θεοῦ] Since among the uncials A C D E N read θεοῦ θεοῦ, while B F G have θεοῦ σιῶν θεοῦ (so Lachm. and Tisch.), we must regard the Recepta as at all events too weakly attested. The preference belongs, however, to θεοῦ σιῶν, because the omitted σιῶν (it is absent also in the Sahid.) would be more easily inserted again at the beginning or end than in the middle.—Ver. 23. καὶ αὐτοὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῆς πρεσβείας ἡμῶν] So Elz. The variations are very numerous. The readings to be taken into account, besides the Recepta, are—(1) καὶ αὐτοὶ τ. ἁμαρτίας τοῦ πρεσβ. ἡμῶν. ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ: so B, Meth. Tisch. 7.;—(2) καὶ αὐτοὶ τ. ἡμῶν αὐτοὶ τ. ἁμαρτίας τ. πρεσβ. τ. ἡμῶν. αὐτοὶ: so D F G, Ambros. Fritzsche;—(3) καὶ αὐτοὶ τ. ἁμαρτίας τ. πρεσβείας ἡμῶν] καὶ αὐτοὶ: so Lachm. and, without bracketing ἡμῶν, Tisch. 8., following A C N, min. Copt. Dam. The first of the three seems to have been the original reading; ἡμῶν is an addition by way of gloss, which was written, in some cases, immediately beside the first καὶ αὐτοὶ (thus arose the reading of Fritzsche), and in some cases only beside the second, thus producing the reading of A C N, as well as the Recepta. With the reading of Fritzsche the second καὶ disappeared, because, after the insertion of ἡμῶν had taken place in the first part, the subsequent καὶ αὐτοὶ was no longer taken analeptically, and therefore καὶ was found to be merely confusing. The reading αὐτοὶ τ. ἁμαρτίας τ. πρεσβείας ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ has so exceedingly weak attestation, that on that very ground it ought (against Bengel and Rinck) to be rejected.—υἱοθεσία] wanting in D F G, codd. of It. Ambrosiaster. But how easily it came to be omitted, when the υἱοθεσία was viewed as something already possessed!—Ver. 24. τὰ καὶ] B** E F G, Syr. Vulg. codd. of It. and some Fathers have only τὰ. So Lachm. But the very absence of need for the καὶ occasioned its omission.—Ver. 26. τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.] Approved by Griesb., adopted also by Lachm. and Tisch. But Elz. and Scholz have τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, against decisive testimony. The sing. is also supported by τῆς δικαιοσύνης in F G, which is an explanatory addition to τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. Comp.
Ambros.: "infirmitatem nostrae orationis." The plural was substituted for the collective singular.— The reading προσονέμομεναι (Griesb. and others have προσονέμομενα) is decisively attested. — After ἵσπερνα, Elz. and Scholz have ἵσπερ ήμῶν, which, following A B D F G Ν* al. Arm. and Fathers, Lachm. and Tisch. have expunged. A defining addition.— Ver. 28. After συνεργεῖ Lachm. reads ἵσπερ, in accordance with A B, Or. It was readily believed that, on account of ver. 27 and 29, άναρα must be understood as accusative and God as subject.— Ver. 34. μᾶλλον ή καί] Lachm. and Tisch. 8. have only μᾶλλον ή, in accordance with A B C Ν, min. vss. and Fathers. But between ή καί and Εγν. the seemingly unmeaning καί was easily overlooked and omitted. — The omission of the second καί (behind the first ή) is less strongly attested by A C Ν, and may be sufficiently explained by non-attention to the emphasis of the thrice-used word.— Ver. 36. ἵσπερ] According to A B D F G Λ Ν 17. al. ἵσπερ is, with Griesb., Lachm., Tisch., and Scholz, to be substituted. See LXX. Ps. xlv. 23.— Ver. 37. τοῦ ἁγαστά] D E F G, vss. and Fathers read τοῦ ἁγαστάσαντα, which has against it the Oriental witnesses, and seems to be an alteration in accordance with an erroneous exposition of τ. ἁγαστ. τ. Χριστοῦ in ver. 35 (see the exegetical remarks on that passage). — Ver. 38. οὗτοι ἔσονται. οὗτοι μίλλα., οὗτοι δυνάμεις] So also Griesb., Lachm., Tisch., and Scholz. But Elz. has οὗτοι δυνάμ., οὗτοι ἔσονται. οὗτοι μίλλα. Against greatly preponderating evidence. A transposition, because δυν. seemed to belong to the category of ἁγαστ. The evidence in favour of οὗτοι δυνάμ., moreover, is so decisive and so unanimous, that it cannot, with Fritzsche, be regarded as an addition from 1 Pet. iii. 22, 1 Cor. xv. 24, or Eph. i. 21. Tholuck, Philippi, and Ewald reject these words. But their various position in different witnesses is quite explained by supposing that their place behind μίλλα., as well as their general isolation, were regarded as surprising and confusing.

Chap. viii. Happy condition of man in Christ. — The certainty of salvation, which is represented in chap. v. 1 f. as the effect of justification by faith, appears here as brought about through the moral freedom attained in Christ. We see from this, that Paul conceived of faith not otherwise than as producing this freedom; so that faith is not only that which appropriates the atonement, but also the continuous subjective source and motive power of the divine life up to the final attain-
ment of bliss. See Luther’s Preface, also his utterances quoted by Ritschl, Rechtfert u. Versöhnung, I. p. 142 ff., 180 f.

Vv. 1–11. Accordingly, the Christian is aloof from all condemnation, because he is free from the law of sin—a result which the Mosaic law could not accomplish, but which God has accomplished through Christ. Yet he must live according to the Spirit, and not according to the flesh; for the latter works death, but the former life.

Ver. 1. “Ἀποστάσεως” draws an inference from the immediately preceding αὐτὸς ἐγώ . . . ἀμαρτίας. If I, for my own person, left to myself, am subject indeed with the reason to the law of God, but with the flesh to the law of sin, then it follows that now, after Christ (as deliverer from the law of sin, ver 2) has interposed, there is no condemnation, etc. This inference, and not that one must be in Christ, in order to get rid of every condemnation (Hofmann), is indicated by γὰρ in ver. 2 as a matter of fact that has become historical. It is arbitrary to seek a connection with anything more remotely preceding (Hofmann, Koppe, Fritzche, Philippi, and Bisping, with εὐχαριστῶ . . . ἡμῶν in vii. 25; according to Bengel, Knapp, and Winzer, with vii. 6); but to suppose in ἄρα “a forestalling of the following γὰρ” (Tholuck), is linguistically just as mistaken as in the case of διό in ii. 1. Moreover, the emphasis is not upon νῦν, but on the prefixed οὐδέν: no condemnation therefore, none is now applicable, after that αὐτὸς ἐγώ κ.τ.λ. has been changed through Christ, etc. This applies against Philippi’s objection, that, according to our conception of the connection, νῦν should have been placed at the beginning. But the objection, that Paul must have continued with δέ instead of ἄρα, is removed by the observation that in the αὐτὸς ἐγώ, properly understood, really lies the very premiss of the altered relation.—νῦν] temporally, in contrast to the former state of the case. Comp. vii. 6. Philippi erroneously holds ἄρα νῦν as equivalent to ἄρα οὖν — which it never is — being forced thereto by the theory that the regenerate person is the subject of discussion in chap. vii. 14 ff. Hofmann’s view, how-

1 On vv. 1–11 see Winzer, Progr. 1828. — On ver. 3, particularly the words ἐν ἴμπαται σωσίσαμεν ἀμαρτίας, see Overbeck in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr. 1869, p. 178 ff.
ever, that \( \nu \nu \) contrasts the present with the future \( \alpha i \omega n \) (even now, during the life in the flesh), is also incorrect. Nothing in the context suggests it, and it must have been expressed in some such way as by \( \eta \eta \), or by a defining addition. — \( \eta \eta \kappa a t \alpha \kappa r m a \) ] se. \( \varepsilon \tau i \) : no sentence of condemnation (ver. 16), whereby God might deny them eternal life, affects them. The reason see in ver. 2. — \( \tau o i \varepsilon n X . ' I . ] \) i.e. to those in whose case Christ is the element, in which they are (live and move). The same in substance, but different in the form of the conception, is \( \pi n e u m a \ X r i s t o \u0394 \varepsilon x e n \) and \( X r i s t o \u0394 \ \varepsilon n \ \upsilon m i n \) in vv. 9, 10.

Ver. 2.\(^1\) For the law of the Spirit leading to life delivered me in Christ Jesus from the law of sin and death. For the right explanation, it is to be observed—(1.) The \( \nu \mu \mu o \) \( \tau . \ \Delta \mu . \ \kappa . \ \tau o i \ \theta a n \) necessarily, in view of the connection, receives the definition of its meaning from chap. vii. 23, 25, as indeed \( \eta \varepsilon \nu \theta \). answers to the \( \alpha i \chi m a l o t i \zeta \) in ver. 23. For this very reason neither the moral law (Wolf) nor the Mosaic law (Pareus, de Dieu, Semler, Böhme, Ammon, and Reiche) can be meant; the latter cannot, for the further reason that, after vii. 7, 12, 16, Paul could not thus name the Mosaic \( \nu \mu \mu o s \) here, as Chrysostom has already urged. It is rather the law in our members, the power of sin in us, which, according to vii. 24, comp. vii. 10, 13, is at the same time the power of (eternal) death (\( \kappa a i \ \tau o i \ \theta a n \a u t o \) ), that is meant. The two are one power, and both genitives are genitives of the subject, so that sin and death are regarded as ruling over the man. — (2.) Since the \( \nu \mu \mu o \) \( \tau . \ \Delta \mu . \ \kappa . \ \tau o i \ \theta a n \) cannot be the Mosaic law, so neither can the contrasted \( \nu \mu \mu o \) \( \tau . \ \pi n . \ \tau \iota \zeta \ \zeta o n s \) be the Christian plan of salvation, like \( \nu \mu \mu o \) \( \pi o t \). in iii. 27, but it must be an inward power in the man by which the law of sin and death is rendered powerless. It is not, however, the \( \nu \mu \mu o \) \( \tau o i \ \nu o \o s \) (which had become strengthened through Christ), as, following older expositors, Morus, Kollner, and Schrader think; because, on the one hand,

\(^1\) In vv. 2, 3, we have one of the passages that are decisive in opposition to the affirmative answer which men have often attempted to give to the question, whether the Son of God would have appeared as man, had man not become sinful. See generally, Julius Müller, *dogm. Abb.* pp. 66 ff., 82 f.
νός and πνεῦμα are specifically different, and if Paul had meant the law of the νός, he must have so designated it, as in vii. 23; and, on the other hand, there would result the utterly paradoxical idea, that the law of reason (and not the divine principle of the πνεῦμα) makes man morally free. The τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ζωῆς is rather the Holy Spirit, who, working inwardly in the Christian (ver. 5), procures to him eternal life (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 6); and ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεῦματος τῆς ζωῆς is the ethically regulative government exercised by the πνεῦμα (not the Spirit Himself, as Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Maier, and Th. Schott understand it, but His ruling power). — ἐν Χ. Ἐ. On account of ver 3, to be connected neither with τῶν ἁγιῶν (Luther, Beza, and others, including Böhme, Klee, Ewald, and Hofmann), nor with τοῦ πνεῦμα. (Flatt; Tholuck: "the sphere, in which the Spirit of life operates"), nor with νόμος (Semler, Reiche), nor with ὁ νόμος τ. τ. π. τ. ζ. (Calvin, Köllner, Glöckler, Krehl, and others), but with ἡλευθεροσύνη. So Theodoret, Erasmus, Melancthon, Vatablus, and others, including Rückert, Olshausen, de Wette, Fritzsche, Reithmayr, Maier, Philippi, and Bisping. In Christ, the law of the Spirit has made us free; for out of Christ this emancipating activity could not occur (comp. John viii. 36); but in the fellowship of life with Him, in the being and living in Him (ver. 1), the deliverance which has taken place has its causal ground. The view which takes it of the objective basis that is laid down in the appearance and work of Christ, is unsuitable, because the discourse treats of the subjective ethical efficacy of the Spirit, which has the εἰλατ ἐν Χριστῷ as the necessary correlative.— ἡλευθ. aorist. For it is a historical act, which resulted from the effusion of the Spirit in the heart. The progressive sanctification is the further development and consequence of this act.

Ver. 3. An illustration justifying the ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἡλευθ. κ.τ.λ., just asserted, by a description of the powerfully effective actual arrangement, which God has made for the accomplishment of what to the law was impossible. — τὸ γάρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου is an absolute nominative, prefixing a judgment on the following κατέκρινε κ.τ.λ. "For the impossible thing
of the law—God condemned,” etc. That is, *God condemned sin in the flesh, which was a thing of impossibility on the part of the law.* See Krüger, § 57. 10, 12. Comp. also Heb. viii. 1, and on Luke xxi. 6; Wisd. xvi. 17; Kümmner, II. 1, p. 42. It could only be *accusative,* if we should assume a general verb (like ἐρωτησε) out of what follows, which would, however, be an arbitrary course (in opposition to the view of Erasmus, Luther, and others). The *prefixing τ. γ. αδιν. τ. ν.* has rhetorical emphasis, in contrast with the ἐν Χ. Ἰ. in ver. 2. Comp. Dissen, *ad Pind. Pyth. iv. 152.* On the genitive, comp. *Epist. ad Diogn.* 9: τὸ αδινατον τῆς ἡμερέας φύσεως, *what our nature could not do.* By a harsh hyperbaton Th. Schott takes a sense out of the passage, which it does not bear: because the impotence of the law became still weaker through the flesh. Erroneous is also Hofmann’s view: “the impotence of the law lay or consisted therein, that it was weak through the flesh.” The abstract sense of “powerlessness,” or incapacity, is not borne by τὸ αδινατον at all; but it indicates that which the subject (here the νομος) is not in a position for, what is impossible to it. See especially Plat. *Hipp. maj.* p. 295 E; comp. 9. 22; Xen. *Hist. i.* 4. 6: ἄπο τοῦ τῆς πόλεως δινατοῦ, i.e. from what the city is in a position to tender. Moreover, since the words taken independently, with Hofmann, would only contain a preparatory thought for what follows, Paul would not have had asyndetically ὁ Θεός, but must have proceeded by a marking of the contrast, consequently with ὁ δὲ Θεός; so that these words, down to κατὰ πνεῦμα in ver. 4, would still have been in connection with γὰρ. And even apart from this, the supplying of the substantive verb would at most only have been indicated for the reader in the event of the proposition having been a general one with ἐστι' understood, and consequently if ἀσθενεῖ, and not ἦσθε, were read. — ἐν δὲ ἡσθ. ἐδα τ. σαρκ. because it was weak (unable to condemn sin) through the flesh, as is described in chap. vii. On ἐν γ, comp. 1 Cor. iv. 4; John

1 Like ver. 1. Paul would have written intelligibly: τὸ γὰρ αδινατ. τῶν νομ. ἐκ τούτου ἐκ νόμου. Especially as, according to Hofmann, ἢ ν would not be a mere copula, but would mean sicut erat, consilii in. Märcker, p. 25, nevertheless agrees with Hofmann.
xvi. 30; Winer, p. 362 [E. T. 484]. It is our causal in that; διὰ τ. σαρκ. is the cause bringing about the ἡσθένει: through the reacting influence of the flesh, vii. 18 ff. — ὁ Θεὸς τῶν ἐαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.] God has, by the fact that He sent His own Son in the likeness (see on i. 23) of sinful flesh, and on account of sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that is, "God has deposed sin from its rule in the σάρκις (its previous sphere of power), thereby that He sent His own Son into the world in a phenomenal existence similar to the sinful corporeo-psyehical human nature." — The participle πέμψας is not an act that preceded the κατέκρινε (Hofmann, referring it to the supernatural birth); on the contrary, God has effected the κατάκρισις in and with the having sent the Son. Respecting this use of the aorist participle, comp. on Acts i. 24; Eph. i. 5; Rom. iv. 20. — ἐαυτοῦ] strengthens the relation to eπὶ τ. ὁμ. σ. ἀμ., and so enhances the extraordinary and energetic character of the remedial measure adopted by God. Comp. ver. 32. We may add, that in the case of ἐαυτοῦ, as in that of πέμψας (comp. Gal. iv. 4) and ἐν ὁμ. σ. ἀμ. (comp. Phil. ii. 7), the conception of the pre-existence and metaphysical Sonship of Christ is to be recognised (in opposition to Hofmann); so that the previous μορφὴ Θεοῦ forms the background, although, in that case, the supernatural generation is by no means a necessary presupposition (comp. on i. 3 f.). See generally, Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, I. p. 235 ff.; Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 317. — ἐν ὁμιόμενοι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτωλαί] in the likeness of sinful flesh; ἁμαρτ. is the genitive of quality, as in vi. 6. He might indeed have come ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ, Phil. ii. 6. But no: God so sent His own Son, that He appeared in a form of existence which resembled the fleshly human nature affected by sin. The ἐν indicates in what material mode of appearance God caused His sent Son to emerge. He came in flesh (1 John iv. 2), and was manifested in flesh (1 Tim. iii. 16). Yet He appeared not in sinful flesh, which

1 In which, however, the idea is not conveyed, that, like a sacrifice, He was loaded with the sin of others (Reiche), which was the case only in His death, not at His sending. Holsten, following the precedent of Gennadius in Cramer's Cat. p. 123, has erroneously apprehended the σάρκις of Christ as having been really τοῦ ἁμαρτίας, and as having thus had the objective principle of ἁμαρτία, which in his case, however, neither attained to subjective consciousness nor to
is otherwise the bodily phenomenal nature of all men. Moreover, His appearance was neither merely bodily, without the ψυχή (Zeller), which, on the contrary, necessarily belongs to the idea of the σάρξ; nor docetic (Krehl; comp. Baur's Gesch. d. 3. erst. Jahrh. p. 310), which latter error was already advanced by Marcion; but it consisted of the general bodily material of humanity, to which, however, in so far as the latter was of sinful quality, it was not equalized, but—because without that quality—only conformed. Comp. Phil. ii. 7; Heb. ii. 14, iv. 15. The contrast presupposed in the specially chosen expression is not the heavenly spirit-nature of Christ (Pfleiderer)—to which the mere ἐν σαρκί, or ἐν ὡμοιώματι ἀνθρώπου, as in Phil. ii. 7, would have corresponded—but rather holy unsinfulness.— The following k. πέρι ἁμαρτ. adds to the How of the sending (ἐν ὡμ. σαρκ. ἁμαρτ.) the Wherefore. The emphasis is accordingly on πέρι: and for sin, on account of sin,—which is to be left in its generality; for the following κατέχειν κ.τ.λ. brings out something special, which God has done with reference to the ἁμαρτία by the fact that He sent Christ πέρι ἁμαρτίας. We are therefore neither to refer πέρι ἁμαρτ., which affirms by subjective act. See Holsten, z. Ev. d. Paul. u. Petr. p. 436 ff.; comp. also Hausrath, neut. Zeitgesch. II. p. 431 f. But if this was the conception which Paul had, what was the expression ἵνα ἰματία meant for? In it lies the very negation of the σάρξ ἁμαρτίας—of the σάρξ, therefore, so far as it had the quality of sin. What Holsten advances in explanation of this expression is forced and irrelevant, as if it were precisely the reality of the being affected by sin that is affirmed. Comp. against this, Sabatier, l'apôtre Paul, p. 285.—Overbeck, along with various appropriate remarks in opposition to Holsten, comes nevertheless likewise to the conclusion that ἵνα ἰματία bears, not a negative, but an affirmative relation to the σάρξ ἁμαρτίας, although the ἁμαρτία of the σάρξ of Christ never in His case became conscious ἁμαρτάνει. But that the Son of God was sent in sinful flesh—which, according to Pfleiderer also (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1871, p. 523), is assumed to be implied in our passage as an ethical antinomy—would be a paradox opposed to the entire New Testament, which Paul could by no means utter (2 Cor. v. 21); and which, in fact, he with marked clearness and precision guards against by saying, not ἵνα ἰματίας, but ἵνα ἰματίας ἐκ. ἰμ., and that in contrast to the quality of the σάρξ of all others, of which he had just predicated by ἵνα ἰματίας ἐκ. τῆς σαρκίς a power so antagonistic to God. That paradox would have run: ἵνα σαρκὶ μὴ ἁμαρτίας, χαρὶ σαρκεῖ ἁμαρτάνειν. See also Zeller in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1870, p. 301 ff., who rightly comes to the conclusion that the σάρξ of Christ was of like nature to the σάρξ ἁμαρτίας, in so far as the latter was a σάρξ, but of unlike nature, οἷον so far as it was affected by sin.
what the sending of the Son was occasioned, exclusively to the expiation (Origen, Calvin, Melancthon, and many others, including Koppe, Böhme, Usteri; comp. Baumgarten-Crusius), in which case θυσίαν (Lev. vii. 37 al.; Ps. xl. 6; Heb. x. 6, 18) was supplied; nor, with Theophylact, Castalio, and others, also Maier and Bisping, exclusively to the destruction and doing away of sin. It contains rather the whole category of the relations in which the sending of Christ was appointed to stand to human sin, which included therefore its expiation as well as the breaking of its power. The latter, however, is thereupon brought into prominence, out of that general category, by κατέκρυψεν κ.τ.λ. as the element specially coming into view. Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschr. 1871, p. 186 f., erroneously, as regards both the language and the thought (since Christ was the real atoning sacrifice, iii. 25), makes καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίαν, which latter he takes in the sense of sin-offering, also to depend on ἐν δόμωματι. — κατέκρυψε τ. ἁμ. This condemnation of sin (the latter conceived as principle and power) is that which was impossible on the part of the law, owing to the hindrance of the flesh. It is erroneous, therefore, to take it as: "He exhibited sin as worthy of condemnation" (Erasmus, de Dieu, Eckermann), and: "He punished sin" (Castalio, Pareus, Carpzov, and others, including Koppe, Rückert, Usteri; comp. Olshausen, and Köstlin in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1856, p. 115). Impossible to the law was only such a condemnation of sin, as should depose the latter from the sway which it had hitherto maintained; consequently: He made sin forfeit its dominion. This de facto judicial condemnation (a sense which, though with different modifications in the analysis of the idea conveyed by κατέκρυσεν, is retained by Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Valla, Beza, Piscator, Estius, Bengel, Reiche, Köllner, Winzer, Fritzsche, Baur, Krehl, de Wette, Maier, Umbreit, Ewald, and others) is designated by κατέκρυψεν, without our modifying its verbal meaning into interfecit (Grotius, Reiche, Glöckler, and others), in connection with which Fritzsche finds this death of the ἁμαρτία presented as mors imaginaria, contained in the physical death of Christ. Various expositors, and even Philippi, mix up the here foreign idea of
atonement ("to blot out by atoning"); comp. also Tholuck and Hofmann. The expression κατέκρυψε is purposely chosen in reference to κατάκρυμα in ver. 1, but denotes the actual condemnation, which consisted in the dominion of the ἀμαρτία being done away,—its power was lost, and therewith God's sentence was pronounced upon it, as it were the staff broken over it. Comp. on John xvi. 11; and see Hofmann's Schriften II. 1, p. 355, and Th. Schott, p. 286. Yet Hofmann now discovers God's actual condemnation of sin ("the actual declaration that it is contrary to what is on His part rightful, that it should have man like a bond-serf under its control") in the emancipation of those who are under sin by bestowal of the Spirit,—a view by which what follows is anticipated, and that which is the divine aim of the κατέκρυψε is included in the notion of it.—Observe further the thrice-repeated ἀμαρτία; the last alone, however, which personifies sin as a power, has the article. — ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ belongs to κατέκρυψ., not to τῷ ἀμ. (Bengel, Ernesti, Michaelis, Cramer, Rosenmüller, and Hofmann), because it is not said τῷ τα., and because this more precise definition, to complete the notion of the object, would be self-evident and unimportant. But God condemned sin in the flesh: for, by the fact that God's own Son (over whom, withal, sin could have no power) appeared in the flesh, and indeed πέρι ἀμαρτίας, sin has lost its dominion in the substantial human nature (hitherto ruled over by it). The Lord's appearance in flesh, namely, was at once, even in itself, for sin the actual loss of its dominion as a principle; and the aim of that appearance, πέρι ἀμαρτίας, which was attained through the death of Christ, brought upon sin that loss with respect to its

1 See, against this, also Rich. Schmidt, Paul Christol. p. 49 ff. He, however, takes σάρκις likewise (comp. Hofmann) as prior to the κατάκρυμα, holding that the latter, which took place through the death of Christ, had for its immediate object the σάρκις and sin only as a mediate object. The meaning, in his view, is: "God has pronounced sentence on the flesh, and therewith at the same time on the sin dwelling in it." The destruction of Christ's flesh is thus an act of universal significance, by which the flesh in general, and therewith also sin itself, has been condemned. But the text clearly and expressly assigns, not the flesh, but τῷ ἀμαρτίας, as the immediate object of κατάκρυμα, so that an impartial exegesis can only discover in τῷ σαρκὶ there, i.e. in what material sphere, the act of the κατάκρυμα τῶν ἀμαρτ. has taken place.
totality. Thus, by the two facts, God has actually deprived it of its power in the human σαρκί; and this phenomenal nature of man, therefore, has ceased to be its domain. Hofmann, without reason, objects that τ. ἁμαρτ. must in that case have stood before κατέκρινε. The main emphasis, in fact, lies on κατέκρινε τ. ἁμαρτ., to which then ἐν τ. σαρκὶ is added, with the further emphasis of a reference to the causal connection. Many others take ἐν τ. σαρκὶ as meaning the body of Christ; holding that in this body put to death sin has been put to death at the same time (Origen, Beza, Grotius, Reiche, Usteri, Olshhausen, Maier, Bisping, and others); or that the punishment of sin has been accomplished on His body (Heumann, Michaelis, Koppe, and Flatt). But against this it may be urged, that plainly ἐν τ. σαρκὶ corresponds deliberately to the previous διὰ τ. σαρκός; there must have been αὐτὸν used along with it. Comp. Baur, neutest. Theol. p. 160 f.

Ver. 4. The purpose which God had in this κατέκρινε τ. ἁμ. ἐν τ. σ. was: in order that (now that the rule of sin which hindered the fulfilment of the law has been done away) the rightful requirement of the law might be fulfilled, etc.—τὸ διὰ τ. νόμον] Quite simply, as in i. 32, ii. 26 (comp. also on v. 16, and Krüger on Thuc. i. 41. 1): what the law has laid down as its rightful demand. The singular comprehends these collective (moral) claims of right as a unity. Others, contrary to the signification of the word, have taken it as justificatio (Vulg.), understanding thereby sometimes the making righteous as the aim of the law, which desires sinlessness (Chrysostom and his followers, including Theodore of Mopsuestia), sometimes the satisfaction of justice (Rothe; comp. on v. 16). Köllner, following Eckermann, makes it the justifying sentence of the law: "that the utterance of the law, which declares as righteous,

1 Many of the older dogmatic exegetes (see especially Beza, Calvin, Calovius, and Wolf in loc.) have explained the demand of the law, and the mode of its fulfilment, contrary to the context (since what is here spoken of is the proper morality of the Christian as emancipated), in such a way that the law's demand is to be understood as well of the punishments which it would require for transgression, as of the perfect obedience which it desires to have; Christ having fulfilled both by His double obedience in our stead, so that the demand of the law is fulfilled in us (by imputation).
and thus not only frees from the punishment of sin, but secures also the reward of righteousness, might be fulfilled on us, if we," etc. Substantially so (δικ. = sententia absolutoria), Fritzsche, Philippi, and Ewald ("the verdict of the law, since it has condemnation only for the sinners, and good promises for the remainder, Deut. xxviii. 1-14"). But against this it may be urged, first, that δικαίωμα τ. νόμου, because the genitive is a rule-prescribing subject, cannot, without urgent ground from the context, be taken otherwise than as demand, rightful claim (comp. also Luke i. 6; Heb. ix. 1, 10; LXX. Num. xxxi. 21); secondly, that vv. 3, 4 contain the proof, not for οίδεν κατάκριμα in ver. 1, but for ver. 2, and consequently ένα... ήμίν must be the counterpart of the state of bondage under the law of sin and death (ver. 2)—the counterpart, however, not consisting in the freedom from punishment and the certainty of reward, but in the morally free condition in which one does what the law demands, being no longer hampered by the power of sin and death, so that the fulfilment of the δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου is the antithesis of the ἀμαρτία so strongly emphasized previously; thirdly, that τοῖς μη... πνεύμα is not the condition of justification (that is faith), but of the fulfilment of the law; and finally, that in ver. 7, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τ. Θεοῦ οίχ ὑποτάσσεται, οίδε γὰρ δύναται is manifestly the counterpart of τὸ δικ. τ. νόμου πληρωθῇ in ver. 3.—πληρωθῇ as in Matt. iii. 15; Acts xiv. 26; Rom. xiii. 8; Gal. v. 14, al. Those commentators who take δικαίωμα as sententia absolutoria take ήμίν as may be accomplished on us (ἐν ήμίν). — ἐν ήμίν] Not: through us, nor yet: in us, which is explained as either: in our life-activity (de Wette), or as referring to the inward fulfilling of the law (Reiche, Klee, and Hofmann), and to the fact that God fulfils it in man (Olshausen; comp. Tholuck); but, as shown by the following τοῖς... περιπατεῖται κ.τ.λ.: on us, so that the fulfilling of the law's demand shall be accomplished and made manifest in the entire walk and conversation of Christians. This by no means conveys the idea of a merely outward action (as Hofmann objects), but includes also the inner morality accordant with the law; comp. Ernesti Ethik d. Ap. P. p. 69 f. Regarding this use of ἐν, see Bernhardy, p. 211 f.; Winer.
The passive form (not: ἵνα πληρώσωμεν) is in keeping with the conception that here the law, and that so far as it must be fulfilled, stands out in the foreground of the divine purpose. The accomplishment of its moral requirement is supposed to present itself as realized in the Christian, and that ἀδιόνατον τοῦ νόμου of ver. 3 is assumed to be thereby remedied.—τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα κ.τ.λ.] quippe qui ambularemus, etc. These words give negatively and positively the specific moral character, which is destined to be found in Christians, so far as the just requirement of the law is fulfilled in them. The μὴ is here, on account of the connection with ἵνα, quite according to rule; Baeumlein, Partik. p. 287 f. In what that fulfilment manifests itself (Hofmann) Paul does not say, but he announces the moral regulative that is to determine the inward and outward life of the subjects. He walks according to the flesh, who obeys the sinful lust dwelling in the σάρξ (vii. 18); and he walks according to the Spirit, who follows the guidance, the impelling and regulating power (ver. 2), of the Holy Spirit. The one excludes the other, Gal. v. 16. To take πνεῦμα without the article (which, after the nature of a proper noun, it did not at all need), in a subjective sense, as the pneumatic nature of the regenerate man, produced by the Holy Spirit (see esp. Harless on Eph. ii. 22, and van Hengel)—as it is here taken, but independently of the putting the article, by Bengel, Rückert, Philippi, and others, following Chrysostom—is erroneous. See on Gal. v. 16. It never means, not even in contrast to σάρξ, the “renewed spiritual nature of man” (Philippi), but the sanctifying divine principle itself, objectively, and distinct from the human πνεῦμα. The appeal to John iii. 6 is erroneous. See on that passage.

Ver. 5. The apostle regards the description just given, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα κ.τ.λ., as too important not to follow it up with a justification corresponding with its antithetical tenor.

1 This would have required the objective negation, since the negation would attach to κατὰ σάρκα. In Plut. Lyc. 10, 19 (in opposition to Hofmann), the negation stands along with the participle, and the relation of dependence is given in the text. See Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 132.

2 Observe that in ver. 10 the contrast is not εἰς ζῶν, but εἰς εὐμα— in opposition to Pfeiderer in Hilgenfeld’s Zeitschr. 1871, p. 177.
This he bases on the opposite φρονεῖν of the subjects, according to their opposite moral quality, so that the emphasis lies, not upon δυνατες and φρονοῦν (Hofmann, "as the being of the Ego is, so is also its mental tendency"), but, as shown by the antithesis οἱ δὲ κ.τ.λ., simply on κατὰ σάρκα and κ. πνεῦμα. The δυνατες might be entirely omitted; and φρονοῦν is the predicate to be affirmed of both parties, according to its different purport in the two cases. — οἱ κατὰ σ. δυνατες] A wider conception (they who are according to the flesh) than οἱ κ. σ. περιπτ. The latter is the manifestation in life of the former. — τὰ τῆς σ. φρον.] whose thinking and striving are directed to the interests of the flesh (the article τῆς. σ. makes the σάρκα objective as something independent); so that thus, according to vii. 21 ff., the fulfilment of the law is at variance with their efforts. Comp. on φρον., Matt. xvi. 23; Phil. iii. 19; Col. iii. 2; Plat. Rep. p. 505 B; 1 Macc. x. 20.

Ver. 6. A second γὰρ. The former specified the reason (ver. 5), this second is explicative (namely); a similar repetition and mutual relation of γὰρ being common also in Greek authors. Comp. xi. 24; see on Matt. vi. 32, xviii. 11; and Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 340; Kühner, II. 2, p. 856. — The striving of the flesh, namely (comp. νοεῖ τῆς σαρκὸς in Col. ii. 18), tends to bring man to (eternal) death (through sin), but the striving of the Holy Spirit to conduct him to (eternal) life and blessedness (of the Messianic kingdom). The explanation: the striving . . . has death as its consequence (Rückert, de Wette, and many others), is right as to fact (comp. vi. 21), but fails to bring out the personifying, vivid form of the representation, which, moreover, does not permit us to introduce the analytic reflection, that the enmity against God is the desire of the flesh "of itself," and that it is death "on account of God" (Hofmann, Schriftbew. I. p. 563). That death is God's penal decree, is true; but this thought does not belong here, where it is simply the destructive effort of the σάρκες itself that is intended to be conveyed, and that indeed, in accordance with the prevailing concrete mode of description, as a conscious effort, a real φρονεῖν, not as an impulse that makes the Ego its captive (Hofmann), since the same predicate φρονεῖμαι applies to the
σάρξ as well as to the πνεῦμα. On εἰρήνη, blessedness, comp. ii. 10. Understood in the narrower sense (peace with God), it would yield a hysteronproteron, which Fritzsche actually assumes.

Ver. 7. Διότι] propterea quod, introduces the reason why the striving of the flesh can be nothing else than death, and that of the Spirit nothing else than life and blessedness: for the former is enmity against God, the source of life; comp. Jas. iv. 4. The establishment of the second half of ver. 6 Paul leaves out for the present, and only introduces it subsequently at vv. 10, 11, in another connection of ideas.— The ἔχθρα eis Θεὸν has its ground assigned by τῷ γ. νόμῳ τ. Θ. οὔχ ἵπτοσάσεται, of which τῷ φρόνημα τῆς σάρκος is still the subject (not ή σάρξ, as Hofmann quite arbitrarily supposes); and the inward cause of this reality based on experience is afterwards specified by οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται (for it is not even possible for it). — δύναται] namely, according to its unholy nature, which maintains an antagonistic attitude to the will of God. This does not exclude the possibility of conversion (comp. Chrysostom), after which, however, the σάρξ with its φρόνημα is ethically dead (Gal. v. 24). Comp. vi. 6 ff.

Ver. 8. Δὲ] is not put for οὐ (Beza, Calvin, Koppe, and others; comp. also Rückert and Reiche), but is the simple μεταβατικόν (autem), which, after the auxiliary clauses τῷ γ. νόμῳ . . . δύναται, leads over to a relation corresponding to the main proposition τῷ φρ. τ. σάρκ. ἔχθρα eis Θεὸν, and referring to the persons in the concrete. The propriety of this connection will at once be manifest if τῷ γ. νόμῳ . . . δύναται be read more rapidly (like a parenthesis). According to Hofmann, the progress of thought is now supposed to advance from the condemnation of sin to the freedom from death. But such a scheme corresponds neither with the preceding, in which sin and death were grouped together (vv. 2, 6), nor with what follows, where in the first instance there is no mention of death, and it is only in ver. 10 f. that the special point is advanced of the raising from the dead.— εὖ σαρκί] is in substance the same as κατὰ σάρκα in ver. 5; but the form of the conception is: those who are in the flesh as the ethical life-
element, in which they subsist, and which is the opposite of the ἐνας ἐν πνεύματι in ver. 9, and ἐν Χριστῷ in ver. 1. Comp. on vii. 5. The one excludes the other, and the former, as antagonistic to God, makes the ἀπεστάλη Θεός (comp. 1 Thess. ii. 15, iv. 1) an impossibility.

Ver. 9. Antithetic (ye on the other hand) application of ver. 8 to the readers. — ἐτέρπει To take this word as quando-guidem, with Chrysostom and others, including Olshausen, is not indeed contrary to linguistic usage, since, like ἐὰν in the sense of ἐπελ (Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 195), ἐτέρπει also is used in the sense of ἐπετερπ (see Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. vi. 1. 26). But in the present instance the context does not afford the smallest ground for this view; on the contrary, the conditional signification: if certainly, if otherwise (see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 528; Baeuml. Partik. p. 202), is perfectly suitable, and with it the following antithetic ἐὰν ἐξει corresponds. It conveys an indirect incitement to self-examination. We may add that Paul might also have written ἔγε without changing the sense (in opposition to Hermann's canon, ad Viger. p. 834). See on 2 Cor. v. 3; Gal. iii. 4; Eph. iii. 2. — ὅικεί ἐν ἰμίν] That is, has the seat of His presence and activity in you. The point of the expression is not the constantly abiding ("stabile domicilium," Fritzsche and others; also Hofmann); in that case it would have needed a more precise definition (see, on the contrary, the simple ὅν ἐξει that follows). Respecting the matter itself and the conception, see 1 Cor. iii. 16, vi. 17, 19; 2 Tim. i. 14; John xiv. 23. Comp. also Ev. Thom. 10: πνεύμα Θεοῦ ἐνοικεί ἐν τῷ πανδίῳ τούτῳ. See passages from Rabbinic writers on the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in man, quoted by Schoettgen, p. 527; Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenthum, I. p. 268. The ἐν πνεύματι, which is not to be taken as "in the spiritual nature" (Philippi), and the πν. Θεοῦ ὅικεί ἐν ὑμῖν said with a significant more precise definition of πνεύμα, stand towards one another in an essential mutual relation. The former is conditioned by the latter; for if the Spirit of God do not dwell in the man, He cannot be the determining element in which the latter lives. Compare the Johannine: "ye in me, and I in you." According to Hofmann, the relation con-
sists in the Spirit being on the one hand, "as active life-ground," the absolutely inward, and on the other "as active ground of all life," that which embraces all living. This, however, is a deviation from the specific strict sense of the πνεῦμα, which, in accordance with the context, can only be that Holy Spirit who is given to believers; and the concrete conception of the apostle receives the stamp of an abstraction. — el δὲ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ.] Antithesis of εἰπερ...ὑμῖν, rendering very apparent the necessity of that assumption. "If, on the other hand, any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him," is not in communion of life with Christ, is not a true Christian; for αὐτοῦ refers to Christ, not to God (van Hengel). Moreover, it is not the non-Christians, but the seeming-Christians (comp. 1 John iv. 13), who are characterized as those who have not the Spirit. — πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ] (comp. Phil. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 11) is none other than the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of God. He is so called because the exalted Christ really communicates Himself to His own in and with the Paraclete (John xiv.), so that the Spirit is the living principle and the organ of the proper presence of Christ and of His life in them.\footnote{Bengel: "testimonium illustre de sancta Trinitate ejusque oeconomia in corde fideliurn."} Comp. on 2 Cor. iii. 16; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 6; Eph. iii. 17; Col. i. 27; Acts xvi. 7. That this, and not perchance the endowment of Christ with the Spirit (Fritzsche), is the view here taken, is clearly proved by the following εἰ δὲ Χριστοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν. Comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 346. The designation of the Holy Spirit by πν. Χριστοῦ is purposely selected in order to render very conspicuous the truth of the οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Kollner wrongly lays down a distinction between the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ; making the former the highest πνεῦμα, the source and perfection of all πνεῦμα, and the latter the higher God-resembling mind that was manifested in Christ. But a distinction between them is not required by vv. 10, 11 (see on that passage), and is decisively forbidden by Gal iv. 6, compared with Rom. viii. 14–16. We cannot even say, therefore, with Umbreit: "the Spirit of Christ is the medium, through which man obtains the Spirit of God;" nor, with van Hengel,
who compares Luke ix. 55: "si vero quis Spiritum, qui Christi est, cum eo non habet communem," with which Paul would here be aiming at the (alleged) Judaism of the Romans.

Ver. 10. The contrast to the foregoing. "Whosoever has not the Spirit of Christ, is not His; if, on the other hand, Christ (i.e. πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, see on ver. 9) is in you," then ye enjoy the following blissful consequences:—(1) Although the body is the prey of death on account of sin, nevertheless the Spirit is life on account of righteousness, ver. 10. (2) And even the mortal body shall be revivified by Him who raised up Christ from the dead, because Christ's Spirit dwelleth in you, ver. 11.—Vv. 10 and 11 have been rightly interpreted as referring to life and death in the proper (physical) sense by Augustine (de. pecc. merit. et rem. i. 7), Calvin, Beza, Calovius, Bengel, Michaelis, Tholuck, Klee, Flatt, Rückert, Reiche, Glöckler, Usteri, Fritzsche, Maier, Weiss l.c. p. 372, and others. For, first, on account of the apostle's doctrine regarding the connection between sin and death (v. 12) with which his readers were acquainted, he could not expect his ράμον to be understood in any other sense; secondly, the parallel between the raising up of Christ from death, which was in fact bodily death, and the quickening of the mortal bodies does not permit any other view, since ζωον. stands without any definition whatever altering or modifying the proper sense; and lastly, the proper sense is in its bearing quite in harmony with the theme of ver. 2 (which is discussed in vv. 3–11): for the life of the Spirit unaffected by physical death (ver. 10), and the final revivification also of the body (ver. 11), just constitute the highest consummation, and as it were the triumph, of the deliverance from the law of sin and death (ver. 2). These grounds, collectively,¹ tell at the same time against the divergent explanations: (1) that in vv. 10, 11 it is spiritual death and life that are spoken of; so Erasmus, Piscator,

¹ They do not permit, moreover, any such widening of the idea, as Philippi and Hofmann give to it. The former declares death to be, like the σώμα itself, spiritual-bodily; as such it is even now the overruling principle, inhabiting soul and body. According to Hofmann, the body is meant as in that death-condition which only finds its conclusion in dying, but in virtue of all this there is already present that, which makes the body incapable of being a manifestation of true life.
Locke, Heumann, Ch. Schmidt, Stolz, Böhme, Benecke, Köllner, Schrader, Stengel, Krehl, and van Hengel. (2) That ver. 10 is to be taken in the spiritual, but ver. 11 in the proper sense; so Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Grotius, Koppe, Olshausen, Reithmayr, and others; de Wette unites the moral and physical sense in both verses, comp. also Nielsen and Umbreit; see the particulars below.— νεκρός] With this corresponds the θνητά in ver. 11. It conveys, however, the idea "conditioni mortis obnoxium" (Augustine) more forcibly, and so as vividly to realize the certain result—he is dead!—a prolepsis of the final fate, which cannot now be altered or avoided. Well is it said by Bengel: "magni vi; morti adjudicatum deditumque." Our body is a corpse! Analogous is the ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον in vii. 10, though in that passage not used in the sense of physical death; comp. Rev. iii. 1; also ἐμψυχοῦν νεκρόν, Soph. Ant. 1167; Epict. fr. 176 : ἑικανάριου εἰ βαστάζω νεκρόν. The commentators who do not explain it of physical death are at variance. And how surprising the diversity! Some take νεκρός as a favourable predicate, embracing the new birth = θανατωθὲν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ (so with linguistic inaccuracy even on account of δὲ ἀμ., Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and with various modifications, also Erasmus, Raphel, Grotius, Locke, Heumann, Böhme, Baumgarten-Crusius, Reithmayr, and Márcker; comp. van Hengel, "mortui instar ad inertiam redactum"). Others take it as: miserable by reason of sin (Michaelis, Koppe, Köllner), comp. de Wette: "Even in the redeemed there still remains the sinful inclination as source of the death, which expresses its power;" Krehl as: "morally dead;" Olshausen: "not in the glory of its original destiny;" Tholuck: in the sense of vii. 10 f., but also "including in itself the elements of moral life-disturbance and of misery." Since, however, it is the body that is just spoken of, and since δὲ ἀμαρτίαν could only bring up the recollection of the proposition in v. 12, every view, which does not understand it of bodily death, is contrary to the context and far-fetched,1 especially since θνητά in

1 Even though it be explained with Ewald, referring to vi. 2 ff., "dead on account of sin, in order that the latter should not again rule." Comp. van
ver. 11 corresponds to it.— δι’ ἀμαρτίαν] The ground: on account of sin, in consequence of sin (Kühner, II. 1, p. 419), which is more precisely known from v. 12. Death, which has arisen and become general through the entrance of sin into the world, can be averted in no case, not even in that of the regenerate man. Hence, even in his case, the body is νεκρόν δι’ ἀμαρτίαν. But how completely different is it in his case with the spirit! Τὸ πνεῦμα, namely, in contrast to the σῶμα, is necessarily not the transcendent (Holsten) or the Holy Spirit (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Calvin, Grotius, and others); nor yet, as Hofmann turns the conception, the spirit which we now have when Christ is in us and His righteousness is ours; but simply our human spirit, i.e. the substratum of the personal self-consciousness, and as such the principle of the higher cognitive and moral activity of life as directed towards God, different from the ψυχή, which is to be regarded as the potentiality of the human natural life. The faculty of the πνεῦμα is the νοῦς (vii. 25), and its subject the moral Ego (vii. 15 ff.). That the spirit of those who are here spoken of is filled with the Holy Spirit, is in itself a correct inference from the presupposition εἰ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, but is not implied in the word τὸ πνεῦμα, as if this meant (Theodoret and de Wette) the human spirit pervaded by the Divine Spirit, the pneumatic essence of the regenerate man. That is never the case; comp. on ver. 16. — ζωή] i.e. life is his essential element; stronger than ζη, the reading of F. G. Vulg. and mss. of the It. Comp. vii. 7. With respect to the spirit of the true Christian, therefore, there can be no mention of death (which would of necessity be eternal death); comp. John xi. 26. He is eternally alive, and that διὰ δικαιοσύνην, on account of righteousness; for the eternal ζωή is based on the justification that has taken place for Christ's sake and is appropriated by faith. Rückert, Reiche, Fritzche, Philippi (comp. also Hofmann), following the majority of ancient expositors, have properly taken δικαιοσύνην thus in the Pauline-dogmatic sense, seeing that the moral righteousness of life (Erasmus, Grotius, Tholuck, de Wette, Hengel: "ne peccati principio serviat." But how gratuitously is this negative sense imported into the positive expression!
Klee, and Maier), because never perfect (1 Cor. iv. 4; Phil. iii. 9, al.), can never be ground of the ζωή. If, however, διὰ δικαιοσύνην be rendered: for the sake of righteousness, "in order that the latter may continue and rule" (Ewald, comp. van Hengel), it would yield no contrast answering to the correct interpretation of νεκρῶν δὲ ἀμ. It is moreover to be noted, that as δὲ ἁμαρτ., does not refer to one's own individual sin (on the contrary, see on ἐφ' ὁ πάντες ἡμαρτον, v. 12), so neither does διὰ δικαιοσύνην refer to one's own righteousness.

— Observe, further, the fact that, and the mode in which, the δικαιοσύνη may be lost according to our passage, namely, if Christ is not in us,—a condition, by which the moral nature of the δικαιοσύνη is laid down and security is guarded against.

Ver. 11. According to ver. 10, there was still left one power of death, that over the body. Paul now disposes of this also, and hence takes up again, not indeed what had just been inferred (Hofmann, in accordance with his view of τὸ πνεῦμα, ver. 10), but the idea conditioning it, εἰ δὲ X. ἐν ὑμ.; not, however, in this form, but, as required by the tenor of what he intends to couple with it, in the form: εἰ δὲ τ. πν. τοῦ ἐγερ. 'Ι. ἐκ νεκρ. οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. In substance the two are identical, since the indwelling of the Divine Spirit in us is the spiritual indwelling of Christ Himself in us. See on ver. 9.

— The δὲ, therefore, simply carries on the argument, namely, from the spirit which is ζωή (ver. 10), to the quickening that is certain even in the case of the mortal body (for observe the position of the καλ). The apostle's inference is: "The Spirit who dwelleth in you is the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus; consequently God will also, with respect to your bodies, as dwelling-places of His Spirit, do the same as He has done in the case of Christ." The self-evident presupposition in this inference is, that the Spirit of God dwelt in Jesus during His earthly career (Luke iv. 1, 14, 18; Acts i. 2; John iii. 34, xx. 22). — ζωοποιήσει Not ἐγερεῖ, but the correlate of ζωή, ver. 10 (comp. ver. 6), and counterpart of νεκρῶν and θυμά, is purposely selected. Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 22. — θυμά] What he had previously expressed proleptically by νεκρῶν, he here describes according to the reality of the present by θυμά.
Observe, moreover, that Paul leaves out of view the fate of those still living at the Parousia. Their change is not included in the expression ᾠδονησίας (Hofmann), — a view which neither the sense of the word (comp. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36; 1 Pet. iii. 18; John v. 21) nor the correlation with ἐγέρσαι permits. But to the readers' consciousness of faith it was self-evident from the analogy of what is here said to them with reference to the case of their being already dead at the Parousia; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 2 Cor. v. 2-4; 1 Thess. iv. 15-17. — On the interchange of Ἰησοῦν and τὸν Χριστὸν Bengel rightly remarks: "Appellatio Jesus spectat ad ipsum; Christi referitur ad nos;" for Jesus as Christ is destined to be the archetype for believers even in an eschatological respect. — διὰ τὸ ἐνυσκόω κ.τ.λ. on account of His Spirit that dwelleth in you. Observe the emphatic prefixing of the αὐτοῦ relating to God. How could God, the Raiser up of Christ, who was the possessor of His Spirit, leave the bodies of believers, which are the dwelling-places of the same Spirit, without quickening? The more characteristic ἐνυσκόω (previously it was only ὁικεῖ) is a climax to the representation. — Köllner's explanation may serve to exemplify the conception of our passage in an ethical sense (Erasmus, Calvin, and many others): "So will He who raised up Jesus from the dead bring to life also your bodies that are still subject to death (sin and misery), that is, ennoble also your sensuous nature and so perfect you entirely." But even apart from this arbitrary interpretation given to the simple ὑγιά (which ought rather with van Hengel to be interpreted: "quamquam mortalia ideoque minoris numeri sunt"), how diffuse and verbose would be the whole mode of expressing the simple thought! How utterly out of place this dualism of the representation, as if the divine work of the moral revivification of the body were something independent, alongside of and subsequent to that of the spirit! See, moreover, generally on ver. 10, and the appropriate remarks of Reiche, Commentar crit. I. p. 62 ff. Lastly, according to de Wette's combination of the two senses — the moral and the physical — the thought is: "This death-overcoming Spirit of God shall destroy more and more the principle of sin and death in your bodies, and
instead of it introduce the principle of the life-bringing Spirit into your whole personality, even into the body itself,—a thought which opens up the prospect of the future resurrection or change of the body. But the resurrection will be participated in by all believers at once, independently of the development noticed in our passage, by which their bodies would have first to be made ripe for it; and even the change of the living at the Parousia is, according to 1 Cor. xv. 51 ff., not a process developed from within outwardly, but a result produced in a twinkling from without (at the sound of the last trumpet),—a result, which cannot be the final consequence of the gradual inward destruction of the principle of sin and death, because in that case all could not participate in it simultaneously, which nevertheless is the case, according to 1 Cor. xv. 51. Notwithstanding, this view, which combines the spiritual and bodily process of glorification, has been again brought forward by Philippi, according to whom what is here meant is the progressive merging of death into life, which can only be accomplished¹ by the progressive merging of sin into the righteousness of life, and of the σώμα into the πνεῦμα (?). The simple explanation of the resurrection of the body is rightly retained by Tholuck, Umbreit, Hofmann, Weiss, and others; whilst Ewald contents himself with the indeterminate double sense of eternal life beginning in the mortal body.

Vv. 12–17. Accordingly we are bound not to live carnally, for that brings death; whereas the government of the Spirit, on the other hand, brings life, because we, as moved by the Spirit, are children of God, and as such are sure of the future glory.

Ver. 12. Ἄπα οὖν] Draws the inference not merely from ver. 11, but from the contents closely in substance bound up together of vv. 10, 11. “Since these blissful consequences are conditioned by the Spirit that dwelleth in us, we are not

¹ If it be attempted to apply this view to the different subjects concerned, the absurdity is encountered, that it is incapable of application to all those to whom no time is afforded between their conversion and their death, or between their conversion and the Parousia, for the development of the alleged spiritual-bodily process of glorification. This exposition, therefore, yields an idea which would even a priori, in the generality in which Paul would have expressed it, lack truth.
bound to give service to the flesh." That has not deserved well of us!—οὖ τῇ σαρκὶ . . . ζην] In the lively progress of his argument, Paul leaves the counterpart, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι, τοῦ κατὰ πνεύμα ζην, without direct expression; but it results self-evidently for every reader from ver. 13. — τοῦ κ. α. ζην] in order to live carnally. This would be the aim of our relation of debt to the flesh, if such a relation existed; we should have the carnal mode of life for our task. Fritzsche thinks that it belongs to ὄφ.: "Sumus debitores non carni obligati, nempe debitores vitae ex carnis cupiditatibus instituendae;" so also Winer, p. 306 [E. T. 410]. But in Gal. v. 3 Paul couples it with the simple infinitive; as in Soph. Aj. 587, Eur. Rhes. 965. Since he here says τοῦ ζην, that telic view is all the more to be preferred, by which the contents of the obligation (so Hofmann) is brought out as its destination for us. The idea conveyed by κατὰ σάρκα ζην is that of being alive (contrast to dying) according to the rule and standard of σάρξ, so that σάρξ is the regulative principle. The more precise and definite idea: carnal bliss (Hofmann), is not expressed. We should note, moreover, τῇ σαρκὶ with the article (personified), and κατὰ σάρκα without it (qualitative), ver. 5.

Ver. 13. Reason for ver. 12—"for so ye would attain the opposite of your destination, as specified in vv. 10, 11." The μέλλειν (comp. iv. 24) indicates the "certum et constitutum esse secundum vim (divini) fatti." Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 72. —ἀποθνῄσκειν] The opposite of the ζωὴ in ver. 10 f.; consequently used of the being transferred into the state of eternal death; and then ζησόμεθα in the sense of eternal life (see ver. 17). Comp. vii. 10, 24, viii. 6, 10. This dying does not exclude the resurrection of the body (Rückert), but points to the unblissful existence in Hades before (Luke xvi. 23) and after (comp. Matt. x. 28) the judgment. If it were true that Paul did not believe in a resurrection for unbelievers, he would stand in direct antagonism to John v. 28 f.; Acts xxiv. 15; Matt. v. 29 f., x. 28; and even 1 Cor. xv. 24 (see on that passage). Here also Philippi combines bodily, spiritual, and eternal death; but see above, on Rom. v. 12. And here it may be specially urged against this view, that the dying
and living are assigned purely to the region of the future. Oecumenius aptly says: τὸν ἀθάνατον θάνατον ἐν τῇ γεέννῃ. — πνεύματι [i.e. by means of the Holy Spirit, comp. vv. 4, 5, 6, 9, and the following πνεύματι Θεοῦ; consequently here also not subjective (Philippi and others: “pneumatic condition of mind”). — τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος. The practices (tricks, machinations, see on Col. iii. 9; Luke xxiii. 51; Acts xix. 18; Dem. 126. 22; Polyb. ii. 7, 8, ii. 9. 2, iv. 8. 3, v. 96. 4; and Sturz, Lex. Xen. III. p. 646) which the body (in accordance with the νόμος ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν, vii. 23) desires to carry out. These we make dead (θανατοῦσθαι), when the Ego, following the drawing of the Holy Spirit, conquers the lusts that form their basis; so that they do not come to realization, and are reduced to nothing. Σῶμα is not used here for σάρξ (Reiche and others); Paul has not become inconsistent with his own use of language (Stirm in Tüb. Zeitschr. 1834, 3, p. 11), but has regarded the (in itself indifferent) σῶμα as the executive organ of the sin, which, dwelling in the σάρξ of the body, rules over the body, and makes it the σῶμα ἁμαρτίας (vi. 6), if the Spirit does not obtain the control and make it Η giỏi's organ. The term πράξεις, further used by Paul only in Col. iii. 9 (not ἔργα), is purposely selected to express the evil conception, which Hofmann (“acts”) without any ground calls in question. It is frequently used thus by Greek authors, as also πράγματα. — The alternating antithesis is aptly chosen, so that in the two protases living and putting to death, in the apodoses death and life, stand contrasted with one another.

Ver. 14. Reason assigned for the ζήσοντες. “For then ye belong, as led by God, to the children of God (for whom the life of the Messianic kingdom is destined, ver. 17; Gal. iv. 7).” Theodore of Mopsuestia: δῆλον ὅτι οἱ τοιούτοι τὴν μακαρίαν ζωὴν παρὰ τῷ ἑαυτῶν πατρὶ ζήσονται. — ἐγνωσται [i.e. are determined in the activity of their inward and outward life. Comp. ii. 4; Gal. v. 18; 2 Tim. iii. 6; Soph. Ant. 620: ὅτε φρένας θεὸς ἔχει, Oed. C. 254 (Reising, Enarr. p. LXL); Plat. Phaed. p. 94 E: ἔγνωσεν ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ σώματος παθημάτων. The expression is passive (hence the dative), though without prejudice to the freedom of the human will, as ver. 13 proves.
"Non est enim coactio, ut voluntas non possit repugnare: trahit Deus, sed volentem trahit," Melancthon.— *viōi Θεοῦ*

Thus Paul elevates the hallowed theocratic conception, ix. 5, *to the purely moral idea*, which is realized in the case of those who are led by the Divine Spirit (which is granted only to those who believe in Christ, Gal. iii. 26). The *οὖτοι* is therefore not unemphatic (Hofmann)—which would make it quite superfluous—but has an excluding and contrasting force (*these and no others*, comp. Gal. iii. 7). Next to it *viōi* has the stress (hence its position immediately after οὖτοι, see the critical remarks), being conceived already as in contrast to *δουλοί*; see ver. 15. The *viōi Θεοῦ* are those who have been justified by faith, thereby lawfully received by Him into the fellowship of children with a reconciled Father (ver. 15), governed by the Holy Spirit given unto them (comp. Gal. iv. 6), exalted to the dignity of the relation of brethren to Christ (ver. 29), and sure of the eternal glory (of the inheritance). For a view of the relation in question under its various aspects in Paul, John, and the Synoptics, see on John i. 12.

Ver. 15 assigns the ground for ver. 14 in application to the readers. *For ye received not,* when the Holy Spirit was communicated to you, a *spirit of bondage,* that is, a spirit such as is the regulating power in the state of slavery.¹ This view of the genitive (Fritzsche, de Wette, Philippi) is required by the contrast; because the *vłoBeaia* when the Spirit is given is already present, having entered, namely, through faith and justification (Gal. iv. 6). Hence it cannot, with others (Köllner, Rückert, Baumgarten-Crusius, Hofmann, Reithmayr, following Theodore of Mopsuestia and others), be taken as the genitive of the *effect* (who works bondage). This also holds

¹ Πιστεύετε ὑμεῖς is therefore what the Holy Spirit received is not. Comp. 2 Tim. i. 7. Altogether contrary to the context, Grotius, Michaelis, and others understand *affectus servilis,* taking it consequently not of the *objective* spirit, but *subjectively;* as do also Reiche, Baumgarten-Crusius, and de Wette, with whom Philippi agrees: "a disposition of mind such as one has in slavery (childhood)." Vv. 14, 16 ought to have precluded such a view. Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others understood it directly of *τó γράμμα τó νῖμον ὡς παρὰ τóν στῦλον μετά δικαίωσεν, καλοῦν τó μᾶλλον ἄμιθον,* Theophylact. Comp. Occumenius: *τó στῦλον τó στῦλον ὡς παρὰ τóν στῦλον μεν δικαίωσεν,* Theophylact.
against Lipsius, *Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 170. — πάων εἰς φόβον]
again to fear, conveys the aim of the (denied) ἔλαβε. πν. δοκ.,
so that πάων, as its very position shows, gives a qualification,
not of ἔλαβε, but of εἰς φόβον: “in order that ye should once
more (as under the law working wrath) be afraid.” — πνεῦμα
νιῶθαι.] i.e. a spirit which, in the state of adoption, is the ruling
principle. Τιοθεσία is the proper term for adoption (θεσαυ
νίων, Plat. *Legg.* xi. p. 929 C; Arr. *An.* i. 23. 11); see Grotius
and Fritzsche, *in loc.;* Hermann, *Privatalterth.* § 64. 15; comp.
on Gal. iv. 5; also Weiss, *bibl. Theol.* p. 340. Therefore not
sonship in general (the Patristic νιῶν), as is the view of the
majority; it is rightly rendered in the Vulgate: “adoptionis
fitiorum;” it does not represent believers as children of God
by birth, but as those who by God’s grace (Eph. i. 5–8) have
been assumed into the place of children, and as brethren of
Christ (ver. 29). Those thus adopted receive the Spirit from
God, but are not begotten to sonship through the Spirit (Hof-
mann); comp. Weiss, *l.c.* — The repetition of ἔλαβετε πνεῦμα
has a certain solemnity. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 7; Phil. iv. 17.
— ἐν τῷ] in whom, as in the element that moves our inner life.
Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 3; Eph. ii. 18.— κράζομεν] we cry, the
outburst of fervid emotion in prayer. Comp. on Gal. iv. 6.
The transition to the first person takes place without special
intention, under the involuntary pressure of the sense of fel-
Talm.* p. 20. From the three passages, Mark, *l.c.,* Gal. iv. 6,
and our present one, it may be assumed that the address ἡμᾶς
(ὅ)| was transferred from the Jewish into the Christian
prayers, and in the latter received the consecration of special
sanctity through Christ Himself, who as Son thus addressed
the Father. This Ἀββᾶ gradually assumed the nature of a
proper name; and thus it came that the Greek-praying Chris-
tians retained the Chaldee word in a vocative sense as a proper
name, and further, in the fervour of the feeling of sonship, added
along with it the specifically Christian address to the Father,
using the appellative ὁ πατήρ in the appositional nominative
(Kühner, II. 1, p. 42); so that the “Abba, Father,” now became
fixed. It has been frequently supposed (and is still by Rückert, Reiche, and Köllner) that Paul added \( \text{o\, pat\,\iota\,p} \) by way of explanation. But against this view it may be urged, that in passages so full of feeling as Rom. viii. 15 and Gal. iv. 6, an interpretation—and that too of a word which, considering the familiarity with Jewish modes of expression in the churches of Rome and Galatia, undoubtedly needed no explanation, and was certainly well known also through the evangelistic tradition as the form of address in prayer that had flowed from the mouth of Jesus—seems unnatural and out of place. Besides, in all three instances, in Mark\(^2\) and Paul, uniformly the mere \( \text{'A\beta\beta\alpha\, o\, pat\,\iota\,p} \) is given without any formula of interpretation (\( \tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\upsilon\, \varepsilon\sigma\tau\iota\) or the like) being added. Other views—destitute, however, of all proof—are: that the custom which insinuating children have of repeating the father's name is here imitated (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Grotius); or that the emphasis affectus (Erasmus) is here expressed (either view would be possible only in the event of the passage standing as \( \text{'A\beta\beta\alpha, 'A\beta\beta\alpha} \); or even that it is meant to signify the Fatherhood of God for Jews and Gentiles (Augustine, Anselm, Calvin, Estius, and others). With our view Philippi is substantially agreed. Against the objections of Fritzsche, who regards \( \text{o\, pat\,\iota\,p} \) as an explanatory addition grown into a habit, see on Gal. iv. 6. — The Father-name of God in the Old Covenant (Ex. xx. 2; Isa. lxiii. 16; Hos. xi. 1; Jer. iii. 19, xxxi. 9) only received the loftiest fulfilment of its meaning in the New Covenant through the \( \nu\omicron\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\alpha\omicron\la\omicron\) accomplished in Christ. Comp. Umbreit, p. 287 f.; Schultz, \textit{altest. Theol.} II. p. 98.

Ver. 16. More precise information respecting the preceding \( \text{'e\nu\, o\, k\rho\alpha\zeta\, 'A\beta\beta\alpha\, o\, p} \).— \( \text{o\, \iota\tau\omicron\nu\, \tau\omicron\omicron\nu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\alpha\nu\, k\omicron\tau\lambda\lambda.} \) Not \( \text{He, the Spirit} \) (Hofmann, inappropriately comparing ver. 21 and 1 Thess. iii. 11); but, since \( \text{o\, \iota\tau\omicron\nu\, \tau\omicron\omicron\nu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\alpha\nu\, k\omicron\tau\lambda\lambda.} \) always means \( \text{ipse} \), the context supplying the more special reference

1 It was owing simply to the provincial dialect of Palestine that \( \text{N\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu} \) and not \( \text{N\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\nu} \) was used. Alberti, Tholuck, and Olahausen think it due to the former having a more childlike (lisp) sound. Other precarious views may be seen in Wolf, \textit{Curt.}; Lightfoot, \textit{Hor.} p. 654 f.

2 In Mark xiv. 36 the expression is put into the mouth of Jesus from a later age. See in loc.

ROM. II.
of the sense: *ipse spiritus*, that is, *Himself, on His own part,* the (received) Spirit testifies with our spirit; He unites His own testimony that we are children of God with the same testimony borne by our spirit, which (1 Cor. ii. 11) is the seat of our self-consciousness. — In συμμαρτ. the συν and its reference to τ. πν. ἡμ. are not to be neglected, any more than in ii. 15, ix. 1, as the Vulgate, Luther, Grotius, and Fathers, also Koppe, Rückert, Reiche, Köllner, de Wette, and others have done. Paul distinguishes from the subjective self-consciousness: *I* am the child of God, the therewith accordant testimony of the objective Holy Spirit: *thou* art the child of God! The latter is the *yea* to the former; and thus it comes that we cry the Abba ἐν τῷ πνεύματί. Our older theologians (see especially Calovius) have rightly used our passage as a proof of the certitudo gratiae in opposition to the Catholic Church with its mere conjectura moralis. Comp. Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; 1 John iii. 24, iv. 13. At the same time, it is also a clear dictum probans against all pantheistic confusion of the divine and the human spirit and consciousness, and no less against the assertion that Paul ascribes to man not a human πνεύμα, but only the divine πνεύμα become subjective (Baur, Holsten). Against this view, see also Pfleiderer, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1871, p. 162 f., who nevertheless, at p. 177 f., from our passage and chap. viii. generally, attributes to the apostle the doctrine that in the Christian the real divine πνεύμα has become the proper human one, and vice versa; comp. on ver. 26. Against the Fanatics Melancthon truly observes, that the working of the Spirit in the believer begins "praecuncte voce evangelii." — τέκνα] The term children, expressive of greater tenderness, called forth by the increasing fervour of the discourse.¹ Comp. ver. 21. The aspect of the legal relation (of the

¹ Hofmann incorrectly imports the idea that *vīs* emphasizes the connection of *life, and vīs the descent; hence Christ is not called *vīs* but only *vīs.* This view is demolished by the fact that, precisely in virtue of His descent as the *μετατίθεντα συμφέρεντα* Ἰησοῦς, Christ is the *vīs.* He is not called *vīs,* simply because *vīs* was the prophetic and historical designation of the Messiah consecrated by ancient usage. In fact, the LXX. render promiscuously Ἰησοῦς as well as Ἰησοῦς (which Hofmann compares) sometimes by *vīs* and sometimes by *vīs.*
CHAP. VIII. 17.

υιοθεσία at the same time recedes into the background. Comp. Phil ii. 15.

Ver. 17. From the truth of the filial relation to God, Paul now passes over by the continuative δὲ to the sure blissful consequence of it,—and that indeed in organic reference to the ζησεωθε promised in ver. 13. — From our childship follows necessarily our heirship. Comp. Gal. iv. 7. Both are to be left perfectly general, without supplying Θεοῦ, since it is only what follows that furnishes the concrete, more precise definition, in which here the general relation is realized. — κληρονόμος Θεοῦ] The inheritance, which God once on a time transfers to His children as their property, is the salvation and glory of the Messianic kingdom. Comp. iv. 14. God is, of course, in this case conceived not as a dying testator, but as the living bestower of His goods on His children (Luke xv. 12). However, the conclusion (ver. 17) forbids us to disregard the idea of inheritance, and to find only that of the receiving possession represented (in opposition to van Hengel). — συγκληρ. δὲ Χριστοῦ] Not something greater than κληρον. Θεοῦ, on the contrary in substance the same, but specifically characterized from the standpoint of our fellowship with Christ, whose co-heirs we must be as κληρον. Θεοῦ, since, having entered into sonship through the υιοθεσία, we have become Christ's brethren (ver. 29). Moreover, that Paul has here in view, not the analogy of the Hebrew law of inheritance that conferred a man's intestate heritage only on sons of his body, if there were such, but that of the Roman law (Fritzsche, Tholuck, van Hengel; see more particularly on Gal. iv. 7), is the historically necessary supposition, which can least of all seem foreign or inappropriate in an epistle to the Romans. — συμπάσχ.] Whosoever, for the sake of the gospel, submits to suffering (Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24), suffers with Christ; i.e. he has actual share in the suffering endured by Christ (1 Pet. iv. 13), drinks the same cup that He drank (Matt. xx. 22 f.). Comp. on 2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Col. i. 24. This fellowship of suffering Paul regards as that which must be presupposed in order to the attainment of glory, of participation in the δόξα of Christ (ἐπερ, as in ver. 9); not indeed as meritum, or pretium vitae æternæ, but as
obedientia propter ordinem a Deo sanctum, Melancthon. Comp. 2 Tim. ii. 11 f. This conviction developed itself, especially under the external influence of the circumstances of an age fruitful in persecution, just as necessarily and truly out of the inward assurance that in the case of Jesus Himself His suffering,1 willed by God, and undertaken and borne in obedience to the Father, was the condition of His glory (Luke xxiv. 26; Phil. ii. 6 ff., al.), as it in its turn became a rich spring of the enthusiasm for martyrdom. Olshausen (comp. also Philippus) mixes up an element which is here foreign: "participation in the conflict with sin in themselves and in the world." Even without introducing this element foreign to the word itself, the συμπάσχεων, as the presupposition involved in the joint-heirship, has its universal applicability, based not merely on the general participation of all in the suffering of this time, but especially also on the relation of the children of God to the ungodly world (comp. John vii. 7, xv. 18 f., xvii. 14). — ἵνα καὶ συνδοξ] in order to be also glorified with Him; dependent not on συγκληρ. (Tholuck), but on συμπάσχον, the divine final aim of which, known to the sufferer, it subjoins.

Vv. 18—31.2 Grounds of encouragement for the συμπάσχον ἵνα κ. συνδοξ.— Namely, (1) The future glory shall far outweigh the present sufferings, vv. 18—25. — (2) The Holy Ghost supports us, vv. 26, 27. — (3) Generally, all things must serve for good to those who love God, vv. 28—31.

Ver. 18. Δογιζωμαι I reckon, as in iii. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 5; Phil. iii. 13. In the singular we are not to discover a turn given to the argument, as if the apostle found it necessary to justify himself on account of the condition εἰπερ συμπάσχον. (Hofmann). Just as little here as in the case of τέπεωμαι in ver. 38. He simply delivers his judgment, which, however, he

---

1 Here also set forth by Hofmann under the aspect of treatment encountered by Him at the hands of the enemies of the work of salvation.
might have expressed with equal propriety in a form inclusive of others, as subsequently he has written οἴδαμεν (ver. 22). Such changing of the person is accidental and without any special design, especially as here he does not say ἐγὼ γὰρ λογίζομαι, or λογίζομαι γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, or otherwise give himself prominence. A certain litotes, however, lies (not indeed in the singular, but) in the use of λογίζομαι itself, which really contains an οἶδα and a πέπευσμαι. — οὐκ ἄξια] not of equal importance, not of corresponding weight; they are unimportant. On πρός, in comparison with, in relation to, comp. Plat. Gorg. p. 471 E: οὐδενὸς ἄξιος ἐστι πρὸς τὴν ἀληθείαν, Protag. p. 356 Δ; Winer, p. 378 [E. T. 505]. On οὐκ ἄξιον ἐστι itself, however, in the sense: non operae pretium est, see Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. vi. 5. 13. Comp. Dem. 300 ult.; Polyb. iv. 20. 2. On the subject-matter, see especially 2 Cor. iv. 17.— τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ] of the present time-period. The νῦν καιρός marks off from the whole αἰῶν οἰδος (see on Matt. xii. 32) the period then current, which was to end with the approaching Parousia (assumed as near in xiii. 11, 12, 1 Thess. iv. 17, 1 Cor. vii. 29, and in the entire N. T.), and was thus the time of the crisis. — μέλλει δὲ ἀποκάλυψις] μέλλουσαν (see on ver. 13) is, as in Gal. iii. 23, prefixed with emphasis, correlative with the foregoing νῦν. Comp. 1 Cor. xii. 22; Plat. Rep. p. 572 B: καὶ τὰ νῦν δοκοῦσιν ἡμῶν ἐννοίας μετριοῖς ἐννοίας. See Stallbaum in loc.— ἀποκαλλ.] Namely, at the Parousia, when the δόξα which is now hidden (in heaven, comp. Col. iii. 3 f.; 1 Pet. i. 4) is to be revealed. — εἰς ἡμᾶς] on us, so that we are those, upon whom (reaching unto them) the ἀποκάλυψις takes place. Comp. Acts xxviii. 6. The δόξα comes to us, therefore, from without (with Christ descending from heaven; comp. Col. iii. 4; Phil. iii. 21; Tit. ii. 13); but is not conceived as having already begun inwardly and then becoming apparent outwardly (in opposition to Lipsius, Rechtfert. p. 206).

Ver. 19. Γάρ] introduces, from the waiting of the creation (to whose groaning that of Christians thereupon joins itself in ver. 23) for this glorious consummation, a peculiar confirmation, couched in a poetic strain, of the fact that the ἀποκάλυψις τῆς δόξης is really impending; and thus lends support
to the comforting *certainty* of that future manifestation, that is, to the element involved in the emphatically prefixed *μέλλουσαν*; comp. Calovius, Fritzsche, de Wette, Krehl, Reithmayr, and Bisping. From Origen and Chrysostom down to Hofmann, there has usually been discovered here a ground assigned for the *greatness* of the glory. But this is neither consistent with the emphatic prominence of *μέλλουσαν*, nor with the subsequent ground itself, which proves nothing as to the *greatness* of the *δόξα*, but stands to the *indubitableness* of the latter, otherwise firmly established and presupposed, in the relation of a *sympathetic testimony of nature*.  

least of all can γάρ introduce a ground of the apostle's belief for his own *λογίζομαι κ.τ.λ.* (van Hengel). According to Philippi, what is to be established is, that the *δόξα* is not already present, but only future, which, however, even taking into account human impatience, was quite self-evident. For the *nearness* of the *δόξα* (Reiche), just as before it was not expressly announced in the simple *μέλλουσαν*, the sequel affords no proof, since the element of speediness is not expressed. — *ἡ ἀποκαραδοκία*] The verb *καραδοκεῖν* (Xen. *Mem*. iii. 5, 6, frequent in Euripides) strictly means: *to expect with uplifted head*, then *to expect generally*, to *long for* (Valck ad *Herod*. vii. 168; Loesner, *Obs*. p. 256 f.); and *καραδοκία* means *expectatio* (Prov. x. 28; *Aq*. Ps. xxxviii. 7). The strengthened (Vigerus, ed. Herm. p. 582; Tittmann, *Synon*. p. 106 ff.) *ἀποκαραδοκεῖν* (Joseph. *Bell. Jud*. iii. 7. 26; Polyb. xvi. 2. 8, xviii. 31. 4, xxii. 19. 3; *Aq*. Ps. xxxvi. 7; Alberti, *Gloss*. p. 106 ff.) and *ἀποκαραδοκία* (only elsewhere in Phil. i. 20) is the *waiting expectation* (not anxious expectation, as Luther has it) that continues on the strain till the goal is attained. See especially Tittmann, *I.c.*; Fritzsche in *Fritschiol. Opuscul*. p. 150 ff. Without warrant, Loesner, Krebs, Fischer, *de vit. Lex*. p. 128 f., and others, including Rückert, Reiche, and van Hengel, have refused to recognise the strengthening element of *ἀνό*, already pointed out by Chrysostom and

---

1 The train of thought may therefore, expressed in Latin, be paraphrased somewhat thus: "*τί, μίλλουσαν κ.τ.λ. inquam, haec enim spec nostra tantae est certitudinis, ut confirmitur totius naturae ad eundem finem nostrum tendentiae expectatione suspirisque.*"
Theodore of Mopsuestia, although Paul himself gives prominence to it repeatedly in ἀπεκδέχεται (comp. vv. 23, 25; 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Phil. iii. 20). — τῆς κτίσεως] Genitive of the subject. The waiting of the κτίσις is with rhetorical emphasis brought into prominence as something independent. See Winer, p. 221 [E. T. 239]. Ἡ κτίσις means—(1) actus creationis; so i. 20, corresponding to the classic usage in the sense of establishment (Pind. Ol. 13. 118; comp. 1 Pet. ii. 13), founding (Polyb., Plut., and others), planting, etc.—(2) The thing created, and that (a) where the context supplies no limitation, quite generally like our creation, Mark x. 6, xiii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Judith xvi. 14; Wisd. ii. 6, al.; and (b) where the context does limit it, in a more or less special sense, as in Mark xvi. 15, Col. i. 23 (of that portion of the creation, which consists of mankind), Col. i. 15, Heb. iv. 13 (of every individual creature); comp. i. 25, viii. 39; also καὶ ἡ κτίσις in 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15. Since, then, the absolute ἡ κτίσις must receive its limitation of sense simply from the connection, the question is, What does the text in our passage exclude from the meaning of τῆς κτίσεως? There are plainly excluded not only the angelic and demoniac kingdom (see ver. 20), but also Christians collectively, as is clear from vv. 19, 21, and 23, where the Christians are different from the κτίσις, and even opposed to it, so that they cannot be regarded (according to the view of Frommann) as forming a partial conception, embraced also in the κτίσις.1 But is the non-Christian portion of humanity to be excluded also? If not, it must be meant either along with something else, or else alone. If the former, then Paul, seeing that irrational nature at any rate remains within the compass of the idea, would have included under one notion this nature and the Jewish and heathen worlds, which would be absurd. But if non-Christian humanity alone be meant, then—(1) we should not be able to see why Paul should have chosen the term κτίσις, and not have used the definite expression κόσμος, which is formally employed for that idea elsewhere in his own writings and throughout the N. T.

1 Frommann unjustifiably appeals to 2 Cor. vii. 7. See, on the contrary, also Zahn, l.c. p. 516 f., and Engelhardt, p. 49.
Besides, the absolute κτίσις nowhere in the entire N. T. means non-Christian mankind (in Mark xvi. 15 and Col. i. 23, πάση stands along with it); and, indeed, πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις (Mark) and πᾶσα κτίσις (Col.) mean nothing else than the whole creation and every creature, and in these cases it is purely the context that shows that created men are meant, while at the same time it is self-evident ex adjuncto (for the discourse concerns the preaching of the gospel to the κτίσις) that Christians are not to be understood. 

(2) The hostile attitude of the then existing κόσμος towards the Christian body would cause the assertion respecting it of a sympathetic and, as it were, prophetic yearning for the manifestation of the children of God to seem a curious paradox, which, moreover, as a truth, in the case of the Jews and Gentiles, would rest on quite a different foundation, namely, the expectation of the Jewish Messianic kingdom, and on the other hand, the yearning dream of a golden age. 

(3) Again, the expressions in ver. 20 are of such a character, that they in no way make us presuppose in the writer such a conception of humanity subjected through sin to the θάνατος as Paul had, but allow us just to think of the κτίσις as having fallen a prey to the lot of mortality, not by its own free action, but innocently, and by outward necessity; the apostle would not have left the θάνατος unmentioned. 

(4) Further, the hope of attaining to the freedom of the glory of the children of God (ver. 21) was only left to the κόσμος, in so far as it should be converted to Christ; but ver. 21, in point of fact, merely asserts that on the entrance of that glory the κτίσις is to be glorified also, without touching, in regard to mankind, on the condition of conversion—which assuredly Paul least of all would have omitted. 

(5) Finally, Paul expected that, previous to the entrance of the Parousia, the fulness of the Gentiles and all Israel would become christianized (xi. 25, 26), and had to shape his conception, therefore, in such a way as to make humanity, taken as a whole, belong to the νίκη Θεοῦ when the manifestation of the kingdom should appear. 

---

1 An antinomy of two different conceptions as to the origin of death (Frommann, 1872, p. 53) is certainly not to be found in Paul's writings. See on v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 47 ff.
as to that, ver. 21 decidedly forbids the connecting of the notion of mankind with ἡ κτίσις. — There remains, therefore, as the definition of the notion of ἡ κτίσις in accordance with the text: the collective non-rational creation, animate and inanimate, the same which we term in popular usage "all nature" (comp. Wisd. v. 18, xvi. 24, xix. 6), from which we are accustomed to exclude intelligent beings. In view of the poetically prophetic colouring of the whole passage, the expressions of waiting, sighing, hoping, of bondage and redemption, excite the less surprise, since already in the O. T. instances of a similar prosopopoeia are very common (Deut. iv. 34; Ps. xix. 2, lxviii. 17, xviii. 8, cvi. 11; Isa. ii. 1, xiv. 8, lv. 12; Ezek. xxxi. 15; Hab. ii. 11; Bar. iii. 34; Job xii. 7-9, al.); and Chrysostom very aptly remarks: ὅστε δὲ ἐμφαντικότερον γενέσθαι τὸν λόγον, καὶ προσωποποιεῖ τὸν κόσμον ἀπαντα τοῦτον ἀπερ καὶ οἱ προφῆται ποιοῦσιν, ποταμοὺς κροτοῦντας χερσίν εἰσάγοντες κ.τ.λ. Comp. Oecumenius and Theophylact. The idea of the glorification of all nature cannot be accounted un pauline, for the simple reason that it is clearly expressed in our passage; and because, moreover, as being connected with the history of the moral development of humanity according to Gen. iii. 17 f., and necessarily belonging to the idea of the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (Matt. xix. 28; Acts iii. 21; 2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.; Rev. xxi. 1), it may be least of all disclaimed in the case of Paul, since it emanates from the prophets of the Old Testament (Isa. xi. 6 ff.; Ezek. xxxvii.; Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 1; comp. Ps. cii. 27; and see Umbreit, p. 291 ff.), and has thence passed over into the Rabbinical system of doctrine. See Eisenmenger, entdeckt. Judenth. II. p. 367 ff., 824 ff.; Schoettgen, Hor. II. pp. 71, 76, 117 ff.; Bertholdt, Christol. p. 214; Corrodi, Chiliasm. I. p. 376 ff.; Ewald, ad Apocal. p. 307 f.; Delitzsch, Erläut. z. s. Hebr. Uebers. p. 87. The above interpretation, therefore, of the κτίσις has been rightly adopted—only that the intelligent creatures have not in all cases been expressly or exclusively separated from it (e.g. Theodoret includes also the ἄρατα, angels, archangels, etc., as Origen previously, and Erasmus and others subsequently, have also done)—by the majority of expositors, following most of the Fathers (in the first instance
Irenæus, *Haer. v. 32. 1*), by Luther, Erasmus, Beza, Melancthon, Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Balduin, Estius, Grotius, Cocceius, Calovius, Calixtus, Seb. Schmid, Wolf, Bengel, and others, including Flatt, Tholuck, Klee, Usteri (in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1832, p. 835 ff.; and *Lehrbegr.* ed. 4 and 5, pp. 373, 399 ff.), Rückert, Benecke, Schneckenburger, Reiche, Glöckler, de Wette, Neander, Nielsen, Reithmayr, Maier, Philippi, Ewald, Umbreit, Bisping, Lechler, *apostol. Zeitalt.* p. 143, Delitzsch, Ruprecht in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851, p. 214 ff., Zahn, Mangold, Hofmann, and Engelhardt; comp. also M. Schenkel and Graf. Among these, however, are several who, like Luther, Beza, and also Fritzsche, wish to understand it too *narrowly,* merely of the *inanimate* creation,—a limitation not given in the text, and moreover antiprophetic (Tertullian, *ad Hermog.* 10); while, on the other hand, Kollner, with whom Olshausen agrees, takes it too *widely* of all created things generally. See, against this, the textual limitation explained above. If, however, in accordance with the above, the removal of intelligent beings from the compass of the *κτισις* must be regarded as decided, the decision is fatal to the view of others, who, following the example of Augustine, explain *η κτισις* as *mankind*; and that *either* in the quite comprehensive sense of *mankind collectively* (in the state of nature), as, following older expositors especially scholastic and Roman Catholic, Doderlein, Gabler, Ammon, Keil (*Opusc.* p. 207), Grimm (*de vi vocabulī κτισ-, Lips. 1812), Schulthess (*evangel. Belchr. üb. d. Erneuer. d. Nat.*, Zurich 1833), Geisler (in the *Annal. d. ges. Theol.* 1835, Jan. p. 51 ff.), Schrader, Krehl, van Hengel, Frommann, and others do; or, with exclusion of the Christians, in the *sense of mankind still unconverted,*1 as Augustine himself suggested,2 by which again,

1 So Wetstein, Baumgarten-Crusius, Jatho, and Köster; formerly (in eds. 1, 2, 3) also Usteri, following Schleiermacher.
2 His entire exposition (see *Expos. quar. propos. ex ep. ad Rom.* 53) runs thus:—"Sic intelligendum est, ut neque sensum dolendi et gemendi opinemur esse in arboribus et oleribus et lapidibus et ceteris hujuscemodi creaturis (hic enim error Manichaeorum est); neque angulos sanctos vanitatibus esse arbitremur; sed omnem creaturam in ipso homine sine ulla caluminia cogitamus. . . . *Omnis autem* est etiam in homine, et spiritualis et animalis et corporalis, quia homo constat spiritu et anima et corpore. Ergo creatura revelationem filiorum
however, many understood specially the unconverted Gentiles (Locke, Lightfoot, Knatchbull, Hammond, Semler, and Nachtingall), and various others the unconverted Jews (Cramer, Böhme, and Gersdorf). Others have even explained it of Christians collectively, as the new creature (Vorstius, Deyling, Nösselt, Socinians and Arminians). And just as little can κτίος be equivalent to ψυχή (Märcker) or to σάρξ, and be supposed to designate the creaturely element in the regenerate (Weissbach in the Sächs. Stud. I. p. 76 ff., and Zyro in the Stud. u. Krit. 1845, 2, 1851, p. 645 ff.). Compare also, regarding the various expositions, M. Schenkel, p. 9 ff.; and against the view which takes it of mankind, Engelhardt, l.c. — τῆν ἀποκάλυπτην τοῖς θεοῖς τ. Θεοῖς] The event, the blissful catastrophe, whereby the sons of God become manifest as such (in their δόξα). How exalted the dignity in which they here appear above the κτίος! Bengel: “ad creaturam ex peccato redundarunt incommoda; ad creaturam ex gloria filiorum Dei redundabit recreatio.” The κτίος, in virtue of its physical connection with that ἀποκάλυπτην, shall be a partaker in the blissful manifestation.

Vv. 20, 21. Ground of this longing.— τῇ ματαιότητι. Prefixed with emphasis: vanitati, to nothingness. The substantive (Pollux, vi. 134) is no longer found in Greek authors, but frequently in the LXX. (as in Ps. xxxix. 6). See Schleusner, Thes. III. p. 501. It indicates here the empty (i.e. as having lost its primitive purport, which it had by creation) quality of being, to which the κτίος was changed from its original perfection.— ἀνεργάγω] was subjected, was made subject to, as to a ruling power formerly unknown to it. This historical fact (aorist) took place in consequence of the fall, Gen. iii. 17.

Dei exspectat, quicquid nunc in homine laborat et corruptioni subjacet. Erant enim adhuc credituri, qui etiam spiritu subjacebant laboriosis erroribus. Sed ne quis putaret, de ipseorum labore tantum dictum esse, adjungit etiam de ipsis, qui jam crediderant. Quamquam enim spiritu, i.e. mente, jam servirent legi Dei: tamen, quia carme servitur legi peccati, quamdiu molestias et sollicitationes mortalitatis nostrae patimur, ideo addit dicens: Non solum, etc. (ver. 28). Non solum ergo ipse, quae tantummodo creatura dicitur in hominibus, qui nondum crediderunt, et ideo nondum in filiorum Dei numeros constituti, congemiscit ac dolet: sed etiam nonmet ipse, qui credimus et primitias Sp. habemus, quia jam spiritu adhaeremus Deo per fidem, et ideo non iam creatura, sed filii Dei appellamur,” etc.
Comp. *Beresh. 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." See also Zahn, p. 532. The reference to an *original* *ματαιότης*, introduced even by the act of creation (Theodoret, Grotius, Krehl, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, and Köster), is historically inappropriate (Gen. i. 31), and contrary to ὅιχ ἐκώσα, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ., which supposes a previous state *not* subject to the *ματ.* Further, since the *ὑποτάξεως* is subsequently mentioned, the interpretation *se subjicit* (Fritzsche) is thereby excluded.—ὁιχ ἐκώσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τ. *ὑποτάξεως.* This must occasion their expectation all the more; for their subjection is at variance with their original state and the desire of immunity founded thereon, and it took place "invita et repellante natura" (Calvin, namely, through the guilt of human sin), *on account of the subjector* (διὰ with the accusative, comp. on John vi. 57), that is, because the counsel and will of the subjecting God (the contrast to one's own non-willingness) had to be thus satisfied.¹ The idea of another than *God* in τὸν *ὑποτάξεως.* (Knatchbull and Capellus: Adam; Chrysostom, Schneckenburger, Bisping, and Zahn: man; Hammond and others, quoted by Wolf: the devil) is forbidden by the very absence of a defining statement, so that the subject is assumed as *well known.* According to Gen. iii. 17, it was indeed man through whose guilt the subjection ensued; but *God* was the subjector (ὁ *ὑποτάξεως*). — ἐπὶ εὐπτιδι ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] *on hope* (iv. 18) that, etc., may be joined either with *ὑποτάξεως.* (Origen, Vulgate, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Piscator, Estius, and others, including Ch. Schmidt and Olshausen) or with *ὑπετάγη.* The latter conjunction brings out more forcibly the ἐπὶ εὐπτιδι; for this contains a new element by way of motive for the expectation of nature. ἐπὶ, *spe proposita,* indicates the condition which was conceded in the *ὑπετάγη,* as it

¹ The marks of parenthesis before ὅιχ and after ὅτι are to be expunged, since the connection and construction proceed without a break. This applies also against Frommann, who assigns to this parenthesis merely the object of explaining the *passive* *ὑπετάγη.* Ewald puts in a parenthesis the entire verse, thus making ὅτι λαβὼν connect itself with ἀνικητικω. But for this there appears likewise no reason.
were, the equivalent provisionally given for it, Acts ii. 24; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 18, and Kühner *in loc.*; Ast, *Lex. Plat.* i. p. 767; Bernhardy, p. 250. — ὅτι that, object of the hope (Phil. i. 20); not *nam*, as it is taken by most expositors, who join ἐν' ἐλπίδι with ἱποτάξ.; among others by Schneckenburger, *Beiträg.* p. 122, who assigns as his reason, that otherwise the αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις could not be repeated. But that repetition is necessitated by the emphasis of the similarity of the relation, which αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις has over-against the children of God, for which reason Paul did not write ὅτι καὶ ἐλευθεροθησταί (in opposition to Hofmann's objection). Besides, the purport of the ἐν' ἐλπίδι necessarily to be stated, in order to give the ground of the expectation of the κτίσις as directed precisely to the manifestation of the sons of God. The indefinite ἐν' ἐλπίδι would supply a motive for its expectation of deliverance in general, but not for its expectation of the glory of the children of God. This applies also against Hofmann, who refers ὅτι κ.τ.λ., as statement of the reason, to the whole preceding sentence, whereby, besides, the awkward idea is suggested, that the subjection took place on account of the deliverance to be accomplished in the future; it had, in fact, an entirely different historical ground, well known from history, and already suggested by the διὰ τὸν ἱποτάξ., namely, the implication of the κτίσις in the entrance of sin among mankind.— καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις] et ipsa creatura, that is, the creature also on its part, not merely the children of God. There is simply expressed the similarity; not a climax (even), of which the context affords no hint.— τῆς φθορᾶς] Genitive of apposition: from the bondage that consists in corruption. See ver. 23. Incorrectly paraphrased by Kollner: "from the corruptible, miserable bondage." At variance with this is ver. 20, according to which τ. φθ. cannot be made an adjective; as is also the sequel, in which τὴν ἐλευθ. corresponds to τῆς δουλείας, and τῆς δόξης τ. τέκν. τ. Ἰησοῦ to the τῆς φθορᾶς. The φθορά (antithesis = ἄφθαρσία, ii. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 42-50) is the destruction, that develops itself out of the ματαιότης, the κατάλυσις opposed frequently in Plato and others to the γένεσις (*Phaed.* p. 95 E; *Phil.* p. 55 A; Lucian, *A.* 19). Comp. on Gal. vi. 8. It is
not the φθορά in the first instance that makes the state of the κρίσις a state of bondage, as Hofmann apprehends the genitive; but the existing bondage is essentially such, that what is subjected to it is liable to the fate of corruption. — εἰς τ. ἐλευθ. is the state, to which the κρίσις shall attain by its emancipation. An instance of a genuine Greek pregnant construction. See Fritzche, ad Marc. p. 322; Winer, p. 577 [E. T. 776]. — τῆς δόξης τ. τ. Θ. Likewise genitive of apposition: into the freedom which shall consist in the glory of the children of God, i.e. in a glory similar thereto (by participation in it); not, as Hofmann thinks: which the glory of the children of God shall have brought with it. If, with Luther and many others, including Böhme and Köllner, τῆς δόξης be treated as an adjective: “to the glorious freedom,” we should then have quite as arbitrary a departure from the verbal order, in accordance with which τῶν τέκνων belongs most naturally to τῆς δόξης, as from the analogy of the preceding τῆς δόξης φθορά. The accumulation of genitives, τ. δόξης κ.τ.λ., has a certain solemnity; comp. ii. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. iv. 13, al. — Observe, further, how Paul has conceived the catastrophe, of which he is speaking, not as the destruction of the world and a new creation, but, in harmony with the prophetic announcements, especially those of Isaiah (Isa. xxxv., lxv. 17, lxvi. 22; comp. Zahn, p. 537; Schultz, alttest. Theol. II. p. 227), as a transformation into a more perfect state. The passing away of the world is the passing away of its form (1 Cor. vii. 31), by which this transformation is conditioned, and in which, according to 2 Pet. iii. 10, fire will be the agent employed. And the hope, the tenor of which is specified by δή κ.τ.λ., might, in connection with this living personification, be ascribed to all nature, as if it were conscious thereof, since the latter is destined to become the scene and surrounding of the glorified children of God. But that δήμιος does not pertain to mankind, whose presentiment of immortality, by means of its darkened original consciousness of God (Frommann), does not correspond to the idea of δήμιος; comp., on the contrary, Eph. ii. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 13. If, on the other hand, the Gentile hope, cherished amidst the misery of the times, as to a better
state of things (according to poets: the golden age of the Saturnia regna), were meant as an image of the Christian hope (Köster), then Paul would have conceived the εἰσπροβοθήσεται as conditioned by the future conversion of the Gentiles. But thus the εἰσπρᾶς would amount to this, that the Gentiles should become themselves children of God, which is inconsistent with ver. 19. There, and likewise in ver. 21, the sons of God are the third element, for whose transfiguration the κτίσις waits, and from whose glorification it hopes, in ver. 21, that the latter shall benefit it also—the κτίσις—through participation therein; and be to it also deliverance and freedom from its hitherto enduring bondage. This is applicable only to the παλαιγγενεσία (see on Matt. xix. 28) at the Parousia.

Ver. 22. Proof, not of the άτοκαραδοκία τής κτίσεως (Philippi), which is much too distant, and whose goal remains quite unnoticed here; nor yet of the δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς (Zahn), which was not the point of the foregoing thought at all; but of what was announced by ἔν' εὐπνοίᾳ, δότι κ. α. ἢ κτ. εἰσπροβοθήσεται κτ.λ. For if that hope of glorious deliverance had not been left to it, all nature would not have united its groaning and travelling until now. This phenomenon, so universal and so unbroken, cannot be conduct without an aim; on the contrary, it presupposes as the motive of the painful travail that very hope, towards whose final fulfilment it is directed.¹ The οίκαμεν (comp. ii. 2, iii. 19, vii. 14) is sufficiently explained as an appeal to the Christian consciousness, in which the view of nature stands in connection with the curse of sin.² The

¹ Consequently the element of proof does not lie in διάμειν, but in the ἰν' υπ' εὐπνοίᾳ κτ.λ., introduced as well known. This in opposition to Hofmann, who refers διάμειν γὰρ κτ.λ. back as probative to the thought τῆς γὰρ μετανίκτης κτ.λ. in ver. 20; and gives as the sense of the argument: "The Christian would not speak of a subjection of the creature under vanity, if he looked upon its present existence as one satisfied in itself and this world as the best world." But it could not at all be an object to prove that relation of μετανίκτης (who can be supposed to have doubted it!); but it was an object to prove the ἰν' εὐπνοίᾳ ἰν' κτ.λ.; this is the punctum saliens, which is then further brought out in ver. 23 ff.

² This consciousness is the necessary premiss of the Christian idea of the Palingenesia of the universe at the end of history, Matt. xix. 28. Hence Frommann is in error in discovering in the above διάμειν the overthrow of our explanation of κτίσις.
perfectly superfluous assumption, that the apostle had a book before him containing a similar deduction (Ewald), is suggested by nothing in the text.— In συντάξει and συνωδίνει the συν is not a mere strengthening particle (Loesner, Michaelis, Sermier, Ernesti, and Kölhner), but, on the contrary (comp. Beza), finds its natural reference in πᾶσα, and denotes "gemitum et dolorem communem inter se partium creaturae," Estius. Calvin, Pareus, Koppe, Ewald, and Umbreit, following Oecumenius, have indeed referred συν to the groaning being in common with that of the children of God; but against this view ver. 23 is decisive, and the reference to men generally, with whom the κτίσις sighs (Fritzsche), is foreign to the context. Fritzsche, without due reason, asserts the want of linguistic usage in favour of our view. For it is unquestionable that, in accordance with the usage of analogous verbs, συντάξει may denote the common sighing of the elements comprised in the collective πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις among themselves (comp. Eph. iv. 16: πᾶν τὸ σῶμα συναρμολογούμενον, comp. ii. 21; Plat. Legg. iii. p. 686 B: ἐπεὶ γενομένῃ γε ἡ τότε διάνοια καὶ συμφωνήσασα εἰς ἑν, Dem. 516. 7: συνοργισθεὶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, 775. 18: συναρμολογεῖται πᾶς ὁ τῆς πόλεως κόσμος). That concrete examples of that nature cannot be quoted, is not decisive against it, since συντάξει (Eur. Ion. 935, comp. συντάξει, Arist. Eth. ix. 11) and also συνωδίνει (Eur. Hel. 727; Porphyry. de abst. iii. 10) are only extant in a very few passages. Comp. generally Winer, de verb. compos. II. p. 21 f. Just the same with συναλγεῖν, Plat. Rep. p. 462 D, and συναλλοεύσασθαι p. 462 E. — συνωδίνει] Not an allusion to the ἀποκάλυψις τῆς ἀποκάλυψης Messiae (see on Matt. ii. 3) are peculiar sufferings, that shall immediately precede the appearance of the Messiah, whilst the travail of nature has continued since as early as Gen. iii. 17 (ver. 20). But the figure is the same in both cases—that of the pains of labour. All nature groans and suffers anguish, as if in travail, over-against the moment of its deliverance. The conception of the ὀδὴνεῖν is based on the fact that the

---

1 So already Theodore of Mopsuestia: βολίων οἵ εἰσίν, οὐκ ἐνθεύεται τὸ τῶν παθῶν κτισμός.

2 Comp. also Nägelsbach, s. Ilias, p. 193, ed. 3.
painful struggling of the κτέσις is directed towards the longed-for change, with the setting in of which the suffering has accomplished its end and ceases. Comp. John xvi. 21. — ἐχρι τοῦ νῦν] that is, up to the present moment; so incessantly has the sighing continued. Formerly Frommann imported the thought: until now, when the revelation of the true goal in Christ has taken place; see, against this, Zahn, p. 524 f. However, Frommann has now corrected his view. Hofmann erroneously takes it as: now still, in contrast to the future change. Comp. rather Phil. i. 5. The point of beginning of the sighing and travelling is that ἀνεῖν in ver. 20. Comp. also ἔως τοῦ νῦν in Matt. xxiv. 21. Now still would be ἄν τοῦ νῦν, 1 Cor. iii 2.

Ver. 23. Climax of the foregoing proof that the ἐπ' ἀλπίδι, ὑπ' α.τ.λ. of the κτέσις, ver. 21, is well founded. "Otherwise, indeed, we Christians also would not join in that sighing." — οὐ μόνον δὲ σιλ. πᾶσα ἡ κτέσις στενάζει. — What follows must be read: ἄλλα καὶ αὐτοὶ, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἕχοντες, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν. See the critical remarks. But we also on our part, though we possess the first-fruits of the Spirit, sigh likewise in ourselves. — τὴν ἀπαρχ. τ. πνεύμ.] τ. πν. is the partitive genitive, as is involved in the very meaning of ἀπαρχή. Comp. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 20, xvi. 15; Jas. i. 18; and all the passages of the LXX. and Apocr., where ἀρχ. stands with the genitive of the thing, in Biel and Schleusner. Comp. Herod. i. 92; Plat. Legg. vii. p. 806 D; Dem. 164. 21; Thuc. iii. 58. 3; Soph. Track. 758; Eur. Or. 96; Phoen. 864; Ion. 402; also ἀπαρχὴ τῆς σοφίας, Plat. Prot. p. 343 A; and ἀπαρχαὶ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας, Plut. Mor. p. 172 C. By the possessors, however, of the ἀπαρχή τοῦ πνεύματος, are not exclusively meant the apostles, who at Pentecost had received the first outpouring of the Spirit, and among whom Paul includes himself on account of his miraculous conversion (Origen, Oecumenius, Melancthon, Grotius, and others). He means rather the Christians of that age generally, since in fact they—in contrast to the far greater mass of mankind still unconverted, for whom, according to Joel iii. 1, the receiving of the Spirit was still a thing of the future (xi. 25 ff.)—were in possession of that, which first had resulted from the communication of the Spirit,
and which therefore stood related to the collective bestowal as the daybreak. So, on the whole, Erasmus, Wetstein, Morus, Reiche, Külner, de Wette, Olshausen, Koster, and Frommann; see also Müller in the *Luther. Zeitschr.* 1871, p. 618. Paul does not say simply τὸ πνεῦμα ἔχοντες, but, in the lofty feeling of the privilege,¹ which he discovered in the earlier calling and sanctification of the then Christians: τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος; "even we, though favoured so pre-eminently that we possess the first-fruit gift of the Spirit, cannot refrain from sighing likewise." This we remark in opposition to the oft-repeated objection, that it was not an element of importance whether they had received the πνεῦμα at the first or a few years later; and also in opposition to the quite as irrelevant objection of Hofmann, that the conception of a measure of the Spirit to be given forth by degrees is nowhere indicated. This conception has no place here, and the Spirit is one and the same; but if, in the first instance, only a comparatively small portion of mankind has received it, and its possession in the case of the remaining collective body is still in abeyance, this serves to constitute the idea of an ἀπαρχή in relation to the whole body. Nevertheless, the sense: best gift of the Spirit (Ch. Schmidt, Rosenmüller), is not conveyed by τὴν ἀπαρχὴν, because that must have been suggested by the context, and also because Paul could not have regarded the later communication of the Spirit as less valuable. Further, the sense of a merely provisional reception of the Spirit, taking place, as it were, on account, in contrast to the future full effusion in the kingdom of heaven (Chrysostom and other Fathers, in Suicer, *Thes.* I. p. 423; Calvin, Beza, Pareus, Estius, Calovius, Semler, Flatt, Tholuck, Philippi, and Bising; comp. also Pfleiderer), is not contained in τὴν ἀπαρχὴν, because Paul, had he wished to speak here of a preliminary reception in contrast to the future plenitude, must necessarily, in accordance with the connection, have so spoken of that of the ἀποθέσεως or δόξα, not of the Spirit, and because a full effusion of the Spirit at the Parousia is nowhere taught in the N. T. The Spirit already received, not a new and more

¹ This is certainly no "side-glance at other Christians" (as Philippi objects), which would be both a far-fetched and a disturbing element.
perfect reception of it in the future \( \alpha i \acute{w} \), by its quickening activity leads to and conditions the eternal \( \zeta \omega \eta \), in which God is then all in all (1 Cor. xv. 28). Others, again, make \( \tau \, \tau \nu \) an epexegetical genitive of apposition: the Spirit as first-fruits, namely, of the state of glory. So Bengel, Keil, Opusc., Winer, p. 495 [E. T. 667], Baumgarten-Crusius, Reithmayr, Rückert, Maier, Hofmann, Zahn, and Engelhardt; comp. also Flatt. But however Pauline the idea may be (2 Cor. i 22, v. 3; Eph. i 14; comp. Rom. ii. 5), it would, when thus expressed, be liable to be misunderstood, since the readers were accustomed to find in the genitive with \( \acute{a} \pi \alpha \rho \chi \acute{h} \) nothing else than that, of which the latter is a portion; and how intelligibly Paul might have expressed himself, either in accordance with 2 Cor. i.c. and Eph. i.c., by \( \tau \omicron \upsilon \alpha \rho \rho \alpha \beta \omega \alpha \nu a \), or by \( \tau \omicron \upsilon \pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \omicron \).! This applies, at the same time, against Fritzsche, who takes \( \tau \omicron \upsilon \pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon \mu \omicron \) as genitive of the subject, and the first gifts of the Spirit as in contrast to the \( \sigma \varphi \alpha \mu \rho \eta \lambda \pi \lambda \alpha \) which the Spirit will give to us in the \( \alpha i \acute{w} \, \mu \acute{e} \lambda \lambda \alpha w \). Against this it may also be urged that the Holy Ghost is not described in the N. T. as the Giver of eternal life (not even in such passages as 2 Cor. i 22, v. 5; Eph. i 14, iv. 30; Gal. vi. 8). It is God who, in like manner as He calls and justifies, conveys also the eternal \( \delta \acute{o} \varsigma \) (ver. 30). The Spirit operates to eternal life by His government (ver. 2), and is the ground (ver. 11) and pledge (\( \alpha \pi \rho \alpha \beta \alpha \delta \omicron \) of that life; but He does not give it.\(^1\) — \( \kappa a l \) \( \alpha \iota \tau \omicron \) Repeated and placed along with \( \epsilon \nu \, \acute{e} \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omega \) with earnest emphasis: \( \epsilon \upsilon \pi \varsigma \, \iota \pi \omicron \varsigma \, \iota \nu \omicron \delta \upsilon \omicron \iota \varsigma \). The latter is not equivalent to \( \epsilon \nu \, \alpha \lambda \lambda \acute{h} \nu \omicron \) (Schulthess and Fritzsche), but denotes, in harmony with the nature of the deep, painful emotion, the inward sighing of the still longing of believers; which suffers, is silent, and hopes, but never complains, being assured of the goal that shall be finally reached. Hofmann incorrectly would join \( \kappa \) \( \alpha \iota \tau \omicron \) \( \epsilon \nu \, \acute{e} \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omega \) with \( \acute{e} \chi \omicron \nu \omicron \tau \omicron \varsigma \). But this would leave the \( \kappa a l \), which, according to the common connection with \( \sigma \varphi \alpha \mu \alpha \varsigma \).

\(^1\) Hence also the expression used by Luther, in the explanation of the third article in the Smaller Catechism, does not accord with the New Testament mode of expression. The sense in which he meant it is brought out, however, in the Larger Catechism.
has its appropriate correlative in the sighing of the κτίσις, without a reference. For, when Hofmann sets it down as the object of the καὶ to emphasize personal possession on the part of the Christians in contrast to the future participation of the κτίσις, there is thus forced on this καὶ the meaning of already; and this all the more arbitrarily, since καὶ αὐτοί just precedes it in the quite common sense of et ipsis (Baeumlein, Partik. p. 151; Breitenbach, ad Xen. Hell. iii. 1. 10), and its emphatic repetition is very appropriate to the lively emotion of the discourse. — νιὸθεσ. ἀπεκδέχ.] whilst we wait for the adoption of children. It is true, believers have already this blessing (ver. 15), but only as inward relation and as divine right, with which, however, the objective and real state does not yet correspond. Thus, looked at from the standpoint of complete realization, they are only to receive νιὸθεσίαν at the Parousia, whereupon the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν νόμων τ. Θεοῦ and their δόξα ensues. Comp. also Matt. v. 9, 45; Luke vi. 15. In like manner the δικαιοσύνη is a present possession, and also one to be entered on hereafter. Comp. on v. 19; and see on Gal. v. 5; Col. iii. 3 f. Luther incorrectly joins νιὸθεσ. with στενάζ., which, with an accusative, means to bemoan or bewail something (Soph. Ant. 873; Oed. C. 1668; Dem. 690. 18; Eur. Suppl. 104; and often elsewhere). — τῆν ἀπολ. τ. σώμ. ἡμ.] epexegetis: (namely) the redemption of our body from all the defects of its earthly condition; through which redemption it shall be glorified into the σῶμα ἀφαρτοῦ similar to the glorified body of Christ (Phil. iii. 21; 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 51), or shall be raised up as such, in case of our not surviving till the Parousia (1 Cor. xv. 42 ff.). So, in substance (τοῦ σώμ. as gen. subj.), Chrysostom and other Fathers (in Suicer, Thes. I. p. 463), Beza, Grotius, Estius, Cornelius a Lapide, and most modern expositors. On the other hand, Erasmus, Clericus, and others, including Reiche, Fritzsche, Krehl, and Ewald, take it as: redemption from the body. This is linguistically admissible (Heb. ix. 15); we should thus have to refer it, not to death, but to deliverance from this earthly body through the reception of the immortal and glorious body at the Parousia, 1 Cor. xv. 51. But in that
case Paul must have added to τοῦ σώματ. ἡμῶν a qualitative more precise definition, as in Phil. iii. 21

Remark.—If we adopt the common reading (ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ ἀσ. τ. πν. ἵχοντες, καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτῶι κ.τ.λ.), which Ewald and Umbreit follow, while Rückert, Philippi, Tholuck, and Hofmann declare themselves in favour of ours (see the crit. remarks), αὐτῷ . . . ἵχοντες is understood, either as meaning the Christians of that age generally, and καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτῶι the apostles (Köllner, following Melancthon, Wolf, and many others), or Paul alone (Koppe, Reiche, Umbreit, and many others); or, the former is referred to beginners in Christianity, and the latter to those who have been Christians for a longer time (Glöckler); or, both (the latter per analepsin) are referred to the apostles (Grotius), or to the Christians (Luther, Beza, Calvin, Klee, Maier, Köster, and Frommann). The interpretation referring it to the Christians is the only right one; so that ἡμῖν brings into more definite prominence the repeated subject. The ἵχοντες, without the article, is fatal to every reference to subjects of two sorts.

Ver. 24. Τῇ γὰρ ἐλπ. ἐσώθ.] Ground of the νιοθεσίαν ἀπεκδ., so far as the νιοθεσία is still object of expectation; for in hope we were made partakers of salvation. The dative, "non medi,

1 See even Melancthon, who rightly observes: "Differunt autem fides et spes, quia fides in praesentia accipit remissionem peccatorum . . . sed spes est expec
tatio futurae liberationis." Faith precedes the latter.
and here especially, as is shown by what follows, he brings into prominence the definite conception of hope, which as δόξα μελλόντων (Plat. Legg. I. p. 644 C) rests in the προσδοκία ἁγαθοῦ (Plat. Def. p. 416 A). Hofmann also takes τῇ ἐλπί. in the sense of the means, but so that it shall signify the benefit hoped for, the object of the waiting, which God has offered to us in the word, by which we were converted to faith (Col. i. 5). Thus, however, the thought that we have been saved by hope (instead of by faith, Eph. ii. 8) is set aside only by the insertion of parenthetical clauses. And in Col. i. 5, the blessing hoped for, heard of through preaching, is set forth as the ground, not of conversion or salvation, but of love. — ἐλπίς δὲ κ.τ.λ. . . ἀπεκδεχόμενη] is a deduction from τῇ ἐλπί, closing the first ground of encouragement, and meaning substantially: "the nature of hope, however, involves our patiently waiting for."—βλέπομένη] But a hope (δὲ μεταβατικόν) that is seen, i.e. whose object lies before the eyes (comp. on the objective ἐλπίς, Col. i. 5; 1 Tim. i. 1; Heb. vi. 18; Thuc. iii. 57. 4; Lucian, Pisc. 3; Aeschin. ad Ctesiph. 100). Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 18. — τὶ καὶ Ελπίζει;?] Why doth he still hope for it? By καὶ is indicated the—in the supposed case groundless—accession of hope to sight (1 Cor. xv. 29). Comp. generally, on this strengthening use of the καὶ, etiam, in lively interrogation, Klotz, ad Devar. p. 633 f., and on 1 Cor. l.c. Bengel aptly remarks: "cum visione non est spe opus."

Ver. 25. Δε ἔντομα.] With patience, perseveringly. Heb. xii. 1; Kühner, II. 1, p. 418. — The indicative ἀπεκδεχόμενη, which is not, with Estius, Koppe, Köllner, and others, to be taken as exspectare debemus, does not announce the virtuous operation (Grotius), but simply the situation, which the circumstance that we hope without seeing involves. The ethical position assigned to us is, that we patiently wait for the object of our hope.

Ver. 26. The second ground of encouragement (see on vv. 18–31), connected with the immediately foregoing by ὄσα ἥρμα.1 — τὸ πνεύμα] The objective Holy Spirit. See vv. 27;
16, 23, and what follows, where the activity of the πνεῦμα is described as something distinct from the subjective consciousness. Köllner incorrectly takes it (comp. Reiche) as: the Christian life-element; and van Hengel: “fiduciae sensus a. Sp. a. profectus.” — συναρτιλ.] The συν must neither be neglected (as by many older expositors, also Olshausen), nor regarded as a mere strengthening adjunct (Rückert and Reiche). Beza gives the right explanation: “ad nos laborantes refertur.” He joins His activity with our weakness, helps it. See Luke x. 40; Ex. xviii. 22; Ps. lxxxviii. 22. — τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν] Not specially weakness in prayer (Ambrose and Bengel), for in what follows there is specified only the particular mode of the help, which the Spirit renders to us in our infirmity. It is therefore to be left general: with our weakness,— so far, namely, as in that waiting for final redemption adequate power of our own for ἐπομονή fails us. — τὸ γὰρ τι προσευχή. κ.τ.λ.] Reason assigned, by specifying how the Spirit, etc.; in prayer, namely, He intercedes for us.— On τό, see Winer, p. 103 [E. T. 135]. It denotes what of praying comes into question in such a position. Comp. Krüger, Xen. Anab. iv. 4. 17. — τι προσευχή. καθό δει] what we ought to pray for according as it is necessary, in proportion (comp. 2 Cor. viii. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 13) to the need. The latter is the subsequently determining element; it is not absolutely and altogether unknown to us what we ought to ask, but only what it is necessary to ask according to the given circumstances. Usually καθό δεί is taken in reference to the form of asking, like τῶς in Matt. x. 19; but thus the distinctive reference of the meaning of καθό, prout (comp. Plat. Soph. p. 267 D; Baruch i. 6) is neglected. Chrysostom rightly illustrates the matter by the apostle’s own example, who ἐπέρ τοῦ σκόλοπος τοῦ δεδομένου αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ σαρκί (2 Cor. xii.) had prayed for what was not granted him. According to Hofmann, καθό δεῖ connects the matter stands with us, (1) on the footing, that we with patience wait; but likewise (2) on the footing, that the Spirit helps us.” The ἐναρμόνω, pariter ac, idem (see generally Kühner, II. 1, p. 564), introduces a symmetrical corresponding relation, which is added on the divine side to our waiting. Comp. Mark xiv. 31; 1 Tim. v. 25; Tit. ii. 6; Plat. Symp. p. 186 E, al.; 2 Macc. xv. 39; 3 Macc. vi. 33.
itself with ὧν υἱὸν θανάτου, so that the thought would be: "we do not so understand as it would be necessary." But how much too feeble in this connection would be the assertion of a merely insufficient knowledge! — ἐπερευροχάεις] i.e. ἐντυρχάει ἐπερ ἡμῶν; He applies Himself for our benefit (counterpart of xi. 2), namely, τῷ Θεῷ, which addition is read by Origen. The double compound is not elsewhere preserved, except in the Fathers, but it is formed after the analogy of ὑπεραποκρίνομαι, ὑπεραπολογεόμαι, and many other words. The superlative rendering of it (Luther: "He intercedes for us the best") is improbable, since ἐντυρχάει does not already express the notion of that which is much (v. 20) or triumphant (viii. 37; Phil. ii. 9), or the like, which would admit of enhancement. — στεναγμ. ἀλαλήτου] i.e. thereby that He makes unutterable sighs, sighs whose meaning words are powerless to convey. The idea therefore is, that the Holy Spirit sighs unutterably in our hearts (ver. 25), and thereby intercedes for us with God, to whom, as heart-searcher, the desire of the Spirit sighing in the heart is known. It was an erroneous view, whereby, following Augustine, Tr. VI. on John ii., most expositors, who took τῷ πν. rightly as the Holy Spirit, held the στεναγμ. ἀλαλήτου to be unutterable sighs which the man, incited by the Spirit,1 heaves forth. The Spirit Himself (comp. also Hofmann) must sigh, if He is to intercede for us with sighs, and if God is to understand the φρόνημα of the Spirit (ver. 27); although the Spirit uses the human organ for His sighing (comp. the counterpart phenomenon of demons speaking or crying

1 According to Philipp: "the sanctified human spirit," whose sighing is traced back to its ultimate origin, the Spirit of God Himself. In the cordial marriage of the Spirit of God with that of man, there takes place, as it were (!), an incarnation of the former. This mysticism is not in harmony with the N. T., which always distinguishes clearly and specifically between the Holy Spirit and the human spirit, as in ver. 16. This applies also against Pfeiderer in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1871, p. 178 f., who thinks that our spirit is to be distinguished from the divine Spirit dwelling in us only in such a way, that the two stand related merely as the form to the real contents of the self-consciousness. In cases such as our passage, according to his view, the Ego knows itself in objective consciousness as furnished with the Divine Spirit, without feeling itself to be so in the subjective consciousness. In this way there is substituted for the twofold spirit in our passage a twofold form and activity of the Christian consciousness, which the plain words do not permit.
out of men), as He likewise does elsewhere for His speaking, Matt. x. 20. See also on Gal. iv. 6. The tongue is analogously, in the case of speaking with tongues, the organ of the Spirit who speaks. The necessary explanation of the πνεῦμα as meaning the Holy Spirit, and the fact that the sighs must be His sighs, overturn the rationalizing interpretations of Reiche: “Christian feeling cherishes, indeed, the quiet longing in the heart, and therewith turns, full of confidence, to God, but nevertheless does not permit itself any inquisitive wishes towards Him;” and of Kollner: “The Spirit gained in Christ . . . works in man that deep and holy emotion in which man, turned towards God in his inmost feeling, cannot, in the fulness of the emotion, express his burden in words, and can only relieve his oppressed heart by silent groanings.” A mere arbitrary alteration of the simple verbal sense is to be found in the view to which Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, and others have recourse, that the Spirit is here the χάρισμα εὐχής, in virtue of which the human soul sighs. Comp. Theodoret, who thinks that Paul means not τὴν ὑπόστασιν τοῦ πνεύματος, but τὴν δεδομένην τοῦ πνεύμου χάριν ὑπὸ τὴν ταύτης διεγειρόμενοι κατανυπόμεθα, πυρσευώμενοι προθυμότερος προσευχόμεθα κ.τ.λ. The question whether, moreover, ἀλαλ. should, with Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, Koppe, Flatt, Glöckler, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Reithmayr, van Hengel, Köster, and others, be rendered unexpressed, i.e. dumb, not accompanied with words, or, with the Vulgate and the majority of commentators, inexpressible (for the expression of whose meaning words are insufficient), is decided by the fact that only the latter sense can be proved by linguistic usage, and it characterizes the depth and fervour of the sighing most directly and forcibly. Comp. also 2 Cor. ix. 15; 1 Pet. i. 8.; Anth. Pal. v. 4 (Philodem. 17); Theogn. 422 (according to Stob. Serm. 36, p. 216).

Ver. 27. Ὅ ἐρευν. τὰς καρδ. Traditionally hallowed (1 Sam. xvi. 7; 1 Kings viii. 39; Ps. vii. 10; Prov. xv. 11; Jer. xvii. 9 f.), description of God, bearing on the subject in

1 As ἀγάπης may be used; but not ἀγάπης, which always means, unutterable, unspeakable.
hand; for it is in the heart, as in the central laboratory of the personal self-conscious life (comp. Delitzsch, *Psychol.* p. 254), that the praying Spirit sighs, Gal. iv. 6. — ὅτι Not for, as many think, including Tholuck, Rückert, de Wette, Philippi, Ewald, and Umbreit. What follows in fact conveys no real ground, since God would in every case know the purpose of the Spirit, and to take οἶδε in the pregnant sense: understands and hears (so Rückert, following Calvin), is utterly unjustifiable, especially after ὁ ἐπευρ. κ.τ.λ. The ὅτι is rather that, annexed by way of explanation: that He, namely. Comp. Grotius, Estius, Benecke, Reiche, Fritzsche, Maier, Krehl, Baumgarten-Crusius, Bisping, Reithmayr, van Hengel, and Hofmann. See on Phil. i. 27, ii. 22, al. — κατὰ Θεόν This, explained by Origen "secundum divinitatem," does not mean: on the instigation of God (Tholuck, appealing improperly to 1 Cor. xii. 8), but: in accordance with God, i.e. so as God desires it, κατὰ γνώμην αἰτίαν, Theodore of Mopsuestia. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10; 4 Macc. xv. 2; Plat. *Apol.* pp. 22 A, 23 B. The sense: in pursuance of the divine disposal, more common in classic usage (see Wetstein on the passage, and Valcken. *ad Herod.* iii. 153), is here foreign. Böhme, Reiche, and Fritzsche render it before God, with God ("in Deum quasi conversus"). This is indeed justifiable from a linguistic point of view (Bernhardy, p. 240), comp. Wisd. v. 1, Ecclus. xxxiv. 6; but how superfluous and unsuited to the emphasis of the prominent position assigned to it! With the emphasis on κατὰ Θεόν it cannot appear strange that Paul has not written κατὰ αἰτίαν, but has rather named the subject. Comp. Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 2: εὐγενεία δὲ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς, . . . ὡς τοὺς θεοὺς κάλλιστα εἰδότας κ.τ.λ. The omission of the article, which does not render the expression adverbial (against Hofmann), establishes in the case of Θεός no difference of sense (Winer, p. 115 f. [E. T. 151]). — ἐνπρὸς ἄγιον] for saints, without the article because qualitative; "sancti sunt et Deo propinqui et auxilio digni, pro quibus intercedit," Bengel. On ἐντυχεῖ ἐνπρὸς τινος, to pray for any one, see Bähr on Plut. *Flamin.* p. 83.

Ver. 28. Third ground of encouragement; comp. on ver. 26. — οὐδαμεν δὲ] It is known to us, however (as in ver. 22). This
δὲ is not: on the other hand, however, in contradistinction to
the sighing discussed since ver. 22, as Hofmann thinks—a
reference, that must have been marked in some way or other
(at least by the stronger adversative ἀλλὰ). It is the usual
μεταβατικὸν, and carries us from the special relation discussed
in ver. 26 f. over to a general one, the consciousness of which
must finally place the good courage of the believer on a footing
all the more sure. — τοῖς ἀγαπ. τ. Θεόν] the dative of com-
munion. Paul characterizes as lovers of God (κατ᾽ ἔξοχον.) the
true Christians (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 9, iii. 8; Eph. vi. 24; Jas.
i. 12), as is plain from τοῖς κατὰ κ.τ.λ. — πάντα] everything,
i.e., according to the context, all destined events, even those full
of pain not excepted (ver. 35). On the thought, comp. Plat.
Rep. p. 613 Α.— ἑυρεγεῖ] works along with, that is, contrib-
utes; βοηθεῖ, Hesychius. See Wetstein. The σωv does not
refer to the common working together of the elements con-
tained in πάντα (comp. ver. 22), but to the idea of the fellow-
ship in which he who supports necessarily stands to him who
is supported. Comp. on ver. 26.— εἰς ἀγαθον] indefinitely:
for good; it works beneficially. Comp. Theogn. 161; Hom.
II. x. 102; Plat. Rep. l.c.; Ecclus. xxxix. 27; Rom. xiii. 4.
Reiche erroneously takes it as: “the good of the Christians,
their eternal welfare.” In that case, the article at least must
have been used as in xiv. 16; and some witnesses in reality
add it. Bengel has the right view: “in bonum, ad glorifica-
tionem usque” (ver. 30).—τοῖς κατὰ πρόθ. κλητοῖς οὖσιν] These
words may mean either (οὖσι as predicate, joining on): “since
they are the called according to His purpose” (so Hofmann), or
(taking τοῖς in conjunction with οὖσιν), as to those who (qui,
qua, i.e. since they indeed) are the called according to His pur-
pose. So usually; and this latter is the true rendering, because
otherwise οὖσι would be put not only quite superfluously, but
also in a way very liable to misconception, since it would occur
to every reader, at the first glance, to join τοῖς with οὖσιν.

1 In this very description of the Christian estate there is implied a ground of
conviction of the διάκονι, the certainty of which is thereupon still more precisely
explained. Hofmann finds a retrospective glance at v. 1 ff., but only by means
of his incorrect view of δ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ, v. 5.
Had Paul meant what Hofmann thinks he did, he would have written simply τοίς κ. π. κλητοίς without οὖν, or possibly οὕτως εἰσιν οἱ κ. π. κλήτωι. — Respecting the idea itself, there is causally involved in the relation of being the called according to His purpose (for the emphasis rests on κλητοίς), the certainty that to them all things, etc.; for otherwise that high distinction, which God has conferred upon them according to the purpose of His grace, would be vain and fruitless, which is impossible (ver. 30). The πρόθεσις here meant is the free decree formed by God in eternity for imparting bliss to believers through Christ (ix. 11; Eph. i. 11, iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9; Eph. i. 9). In accordance with that decree, the call of God to the Messianic salvation through the preaching of the gospel (x. 14; 2 Thess. ii. 14) has gone forth to those comprehended in that decree. Therefore, when Paul terms the Christians κλήτωι, it is self-evident that in their case the call has met with success (1 Cor. i. 24), consequently has been combined with the converting operation of the divine grace,—without the latter, however, being found in the word itself, or the word being made equivalent to ἐκλεκτοί. Comp. Lamping, Pauli de praedest. decreta, Leonard. 1858, p. 40 f. Christians are at the same time κλητοί, ἐκλεκτοί (ix. 11), ἅγιοι κ.τ.λ.; but the significations of these predicates correspond to different characteristic qualities of the Christian state. Consequently, just as it was quite a mistaken view to interpret πρόθεσις of the personal self-determination of the subjects (Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others), so also it was an unbiblical and hazardous distinction (see against this, Calovius) to put the called κατὰ πρόθεσιν in contrast with those who are called μὴ κατὰ πρόθ. (Augustine, Estius, Reithmayr, and others). Weiss aptly observes, in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1857, p. 79: “Election and calling are inseparable correlative ideas; where the one takes place, there the other takes place also; only we cannot take cognizance of the former as an act before all time and within the divine mind, while the latter becomes apparent as a historical fact.” Comp. also his bibl. Theol. p. 386 f.

Vv. 29, 30. More detailed development and expression of τοίς κ. πρόθ. κλ. οὖν,—as a continued confirmation of the
"For this divine plan of salvation advancing from the Gen Ripoa to the gen Lhas, leads the Christian safely and surely to the gen Doga;" hence it is not conceivable that anything whatever, in opposition to this plan, should exercise other than a beneficial influence upon them (ver. 31 ff.). — Gen propo foreknew, namely, as those who should one day, in the way of the divine plan of salvation, become symarpoi gen iexwos gen Nioi aitou. That this character, in which they were foreknown by God, presupposes the subjection to faith (the gen Upako gen pisteos i. 5), was self-evident to the Christian reader. Erasmus aptly remarks: "Non temere elegit Deus quos elegit, novit suos multo antequam vocaret." The text merely gives the terminus of the gen propo in gen propo and gen propo quite indefinitely, namely: before their calling. More precise definitions, therefore (e.g. that of Tholuck: "before the foundation of the world," though in itself correct, Eph. i. 4, lii. 11), should not be here given. The taking of the gen propo in the sense of prescience, demanded by the signification of the word, has been followed (though with various, and in part very arbitrary, attempts to supply that, as which the persons concerned were foreknown by God) by Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Paraphr., Toletus, Calovius, and others, including Reiche, Neander, Tholuck, Reithmayr, Maier, Philippi, van Hengel, Hahn, Ewald, Weiss, and others. The question whether this exposition or the other of the pre-election (Calvin and others, including Rückert, Usteri, Köllner, de Wette, Fritzscbe, Krehl, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Lamping), is the true one, cannot be got rid of by mixing up the two conceptions (Umbreit); nor is it to be decided by dogmatic presuppositions, but simply by the usage of the language, in accordance with which gen propo, never in the N. T. (not even in xi. 2, 1 Pet. i. 20) means anything else than to know before-

1 This filling up of the idea of gen propo is implied, namely, in what follows. If God has destined them beforehand to a future fashioning in the likeness, etc., He must also have already known them beforehand as those who should one day be thus fashioned. Consequently we are not to understand the predisposition to love (ver. 28) as the object of the gen propo (Weiss l.c. p. 74 f., and bibl. Theol. p. 385). Bengel well remarks on gen symarpoi n. n. l.: "Hic est character prae-cognitorum et glorificandorum."
hand (Acts xxvi. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Judith ix. 6; Wisd. vi. 13, viii. 8, xviii. 6). Comp. Philippi in loc., and his Glaubenslehre, IV. 1, p. 117 ff., ed. 2. That in classic usage it ever means anything else, cannot be at all proved. See, on the contrary, Hom. Cer. 258; Xen. Ap. 30; Plat. Rep. p. 426 C; Theaet. p. 203 D; Tim. p. 70 C; Eur. Hipp. 1072; Dem. 861. 13; Lucian, Prom. 20. Comp. also πρόγνωσις and προγνωστικός. An appeal is made to the familiar use of γνωστός in the sense of judicial cognizance, or even of other resolutions and decisions (Herod. iv. 25, i. 74, 78; Thuc. iv. 30, iii. 99, and many other instances). But, in the first place, it is never in this sense joined with the accusative of the person without an infinitive; and secondly, there is no such precedent of usage for the compound προγνωσκειν, current as it was in Greek authors; for the few passages in which it means to take forethought about something (Thuc. ii. 64. 5; Xen. Cyr. ii. 4. 11, with a very doubtful reading) are not suitable for comparison, either as regards the sense, or as respects the union with the personal accusative in our passage. The incorrectness of this explanation is confirmed, moreover, by the analogy of the following clauses, which always add another and different idea to the one preceding. The right interpretation remains, therefore: praecognovit (Vulg. = praescivit), which, however, is neither to be altered, with Augustine, Vatablus, Grotius, Estius, and others, into approbavit jam ante, to which view also Tholuck and Rückert incline (see on vii. 15); nor to be taken, with Hofmann, in that sense of γνωσθειν which obtains in 1 Cor. viii. 3, xiii. 12, Gal. iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 19 (an appropriating cognizance of what is akin and homogeneous, according to Hofmann). The latter, to which also Delitzsch ultimately comes, Psychol. p. 39, is incorrect, because in accordance with it the πρόγνωσις would be a relation of communion already entered into actively by God, which would necessarily include the προερχόμενος, and consequently exclude the latter as a special and accessory act. For to suppose that Paul, with πρόγνωσις and προερχόμενος, does not mean two acts following each other in succession, but

1 Comp. Calvin: the πρόγνωσις is an "adoptio, qua filios suos a reprobis semper discrevit;" this notitia being dependent a beneplacito of God.
asserts the former of the persons, and the latter of the character ascribed to them (Hofmann), is wholly groundless in presence of the clearly progressive description of the apostle. The right view, since faith is the subjective ground of salvation, is that held by Calovius and our older dogmatists: “quos credituros praevidit vel suscepturos vocationem.” It is God’s being aware in His plan, by means of which, before the subjects are destined by Him to salvation, He knows whom He has to destine thereto. Comp. on xi. 2. — καὶ προσώπωσι] them He destined also beforehand. To what? συμμόρφος. τῆς εἰκ. τ. vi. adv.: to be conformed to the image of His Son, i.e. to be such as should present the image of His Son in their conformation. From the following eis τὸ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ. it is plain that Paul here means the same which in ver. 23 he has designated as φιλοσεβαίαν, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν, consequently the glory to which God has predestined them, the state of the μεταμόρφωσις δόξα (ver. 18), so far as this shall be the same (even in respect of the glorified body, Phil. iii. 21, 1 Cor. xv. 49) as that which the exalted Christ has. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 18, 1 John iii. 2. The fellowship in suffering (Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and others) is here remote. What Paul has in view must be the same as he denotes in ver. 30 by ἐσορθοτείνεια, consequently the conformitas gloriae. This very thought of the entire glorious appearance, which he means, has suggested the vivid expression συμμόρφος. τ. εἰκόνος; wherefore we are not, with Chrysostom (ὑπερ γὰρ ὁ μορφωθηκὼς ἡν φύσει, τοῦτο καὶ αὐτόν γεγένησαν κατὰ χάρων), Theophylact, Bengel, and others, to refer it to the present φιλοσεβαία. Theodoret has the right view. The conformity of the inner being is not conveyed in the expression (Hofmann understands it as included), but is the moral presupposition of the glory meant.— σύμμορφος (Lucian, Amor. 39), in Phil. iii. 21 with the dative, here with the genitive. See Bernhardy, p. 171; Kühner, II. 1, p. 295. — eis τὸ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.] Not an inferential clause (see on i. 20), but—as the very notion of προσώπωσι embraces the purpose—the final aim of προσώπωσι. συμμόρφωσι. κ.τ.λ. Nor is the main thought contained in εἰς πολλ. ἀδελφ., as de Wette very arbitrarily supposes; but, on the contrary, Paul contemplates Christ as the One, to whom the divine decree referred as to its
final aim. Christ was to fulfil His lofty commission not merely by standing in the relation of His glory to the Father as the μονογενής, but by being the First-born among many brethren, i.e. among many who through Him, the essential and primordial Son of God, should, as adopted vioi Θεοί, and consequently in so far as His brethren, have attained to the same δόξα of sharing the possession of the dignity and privilege (Col. i. 18) of the First-born. Comp. also Heb. i. 6, and Lüemann in loc. — εκάλεσεν Like κλητοῖς in ver. 28. For those who despised the invitation to salvation conveyed to them through the preachers of the gospel did not belong to the called, whom God ἐρώτησεν and ἐνοπίσετε; the following τούτων κ. ἐδικ. also presupposes that the calling has been attended with the result of the ἐπακοῇ πίστεως. Comp. on ver. 28. Hence the divine saving grace is to be conceived as working by means of the word on those who become called, namely, in opening and preparing the heart for the reception of the word, Acts xvi. 14; Phil. i. 6, 29; John vi. 44. God has fore-known those who would not oppose to His gracious calling the resistance of unbelief, but would follow its drawing; thereafter He has fore-ordained them to eternal salvation; and when the time had come for the execution of His saving counsel, has called them, etc. (ver. 30). With the κλήσις begins the execution of the προφητείας in accordance with the πρόγνωσις; and the subjects concerned are, in contrast to the multitude standing outside of this divine process of salvation, the ἐκκλησία (ver. 33). — ἐκάλεσαν] Justification is consequently the sole ground of the glorifying; sanctification is added to it, in order that the justified may attain that goal in the way that God desires. — ἐσώτερον] Justification, as a divine act of imputation, is really (not merely ideally or in principle, in opposition to Lipsius, Rechtsfert. p. 48 f.) accomplished; but the glorification falls to the future (ver. 21, v. 2, and constantly in N. T.; comp. also 1 Cor. ii. 7, Rom. ix. 23). Notwithstanding, the aorist neither stands for the future nor for the present (in opposition to Köllner; see

1 Comp. Philippi, Glaubensl. II. p. 214, ed. 2.
Herm. ad Viger. p. 746; nor does it express anywhere in the N. T. a habit, as Flatt thinks—against which view, in the present instance, the analogy of the preceding aorists is decisive; but it represents the de facto certainly future glorification as so necessary and certain, that it appears as if already given and completed with the ἐδικαιώσεν. "Whom He has justified, them He has—viewing the relation from its final aim—therewith also glorified." See Herm. ad Viger. p. 747; Kühner, II. I, p. 142.

In order thus to place the glorification on the same platform of certainty with the προέγραψε, προφίλησε, ἐκάλεσε, and ἐδικ., Paul selected the proleptic aorist. On the other hand, the triumphant flow of the great chain of thought and the thoroughly Pauline boldness of expression (comp. on Eph. ii. 5) are misapprehended, if the act be regarded as accomplished only in the decree of God (Grotius, Reiche, and Umbreit); or if the expression be referred to the glory of God possessed "at first only inwardly and secretly" (Hofmann), or to "repute with God" (Märcker), or to the bestowal of grace and νικησθείσα here below (Chrysostom and his followers, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, and Erasmus), to which also van Hengel adheres, appealing to John xii. 28.

Vv. 31–39. Inference from vv. 29, 30. So, then, the Christian has to fear nothing that might be detrimental to his salvation; but on the contrary he is, with the love of God in Christ, assured of that salvation.—This whole passage is (observe the logical relation of ὅτι in ver. 29, and ὅτι in ver. 31) a commentary on ver. 28. And what a commentary! "Quid unquam Cicero dixit grandiloquentius?" Erasmus on ver. 35. Comp. Augustine, de doctr. Chr. iv. 20. A sublime ὅγκος τῆς λέξεως (Arist. Rhet. iii. 6) pervades the whole, even as respects form.

Ver. 31. What shall we therefore say (infer thence) with respect to these things (vv. 29, 30)? — εἰ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.] Here-with begins a stream of triumphant questions and answers (on to ver. 37) which contains what we say.—The Θεὸς ἐπὶ ἡμῶν briefly sums up the divine guardianship according to the tenor of vv. 29, 30. — τίς καθ ἡμῶν;] a question not of challenge (Hofmann), with which the following does not
accord, but of the sure, already triumphant certainty that all hostile power must be unsuccessful and harmless for us. On εἶναι κατὰ τῶν, comp. Ecclus. vi. 12; Wisd. iv. 6; Plut. Nic. 21; and on the contrast of ἵππος and κατά, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

Ver. 32. The answer to the foregoing question, like wise interrogative, but with all the more confidence.—δόγμα] quippe qui, He, who indeed, brings into prominence causally the subject of what is to be said of him by τός κ.τ.λ. (see Baemlein, Partik. p. 57 f.; Bornemann, ad Xen. Symp. iv. 15; Maetzn. ad Lyceurg. p. 228). This causal clause is with great emphasis prefixed to the τός κ.τ.λ., of which it serves as the ground (the converse occurs e.g. in Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 14; Aristoph. Ran. 739).—τοῦ ἑδύν] full of significance, for the more forcible delineation of the display of love. A contrast, however, to the νίκης θέτοις (Theophylact, Pareus, Wetstein, Tholuck, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Fritzsche, Philippi) is not implied in the text. Comp., rather, viii. 3: τὸν ἔκτο πάντως νικ. —οὐκ ἐφείσατο] Comp. xi. 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 4, 5; frequent also in classical authors. "Deus paterno suo amori quasi vim adhibuit," Bengel. The prevalence of the expression, as also the fact that Paul has not written τοῦ νικὸν τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, makes the assumption of an allusion to Gen. xxii. 12 seem not sufficiently well founded (Philippi, Hofmann, and many older commentators). The juxtaposition of the negative and positive phrases, οὐκ ἐφ., ἀλλ'...παρέδ., enhances the significance of the act of love. On παρέδεικνεν (unto death), comp. iv. 25. σὺν αὐτῷ: with Him who, given up for us, has by God's grace already become ours. Thus everything else stands to this highest gift of grace in the relation of concomitant accessory gift. —πῶς οὐχὶ καί] how is it possible that He should not also with Him, etc.? The καί belongs, not to πῶς οὐχὶ (Philippi), but to σὺν αὐτῷ; comp. iii. 29; 1 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 19. The inference is a majori ad minus. "Minus

1 That question no longer required a corroboration (Hofmann) after ver. 28 ff. Besides, Paul would have expressed this meaning by γι. Regarding the frequent use of γι to introduce the answer in classical Greek, see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 332 f.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 347; Baemlein, Partik. p. 62; Rühner, II. 2, p. 784.
est enim vobis omnia cum illo donare, quam illum nostri causa morti tradere," Ambrosiaster. Comp. Chrysostom. —
ta panta] the whole, of what He has to bestow in accordance with the aim of the surrender of Jesus; that is, not "the universe of things" (Hofmann), the κληρονομία of the world, which is here quite foreign, but, in harmony with the context, vv. 26–30: the collective saving blessings of His love shown to us in Christ. This certainty of the divine relation toward us, expressed by τως κ.τ.λ., excludes the possibility of success on the part of human adversaries.

Ver. 33 ff. It is impossible that this σων αυτῳ τα panta ἡμιν χαριστησαι should be frustrated, either on the side of God, with whom no accusation of His elect can have the result of their condemnation (ver. 33, down to κατακρίνων in ver. 34), or on that of Christ, whose death, resurrection, etc., afford the guarantee that nothing can separate us from His love (ver. 34, Χριστος ὁ ἀποθανων, on to ver. 36). In the analysis of this swelling effusion we must return to the method for which Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and other Fathers paved the way, and which Erasmus followed: namely, that to the question τις ἐγκαλέσει κ.τ.λ. the answer is: Θεος ὁ δικαιων τις ὁ κατακρίνων; and then follows, moulded in similar form to that answer, the expression, passing over from God to Christ, Χριστος... ἡμών τις ἡμᾶς χαρίσει κ.τ.λ.; so that after δικαιων, and also after ἰνέρ ἡμῶν, only a colon is to be inserted. Who shall raise accusation against the elect of God? Answer, in a boldly triumphant counter-question,—God is the justifier, who the condemner? (there is consequently no one there to condemn, and every accusation is without result! Comp. Isa. l. 8.) And as regards Christ: Christ is He that has died, yea rather also has risen again, who also is at the right hand of God, who also intercedes for us: who shall separate us from the love of Christ? This view (followed also by van Hengel, but by Hofmann only with respect to the first portion as far as κατακρίνων), though abandoned by nearly all modern expositors, 1

1 The difficulty started by Philippi, that corresponding to the τις λυσαλ. τα & ta in ver. 33, there is introduced, with the τις ἡμ. χαρι. κ.τ.λ. of ver. 36, a question for which nothing prepares the way, and which is not answered in the
is corroborated by its entire accordance with the sense, by the
harmony of the soaring rhetorical form, and by its freedom
from those insuperable difficulties which beset the modes of
division that differ from it. Of the latter, two in particular
fall to be considered. 1. Luther, Castalio, Beza, Calvin,
Grotius, Wolf, and many others, including Ammon, Tholuck,
Flatt, Fritzsche, Philippi, Reithmayr, and Ewald, take Θεὸς ὁ
δικαιῶν as affirmative answer to τίς ἐγκαλέσειι κ.τ.λ.; then τίς
ὁ κατακρίνων as a new question, and as the affirmative answer
there to: Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανὼν κ.τ.λ., thus: Who shall accuse,
etc.? God is the justifier (consequently no accuser shall succeed).
Who is the condemnor? Christ is He that has died, etc. (so
that He cannot, therefore, condemn us in judgment). But
against this view it may be urged, (a) that Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν and
τίς ὁ κατακρίνων are, as regards both substance (δικαιῶν and
κατακρίνων) and form (Paul has not written τίς κατακρίνων to
correspond with τίς ἐγκαλέσειι), correlative, and therefore may
not, without arbitrariness, be separated; (b) that in ver. 34
Christ is not at all described as a judge, which would be in
keeping with the ὁ κατακρίνων, but, on the contrary, as re-
deeper and intercessor; (c) that, if τίς ἐγκαλέσειι is at once
disposed of by Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν, it must be already quite
self-evident that there can be no κατακρίνων, and conse-
quently τίς ὁ κατακρίνων as a new question, would be something
superfluous and out of keeping with so compressed an utter-
ance of emotion; (d) and, finally, that in the entire context
there is no mention of the last judgment. 2. The theory, that
came into vogue after Augustine, doctr. Chr. iii. 3, and Am-
brosiaster (adopted in modern times by Koppe, Reiche, Köllner,
Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, de Wette, and Maier, also by
Griesbach and Lachmann; Tholuck is undecided), consists in
supplying ἐγκαλέσειι with Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν, and taking it as a

foregoing ver. 34—is incorrect in itself, since the answer to this question is cer-
tainly yielded by ver. 34; and it mistakes, moreover, the truly lyric character
of the magnificent passage. Tholuck's objections, as also those of Hofmann,
regarding the second half (from Χριστὸς ὁ ἀποθανὼν onwards), are quite unim-
portant. The latter lays particular stress on the fact that Paul has not added ὁ ἄνω to ἀποθανὼν. As if that purpose of the ἄνω, were not perfectly self-
evident, especially amidst such a vehement flight of the discourse!
question, and dealing in a corresponding manner with Χριστός ... ἡμῶν also: Who shall accuse? Shall God do so, who justifies? Who shall condemn? Shall Christ do so, who has died, etc.? But against this view it suffices to urge the decisive reason, that to conceive of God as accuser (before Christ) is destitute of scriptural analogy, and could not at all have occurred to the apostle. Hofmann takes Χριστός ... ἐντυγχ. ἐπερ ἡμ. as a question with two dissimilar relative adjuncts, of which the first declares how it was possible, after the question τίς δὲ κατακρ., to subjoin the further question, whether it might not be feared with regard to Christ that He should condemn where God acquits; while the second shows the impossibility of such a fear. But this artificial interpretation, in connection with which the first and second καλ (see the critical remarks) are condemned as not genuine and this condemnation is acutely turned to account, fails, so far as the substance is concerned, on the very ground that the thought of its being possible perhaps for Christ to condemn where God acquits would be an absurd idea, which could not occur to a Christian consciousness; and, so far as form is concerned, on the ground that the second relative clause is annexed to the first with entire similarity, and therefore does not warrant our explaining it, as if Paul, instead of δὲ καλ ἐντ., should have written ἀλλὰ καλ ἐντ.

In detail, observe further: The designation of Christians in ver. 33 as ἐκλεκτοὶ Θεοῦ is selected as having a special bearing on the matter, and renders palpable at once the fruitlessness of every ἐγκλησία; while Θεοῦ coming immediately after Θεοῦ has rhetorical emphasis.—κατὰ ἐκλ. Θεοῦ] i.e. against those whom God has chosen[1] out of the κόσμος (John xvii. 6) to be members of His Messianic peculiar people to be made blessed for Christ's sake, according to His eternal decree (Eph. i. 4); comp. on ver. 30. This is the Christian conception (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9) of the Old Testament ἐκλεκτ. (Ps. cv. 43, cvi. 5; Isa. xlii. 1, lxv. 9; Wisd. iii. 9, al.). The elect constitute the Israel of God, Gal. vi. 16. Regarding the genitive Θεοῦ (ἐκλ.) is used quite as a substantive; comp. Col. iii. 12; Matt. xxiv.

[1] Against Hofmann, who (Schriften. I. p. 223 f.) calls in question the reference to others, non-elect, see on Eph. i. 4.
The absence of the article (comp. ver. 27) in the case of ἐκλ. Ἡσεὺ brings out the quality of the persons.—The predicates of Christ in ver. 34—under which His death is to be conceived as an atoning death, His rising again as having taken place διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡμῶν (iv. 25), and His being at the right hand of God as personal participation in the government of the world (Eph. i. 20, Col. iii. 1, al.; comp. also Dissen, ad Pindar. Fragm. xi. 9) in the heavenly dwelling-place of the Father's glory (see on Matt. vi. 6)—exclude the possibility of any one separating us from the love of Christ. For, as regards His past, He has proved by His death the abundance of His love (v. 6 f.; Eph. iii. 18 f.), and this demonstration of His love has been divinely confirmed by His resurrection; and as regards His present, through His sitting at the right hand of God He possesses the power to do for His own whatever His love desires, and through His intercession He procures for them every protection and operation of grace from the Father (Heb. vii. 25, ix. 24; 1 John ii. 1). But this intercession (comp. ver. 26 f.) is the continuous bringing to bear of His work of atonement, completed by His ἱλαστήριον, on the part of Christ in His glory with the Father; which we are to conceive of as real and—in virtue of the glorified corporeity of the exalted Christ, as also in virtue of the subordination in which He even as σώματος stands to the Father—as request properly so called (ἐνεργεῖσθαι) through which the "continuous quasi vigor" (Gerhard) of redemption takes place. Comp. John xiv. 16. There has been much dogmatic and philosophical explaining away of this passage on the part of systematists and exegetes. Some apt observations are to be found in Düsterdieck on 1 John ii. 1, who nevertheless, without assigning his exegetical grounds, calls in question that the intercession is vocalis et oralis. As such, however, it must be conceived, because it is made by the glorified God-man; though the more special mode in which it takes place is withdrawn from the cognizance of our earthly apprehension. Comp. Philippi, Glaubensl. IV. 2, p. 336, ed. 2.—μᾶλλον δὲ is the ino vero, vel potius, by which the speaker amends his statement (see
on Gal. iv. 9); for what would Christ’s having died have been of itself? how could it have been to us the bond and the security of His love against all distresses, etc., ver. 35 f., if the divine resurrection had not been added to it? Paul therefore appends to the bare ἀνεθανόν, by way of correction: imo vero etiam resuscitatus, in which the καὶ, also, signifies: non solum mortuus, sed etiam resusc.; comp. Eph. v. 11. It is thus clear that (contrary to Hofmann’s view) this καὶ was quite essential and indispensable; for it was not the ἀνεθανόν itself, but its having been mentioned alone and without the resurrection belonging to it, that needed correction. It is, moreover, self-evident that all this application of the corrective expression is here merely of a formal nature, serving to bring into marked prominence the two elements in their important correlation.— The ἀν καὶ occurring twice has a certain solemnity.— Ver. 35. τὸς] Paul puts the question by τίς, not τί, in conformity with the parallel τίς ὁ κατακρίνων. The circumstance that he subsequently specifies states and things, not persons—which, however, naturally suggest themselves to the conception of the reader—cannot lead any one astray, least of all in such a bold flight of rhetoric.— ἀντὶ τίς ἁγ. τ. Χριστοῦ] Most expositors take τοῦ Χ. (comp. Eph. iii. 19) as genitive of the subject, and rightly, because this view was already prepared for by ver. 34 (in which the great acts of Christ’s love toward us are specified), and is confirmed by ver. 37 (διὰ τοῦ ἁγ. ἡμᾶς), and by ver. 39, where the ἁγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ comes in the place of the ἁγάπη τοῦ Χ. This excludes the interpretation of others, who understand it of the love to Christ (Origen, Ambrosiaster, Erasmus, Majus, Heumann, Morus, Köllner, and Ewald). Köllner’s objections to our view do not touch its true sense, since the point in question is not a possible interruption of the love of Christ to us, nor yet the hindering of our access to it (Philippi), but a possible separation from the love of Christ (that helps to victory, ver. 37) through hindrances intervening between it and us, which might nullify its manifestation and operation upon us and might thus dissolve our real fellowship with it.1 It was therefore very unwarranted in de Wette

1 The tribulations, etc., are, forsooth, not something which might form a wall
(comp. Calvin, Rückett, and Tholuck) to convert, in accordance with v. 5, the love of Christ into "the joyful feeling of being loved by Christ," which ver. 37 does not permit, where manifestly the aid of the exalted Christ, who has loved us (comp. Matt. xxviii. 20; Phil. iv. 13), is meant.

Ver. 36. The marks of parenthesis are to be expunged, because the construction is unbroken, and ἀλλ' ἐν τούτ. πᾶσιν in ver. 37 refers to ver. 35 and ver. 36. On the accumulation of designations that follows, comp. 2 Cor. vi. 4 f.; and on the so frequently repeated ἡ, Xen. Mem. i. 1. 7, Soph. O. C. 251. By way of scriptural proof for the most extreme element mentioned, for ἡ μάχαιρα, Paul quotes a passage, in accordance with which even the slaying sword has here its place already prophetically indicated beforehand. In Ps. xlv. 23 (quoted exactly from the LXX.), where the historical meaning refers to the daily massacres of Jews in the time of the Psalmist (in an age after the exile, but not so late as the Maccabean), he recognises a type of the analogous fate awaiting the Christian people of God, as their sacred-historic destiny. ᾿Ακτάλληλος τοῦ προκειμένου ἡ μαρτυρία: ἐκ πρωτίστου γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἔρημα τῶν αὐτῶν ἐγκακτών σκόπων, Theodoret. Therein lies the justification of this typical view. But since our passage specially mentions only the being put to death and the slaying, we have no right to make the reference which Paul gives to them extend, with Hofmann, to the treatment in general which the Christians should have to experience, instead of leaving it limited to μάχαιρα.— ὅτι for. A part of the quotation, without relevant reference to the connection in our passage.— ἐνεκήνσεν σοῦ There is no reason whatever for departing, with Köllner (comp. Hofmann), from the reference of the original text to God, and referring σοῦ to Christ. For, in the first place, the probative point of the quotation does not lie in ἐνεκήνσεν σοῦ (but in θανατ. and ἔλογ. ὡς πρόβ. σφ.); and in the second place,
the very massacres of the Christians took place on account of God, because they continued faithful to Him in Christ, while the denial of Christ would have been a denial of God, who had sent Him. Hence martyrdom was regarded as a δολίζων θανάτω τῶν Θεόν (John xxi. 19). — διαν τὴν ἡμ. Not quotidie (Castalio, Grotius, and Glöckler); Paul follows the LXX., who thus translate μὴ ἐκ τῆς. It means: the whole day (comp. x. 21; Isa. lxii. 6; Ex. x. 13; 1 Sam. xix. 24; 1 Macc. v. 50) are we murdered, so that at every time of the day murder is committed upon us (now on one, now on that one of us); it ceases not the livelong day. And this is the consequence of the fact, that we have been counted (aorist) as sheep for the slaughter, reckoned like sheep destined for slaughter.

Ver. 37. But in all this—namely, what is specified in vers. 35 and 36—we conquer, etc. This διὰ does not break off an incomplete sentence (Hofmann), but is rather the simple antithetic at, but, whatever sufferings and dangers may await us. — ἵπερυμ. We gain a victory that is more than victory; we are over-victorious. Luther well renders: “we overcome far.” Comp. v. 20. It does not involve more than this; neither the easiness of the victory (Chrysostom, Theophylact), nor the “in cruce etiam gloriamur” (Beza), which is rather the consequence of this victory; for a sublime testimony to the latter, see 2 Cor. iv. 8—11. In the ancient Greek ἱπερυμ. is not extant, but it occurs in Socr. H. E. iii. 21, Leo Tact. xiv. 25, although in a derogatory sense (υπερικιάν μὲν καλόν, ἱπερυμ. δὲ ἐπιφθονον). Nevertheless there is contained in our passage also a holy arrogance of victory, not selfish, but in the consciousness of the might of Christ.— διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπ. ἡμᾶς] He who hath loved us is the procurer of this our victory, helps us to it by His power. Comp. esp. 2 Cor. xii. 9. That it is not God (Chrysostom, Estius, Grotius, Bengel, and others, including Reiche, Köllner, Olshausen, and van Hengel) that is meant, but Christ (Rückert, de Wette, Philippi, Tholuck, Ewald, and Hofmann), follows, not indeed from Phil. iv. 13, but from the necessary reference to τίς ἡμ. χαρ. ἀπό τ. ἁγ. τ. Χ. in ver. 35; for ver. 37 contains the opposite of the separation from the love of Christ.— ἀγαπήσ.] denotes the act of love κατ’ ἐξοχήν, which Christ
accomplished by the sacrifice of His life. This reference was self-evident to the consciousness of the readers. Comp. v. 6; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 2, 25.

Vv. 38, 39. Paul now confirms what he had said in ver. 37 by the enthusiastic declaration of his conviction that no power, in whatever shape it may exist or be conceived of, etc. For the singular πέπισμα there is as little necessity for seeking a special reason (Hofmann, e.g., thinks that Paul wished to justify the confidence, with which he had expressed ver. 37) as in the case of λογίζομαι in ver. 18, especially as ver. 37 contains only the simple assertion of a state of fact, and not a how of that assertion.—The following expressions (θάνατος κ.τ.λ.) are to be left in the generality of their sense, which is, partly in itself and partly through the connection, beyond doubt; every arbitrary limitation is purely opposed to the purpose of declaring everything—everything possible—incapable of separating the believers from the love of God in Christ. Hence: οὐτε θάνατος οὐτε ζωή: neither death nor life, as the two most general states, in which man can be. We may die or live: we remain in the love of God. The mention of death first was occasioned very naturally by ver. 36. It is otherwise in 1 Cor. iii. 22. Grotius (following Chrysostom and Jerome, ad Agias. 9) imports the idea: “metus mortis; spes vitae,” which Philippi also regards as a “correct paraphrase of the sense.”—οὐτε ἀγγελοί οὐτε ἀρχαί] Neither angels (generally) nor (angelic) powers (in particular). ἀγ. is, with Chrysostom, Theophylact, Beza, Tholuck, Philippi, Frizsche, Hofmann, and others, to be understood of good angels, because the wicked are never termed ἀγγελοί without some defining adjunct (Matt. xxv. 41; 2 Cor. xii. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 4; comp. Jude, 6). The objection repeated by Reiche (who, with Clemens Alexandrinus, Toletus, Grotius, Estius, and others, understands it of wicked angels), that an attempt on the part of the good angels to separate Christians from God is inconceivable, does not hold, since, according to Gal. i. 8, the case of such an attempt falling within the sphere of possibility could certainly be—not believed, but—conceived ex hypothesi by Paul. Theophylact already aptly says: οὐχ ὡς τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀφιστώτων τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ,
Against the view that ἀγγ. denotes good and wicked angels (Wolf, Bengel, Koppe, and van Hengel), the linguistic usage is likewise decisive, since according to it the absolute ἀγγ. signifies nothing else than simply good angels. Comp. on 1 Cor. iv. 9. — ἀρχαί obtains, through its connection with ἀγγ., its definite reference to particular powers in the category of angels—those invested with power in the angelic world. Paul recognises a diversity of rank and power in the angelic hierarchy (of the good and the wicked), and finds occasion, especially in his later epistles, to mention it (Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. vi. 12; Col. ii. 15); without, however (comp. on Eph. i. 21), betraying any participation in the fluctuating definitions of the later Jews. See, respecting these definitions, Bartolocci, Bibl. rabb. I. p. 267 ff.; Eisenmenger, entdecktes Judenthum, II. p. 370 ff. Olearius, Wetstein, Loesner, Morus, Rosenmüller, Flatt, and Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 460, refer ἀρχαί to human ruling powers; van Hengel to "principatus quoslibet." Against these its connection with ἀγγ. is decisive, because no contrast is suggested of non-angelic powers. Just as little, because without any trace in the text, are we to understand with Hofmann the ἀρχαί, in contrast to the good God-serving ἀγγέλοι, as spirits "that in self-will exercise a dominion, with which they do not live to the service of God," i.e. as evil spirits. — οverty ἔνεστωτα οverty μελαντα neither that which has set in nor that which is future. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 22. Quite general, and not to be limited to sufferings (Vatablus, Grotius, Flatt, and others). ἔνεστ., however, does not absolutely coincide with the idea things present (as it is usually taken), which is in itself linguistically possible, but is never the case in the N. T. (see on Gal. i. 4); but it denotes rather what is in the act of having set in, has already begun (and μελλ. that, the emergence of which is still future). So, according to Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 22, vii. 26; 2 Thess. ii. 2. Aptly rendered by the Vulgate: "instantia." Comp. Lucretius, i. 461: "quae res instet, quid porro deinde sequatur." — overty δινάμεις nor powers; to be left

in its utmost generality, personal and impersonal (Hofmann arbitrarily limiting it to the latter). The common interpretation, angelic powers, would be correct, if its position after ἄρχαι were right; but see the crit. remarks. The incongruity of the apparent isolation of this link vanishes on observing that Paul, in his enumeration, twice arranges the elements in pairs (θάνατος . . . ἄρχαι), and then twice again in threes (viz. οὐτε ἐνεστ. οὐτε μέλλ. οὐτε δυνάμ., and οὐτε ὕψωμα οὐτε βάθος οὐτε τίς κτίσις ἐτέρα), and the latter indeed in such a way, that to the two that stand contrasted he adds a third of a general character. — οὐτε ὕψωμα οὐτε βάθος] neither height nor depth; likewise without any alteration or limitation of the quite general sense of the words. No dimension of space can separate us, etc. Arbitrary definitions are given: heaven and hell or the nether world (Theodoret, Bengel, Wetstein, Michaelis, Klee, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, and Hofmann); heaven and earth (Fritzsche; comp. Theophylact, Morus, and Flatt); the height of bliss and the depth of misery (Koppe); spes honorum and metus ignominiae (Grotius, Rosenmüller); sapientia haereticorum and communes vulgares (Melancthon); neque altitudo, ex qua quis minaretur praecipitium, neque profundum, in quo aliquis minaretur demersionem (Thomas Aquinas, Anselm, Estius). — οὐτε τίς κτίσις ἐτέρα] nor any other created thing whatever, covers all not yet embraced in the foregoing elements; and thus the idea of “nothing in the world in the shape of a creature” is fully exhausted. The attempt to bring the collective elements named in their consecutive order under definite logical categories leads to artificialities of exposition, which ought not to be applied to such enthusiastic outbursts of the moment. — Instead of τῆς ἀγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ (ver. 35), Paul now says, τῆς ἁγ. τοῦ Θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ., not thereby expressing something different, but characterizing the love of Christ (toward us) as the love of God which is in Christ Jesus. The love of Christ, namely, is nothing else than the love of God Himself, which has its seat and place of operation in Christ. God is the original fountain, Christ the constant organ and mediating channel of one and the same love; so that in Christ is the love of God, and the love of Christ is the love of God in Christ. Comp. v. 6, 8.
CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 3. The verbal order ἀνάθημα ἱναι αὐτὸς ἵγω (recommended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.) receives preponderant attestation from A B D E F G, min., vss., and Fathers; as also from δ, reading ἵναι before ἀνάθ. Erroneously attached to πυχῆμην, αὐτὸς ἵγω became placed before ἀνάθ. (Elz.).—Ver. 4. αἱ διαθήκαι] B D E F G, min., Vulg., with several Fathers, read ἣ διαθήκη, which Lachm. has adopted. An alteration, because the plural was understood of the Old and New Test. (Gal. iv. 24), and yet the latter could not be considered as a privilege of the Jews.—Ver. 11. παροιμ] Lachm. and Tisch. read παραστ, according to A B δ, min., Or. Cyril. Damascus. Rightly; the more usual opposite of ἄγαθος easily intruded.—Ver. 15. The order τῷ Μωϋσῆ γὰρ is decidedly to be received, with Lachm. and Tisch., following B D E F G δ. The Recepta τ. γ. M. is a mechanical alteration.—Ver. 16. ἰλιώτος] A B* D E F G P δ, 39, read ἰλιώτος; so Lachm. and Tisch. But since in no other passage of the N. T. is ἰλιῶν, the form belonging to the καὶ (see Ἐλγμ. M. 327. 30), to be found; and in ver. 18 only D* F G have ἰλιῶν instead of ἰλιῶν (and yet in both places Paul doubtless used one form); it is most probable that ὦ instead of ῥ was merely an early copyist’s error, which, as the form -aw was actually in existence, became diffused, and also induced in some Codd. the alteration ἰλιῶν in ver. 18 (so Tisch. 7).—Ver. 27. κατάλειμμα] A B δ, Eus. read ὑπάλειμμα; so Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly; see LXX. Isa. x. 22.—Ver. 28. ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἵνα λόγον σωτηρισμοῦ] is wanting in A B δ, 23*, 47*, 67*, Syr. Aeth. Erp. Copt. Eus. Damascus. Aug. It certainly bears the suspicion of being an addition from the LXX.; but its deletion, which Lachm. and Tisch. 8 have carried out, is precluded by the ease with which it was possible for transcribers to turn from ἱστημένων at once to σωτηρισμοῦ. —Ver. 31. The second δικαιοσύνη is wanting in A B D E G δ, 47, 67*, 140, Copt. It. Or. and several Fathers, and is marked with an obelus in F. Omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But the omission admits of no sense accordant with the context. See the exeg. notes. The weight of the omitting codd. is much diminished by the counter-
testimony of ancient vss. (including Syr. and Vulg.) and of most Greek Fathers. The omission itself might easily, from the frequent recurrence of the word in vv. 30, 31, occur through a homoeoteleuton, which led, in the first instance, to the disappearance of the words τις νῦν. δικαιοσύνης (they are still absent from 2 min.), followed by their incomplete restoration.— Ver. 32. νῦνοι] Wanting in A B F G σ*, min., Copt. Vulg., and several Fathers. Rightly deleted by Lachm. and Tisch. A defining addition.— The γάρ after προσίκεραθεν, which is wanting in A B D F G σ* 47*, Copt. It. Vulg. ms, Goth. Ambr. Ruf., Dam. (and is omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8), is simply a connective insertion.— Ver. 33. παρά] has preponderant evidence against it, and must, with Lachm. and Tisch., be struck out. An addition from x. 11, where it stands in all the witnesses.

Chap. ix.—xi.¹ On the non-participation hitherto of the greater part of the Jews in the Christian plan of salvation; and specially (a) the lamentation over this (ix. 1—5); (b) the Theodicee on its account (ix. 6—29); (c) the fault thereof, which rests upon the Jews themselves (ix. 30—33 and x. 1—21); (d) the consolation in reference to this (xi. 1—32), with final giving glory to God (xi. 33—36). Paul could not do otherwise, he must still settle this great problem; this is inevitably demanded by all that had gone before. For if the whole previous treatise had as its result, that only believers were the recipients of the promised salvation, and if nevertheless the Messianic promise and destination to salvation had their reference in the first place (comp. i. 16) to the Israelites, concerning whom, however, experience showed that they were for the

most part unbelieving (comp. John i. 11), this contradictory
relation thus furnished an enigma, which Paul, with his warm
love for his people, could least of all evade, but in the solu-
tion of which he had on the contrary to employ all the boldness
and depth of his clear insight into the divine plan of re-
demption (Eph. iii. 4 ff.). The defence of the efficacy of his Gentile
apostleship (Th. Schott, and in another way Mangold and
Sabatier) is not the object of the section—that object Paul
would have known how to meet directly—but such a defence
results indirectly from it, since we see from the section how
fully the apostle had recognised and comprehended his place
in connection with the divine plan of salvation. The problem
itself, the solution of which is now taken in hand by the
apostle, was sufficiently serious and momentous to be treated
with so much detail in this great and instructive letter to
the important mixed community of the world’s capital, which,
however, does not thereby appear to have been a Jewish-
Christian one.

Vv. 1–3. The new section is introduced without connection
with the foregoing, but in a fervent outburst of Israelitish
patriotism, the more sorrowful by contrast with the blessed-
ness of the Christian previously extolled and so deeply expe-
rienced by the apostle himself. This sorrow might be deemed
incredible, after the joyous triumph which had just been
exhibited. Hence the extremely urgent asseveration with
which he begins: truth I speak in Christ, that is, in my
fellowship with Christ; is the element, in which his soul
moves. Just so Eph. iv. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 17,
xii. 19. The explanation adopted by most of the older com-
mentators (especially Joh. Capellus, Clericus, Locke), and by Nösselt,
Koppe, Böhme, Flatt, Reiche, Köllner, and others, of in the
sense of adjuration, is a perfectly arbitrary departure both from
the manner of the apostle, who never swears by Christ, and
also from Greek usage, which would have required with
the genitive (Kühner, II. 1, p. 448; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II.
p. 647); and cannot at all be justified from Matt. v. 34,
LXX. Jer. v. 7, Dan. xii. 7, Rev. x. 6, because in these

1 On vv. 1–5, see Winzer, Progr. Lips. 1832.
passages ὑμῶν expressly stands beside it.—οὗ ὑστὸν [πρὸτερον δὲ διαβεβαιώτατα περὶ ὁν τελείει λέγειν ὅπερ πολλοῖς ἔθος ποιεῖν, ὅταν μέλλω οἱ τῷ λέγειν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀπιστοῦμενον (comp. e.g. Acts xxi. 21), καὶ ὑπὲρ οὗ σφόδρα ἐκαίνιοι εἰς πεπεικότες, Chrys. Compare 1 Tim. ii. 7. Conversely, Lys. iv. 12: ὑστεραὶ κ. οὐκ ἀληθὴ λέγει. — συμμαρτ. μοι τῆς συνειδ. μοι] ground assigned for the οὗ ὑστὸν: since with me (agreeing with my express assurance) my conscience gives testimony. Compare ii. 15, viii. 16. —ἐν πνεύμ. ἀγίῳ] is by no means to be connected with τῆς συνειδ. μοι (Grotius and several others, Semler, Ammon, Vater: “conscientia a Spiritu sancto gubernata”), because otherwise τῆς would not be wanting; but either with οὗ ὑστὸν (Cramer, Morus, Nosselt, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Winzer, Reiche, Köllner, Fritzsche; of whom, however, only Winzer and Fritzsche take it not as an oath, but as equivalent to ὁς ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ ὁν), or—which is the nearest and simplest—with συμμαρτ. (Beza, Böhme, Tholuck, Rückert, de Wette, Maier, Philippi, van Hengel, Hofmann, and others). Compare Matt. xxii. 43; Luke ii. 27; Mark xii. 36; 1 Cor. xii. 3. The testimony of his conscience, Paul knows, is not apart from the πνεύμα that fills him, but “Spiritu sancto duce et moderatore” (Beza), in that πνεύμα. And thus the negative οὗ ὑστὸν receives its sacred guarantee through a concurrent testimony of the conscience ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, as the positive ἀλήθ. λέγω had received it through ἐν Ἑρωτῇ. This very appropriate symmetry dissuades us from joining συμμαρτ. μοι κ.τ.λ. to ἀλήθ. λέγω, so that οὗ ὑστὸν would be only “thrown in between” (Hofmann). —ὅτι λίτη κ.τ.λ.] that, etc. A comma only preceding. Over what is this sorrow? Over the exclusion of a great part of the Jews from the Messianic salvation. With tender forbearance Paul does not express this, but leaves it to be gathered by the reader from what follows, in which he immediately, by γὰρ, assigns the ground for the greatness and continuance of his sorrow. —μὴ καθ’ ἑαυτόν] I would wish, namely, if the purport of the wish could be realized to the advantage of the Israelites. Comp. on Gal. iv. 20, where also no ἀν is annexed. But van Hengel takes it of a wish which had actually
arisen in the mind of Paul amidst his continual sorrowfulness. So also Hofmann: the wish had entered his mind, though but momentarily. But a thing so incapable of being fulfilled he can scarce have actually wished; he would only wish it, if it were capable of being fulfilled; this is expressed by ἐπιχύμην, and that without αὐτός, as a definite assurance; comp. on Acts xxv. 22; Gal. iv. 20; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 187; Kühner, II. 1, p. 178. On the wish itself, comp. Ex. xxxii. 32.—ἀνάθεμα] or, in the Attic form, ἀνάθημα (Lobeck, ad Phryn. pp. 249, 445, and Paralip. p. 391 ff.), in Greek writers (also Luke xxi. 5; 2 Macc. ii. 13, et al.) a votive offering, corresponds frequently in the LXX. to the Hebrew דַּעַם, and means something devoted to God without redemption (Lev. xxvii. 28); then—in so far as such a thing was devoted to the divine wrath, and destined to destruction (see Ewald, Alterth. p. 101 ff.)—something abandoned to destruction; a curse-offering. So in the N. T. See Gal. i. 8, 9, 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22, which passages at the same time prove that the (later) special sense of דַּעַם, as denoting the Jewish curse of excommunication, is not to be here introduced. The destruction, to which Paul would fain yield himself on behalf of his brethren, is not to be understood of a violent death (Jerome, Limborch, Elsner, and others, also Michaelis, Nösselt, Flatt), but, as ἄνοιγμα X. renders necessary, of the everlasting ἀνάθεμα. It has been objected that the wish must thus be irrational (Michaelis: "a frantic prayer"); but the standard of selfish reflection is not suited to the emotion of unmeasured devotedness and love out of which the apostle speaks. Groundlessly, and contrary to Paul's usage elsewhere, Hofmann weakens the positive notion of the expression into the negative one of the being excluded from Christ. This element is implied in ἄνοιγμα τοῦ Χ. as the specific accompanying relation of the ἀνάθεμα. Bengel well remarks that the modulus ratio-cinationum nostrarum as little comprehends the love of the apostle, as does a little boy the animos heroum bellicorum.—αὐτός ἰδών] belonging to εἰςως by attraction (Kühner, II. 2, p. 596): I myself, I, as far as my own person is concerned. Comp. on vii. 25. Paul sees those who belong to the fellowship of his people advancing to ruin through their unbelief; therefore he
would fain wish that he himself were a curse-offering, if by means of this sacrifice of his own self he could only save the beloved brethren. The contrast, with reference to which αὐτὸς ἐγώ is here conceived, lies therefore in ἐν Χ. ὁ πλ. ἀδελφ. μου, whose unhappy state appears already in vv. 1, 2 so sad in the eyes of the apostle; not in the duty of the apostle's calling (Th. Schott); and least of all in a "nescio quis alius" (Fritzsche). Theodoret and Theophylact (comp. Chrysostom) refer back to viii. 39 (I myself, whom nevertheless nothing can separate, etc.); but this lies too far off. Van Hengel (after Krehl): "Ipse ego, qui me in Christi communione esse dixi." But ἐν Χ. in the previous instance was merely an accessory definition.— ἀπὸ τοῦ Χ. away from Christ, separated from Him. Comp. 2 Thess. i. 9; Gal. v. 4; 2 Cor. v. 6, xi. 3; Lev. xxvii. 29; and see generally, Nägelsbach on Ilias, p. 188, ed. 3; Ameis on Hom. Od. Anh. ξ, 525; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 277. Christ is not conceived as author of the ἀνάθ. (Nösselt, Morus, Flatt, and others); for away (comp. Lev. xxvii. 29) does not stand for ἀπό, which latter DEG actually read in consequence of this erroneous view.— ἐν ἀπερ ὁ πλ. ἀδελφ. μου] ἐν ἀπερ is here also not instead of (Rückert, Tholuck, Olshausen, and many others), but for the advantage of, for their deliverance. Grotius aptly paraphrases: "Si ea ratione illos ad justitiam veram et ad aeternam salutem possem perducere."— κατὰ σ.] subjoined, without the connective of the article, as a familiar accessory definition, which blends with the principal word into a single notion. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 18; Eph. ii. 11, vi. 5. Moreover, there lies in the addition τ. συγγ. μ. κ. σ. already something conveying with it the wish of love, and that from the natural side; the theocratic grounds for it follow, ver. 4 ff.

Ver. 4. Οὐτως κ.τ.λ.] quippe qui, who indeed; a description—assigning the motive for what is said in ver. 3—of the ἀδελφῶν κατὰ . . . σάρκα according to their theocratic privileges, and first of all by significant designation according to their ancient and hallowed (Gen. xxxii. 28, xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 21 f.; Phil. iii. 5; John i. 48) national name Ἰσραηλῖται. To the latter are then attached the relative definitions, which
are threefold (ἀγν... ἀγν... ἐξ ἀγν); the first of them embraces six particulars connected by καὶ,—purely sacred-historical divine benefactions. — ἡ ἰδιοθεσία] the adoption. They are those adopted by God into the place of children, which must of course be understood, not in the Christian (chap. viii.) but in the old theocratic sense, of their adoption, in contradistinction to all Gentile peoples, to be the people of God, whose Father is God. Comp. Ex. iv. 22 ff., xix. 5; Deut. xiv. 1, xxxii. 6; Hos. xi. 1, et al. In the ἰδιοθεσία of the N. T. (see on viii. 15), the specific essence of which is the reconciliation obtained for Christ's sake, there has appeared the antitype and the completion of that of the O. T. — καὶ ἡ δόξα] The fivefold καὶ lends an emphatic weight to the enumeration. ἡ δόξα is the glory κατ' ἐξοχήν, i.e. ἡ ἔνατη ἐνόσσωσι (Ex. xxiv. 16, xl. 34, 35; 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; Ezek. i. 28; Heb. ix. 5), the symbolically visible essential communion of God, as it was manifested in the wilderness as a pillar of cloud and fire, and over the ark of the covenant; the same as ἡ ἄνευς, of which the Rabbins maintained (erroneously, according to Lev. xvi. 2) that it had hovered as a cloud of light continually over the ark of the covenant. See Ewald, ad Apoc. p. 311. But ἡ δόξα is not the ark of the covenant itself (Beza, Piscator, Hammond, Grotius), for in 1 Sam. iv. 22 the ark of the covenant is not called "the glory of Israel," but this is only predicated of it. Others understand the whole glory of the Jewish people in general (de Dieu, Calovius, Estius, Semler, Morus, Böhme, Benecke, Köllner, Glocker, Fritzsch, Beck). Incorrectly, since it is merely individual privileges that are set forth. — αἱ διαθήκαι] not the tables of the law (Beza, Piscator, Paretus, Toletus, Balduin, Grotius, Semler, Rosenmüller), which it cannot denote either in itself or on account of the following νομοθ.; nor yet the O. and N. T. (Augustine, Jerome, Calovius, and Wolf, in accordance with Gal. iv. 24), which would be entirely unsuitable in respect of the N. T.; but the covenants concluded by God with the patriarchs since Abraham. Compare Wisd. xviii. 22; Ecclus. xiv. 11; 2 Macc. viii. 15; Eph. ii. 12. — ἡ νομοθεσία] The (Sinaitic) giving of the law. This is "una et semel habita per Mosen;" but the "testamenta frequenter statuta sunt," Origen.
There is no ground for taking it, with others (including Reiche, de Wette, Fritzsche), not of the act, but of the contents, like νῶμος (why should not Paul have written this?). Certainly, he who has the νομοθεσία has also the νόμος; but on that account the two significations are to be kept distinct even in places like 2 Macc. vi. 23. The giving of the law was a work (comp. Plat. Legg. vi. p. 751 B: μεγάλον τῆς νομοθεσίας ἔργον δύνατον), by which God, who Himself was the νομοθέτης, had distinguished the Israelites over all other peoples.— ή λατρεία the cultus κατ' ἐξοχήν, the service of Jehovah in the temple. Comp. Heb. ix. 1. It corresponds to the νομοθέτης, in consequence of which the λατρεία came into existence; just as the following αἱ ἐπαργύγειαι (κατ' ἐξοχήν, the collective Messianic promises) is correlative to the αἱ διαθήκαι, on which the ἐπαργύγγυς were founded. The chiasmus in this order of sequence (comp. Bengel) is not accidental; but αἱ ἐπαργύγειαι 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.

Ver. 5. Now, after that first relative sentence with its six theocratic distinctions, two other relative clauses introduce the mutually correlative persons, on whom the sacred-historical calling of Israel was based and was to reach its accomplishment.— αἱ πατέρες] Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who are per excellentiam the patriarchs, Ex. iii. 13, 15, iv. 5; Acts ii. 13, vii. 32. — καὶ εὗτος ὁ κ.τ.λ.] The last and highest distinction of the Israelites: and from whom Christ descends, namely, according to the human phenomenal nature, as a human phenomenon, apart from the spiritually-divine side of His personality, according to which He is not from the Jews, but (as νῦν Θεοῦ κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγωνισμόν, i. 4) is ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Regarded in the light of His supernatural generation, He would be also κατὰ σάρκα of God. Comp. Clem. Cor. I. 32: ἐὰν αὐτὸν

1 See on ver. 5, Herm. Schultz, in the Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol. 1868, p. 462 ff., where also a list of the earlier literature is given; Grimm, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1869, p. 311 ff. Among the English opponents of the Unitarians there is to be especially noted, in defence of the orthodox explanation, Smith, Scripture testimony to the Messiah, 1847, ed. 4, II. p. 870 ff.
On the article τὸ κ. σ., see Heind. ad Gorg. p. 228; Buttm. neut. Gr. p. 84. The καὶ before εἰς τὸν forbids the reference of the latter to οἱ πατέρες. — ὁ ὑπὲρ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογ. εἰς τ. αἰῶνας] This passage, which has become of dogmatic importance, has received two different leading interpretations, by the side of which yet a third way, namely, by taking to pieces the relative sentence, came to be suggested. (1) The words are referred (placing a comma after σάρκα) to Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever. So, substantially, Irenaeus (Haer. iii. 16. 3), Tertullian (adv. Prax. § 13, p. 2101, ed. Seml.), Origen, Cyprian, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Augustine, Jerome, Theodoret, and later Fathers; Luther, Erasmus, Paraphr., Flacius, Calvin, Beza, and most of the older expositors; and of the later, Michaelis, Koppe, Tholuck, Flatt, Klee, Usteri, Benecke, Olshausen, Nielsen, Reithmayr, Maier, Beck, Philippi, Bisping, Gess, Krummacher, Jatho, Hahn, Thomasius, Ebrard, Ritschl, Hofmann, Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 306, Delitzsch, and others; in a peculiar fashion also, Herm. Schultz (see below); de Wette is undecided. (2) The words are regarded (placing a period after ἀπαντᾷ, as do Lachm. and Tisch.) as a doxology to God, isolated from the foregoing: "Blessed for ever be the God who is over all." So none of the Fathers (as to those erroneously adduced by Wetstein, see Fritzsche, p. 262 ff.), at

---

1 So also the Catech. Racov. 159 f. But, in its view, since there are not two Gods, "qui natura sit Deus" cannot be understood. Conversely, Flacius infers from ἵνα πάντως, that Christ is designated as naturaliter Deus.

2 Yet the non-reference to Christ is indirectly implied in Ignatius, Tars. interpol. 5 (τὸ ἀνωτέρος ὑπὲρ τὸ σάρκα Θεός κ. τ. λ.), and Phil. interpol. 7. The reference to God is also found in a fragment ascribed to Diodorus, in Cramer, Caten. p. 162, where it is said: ἠνωτέρος φυσικῶς Χριστός. Θεὸς ὁ ὑπὲρ μίαν φύσιν, ἐν γαρ ἐν χρόνοις Θεῶς. In the Arian controversies our passage was not made use of. But at a later period it was triumphantly made available against the Arians. Thus Occumenius, e.g., exclaims: ἰκανία λαμπρῶτα Θεὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνσώματι ἐκάστοτες· αἰεχθεῖτε τραύλις Ἀριτίς, ἀκοῦστε ἡπᾶρ Πάκτων ἐτελευτημένοιν τὸν Χριστὸν Θεὸς ἀληθῶς! Comp. Theophylact; also Proclus, de fid. p. 58, who says generally of our passage: παραβολῶς εὐφαντικῶς ἀποφαντικῶς τῶν φιλοδραμών. In Cyril of Alexandria this passage is insisted on in opposition to the assertion of Julian, that only John calls Christ God; whilst the ἑκάστοτε of the Synod of Ephesus make no reference to it, which is, however, carefully done in the Synod of Antioch. See the passages in question in Tisch. 8, who also observes that, among the codd. C L. 5, 47, place a full stop after σάρκα.
least not expressly; but Erasmus in his *Annot.*, Wetstein, Semler, Stolz, and several others, and recently Reiche, Köllner, Winzer, Fritzsche, Glöckler, Schrader, Krehl, Ewald, van Hengel, and, though not fully decided, Rückert. See also Baur, II. p. 231; Zeller, in the *Theol. Jahrb.* 1842, p. 51; Räbiger, *Christol. Paul.* p. 26 f.; Beyschlag, *Christol.* p. 210. Now the decision, which of the two leading interpretations fits the meaning of the apostle, cannot be arrived at from the language used, since, so far as the words go, both may be equally correct; nor yet from the immediate connection, since with equal reason Paul might (by no means: *must*, against which is the analogy of ver. 3; and the divine in Christ did not belong here, as in i. 3, *necessarily* to the connection) feel himself induced to set over-against the human side of the being of Jesus its divine side (as in i. 3), or might be determined by the recital of the distinctions of his nation to devote a doxology to God, the Author of these privileges, who therefore was not responsible for the deeply-lamented unbelief of the Jews; just as he elsewhere, in peculiar excited states of piety, introduces a giving glory to God (i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Gal. i. 5; comp. 1 Tim. i. 17). Observe, rather, with a view to a decision, the following considerations: Although our passage, referred to *Christ*, would term Him not ὁ Θεός, but (who is God over all) only ὁ Ἰησοῦς *predicatively* (without the article), and although Paul, by virtue of his essential agreement in *substance* with the Christology of John, might have

---

1 As van Hengel has attempted, who starts from the idea that the contrast to be thought of in τι ναός ἐσμεν (according to him: "non quatenus spiritus divini particeps erat") *excludes a wider antithesis*, and therefore a point must necessarily be placed after ἐσμεν. Such prepositional definitions with the accusative of the article τι or το (see also Kühlner, II. 1, p. 272) certainly denote a complete contrast, which is either expressly stated (as e.g. Xen. *Cyr.* v. 4. 11, τοιοῦτοι τοι αὐτοὶ τοι σύγχρονοι, τοι οἰκί οἰκονόμοι: *Plat.* *Min.* p. 320 C; Rom. xii. 5, τοι οἱ ναῦσι τοι), or may be self-evident from the context, as i. 15, xii. 18, and very frequently in the classics. The latter would, however, be the case in our passage according to the ancient ecclesiastical exposition, inasmuch as the contrast obviously implied in τι ναός ἐσμεν would permit us mentally to supply a τι ναός χρισμόν as suggesting itself after τοι. That self-evident negative antithesis: *non quoad spiritum*, would thus have in τοι οἰκί *nauta ὁ Θεός κ.λ. its positive elucidation.
affirmed, just as appropriately as the latter (i. 1), the predicative Θεός (of divine essence) of Christ, because Christ is also in Paul's view the Son of God in a metaphysical sense, the image of God, of like essence with the Father, the agent in creation and preservation, the partaker in the divine government of the world, the judge of all, the object of prayerful invocation, the possessor of divine glory and fulness of grace (i. 4, x. 12; Phil. ii. 6; Col. i. 15 ff., ii. 9; Eph. i. 20 ff.; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4, viii. 9); yet Paul has never¹ used the express Θεός of Christ, since he has not adopted, like John, the Alexandrian form of conceiving and setting forth the divine essence of Christ, but has adhered to the popular concrete, strictly monotheistic terminology, not modified by philosophical speculation even for the designation of Christ; and he always accurately distinguishes God and Christ; see, in opposition to such obscure and erroneous intermingling of ideas, Rich. Schmidt, Paulin. Christol. p. 149 ff. John himself calls the divine nature of Christ Θεός only in the introduction of his Gospel, and only in the closest connection with the Logos-speculation. And thus there runs through the whole N. T. a delicate line of separation between the Father and the Son; so that, although the divine essence and glory of the latter is glorified with the loftiest predicates in manifold ways, nevertheless it is only the Father, to whom the Son is throughout subordinated, and never Christ, who is actually called God by the apostles (with the exception of John i. 1, and the exclamation of Thomas, John xx. 28)—not even in 1 John v. 20. Paul, particularly, even where he accumulates and strains to the utmost expressions concerning the Godlike nature of the exalted Christ (as Phil. ii. 6 ff.; Col. i. 15 ff., ii. 9), does not call Him Θεός, but sharply and clearly distinguishes Him as the κύριος from

¹ Not even in 2 Thess. i. 12 (in opposition to Hofmann's invention), or in Eph. v. 5. As regards the Pastoral Epistles, if they actually denominate Christ Θεός, this would be one of the signs of a post-apostolic epoch. But not once do they do this. The most specious passage is still Tit. ii. 13, respecting which, however, Huther is in the right, and Philippi, Glaubenlehre. II. p. 208, ed. 2, is incorrect. In 1 Tim. iii. 16, οὗ is to be read, with Lachm. and Tisch.; on Tit. i. 4 even Philippi desires to lay no particular stress; it has, in fact, no bearing whatever on our passage, any more than Col. ii. 2 (see in loc.).
Θεός, even in x. 9, 1 Cor. xii. 3 (in opposition to Ritschl, *Altkath.* K. p. 79 f.). The post-apostical period (and not at all 2 Pet. i. 1, see Huther) first obliterated this fine line of separation, and often denominated Christ Θεός, ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, and the like. So, e.g., already several of the Ignatian epistles in the shorter recension (not those ad Magnes., ad Philadelph., ad Trall., not even chap. vii.) and the so-called second epistle—not the first—of Clement, nor the epistle of Polycarp. In the closest internal connection herewith stands the fact, that in the properly apostolical writings (2 Pet. iii. 18 does not belong to them, nor does Heb. xiii. 21) we never meet with a doxology to Christ in the form which is usual with doxologies to God (not even in 1 Pet. iv. 11); therefore, in this respect also, the present passage would stand to the apostolic type in the relation of a complete anomaly. Besides, the insuperable difficulty would be introduced, that here Christ would be called not merely and simply Θεός, but even God over all, and consequently would be designated as Θεός παντοκράτωρ, which is absolutely incompatible with the entire view of the N. T. as to the dependence of the Son on the Father (see Gess, *v. d. Pers. Chr.* p. 157 ff.; Kahnis, *Dogm.* I. p. 457 ff.), and especially with passages like viii. 34 (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ), 1 Cor. iii. 23, viii. 6, xi. 3, Eph. iv. 5, 6, and notably 1 Cor. xv. 28. Accordingly, the doxology of our passage cannot be referred to Christ, but must be referred to God; although Philippi continues of opinion that the former reference has all in its favour and nothing against it. On the other hand, Tholuck (see also Schmid, *bibl. Theol.* II. p. 540, ed. 2) does more justice to the objections against the old ecclesiastical interpretation, which Messner also, *Lehre d. Ap.* p. 236 f., prefers, but only with a certain diffidence; whilst Herm. Schultz (comp. Socinus, in

1 There certainly occurs at chap. ii., in Clement, the expression πάντις υἱός (i.e. τίς θεός), where we are not to correct it into πάντως, with Hilgenfeld. This expression, however, is fully explained, without Christ being named Θεός, from the Pauline view: Οὐκ ἐστὶ υἱὸς καταλήκτων θεοῦ, 2 Cor. v. 19.

2 The doxology in xvi. 27 does not refer to Christ. 2 Tim. iv. 18 certainly refers to Christ; but this is just one of the traces of post-apostolic composition.
Calovius, p. 153) comes ultimately to a lower acceptation of the notion of Θεός, which is meant not metaphysically, but only designates the fulness of power committed to Christ for bheof of His work, and excludes neither dependence and coming into being, nor beginning and end. Against the latter suggestion it may be decisively urged, that thus characteristics are attached to the notion Θεός, which, compared with the current Pauline mode of expression, directly annul it, and make it interchangeable with κύριος, as Paul uses it of Christ (Eph. iv. 5, 6; Phil. ii. 11; 1 Cor. viii. 6, and many other passages). See, in opposition to it, also Grimm. If we suppose the quite singular case here to occur, that Paul names Christ God, yea God over all, we need not shrink from recognising, with the orthodox interpreters, an expression of the fact that Christ is not nuncupative, but naturaliter God (Flacius, Clav. II. p. 187). (3) Another way, that of taking to pieces the relative clause, was suggested by Erasmus, who proposed to place the point (as in Cod. 71) after πάντων (in which Locke, Clarke, Justi, Ammon, Stolz, Grimm, l.c., and in de Johann. Christol. indole Paulinae compar. p. 75 f., Baumgarten-Crusius, Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, I. p. 200 ff., and Märcker follow him), so that qui est super omnia (or omnes) refers to Christ (comp. Acts x. 36), and then the doxology to God follows. But how intolerably abrupt is this!—not merely the brief description given of Christ, but also the doxology itself, which with ὃ ὅν ἐπὶ πάντων loses its natural connection with the preceding. Again, with this separation would disappear the motive for Paul's not having put εὐλογ. in the first place, as usually (comp. 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; also the doxologies in the LXX.). This motive is, namely, the emphasis which Θεός obtains by the characteristic description ὃ ὅν ἐπὶ πάντων (the God who is over all). Still more disjointed and halting the language becomes through the punctuation of Morus (who, however, concurs in referring the whole to Christ): ὃ ὅν ἐπὶ πάντων, Θεός, εὐλογ. eis τ. αi. 1

1 With emphasis, too, in the LXX. Ps. lxviii. 20, νέπις ὃ Θεός appears to be prefixed to εὐλογ. Yet the translator must have had ἔν τις twice in the original text. 2 Otherwise Hofmann (comp. his Schriften. I. p. 144; also Kahnis, Dogmat. I. p. 453 f.): Paul predicates ὃ ὅν ἐπὶ πάντων of Christ, and then causes Θεός
Why Reiche, whom Krehl and van Hengel have followed, although rightly referring the whole to God, has adopted this punctuation (He who is over all, God, be praised for ever), we cannot perceive; ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, taken independently, forms in fact, according to a quite customary manner of expression, one phrase, so that Θεός is not without the article. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 7; Kühner, II. § 464, 8, c. Finally, Grotius (not also Schoettgen, as Schultz states) would consider Ἐμοί as not genuine, and would refer ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ π. ἐλα. to Christ, to whom “laus et honor debetur supra omnes, i.e. etiam supra Abrah., Isaac et Jacob.” But that Θεός is not wanting in the Peschito, as Grotius maintains, is decisively settled (see Koppe), and the witnesses who actually omit it (edd. of Cyprian, and Hilary, Leo once, Epheam) are much too weak and doubtful; see Bengel, Appar. crit. in loc. Quite arbitrary is the conjecture of Sam. Crell (Artemonius): ὅν ὁ ἐπὶ κ. τ. λ. — ἐπὶ πάντων neuter. The limitation which takes it as masc. (Syr., Beza, Grotius, Socinus, Justi, Hofmann, and others), in which case it is by some held to apply to men generally, by others to the patriarchs, must have been presented by the context; but it is not at all suggested by anything, not even in the reference of the sense, which Fritzsche introduces: “qui omnibus hominibus prospicit Deus, ut male credas Judaeos ab eo destitutos esse, etc.” — ἐπὶ indicates the relation of the rule over all things; see Lobeck, ad Herod. p. 474, ad Phryn. pp. 164, 174; Bähr, ad Plut. Alc. p. 162. God is the παντοκράτωρ, 2 Cor. vi. 18; often in the Apocalypse, ὁ μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων κ. τ. λ., 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.

ὁ λόγος, οὐ προτέρους ἀκούειν ἐκ τοῦ λόγου. But if we once believe that the sentence must be referred to Christ, it is in any case far more in keeping with the emotional flow of the language to leave the whole unbroken, without making an artificial abatement from the result, that Paul has named Christ ἡ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς θείας. This artificial abatement is thus brought out by Hofmann: he takes ἡ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς as in contradistinction to ἡ ἐκ, and θείας as in contradistinction to ἡ πάντων, after which arbitrary analysis the twofold antithetic sequence of thought is supposed to be: “He who supremely rules over all has come forth out of this people, and, in respect of the self-transmitting human corporeal nature, there has come forth out of this people He who is God.” As though Paul had written: ἡ ἐκ ἠ πατρίσις ἡ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ πάντων ἡ πάντων ἡ πάντων, ἡ ἐκ θείας διατρήσεις οὐ ναύτης, Gen.

1 Van Hengel assumes that the Israelites and patriarchy and Christ are intended.
Vv. 6–13. First part of the Theodicè: God’s promise, however, has not become untrue through the exclusion of a part of the Israelites; for it applies only to the true Israelites, who are such according to the promise, which is confirmed from Scripture.

Ver. 6. Having in vv. 4, 5 adduced the great divine prerogatives of his people, and given honour to God for them, as his Israelitish sympathies impelled him to do, his thought now recurs to that utterance of grief in vv. 2, 3, over-against which (δὲ) he now proposes to justify the God of his people. Quite unnecessarily Lachmann has put vv. 3–5 in a parenthesis. — oβχ ὁλὼν δὲ, ἵνα does not mean: but it is not possible that (Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Homberg, Semler, Ch. Schmidt, Morus, Böhme, Rosenmüller, Benecke, Ewald); for in that case ἵνα would not be allowable, but the infinitive must follow (Matthiae, § 479; Krüger, § 55. 3. 1); moreover, as Calvin has rightly observed, ὁλὼν ἦν would be found, at least according to the invariable usage (4 Macc. iv. 7; Xen. Anab. ii. 2. 3, vii. 7. 22; and Bornemann, in loc.; de Rep. Ath. ii. 2; Mem. iv. 6. 7; Thuc. vii. 42. 3; Soph. Phil. 913; O. C. 1420; Ast, Lex. Plat. II. p. 425), instead of which scarcely an uncertain example (as Gorgias, pro Palam. in Wetstein) is forthcoming of the simple ὁλὼν without ἦν, whilst the masculine ὁλὼν εἶμι (without ἦν) is frequent (see Schömann, ad Is. p. 465; Weber, Dem. Aristoc. p. 469; Kühner, II. 2, p. 702. 580). It is rather to be explained by the very current usage in later Greek (Lennep. ad Phalar. p. 258; Fritzsche on our passage) of oβχ. ὁλὼν with a following finite tense; e.g. oβχ ὁλὼν ὅμιλον ὀμοίων in Phryn. p. 372, and the passages from Polybius in Schweighäuser, p. 403). According to this usage, the attracted ὁλὼν is not to be resolved, with Hermann, ad Viger. p. 790, into ὁλὼν ὁλὼν, because the following verb does not suit this, but with Fritzsche into ὁλώνου ὅτι: the matter is not of such a nature, that. But since Paul has here expressed ὅτι, he cannot have conceived it as contained in ὁλὼν: in reality he has fallen into a mixing up of two kindred modes of expression,—namely, of oβχ

1 And yet Hofmann terms the words ὁλὼν ὅτι... κ.λ., taken as a doxology, an uncalled-for, and aimless, insufferable interruption. Psychologically, a very unjust judgment.
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\( \delta e o v \) with a finite tense, and \( \nu \chi \ \delta t i, \) i.e. \( \nu \chi \ \epsilon r o \ \delta t i. \) See Tyrwhitt, *ad Arist. Poet.* p. 128; Hartung, *Partikell.* II. p. 153 f.; Kühner, II. 2, p. 800 f. *Without* this intermingling he would have written \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v \ \delta e \ \epsilon k p e t \tau \omega k e n; \) but *consequent* on this intermingling he wrote \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v \ \delta e, \ \delta t i \ \epsilon k p t., \) which accordingly may be analyzed thus: \( \delta t i \ \tau o u o v \ \delta e \ \lambda e g a, \ \delta e o v \ \delta t i, \) *I do not speak of a thing of such kind, as (that is) that.* So also substantially Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 319, and previously, by way of suggestion, Beza. The deviation from Greek usage into which Paul has fallen renders also necessary this solution, which *deviates* \(^1\) from the analysis of the Greek \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v \ \delta e \ \epsilon k p e t \tau \omega k e n. \) *And we have here, amongst the many solecisms falsely ascribed to the apostle, a real one. Observe, moreover, the strength of the negation implied in \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v; \) for this affirms that the lament of the apostle was to be something quite other than a lament over the frustration of the divine word. According to Hofmann, \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v \) is to be again supplied to \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v, \) and \( \delta t i \) to be taken as *because,\(^2\) so that thus Paul would deny that he had for that wish the ground, which is named in \( \delta t i \ \epsilon k p e t \tau \omega k e n \) \( \kappa . t . \lambda . \) This is—indepen
dently of the arbitrariness of the insertion of \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v—\) incorrect, just because the thought that this \( \nu \chi \ \delta e o v \) could have had that ground would be an absurd thought; for it would suppose a fact, which is inconceivable as a *motivus* of the wish. — \( \epsilon k p e t \tau \omega k e n \) has fallen out of its position, i.e. *fallen through,* become unavailing, without result. See Plut. *Tib. Gracch.* 21; Ael. *V. H.* iv. 7; Kypke, II. p. 173 f. So *\( \delta i a p i t t e n, \) Josh. xxi. 45; Judith vi. 9; and *\( \pi i t t e n, \) Josh. xxi. 14; both in use also among the Greeks; comp. *\( \epsilon k e B a l-\) lεσθαι, Dissen, *ad Pind. Nem.* xi. 30. The opposite is *\( \mu ε n e i n, \) ver. 11. Comp. also 1 Cor. xiii. 8. — *\( \delta \ \lambda \gamma o s \ \tau . \ \Theta e o u \)\] namely, not the *Dei edictum* (ver. 28) as to the bestowal of blessing only on the election of the Israelites, as Fritzsche, an-

\(^1\) Fritzsche prefers to assume a *constructio* \( \rho i s \ \nu \ \epsilon m a n i m o s, \) so that Paul has written \( \delta t i, \) because in \( \nu \chi \ \delta t i \) lies the essential meaning: *sed multum abest.* — Van Hengel proposes to resolve the expression thus: *\( \tau o u o v \ \lambda i g a, \ \delta e o v \ \tau o u o v \ \kappa e n, \) \( \delta t i \ \lambda i g a, \ \delta t i.\)

\(^2\) Comp. also Erasmus, Castalio, Raithmayr.
ticipating, would have it, but generally the promise given by God to the Israelites, by which the assurance of the Messianic salvation is obviously intended. This sense the context yields generally, and especially by εξ ἰων ὅ Ἐριστᾶς τὸ κ. σ., ver. 5, without our having exactly to think of Gen. xii. 3, where the promise is to Abraham (Th. Schott).— οὖ γὰρ πάντες κ.τ.λ.] for not all who spring from Israel, not all Ἰσραήλ (ver. 27), are Israelites (Israel's children, according to the divine idea), so as to be all destined to receive the salvation promised to the Israelites. Comp. Gal. iv. 29, vi. 16. The first Ἰσραήλ is the name of the patriarch; the second, instead of which the old reading Ἰσραήλίται (D. Chrys.) contains a correct gloss, is the name of his people (xi. 2, 7, 26, al.). Mistaking the subtle emphatic character of this mode of expression, Hofmann, in spite of the clear εἰς εξ, takes the first Ἰσρ. also as a name of the people, so that the sense would be: the unity of the people is something other than the sum of its members. To εἰς Ἰσρ. corresponds σπέρμα Αβρ., ver. 7.

Ver. 7. Nor yet, because they are descendants of Abraham, are they all (his) children. — Before οὖθ' a colon only is correct, because the discourse proceeds continuously, annexing denial to denial. — εἰς[ ] The subject is that of the previous clause, οἱ εἰς Ἰσραήλ. The τέκνα of Abraham, as significantly contrasted with the mere bodily descendants (σπέρμα), are those destined by God to receive the promised salvation. Comp. Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33, 39; Justin, c. Tryph. 44. That it is not God's children that are to be understood (although they are such), as, after Theodoret and several others, Glöcker afresh takes it, is manifest from the foregoing parallel οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ, and from the fact that it is not till afterwards that τέκνα τ. Θεοῦ are spoken of. — Wrongly, but in consequence of his erroneous understanding of the ὅτι, ver. 6, Hofmann regards οὖθ' ὅτι εἰς σπ. Ἀβρ. as the negation of a second ground of the γιγάνης, so that then a new sentence begins with πάντες τέκνα. This view the obvious correlation of οὖθ' . . . τέκνα with the preceding οὖ γὰρ πάντες κ.τ.λ. should have precluded. — After ἀλλ' we are not to supply γιγαντίαν or οὕτως ἐρρέθη, which would be quite arbitrary; but the saying in Gen. xxii. 12, which is
well known to the reader as a saying of God, is subjoined unaltered and immediately (comp. Gal. iii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. xv. 27) without a καθως γέγραπται (xv. 3; 1 Cor. i. 31) or the like being introduced, or the second person being altered into the third; simply because it is taken for granted that the saying is one well known. — ἐν Ἰσαάκ κληθ. σοι σπέρμα] closely after the LXX., which renders the original literally. In the original text we read ἐν Ἰσαάκ κληθ. σοι σπέρμα: through Isaac posterity shall be named to thee, i.e. through Isaac it will come to pass to thee, that posterity of thine shall have the status and the name of the σπέρμα Ἰαβ. (comp. Heb. xi. 18); the descendants of Isaac (consequently not the Ishmaelites) shall be recognised as thy posterity (and therewith as the heirs of the divine promise).¹ But the apostle has otherwise apprehended the sense of the passage according to its typical reference; for it is evident from the relation of ver. 9 to ver. 8, that he limited that saying to the person of Isaac himself, who (not Ishmael) was the promised child of Abraham, and thus represented in himself the character of the true posterity of Abraham accounted as such by God. Hence, in the sense of the apostle: "In the person of Isaac will a descendant be named to thee;" i.e. Isaac will be he, in whose person the notion "descendant of Abraham" shall be represented and recognised. Paul finds in this divine declaration the idea enunciated (ver. 8), that not on bodily descent (which was also the case with Ishmael), but on divine promise (which was the case with Isaac, ver. 9), the true sonship of Abraham is founded. Usually (not by Philippi and Ewald, who concur with our view) the passage is understood, conformably to the historical sense of the original, not of the person of Isaac, but of his posterity; which, because Isaac himself was the son of promise, represents the true descendants of Abraham according to the promise. But to this posterity all Israelites certainly belonged, and it would therefore be inappropriate to set

¹ According to Hofmann, the sense is: "The race, whose ancestor Abraham is assumed to be, shall bear Isaac's name." This sense would, instead of πρῶτος, require πρῶτος ἄν γεν. and in the Greek Ἐσώ εἰμαι (Isa. xliii. 7) or (xlviii. 1) ἐσώ εἰμαι Ἰσώ.
them down, by virtue of their extraction from Isaac, as the type of the true sonship of Abraham, when the very claim to that sonship, resting upon bodily descent, is to be withdrawn from them. The person of Isaac himself, as contrasted with Ishmael, was this type, which was thereupon repeated in Jacob, as contrasted with Esau (in their persons), vv. 10–13. Chrysostom aptly indicates the reference to Isaac himself: διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἔγνων ἐν Ἰσαὰκ τῷ Ἰσαὰκ, οὗ τὰ μᾶλλον γεννώμενο υἱὸν κατὰ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, οὗτοι μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ σπέρμα τὸ Ἀβραὰμ· πῶς οὖν ὁ Ἰσαὰκ ἑγεννηθή; όσο κατὰ νόμον φύσεως, οὐδὲ κατὰ δύναμιν σαρκός, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ἑπαγγελίας. — κρατήσεται] nominabitur. See Winer, p. 571 f. [E.T. 769]; Eur. Hec. 625, and Pflugk, in loc. The opinion of Reiche, that καλ. denotes to call out of nothing (see on iv. 7), which it signifies also in Gen. xxi. 12, so that the sense would be: “In the person of Isaac a descendant will be imparted to thee,” is erroneous, because that saying of God was uttered after the birth of Isaac.— σοι] Dative of ethical reference.— τοῦτο] This purports, thereby the idea is expressed. Rightly Grotius: “Haec vox est explicantis ἐπόνουν latentem, quod νῦν dicitur Hebraeis.” — τέκνα τ. Θεοῦ] Paul characterizes the true descendants of Abraham, who are not so from bodily generation, as God’s children, that is, as such descendants of the ancestor, whose Abrahamic sonship is not different in the idea of God from that of sonship to Him, so that they are regarded and treated by God as His children.— τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας] might mean: the promised children (so van Hengel); for the promised child of Abraham was Isaac (ver. 9), whose birth was the realization of a promise (and so Hofmann takes it). But that Paul had the conception that Isaac was begotten by virtue of the divine promise, is evident from Gal. iv. 23 (see in loc.), and therefore the genitive (as also previously τῆς σαρκὸς) is to be taken causatively: the children of Abraham who originate from the divine promise, who are placed in this their relation of sonship to Abraham through the creative power of the divine promise, analogously to the begetting of Isaac; ἢ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἵσχος ἐτέκε τὰ παιδίαν, Chrysostom. — λογίζεται] by God. Comp. iv. 3, 5.— eis σπέρματα] that
is, as an Abrahamic posterity. See ver. 7. To understand Gentiles also, is here foreign to the context (in opposition to Beyschlag); see vv. 9–13. Abraham's race is treated of, to which not all who descend from him are without distinction reckoned by God as belonging.

Ver. 9. Proof of the foregoing ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελλας. "The children of promise, I say, for a word of promise is that which follows: about this time, etc." Hence, therefore, we see that not the bodily descent, but the divine promise, constitutes the relation of belonging to Abraham's fatherhood. The quotation is freely put together from Gen. xviii. 10 and xviii. 14, after the LXX. — ἔτος οὖν οὗτων οὕτως, at this time (namely, of the next year), corresponds ἐν τῷ νέῳ to in the original (comp. 2 Kings iv. 16, 17; Gen. xvii. 21), which is to be explained: as the time revives, that is, when the time (which is now a thing of the past and dead) returns to life; not with Fritzsche: in the present time (of the next year), which suits the words of the LXX., — where, by way of explanation, the classical εἰς ἐτας, over the year, is added, — but not the Hebrew. See Gesenius, Thes. i. p. 470; Tuch and Knobel on Gen. xviii. 10. On the whole promise, comp. Hom. Od. xi. 248 f., 295.

Ver. 10. A fresh and still more decisive proof (for it might be objected that, of Abraham's children, Sarah's son only was legitimate) that only the divine disposal constituted the succession to Abraham which was true and valid in the sight of God. Comp. Barnab. 13. The more definite notion of promise, which was retained in the preceding, is here expanded into the more general one of the appointment of the divine will as made known. — οὗ μόνον δὲ] See generally on v. 3. What is supplied must be something that is gathered from the preceding, that fits the nominative Ἡσέκα, and that answers as regards sense to the following ἐρχέθη αὐτῆς. Hence, because τῇ Σαρία προέδρευσε, and with ἀλλὰ καί another mother's name is introduced, we must supply, as subject, not Abraham (Augustine, Beza, Calvin, Reithmayr, van Hengel; comp. also Hofmann, who however thinks any completing supplement useless), but Σαρία; and moreover, not indeed the definite λόγον
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ἐπαργεῖας ἐλέευ or ἐπαργεῖαμένη ἡν (Vatablus, Fritzsche, Winer, Krehl, Baumgarten-Crusius), but the more general λόγον or ἰδίαι Θεοῦ ἐλέευ, which is suitable to the subsequent ἐρέθη, as well as to the contents of the sayings adduced in vv. 12, 13: "But not only had Sarah a saying of God, but also Rebecca, etc." We must therefore throw aside the manifold arbitrary supplements suggested, some of which are inconsistent with the construction, not suiting the nominative Ὁ βεβ., as e.g.: "non solum id, quod jam diximus, documentum est ejus, quod inferre volumus; Rebecca idem nos docet" (so Grotius, also Seb. Schmid, Semler, Ch. Schmid, Cramer, Rosenmüller, and several others; comp. Tholuck and Philippi); or: τὸ τῶν ἡν (Rückert, de Wette), so that the nominative Ὁ βεβ. forms an anacoluthon, and the period begun enters with ver. 11 upon quite another form (how forced, seeing that vv. 11 and 12 in themselves stand in perfectly regular construction!). It is only the semblance of an objection against our view, that not Sarah, but Abraham, received the word of promise, ver. 9; for Sarah was, by the nature of the case, and also according to the representation of Genesis, the co-recipient of the promise, and was mixed up in the conversation of God with Abraham in reference to it (Gen. xviii. 13–15); so that Paul, without incurring the charge of contradicting history, might have no scruple in stating the contrast as between the mothers, as he has done. — ἐξ ἐνὸς κοινῆς ἔχουσα] Who had cohabitation of one (man), the effect of which was the conception of the twin children. The contextual importance of this addition does not consist in its denying that there was a breach of conjugal fidelity, but in its making palpably apparent the invalidity—for the history of salvation—of bodily descent. She was pregnant by one man, and yet how different was the divine determination with respect to the two children! — ἐξ ἐνὸς] masculine, without anything being supplied; for Ἰσ. τ. π. ἡμ. is in apposition. κοινῆς, couch, bed, often marriage bed (Heb. xiii, 4), is found seldom in the classical writers (Eur. Med. 151, Hippol. 154; not Anacr. 23, see Valck. Schol. II. p. 594), with whom εὐνή and λέχος often have the same sense, euphemistically used as equivalent to concubitus, but frequently in the LXX.

ROM. II.
See Schleusner, *Thes.* III. p. 347. Comp. *Wisd.* iii. 13, 16. — τοῦ πατρ. Ἰ. from the Jewish consciousness; for the discourse has primarily to do with the Jews. Comp. iv. 1. If Isaac were to be designated as the father of Christians (Reiche, Fritzsche), the context must have necessarily and definitely indicated this, since believers are Abraham's (spiritual) children. We may add that Ἰ. τοῦ πατρ. ἣμᾶς is not without a significant bearing on the argument, inasmuch as it contributes to make us feel the independence of the determination of the divine will on the theocratic descent, however legitimate.

Vv. 11, 12. Although, forsooth, they were not yet born, and had not done anything good or evil, in order that the purpose of God according to election might have its continued subsistence, not from works, but from Him who calls, it was said to her, etc. — μὴν] not οὗτος, because the negative relation is intended to be expressed subjectively, that is, as placed before the view of God and weighed by Him in delivering His utterance. See Winer, p. 450 [E. T. 608]; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 295. Comp. Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 1. 37. — The subject (ἀν) to the participles is not expressed, according to a well-known classical usage (Matthiae, § 563; Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 2. 17), but it would be self-evident to the reader from the history familiar to him, that the twins of Rebecca were intended; Winer, p. 548 [E. T. 736]. — The sentence expressive of purpose, ἵνα . . . καλωθῶς, is placed with emphasis before ἐπρέπη, and therefore not to be placed in a parenthesis. — ἵνα] introduces the purpose which God had in this, that, notwithstanding they were not yet born, etc., He yet gave forth already the declaration of ver. 12. He thereby purposed, namely, that His resolve — conceived in the mode of an election made amongst men — to bestow the blessings of the Messianic salvation should subsist, etc. — ἡ κατ' εἰκονίαν. πρόθεσις] can neither be so taken, that the εἰκονία precedes the πρόθεσις in point of time (comp. viii. 28), which is opposed to the nature of the relation, especially see-

1 Taken by Beck in a rationalistic sense: "The fundamental outline which serves as a standard for the temporal training of the ιςλαγ, and pervades their temporal development in all its parts."
ing that the \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \) pertains to what was antecedent to time (see on viii. 28);\(^1\) nor so that the \( \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta \) follows the \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \), whether it be regarded as the act of its fulfilment (Reiche) or as its aim (Krehl). These latter interpretations might certainly be justified linguistically (see Kühner, II. 1, pp. 412, 413), but they would yield no specific peculiarity of the act of the \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \). Yet, since \( \kappa\alpha\tau' \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta \nu \) must be the characteristically distinctive mark of the purpose, it cannot by any means denote: the resolution adopted in respect of an election (Grotius, Rückert); but it must be apprehended as an essential inherent of the \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \), expressing the modal character of this divine act: the purpose according to election, i.e. the purpose which was so formed, that in it an election was made. The \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \) would have been no \( \pi\rho\theta. \kappa\alpha\tau' \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta \), no “propositum Dei electivum” (Bengel), if God had resolved to bless all without exception. His resolve to vouchsafe the Messianic blessedness did not, however, concern all, but those only who were to be comprehended in this very resolve (by virtue of His \( \pi\rho\gamma\nu\omega\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \), viii. 29), and who were thereby, by means of the \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \) itself, chosen out from the rest of men (xi. 5), and thus the \( \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \) was no other than \( \kappa\alpha\tau' \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta \pi\rho\delta\varepsilon\upsilon\varsigma \) (comp. Bengel, Flatt, Tholuck, Beck, Fritzsche, Philippi, Lamping). In a linguistic aspect \( \kappa\alpha\tau' \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta \) (frequently in Polybius, see Raphel) comes under the same category with the well-known expressions \( \kappa\alpha\tau\varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma, \kappa\alpha\theta' \upsilon\tau\rho\varepsilon\beta\omicron\sigma\lambda\nu\varsigma\varsigma \kappa.\tau.\lambda. \) (Bornem. ad Cyrop. i. 4. 23; Bernhardy, p. 241). Comp. xi. 21; 1 Tim. vi. 3. But it is incorrect to alter, with Carpzov, Ernesti, Cramer, Böhme, Ammon, Rosenmüller, the signification of \( \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\nu \), and to explain \( \kappa\alpha\tau' \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\nu \pi\rho\theta. \) as “propositum Dei liberum.” For, as election and freedom are in themselves dif-

---

\(^1\) Since the divine \( \pi\rho\theta.\upsilon\varsigma \) is antecedent to time (Eph. iii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9), as is also the \( \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\varsigma \) (Eph. i. 4; and see Weiss, bibl. Theol. § 126), we cannot, with Byschlag, p. 38, understand it of the plan developing itself in history, pertaining to the history of God’s kingdom, as God forms it in the calling of Abraham and executes it to the apostolic present. Mistaken also is van Hengel’s view, according to which the \( \kappa\alpha\tau' \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\omicron\upsilon\gamma\varsigma, \pi\rho\theta. \) is to be limited to the determination of choice respecting the two brothers, and \( \pi\rho\theta. \) to the abiding realization of it in the posterity of both sides, while \( \varepsilon\kappa\lambda\nu \) is supposed to be a gloss.
ferent conceptions, so in those passages which are appealed to (Joseph. Bell. Jud. ii. 8. 14; Psalt. Sal. ix. 7), ἐκλ. is none other than electio; and especially in the N. T. ἐκλογή, ἐκλεγέσθαι, and ἐκλεκτός are so statedly used for the dogmatic sense of the election to salvation, that no alteration can be admitted. In general, Hofmann has rightly understood it of the quality, which the purpose has from the fact that God chooses; along with which, however, he likewise transposes the notion of the ἐκλογή into that of the free act of will, "which has its presupposition only in the chooser, not on the side of the chosen." This anticipates the following, which, moreover, joins itself not to ἐκλογή, but to the abiding of the κατ' ἐκλ. πρόθεσις; hence ἐκλογή must be left in its strict verbal sense of election. The ἐκλογή may in and by itself be even an unfree act of will; its freedom does not lie in the notion in itself, but it is only to be inferred mediately from what is further to be said of the μένειν of the κατ' ἐκλ. πρόθεσις, viz. οὐκ ἐξ ἐργαων κ.τ.λ. — μένη] The opposite of ἐπεττοικεῖν, ver. 6. Comp. Xen. Anab. ii. 3. 24; Eurip. Iph. T. 959; Herod. iv. 201. It is the result aimed at in such a declaration as God caused to be given to Rebecca before the birth of her two sons: His purpose according to election is meant to remain unchangeable, etc., so much He would have to be settled in His giving that declaration.— οὐκ ἐξ ἐργαων κ.τ.λ.] is by most joined, through a supplied ὅσα, to πρόθεσις τ. Θεοῦ;¹ by Fritzsche regarded even as a supplementary definition to κατ' ἐκλογήν, in which he is followed by Lamping, as though Paul had written οὐκ ἐξ ἐργαών κ.τ.λ. But for rejecting the natural and nearest connection with μένη there is absolutely no ground from the sense which thus results: the elective

¹ Luther, however, with whom agree Hofmann and Jatho, connects with ἦς ἐν αὐτῷ. But this last has already its defining clause in μένειν κ.τ.λ., and that a clause after which οὐκ ἐξ ἐργαων κ.τ.λ., annexed to the ἦς ἐν αὐτῷ as a definition of mode, would be something self-evident and superfluous. Hofmann insists, quite groundlessly, that, according to the ordinary connection of οὐκ ἐξ ἐργαων κ.τ.λ., instead of οὐκ, μέ must have been used. On account of the following ἐξ ἐν αὐτῷ, on which the main stress is meant to be laid, οὐκ, even in a sentence expressing purpose, is quite in its place. See Buttm. Neut. Gr. p. 302, 8. The negation adheres to the ἦς ἐν αὐτῷ, see Kühner, II. 2, p. 747 f.
resolution must have its abiding character not on account of works, which the subjects concerned would perform, but on account of God Himself, who calls to the Messianic salvation. Accordingly, οὐκ εἰς ἔργων κ.τ.λ. is a causal specification annexed to the—in itself independent—μένη, namely, of its objective actual relation (hence οὐ, not μή), and should be separated from μένη by a comma (Paul might more formally have written: καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ εἰς ἔργων κ.τ.λ.). Hence the objection that μενεῖν εἰκ is not found is of no importance, since μένη in itself stands absolutely, and εἰκ is constantly employed in the sense of by virtue of, by reason of. See Bernhardy, p. 230; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 551. — On the form ἐρήθη, which, instead of the recepta ἐρήθη, is to be adopted with Lachmann and Tischendorf, following the preponderance of testimony, in all passages in Paul, see on Matt. v. 21, and Kühner, I. p. 810 f.—The quotation is Gen. xxv. 23, closely following the LXX.; ἄρτ forms no part of it, but is recitative. In the connection of the original text, ὁ μείζων and ὁ ἐλάσσως, the greater and the smaller, refer to the two nations represented by the elder and younger twin sons, of which they were to be ancestors; and this prediction was fulfilled first under David, who conquered the Edomites (2 Sam. vii. 14); then, after they had freed themselves in the time of Joram (2 Kings viii. 21), under Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 7; 2 Chron. xxv. 11) and Uzziah (2 Kings xiv. 22; 2 Chron. xxvi. 2), who again reduced them to slavery; and lastly, after they had once more broken loose in the time of Ahaz (2 Chron. xxviii. 17; according to 2 Kings xvi. 6, they had merely wrested the port of Elath from the Jews), under Johannes Hyrcanus, who completely vanquished them, forced them to be circumcised, and incorporated them in the Jewish state (Joseph. Ant. xiii. 9. 1). Paul, however, has in view, as the entire context vv. 10, 11,
13 evinces, in ὁ μείζων and τῷ ἐξάσθαι, Esau and Jacob themselves, not their nations; so that the fulfilment of the soul is to be found in the theocratic subjection into which Esau was reduced through the loss of his birthright and of the paternal blessing, whereby the theocratic lordship passed to Jacob. But inasmuch as in Gen. i.e. the two brothers are set forth as representatives of the nations, and their persons and their destiny are not consequently excluded,—as, indeed, the relation indicated in the divine utterance took its beginning with the brothers themselves, by virtue of the preference of Jacob through the paternal blessing (Gen. xxvii. 29, 37, 40),—the apostle's apprehension of the passage, as he adapts it to his connection, has its ground and its warrant, especially in view of similar hermeneutic freedom in the use of O. T. expressions. — ὁ μείζων and τῷ ἐξάσθαι have neither in the original nor in Greek the significance: the first-born and the second-born, which indeed the words do not denote; but Esau, who is to come to birth first, is regarded as the greater of the twins in the womb, and Jacob as the smaller.

Ver. 13. "This utterance (ἐπήθη) took place in conformity with the expressly testified (in Mal. i. 2, 3, freely cited from the LXX.) love of God towards Jacob and abhorrence of Esau." Thus, that utterance agrees with this. But just like Paul, so the prophet himself intends by Ἰακώβ and Ἡσαῦ, not the two nations Israel and Edom, but the persons of the two brothers; God loved the former, and hated the latter (and therefore has exalted Israel and destroyed Edom). — The aorists are, in the sense of the apostle—as the relation of καθὼς γέγραπται to the preceding, imparting information respecting the subjective ground of the divine declaration in ver. 12, shows—to be referred to the love and abhorrence entertained towards the brothers before their birth, but are not to be understood of the de facto manifestation of love and hatred by which the saying of Gen. xxv. 23 had been in the result confirmed (van Hengel). Ἐμίσησα, moreover, is not to have a merely privative sense ascribed to it: not to love, or to love less (as Fessel, Glass, Grotius, Estius, and many, including Nösselt, Koppe, Tholuck, Flatt, Beck, Maier, Beyschlag), which is not admissible even in
Matt. vi. 24, Luke xiv. 26, xvi. 13, John xii. 25 (see, against this and similar attempts to weaken its force, Lamping); but it expresses the opposite of the positive ἐγκάτ., viz. positive hatred. See Mal. i. 4. And as that love towards Jacob must be conceived of as completely independent of foreseen virtues (ver. 11), so also this hatred towards Esau as completely independent of foreseen sins (in opposition to the Greek Fathers and Jerome on Mal. i). Both were founded solely on the free elective determination of God; with whom, in the necessary connection of that plan which He had freely adopted for the process of theocratic development, the hatred and rejection of Esau were presupposed through their opposite, namely, the free love and election of Jacob to be the vehicle of the theocracy and its privileges, as the reverse side of this love and choice, which the history of Edom brought into actual relief.

Vv. 14–18. Second part of the Theodicy: God does not deal unrighteously, in that His πρόθεσις according to election is to have its subsistence, not ἐξ ἔργων, but ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος; for He Himself maintains in the Scripture His own freedom to have mercy upon or to harden whom He will.—This reason has probative force, in so far as it is justly presupposed in it, that the axiom which God expresses respecting Himself is absolutely worthy of Him. Hence we are not, with Beyschlag, to refer the alleged injustice to the fact that God now prefers the Gentiles to the Jews, which is simply imported into the preceding text, and along with which, no less gratuitously, the following receives the sense: "the Jews have indeed become what they are out of pure grace; this grace may therefore once again be directed towards others, and be withdrawn from them" (Beyschlag).

Ver. 14. A possible inference, unfavourable to the character of God, from vv. 11–13, is suggested by Paul himself, and repelled. — μὴ ἄδικα. παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ; ] But is there not unrighteousness with God? Comp. the question in iii. 5. παρὰ, with qualities, corresponds to the Latin in. See Matthiae, § 588. 6. Comp. ii. 11.

Ver. 15. Reason assigned for the μὴ γένοντο, not for the legitimacy of the question μὴ ἄδικα π. τ. Θ. (Mangold, p. 134), so that the opponent's language continues, until it "culmi-
mates in the audacious exclamation of ver. 19." Ἡρά after μὴ γένοντο always relates to this. Bengel rightly remarks on ἡρά: "Nam quod asserimus, Dei assertum est irrefragabile." — τῷ Ἡσώ η. (see critical remarks) brings into strong relief the venerated recipient of the word, which makes it appear the more weighty (comp. x. 5, 19). The citation is Ex. xxxiii. 19, verbally following the LXX. (which would have more closely translated the Heb. by εὐεροὺ διν ἐλεησόω κτ.λ.).¹ In the original text it is an assurance by God to Moses of His favour now directly extended towards him, but expressed in the form of a divine axiom. Hence Paul, following the LXX., was justified in employing the passage as a scriptural statement of the general proposition: God's mercy, in respect of the persons concerned, whose lot it should be to experience it, lets itself be determined solely by His own free will of grace: "I will have mercy upon whosoever is the object of my mercy;" so that I am therefore in this matter dependent on nothing external to myself. This is the sovereignty of the divine compassionating will. Observe that the future denotes the actual compassion, fulfilling itself in point of fact, which God promises to show to the persons concerned, towards whom He stands in the mental relation (ἐλεοῦ, present) of pity. The distinction between εὐεροῦ and οἰκτείρω is not, as Tittmann, Συμνο. p. 69 f., defines it, that εὐεροῦ denotes the active mercy, and οἰκτείρω the compassionate kindness, but that the same notion misereri is more strongly expressed by οἰκτείρω. See Fritzsche. Comp. Plat. Ευθυδ. p. 288 D: εὐεροῦσαντε με καὶ οἰκτείραυτε. The latter denotes originally bewailing sympathy, as opposed to μακράλευν (Χεν. Αναβ. iii. 1. 19). Comp. οἰκτείρω (to which ὅνυμός, Plat. Rep. iii. p. 387 D, corresponds), οἰκτείρω, οἰκτρός κτ.λ. On the form οἰκτειρῆσω, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 741. — διν ἄν] The ἄν is that everywhere usual with the relative in the sense of cunque. Hence conditionally expressed: if to any one I am gracious, etc. See generally Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 293 f.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. I. p. 119. Consequently,

¹ Even thus εὐεροῦ would be future indicative, not subjunctive (in opposition to Fritzsche's criticism). See Bornemann, ad Xe. Απολ. 16; Poppo, ad Cyrop. ii. 1. 13; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 61. 5 D.
not merely the mercy in itself, but also the determination of those who should be its objects, is designated as a free act of God, resting on nothing except on His elective purpose, and affecting the persons according to it; for the emphasis lies in the relative clause on the repeated ἄν ἄν, as ἄν generally has its place after the emphatic word.

Ver. 16. Paul now infers from this divine word the doctrine implied in it of the causality of the divine redemption. — ὅτ' ἐὰν θέλωντος] sc. ἔστι. Accordingly, therefore, it (the participation in that which has just been designated in the divine utterance as ἔλεος and οἰκτηριμὸς) is not of him that wills, nor of him that runs, but of God who is merciful; it depends not on the striving and urgent endeavour of man, but on the will of the merciful God.¹ The relation of the genitive is: penes. See Bernhardy, p. 165; Kühner, II. 1, p. 316 f. — τρέχειν, a figurative designation of strenuously active endeavour, borrowed originally from the competitive races (1 Cor. ix. 24). Comp. Gal. ii. 2, v. 7; Phil. ii. 16; also in the classical writers. Incorrectly, Reiche (following Locke and others) thinks that θέλοντος was probably chosen with reference to the wish of Abraham to instal Ishmael, and of Isaac to instal Esau, in the heirship; and τρέχειν with reference to the fruitless running in of Esau from the chase (Theophylact understands it of his running off to the chase). For Paul, in fact, draws an inference with his ἃπα ὅλων only from the divine utterance issued to Moses; and hence we are not even to conjecture, with van Hengel, a reference to Pharaoh's hasty pursuit of the Israelites. Not on the runner himself depends the successful struggle for the prize (in opposition to Reiche's objection), but he, whom God has chosen to obtain it, now on his part so runs that he does obtain it. Consequently the conception is, that man by his τρέχειν never meritoriously acquires the divine favour; but, fulfilling the predetermination of God, he, in the power of the grace already received, demeans himself conform-

¹ The proposition in the generality with which it is expressed forbids the assumption of a particular reference to Israel (Beyschlag), whose moral and religious endeavour (ver. 31) hinders not the right of God's world-ruling majesty to open the heart of the Gentiles for the gospel, and not that of the Jews.
ably to it; hence Paul, in another place, where the context suggests it, exhort to the τρέχειν (1 Cor. ix. 24). Beck's opinion, that θέλειν and τρέχειν are here intended not in the moral sense, but metaphysically and juridically, is nothing but an exegetically groundless deviation from the simple and clear meaning of the words. — τ. ἐλεόντος Θεοῦ to be taken together. Had Paul intended τ. ἐλεόντος as independent, and Θεοῦ as an opposition, he would have only weakened the antithetic emphasis by the very superfluously added Θεοῦ (in opposition to Hofmann).

Ver. 17. Γάρ] Establishment of this doctrine e contrario,1 as the inference of ver. 18 shows. — ἦ γράφη] for in it God speaks; comp. Gal. iii. 8, 22. — τῷ Φαραώ] Paul has selected two very striking contemporaneous and historically connected examples, in ver. 15 of election, and here of rejection. The quotation is Ex. ix. 16, with a free and partly intentional variation from the LXX. — ἄρτι does not form part of the declaration, but introduces it, as in ver. 12. — εἰς αὐτῷ τοῦτο] brings the meaning into stronger relief than the ἐνεκείν τοῦτον of the LXX: for this very purpose (for nothing else). Comp. xiii. 6; 2 Cor. v, vii. 11; Eph. vi. 22; Col. iv. 8. — εἰς ἑαυτόν ἑαυτῷ] The LXX translates ἔφυγεν by διετήρησεν, i.e. vivus servatus es, and so far, leaving out of view the factitive form of the Hebrew word (to which, however, a reading of the LXX. attested in the Hexapla with διετήρησεν se corresponds), correctly in the historical connection (see Ex. ix. 15). Paul, however, expands the special sense of that Hebrew word to denote the whole appearance of Pharaoh, of which general fact that particular one was a part; and he renders the word according to this general relation, which lies at the bottom of

1 The counterpart of that is, namely, the divine hardening; and if this likewise presents itself as dependent only on the divine determination of will, — as the language of Scripture to Pharaoh testifies, — what is said in ver. 16 thus receives a further scriptural confirmation from the correlative counterpart. Beyschlag also recognises a reasoning e contrario, but sees in Pharaoh the type of Israel, unto whom the gospel has not merely remained strange, but has tended to hardening. Thus in this type "the present exchange of rôle between Israel and the Gentile world is illustrated in a terrible manner." This change of rôle is imported.
his view, and in reference to which the active form was important, by: I have raised thee up, that is, caused thee to emerge; thy whole historical appearance has been brought about by me, in order that, etc. Comp. the current use of ἐγείρειν in the N. T., as in Matt. xi. 11, xxiv. 11; John vii. 52, et al.; Ecclus. x. 4; 1 Macc. iii. 49; and the Hebrew דת. So, in substance, Theophylact (εἰς τὸ μέσον ἱγανον), Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Bengel, and various others, including Reiche, Olshausen, Rückert, Beck, Tholuck, Philippi; formerly also Hofmann; comp. Beyschlag: "I have allowed thee to arise." The interpretation: vivum te servavi (Vorstius, Hammond, Grotius, Wolf, and many, including Koppe, Morus, Böhme, Rosenmüller, Nösselt, Klee, Reithmayr), explains the Hebrew, but not the expression of the apostle; for Jas. v. 15 ought not to have been appealed to, where the context demands the sense of "erigere de lecto graviter decumbentem." Yet even now Hofmann compares Jas. v. 15, and explains accordingly: I have suffered thee to rise from sickness. But this would only be admissible, provided it were the sense of the original text, which was assumed by Paul as well known; the latter, however, simply says: I allow thee to stand for the sake of, etc. (comp. Knobel, in loc.), with which also the LXX. agrees. Others explain: I have appointed thee to be king (Flatt, Benecke, Glöckler). Others: I have stirred thee up for resistance (Augustine, Anselm, Köllner, de Wette, Fritzsche, Maier, Bisping, Lamping, comp. Umbreit), as ἐγείρειν and ἐγείρεσφ. denote, in classical usage, to incite, both in a good and bad sense; comp. 2 Macc. xiii. 4; Hist. Sus. 45. But these special definitions of the sense make the apostle say something so entirely different both from the original and from the LXX., that they must have been necessitated by the connection. But this is not the case; not even in respect to the view of Augustine, etc., since in ver. 18 οὐ δὲ θέλει, σκληρύνει is not inferred from the verbal sense of τῇ γηγείρει σε, but from the relation of the ἐπος κ.τ.λ. to the τῇ γηγείρει σε (εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο εὐνέκει this)—a relation which would presuppose a hardening

1"Deus Pharaonem a sé profectum dicit eique hanc impositionem esse personal."
of Pharaoh on the part of God, and for the reader who is familiar with the history (Ex. iv. 21, vii. 3, xi. 10, xiv. 4, et al.), actually presupposes it. — δπως ενδείξεται κ.τ.λ.] namely, by means of thy final overthrow; not: by means of the leading out of Israel (Beylschlag), against which is εν σοι. — ενδείξεται] may show, may cause to be recognised in thy case. Comp. iii. 25; Eph. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 16. — διόμωρ ] LXX.: ἰσχύν. With Paul not an intentional alteration, but another reading according to the Hexapla (in opposition to Philippi). — διαγγέλλειν] might be thoroughly published. Comp. Luke ix. 60; Plat. Protag. p. 317 A; Pind. Nem. v. 5; Herodian, i. 15. 3, ii. 9. 1; Plutarch. Camillus. 24. — το θνομά μου] As naming Him who has shown Himself so mighty in the case of Pharaoh. For the opposite, see ii. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 1. — εν πάσῃ γῇ] in the whole earth; a result, which in the later course of history (comp. Eusebius, praep. ev. ix. 29), especially was fulfilled in the dispersion of the Jews and the spread of Christianity, and continues to be fulfilled. The explanation: in the whole land (van Hengel), is less in keeping with the tendency of the original text than the all-comprehensive destination of this great judgment of God.

Ver. 18. Result from vv. 15–17. — σκληρύνει] Opposite of ἐλέει, not merely negative like οὐκ ἔλεει (Bengel), but positive: He hardens him, makes him thereby incapable of being a σκέπων ἡλέους (ver. 23). Such an one becomes σκληρός τε καὶ μετάστροφος (Plato, Crat. p. 407 D), σκλ. καὶ ἄπειθης (Plato, Locr. p. 104 C), in a moral respect.¹ Comp. Acts xix. 9; Heb. iii. 8, 13, 15, iv. 7; σκληροκαρδία, Matt. xix. 8; Mark xvi. 14; Rom. ii. 5; see also Soph. Aj. 1340, Track. 1250; Lobeck, ad Aj. p. 384; from the O. T., Umbreit, d. Sünde, p. 113 ff. Vv. 19 ff. prove that all warping or alteration of

¹ For an analogous pagan conception, comp. especially Euripides, in Lycurgus adv. Leocr. p. 188 (§ 92):


See also Ruhnken, ad Vell. Paterc. ii. 57, p. 265 ff.
this sense of the word is erroneous; that the suggestion, e.g.,
in Origen and several Fathers, in Grotius, Koppe, Flatt, Klee,
Maier, and others, that only the divine permission is intended
(comp. Melancthon: "Indurat, i.e. *sinit esse durum, nec con-
vertit eum"), is erroneous; and equally erroneous is the inter-
pretation *duriter tractat* (Carpzov, Semler, Cramer, Ernesti,
which is contrary to the signification of the word (also in the
LXX. Job xxxix. 16 ¹). Evidence to the same effect is supplied
by the *twofold* representation given of the hardening of Pharaoh
in Exodus, where it appears partly as *self-produced* (viii. 15, 32,
ix. 34; comp. 1 Sam. vi. 6), partly as * effected by God* (iv. 21,
vii. 3, ix. 12, x. 20, 27, xi. 10). Of these two ways of re-
garding the matter, however, Paul, suitably to his object, has
expressly adopted the latter; Pharaoh *hardened by God* is to
him the type of all who obstinately withstand the divine
counsel of salvation, as Israel does. In opposition to Beck's
evasive expedients, see Lamping. On the *hardening itself*
Olshausen remarks:—(1) That it presupposes already the
beginnings of evil. But this is at variance with δυν θέλει and
εκ τού αιτοῦ φυράματος, ver. 21. (2) That it is not an aggra-
vation of sin, but a means of preventing its aggravation. But
Pharaoh's history is against this. (3) That the total hardening
is an expression of simple penal justice, when sin has become
sin against the Holy Ghost. But in that case there could be
no mention of a δυν θέλει. The clear and simple sense of the
apostle is, that it depends on the free determination of God's
will whether to bless with His saving mercy, or, on the other
hand, to put into that spiritual condition, in which a man
can be no object of His saving mercy (but rather of His ἐφύή
only). Accordingly, the will of God is here the *absolute* will,
which is only in the ἐλει a will of grace, and not also in the
σκληρονεί (in opposition to Th. Schott). Of the style and

¹ In Job, l.c., ἀνισεληνοῦν, LXX., is said of the ostrich, which *renders hard,*
i.e. makes hardy, its young ones. Comp. Leon. Tarent. 11; Athen. I. p. 24 D;
Theophr. *C. pl.* iii. 16. 2, v. 15. 6. Such is also the meaning of ἀνισεληνοῦν.
The sense of the original (ἲς ἁρπή) is not decisive. The LXX. has understood it
as ἀνισεληνοῦ. Comp. Lamping, p. 188 f.
manner in which the older dogmatic interpreters have here introduced qualifying clauses in the interests of opposition to absolute predestination, the development of the matter by Calovius may serve as an example. He maintains, that when it is said that God hardens, this is not to be taken υπερηφανικῶς or effective, but (1) συγχωρητικῶς, propter permissionem; (2) ἀφορμητικῶς, propter occasione, quam ex iis, quae Deus agit, sumunt reprobī; (3) ἐγκαταλειπτικῶς, ob desertionem, quod gratia sua deserat reprobos; (4) παραδοτικῶς, ob traditionem in sensum reprobum et in ulteriorem Satanae potestatem. But Philippi's suggestion of the immanent law which the divine freedom carries within itself,—according to which God will have mercy upon him who acknowledges His right to have mercy on whom He will, and to harden whom He will; and will harden him who denies to Him this right,—will only then come into consideration by the side of what Paul here says, when (see remarks after ver. 33) we are in a position to judge of the relation of our passage and the connection that follows it to the moral self-determination of man, which the apostle teaches elsewhere; seeing that no further guiding hint is here given by Paul, and, moreover, that immanent law of the divine freedom, as Philippi himself frankly recognises, is not at all here expressed. For now the apostle has been most sedulously and exclusively urging nothing but the complete independence of the divine willing in ἐλεείν and ἐκληρώνειν,¹ which the Form. Conc. p. 821 does not duly attend to, when it maintains that Paul desired to represent the hardening of Pharaoh as an example of divine penal justice. Not "ut eo ipso Dei justitiam declararet," has Paul adduced this example, although it falls historically under this point of view, but as a proof of the completely free self-determination of God to harden whom He will. Accordingly, the hardening here appears by no means, as has been lately read between the lines, "as a consequence of preceding conceited self-righteousness" (Tholuck), or "such as the man himself has willed

¹ Observe that in ἐλεείν the emphasis falls on ἐλεείν, not—as in ver. 15, where ἐλεεύθερον was added—on ἐλεεύθερον. In the second clause this emphatic ἐλεείν is then repeated, on which occasion ἐλεεβάς (again, on the other hand) brings out the corresponding symmetry of the relative definition on both sides (Hartung, Partik. I. p. 168 f.).
it” (Th. Schott), or conditioned by the divine standard of
holiness confronting human sin (Weiss), or with an obvious
presupposition of human self-determination (Beyschlag). Else-
where the hardening may be adjudged as a punishment by God
(Isa. vi. 9 ff.; Ps. Ixix. 28; see Umbreit, p. 310 f.), but not so
here. The will of God, which in truth can be no arbitrary plea-
sure, is no doubt holy and just; but it is not here apprehended
and set forth under this point of view and from this side, but
in reference to its independence of all human assistance, conse-
quently in accordance with its absolute aseitas, which is to be
retained in its clear precision and without any qualifying
clause to the words δυ θέλει δεσμί,1 and must not be obscured
by ideas of mediate agency that are here foreign.

Vv. 19–21. Third part of the Theodicē: But man is not
entitled to dispute with God, why He should still find fault.
For his relation to God is as that of the thing formed to its
former, or of the vessel to the potter, who has power to fashion out
of a single lump vessels to honour and dishonour.

Ver. 19. An objection supposed by the apostle (comp. xi. 19)
which might be raised against ver. 18, not merely by a Jew,
but generally. — ὅμως] in pursuance of the δυ δε θέλει αἰκληρώνει.
— ἐν] logical, as in iii. 7, and frequently: If He hardens out
of His own determination of will, why does He still find fault?
That fact surely takes away all warrant from the reproaches
which God makes against hardened sinners, since they have
been hardened by the divine will itself, to which no one
yet offers opposition (with success). — τῷ γὰρ θυμ. κ.τ.λ.]
ground assigned for the question, τι ἐτι μέμφ.— ἀνδέστηκε]
Who withstands? whereby, concretely, the irresistibility
of the divine decree is set forth. The divine decree is exalted
above any one's opposition. According to the present opinion
of Hofmann (it was otherwise in the Schriftbew. I. p. 246 f.),
the opponent wishes to establish that, if the words δυ θέλει,

1 Hofmann rightly remarks: the λαμίν is designated as an act, whose object
one is in virtue of the fact, that God wills to make him its object. Just so it
stands with the εξεληρώνη, by which God fulfils His own will in the person con-
cerned, without having his action and character as a ground of determination
in the matter.
συνεργώνετι be correct, no one may offer opposition to that which
God wills, and therefore God can in no one have anything to
censure. But thus the thought of the question τίς ἀνθέσετηκε
would be one so irrational and impious (as though, forsooth,
no sinner would be opposed to God), that Paul would not even
have had ground or warrant to have invented it as an objection.
That question is not impious, but tragic, the expression
of human weakness in presence of the divine decree of
hardening. — On the classical θεύλημα (more frequently
θεύλημα), the thing willed, i.e. captum consilium (only here in
Paul), see van Hengel, Lobeck, ad Aj. 44. Comp., as to the
distinction between θεύλημα and θέλω (Eph. i. 11), on Matt.
i. 19.

Ver. 20. Mevovvye] Imo vero, here not without irony: Yea
verily, O man (ii. 1), who art thou (quantulus es) who repliest
against God? See on Luke xi. 28; also Ast, Lex. Plat. II.
p. 303. On συν τίς εἶ, comp. xiv. 4; Plato, Gorg. p. 452 Β:
συν δὲ . . . τίς εἶ, ὧν ἀνθρώπε; Paul does not give a refutation
of the τί ἐτι μέμψ., but he repudiates the question as un-
warranted; "abruptit quaestionem" (Melancthon), and that
wholly from the standpoint of the entirely unlimited divine
omnipotence, on which he has placed himself in the whole of
the present connection, and consistently with that standpoint.
— δ ἀνταποκριμ.] For in τί ἐτι . . . ἀνθέστι there is contained
an oppositional reply, namely, to God's finding fault, not to the
saying of Scripture, ver. 17 (Hofmann), which the apostle's
present train of thought has already left behind. On the
expression, comp. Luke xiv. 6; Judg. v. 29; Job xvi. 8,
xxxii. 12. The word is not found in the Greek writers. But
ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι, says Paul, as little belongs to man against
God, as to the thing formed belongs the question addressed to
its former: Why hast thou made me thus (as I am)? This
comparison is logically correct (in opposition to Usteri, Lchrbrgr.

1 The general expression "opposition" [Widerpart] does not correspond with
sufficient definiteness to the notion of ἀνθέσεως, since the latter everywhere sig-
nifies the real and active resistere. So also in Paul (xiii. 2; Gal. ii. 11; Eph.
vi. 13), Comp. Soph. Fragn. 234; Dindorf: τίς τινες ἀνθέσεως; οὐδ' ἄρσ ἀνθέσεως.
Plato, Symp. p. 196 D.
p. 269), since the tertium comparationis generally is the constituting of the quality. As the moulder produces the quality of the vessel formed by him according to his own free will, so God constitutes the moral quality (fitted for blessedness or not so) ot men as He will. Only when it is maintained that the comparison with the thing formed must properly refer only to the first formation of men, and not to the subsequent ethical moulding of those created (as in Pharaoh's case, whom God hardened), can its logical correctness be denied. But Paul wrote in a popular form, and it is to do him injustice to press his simile more than he himself, judging by the tenor of the entire connection, would have it pressed. Glöckler (following Pareus) finds in μὴ ἔρεικεν κ. τ. λ. and ver. 21 an argumentatio a minore ad majus: "If not even in the case of an effigy can such a question be addressed to its former, how much less can man, etc." But this also is to be quite laid aside, and we must simply abide by the conception of a simile, since that question on the part of the thing formed cannot certainly be conceived as really taking place, and since the simile itself is of so frequent occurrence in the O. T., that Paul has doubtless employed it by way of reminiscence from that source. See Isa. xxix. 16, xliv. 9; Jer. xviii. 6; Wisd. xv. 7; Ecclus. xxxvi. 13. Vv. 21-23 also show that Paul sets forth God Himself under the image of the potter. According to Hofmann, the sense of the question resolves itself into a complaint over the destiny, for which the creature is created by God. But the contextual notion of ποιεῖν is not that of creation, but that of preparation, adjustment (vv. 21, 22), correlative to the making of the potter, who does not create his vessels, but forms and fashions (πλάσατοι) them thus or thus; and οὕτω simply specifies the mode of the making: in such shape, in such a kind of way, that I have not issued from thy hands as one of another mould. Comp. Winer, p. 434 [E. T. 584]. It is the τρόποις of the ποιεῖν, which presents itself in the result.

Ver. 21. "H] The sense, without an interrogation, is: Unless perhaps the potter should not have power over his clay (τοῦ ἀντοῦ), to make (ποιῆσαι, the infinitive of more precise definition), etc. Comp. Wisd. xv. 7. — ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράμα. The φύραμα (comp.
on xi. 16; 1 Cor. v. 6) is the lump of the πηλός, mixed with water and kneaded, out of which the potter makes the different vessels. In the application of the simile, the same lump denotes human nature in and by itself, as it is alike in all with its opposite moral capabilities and dispositions, but not yet conceived of in its definite individual moral stamp. Out of this, like the potter out of the clay-dough which is susceptible of various moulding, God—who does not merely "allow to come into being" the different moral quality of individuals, in order then to fulfil on them the ἐλεημόσυνα or σεληνήμωσα which He will (Hofmann), but effectively produces it—makes partly such as are destined to stand in honour (namely, as partakers of the Messianic glory), partly such as are to stand in dishonour (namely, through the eternal ἀπώλεια). Comp. vv. 22, 23. See also 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21. The former is the effect of His ἐλεημόσυνα, as in the case of Moses; the latter that of His σεληνήμωσα, as in the case of Pharaoh. Much too general and rationalizing, in opposition to the text, is van Hengel's view, that the figure refers generally to the "inexplicabiles divini rerum humanarum regimini rationes;" and Beyschlag's view amounts to the same thing: "out of the material of the human race (?) which is at His disposal as it continues to come into existence, to stamp individuals with this or that historical destination" (?). — ἐν τοῖς τιμήν] This is the destination of the vessel; it is either to be honoured, so that it has τιμή (as e.g. a sacred vase), or is to experience the opposite, so that ἀτιμία cleaves to it (as e.g. an utensil destined to foul use). — Observe the purposely-chosen arrangement of the words: the juxtaposition of οὐκ ἐχει (or lacks), the juxtaposition of ὁ κεραμεύς τοῦ πηλοῦ (although τοῦ πηλ. belongs to ἔξορυγος); comp. Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 332), and the prefixing of εἰς τιμήν.

Vv. 22–29. Fourth part of the Theodicee: God, full of long-suffering, has borne with vessels of wrath, in order withal to make known His glory on vessels of mercy, as which He has

1 This massa is by Augustine onesidedly viewed as "pecato originali infecta, corrupta damnationique obnoria," so that then the vessels εἰς τιμήν are those which assumuntur in gradum, and the vessels εἰς ἀτιμία those which ad luendum debitum relinquuntur.
also called us Christians both out of the Jews and out of the
Gentiles. Comp. on vv. 22, 23; Wisd. xii. 20, 21. These
two kinds of σκεῦη are necessarily the same as those meant in
383). This is shown by the retention of σκεῦη, as well as by
the attributes κατηργημένα and ἀ προτοίμασεν corresponding
to the ποιήσας of ver. 21, just as εἰς ἀπώλειαν aptly corre-
sponds to the εἰς ἀτμίλων, and εἰς δόξαν to the εἰς τιμήν, ver.
21. The former vessels as κατηργημένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν are
necessarily σκεῦη ὀργῆς, for the divine ὀργή and ἀπώλεια are
correlates, which suppose one another. But the guilt, which
is supposed by the notion of ὀργή, is, in the entirely consistent
connection of our passage, presented—by the καταρρίξεων
which precedes the guilt, and in virtue of which God has made
them such as they are and not otherwise—as the consequence
of the moral development conditioned by this previous pre-
paration. Weiss fails to recognise the one sidedness of the
mode of view here necessarily intended and boldly carried out
by the apostle, which will not, moreover, bear the attempts of
Hofmann to explain it away, or those of Beyschlag to twist
the notion; the latter least of all, on the subjective ground
that the strictly understood notion of σκεῦη ὀργῆς is incapabe
of fulfilment, which at the absolute standpoint of the text it
is not.

Ver. 22 f. forms a conditional interrogative sentence, the
apodosis of which is not expressed, but is gathered from the
context, viz.: Wilt thou still be able to venture the ἀναυα-
κρίνεσθαι τῷ θεῷ of ver. 20 f.? Must thou not utterly be-
come dumb with thy replies? Comp. on John vi. 61; Acts
xxiii. 9; Luke xix. 41: see also Calvin and Calovius, in loc.;
Fritzsche, Conject. p. 30; Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 212;
Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 297. This aposiopesis with ei δὲ
corresponds perfectly to our: but how if, etc. It is to be
translated: “But how if God, although minded to manifest His
wrath and to make known His power, has endured with much
long-suffering vessels of wrath, which are nevertheless adjusted
for destruction, in order also to make known the riches of His
glory on vessels of mercy, which He has prepared beforehand for
glory?" Paraphrased, the sense is: "But if God, notwithstanding that His holy will disposes Him not to leave unmanifested His wrath and His power, but practically to make them known, has nevertheless hitherto, full of long-suffering, endured such as are objects of His wrath, and spared them from the destruction, to incur which they are nevertheless constituted and fitted like a vessel by the potter—endured them and spared them not merely as a proof of such great long-suffering towards them, but also with the purpose in view of making known, during the period of this forbearance, the fulness of His glorious perfection in respect to such as are objects of His mercy, whom He, as the potter fashions a vessel, has prepared beforehand, and put in order for eternal glory,—how, in presence of that self-denying long-suffering of God towards vessels of wrath, and in presence of this gracious purpose, which He withal, at the same time, cherishes towards the vessels of mercy, must any desire to dispute with God completely depart from thee!"—In detail the following points are to be observed: ὅς is neither equivalent to ὁ, nor resumptive, but the simple δε, making the transition to something further, namely, from the previous dismissal of the objector to the refutation which puts him to shame. Tholuck (comp. also Weiss, Reithmayr, and others) takes it antithetically, so that the sequence of thought would be: "I assert this as God's absolute right against you, if you choose to take your stand on the point of right; but how if God has not so much as even dealt thus, etc.?" But such an interpretation, which would require the contrast to be much more strongly marked than by the mere δς, is at variance with the retention in the sequel of the figurative σκεῦη and their preparedness; because it is thence evident, that what Paul had previously said concerning the freedom of God to prepare men of different character and destiny like potters' vessels, he by no means intended to cancel, as if God had not thus dealt. Θέλων is, with Fritzsch, Philippi, Lamping, and several others, to be resolved by although, because only thus is there yielded the logi-

1 Hofmann asserts, with singular dogmatism, that the metabolic ἢ (Hartung, I. p. 165) is not fitted to introduce the transition to a stronger reply. Why not? "It introduces a new point (Baeumlein, p. 90)."
cally correct preparation for the notion of πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, which is a self-denying one; the θέλεω ενδείκτασθαι κ.τ.λ. is the constant essential characteristic of the holy God, and yet He has borne, etc. The analysis: because God willed (so most, including de Wette, Rückert, van Hengel), yields the sense that God has, in order thereupon to issue all the more evident a penal judgment, endured patiently, etc.; but this would not amount to a πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, but in fact to a delay occasioned by an ungodlike motive, and having in view the heaping up of wrath. Unworthy of God, and only rendered possible by the importation of parenthetical thoughts, is the sense which Hofmann educes: God has not so borne with those men, that He would first see how it would be with them, in order then to deal with them accordingly; but He has done so with the will already withal firmly settled, to prove, etc. That negative and this already firm settlement of will are read between the lines.—Θέλεω 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 μακροθυμίᾳ. Τὸ δυνατὸν αὑτοῦ is what is possible to Him, what He is in a position to do. Comp. viii. 3, τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου. Xen. Hell. i. 4. 13, τὸ τῆς πόλεως δυνατὸν. As to the matter itself, see 3 Macc. ii. 6. The aorist ἤπειρεν does not refer to the long forbearance with Pharaoh (Chrysostom, de Wette, and most); the reference to him has been already concluded with ver. 18; but Paul intends generally the time kíthērion (which will in like manner run on under this divine long-suffering up to the Parousia), when God has still restrained the will of His holiness, and has not yet accomplished the destruction of the objects of His wrath, which He will do for the first time in judgment. The σκείφι ὁργῆς, without the article, vessels of wrath, denotes not some, but such σκείφι generally, qualitatively understood, namely, vessels which are prepared (ver. 20 f.) to experience God's wrath on themselves, to be the objects of it. The effect of this wrath, which will go

And that so that both kinds of vessels exist among Jews and Gentiles (see ver. 24); in opposition to van Hengel, who thinks that the vessels of wrath represent only the Jewish people; comp. also Weiss and others.
forth at the judgment, is *everlasting destruction*;\(^1\) hence *καταρρέω*, adjusted for destruction (not “ripe for destruction,” as Weiss and Hofmann explain), serves to bring the *μακροθυμία* into still clearer relief, which is not that which *waits for the self-decision of human freedom* (Beyschlag), especially for *amendment* (in opposition to Bengel, Tholuck, and others), but that which *delays the penal judgment* (comp. on Luke xviii. 7), the *prolongatio irae*, Jer. xv. 15, *et al.* The passage ii. 4 f. is no protest against this view, since the apostle does not there, as in the present passage, place himself at the standpoint of the absolute divine will. The subject who has adjusted those concerned for *αἰὼν* is *God*;\(^2\) and any saving clause whereby the passive sense is made to disappear, or the *passive expression*—which, after ver. 20 f., not even a certain refinement of piety is to be suggested as underlying—is made to yield the sense that they had adjusted *themselves* for destruction, or had *deserved* it (see Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Grotius, Calovius, Bengel, and many; also Steudel, Olshausen, Reithmayr, Beck, Hofmann, and Krummacher), is opposed to the literal meaning and to the context (ver. 21). See also Lamping, p. 213. Hofmann’s interpretation especially: “who had advanced to that point, and *found* themselves therein,” is wrecked on his incorrect explanation of *τοι με ἐποίησας οὕτως*, ver. 20. In καὶ ἵνα κ.τ.λ., καὶ is also, *introducing*, in addition to the object involved in the previous *ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ*, that accessory object which God had in view in enduring the vessels of wrath in reference to vessels of mercy (the use of the genit. *ἐνέκοιτο* corresponds to that of *ἀπῆλθε*, ver. 22). Besides His great long-suffering towards those, He would *also* make known how rich in glory He was towards those. For had He not so patiently tolerated

\(^1\) Hahn, *Theol. d. N. T.* I. p. 166 f., erroneously refers the *ἰηάν* and the *ἀπόλλυμι* to time, as opposed to eternity. The employment of *ο.IsNotNull* in contrast is decisive against this view. Comp. Ritschl, *De ira Dei*, p. 15. This remark also applies against Beyschlag, p. 57, who thinks that I change notions pertaining to the history of God’s kingdom into abstract dogmatic ones. As though the everlasting *ἀπόλλυμι* and the everlasting *ἰηάν* were not precisely the issues of that kingdom’s history!

the σκέψις ὁργῆς, but already caused the penal judgment to set
in upon them (which is to be thought of as setting in along
with the Parousia, not antecedently to this, like the destruction
of Jerusalem); He would have had no space in which to make
known His glory on σκέψις ἀκένως. But this purpose was
to be served exactly by that long period of forbearance, during
which such σκέψις as were prepared beforehand by God for
eternal δόξα should through their calling (ver. 24) be led to
Christ, and thereby the fulness of the divine glory should be
made known in respect to them; which making known is matter
of fact (Eph. iii. 10). In τῆς δόξας αὐτοῦ, the context directs us
to think of the divine majesty in relation to its beneficent
glory, its glory in the bestowal of blessing; but eis δόξαν, as
the opposite of eis ἀπόλυ., denotes the everlasting Messianic
glory (viii. 21, 30). The verbs ἑτομάζειν and καταρτίζειν are
not as different from one another as existence (Dasein) is from
mode of existence (Sosein),—an assertion of Hofmann's as in-
correct as it is devoid of proof,— but ἑτομάζειν also denotes to
constitute qualitatively, to prepare in the corresponding quality
(1 Cor. ii 9; Eph. ii 10; Phil. 22; Matt. iii 3; Luke
i. 17, ii. 31; John xiv. 2, et al.). Comp. here especially
2 Tim. ii 21. Against such an error the well-known reflexive
use of ἑτομάζειν ἐαυτόν (Rev. viii. 6, xix. 7) should have
warned him, as well as the equivalent use of the middle
(1 Macc. v. 11, xii. 27, and very frequently in the classics). It
is solely with a view to variety and illustration that Paul uses
for the same notion the two verbs, of which Hofmann rationalizes
the ἑτομάζειν to mean: "that it is God who has caused those
who attain to glory to come into being for the end of possessing
the glory, to which they thereupon attain by the fact that
He pours forth His own upon them." Nor is there anything
peculiar to be sought behind the change from passive to
active; the transition to the active was more readily suggested
by the thought of the activity of love. The προ in προηγοῦμαι
is not to be disregarded (see on Eph. ii. 10); nor is it to be
referred to the time before birth, nor to the aeterna electio (the
latter is the act of God, which before time preceded the praepa-
ration); but to the fact that God has so previously fashioned
the σκέψις ἐλέους, before He makes known His glory on them (just as the potter fashions the vessel), that is, has constituted in them that ethical personality, which corresponds to their destination to obtain eternal δόξα through Christ. In εἰς the act of making known is contemplated as extending over the men, who are its objects. If, with Beza and Fritzsche (Conject. p. 29; not abandoned in his Comment. p. 343 f., but placed alongside of the ordinary mode of connection), we should make καὶ ἔνα γνωρίσθη κ.τ.λ. dependent, if not simply on κατηνοιωμένα (Rückert), yet on κατηνος εἰς ἀπώλειαν (so also Beyschlag), in which case καὶ would have to be taken most simply as and, the entire balance of the discourse would be deranged, inasmuch as the important thought καὶ ἔνα γνωρίσθη κ.τ.λ., on which the whole sequel depends, would be subordinated to a mere secondary definition. The centre of gravity of the argument lies in the bearing with the vessels of wrath on the part of the divine long-suffering; and thereof in ver. 23 there is brought forward an explanation glorifying God, which is added in respect to the σκέψις ἐλέους. The connection above referred to would also certainly yield a severity of thought, a rigour of telic view, which, granting all the boldness of deduction with which Paul follows out the idea of predestination, yet finds nothing further in accord with it in the whole treatise; the thought, namely, that God has made ready the σκέψις ὑπογίας for destruction, in order, through the effect of the contrast, the more fully to make known His glory in the

1 Thus the ἔτοιμαζεν, to prepare beforehand, is to be understood according to the context (vv. 21, 22), in the real sense, therefore, of actual constituting, as previously κατηνοω, and not in the sense of the mere predestination in the divine counsel (Philippi), to which also the explanation of Delitzsch, Psychol. p. 40, amounts, who represents God as having eternally before Him "the whole future state of the facts as to the decision" of the subjects, and dealing accordingly. Comp. Matt. xxv. 34, 41; 2 Tim. ii. 21; Eph. ii. 10.

2 Beyschlag incorrectly objects, that thus the notion of long-suffering is deprived of its value; for it is no more such, if it is exercised not for the sake of its objects, but for the love of others. This does not take account of the fact that Paul has certainly expressed with sufficient definiteness, by his καὶ before ἔνα, that he is speaking only of an aim which subsisted along with others, not of that which took place alone.

3 Beyschlag here pushes to the utmost his explanation from the history of
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σέβεστας ἑλέους.—It is further to be remarked, (1) That the interrogative conditional sentence forming an apodoses terminates with ver. 23, and is not (with Fritzsche) to be extended to ver. 24, since all that follows from ver. 25 onward belongs to the topic started in ver. 24. (2) That we are not, following Reithmayr and older commentators with Philippi, 1 to supply a second εἰ between καὶ and ἧνα in ver. 23, and to assume that Paul had intended at the close of ver. 23 to say ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῶν, but that he at once directed his glance at the concretes, and therefore wrote ὅς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς instead of ἐκάλεσεν αὐτῶν. Thereby a rambling and confusion in the presenting of his thoughts is, quite unnecessarily, imputed to the apostle, which would be very glaring, particularly in a dialectic passage so stamped throughout with clearness, definiteness, and precision as the present. Similarly, but still more confusedly, Tholuck. The language in w. 22, 23 is condensed and rich in thought, but runs on according to plan and rule in its form. (3) The apodosis (which on our understanding is not expressed) is not to be found in ver. 23, because this would only be possible by arbitrarily supplying hoc fecit, or the whole preceding chief sentence. So Ewald:

God's kingdom, in order to obtain the very opposite of this rigour: "If God now drives the Jewish people through hardening towards destruction, He does certainly no more towards them than what they have richly deserved (!); but, at the same time, by breaking the brittle shell of Judaism, in which the gospel has germinated (!), He turns the same to account for the unfettered adoption of the Gentile world, and brings in, along with the day of judgment (!) on Israel, the day likewise (!) of the glorification of the community chosen (!) by Him out of all the world." This is consistent interpolation, with an elastic interpretation of the strict notions conveyed by the words.

1 In regard to my explanation, Philippi stumbles especially at the fact that Paul has not written ἐν ἐνίοτε ἐνίοτε ἐνίοτε ἐνίοτε. But the apostle has in truth the two kinds of ἐνίοτε in view solely according to their quality; the opposition thought of by him is purely qualitative; a numerical comparison did not concern him. Had God not been so long-suffering towards vessels of wrath, He would not have been able to make known how rich in glory He was towards men of an opposite sort—towards vessels of grace. The reflection is not concerned with how many of one and the other class were in reality extant; but with the fact that God, with His long-suffering exercised in spite of His holy will towards the first category, had purposed at the same time the making known of His ἕις respecting the second category. Philippi's doubt, still expressed in the third edition, touches Fritzsche's exposition, but hardly mine.
"so He did that also, in order that He might make known, on the other hand, the riches of His glory, etc.;" so also Th. Schott and Hofmann. — With our explanation agree substantially Calvin, Grotius, and several others; including Winer, p. 530 [E. T. 713]; Baur, in the Theol. Jahrb. 1857, p. 200; Lamping and van Hengel, whilst Umbreit educes something which has no existence in the passage, as though it ran: εἰ δὲ ἐβεβελεῖν ὁ Θεὸς . . . ἄλλ' ἡμεγεκαν κ.τ.λ. (He has, on the contrary, endured, etc.)

Ver. 24. Not a confirmation of the design of the divine endurance expressed in ver. 23 (Hofmann), but as the continuation of the relative construction most readily suggests, the concrete more precise designation of those intended by σκεύη ἑλοῦν, and that for the confirmation of what was said of them by ἀ προητομάσεν εἰς δόξαν. The καὶ denotes what is added to this προητοῦμ. ἐ. δ.: as which σκεύη Ἡτε has also called us to this glory of the Messianic kingdom. — οὗτοι attracted by ἡμᾶς into the same gender. See Bernhardy, p. 302; Winer, p. 156 f. [E. T. 207]. The relative after an interrogative sentence has the emphasis of an οὗτος γάρ (Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 2. 64); but the masculine is first introduced here, not in the preceding relative sentence (against Hofmann's objection), because the neuter expression ἀ προητοῦμ. was required by the conformity with the correlate κατηργημένα. — οὗ μόνον κ.τ.λ.] Therefore without preference of the Jews. "Judeus credens non est eo ipso vocatus, quod Judeus est, sed vocatus est ex Judaeis," Bengel.

Ver. 25. Of the καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν1 it is shown that it is in accordance with (ὁς) a divine prophetic utterance. The ἐξ Ιουδαίων required no confirmation from prophecy; but the

1 According to Hofmann (comp. his Weissag. u. Erf. II. p. 215, and Schriftbew. I. p. 251), Paul has referred the quotation to the Jewish people, in so far, namely, as it was called out of free grace, according to which the bestowal of grace promised by Scripture appears as an act of God not founded on the condition of the subjects. But this after the immediately preceding ἄλλα καὶ ἔστω is quite inadmissible, as it is also forbidden by the transition to Israel, which first appears in ver. 27. Very rashly, Hofmann terms the establishing of the typically prophetic reference to the Gentiles an "idle talk." Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 10, with Wiesinger and Huther thereon. See also on x. 20. The simply correct view is already given by Chrysostom.
other statement required it the more, inasmuch as it was exactly
the Gentiles who had become believing that had been intro-
duced as σωκίν ἐκάουσ, in place of the Jews who had remained
unbelieving. — ἐν τῷ Βοσ. [in libro Hoseae: comp. Mark i. 2;
John vi. 45; Acts vii. 42. The passage Hos. ii. 25 (the citation
varies both from the LXX. and the original text) treats of
the idolatrous people of the ten tribes, to whom God announces
pardon and renewed adoption as the people of God. The
apostle recognises in this pardon the type of the reception of the
Gentiles to salvation, and consequently, as its prophetically Me-
sianic sense, a prediction of the calling of the Gentiles; and
from this point of view, which has its warrant in the likeness
of category to which the subjects belong (comp. Hengstenberg,
Christol. I. p. 251), he has also introduced the deviations from
the words of the original and of the LXX., transposing the two
parallel sentences, and rendering the thought ἐρω τῷ Βοσ. ὁ λαῷ
μου κ.τ.λ. (LXX.) by καλέσω κ.τ.λ., because the divine/κεῖσις
of the Gentiles loomed before him as the Messianic fulfilment
of the saying. Yet we are not thereby justified in under-
standing καλέσω and κληθήσονται, ver. 26, immediately in the
sense of vocation (Fritzsche); for καλεῖν τινά ἄν, to call any
one to something, is without linguistic warrant, and the de-
parture thus assumed from the original and from the LXX.
would be unnecessary, and would amount to a mechanical pro-
ceeding. On the contrary, καλεῖν is to be left in its ordinary
signification to name (comp. Hos. i. 6); the divine naming,
however, as "my people, my beloved," of which the Gentiles
were previously the very opposite, is in point of fact none
other than just their calling to Messianic salvation, in conse-
quence of which they are then named also from the human side
τινὰ θεοῦ κόσμος (ver. 26), and are therewith recognised accord-
ing to the theocratic status which they have obtained. The vivid
thought laid hold of the expression καλέσω the more readily,
since in this word to call and to name form a single notion.
Accordingly we must translate: I will name that which is not
my people, my people; and her who is not beloved, beloved. Both
expressions refer in the original to the significant names of a
son (τοῦ ἀχί) and of a daughter (τοῦ τιμής) of the prophet, which
he had been directed to give them as symbolically significant of the rejection of the people, Hos. i. 6-9.— On the υμι standing beside the noun with the article, where the denial refers to a concrete definite subject, see Baeumlein, Partik. p. 276.

Ver. 26. Hos. ii. 1 (almost literally from the LXX., i. 10) is joined to the former passage, so that both are regarded as forming one connected declaration. Often so in Rabbinical usage, even when the passages belong to different writers. See Surenhusius, κατὰ λα., p. 464. 45. — καὶ ἐσται [τὰ ὁκ.] and it (the following) will come to pass. Comp. Acts ii. 21. These words are included in those of the prophecy (see also the LXX.), and therefore a colon is not to be placed after καὶ, as though they were the apostle's (Hofmann and others).— These words also treat, in Hosca himself, of the theocratic restoration of the exiled people of the kingdom of Ephraim, so that ἐν τῷ τῶν ὄσιν denotes Palestine, whither the outcasts were to return (not the place of exile, as Hengstenberg, I. p. 248, and others think). But Paul recognises the antitypic fulfilment, as before at ver. 25, in the calling of the Gentiles, who, previously designated by God as not His people, become now, in consequence of the divine calling, sons of the living (true) God. See on ver. 25. But in this sense of Messianic fulfilment, according to Paul, the τῶν ὄσι ἐπ᾿ ἐρήμου αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ. cannot be Palestine, as it is in the historical sense of the prophet; nor yet is it “the communion of saints” (de Wette, comp. Baumgarten-Crusius: “the ideal state, the divine kingdom”), nor the “coetus Christianorum, ubi diu dubitatum est, an recte gentiles recuperentur” (Fritzsche); but simply—and this is also the ordinary explanation—the locality of the Gentiles, the Gentile lands. There, where they dwelt, there they, called by God to the salvation of the Messiah, were now named sons of the true God; and there, too, it had been before said to them: Ye are not my people! in so far, namely, as this utterance of rejection was the utterance of God, which, published to the Gentiles, is conceived, in the plastic spirit of poetry, as resounding in all Gentile lands. To suppose the locality without significance (Krehl), is inconsistent with its

1 For analogous examples of υμι after ἀν. εἰπώ, see Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 132.
being so carefully designated. And to take \( \epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\omicron \omicron \) with Ewald, not in a local sense at all, but in that of instead that, even if it agree with the Hebrew (comp. Hitzig), cannot be made to agree with the Greek words. The LXX. understood and translated \( \tau\omicron \varepsilon \eta\omicron\kappa\omicron \) locally, and rightly so.

Vv. 27, 28. If Paul has, in vv. 25, 26, shown \( \alpha\omicron\lambda\lambda\alpha \ kai \ v\epsilon\omicron \ \epsilon\theta\nu\nu\nu \) to be based on prophecy, he now begins, seeing that the accepted Gentiles have taken the place of the excluded Jews, also to adduce prophetical evidence of the exclusion of the greater part of Israel.— \( \delta\epsilon \) leads over to another prophet, who prophesies something further, and that concerning Israel: "But Esaias cries respecting Israel, etc." — \( \kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\zeta \) Of the loud crying, and therewith peculiarly impassioned, profoundly moved, and urgent call of the speaker, comp. Acts xxiii. 6, xxiv. 21; John vii. 28, 37, xii. 44, i. 15. — \( \nu\tau\omicron\eta\rho \) Like \( \tau\omicron\varepsilon \eta \), in respect of, as, since Demosthenes, frequently with verbs of saying. The quotation is Isa. x. 22 f., not quite closely following the LXX., and with a reminiscence (\( \delta \ \alpha\rho\mu\beta\mu \, \tau. \, \nu\io\omicron \, 'I\rho\rho. \)) of Hos. ii. 1. — \( \tau\omicron \nu\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha \sigma\omicron\theta. \) The remnant concerned (with emphatic accentuation, i.e. not more than the remnant) will be saved; that is, in the sense of the apostle: out of the countlessly great people only that small number which remains after the rejection of the hardened mass will attain to the Messianic salvation. With this understanding Paul employed the trans-

1 Only this view agrees with the connection, since the prophet Hosea was previously cited by name, and now another is likewise introduced by name. Therefore we are not to say, with van Hengel, that by \( \eta \) the prophet is placed in contradistinction to God Himself speaking. But Hofmann’s opinion, that the position of \( \nu\tau\omicron\eta\rho \varepsilon \omicron \, 'I\rho\rho. \) (for Paul has not placed \( \nu\tau\omicron\eta\rho \varepsilon \omicron \, 'I\rho\rho. \) first) proves that ver. 25 refers to Israel, is incorrect; because, if ver. 25 did not refer to the Gentiles, Paul would have had no reason for here adding \( \nu\tau\omicron\eta \, 'I\rho\rho. \), since in the very passage under citation Israel is expressly named. The train of thought is: (1) Hosea gives the divine prediction respecting the not-God’s-people (respecting the Gentiles), vv. 25, 26; (2) Isaiah utters a prophecy which contains information respecting the relation of Israel to the reception of salvation. Thus both prophets establish what was said in ver. 24, \( \epsilon\omicron \mu\omicron\nu \iota \varepsilon \iota\omega\omega\iota \), \( \alpha\omicron\lambda\lambda\alpha \ kai \ \epsilon\theta\nu\nu\nu \),—namely, Hosea the \( \kappa\omicron \iota \iota \iota \), and Isaiah the \( \nu\mu\omicron\nu \iota \varepsilon \iota\omega\omega\iota \). Thus the emphasis in ver. 27 lies primarily on ‘Hosea’s \( \iota \), whose prophecy, differing from the oracle of Hosea, is to be introduced by the significant \( \kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\zeta \nu\tau\omicron\eta\rho \, 'I\rho\rho. \) Paraphrase somewhat thus: But Isaiah, what do we hear from him? We hear the cry respecting Israel, etc.

2 Hofmann misinterprets the passage in Isaiah, making it to mean that the
lation in the LXX.—not verbally exact, but corresponding to
the Messianic reference—of ἀνάστασις by σωθησθαι (which they
understood of the deliverance by a return into Palestine) in
the Messianic sense. In Isaiah the word refers to the return
to God, is converted, of which the Messianic σωθησθαι is just
the consequence.

Ver. 28. The Hebrew runs: יָדוּעִים הָאֵחַ, יָדוּעִים הָאֵחַ, Extermination is decided,1
streaming justice (i.e. penal justice); for extermination and decision
(penal decision) the Lord Jehovah Zeboah makes (i.e. is on the
point of executing) in the midst of the whole earth (on Zion).
The LXX. did not understand these words, and translated them
incorrectly (on how they came to do so, see Fritzsche, also
Maier, in the Theol. Jahrb. 1845, I. p. 190 f.). This cannot
be denied; nor are we, with Olshausen, to attempt to conceal
or smooth over the fact by arbitrary interpretation of the
Hebrew. Paul has nevertheless felt no scruple in abiding by
their translation with a few unimportant deviations, since its
sense is not less suitable than that of the original to the con-
whole people Israel, which shall return, be it never so numerous, is called a
“remnant,” for the reason that it has come out of a severe time of distress.
In correspondence with this sense, the passage, which is incorrectly translated
by the LXX. (because they have יִשְׂרָאֵל, and add יָדוּעִים to יִשְׂרָאֵל), is held to be rightly understood by Paul: “that the remnant which obtains salvation is one with the people, of which the case is supposed, that it is then as numerous as the sand by the sea.” Against this it may be urged (1) that יָדוּעִים יִשְׂרָאֵל according to the context (comp. also vii. 3) cannot mean: the return of the people will be the return of a remnant, so that the latter would be the people itself, but only: a remaining part (not the mass) will return in the people, i.e. among the people,—the rest not. (2) The LXX. have understood the original substantially with perfect correctness, inasmuch as, instead of writing word for word יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל, they give the explanation: יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל. (3) Paul follows the LXX. in this, only passing over the self-understood יָדוּעִים.
That the LXX. render יָדוּעִים, and Paul writes יָדוּעִים, is entirely
unnecessary.

1 According to Hofmann, יָדוּעִים must be not predicate, but adjective: “an
end-making, which actually and truly makes an end,” which permits no further
extension of the present state of the world; such an end-making will bring in
the state of righteousness as with the force of waves. Incorrectly, because thus
ירחַמּוּ is made to contain something which is not in it (even at Job xv. 1), and
because יָדוּעִים is understood with Drechsler contrary to the context, and unsuit-
ably to the figurative הָאֵחַ (comp. viii. 7, xxviii. 15, 18).
nection and object which the declaration here subserves. The
words, as Paul has them, mean: "For utterance-accomplishing
and (as matter of fact, through a speedy execution of it) short-
cutting in righteousness (is He); for a short-cut utterance (i.e. a
saying in which the whole penal decision is summarily included)
will the Lord bring to pass on the earth." In reference to single
expressions, remark: (1) λόγος, which belongs to both parti-
ciples, is neither decree (usually so taken, but this is not its
meaning), nor matter of fact (Beza, Melancthon, Castalio, Calvin,
Koppe, Reithmayr, formerly also Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erf. II.
p. 213, and various others), which it never denotes with Paul,
nor reckoning,¹ which, in connection with τοιείν, would be con-
trary to idiom, but dictum, an utterance, which He has delivered;
and this indeed, in the first clause of the verse, which expresses
the executive justice of God in general, is to be understood
quite generally; comp. Erasmus, Paraphr.: "quicquid dixit,
plene praestet et quidem compendio." In the second clause,
on the other hand, which adduces proof of that general de-
scription of God with the concrete case, the occurrence of which is
predicted, the divine saying of ver. 27, delivered through the
prophet, is intended. (2) συντέμων, used of something that
is said (speeches, answers, and the like), like aρροσκ, never
denotes in Greek anything else than to cut short (Plato, Protag.
p. 334 D, Ep. 3, p. 318 B; Aeschines, p. 32. 23; Euripides,
Iph. A. 1249, Aed. fr. v. 2; Lucian, bis. accus. 28; Soph.
fragm. 411, Dind.; 2 Mac. x. 10; Pflugk, ad Eur. Hec.
1180), and it is therefore inadmissible to depart from this
signification of the συντέμων λόγων (Plato, Phaedr. p. 267 B).
We must, however, observe that in συντέμων this "comprising
in short" must be a matter of fact, consisting in the short sum-

¹ So now Hofmann, omitting (see critical notes) the words ἐν διαχωρίσει ἐν λόγω
συντεμομ. The λόγος τοιείν is supposed to be the appointment of an accounting,
which is designated by συντεμομ as a settlement of account, and by συντεμομ as an
abridged process of accounting. The notion of holding a reckoning is certainly
expressed in the Greek writers by the familiar phrases λόγος λειμβαίνω, ὡς τοι
λόγος τοιείν, λόγος αὐτίκης, etc., but not by λόγος τοιείν, which has quite other signi-
fications, and in which λόγος never means reckoning. Besides, συντεμομ with
λόγος demands for the latter, according to constant usage, the signification of
speech, saying.
mary despatch of the matter (comp. LXX. Isa. xxviii. 22; Eur. Hes. 450), like our "cut it short;" while, on the other hand, \( \sigma ντετημήημένον \) (perfect) refers to the concise, short, and stern style in which the saying itself is conceived (\( \tau \circ \ \nuτολειμμά \ οωθήσεται! \)).

Passages in which \( \sigma ντέμενεν \) denotes overtake and the like (as Soph. Ant. 1090) have no bearing on the present one. Neither are we to adopt what Tholuck reads into it, that God will accomplish the promise delivered in Isa. x. 20, 21, only with great limitation of the number of the people, which would, besides, be not at all suitable to the perfect participle \( \sigma ντετημήημένον \). Moreover, the LXX. cannot have meant \( \lambda \circ γον \) of the word of promise, but, according to the sense of the original, only of the penal judicial declaration.

(3) \( \varepsilon ν \ \deltaικαστήρι \) does not stand for the righteousness of faith (Fritzsche), but is to be referred, according to the context, as in the Hebrew, to the judicial righteousness of God. (4) The participles \( \sigma ντετη\) and \( \sigma ντέμενον \) require only \( \varepsilon ντί \) to be supplied. See Hermann, ad Viger. p. 776; Bernhardy, p. 470; Kühner, II. 1, p. 37. And (5) as respects the argumentative force of the \( \gamma \circ p \), it lies in the fact that, if God causes such a penal judgment to be issued on Israel, the part of the people remaining spared, which obtains salvation, can only be the \( \nuτολειμμά \) out of the mass, that which remains over. Incorrectly Hofmann, in accordance with his erroneous interpretation of vv. 27, 28, explains: So long as this present world-period endures, Israel's final salvation might remain in suspense; "but Jehovah leaves it not on this footing, He makes an end and settles accounts

---

1 The Vulgate has, with literal correctness, rendered \( \text{brevians and brevatum} \). Van Hengel abides by this signification, but assumes as the sense of \( \sigma ντίμιν \): *de ipso tamen minatone non nihil detrahens*, so that God, in virtue of His righteousness, does not reject all, but saves a small part, consisting of the less refractory; \( \sigma ντετημήημίν \) he then makes dependent on \( \text{κοινός} \): "faciet, ut dictum sum incitum sit, i. e. ut minatio sua plerosque tantum Judaeorum attingat, de ea detrahens ad salutem pauciorum." But so \( \sigma ντίμιν \) would amount to the sense of subjecting something in part to deduction; but it is not employed thus of speeches, but only of things, Thuc. viii. 45. 2 (*το το μεταφέρει κοινός*), Xen. Hier. iv. 9 (*το ταυτόν κοινόν*).

2 The subject, God, is here understood of itself according to the following context, so that it is unnecessary to parenthesize \( \varepsilon ντίμιν \) in order to gain \( \nuπίμαnas \) as subject, as van Hengel artificially proposes.
with the world, and the remnant which is then Israel's people returns to Him and attains to salvation."

Ver. 29. Since the preceding prophecy was not introduced by καθὼς or ως, we must here punctuate καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαίας, εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ., so that Paul adopts as his own the words of Isa. i. 9 (closely following the LXX.): "And, as Isaiah has prophesied, if the Lord of Zebaoth had not left behind to us a seed (in the sense of the apostle, this is that very ἵνα λειμμα of ver. 27, which, like seed out of which new fruit grows, preserves and continues the true people of God), we should have become as Sodom, and like to Gomorrha;" the whole nation (by exclusion from Messianic salvation) would have without exception perished (fallen unto ἀπώλεια). — προείρ. Not to be understood, with Baumgarten-Crusius and van Hengel, following Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Michaelis, and others: has said at an earlier place, for local specifications of this kind are quite unusual in quotations with Paul, and here such reference would be without significance. It is used in the prophetic sense; the prophet has said of the fate of the people in his time, with a forecast of its corresponding fate in the present time, what holds good of Israel's present; the mass of its people is hardened by divine judgment, and forfeits salvation, and only a holy σπέρμα is left to it. Comp. on προείρ., Acts i. 16; Plato, Rep. p. 619 C; Lucian, Jov. Frag. 30; Polyb. vi. 3. 2. — ως Τὸμ.] Two modes of conception are intermixed: become like, and become as, LXX., Hos. iv. 6; Ezek. xxxii. 2; Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 140 f. Compare the classical connection of ἐμοίος and ὁμοίος with ως and ὁμοιος.

Vv. 30–33. The blame of their exclusion rests upon the Jews themselves, because they strove after righteousness not by faith, but by works; they took offence at Christ. Observe how Paul here "with the fewest words touches the deepest foundation of the matter" (Ewald).

Vv. 30, 31. From the preceding prophecies, ver. 25 ff. (not with particular regard to ver. 16, as de Wette), Paul now, in order to prepare the transition to the διατι; ὑπὶ κ.τ.λ., ver. 32,

1 To supply an apodosis (Philippi: δεῦ μὲν καὶ ὑπὶ ἠχον) is therefore completely superfluous, and consequently arbitrary.
draws the historical result, and that in the form of question and answer: "What shall we say then? (we shall say) that Gentiles, they who strove not after righteousness, have obtained righteousness, but righteousness which proceeds from faith; while Israel, on the contrary, in spite of its endeavour after the law which justifies, has not attained to this law." Others take δικαιοσύνη to be a question, namely either: "What are we to say to the fact, that Gentiles, etc.?" So, following Theodore of Mopsuestia and others, Heumann, Flatt, Olshausen, also Morus, who takes δικαιοσύνη as because. Or: "What are we therefore to say? Are we to say that Gentiles, etc.?" So Reiche, who is then compelled to consider δικαιοσύνη, as an answer inserted as in a dialogue, and to see in ver. 32 the "removal of the ground of the objection by a disclosure of the cause of the phenomenon, which has now no longer anything surprising in it." But Reiche's view is to be rejected, partly on the ground that the insertion of a supposed answer, δικαιοσύνη, is a makeshift and unexampled in Paul's writings; partly because δικαιοσύνη, even with the exclusion of δικαιοσύνη, contains complete Pauline truth, and consequently does not at all resemble a problematic inquiry, such as Paul elsewhere introduces by τι ἐρωθεῖν; and then refutes as erroneous (see iv. 1). This, too, in opposition to Th. Schott, who, taking τι ἐνδικαιοσύνην; as a single independent question (What shall we now say to the fact, that Gentiles, etc.), then finds the answer in δικαιοσύνην ἐκ πίστεως, but afterwards, no less strangely than groundlessly, proposes to connect δικαιοσύνη immediately, no punctuation being previously inserted, with the proposition Ἰσραήλ ἐκ κ.τ.λ. Finally, it is decisive against Heumann and others, that the answer of ver. 32, δικαιοσύνη κ.τ.λ., does not concern the Gentiles at all (see ver. 30). — ἑθήνι Gentiles (comp. ii. 14), not the Gentiles as a collective body. On the part of Gentiles righteousness was obtained, etc. — τὰ μὴ διωκόν. They, whose endeavour (for they had not a revelation, nor did they observe the moral law) was not directed towards becoming righteous, they obtained righteousness, but — and hereby this paradox of sacred history is solved—that which proceeds from faith. In
the first two instances δικ. is used without any special definition from the Christian point of view; the latter only comes to be introduced with the third δικ. — δὲ] comp. iii. 22; Phil. ii. 8.— On the figurative διώκειν, borrowed from the running for the prize in the racecourse, as also on the correlate καταλαμβάνειν, comp. Phil. iii. 12–14; 1 Cor. ix. 24; 1 Tim. vi. 11, 12; Ecclus. xi. 10, xxvii. 8; on διώκειν δικαιοσύνην, Plato, Rep. p. 545 Δ. Observe the threefold δικαιοσύνη, as in ver. 31 the repetition of νόμον δικαιος. The whole passage is framed for pointed effect: "Vehementer auditorum commovet ejusdem redintegratio verbi ... quasi aliquod telum saepius perveniat in eandem partem corporis." Auct. ad Herenn. iv. 28.

Vv. 31, 32. Israel, on the contrary, striving after the law of righteousness, has (in respect to the mass of the people) not attained to the law of righteousness.— νόμον δικαιος.] The law affording righteousness. Quite erroneous is the view of Chrysostom, Theodoret, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Bengel, Heumann, that it is a hypallage for δικαιοσύνην νόμον; and that of Rückert and Köllner is arbitrary, that Paul, in his effort after brevity and paradox, has used a condensed phrase for τον νόμον ώς νόμον δικ. On the contrary, the justifying law is in both instances (comp. δικαιοσύνην, ver. 30) to be left without any more precise concrete definition, and to be regarded as the ideal (comp. also Fritzche and Philippi), the reality of which the Israelites strove by their legal conduct to experience in themselves (to possess), but did not obtain. The justifying law! this is the idea, which they pursued, but to the reality they remained strangers. If, finally, we chose, with many others (including Bengel, Koppe, Flatt, Reiche, Köllner, Krehl, de Wette), to understand the first νόμ. δικ. of the historical Mosaic law, and the second of Christianity, διώκων would be opposed to us; for this, according to ver. 30, expresses not the endeavour to fulfil the law, but the endeavour to possess the law, as, indeed, οἷς ἔφθασε εἰς must correspond to κατέλαβε in ver. 30,

1 Ver. 31, although belonging to the answer to the εἰ ὁ λόγος, and therefore regarded by many as still dependent on ἐν, is nevertheless better taken as an independent proposition, because thus more emphatic, and because ἐν, ver. 32, refers only to ver. 31.
and therefore must simply denote *non pervenit* (Vulg.), not: *non pracvenit* (Erasmus, Estius, Hammond, and others, including Ewald and Jatho). Comp. on Phil. iii. 16. The reading of Lachmann, *eis νόμον οὐκ ἐφθασε*, which Hofmann follows, is explained by the latter: *Israel was set upon fulfilling a law which teaches what is right* (δι' ὧν τούτον νόμον δικαιοσύνης), *but did not thereby succeed, did not become ἐννομος* (*eis νόμον οὐκ ἐφθασε*); because the law remained for it, like a shadow, ever only near, but unattainable, *thus Israel had not at all come to have its standpoint generally in a law and to live in it*, neither in that of the Old Testament, which it sought to follow, nor in that of the New Testament, on which it turned its back. An entirely subjective artificial complication of ideas, with invented accessories, and not even historically correct, since in fact the Israelites stood and lived only too much ἐν νόμῳ and ἐν ἐννομοί, but could not withal attain to the νόμος δικαιοσύνης. *This δικαιοσύνης is the tragic point of the negative counter-statement, and hence is indispensable in the text.* — ἐπεὶ τι] sc. *eis νόμον δικ. οὐκ ἐφθασε*; answer: *ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, sc. ἐδίκωσαν νόμον δικ.* For, had they started from faith in their striving, they would have obtained in Christianity the realization of their endeavour, the νόμον δικαιοσύνης; through faith in Christ, to whom the law already points (iii. 31, x. 5 ff.; John v. 46), they would have become righteous, and would thus in the gospel have really attained what floated before them as an idea, the justifying law.— ὡς ἐξ ἐργ. ὡς can neither denote a *hypocritical conduct* (Theophylact), nor presumed works (Fritzsche), nor quasi (van Hengel, following the Vulgate); for, indeed, the Jews really *set out from* the works of the law in their endeavour. On the contrary, it means: Because their διόκεων was in the way, in which a διόκεων starting from works is constituted; the (perverted) *kind and quality of the endeavour*¹ is designated, comp. 2 Cor. ii. 17; John i. 14. The ἐξ ἐργ. is by ὡς brought

¹ To this, according to the real sense, Philippi's explanation amounts; taking ὡς, however, of the subjective conception of the διόκεων, equivalent to ὡς φησίν ο.ι. This is inadmissible, because, as with in virc., so also with ἐξ ἐργ., only the notion of διόκεω can be supplied. Hofmann has, in consistency
into fuller relief; see Klotz, ad Devar. p. 757 f. — προσέκοψαν κ.τ.λ.] without γάρ (see critical remarks), but thus coming in all the more strikingly: they stumbled, etc.; that is the fatal fact, which befell them in their διώκειν, and caused that they οὖν ἐκ πίστεως κ.τ.λ. Had they not stumbled at the stone of stumbling, they would have entered on the right line of endeavour ἐκ πίστεως, instead of their perverted one ὅς ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου. The simple appropriateness, clearness, and force, with which the προσέκοψαν κ.τ.λ. is thus introduced, must exclude the connection with ἀλλ' ὃς ἐξ ἐργῶν νόμου (Lachmann), followed also by Th. Schott ("but, as could not but happen in consequence of works, came to ruin on the stone of stumbling"). The λίθος προσκόμματος, the stone on which one stumbles (trips), is Christ, in so far as occasion for unbelief is taken at His manifestation (especially at His death on the cross, 1 Cor. i. 23). Comp. Luke ii. 34; 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8. The figure is in perfect correspondence with the conception of the διώκειν, and was perhaps selected in anticipation of the passage of Scripture to be adduced. Aptly, moreover, Theophylact remarks: "Καὶ ἠρπακότοις οὗτος ἔσται τύπος ἅρματος ἐν τῇ ἐκβάσεις τῶν ἀποτηρήσαντων ὁμόμοιατο ὁ Χριστός· αὐτὸς γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὸν θεμέλιον καὶ ἐδραίωμα ἐτέθη.

Ver. 33. This προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ τ. προσκ. ensued—and this is the θεία μοῖρα herein—in conformity with the prophetic declaration, according to which Christ is laid as the stone of stumbling in Israel (ἐν Σιών, as the theocratic seat of the people), and faith on Him would have been that very thing which would have preserved them from the forfeiture of salvation.—Isa. xxviii. 16 and viii. 14 are blended into one declaration, with a free but pertinent variation both from the original and also from the LXX. With Isaiah, in the first passage, the theocracy—the kingdom of Jehovah, whose sacred basis and central seat is the temple—is the stone laid by God; and in the second, God Himself is the stone of stumbling and the rock

with his erroneous understanding of ver. 31, extorted from the words the sense, "that Israel fancied itself to be in the position of a doing, by virtue of which it was in pursuit of the law of God."

1 See the varying interpretations in Gesenius, Drechsler, Hofmann. The latter understands the house of David.
of offence for His enemies. But Paul (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 6–8) justly perceives in the passages *prophecies of the Messiah* (as do also the Rabbins), and, in connection with the Messianic character, of all the glory and triumph of the theocracy, the fulfiller of which is the Messiah. — ὁ πιστ. ἐπ. αὐτῷ] he who relies on Him, in the Messianic fulfilment: *he who believes on Christ.* Comp. x. 11; 1 Tim. i. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 6; Luke xxiv 25. Christ, the object of faith, is conceived of as He to whom faith adheres as its foundation (comp. Bernhardy, p. 250); there is therefore no need of the circumlocution: "fidem *in Deo ponit Christo fretus*" (van Hengel). See also on Matt. xxvii. 42, and comp. ἑπταδέκτα παρθενο, xvi. 12. We may add that πᾶς, if it were the genuine reading, would not have the emphasis; but the latter lies upon ὁ πιστεών, as the opposite of προκάπιστων. — κατασχυνθότεν] The LXX. have this verb (*κατασχυνθῇ*), apparently deviating from the original text, Isa. xxviii. 16, where probably they have merely given an inaccurate translation of * rơi, * according to the approximate sense, and have not adopted another reading, namely חרב (Reiche, Olshausen, Hofmann).—In the sense of the Messianic fulfilment of the saying, "he will not be put to shame" means, "he will not forfeit the Messianic salvation." Comp. on v. 5.

**Remark.**—The contents of ix. 6-29, as they have been unfolded by pure exegesis, certainly exclude, when taken in and by themselves, the idea of a decree of God *conditioned* by human moral self-activity, as indeed God’s *absolute* activity, taken as such by itself, cannot depend on that of the individual. On the other hand, a fatalistic determinism, the “*tremendum mysterium*” of Calvin, which, following the precedent of Augustine, robs man of his self-determination and free personal attitude towards salvation, and makes him the passive object of divine sovereign will, may just as little be derived as a Pauline doctrine from our passage. It cannot be so, because our passage is not to be considered as detached from the following (vv. 30–33, chap. x. xi.); and because, generally, the countless exhortations of the apostle to obedience of faith, to steadfastness of faith and Christian virtue, as well as all his admonitions on the possibility of losing salvation, and his warnings against falling from grace, are just so many evidences against that view, which puts aside the divine will of love, and does away the essence of
human morality and responsibility. See also, against the Calvinistic exposition, Beyschlag, p. 2 ff. If we should assume, with Reiche and Köllner, Fritzscbe and Kreil, that Paul, in his dialectic ardour, has allowed himself to be carried away into self-contradiction, we should thus have a self-contradiction so palpable, and yet so extremely grave and dangerous in a religious and ethical aspect, making the means of grace illusory, and striking so heavily at the Christian moral idea of divine holiness and of human freedom,— that we should least of all suppose this very apostle to be capable of it; for, on the one hand, his penetration and his dialectic ability well might, just as, on the other hand, his apostolic illumination in particular, and the clearness and depth of his own moral experience, must, have guarded him against it. But this affords no justification of the practice which has been followed by those of anti-predestinarian views from the time of Origen and Chrysostom (see Luthardt, vom freien Willen, p. 14 ff.) until now (see especially Tholuck on vv. 16–18, 20–22, and also Weiss, ib.; comp. Gerlach, letzte Dinge, 1869, p. 159), of importing into the clear and definite expressions of the apostle in this place, and reading between the lines, the moral self-determination and spontaneity of man as the correlate factor to the divine volition. On the contrary, a correct judgment of the deter-

1 Fritzscbe, II. p. 550: "Mellius sibi Paulus consensisset, si Aristotelis, non Gamalielis alumnus fuisset."

2 This practice of importing is obvious, among the Greek Fathers, especially in Theodore of Mopsuestia, and among modern theologians since the precedent of Arminius (see Beyschlag, p. 9 ff.), but especially in Tholuck's paraphrase of the passages in question. Thus he paraphrases, e.g., ver. 17: "How greatly this is the case, is shown according to Scripture in Pharaoh, of whom, in spite of his running against the divine will, it is said, etc." Again, in ver. 18: "Thus God executes His decree of mercy on those who desire to become blessed through mercy [ἐλαύν], and hardens those who in their resistance reject such decree of grace" [ἐλαύν]. It is self-evident that, with such importations and alterations of the sense, no text is any longer sufficiently safe from the subjectivity of its interpreter. See, against such methods, the in the main apt observations of Baur in the Theol. Jahrb. 1857, p. 196 ff., and in his N. T. Theol. p. 182 ff. Lechler also, Apost. Zeit. p. 122 ff., passes an unprejudiced and correct judgment; whilst Weiss, by the mediating suggestion that God may determine, according to His unlimited will, to what condition He will annex His grace, can by no means avail against the clearness and definiteness of the text; and Hofmann, by the intermingling of rationalizing attempts to explain the details, cannot remove the difficulties. Philippi (Glaubensl. IV. 1, p. 113) rightly leaves the absolute divine freedom in the bestowal of salvation, as Paul dwells on it, intact, and connects with this result the solution which is disclosed by Paul himself in reference to that, at
ministic propositions of vv. 15–23 lies in the middle between
the admission, which is psychologically and morally impossible,
of a self-contradiction, and the importation, which is exegetically
impossible, of conceptions of which the apostolic expression is the
stark opposite—somewhat as follows. Seeing that the mode of
the concurrence, so necessary in the moral world, of the individual
freedom and spontaneity of man on one side, and the absolute
self-determination and universal efficiency of God on the other,—
which latter, however, as such by no means lacks the immanent
law of holiness (against the objection of Beyschlag, p. 20),—is
incomprehensible by human reflection, so long, that is, as it does
not pass out of the sphere of the Christian fundamental view
into the unbiblical identity-sphere of the pantheistic view, in
which indeed freedom has no place at all;¹ as often as we treat
only one of the two truths: “God is absolutely free and all-
efficient,” and “Man has moral freedom, and is, in virtue of
his proper self-determination and responsibility as liberum
agens, the author of his salvation or perdition,” and carry
it out in a consistent theory and therefore in a onesided
method, we are compelled to speak in such a manner, that
the other truth appears to be annulled. Only appears, however;
for, in fact, all that takes place in this case is a temporary
and conscious withdrawing of attention from the other. In
the present instance Paul found himself in this case, and he
expresses himself according to this mode of view, not merely
in a passing reference, vv. 20, 21 (Beyschlag), but in the
whole reasoning of vv. 6–29. In opposition to the Jewish
conceit of descent and of works, he desired to establish the
free and absolute sovereign power of the divine will and
action, and that the more decisively and exclusively, the
less he would leave any ground for the arrogant illusion of
the Jews, that God must be gracious to them. The apostle
first sight, onesided theory at the close of this very chapter, and in chap. x.
and xi. The doctrine of election of Schleiermacher pours unbiblical notions into
the mould of biblical expressions, and finishes with a general apokotastasis;
whilst in the Hegelian school, to which evil is a necessary element in the absolute
process, the positive fundamental doctrines of the gospel as to sin, grace, regene-
ration, and reconciliation with God, when they are thought to be raised at all
to their notion [Begriff], find no longer a place. For the history of doctrine in
modern times here concerned, see Luthardt, vom freien Willen, p. 366 ff.
¹ To say nothing at all of the modern materialism (Vogt, Molleschott, Büchner,
and others), according to which spirit is replaced by the exertion of force in
brain-substance, nerve-material, change of matter, and in material substrata
generally. See on it, and its relation to theology, Rosenkranz in Hilgenfeld,
Zeitschr. 1864, p. 225 ff.
has here wholly taken his position on the absolute standpoint of the theory of pure dependence upon God, and that with all the boldness of clear consistency;¹ but only until he has done justice to the polemical object which he has in view. He then returns (see vv. 30 ff.) from that abstraction to the human-moral standpoint of practice, so that he allows the claims of both modes of consideration to stand side by side, just as they exist side by side within the limits of human thought. The contemplation—which lies beyond these limits—of the metaphysical relation of essential interdependence between the two,—namely objectively divine, and subjectively human, freedom and activity of will,—necessarily remained outside and beyond his sphere of view; as he would have had no occasion at all in this place to enter upon this problem, seeing that it was incumbent upon him to crush the Jewish pretensions with the one side only of it—the absoluteness of God. The fact that, and the extent to which, the divine elective determination is nevertheless no "delectus militaris," but is immanently regulated in God Himself by His holiness, and consequently also conditioned by moral conditions on the human side, does not enter into his consideration at all for the moment. It is introduced, however, in ver. 30 ff., when the onesided method of consideration temporarily pursued is counterbalanced, and the ground, which had been given up for a while in an apologetic interest to the doctrinal definition of an absolute decree, is again taken away. Comp. also Beck l. c., and Baur, neut. Theol. p. 182 ff. But when Beyschlag places chap. ix. under the point of view, that the discussion therein relates not to a decree, antecedent to time, for men's everlasting salvation or perdition, but only to their adoption or non-adoption into the historical kingdom of God (thus into Christianity), and that of the Jews and Gentiles as the two groups of mankind, not of individual men, and when he finds the true key of exposition in this view; his idea cannot be justified by the simple exegesis of chap. ix., and without anticipating the contents of chap. x. and xi.; and the difficulty in principle, which is involved in the entirely free self-determination of the divine will, remains—while it is transferred to the sphere of the action of God in the historical government of the world—even thus unremoved.

¹ He says by no means only how God could proceed without violating a claim of right (Julius Müller, u. d. Sünde, I. p. 541, ed. 5), but how He does proceed. Older expositors have also endeavoured to help themselves with this problematic periphrasis. See, e.g., Flacius, Clav. II. p. 387.
CHAPTER X.

Ver. 1. ἤ before πρὸς is wanting according to a large preponderance of evidence, and is omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. A hasty grammatical emendation, as ἰσοτίτ before ἱς is supplied in Elz. — αὐτῶν] Elz. : τοῦ 'Ἰσραήλ, according to decisive evidence. With ver. 1 a church-lesson begins. — Ver. 3. After ἰδίας, διακατόνθητι is wanting in A B D E P, min., and several versions (including Vulg.) and Fathers. Omitted by Lachm. But the very emphasis of the thrice-occurring word, so obviously intended (comp. ix. 30), speaks for its originality; and how easily the omission of the second διακατόνθητι might arise, as that of a supposed quite superfluous repetition! — Ver. 5. αὐτὸν] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: αὐτῷ, according to A B N*, 17, 47, 80, Copt. Arm. Vulg. Germ. Damasc. Ruf. But this would involve that, with the most of these, and with yet other witnesses, the preceding αὐτά should be omitted, as also Tisch. 8. has done. However, both αὐτῷ and the omission of αὐτά appear like an emendatory alteration, since the context contains no reference for αὐτά and αὐτῶν. In the same light we must also regard the reading ἐν τῷ δικαίωμα τῆς ἐν νόμῳ (instead of τῷ δικ. . . . ἐν), as Tisch. 8. has it, in A D* N*, and some min., Vulg., and some Fathers. — Ver. 15. τιθῆναι, τῶν σωτήρων, τάς σωτήρια) is wanting in A B C N*, min., Copt. Sah. Aeth. Clem. Or. Damasc. Ruf. Omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Copyist’s omission, through the repetition of σωτήρ. If it had been interpolated from the LXX. (Isa. lii. 7), ἀξιόν σωτήρια would have been written instead of the mere σωτήρια. The article before λόγος is, with Lachm., on decisive evidence to be omitted, although it is also wanting in the LXX. — Ver. 17. Θεοῦ] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: Θεοῦ, according to B C D* E N*, min., several vss., Aug. Pel. Ambrosiast. There is no genitive at all in F G, Boern Hilar. But how readily this omission might suggest itself by a comparison of ver. 8! Ἰησοῦ, however, appears to be a more precise definition of the sense of the divine ἡμῶν, the expression of which by θεός is found already in Syr. and Clem. — Ver. 19. The order Ἰσρ. ὡς Ἰς ἁγιάω is supported by decisive evidence; Elz.: ὡς Ἰς ἁγιάω Ἰσρ.
Vv. 1–13. More particular discussion of the guilt of the Jews specified in ix. 32; introduced (vv. 1, 2) by a reiterated assurance of the most cordial interest in their salvation.

Ver. 1. 'Aδελφοι'. Address to the readers, expressive of emotion. Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Gal. iii. 15. — μεν without a corresponding δέ; the thought following in ver. 3 loomed before the apostle, as standing in the relation of opposition to his heartfelt interest, of which the solicitude thus remained unfulfilled through the perverted striving after righteousness of the people. — εὐδοκία does not denote the wish, the desire (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and many, including Rückert, Reiche, Köllner, de Wette, Olshausen). It may mean pleasure, delight (Bengel: "Iubentissime auditurus esset de salute Israelis;" comp. Philippi), Matt. iii. 17, xi. 26; or goodwill (Phil. i. 15, ii. 13), i.e. propensa animi voluntas. See generally Fritzsche. The latter signification is that most immediately suggested by the connection here; comp. van Hengel, "benevolapropensio." It is indeed the intention of the will (Hofmann), but conceived of and designated as the being well-disposed of the heart, as it was such.—πρὸς τὸν Θεόν is joined to ἡ δέσπος, hence there was no need of the (not genuine) article (Acts viii. 24; Winer, p. 128 f. [E.T. 169 f.]); to the connection with ἐστί to be understood, εὐδοκία would not be suitable. Hence: The goodwill of my heart and my petition to God are on their behalf towards this end, that they might obtain salvation; σωτηρία is the goal which my εὐδοκία wishes for them, and my prayer entreats for them. In this view ἀπέρ αὐτῶν belongs so necessarily to the completeness of the thought, that we are not to assume a tacit contrast to a κατά (Hofmann). The article before δέσπος represents, according to the context, the personal pronoun (ἡ ἐμὴ δέ); Winer, p. 103 [E. T. 135]; Kühner, II. 1, p. 515. — On the distinction between δέσπος and προσευχῆ, petition and prayer, see on Eph. v. 18. Bengel aptly remarks: "Non orasset Paulus, si absolute reprobati essent."

Ver. 2. Reason assigned why ἡ εὐδοκία . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν. — ζηλον Θεοῦ, zeal for God. Comp. Acts xxii. 20, xxii. 3; Gal. i. 14; John ii. 17; 1 Macc. ii. 58. This their zeal makes
them worth that interest of my heart.— *οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν* knowledge is not that, according to the measure of which they are zealous for God. We must here again (comp. on i. 28) note the *composite* expression; for the Jews were not wanting in *γνῶσις* generally, but just in the very point, on which it depended whether their *γνῶσις* was the right and practically vital *ἐπίγνωσις*.

Ver. 3. Confirmatory elucidation of *οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν*: “for else they would not, unacquainted with the divine righteousness (see on i. 17), have insisted on their own righteousness, and striven against the divine.” This is just the *actual proof* that their zeal for God is wanting in knowledge.— *ἀγνοοῦντες*] does not mean any more than at ii. 4, 1 Cor. xiv. 38, anything else than *not knowing*; Reiche, de Wette, Tholuck, Ewald, and several others: *misapprehending*; Hofmann: *overlooking*. The *guilt* of this not-knowing Paul does not further enter into, not so much (comp. Acts iii. 17, xvii. 30) from mild forbearance (Rückert and others), but because he had simply nothing else than the *οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν* to explain.— *τὴν ἱδίαν δικαιοσύνην*] *τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, τὴν ἐξ ἐργῶν ἱδίαν καὶ πόνων κατορθούμενην*, Theophylact. Comp. Phil. iii. 9, and see on i. 17.— *στήσας*] *stabilire, to make valid*. Comp. iii. 31; Heb. x. 9.— *ἐπετάγησαι*] The δικ. *Θεοῦ* is conceived of as a divine ordinance, to which one subjects oneself (through faith). The sense is not that of the passive, as viii. 20, but that of the middle, as in viii. 7, xiii. 1, and frequently, expressing the obedience. As to the subject-matter, comp. *προσέκοψαι κ.τ.λ.*, ix. 32.

Ver. 4. *For the validity of the law has come to an end in Christ, in order that every believer may be a partaker of righteousness.* Herewith Paul, for the further confirmation of what was said in ver. 3, lays down the great principle of salvation, from the non-knowledge of which among the Jews that blinded and perverted striving after righteousness flowed.— *Τέλος νόμου*, which is placed first with great emphasis, is applied to Christ, in so far as, by virtue of His redemptive death (Gal.

---

1 In the classical passages also, which are adduced for the signification *misapprehend* (as Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 25, 29, *Cyr.* iv. 1. 16; Dem. 151. 7, et al.), the sense of *not know* is to be maintained.
iii. 13, iv. 5), the divine dispensation of salvation has been introduced, in which the basis of the procuring of salvation is no longer, as in the old theocracy, the Mosaic νόμος, but faith, whereby the law has therefore ceased to be the regu-
lative principle for the attainment of righteousness. Only this view of τέλος, end, conclusion (adopted after Augustine by most of the modern expositors), is conformable to what follows, where the essentially different principles of the old and new δικαιοσύνη are stated. For its agreement with the doctrinal system of the apostle, see vii. 1 ff. Contrary to the meaning of the word τέλος (even in 1 Tim. i. 5), and contrary to the inherent relation of what follows, Origen, Erasmus, Vatablus, Elsner, Homberg, Estius, Wolf, Ch. Schmidt, Jatho, and several others, take it as: fulfilment of the law ("quicquid exigebat lex moralis praestitit perfectissime," Calovius), which many dogmatic expositors understood of the satisfactio activa, or of the activa and passiva together (Calovius). Linguistically faultless, but at the same time not corres-
dponding to the connection, is the interpretation of Chrysos-
tom, Theophylact, Melancthon, Beza, Michaelis, and others, that the object and aim of the law was the making men righteous, and that this was accomplished through Christ; or (Theodoret, Toletus, Vorstius, Grotius, Wetstein, Loesner, Heumann, Klee, Glöckler, Krummacher), that Christ was called the object and aim of the law, because everything in the law, as the παράγωγός εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. iii. 24), led up to Him; "quicquid praecipiat, quicquid promittat, semper Christum habet pro scopo," Calvin. Observe further, that Χριστός must be the definite historical person that appeared in Jesus, and not the promised Saviour generally, without regard to whether and in whose person He appeared (Hofmann), an abstraction which would have been impossible to Paul, particularly here, where all righteousness is traced back only to definite faith in contrast to works—as impossible as is the reference combined

1 The πλάρωσις τοῦ νόμου, Matt. v. 17, does not conflict with the present pas-
se. For the ideal, purely moral import of the law cannot be annulled, and it is exactly this which Christ has freed from its limitations. See on Matt. l.c. Comp. also Lipsius, Rechspr. p. 85 ff.
with it, of *vómos* to any law whatever, no law has validity any longer, if the promised Saviour be at hand. See, in opposition to this, immediately below, ver. 5 ff. — *eiς δικαιοσ. παντὶ τῷ πιστ.* aim, for which Christ is the end of the law: in order that every one who believes may obtain righteousness. The principal stress lies on *πιστ.*, as the opposite of that which the law required in order to righteousness; see vv. 5, 6, iii. 21 ff.

Ver. 5. Now follows, as far as ver. 10, the proof of ver. 4, and that from Moses himself. — ηράφει τὴν ἐκ.] writes concerning righteousness, John i. 46; Hermann, ad Eur. Phoen. 574. As to the use of the present tense, comp. the frequent *λέγει* in scriptural citations. — The passage introduced by the recitative *δὴ* is Lev. xviii. 5, almost exactly after the LXX. Comp. Neh. ix. 29; Ezek. xx. 21; Gal. iii. 12. — *αὑτά*] refers in the original, and so also here, to the *προστάγματα Θεοῦ*, which Paul supposes as well known; but the principal stress lies upon *ποιήσας*: he who shall have *done* them, so that thus Moses exhibits the *doing* as the condition of the attainment of ζωή (which is referred by Paul not to the happy and prosperous life in Palestine, but to its antitype, the ζωή αἰώνιος). — *ἐν αὑτοῖς*] i.e. by the fact, that they are fulfilled.

Vv. 6–8. The righteousness which comes from faith is personified (comp. Heb. xii. 5), so that the following words of Moses, in which Paul recognises an allegorically and typically prophetic description of this righteousness, appear as its self-description. An increasing animation, and indeed triumphant tone in the representation, which thus introduces over-against that dark background (ver. 5) the bright picture the more immediately in concrete vividness. Hofmann artificially imports the antithesis, that the righteousness of the law is found only in a description of the lawgiver, but the righteousness of faith itself speaks as one existing and present. There is the less room for this supposition, since vv. 6 ff. are also Mosaic expressions. But that Paul actually regarded the words of Moses as a prophetic testimony to the nature of the righteousness of faith, is an opinion sanctioned only by a minority of expositors (Augustine, *de nat. et grat.* 83; Bucer, Balduin, Calovius, Semler, Ch. Schmidt, Reiche,
Köllner, Olshausen, Benecke, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald, Umbreit). The majority, on the other hand, assume that Paul only clothed his own thoughts in the words of Moses, and used the latter as a suitable substratum for the former. So Tholuck, Flatt, Rückert, Reithmayr, Maier, Philippi: "a holy and charming play of the Spirit of God upon the word of the Lord;" van Hengel and several others, as formerly Chrysostom, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide; Bengel: "suavissima parodia." But against this view is the fact that ver. 5 begins with γὰρ a demonstration of the τέλος νόμου Χριστοῦ, of which ver. 5 contains only the one, and vv. 6–8 the other, side; both sides, however, unite their probative force in Μωυσῆς γὰρ γράφει. Therefore it is quite wrong (see esp. Rückert, Philippi) to look upon ἡ δὲ ἐκ πιστ. δικαιοσύνη as the opposite to Μωυσῆς, and to suppose that the parallel would be more sharply drawn if Paul had said: But Christ speaks thus, etc. No, δὲ places the righteousness of faith in opposition to the previously mentioned δικαιοσύνη ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου; and for these two modes of righteousness the testimony of the lawgiver himself is introduced by Μωυσῆς γὰρ γράφει. "For Moses writes of the righteousness of the law, etc.; but the other kind of righteousness, the righteousness of faith, says (in the same Moses) thus, etc." The Μωυσ. γ. γρ. thus holds good not only for ver. 5, but also covers vv. 6–8; therefore the absence of a formula of quotation before ver. 6 is no valid argument against our view. This applies likewise against Hofmann, according to whom that, which the righteousness of faith speaks, is intended to recall Deut. l.c.; in such a way, however, that the word of which Moses speaks is related to that which the righteousness of faith means, as the

1 Luther, on Deut. l.c., says that Paul has, abundante spiritu, taken occasion from Moses against the justitiorios velut novum et proprium textum componenti.

2 Hofmann arrives at the sense: "What Israel could not say in respect of the revealed law of God, after possessing it, that should he, to whom the righteousness of faith speaks, not think in respect of the revealed and perfect Saviour." But how could Paul, without any indication whatever, have expected of the reader that he should infer, from mere reminiscence of the Mosaic words, the point of the thought intended, that what the one could not, the others should not?
O. T. to the N. T., and thus the former is a prediction of the latter. Groundless is the further objection, that Paul nowhere else thus mixes up a biblical passage with comments. For we are acquainted with comments in the style of the Midrash in Paul's writings (ix. 8; Gal. iii. 16, iv. 23, 24); and that they are here interspersed is unessential, and was very naturally suggested by the opposed ἀναβ. εἰς τ. οὐρανόν and καταβ. εἰς τ. ἀβυσσόν. In conclusion, we must further observe that, if Paul had given the biblical words only as the clothing of his own representation, yet we should have to assume, and that for the very sake of the honesty of the apostle (which Philippi thinks endangered by our view), that he actually found in the saying the typical reference to the righteousness of faith; even the holy "play" upon words of the Spirit can be no erroneous play. Theodoret took the right view: διδάσκει πάλιν νόμον καὶ χάριτος τὴν διαφοράν, καὶ ἁμφότερον εἰσάγει Μωϋσία τὸν νομοθέτην διδάσκαλον. Erasmus, Paraphr.: "utriusque justitiae imaginem Moses ipse depinxit." Comp. also Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erf. II. p. 217. The Mosaic declaration itself is Deut. xxx. 12-14, with free deviations bearing on his object, from the original and the LXX. Moses has there said of the commandment of God to Israel to fulfil His law (for the passage speaks of nothing else according to its historical sense) in ver. 11, that this commandment does not transcend the sphere of what is capable of accomplishment, nor does it lie at strange distance; and he then adds, ver. 12 ff., in order more precisely to depict this thought: It is neither in heaven nor beyond the sea, so that one must first ascend to the former or sail over the latter (comp. Bar. iii. 29, 30) to fetch it, that one may hear and do it; rather is it quite near, in the mouth and in the heart (and in the hands, an addition of LXX., and in Philo); that is, the people itself carries it in its mouth, and it is stamped upon its heart, in order that they may accomplish it (ἵνα). Paul finds here a type, and therewith an indirect prophecy, of the demand which the righteousness of faith presents, entirely different from that ποιεῖν which is demanded by the righteous-

1 But for this purpose Hofmann employs an incorrect reference and understanding of ἡκ., ver. 9.
ness of the law, inasmuch as the righteousness of faith forbids only unbelief in reference to Christ, as though He had not come from heaven, or had not risen from the dead, and directs men, on the other hand, to the word of faith, which, through its preachers, is laid in their mouth and heart. The sum and substance of this typically prophetics sense is therefore: "Be not unbelieving, but believing;" and here the grand historical points, to which faith as well as unbelief relate, could not be brought into relief more definitely and significantly than by means of the Χριστοῦ καταγενέων and ἀναγενέων (in opposition to Tholuck's objection). According to Fritzsche (comp. Calovius), the sense meant is: no one can become righteous through works, "faciendo et moliendo," vv. 6, 7; for in fact one must otherwise have been able—since the becoming righteous rests upon the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ—to ascend into heaven in order to bring Him down, or to descend into the lower world in order to bring Him up; but (ver. 8) after that salvation has been obtained by Christ, we are to have faith only. But in this case, vv. 6, 7 would surely be a warning from the mouth of the righteousness of faith against a facere et moliri, which would be of quite another kind than that of the righteousness of the law, and which even would have included in abstracto, as a presupposition, this very faith in the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Still less can we, with Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Grotius, and several others (comp. also Reithmayr, Philippi, and Krummacher), find in vv. 6, 7 the denial of the difficulty, and then in ver. 8 the assurance of the facility, of becoming

1 The allegorical and typical signification of the apostle finds its correct logical point of connection in the fact that every one who, instead of bearing the φως of God in his mouth and in his heart, asks, Who will ascend into heaven for us, and bring it to us? puts a question of unbelief.

2 For he who thinks that one must ascend into heaven to bring Christ down, denies thereby that Christ has come in the flesh; and he who supposes that one must descend into the lower world to bring Christ up from the dead, denies that He arose from the dead. This likewise against Hofmann, p. 436, according to whom it is only meant to be said, that in order to produce Christ, an impossibility—namely, an ascent into heaven, or a descent into the lower world—would be requisite. Therein lies the folly, as if that which we have were at unattainable distance.
righteous. For against this view is the fact, in the first place, that in what Paul subjoins, ver. 9 ff., nothing at all is said of difficulty and facility; secondly—and this is decisive—the fact that vv. 5–8 is to be a proof founded on Moses of the statement, τέλος νόμου Χριστός; but it is evident, that not from the facility of the Christian δικαιοσύνη, but from its being essentially different from the old (the latter resting on doing, the former on faith), it follows that with Christ, the Mediator of the new δικαιοσύνη, the νόμος must have reached its end. This, too, in reply to Knapp, Scr. var. arg. II. p. 558 f., who, besides the erroneous point of view of difficulty and facility, reads otherwise between the lines the most essential points of his interpretation. See, on the other hand, van Hengel, who, however, on his side assumes that Paul desired "avocare" unsettled Jewish Christians "a salutis duce longe quaerendo, quum quisque, qui Christi communione utatur, per fidem in Deo positam possideat, quod, ut ex legis alicujus observatione, sic etiam aliunde afferrimi non possit." The connection with ver. 4 likewise tells against this view, as does also the circumstance that, if only the longe quaerere were the conception presented, it would not be easy to see why Paul should have inserted at all his explanations τούτον ἐστιν κ.τ.λ., and why he should not have retained in ver. 7 the words of the LXX.: τῆς διαπεράσει ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς βαλάσσης. — μὴ εἶπῃς ἐν τ. καρδ. σου] LXX.: λέγων, Heb. "אָלָךָ", wherein, according to the connection ("It is not in heaven that one might speak," etc.), the forbidding sense indirectly lies. This Paul expresses directly, because his quotation is severed from the connection of the original; and he adds ἐν τ. καρδ. σου, because unbelief has its seat in the heart, and the expression "to speak in the heart" (as Ps. xiv. 1; Matt. iii. 9; Rev. xviii. 7) was very current in the mention of unholy thoughts and dispositions (Surenhusius, κατάλλ., p. 479.) — τὸς ἀναβ. εἰς τ. οὐρ.] Who will ascend into heaven? In the sense of the apostle, the inquiry is one not expressive of a wish ("utinam quis sit, qui nos e longinquo in viam salutis ducat," van Hengel), nor yet of despair, but—correlative of that τῷ πιστεύοντι in ver. 4, and opposed to the ὁ ποιήσας, ver. 5—the inquiry of unbelief, which holds the
appearance of Christ from heaven, i.e. His incarnation, as not having taken place, and as an impossibility. Therefore Paul adds the Midrashistic interpretation: that expresses, that signifies: in order to bring Christ down—this is the object, which is implied in ἀναβησθεὶς εἰς τ. οὐρ., and by its addition Paul thus contributes a more precise explanation of the question (τοῦτο ἐστὶ: scilicet), namely, as respects its tendency, as respects that at which it aims. Thus more exactly defined, the question would presuppose, that he who puts it does not believe that Christ has come out of the heavenly world and has appeared in the flesh (comp. viii. 3), ἐν ὡμοιώματι ἄνθρω- πων (Phil. ii. 6, 7; comp. 1 John. iv. 2). Following Melancthon, Castalio, Calvin, and others, Reiche thinks that unbelief in regard to the session of Christ on the right hand of God is meant. But if there were here a prohibition of the desire to behold with the eyes this object of faith (Reiche), the second question, which nevertheless is manifestly quite parallel, would be highly inappropriate; for then an existence of Christ in the ἀναβησθεὶς would of necessity be an object of faith, which yet it is not at all. Nor could we see why Paul

1 Many others (Erasmus, Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Bengel, Usteri, Rückert, Glöckler, etc.) regard τοῦτο ἐστὶ as the ground of the prohibition, and that in the sense: that is just as much, etc. So also Philipp: "Righteousness is for me as distant and high as if it were in heaven and I must fetch it down from thence; . . . that is just as much as if thou wouldest bring down Christ from heaven, as if thou didst deny that He has already come down from heaven and become man;" and afterwards, ver. 7: that is just as much as to deny that He has already risen from the dead. But it is inappropriate to conceive of righteousness itself as the imagined distant (and to-be-fetched) object, because righteousness itself is speaking, and because Paul names Christ Himself as the object to be fetched. Inappropriate, too, is the idea of allowing righteousness in any way to be represented as found in Hades, and brought up thence, whence Christ, indeed, has not brought it with Him. To this connection belongs van Engel's view: "Haec quaeferere nihil aliud est quam Christum indigne tractare, tanquam e locis remotis, at salutis autor sit, in terram revocandum." In this case the Christum indigne tractare is imported. Further, it makes absolutely no difference to the sense of τοῦτο ἐστὶ, whether it is written divided (Lechm., Tisch.) or united (σώματος, Hofmann). The codd. yield no certain basis; see Lipsius, gramm. Untert. p. 181 ff. Τοῦτο is the subject, and ἐστὶ: the copula of that which is to be predicated epegegetically of the subject.

2 The ἔπειτα καταγγέλλει presupposes the certainty of the personal pre-existence. Comp. Lechler, Apost. Zeit. p. 50.
should have said καταγαγέω in ver. 6, since the matter would in fact turn only on a seeing of Christ in heaven. Moreover, Paul, considering the freedom with which he handles this passage from Moses, would have transposed the two questions, in order to avoid the glaring historical prothysterōn which occurs, if the first question refers to the session of Christ at the right hand of God, to which van Hengel also refers it. According to Glöckler, the question, Who will go up into heaven? means to ask, Who will accomplish redemption? for the ascension was a necessary requisite for the Mediator; and therefore τοῦτο ἐστι signifies: this would mean to deny the ascension of Christ. Consistently, Glöckler then understands the second question as, Who will (voluntarily) go into death? this would mean to deny the death of Christ. But by this necessarily consistent view of ver. 7 the whole exposition is overthrown. For ver. 9 proves that ver. 7 refers to the resurrection of Christ; nor did unbelief, in truth, deny the death of Christ, but took offence at it. Like Glöckler, Lipsius, Rechtsfertigungsl. p. 102 f., has essentially misunderstood both verses, and Rückert the question of ver. 7. — ἢ τις καταβ. εἰς τ. ἀβς.;] The colon after ἢ is to be omitted. The question is, in the sense of the apostle, likewise a question of unbelief, and that in reference to the fact and the possibility of the resurrection of Christ εἰς νεκρῶν (i.e. out of Schoel, ἀβυσσος). The LXX., following the original, has: τις διαπέρασεν ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης; But Paul, in his typical reference to Christ, had sufficient cause and liberty, from the standpoint of the historical fulfilment, to put expressly, instead of ἐπέρα τῆς θαλάσσης, even without reflecting that the springs of the sea lie in the lowest depth of the earth (see Ewald, Jahrb. III. p. 112), the familiar contrast to heaven, εἰς τ. ἀβυσσον (Job xi. 8; Ps. cvii. 26, cxxxix. 8; Amos ix. 2; Ecclus. xvi. 18, xxiv. 5). For Christ is the object of justifying faith, not merely as He who came from heaven, but also as He who descended into Hades, and came up again thence, and rose from the dead. — ἀλλὰ τι λέγει;] But what says it (the righteous-
ness of faith)? An unexact contrast to μη εἰπης, ver. 6, as though previously the negation had stood with λέγει, ver. 6 (οὐχ οὔτω λέγειν εἰπε ν κ.τ.λ.). The interrogative form serves "ad attentionem excitandam," Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 186. 347. Comp. Gal. iv. 30.—ἐν τῷ στόμῳ σ. κ. ἐν τ. κ. σ.] Epexegeesis of ἐγγός σού ἐστιν.—τοῦτο ἐστι κ.τ.λ.] This ῥῆμα, so designated by the righteousness of faith, signifies the word of faith. The genitive τ. πιστ. is genit. objecti (comp. Acts xx. 32; Heb. v. 13; Eph. i. 13, vi. 15; Gal. iii. 2). Note here the two articles; for that ῥῆμα intended by the righteousness of faith is not generally "a word of faith," whose contents desire to be believed as historical reality (as Hofmann takes it), but the definite specific κύριν γαμα, whose entire summary contents are faith in Jesus Christ; comp. vv. 4, 9 ff., i. 5, 17.

—κηρύσσομεν] we preachers of the gospel.

Ver. 9. Not a statement of the contents of the ῥῆμα,1 but assigning the ground of the immediately previous τοῦτο ἐστιν τῷ ῥῆμα τῆς πιστεως δ κυρίσσο.2 The force of the argument lies in the fact that, in respect of the ῥῆμα published by its preachers, confession and faith (mouth and heart) must be consentaneous in order to obtain salvation, which is what Moses also means of the ῥῆμα (ver. 8). — ὁμολ. ἐν τ. στόμῳ σου] corresponds to ἐν τῷ στόμῳ σου (ἐστιν) in ver. 8, as afterwards πιστ. ἐν τ. καρδ. σου to ἐν τ. καρδ. σου in ver. 8.—κύριον] as Lord (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 3, viii. 6; Phil. ii. 11). "In hac appellatione est summa fidei et salutis," Bengel. It refers to the question τῆς ἀναβ. εἰς τ. οὐρ., ver. 6; for the whole acknowledgment of the heavenly κυρίας of Jesus as the σώματος of God is conditioned by the acknowledgment of the preceding descent from heaven, the incarnation of the Son of God; viii. 3; Gal. iv.

passage has therefore more probative force in favour of that doctrine than Güder, Lehre von der Erschein. Christi unter d. Todten, p. 20 f., is willing to accord to it.

1 So van Hengel and others. But by τοις πιστις the ῥῆμα in ver. 8 is already completely defined.

2 Which is not with Hofmann to be leaped over, so that ἦγος refers to ἐγγός σοι τῷ ῥῆμα ἐστιν, and introduces the reason why it is that we have this word so near, in the mouth and in the heart. Hofmann strangely objects to the view taken above, that not ἦγος, but γὰρ, must then have been used. Why so?
4; Phil. ii. 6, et al. — τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ νεκρῶν] corresponds to the question of ver. 7. — σωθήσεται] corresponds to ζήσεται in ver. 6, but characterizes the latter, according to the doctrinal system of the apostle (i. 16, v. 9, 10, et al.), as a deliverance from destruction to the Messianic salvation. — The confession of the mouth (of high essential importance for the relations of every time, and peculiarly of that time!) and faith in the heart are not separate things, as though one without the other had as its consequence the σωτηρία, but they are mutually dependent requisites. Comp. Knapp, p. 565 ff. — The resurrection of the Lord here appears, as suggested by ver. 7, and according to iv. 25 quite justly, as the object of that faith which makes blessed. Without it, His death would not be the atoning death, 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18, nor would He Himself be the Son of God, i. 4.

Ver. 10. Elucidation of ver. 9. With πνευμ. and ὑμοῖς. Jesus is not to be supplied as subject (Hofmann), which is not even in accordance with the linguistic usage of the N. T., for 1 Tim. iii. 16 has a singular poetical style; but the contents of the faith and of the confession are understood, according to ver. 9, entirely of themselves. "With the heart, namely (γὰρ), one believes unto righteousness, but with the mouth confesses unto salvation." In the style of Hebrew parallelism the thought is thus expressed: "With the faith of the heart is united the confession of the mouth to the result that one obtains righteousness and salvation." The righteousness obtained through faith would, forsooth, fall to the ground again, and would not be attended by salvation, if faith had not the vital force to produce confession of the mouth (which speaks out of the fulness of the heart); see Matt. x. 32; comp. 2 Cor. iv. 13. We have thus here no merely formal parallelism, but one framed according to the actual relation of the dispensation of salvation; and in this case, moreover, Paul observes the genetic sequence in καρδίᾳ...στόματι, because he is now no longer dependent on ver. 8.

Ver. 11. Now, after that grand proposition: τέλος νόμον Χριστός κ.τ.λ. (ver. 4), has been proved from Moses himself (vv. 5–8), and this proof has received its confirmatory discus-
sion (vv. 9, 10), Paul brings forward, as if for the solemn sealing of all this, once more that weighty word of Scripture which he has already adduced in ix. 33. But this scriptural saying (Isa. xxviii. 16) now receives, with the object of closely connecting with it what is further to follow, the significant addition of the universal element πᾶς (perhaps already with a regard to Joel iii. 5), which indeed is found neither in the LXX. nor in the Hebrew; but in the unlimited ὁ πιστεύων in Isaiah, ground and justification for its appearance was found to the apostle's mind, since he had the sacred historical fulfilment of the prophecy before his eyes, and therein its more particular definitive character.

Ver. 12. Elucidation of πᾶς.—οὐ γὰρ ἐστι διαστ. Ἰονᾶς τε καὶ Ἔλλην. in respect, namely, to the bestowal of blessing on the believing, ver. 11. Comp. iii. 22. — For the Lord of all is one and the same. This κύριος is Christ (Origen, Chrysostom, Calovius, Wolf, Bengel, Böhme, Tholuck, Flatt, Rückert, de Wette, Fritzsche, Philippi, Hofmann, and several others), the αἰτής of ver. 11, and the κύριος of ver. 13, who is necessarily identical with this αἰτής. Were God intended (Theodoret, Theophylact, Grotius, and many, including Ammon, Reiche, Köllner, Ewald, Umbreit, van Hengel, Krummacher), it would in fact be necessary first to suggest the Christian character of the demonstration (as Olshausen: "God in Christ").

— κύριος πάντων] comp. Phil. ii. 11; Acts x. 36; Rom. xiv. 9. — πιστεύω] comp. Eph. iii. 8: "Quem nulla quamvis magna credentium multitudo exhaure potest," Bengel. In what He was rich, the Christian consciousness understood of itself; it is contained also in the previous καταυχυθήσεται and in the subsequent σωθήσεται,—namely, in grace and salvation. Comp. v. 15, xi. 33, and on 2 Cor. xiii. 13. — eis πάντας] for all, for the benefit of all. See Bernhardy, p. 219; Maetzner, ad Lycurg. 85. — The calling upon Christ, who nowhere in the N. T. appears as identical with the Jehovah of the O. T. (in opposition to Philippi), is not the worshipping absolutely, as it takes place only in respect of the Father, as the one absolute God; but rather worship according to that relativity in the consciousness of the worshipper, which is conditioned by the
relation of Christ to the Father (whose Son of like nature, image, partner of the throne, mediator and advocate on behalf of men, etc., He is). This is not imported as an Origenistic gloss (Philippi), but is necessarily founded on the dependence and subordination in which even the glorified God-man Christ, in virtue of His munus regium, stands in relation to the Father; see on 1 Cor. iii. 23, xi. 3, xv. 28. Comp. Lücke, de invocat. J. Chr., Gott. 1843. He who calls upon Christ is conscious that he does not call upon Him as the absolute God, but as the divine-human Representative and Mediator of God exalted to the divine glory, in whom God's adequate revelation of salvation has been given. To the mediatorial relation of Christ Hofmann also reverts.¹ Comp. on Phil. ii. 10, 11; 1 Cor. i. 2.

Ver. 13. Ground assigned for εἰς πάντας τὸν ἐπικαλ. αἰτίον, ver. 12, and that with words of Scripture from Joel iii. 5. This passage (LXX. ii. 32, closely following the LXX.) treats of the coming in of the Messianic era; hence Paul might refer κυπλοῦ, which in the original points to God, justly to Christ, who has appeared in the name of God, and continually rules as His Representative and Revealer, and Mediator, whose name was now the very specific object of the Christian calling on the Lord. That Paul writes not αἰτίον, but κυπλοῦ, is from no particular motive (against Hofmann); he simply reproduces the words of Scripture, which he presumes to be well known and makes his own.

Vv. 14–21. In order to realize this calling upon the Lord, proclaimers of the gospel had of necessity to be sent forth; nevertheless all did not obey the gospel; in which case neither does this excuse avail, that they had not heard the preaching (ver. 18); nor that, that Israel did not recognise the universality of the preaching (ver. 19 ff.). Thus, following up 1–13, there is still further set forth the people's own guilt in their exclusion.

Vv. 14, 15. Introduction: In order now that men should

¹ According to Hofmann, the promise attached to the calling on Jehovah is regarded by the apostle as valid in New Testament times, for those, and those only, who place their confidence of salvation on Jesus and thus call on Him.
call on the name of the Lord, it is necessary that they should have been believing, hearing, preaching, and that the sending forth of preachers should have taken place, which sending forth also the Scripture prophecies. The object of this introduction is not already to cut off every way of escape from the Jews (Chrysostom, Theodoret, and several others, including Köllner), for this is spoken of for the first time in ver. 18 ff.; but the necessity of the evangelical ἀποστολή is first of all to be established generally, in order then to make the disobedience of the Jews stand out with the force of contrast. Grotius and Michaelis see in vv. 14, 15 a Jewish objection, which alleges that the gospel had not been preached to all the Jews in the world, etc.; Paul then answers in ver. 16 ff. But how unsuitably he would have answered! Must he not, before everything else, make good—what he only brought in at ver. 18—that all Jews had heard the announcement of the gospel? The objection here assumed is made by Paul himself in ver. 18. — οὖν] draws an inference from ver. 13: How shall they accordingly (in pursuance of the requirement of ἐπικαλέσθαι contained in ver. 13) call on, etc.? On the future of ethical possibility, see Winer, p. 262 [E. T. 348]. Important codd. and Lachm. have, instead of the futures, the deliberative subjunctive aorists: How should they, etc.? The attestation in the case of the different verbs, of which Tisch. 8. likewise reads the subjunctive forms, although he retains instead of ἀκούσωσιν the future form ἀκούσωνται, is so unequal, that we can come to no decision. Comp. generally Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 734 f. The subject to ἐπικαλέσωνται κ.τ.λ. is those who, according to the passage of Scripture in ver. 13, shall attain to salvation through calling on the name of the Lord; that to κηρύξωσιν and ἀποστάλη, the κηρύσσοντες. The impersonal rendering (Fritzsche, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Philippi, van Hengel, and several others) has against it the fact that κηρύξῃ has not the same general subject as the foregoing verbs. — εἰς δὲ οὖν ἐνίοτε.] Him, on whom they have not become believing; see Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 92. — πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν κ.τ.λ.] Rightly the Vulg.: "Quomodo credent ei, quem non audierunt." οὐ is not an adverb of place (Hofmann); for thus after εἰς οὖν
the symmetry of the discourse would only be heterogeneously disturbed. Nor can it denote de quo (Luther, Castalio, and many, including Philippi and van Hengel), since ἀκούειν τινός in the sense of ἀκ. περὶ τινός, without a participle annexed, is entirely foreign both to the N. T. and to Greek prose (Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 9 is a case of attracted genitive); and in Homer only, Od. iv. 114, is the solitary instance of it found. See Kühner, II. 1, p. 309; Buttmann, Progr. über d. syntakt. Verbind. der Verba ἀκούειν and ἀκροασθαι, Potsd. 1855, pp. 7, 12, and neut. Gr. p. 144 f. Just as little is the object, i.e. the contents of the preaching heard, meant by οὗ, which would rather be expressed by ὅν (Eph. iv. 21); but rather the speaking subject, who is listened to as he from whom the discourse proceeds (Mark vi. 20, vii. 14; Luke ii. 46, et al.; Winer, p. 187 [E. T. 249]), Christ being in this case conceived of as speaking through His preachers (see the following); comp. Eph. ii. 17. On the general thought, comp. Plat. Rep. p. 327 C: ἦ καὶ δύναςθαι ἂν, ἦ δ' ὃς, πείσαι μὴ ἀκούνοντας; — χειρὶς κηρύσσοντι] without their having a preacher, apart from a preacher. Comp. Tittmann, Synon. p. 95; who, however, wrongly explains, οὗ πιστεύοντες τῷ κηρύσσοντι. — ἀποσταλῶσι] Whence? διὰ ἰηματος θεου, ver. 17, informs us.—The form of the argument is a sorites, and its conclusion: The appointment of evangelical heralds is the first condition in order to bring about the calling upon the Lord. This retrograde sorites thus leads us back to the source; and of the ἀποστολῇ thus suggesting itself as primarily necessary, the prophetic confirmation from Isa. lxi. 7 (not closely after the LXX.) is then given. This “dulcissimum dictum” (Melanchthon), because it speaks of the message of blissful liberation from exile, therein possesses the Messianic character, as concerning the restoration of the theocracy; and therefore is legitimately understood by Paul—in connection with the Messianic idea and its historical fulfilment—as a prophecy of the evangelical preachers. These preach salvation (σωτηρία), meaning in Isaiah also not merely peace, but the neo-

---

1 Comp. the Homeric ἐυλάβεσθαι τινος, equivalent to ἐπὶ τινος (Näbelabach, Ilias, p. 104, ed. 3).

2 Comp. Hengstenberg, Christol. II. p. 252.
cratic saving deliverance), preach good (ἦν); that is, still more generally, omne quod felix faustumque est, which is to be received through Christ, the accomplisher of the divine dominion. That the Rabbins also understood the passage in a Messianic sense, and in what way, see Wetstein.—The opposite of the poetical: how pleasant are the feet (i.e. how welcome the arrival), etc., at iii. 15; Acts v. 9; Neh. i. 15; see Schaefer, ad Eur. Or. 1217; Boeckh, Expl. Pind. p. 281; Wunder, ad Soph. El. 1357 f. p. 120.

Ver. 16. 'Αλλ' contrast to the prophetic saying of ver. 15: But notwithstanding that accordingly the blessed sending forth of messengers of salvation did not fail to take place—all did not obey the message of salvation, all did not submit to the requirement (of faith), which the glad news concerning Messiah and His kingdom placed before them; comp. i. 5, xvi. 26; 2 Thess. i. 8. With Theodore of Mopsuestia, who takes ἄλλα' οὐ κ.τ.λ. as a question (comp. Theodoret), Reiche thinks that ἄλλα'ἔδωργ. is an opponent's objection, which Paul accordingly repels by the passage from Isaiah. Against this view the presence of the following γάρ would not be decisive—it would rather be quite in its proper place in the reply (Herm. ad Viger. p. 829; Hartung, Partikell. I. p. 473 f.)—but vv. 18 and 19 (comp. xi. 1, 11), to which Reiche appeals, testify directly against it, because there ἄλλα' is found. Fritzsche, following Carpzov, refers οὖ πάντες to the Gentiles, of whom, however, although van Hengel also understands them to be intended in vv. 14, 15, nothing is said in the whole context; hence it is not to be even taken quite generally (Hofmann), but is to be referred textually to the Jews, of whom so many, notwithstanding that the lovely feet of the messengers of salvation came to tread amongst them, yielded no result. The negative expression for this multitude is a litotes, forbearing, but making it felt quite tragically enough, that the opposite of οὖ πάντες should have been found. Comp. iii. 3: ἡ πιστησάν τινες. — γάρ] prophetic confirmation of the sad phenomenon (οὖ πάντες κ.τ.λ.), which thus, as already predicted, enters into the connection of divine destiny, and is not an accidental occurrence. This Hofmann
misapprehends, extending the reference of the γὰρ to the following ἄρα ἡ πίστις κ.τ.λ., which is impossible on account of the ἄρα commencing a new sentence, since Paul has not written εἰ γὰρ Ἰσαάς λέγει κ.τ.λ. . . . ἄρα ἡ πίστις κ.τ.λ., whereby to these latter words would fall the definition of the citation, as Hofmann thinks.— In the lament of the author of Isa. liii. 1 (closely following the LXX., even with the κύριε added by them) over the unbelief of his time in the prophetic preaching (ἀκοή, see on Gal. iii. 2), Paul sees—and on account of the Messianic character of the entire chapter justly—a prophecy of the Jewish unbelief of Christian times in the Christian preaching. Comp. John xii. 38. Following Syr., Calovius, and others, Umbreit and Hengstenberg, Christol. II. p. 307, take ἀκοή as the thing heard, i.e. “that which is announced to us through the word of God (by revelation).” But the very following ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς shows, that Paul did not wish to be understood as meaning the divine communication which the preacher received, but the preaching of that word heard by the listeners. The historic aorist corresponds closely to ἅπηκουσαν. We may add that Theophylact rightly remarks: τὸ τίς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀκοῆς ἐνταῦθα τοπεστήθη ἐπιστέυσαν.

Ver. 17. Inference from the prophetic passage, with the view of substantially recapitulating what was said in ver. 14, and then pursuing the subject in ver. 18.—[ἀκοή] the same as in ver. 16, the announcement, which is heard; comp. on John xii. 38. From this comes faith; the heard preaching of the gospel brings about in men's minds faith on Christ; but preaching is brought about by God's behest (Luke iii. 2; Matt. iv. 4; Heb. xi. 3), set to work by the fact that God commands preachers to their office. Rightly have Beza, Piscator, Semler, Cramer, Fritzche, Glöckler, Tholuck, Baumgarten-Crusius, so understood ῥήμα Θεοῦ. For the ordinary interpretation of it, also followed by Hofmann, as the preached word of God, is incorrect for this reason, that according to it ῥήμα Θεοῦ in point of fact would not be different from ἀκοή; and this ῥήμα Θεοῦ does not point back to ver. 8, but to ἀποσταλὼσι in ver. 15, as the remaining contents of the verse show, so that
the signification saying obtains textually the more precise definition of its sense as behest. But when ἀκοὴ has been taken in two different senses in ver. 16 and ver. 17, so that in ver. 16 it signifies the preaching, but in ver. 17 the hearing (Rückert, de Wette, Philippi, according to whom the preaching is to be analysed into its two elements, the hearing and the word of God, comp. Tholuck); or when in διὰ ρῆματος Θεοῦ, instead of “God’s word,” divine revelation has been substituted (Reiche, van Hengel, comp. Olshausen, who explains it as equivalent to διὰ πνεύματος Θεοῦ): these are just make-shifts in order to separate the incorrectly assumed notion of ῥῆμα Θεοῦ from that of ἀκοὴ. — How could Paul infer also ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ρῆματος Θεοῦ from Isaiah? Certainly not from the mere address κύριε, but rather from the whole attitude of the prophet towards God, as it is expressed in κύριε . . . ἡμῶν,— an attitude in which the prophet stands as the servant and ambassador of God, so that God thus appears as He on whose saying, i.e. on whose command, the ἀκοὴ is preached.

Ver. 18. A perhaps possible exculpation for the Jews is suggested by Paul as a spontaneous objection, and that in the form of a question to be negatived, and is then repelled with words from Scripture. “But I ask: Was it then in any way not possible for them to come to faith εἴ ἀκοῇ? The preaching surely did not remain unheard by them, surely did not fail to come at all to their ears?” The correct view is simply and clearly given by Chrysostom. Incorrectly Hofmann: After Paul has introduced the prophet as speaking, he leaps over to the saying something himself, which that prophetic saying suggests to him. Against this may be urged, (1) that not here for the first time, but already in ver. 17, it is Paul who

---

1 That ἀκοῇ may denote hearkening, listening to, is undoubted. See Plato, Theaet. p. 142 D; Diod. xix. 41. But more usually it denotes, even in the classics, either the faculty of hearing, or, as here, the thing heard. Comp. on Gal. iii. 2.

2 In which they cannot succeed, however, for εἴ ἀκοῇ in fact could not be a hearkening in the abstract, but only the hearkening to the word of God (the gospel). So also, the thing heard would be even in itself the word of God; therefore we are not to explain, with van Hengel: “id verò, quod auditum est, debetur patefactioni divinæ.”
speaks; (2) that he, in placing himself in contradistinction to the prophet, must have written not merely ἄλλα λέγω, but ἄλλ’ ἐγὼ λέγω; (3) that ἄλλα λ. is not to be taken, with Hofmann, "Well! then I say," since in that case ἄλλα would have the sense of agreement or concession (see Baeumlein, Partik. p. 16), which is suitable neither here nor in ver. 19.1 The ἄλλα is the quite customary ἄλλα of objection, which is made by oneself or in the name of the opponent; Baeumlein, p. 13.— On the following question: Surely it cannot be that they have not heard? observe that οὐκ is closely joined to ήκουσαν, expressing the opposite of ήκουσαν (Baumlein, p. 277 f.; Winer, p. 476 [E. T. 642]; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 22), and that the interrogative μή supposes the negative answer: by no means has it remained unheard by them, which negation of the οὐκ ήκουσαν implies the assertion of the ήκουσαν.— ήκουσαν] so. τὴν ἀκοήν. The subject is those who remained unbelieving (οὐ πάντες ὑπήκ., ver. 16), by whom Paul certainly means the Jews, although without expressing it directly and exclusively. The reference to the Gentiles (Origen, Calvin, Fritzsche, and others, including van Hengel and Krummacher) is quite foreign to the connection; comp. on ver. 15.— μενούνης] imo vero.2 See on ix. 20. — εἰς πᾶσαν κ.τ.λ.] from Ps. xix. 5 (close after the LXX.), where the subject spoken of is the universally diffused natural revelation of God; Paul clothes in these sacred words the expression of the going forth (ἐξῆλθεν, aor.) everywhere of the preaching of the gospel. Comp. Justin, c. Tryph. 42, Apol. i. 40. — ο ὕψων αἰτῶν] their sound, the sound which the preachers (to these, according to the connection, αἰτῶν refers, which in the psalm refers to heaven, the handiworks of God, day and night) send forth while they preach. In the LXX. it is a translation of ὄψις, which some have understood, with Luther, as their measuring line (comp. Hupfeld), some, and rightly so, according to the

1 Hofmann appeals without pertinence to Hartung, II. p. 85. For the pro-indé in challenges or exclamations is here entirely heterogeneous.

2 Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly says: το μενούνης ἔτει λέγει: αἰκρῆσας... λέον το ζητούμενον. Comp. on the μεν introducing a correcting answer, Hermann, ad Viger. p. 845; Pfugk, ad Eur. Hec. 1261; Kühner, II. 2, p. 711.
parallelism, with the LXX., Symm., Syr., Vulg., and most expositors, as their sound. — The answer μενόνης κ.τ.λ. (in which, moreover, Paul does not adduce the passage from the Psalms as a quotation) confutes the οὐκ ἔκουσαν very forcibly, because it argues a majori, and even applies to all the Jews of the dispersion. But the conclusion that, according to our present passage, the gospel had at that time actually penetrated everywhere (even to China, America, etc.), is simply an arrant mistake, contrary to the nature of the popularly poetical expression, although, in imitation of the older commentators, renewed by Löhe (v. d. Kirche, p. 34 ff.), and Pistorius in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1846, II. p. 40. The universal extension of the gospel (comp. Col. i. 6, 23; Clem. Cor. i. 5) set on foot by the apostles on a sufficiently large scale, is continually in course of development. Comp. xi. 25, 26.

Ver. 19. A further possible exculpation,1 introduced in emphatic conformity with the preceding, and the repelling of it by means of scriptural declarations down to ver. 21. On ἀλλά Theodore of Mopsuestia rightly observes: πάλιν ἔτεραν ἀντίθεσε σε ἑπάγει. — μὴ Ἰσραήλ οὐκ έγνω; surely it did not remain unknown to the Israelites? The “it” to be supplied with έγνω (see Nägelsbach, z. Pías, p. 120, ed. 3) is: δὲ εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξελεύσεται ὁ θεός αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. This universal destination of the preaching of Christ expressed in ver. 18 must have been known by the Jews, for long ago Moses and also Isaiah had prophesied the conversion of the Gentiles—Isaiah likewise, the refractory spirit of opposition thereto of the Jews (vv. 20, 21). This reference of οὐκ έγνω alone (followed also by de Wette, Fritzsche, and Tholuck) flows purely in accordance with the text from what immediately precedes, and is at the same time naturally in keeping with the contents of the corresponding biblical passages; for the conversion of the Gentiles and the universality of Christianity are

1 The correctness of which would in turn weaken the blameableness pointed out in ver. 18. Comp. Chrys.

2 Those previously meant (in opposition to Hofmann) are here expressly named — which indicates a climax of the increasing urgency of the question, and which is the more naturally suggested to Paul, since he has already in view a prophecy directed to the people in contrast to the Gentiles (ver. 21).
one; since the former was prophesied to the Jews, the latter could not be unknown to them; and they could not therefore allege as the excuse for their unbelief: We did not know that Christianity is destined for the whole of humanity—the less could they do so, since Isaiah places before them the true source of their unbelief in their own spirit of resistance. The view of the passage which comes substantially nearest to ours, is that of Thomas Aquinas, Cornelius a Lapide, Piscator, Pareus, Toletus, Calovius, Turretine, Morus, Rosenmüller, Koppe, Benecke, Kollner, Ewald (comp. Tholuck), who supply with οὐκ ἐγνω: that the gospel would pass over from the Jews to the Gentiles. So Pelagius and Theodore of Mopsuestia: τὸ τοῦ ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσελήφθαι εἰς τὴν εὐσέβειαν. But this is wrong, in so far as the object to be supplied is not purely borrowed from the preceding, but is already in part anticipated from what follows. Beza has vaguely and erroneously supplied Deum with ἐγνω; Reithmayr, on the other hand, thinks no object is to be supplied; while others imagine the gospel to be the object (“Have they not learnt to know the gospel, in order to be able to believe in it?”). So Chrysostom, Vatablus, Gomarus, Hammond, Estius, and several others, including Rückert, Ols­hausen, van Hengel, Beyschlag, Mangold, and, with a peculiar turn, Philippi also; similarly Hofmann and others, taking up the following πρῶτος (see below). In that case—against which there is no objection in itself—μη Ἰσραήλ οὐκ ἐγνω would be so complete a parallel to μη οὐκ ἡκουσαν in ver. 18, that here, as there, the gospel would have to be supplied. But as this is by no means necessary (in opposition to Hofmann)—since it fully satisfies the symmetry of the discourse, if in both instances ἀλλὰ λέγω has its reference to what immediately precedes—so it is directly opposed by the fact, that the following reply beginning with πρῶτος would not be suitable. For if we were to assume that Paul has given an indirect answer (“when he shows that the Gentiles believe, he says: How should not, could not Israel have believed, if it had willed?” Olsh.), this would only be a makeshift, in which the answer would appear the more unsuitable in proportion to its indirectness, and still leave open the possibility of the οὐκ ἐγνω. Or if we were to
suppose with Rückert, that the thought is: "Want of knowledge is not the cause, but God is now putting into penal execution what He has threatened, and is allowing salvation to pass over to the Gentiles, in order thereby to convert the Jews to a better disposition," the point of the ἐγνω would not be entered into at all, and moreover, the essential part of the interpretation would simply be supplied by the reader. This objection is at the same time valid against van Hengel, according to whom it is to be made to appear from the following prophetic quotations that Israel had indeed known, but had shamefully despised, the gospel. Or if, finally, with Philippi, we are to say that the passages from the prophets contained not a refutation, but a substantiation, of the fact that verily Israel\(^1\) had rejected the gospel (which rejection lies in οἷκ ἐγνω), this would be inconsistent with the interrogative form with μὴ (comp. on iii. 5), which necessarily presupposes the denial\(^2\) of the οἷκ ἐγνω (consequently the affirmative: ἐγνω). In entire deviation from the views just given, Eeiche thinks that Ἰσραὴλ is accusative, and Θεὸς to be supplied as subject. "Did not God recognise Israel for His people? How could He permit it to be so blinded and hardened?" It is decisive against this view, that to supply Θεὸς as subject, especially after ver. 18, is highly arbitrary, and that the following passages of Scripture would be quite inappropriate.—πρὸτερος] not in the sense of πρῶτερος (which, regarded by itself, might indeed be the case according to the context; see on John i. 15);

\(^1\) Philippi paraphrases: "Is it conceivable that Israel precisely, the chosen people of God, did not recognise the Messianic εὐαγγελία destined in an especial manner for it, or the preaching thereof, while yet the Gentiles attained to this knowledge?" "The adduced passages from the prophets show now that there was by no means any cause of wonder over this fact, for thus exactly it had been predicted in the divine word,—namely, that the Gentiles would accept, but Israel would reject, the salvation."

\(^2\) Philippi, indeed, in eds. 2 and 3, proposes, in the event of the denial of the question being retained,—which, however, he does not concede,—the expedient, that then the prophetic passages might serve to prove that the fact of the prophecy, which appeared in itself incredible, had nevertheless occurred in correspondence therewith. But the contents of this thought would be invented, not gathered from the language; and self-contradictory besides, for the no would be involved in the question, and in πρῶτος u. s. l. the yes, which had yet occurred in accordance with prophecy.
but, since Moses is quoted, with whom the testimony of God in the O. T. begins: *as the first* (who in Scripture comes forward in opposition to this) *speaks* Moses. Of the later testimonies of Scripture, Paul then contented himself with adducing only the bold divine utterances of Isaiah. Theodore of Mopsuestia well gives it: ἑ ὅ τ ως Μωσής. Wetstein, Michaelis, Storr, Flatt, Hofmann, connect πρώτος with οὐκ ἔγνω. But the supposed sense: "Did not Israel first learn to know it (the gospel)?" or, as Hofmann expresses it: "Was it possibly to stand in such a position, that Israel did not obtain the first experience of it?" must have been expressed without μὴ. — ἕγω παρατείνω, κ.π.λ.]. Deut. xxxii. 21, almost exactly after the LXX. God there, in the song of Moses, threatens the idolatrous Israelites, that He on His part (ἐγὼ) will bless a Gentile people, and thereby incite the former to jealousy and to wrath, as they had incited Him by their worship of idols. Paul recognises in this—according to the rule of the constancy of the divine ways in the history of the development of the theocracy—a type of the attaining of the Gentiles to participation in the communion of God’s people, whereby the jealousy and wrath of the Jews will be excited.— ἐν' οὐκ ἔδει, in respect to a not-people; for only the people of God was the real one, the people corresponding to the divine idea of a people; every other is the negation of this idea. Comp. ix. 25; 1 Pet. ii. 10. On the connection of οὐ with nouns, cancelling the notion objectively, see Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 129; Grimm on 2 Mace. iv. 13. Often found in Thucydides (Kruger on i. 137. 4). On ἐν' over, on the ground, that is, on account of, comp. Demothenes, 1448. 4: παρατείνω-θέτων ἐν' τῷ γεγενημένῳ, Polyb. iv. 7. 5.— ἄνωτέρω] τῷ γαρ

1 By taking πρώτος with ἔγνω, there would result the quite preposterous sense of the question: Surely it is not possibly the case that Israel first remained unacquainted with it! i.e. that the Israelites were the first to whose knowledge the gospel had not come! Hofmann groundlessly refers to Buttmann, sect. Gr. p. 214, and explains as though οὖν did not qualify ἔγνω, but πρώτος, as though consequently Paul had said: μὴ ἰσραήλ οὐ πρώτος ἔγνω. This would be: Surely Israel has not experienced it only in the second place (the Gentile world in the first)! With strange incorrectness, Hofmann says that, according to our way of taking πρώτος, οὐ should stand instead of ἔγνω. Moses speaks and writes (ver. 5) still at this day as πρώτος in the O. T.
Vv. 20, 21. *Δέ* marking the transition to another prophet, as at ix. 27. — *ἀποτολμᾷ κ. λέγει* is emboldened and says. The latter is the immediate consequence of the former; hence here not a Hebraizing mode of expression for the adverbial notion (*he freely speaks out*), but *ἀποτολμ. is absolute* (Hom. II. x. 232, xii. 51, et al.). Comp. Winer, p. 437 f., Butt- mann, p. 249; and see Maetzner, ad Antiph. p. 173; Hom. II. i. 92: θάρσησε καὶ ἠδὰ μάντις. — *ἀποτολμᾷ* ἐβιάσατο γυμνὴν εἰπεῖν τὴν ἁλήθειαν καὶ κυνυνεῖσαι ἢ ἀποσωπήσαι, Theophylact. Yet the prophet of bold speech is represented as present, as previously Moses in *λέγει*. The citation is Isa. lxv. 1, freely from the LXX., and with undesigned transposition of the two parallel clauses. According to its historical sense, the passage refers to the *Jews* who had become apostate from God through immorality and idolatry, on whose behalf the prophet has just begged for grace, to which entreaty Jehovah begins His answer by reminding them how He had given Himself to be found, and revealed Himself with prevenient undeserved kindness to the faithless people. But in the apostate Israel, which was in fact sunk into an *idolatrous* condition (see esp. Isa. lxiv. 6, lxv. 3 ff.), and in the relation to it which Jehovah here affirms of Himself, Paul sees a *typical representation of the Gentile world*, which (as ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, Eph. ii. 12) did not concern itself about God, but to which God has given Himself to be found, and (epexegetical parallel) to be recognised in His self-revelation (through the gospel). The Gentiles have accepted this prevenient divine compassion, but Israel in its obstinate apostasy has *resisted* it; hence Paul continues in ver. 21 with πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραήλ ἡμῖν. The latter clearly indicates that Paul really found in ver. 20 the prophetical reference to the *Gentile world* (of which Israel is the opposite); and not, as Hofmann with strict adherence to the historical sense of the original supposes, the *fruitlessness of the divine long-suffering towards Israel*, which

1 Not to the *Gentiles* (Calvin, Vitringa, Philippi). See, on the other hand, Delitzsch on Isa.
justifies God's dealing if He now rests not until He has requited its disobedience. According to this interpretation, πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ would have been already said in ver. 20, against which view ver. 21 testifies. — εἰρθήνυ] not: "I have allowed myself to be found" (Reiche and others), but: I have been found. On the sense, comp. Acts xvii. 27; and on the connection of εἰρ. and ἐμφ. ἐγευ, Wisd. i. 1 f. The aorists are, in the sense of the apostle, to be understood of that which has taken place in the Christian present.— τοῦ ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπηρωσ.] who inquired not of me, namely, respecting revelation; comp. Ezek. xx. 1; Dem. 1072. 12. — Ver. 21. τοῦ not adversus (Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Toletus, Grotius, Cramer, Koppe), since in itself—without a more special indication of the text which would yield the hostile sense—it denotes only the simple placing in contrast. Hence, either: in reference to Israel (Estius, Wolf, Ch. Schmidt, and others, including Tholuck, de Wette, Fritzsche, Philippi), like Heb. i. 7, 8, Luke xii. 41, xx. 19; or, "in the case of Israel He declares" (Köllner, Rückert, Ewald, and others, following Luther and Vulg.). The former view, which is adopted also by van Hengel, is to be preferred for this reason, that δὲ introduces a contrast, not with those to whom the previous passage was directed, but with those to whom it refers in respect of its figurative application.— λέγει] Isaiah, namely. That he speaks in the name of God, is understood of itself.— δλην τὴν ἡμέρ.] the whole day, like viii. 36. Expresses the unremitting nature of the love.— ἄνισθ. κ. ἀνιλέγοντα] present participle, denoting the continuance of the conduct. ἀνιλέγ. is not to be explained, with Grotius, Reiche, Fritzsche, van Hengel, and most, as to be refractory, which it does not mean, but to contradict. The Jews—although God stretched out His saving hands towards them from early morning till evening (comp. Prov. i. 24)—are disobedient, and say: We will not! Comp. Matt. xxiii. 37; Tit. ii. 9; 3 Macc. ii. 28; Lucian. D. M. xxx. 3; and see on John xix. 12. Also in Achilles Tatius, v. 27 (in opposition to Kypke and Fritzsche), ἀνιλέγεων is conceived as contradiction; as also ἄνιλεγολα, Heb. xii. 3. Note how opposed the passage is to absolute predestination, and particularly to the Calvinistic "voluntas beneplaciti et signi."
CHAPTER XL

Ver. 1. After τ. λαῦν αἰτοῦ, A D* K** and some Fathers have ἕν προϊγειν. So Lachm. in brackets. An addition from ver. 2. — Ver. 2. After Ἰσραὴλ Elz. has λίγων, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 3. τά θυσιαστ. Elz.: καὶ τὰ θυσ., against so important witnesses, that καὶ would appear a connective addition. Comp. the LXX. — Ver. 6. The addition in Elz., εἰ δὲ εἰς ἑργαν, οὐκέτι ἵνα χάρις: ἵνα τὸ ἑργαν οὐκέτι ἵνα ἑργαν, is wanting in A C D E F G P K*, 47, Copt. Sah. Arm. Vulg. It. Dam. Ruin., and all the Latin Fathers. An old interpolation (found already in B L K*, Syr. Arr. Chrys.), with a view to the completion of the proof; rejected by Erasmus, Grotius, Wetstein, Griesbach, Scholz, Lachm.; adopted, indeed, by Tisch. 7, but again omitted in ed. 8; after Beza, Bengel, Matthiae, Rinck, defended most thoroughly by Fritzsche and Reiche (in opp. to his Commentary) in the Comment. Crit. I. p. 68 ff. But considering the preponderance of the opposing testimony, the completely superfluous character of the proposition in the argument, and the anomalous form in which the words appear in the principal Codex which contains them (B: εἰ δὲ εἰς ἑργαν, οὐκέτι χάρις: ἵνα τὸ ἑργαν οὐκέτι ἵνα χάρις), and also the other variations in detail (see Tisch. 8), the defences of them are not convincing. See also van Hengel. The argument for retaining them, on the ground that an interpolator would have framed them more closely in conformity with the first half of the verse, is weakened by the fact that very ancient authorities have ἵνα instead of γίνεται also in the first half of the verse. — Ver. 7. τῷ πρὸ Elz.: τῷ πρὸ, against decisive evidence. An emendation in accordance with the usual construction. — Ver. 13. γὰρ Lachm., Tisch. 8: δὲ, according to A B P K, min. Syr. Copt. Damasc. Theodoret. ms.; C has ὅπω; Aeth. utr. no particle. With such divided testimony, δὲ is the best supported, and to be preferred; it came to be glossed by more definite particles. — μίν] is wanting in D E F G, min., which was occasioned by the apparent absence of reference for the μίν. Lachm., Tisch. 8: μίν ὅπω, according to A B C P K, Copt., which has therefore the external attestation decidedly in its favour, but is to be explained from the fact that the unrelated μίν was glossed by ὅπω (a new sentence was
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198 commenced with τ' δεδ (τ' δεδ); therefore these authorities indirectly pass over to the side of the otherwise weakly accredited Recepta. — Ver. 17. της μης καί] This καί is wanting in B C Κ*, Copt. Omitted by Tisch. 8; but how easily it might be suppressed, owing to the homoeoteleuta! In D* F G, codd. It. Ir., της μης is also wanting from the like cause. — Ver. 19. κλάδων] So Rinck, Scholz, Lachm., Tisch. 8, according to decisive testimony. But Elz. and Tisch. 7 have των κλάδων, the article being mechanically introduced in imitation of των κλάδων, vv. 17, 18. Were των original, and had it been desired through its omission to designate the των των κλάδων in ver. 17 (Matth., Fritzsche), it would have more readily occurred to the mechanical tendency of copyists to insert των instead of των. — Ver. 20. υψηλοφόνοι] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: υψηλά φρένα, according to A B Κ. Resolution of the word—which is only found besides in 1 Tim. vi. 17—into its elements in conformity with xii. 16. — Ver. 21. μήτως] is wanting in A B C Κ*, min., Copt. Damasc. Ruf. Ang. Omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8. But the offence which was taken partly at the apparent unrelatedness of μήτως (which is therefore exchanged in Or. for πώσω μάλλον and πώσω γλίνη), partly at the following future, readily induced the omission. For φιέσαται, which Elz. has instead of φιέσαται, is very feebly supported by evidence, and has manifestly come in in accordance with the original μήτως; wrongly defended anew by Rinck. See the exegetical notes; comp. also Beng. Apparal. Crit.— Ver. 22. In the second clause Lachm. and Tisch. have, instead of άντωμαία, άντωμα, and instead of χρηστότητα, χρηστότης Θεού; the former according to A B C Κ*, min., Copt. Damasc. Ruf. Ang.; the latter according to A B C D* (Κ has χρηστότης Θεού), 67**, Arm. Or. Eus. Damasc. Rightly; the common reading is a hasty grammatical emendation. Θεού, too, bears, in its belonging to the reading χρηστότης, the stamp of genuineness. — Ver. 25. παρ' ιαυ.] Lachm. and Tisch. 7: in iaur., according to A B, Damasc. The latter is to be preferred (παρ' ιαυ. was introduced through a comparison of xii. 16), and it explains, too, the origin of the bare ιαυος in F G; for by the omission of the N the preposition would easily come to be dropped. — Ver. 30. ιματία] Elz., Scholz: καί ιματία, against decisive evidence. — Ver. 31. Before εληθ. B D* Κ, Copt. Dam. have τως; so Lachm. in brackets, and Tisch. 8. Inappropriate addition, arising from misconception, instead of which some min. have υστερο. — Ver. 32. τως πάντας] Instead of the first τ. ι., D. Ir. et al. have τά πάντα, and F G πάντα. Also Vulg. It. express the neuter, however, is taken from Gal. iii. 22.
CONTENTS:—After the humiliation hitherto expressed, there now follows the consolation in respect to the exclusion of a large part of Israel. (1) God has not cast off His people, but has allowed a part of them, according to a gracious election, to attain to salvation, and has hardened the remainder, vv. 1–10. (2) Yet God wills not their final destruction; nay, their unbelief subserves the salvation of the Gentiles, and their conversion will have yet more happy consequences. This is matter for hope, and the Gentile Christians may not therefore give way to self-exaltation, vv. 11–24. (3) For the hardening of a portion of the people will last no longer than until the whole of the Gentiles have become Christians; and then Israel will obtain salvation, vv. 25–32. How unfathomable are the riches, wisdom, and knowledge of God! To Him be glory! vv. 33–36.

Ver. 1. Δέγω οὖν] corresponds to the twofold ἀλλὰ λέγω, x. 18, 19, but so, that now this third interrogative λέγω is introduced in an inferential form. In consequence, namely, of what had just been clearly laid down in x. 18 ff., as to the guilt of resistant Israel in its exclusion from salvation in Christ—over-against the Gentiles' acceptance of it—the difficult question might arise: Surely God has not cast off His people? Surely it is not so tragic a fate, that we must infer it from that conduct of the people?¹ Paul states this question, earnestly negatives it, and then sets forth the real state of the matter. The opinion of Hofmann, that the apostle starts this question because the scriptural passages x. 18 ff. show that it is to be negated, is the consequence of his incorrect interpretation of those scriptural sayings, and is confuted by the fact that the negation is first given and supported in what follows, not drawn from what precedes, but made good by a quite different scriptural proof, ver. 2.—μη ἀπώσατο κ.τ.λ.] Comp. Ps. xciv. 14, xcv. 3; 1 Sam. xii. 32; on the form, see Winer, p. 86 [E.T. 111]. Reiche thinks, but erroneously, that the question is not expressed

¹ Namely, as a divine measure of retribution taken in consequence of their spirit of resistance to the message of salvation preached to them. The divine act of casting off from Himself is not viewed as the cause (against this is x. 21), but as the penal consequence, of the disdaining God's loving will.
sharply enough, and that ἀπαντά is to be supplied. Ἀπώσασι has in truth the emphasis, and is placed first on that account; so that Paul’s simple idea is, that the casting off of God’s people, exclusion from the divine decree of the bestowal of salvation, recall of this destination to salvation, may not be inferred from what has gone before. Rightly, too, Bengel remarks: “Ipsa populi ejus appellatio rationem negandi continet.” This ratio negandi is then, in ver. 2, additionally strengthened by ἐν προέγνω. — The μὴ γένοντο expresses horror at the ἀπώσασι, not at the λέγω (van Hengel), as though Paul had written simply ἀπώσασι without μὴ. — καὶ γὰρ ἑγὼ κ.τ.λ. For I also, etc., expresses the motive for μὴ γένοντο! For Paul, as a true Israelite of patriotic feeling, cannot, in virtue of his theocratic self-esteem, admit that ἀπώσασι, but can only repel the suggestion with abhorrence. Comp. de Wette and Baumgarten-Crusius. A peculiar proof of the ὥς ἀπώσασι was yet to follow. Usually it is thought that Paul proves the negation by his own example, since he in truth was not cast off. So also Philippi. But apart from the consideration, that the example of a single elected one, however highly favoured,1 would be far from convincing, we see no reason why Paul should have added ἐκ σπέρμ. Ἀβρ., φυλ. Βειναμ.; moreover, it appears from ver. 2, where he defines the negation, emphatically reiterates it, and then confirms it from Scripture, that he did not intend till ver. 2 to aduce the argument against the ἀπώσασι, which he had only provisionally rejected in ver. 1. Without the least indication from the text, Hofmann introduces into κ. ἑγὼ the reference: Even I, the apostle entrusted with the calling of the Gentile world (which is supposed to imply a sealing of the sacred historical call of Israel); even I, as once upon a time a persecutor, deserving of rejection. — ἐκ σπέρμ. Ἀβρ., φυλ. Βειναμ.] added, in order to exhibit the just and genuine privileges of his birth. Comp. Phil. iii. 5; Acts xiii. 21; Test. XII. Patr. p. 746 f. The tribe of Benjamin was in truth, along with that of Judah, the theocratic core of the nation after the exile. Es. iv. 1, x. 9.

1 Theodore of Mopsuestia asks: τῶν γὰρ ἄνω... τι ἐν ἀπώσασι τιθέναι τῷ Θεῷ τῷ ἔχως πατέρες εἰρημένων καὶ πρὸς τοῖς οἰκονομίας ἐνδείξιν ὑπερτελείως ἢ;
CHAP. XI. 2.

Ver. 2. Ὄν προέγνω] An element which renders the impossibility of ἀπώσατο at once palpable; comp. ver. 29. Others take it as a limiting definition, τὸν λ. αὐτοῦ δν πρ. being understood of the spiritual people of God destined to the Christian salvation (Origen, Augustine, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, and others, including Heumann, Semler, Rosenmüller, Flatt, Glockler). But against this view it is decisive that τ. λαὸν αὐτ. in ver. 1, without any limitation, denotes the Jewish nation, and consequently Paul himself would now completely disarrange the point in question; the whole chapter has for its subject, not the spiritual Israel, but the fate of the nation in respect to the salvation of Messiah. Hence, too, we are not to supply, with Philippi, p. 554, after δν προέγνω the limitation: as seminary of the spiritual πράγμα.— The sense of προέγνω has been understood as variously as in viii. 29, but is to be taken just as there: God knew His people as such beforehand, before it actually existed; that is to say, it was to Him, to whom the whole future development of sacred history was present in His pretemporal counsel and plan, known and certain: Israel is my peculiar people! And consequently God cannot have afterwards rejected Israel; for this would in truth presuppose that which is inconceivable with God (comp. Acts xv. 18), and irreconcilable with the ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ (Heb. vi. 17), namely, that He had been deceived in His προέγνω; comp. ver. 30 ff. To suppose the qualitas mala of the people as that which God foreknew (van Hengel) is inadmissible, for the reason that προέγνωσις must be the premiss of the προορίζειν of the people of God (comp. viii. 29); hence, too, it is not to be objected, with Hofmann,1 against our view, that God would surely have been able to foresee the fact that, and the time when, His people would cease to be His people. — ἦ οὐκ οὖν τυποῦ ἡ. τ. ἡ, 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

1 Who also here (comp. on viii. 29) takes προέγνω as an act of the will, by which God has beforehand constituted Israel what it, in accordance therewith, actually became. This would amount to the notion of the προορίζειν in the divine decree (comp. Eph. ii. 10).
the people to God had once occurred, but God has made the declaration that He had (not indeed cast off His people, but) reserved to Himself, in the midst of the depravity of the mass, a number of faithful ones. So (ver. 5) too now there has taken place, not a rejection of the people, but rather a gracious election out of the people. — ἐν Ἡλίᾳ belongs to τῷ λέγει, but is not: de Elia (Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Piscator, Castalio, Calovius, and others), which would be linguistically erroneous, but: in the passage treating of Elia. Comp. Thuc. i. 9, 3, where ἐν τοῦ σκῆπτρου ἄμα τῇ παραδόσει εἰρηκένων means: at the passage, where he (Homer) treats of the yielding of the sceptre, he has said, etc. Very prevalent is this mode of quotation in Philo, and also in the Rabbinical writings (Surenhusius, κατὰ λόγον p. 493). Comp. also Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37, but not Heb. iv. 7.— ὅς ἐντυγχ. τ. Θ. κατὰ τ. Ἡροδ. dependent on οὐκ οἴδατε, as a more precisely defining parallel of ἐν Ἡλίᾳ λέγει ἡ γρ. Comp. Luke vi. 4, xxii. 61; Acts xi. 16, xx. 20, et al.; Goller and Kriiger on Thuc. i. 1. 1. On ἐντυγχάνειν (viii. 27, 34; Heb. vii. 25), with dative of the person concerned (frequently in Plutarch, Polyb., Lucian, etc.), comp. Acts xxv. 24; Wisd. viii. 21, xvi. 28. On κατά (accusing), comp. 1 Macc. viii. 32; 2 Macc. iv. 36.

Ver. 3. 1 Kings xix. 10, 14, freely from the LXX. — ἀπέρετον. The Israelites, namely, under Ahab and Jezebel. 1 Kings xviii. 4, xiii. 22. — κατασκάψατε have thoroughly destroyed, have razed. Comp. Soph. Phil. 986: Τρόλαν . . . κατασκάψας. Eur. Hec. 22 (of the domestic altar); Dem. 361. 20; Plut. Pomp. 10; 2 Macc. xiv. 38 (τὰ θυσιαστήριαν). — τὰ θυσιαστήρια. On the plural, as the temple in Jerusalem was the place exclusively destined for worship, the view of Estius suffices: "Verisimile est, Eliam loqui de altaribus, quae passim in excelsis studio quodam pietatis Deo vero erecta fuerant; maxime postquam decem tribus regum suorum tyrannide prohibita fuerunt, ne Jerusolymam ascenderent sacrificii causa. Quamvis enim id lege vetitum esset [see Lev. xvii. 8, 9; Deut. xii. 13, 14] ac recte fecerint Ezechias et Josias, reges Judae, etiam ejusmodi aras evertendo, tamen impium erat eas
subvertere odio cultus Dei Israel." Comp. Grotius, also Keil, on the books of Kings, p. 262, Archäol. I. § 89.— ἤπειρελείφθη. μόνος] in the sense of Elias: alone of the prophets; but according to the application designed by the apostle, as ver. 4 shows: as the only one of Thy faithful. But in this case we are not to assume, as Hofmann and others wish to do, that Paul, in order to suggest this sense, has transposed the original order of the two clauses of the verse—which is rather to be regarded as accidental; and this, considering the freedom of citation otherwise used, we need the less hesitate about, since Paul could not, even in the original order, see the reference of the verse which was in his thoughts to be excluded.— On ἐπεσέω, to seek after one's life, see on Matt. ii. 20.

Ver. 4. 'Ἀλλὰ] But, although Elijah complained that he had been left sole survivor.— ὁ χρηματισμός] the divine oracular utterance (replying to this accusation). Found here only in N. T. (in the Apocrypha, 2 Macc. ii. 4, xi. 17); but see Diod. Sic. i. 1, xiv. 7, and Suicer, Thes. II. p. 1532; and respecting Χρηματίζω, on Matt. ii. 12. — κατέλησον κ.τ.λ.] 1 Kings xix. 18, with free deviation, bearing on his object, both from the LXX. and from the original. It means: I have left remaining, so, namely, that they are not slaughtered with the rest. Comp. Xen. Anab. vi. 3. 5: ὀκτὼ μόνος κατέλησον (superstites, vivos reliquerunt); 1 Macc. xiii 4. Hofmann incorrectly takes κατέλησον as the third person plural, having the same subject as ἀπέκτειναν. A groundless departure from the Hebrew text and from the LXX., according to which God is the subject. And it is God who has guided and preserved those who remained over.— ἐμαυτῷ] i.e. to myself as my property, and for my service, in contrast to the idolatrous abomination.— οἴτινες κ.τ.λ.] ἵνα comparatos ut, etc.— γόνυ] Not a knee has been bowed by them; hence the singular, comp. Phil. ii. 10. — τῇ Βααλ] Dative of worship. Bernhardy, p. 86. Comp. xiv. 11. The Phoenician divinity Βααλ, the adoration of which was very widely diffused (Keil, § 91) amongst the Jews, especially under the later kings, though not of long subsistence (see Ewald, Alterth. p. 304), is most probably to be regarded as the sun-god (Movers, Phönizier, I. p. 169 ff.; J. G.
Müller in Herzog's *Encyklop.* I. p. 639 f.), not as the planet Jupiter (Gesenius in the *Hall. Encyklop.* VIII. p. 384 ff.). It is remarkable—seeing that יָם (according to different local and ritual forms also in the plural) is a masculine noun—that in the LXX. and in the Apocrypha it has sometimes, and most frequently, the masculine article (Num. xxii. 41; Judg. ii. 13; 1 Kings xvi. 31, *et al.*), sometimes the feminine (Zeph. i. 4; Hos. ii. 8; 1 Sam. vii. 4; always in Jer.; Tob. i. 5, *et al.*). That the LXX. should have thought יָם to be of the common gender, and to denote also Astarte (Reiche), is not probable for this reason, that in the LXX. not merely are the masculine Baal and Astarte often mentioned together (Judg. ii. 13, x. 6, *et al.*), but also the feminine Baal and Astarte (1 Sam. vii. 4). The view that the feminine article was assigned to בָּאָל contemptuously (Gesenius, in Rosennmüller's *Repert.* I. p. 139), as also Tholuck and Ewald, *Alterth.* p. 302, assume, finds no sufficient support—seeing that בָּאָל was a very well known divinity—in the feminine designation of idols unknown to them in the LXX. at 2 Kings xvii. 30, 31; cannot be justified by comparison of the Rabbinical designation of idols as מַעֲרָכָה; and cannot be made good in the particular passages where the LXX. have the masculine or the feminine. To refer the phenomenon solely to an opinion of the LXX., who held יָם to be the name of a god and also that of a goddess, and therefore, according to the supposed connection, used now the masculine and now the feminine article,—the latter particularly, where the word occurs along with מַעֲרָכָה (Fritzsche), as in Judg. ii. 13, x. 6, 1 Sam. vii. 4,—is improbable in itself (because of the unity of the Hebrew name), and cannot be maintained even in passages like Judg. iii. 7, 2 Kings xxi. 3 (comp. with 1 Sam. xii. 10; Hos. ii. 10, 15), without arbitrariness. An historical reason must prevail, and it appears the most feasible hypothesis that Baal was conceived as an androgynous divinity (Beyer, ad Selden. *de Dis Syr.* p. 273 f., Wetstein, Koppe, Olshausen, Philippi), although more precise historical evidence is wanting. The feminine article has been also explained by supplying a substantive (eiciuti by Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, and others;
στήλη by Glass, Estius; θρησκεία by Cramer; even δαμάλει by Drusius, after Tob. i. 5, but see Fritzsche on Tob.; but this is both erroneous and arbitrary, because at least the expression must have run τῷ Βαάλ, since θυσία has always the article. This linguistic incongruity van Hengel avoids only by the precarious conjecture that τῶ Βαάλ signifies the column of Baal, and ὁ Βαάλ the god Baal.—We have to remark, moreover, that the LXX. have in our passage the masculine article; but Paul, acquainted with the use also of the feminine article, has, in quoting from memory, changed the article. According to Fritzsche and Ewald, he had found τῷ in his copy of the LXX.; but τῷ is now found only in more recent codd. of the LXX., into which it has found its way merely from our passage.

Ver. 5. In this way, corresponding to this Old Testament historical precedent, therefore (in order to make the application of vv. 3, 4), there has been (there has come into existence, and actually exists—perfect) also in the present time, in consequence of an election made out of grace, a remnant, namely, a small part taken out of the hardened mass of the people, i.e. the comparatively insignificant number of believing Jews, whom God’s grace has chosen out of the totality of the people. It is related to the latter as a remainder (Herod. i. 119; 2 Kings xix. 4) to a whole, from which the largest part is removed (vv. 3, 4, ix. 27, 29), notwithstanding Acts xxi. 20. The point of comparison is the notion of the λείμμα in contrast to the remaining mass; the latter in the typical history has perished, but in the antitypical event has forfeited saving deliverance.—κατ’ ἐκλ. χάρ. opposed to the presumption in reference to works of the Jewish character; hence, too, the emphatic declaration in ver. 6. It is to be connected not with λείμμα as its more precise definition (Hofmann), but with γέονεν as its mode. This is evinced by the following εἰ δὲ χάριτι, etc. γέονεν, where χάριτι is equivalent to the κατ’ ἐκλογ. χάριτος.

Ver. 6. This thought is not merely by the way and incidental (Koppe, Rückert, de Wette, Fritzsche, Maier, and others), but it belongs essentially to the development of the
apostle's thought to set forth the mode according to which λείμμα γέγονε, not only positively (καὶ ἐκλ. χάρ.), but also negatively (οὐκ ἐξ ἐργ.). Because he then, in ver. 7, goes on to argue: ὅτι ἐπιλήφθη Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ., which ἐπιλήφθην, in fact, took place exactly ἐξ ἐργῶν, ix. 32. — εἰ δὲ χάριν ἀλλ' ἐργα ἐκεῖνον; As previously the individuals who compose the λείμμα are conceived as the objects of the divine grace, through which they belong to the λείμμα; so are they also (not the people generally, as Hofmann takes it) conceived in this contrasted negative statement as the subjects, who do not owe it to legal works that in them is present the λείμμα composing the true community of God. On the logicalomen, see on vii 17. Of ἐξ ἐργῶν there can be nothing more said. — εἰπεῖ ἵπ χάρις κ.τ.λ.] because (otherwise) grace ceases to be grace (namely, if ἐξ ἐργῶν λείμμα γέγονε)—since in truth "gratia nisi gratis sit, gratia non est," Augustine. Ἡ χάρις is the definite grace, which has made the election, and γινεῖται (not equivalent to ἐστὶ) means: 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.

Ver. 7. Ὅτι οὖν] infers the result from vv. 5 and 6. Since a λείμμα has been constituted according to the election of grace, and therefore not possibly from the merit of works: accordingly Israel (as regards the mass) has not obtained that which it strives after (namely, δικαιοσύνη, as is known from ix. 30 ff.)—for it strives, in fact, ἐξ ἐργῶν—the election, on the other hand, namely, that chosen λείμμα, has obtained it (for they were the objects of the divine χάρις); but the rest were hardened. In this manner the true state of the case is now set forth, in contrast to ἀπώσατο, without its being necessary on this account to refer τι οὖν to the whole preceding vv. 2–6 (de Wette, Fritzsche, Philippi, and others); since the reference to vv. 5, 6 is quite sufficient, and quite in keeping with the logical progression. Reiche (comp. Lachm., who places a note of interrogation after τι οὖν and after ἐπέτυχεν) makes the
question extend to ἐπέτυχεν, to which question of wonder Paul then answers by ἥδε ἐκλ. κ.τ.λ. But the futility of Israel's endeavour has already been long (ix. 31, 32) known to the reader, and is therefore not appropriate as the subject of such a question. Hofmann also takes δ ἐπιζητεῖ . . . ἐπέτυχεν as a question, but in the sense whether that which Israel has not obtained is the same thing as that to which its quest and striving tends (namely, its own righteousness)? To the self-evident negation of this question δέ then relates in the sense of nevertheless, and after the second ἐπέτυχεν there is to be supplied, not δ ἐπιζητ. Ἰσραὴλ, but merely δ ἐπιζητεῖ (namely, to be, out of grace, the people of salvation). This complete distortion of the sense falls to the ground from the very fact, that for the second ἐπέτυχεν, since δ ἐπιζητεῖ is not appended, no other object can be thought of without the greatest arbitrariness than that of the first ἐπέτυχεν, namely δ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ; and also, as respects the contents of the question, from the consideration, that if we should not be able to say that Israel has not obtained that for which it strove, this would stand in contradiction to the universal Pauline dogma of the impossibility of righteousness by the law. — ἐπιζητεῖ does not denote the zealous pursuit (Fritzsche, Philippi), but its direction, correlative to ἐπέτυχεν. See on Matt. vi. 33; Phil. iv. 17. By the present, the continuance of the endeavour is admitted.—The τοῦτο (on the accusative instead of the customary genitive, see Matthiae, § 328; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 861) has tragic emphasis: even this it has not reached.— ἥδε ἐκλογή] that is, here "reliquiae illius populi, quas per gratiam suam Deus elegit," Estius. Comp. the use of ἐρωματικός, etc., Lobech, ad Phryn. p. 469.—The πορωσις, hardening (not blinding, as Hofmann thinks; see on 2 Cor. iii. 14), is the making unsusceptible in understanding and will as respects the appropriation of salvation in Christ. Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 78; Winzer, Progr. 1828, p. 8. The subject who hardens is God. Comp. 2 Cor. iii. 14, and on ix. 8.

Ver. 8. This ἐπαιρωθησαν ensued in conformity with that which stands written, etc. That which is testified of the hardening of the people in the time of Isaiah, and as early as
that of Moses, has its Messianic fulfilment through the hardening of the Jews against the gospel, so that this hardening has taken place καθὼς γέγραται κ.τ.λ. This prophetic relation is groundlessly denied by Tholuck and Hofmann. The agreement denoted by καθ. γέγρ. is just that of prophecy and fulfilment according to the divine teleology. Comp. Matt. xv. 7.—In the citation itself, Isa. xxix. 10 (as far as κατανύξεως) and Deut. xxix. 3 (not Isa. vi. 9) are combined into one saying, and quoted very freely from the LXX. Deuteronomy l.c. has after ἀκούειν: ἐστὶν ἡμέρας ταύτης, hence ἔστιν ἡμέρα σήμα ἡμ., belongs to the quotation; and the words καθὼς...ἀκούειν must not be put in a parenthesis, as Beza, Wolf, Griesbach, and others have done. — ἔδωκεν] He gave1 not mere permission (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and many). — πνεῦμα κατανύξεως] Heb. יָדוּר מְנָע, i.e. a spirit producing stupefaction, which is obviously a daemonic spirit. Comp. 2 Cor. iv. 4; Eph. ii. 2. Elsewhere the LXX. translate πῦρνα by ἐκστασίς (Gen. ii. 21, xv. 12), or θάμβος (1 Sam. xxvi. 12), or ἀνδρόμην (Prov. xix. 15). They gave the approximate sense of the word differently according to the connection. But that they understood κατάνυξες actually as stupefaction, intoxication, is clear from Ps. lx. 5, where they have rendered יֶדְּרָאִית intoxicating wine, by oἶνον κατανύξεως. See in general, Fritzsche, Exc. p. 558 ff. This sense of κατάνυξες is explained by the use of κατανύσσεσθαι, compungi, in the LXX. and the Apocrypha to express the deep, inward paralyzing shock caused by grief, fear, astonishment, etc., whereby one is stupified and as if struck by a blow (Schleusner, Thes. III. p. 256; comp. on Acts i. 37). In classical Greek neither the substantiv nor the verb is found. We may add that every derivation is erroneous, which does not go back to νίκος (comp. τοῦτος, Plut. Mor. p. 930 F); nor is it admissible (since Paul certainly knew that κατάνυξες expressed πῦρνα) to seek explanations which depart from the notion of πῦρνα. So e.g. Calvin: “Spiritum vocat...compunctionis, ubi scilicet quaedam fellis amaritudo se prodit, imo etiam fūror in respuenda veritate.” Similarly Luther (“an embittered spirit”) and Melanchthon. Chrysostom, indeed (and Theophylact),

1 LXX. Isa. xxix. 10: συνόταιρ ὁδὸς πόλεως στιθαρατι κατανύξεως.
hits the thing itself rightly: κατάνυξιν ἑνταῦθα τὴν περὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἑξεὶ τῆς ψυχῆς φησί τὴν ἀνάτομος ἐκοινωνικαὶ ἀμεταθέτωσι, but his analysis of the word: κατανυξιμὴν ἡπὶ οὐδὲν ἐτερὸν ἐστὶν ἢ τὸ ἑμπαγὴν τοῦ καὶ προσηλώσθαι, is arbitrarily far-fetched. — τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν] A fatally pregnant oxymoron. The genit is that of the aim: eyes, in order that they may not see, etc. Linguistically correct is also the rendering of Grotius: eyes of not-seeing, i.e. “oculos ad videndum ineptos,” Fritzsche, comp. Philippi and van Hengel. But the former view corresponds better at once to the original text (LXX. οὐκ ἐδώκει... ὃθαλαμοὺς βλέπεις κ. ὑτὰ ἀκούειν) and to the telic τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, ver. 10. Comp. Isa. vi. 9, 10; John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 27. — ἐὼς τ. σήμ. ἡμέρ.] belongs to the whole affirmation ἐδώκευν κ.τ.λ. Thus uninterruptedly God dealt with them. The glance at a future, in which it was to be otherwise (Hofmann), is here (comp. ver. 10) still quite remote.

Vv. 9, 10. A further Scripture proof of ἐπωρόθησαι,1 and that from Ps. lxix. 23, 24, quoted with free deviation from the LXX. The composer of this psalm is not David (in opposition to Hengstenberg, Hävernick), but some one of much later date; a circumstance which we must judge of analogously to the expression of Christ, Matt. xxii. 43. The suffering theocrat of the psalm is, as such, a type of the Messiah, and His enemies a type of the unbelieving Jews; hence Paul could find the fulfilment of the passage in the πάροισις of the latter. Consequently, in pursuance of this typical reference, the sense in which he takes the words is as follows: “Let their table become to them for (let it be turned for them into, comp. John xvi. 20) a snare, and for a chase, and for a trap, and (so) for a retaliation;” i.e., while they feast and drink securely and carelessly at their well-furnished table,2 let the fate of violence overtake them unawares, just as wild

1 With the simple καί, and, to take which climactically (Hofmann) is justified neither by the name of David nor the contents of the passage. It would place a quite uncalled-for emphasis on διαφιά (even David).

2 To conceive of the table as an outspread coverlet (Gesenius, Thea. III. p. 1417, Hofmann) in which they entangle themselves, is to come very unnecessarily and arbitrarily to the aid of the boldness of the poetical expression.
beasts are surprised in a snare, and by the capture of the chase; and by a trap; and so must retaliation alight upon them for that which they have done (in rejecting, namely, faith on Christ). But what violent calamity is meant, the sequel expresses, namely: "Darkened must their eyes become, that they may not see," i.e. they must become spiritually blinded, incapable of discerning the truth of salvation; and finally the same thing under another figure: "And bend their back always," denoting the keeping them in bondage, and that, in the sense of the apostle, the spiritual bondage of the unfree condition of the inner life produced by the πώρωσις.1 The hardening, therefore, which Paul recognises as predicted in the passage, does not lie in ράπτετα αυτών (FRITZSCHE), — which is not to be explained "of the law and its works, which was Israel's food" (Philippi, following older expositors, also Tholuck), — but in γενηθήτω εἰς παγίδα κ.τ.λ., and is more precisely indicated in ver. 10. The express repetition in ver. 10 of the becoming blinded, already designated in ver. 8, forbids our explaining the prophetic images in vv. 9, 10 generally as representations of severe divine judgments like Pharaoh's overthrow, in which case the specific point of the citation would be neglected (in opposition to Hofmann). — ἐκαὶ εἰς θήραν stands neither in the Hebrew nor in the LXX.; but θήρα means chase, not net (Tholuck, Ewald), to establish which signification the solitary passage Ps. xxxv. 8, where the LXX. render εὐθεία inexact by θήρα, cannot suffice. It often means booty (van Hengel) in the LXX. and in classical Greek; but this is not appropriate here, where the "becoming for a booty" is said not of such as men, but of the ῥάπτετα. This shall be turned for them into a close, so that they, in their secure feasting, become like to the unfortunate object of the chase, which is captured

1 Those who have found in ver. 9 the destruction of Jerusalem predicted (Michaelis, after Grotius, Wetstein, and many), so as to refer ῥάπτετα to the Passover meal, for the celebration of which the Jews were in Jerusalem at the very time the city was invested (Josephus, Bell. Jud. vi. 9, 3, 4), or even (Grotius) to the altar in the temple; and those who have regarded ver. 10 (καὶ ἐκαὶ τὰ ὄρα ἔχει κ.τ.λ.) as a prophecy of the servitude of the Jews to Rome (so some of the Fathers); could not have given an explanation more opposed in sense to the connection.
by the hunter. — σκάνδαλον] corresponding primarily to the classical σκανδαλισθειν, the stick set in a trap (Schol. Ar. Ach. 687), is frequently in the LXX. (see Schleusner, Thes. V. p. 38), and so also here, the translation of μία, snare, by which we must therefore abide. — ἤματηομα is not found in classical Greek, but often in the LXX. and Apocrypha, Luke xiv. 12. — καὶ τὸν νῶτον Κ.Τ.Λ.] is to be taken, according to the context, as the expression of the idea of hardening (represented as a bending together under the yoke of spiritual servitude), not, with Fritzsche, of rendering miserable through the withdrawal of the Messianic salvation. On the masculine ὁ νῶτος, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 290.

Ver. 11. At this point begins the teleological discussion respecting the oi δὲ λοιποί ἐπωρώθησαν, ver. 7. See the contents above. — λέγω οὖν] quite as in ver. 1: I ask therefore, attaching it by way of inference to the ἐπωρώθησαν just supported by Scripture. — μὴ ἐπαυσαν, ἓνα πέσο. But their stumbling had not the aim (ordained by God) that they should fall? i.e., by the fact of their stumbling at Christ (ix. 32, 33), and refusing faith to Him, has the divine purpose not aimed at their everlasting ἀπώλεια? This emphasis on πέσαν (come to be prostrate) involves the climactic relation to ἐπαυσαν (to stumble), — a relation which Hofmann loses sight of when he makes the question express nothing further than: whether the fall which Israel suffered had been its own aim? Photius aptly remarks: τὸ πταύμα αὐτῶν οὐχὶ εἰς κατάπτασιν τέλειαν γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ μόνον οἷον ὑπεσκελώθησαν. Others have found the point of the question not purely in the climax of the two figurative verbs, but in definitions mentally supplied, which, however, as such, cannot be admitted. So, in particular, Augustine and many: only in order that they should fall, as though it ran μόνον ἵνα, as Umbreit still takes it (comp. Hofmann); further Melancthon: “non sic impegerunt Judaei, ut in tota

1 How very often ἐπαύς, ἔπαιρ, and ἔπαρει are used also in classical Greek in the figurative sense, see in Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 539; Heind. ad Plat. Theaet. p. 143.

2 On vv. 11–33, see Luthardt, Lehre von d. letzten Dingen, p. 106 ff.; von Oettingen, Synagogale Elegik des Volks Israel, 1858, p. 133 ff.
gente nemo sit salvandus,” as though it ran ἵνα πάντες; and yet further, Ewald: “that they might purely in accordance with the divine design, and therefore without their freedom and their own will, fall into sin and into destruction,” as though it ran ἵνα ἐξ ἀνάγκης, or the like. We must simply abide by the view, that πταλεύ is a figure for the taking offence at Christ which refuses faith, and πάπτευν a figure for the being involved in everlasting destruction; comp. Heb. iv. 11, Ecclus. ii. 7. In the former the latter was not present as the aim of God’s purpose.— On ἐπτασαν, comp. the proverb: μη δις προς τὸν αὐτῶν λίθον πταλεύ, Polyb. xxxi. 19. 5, xxxi. 20. 1; and on the sense of moral stumbling, Jas. ii. 10, iii. 2; 2 Pet. i. 10; Eur. Αεг. fr. ii. 1: πταλαυν ἀρετὰν ἀποδείξασθαι. The subject is the λοιπόν of ver. 7, the mass of the people not belonging to the ἐκλογή. — τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτ. through their fault consisting in the refusal of faith, through their offence. Παραπτ. does not refer to πέσωσι (Reiche, Tholuck, and several others),—which the emphatic sense of πέσ. forbids; but in substance that πταίσαμα is meant, which is morally characterized by means of παράπτωμα as delictum (so rightly Vulg.), as ἀμαρτία (comp. John xv. 9), according to its stated figurative designation (comp. also iv. 25, v. 15). Quite against the usage of the N. T., Tholuck renders: defeat (Diod. xix. 100). — τοῖς ἑθεσίοις] se. γέγονεν. That through the despising of the Messianic salvation on the part of the Jews its attainment by the Gentiles was effected—this experience Paul had learnt to recognise as that which it actually was, as the way which the fulfilment of the divine arrangement, i. 16, took. Comp. Matt. xxi. 43, xxii. 9; Acts xiii. 46, xxviii. 28.— εἰς τὸ παράξ. αὐτοῖς] aim; comp. Calovius: “Assumptio novi populi directa fuit ad veteris provocacionem ad aemulationem, ut nempe Israelitae . . . seria aemulatione irritati, et ipsi doctrinae ev. animos suos submittere.” Comp. x. 19. With this εἰς τὸ παράξ. αὐτ., exactly the counterpart of ἵνα πέσωσι is expressed.

Ver. 12. Δέ] μεταβατικόν, leading over from what has been said in ver. 11 to a very joyful prospect thereby opened into the future.— The conclusion is a “felici effectu causae peioris
ad feliciorem effectum causae melioris." — πλοῦτος] for the Gentile world (κόσμος) became enriched with the σωτηρία (ver. 11), through the παράπτωμα of the Jews. — τὸ ἡπτημα αὐτ. πλοῦτ. ἐθνῶν [and their overthrow riches for Gentile peoples. Parallel to the foregoing. — ἡπτημα] is not found in the old Greek, but only in the LXX. Isa. xxxi. 8, and 1 Cor. vi. 7; it is, however, equivalent to the classical ἤπτα, which is the opposite of νίκη (Plato, Lach. p. 196 A, Legg. i. p. 638 A; Dem. 1486. 3; Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 19, 20), and, corresponding to the signification of ἤπτασθαι, proficisci, vincere, means clades, both in its proper sense, and also generally: succumbing, decline (comp. Dem. 1466. 23, ἤπτα τῆς προάπτ. ἐρυθώσων), loss suffered (1 Cor. vi. 7), getting the worse. See Perizon. ad Ael. V. H. ii. 25. Here the proper signification is to be retained, and that, as the contrast of τὸ πλήρωμα requires, in a numerical respect. So now also Tholuck, likewise Mangold. Through the fact that a part of the Jews was unbelieving, the people has suffered an overthrow, has, like a vanquished army, been weakened in numbers, inasmuch, namely, as the unbelieving portion by its unbelief practically seceded from the people of God. Comp. Vulg.: "diminutio eorum;" Luthardt: "loss in amount." If it be explained as: loss of the Messianic salvation, which they have suffered (Fritzsche and others 1), or: the loss which the kingdom of God has suffered in their case (Philippi, comp. Kahnis, Dogm. I. p. 573), the former is not appropriate to the contrast of πλήρωμα, and the latter introduces the reference to the kingdom of God, as that which has suffered the detriment, the more unwarrantably, inasmuch as the genit. αὐτῶν is expressed. The threefold αὐτῶν is to be taken with the like reference as the genitive of the subject, and applies in each instance to the people Israel as a whole (whose collective guilt also is the παράπτωμα), in contrast to the κόσμος; and the ἐθνη—which likewise is not preserved in Philippi's view. This very

1 So also de Wette; similarly Ruckert: "the loss of their original dignity and glory as the people of God;" and Hofmann: "their hurt, in that they, by virtue of their unbelief, are not what they should be." Comp. Köllner and Glöckler. Among the older interpreters, Calvin: "Diminutio honoris sui, qui fuerant populus Dei gloriosus."
circumstance, and more decisively the utter absence of linguistic proof, tells also against the traditional usual rendering, according to which ἥπτημα is supposed to signify the minority: "paucitas Judaorum credentium" (Grotius). So, in substance, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Erasmus, Beza, Estius, Wetstein, Bengel, and many others, including Reiche, Olshausen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Maier, Bisping, Reithmayr; comp. Ewald: "their remaining behind." — πόσων μάλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν] sc. πλοίων ἔθνων γενήσεται; how much more their becoming full, that is, how much more will it issue in the enrichment of the Gentiles with the Messianic salvation, if the Jews, after the defeat which they have suffered, shall again be reinstated to their plena copia, so that they will then again in their full amount (ver. 26), as an integral whole, belong to the people of God,—which will take place through the conversion of all Israel to Christ (not would, as Luther has it 1). The ἥπτημα αὐτῶν is then compensated, and the πλήρωμα αὐτῶν brought in, which, moreover, may take place even with a continuance of the diaspora. On πλήρωμα generally, see Fritzsche, II. p. 469 ff. Comp. on Eph. i. 10. The numerical reference of the πλήρωμα αὐτῶν is suggested by the correlative τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνων in ver. 25; and in so far the view which takes it of the full number of the Jews (Theodoret: πάντες πιστεύσαντες μετέχουν ἀγαθῶν πάσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐγένοντο ἐν πρόξενοι, so most) is correct. Comp. Ewald: "their full admission, supplying what is wanting." With this Umbreit mixes up at the same time "the fulfilment of their predestination;" whilst van Hengel sees in the πλήρωμα αὐτ., not absolutely the full number, but only the collective body of those destined by God to conversion, which, however, is not expressed, but is supplied by the reader. The various views correspond to the varying explanations of ἥπτημα. So e.g. Fritzsche: the fulness of Messianic salvation, which they will possess; Philippi: the filling up—which takes place through their conversion—of the blank in the

1 Philippi also explains vv. 12 and 15 not of an actual, but only of a possible πρόελευσις of Israel (p. 554). Vv. 13, 14 are not in favour of this, where Paul has in view the intermediate time until the final πρόελευσις of the πλήρωμα; and ver. 26 is decisive against it.
kingdom of God which arose through their unbelief;¹ Rückert, Köllner: the restoration of Israel to its befitting position; Hofmann: the status, in which they are fully and entirely that which they ought to be (qualitative). Luthardt also takes the correct view.

Vv. 13, 14. Not a parenthetical thought (Reiche), but the connection with the preceding and following is: “ποιητικὴ μᾶλλον τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν Ισραήλ ῥάθειμα, I say: but you precisely, the Gentile Christians,—who might think that my office belongs only to you and the Gentiles, and that the conversion of the Jews lies less in my vocation,—you² I hereby make to know (ὑμῖν λέγω), that I, as apostle of the Gentiles, etc.; for (motive) the conversion of the Jews will have the happiest consequence (ver. 15).” — τοῖς ἔθνεσι δὲ ἔθνεσιν ἐν ὑμῖν λέγω, as an apposition to ὑμῖν, the readers according to their chief constituent element, in virtue of which the Christian Gentile body is represented in them; comp. i 13. Observe that Paul does not write τοῖς δὲ ἔθνεσιν ἐν ὑμῖν λέγω, as though he intended only a Gentile fraction of the otherwise Jewish-Christian community (in opposition to Mangold). In contradistinction to his readers, the Jews, although his flesh, are to him third persons, whom he, as apostle of the Gentiles, might mediate serve. Baur fails to recognise this, I. p. 371. — ἐὰν ὑπὸ [not temporal (quamdiu, Matt. ix. 15; 2 Pet. i. 13), but: in quantum, in as far as I, etc. Comp. Matt. xxv. 40; Plato, Rep. p. 268 B; Xen. Cyr. v. 4. 68. Just so ἐὰν ὑπὸ and καθ' ὑπὸ. — μὲν] as so often in Paul without a corresponding δὲ. But we see from the following that the train of ideas passing before his mind was this: “I seek indeed, so far as I am one who has the commission of Apostle to the Gentiles (observe the emphatic ἐγώ, in which a noble self-consciousness is expressed), to do honour to my office, but I have in view withal (for see x. 1, ix. 2, 3) to incite my kinsmen to emulation, etc.” — ἐπισκόποι] whether

¹ Comp. Melancthon: “Complementum integræ ecclesiae convertendæ ex semine Abraham.” Similarly Origen.

² According to the reading ὑμῖν (see the critical notes). This ὑμῖν forms a contrast with the perspective just opened by ἐπισκόποι. τ. πλήρ. αὐτῶν in favour of the Jews.
in any way. The practical honouring of the office, which consists in a true discharge of it, is an acting, whereby the desired attainment is attempted, see on i. 10; Phil. iii. 11; Acts xxvii. 12; Buttmann, neu Gr. p. 220. Less in accordance with the text—since the very εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ. presupposes an actual δοξάζειν (2 Thess. iii. 1; John xii. 28).—Reiche and Ewald (after Grotius and many others, including Flatt) take it as: I boast, hold my office something high and glorious. Hofmann, indeed, understands an actual glorification, but conditioned by εἰ πῶς κ.τ.λ., so that the latter is not whether possibly, but if possibly. From this the illogical relation of present and future which thus arises must deter us (Paul must have used the future δοξάζω).—παραξ. and σώφρον future indicative, like i. 10. On σώφρον, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 16, ix. 22. The enclitic μοῦ standing before the noun cannot be emphatic (van Hengel), but represents, at the same time, the dative of interest (whether I shall perhaps rouse to me my flesh to jealousy), like 1 Cor. ix. 27, Phil. ii. 2, Col. iv. 18, et al., and frequently in classical Greek.—αὐτῶν] refers to those intended by the collective τὴν σάρκα. Σάρκα δὲ εἰπόν γναθότητα καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἐνέφημε, Theophylact. Theodoret quite erroneously thinks that Paul wished to intimate a denial of spiritual fellowship. On the contrary, πλέον αὐτῶν σκευούμενος (Oecumenius), he says μ. τ. σάρκα, which is like τοῦς συγγενεῖς μοῦ κατὰ σάρκα, ix. 3, but more strongly significant. Gen. xxxvii. 27; Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1. Comp. Isa. lviii. 7. Note the modesty of the expression τινὸς, which, however, was suggested by the experience of the difficulty of the conversion of the Jews; comp. 1 Cor. ix. 22.

Ver. 15. By way of inference, like ver. 12; γὰρ assigns a motive for vv. 13, 14. —ἀποβολή, casting away; Plato, Legg. xii. p. 493 E, 944 C; Aq. Prov. xxviii. 24. By this is meant their exclusion from the people of God on account of their

1 Hofmann adduces as an example Xen. A. 19. iv. 7. 3. But such passages are of a quite different kind (see Brunck, ad Arist. Plat. 1064; Maetzner, ad Lycurg. p. 251); and to the necessary connection expressed in them of the consequence with the condition, the "if in any way" (possibly), which would make the condition problematic, would be wholly unsuitable. Comp also Kühner, ad. Xen. l. c. and Gramm. II. 1, p. 120.
unbelief, and the opposite of it is their πρόσληψις, reception in addition (Plato, Theae. p. 210 A), by which they, having become believing, are adopted by God into the fellowship of His people. The view of ἀποβολή as loss (Acts xxvii. 22; Plato, Phaed. p. 75 E; Lach. p. 195 E; Plut. Sol. 7) is less suitable to this contrast (in opposition to the Vulg., Luther, Bengel, and others, including Philippi, who understands the loss, which the kingdom of God has suffered in their case). — κατάλλαγὴ κόσμου] in so far, namely, as the converted portion of the Gentiles has attained to δικαιοσύνη through faith, and is no longer subjected to the ὁργή of God; and therewith reconciliation of the Gentile world with God has begun. Comp. v. 11. It is a more precise definition of the notion expressed in ver. 12 by πλοῦτος κόσμου. — ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῷ] i.e. life, which proceeds from the dead (namely, when these arise). The πρόσληψις of the still unconverted Jews, Paul concludes, will be of such a kind (τίς, not τί, is his question), will be of so glorious a character (comp. Eph. i. 18), that it will bring with it the last most blessed development, namely, the life beginning with the resurrection of the dead in the αἰών ὁ μέλλων, the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, which has the awakening from death as its causal premiss. Hence Paul does not say ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν (as Philippi objects); for his glance is already passing beyond this event to its blessed consequence. The transformation of the living is included in this last development (1 Cor. xv. 51), which is here designated a potiori; comp. viii. 11. The conclusion of the apostle does not, however, rest on Matt. xxiv. 14 (Reiche after Theodoret), but on the fact of the κατάλλαγὴ κόσμου, whose most blissful final development (as it, according to Paul, must necessarily be occasioned by the blissful opposite of the ἀποβολή) can be none other than the blessed resurrection-life which will set in with the Parousia (Col. iii. 3, 4; 1 Thess. iv. 14 ff.). The view which takes ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῷ in the proper sense has been held by Origen, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Anselm, Erasmus, Toletus, Semler, Reiche, Göckler, de Wette, Nielsen, Fritzsche, Rückert, Reithmayr, Bisping, Hofmann, Beyschlag, and others. Approaching it, but taking the resurrection by way of compa-
son, stands the view of Ewald: "The final completion of all history down to the last day, and like the very resurrection itself, which is expected on this day." Luthardt, too, is substantially in the right, taking, however, veβpou in the ethical sense: from the dead Israel the new bodily life of glorification will proceed. A heterogeneous mode of viewing the contrasts, for which the text affords no support. The non-literal interpretation of the "futura quasi resurrectio ex mortuis" (Melancthon), i.e. of the "novitas vitae ex morte peccati" (Estius; so in substance Calvin, Hunnius, Calovius, Vorstius, Bengel, Carpzov, Ch. Schmidt, Cranner, Böhme, Baumgarten-Crusius, Maier; also Lechler, apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalt. p. 129; Krummacher, p. 172 f.; and Kahnis, Dogm. I. p. 574), is to be set aside on the ground that then nothing higher than the καταλλαγή (and it must be something far higher) would be expressed, but only its ethical consequence in the activity of life. Olshausen, too, understands it primarily of the spiritual resurrection, yet thinks that the notion "plays into the bodily resurrection" (?). Umbreit finds spiritual and bodily revival from death conjoined. Others explain the expression metaphorically, as designating summum gaudium (Grotius after Oecumenius) or summa felicitas (Hammond, Koppe, Köllner). Comp. Theophylact (ἀνεφα ἁγαθά), Beza, Flatt, van Hengel, and now, too, Tholuck, who recurs to the general thought of the most important position in the history of the divine kingdom to be occupied by converted Israel. But interpretations of such a non-literal character must be necessitated by the context; whereas the latter by the relation, in accordance with the connection, of κύη ἐκ νεκρῶν to the quite proper καταλλ. κόσμου requires us to abide by the literal sense. Hence we are not to understand, with Philippi, at once both the extensive diffusion of the kingdom of God, and a subjective revivification of Christendom, which had again become dead, "and thus a glorious flourishing time for the church on earth." So, again, Auberlen supposes a charismatic life of the church, and depicts it with the colours of the palingenesia

1 Calvin's excuse: "Nam etsi una res est, verbis tamen plus et minus incept ponderis," only shows the baldness of this interpretation.
of the golden age. No such ideas are here expressed; and it would have been peculiarly necessary to indicate more particularly the dead state into which Christendom was again to fall, especially after the καταλλαγή κόσμον already including within itself spiritual revival. And by no means is the supposed flourishing time (the time of worship (!) Auberlen calls it, as opposed to the present time of preaching) compatible with the nearness of the Parousia (xiii. 14; 1 Cor. vii. 29, et al.), with the ἀνάγνωστομ immediately preceding it (1 Cor. vii. 26; Matt. xxiv. 29), and with the σωματία of the last period (on Gal. i. 4).

Ver. 16. δε] continuative; but this πρόσληψις, how well it corresponds to the character of holiness, which has been associated with the people of Israel from its origin till now! The two figures are parallel, and set forth the same thought. — ἀπαρχὴ] obtains the genitival definition to be mentally supplied with it through τὸ φύραμα, just as in the second clause ἡ μίζα is the root of the κλάδον. The ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ φυράματος is known from Num. xv. 19–21 to be a designation of the first of the dough; that is, from every baking, when the dough was kneaded, a portion was to be set aside and a cake to be baked therefrom for the priests. See Philo, de sac. hon. II. p. 232; Josephus, Ant. i. 4. 4; Saalschutz, M. R. p. 334; Keil, Archdol. I. § 71; and the Rabbinical prescriptions in Mischn. Surenh. p. 289 ff. This ἀπαρχή, as the first portion devoted to Jehovah from the whole, was designed to impart the character of its consecration to the remainder of the lump. The article with φύραμα denotes the lump of dough concerned, from which the ἀπαρχή is separated; hence διὸν did not require to be expressed (in opposition to Hofmann's objection). Grotius and Rosenmüller take τ. φύρ. to be the corn destined for the baking, and ἀπαρχή to be the first-fruits. But (ix. 21) φύραμα always denotes a mass mixed (with moisture or otherwise), particularly a kneaded one, and is in the LXX. (Ex. xii. 34) and in Paul (1 Cor. v. 6, 7; Gal. v. 9) the standing expression for dough. Estius, Koppe, Köllner, Olshausen, Krehl rightly take it so, but nevertheless understand by ἀπαρχή the sacred first-fruits (comp. Ex. xxiii. 10) which
were employed for φύραμα. But in that case ἄπαρχῃ obtains a genitival definition not presented by the text; and this can the less be approved, since ἄπαρχῃ φυράματος, in fact, was the stated expression from Num. l.c. This applies also against Hofmann, who likewise explains the ἄπαρχῃ as the firstling-sheaf, but considers the φύραμα to be the dough worked up from the harvest-fruit generally.—The figure is correctly interpreted, when by ἥ ἄπαρχῃ we understand the patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), and by τὸ φύρ. the whole body of the people, to whom the character of holiness—of consecration in property to God—passed over from the former. With the holiness of the πατέρες, ix. 4–13 (in accordance with which we are not here to think of Abraham alone), is given also the holiness of the theocratic people, their posterity, according to the divine right of covenant and promise. Comp. ix. 4, 5. But this holiness, which Paul looks upon, as respects the national whole, in the light of a character indelebilis, is not the inner moral, but (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 14) the theocratic legal holiness ("quod juribus ecclesiae et promissis Dei fruipossint," Calovius). The expression is taken of the patriarchs by Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Calovius, Bengel, and others, including Koppe, Tholuck, Köllner, Olshausen, Fritzsche, Philippi, Maier, de Wette, Krehl, Umbreit, Ewald, Reithmayr, Hofmann (though the latter thinks only of Abraham). This is correct, because the second figure (ἐὰν δὲ πληξα κ.τ.λ.) is capable of no other interpretation (see below); but to explain the two figures differently, as Toletus and Stolz, Reiche and Rückert, Glöckler, Stengel, Bisping, van Hengel, after Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theo-

1 Toletus and Stolz suppose the ἄπαρχῃ to be the Jews who first accepted Christianity, and the φύραμα to be the remaining part of the nation. The second figure they suppose to denote our first parents and their posterity. So, too, van Hengel.

2 In substance like Toletus and Stolz. On the first figure Reiche remarks: "As the whole, whereof a firstling gift is consecrated to God, is something excellent, worthy of God, or by the very offering of it is declared to be such, so is also the Jewish people through the fact, that a part of it has been received into God's fellowship, declared to be a noble people, worthy to be wholly accepted, as soon as it only fulfils the conditions."
doret,¹ have in manifold ways arbitrarily done, is simply a violation of the parallelism.² This holds also against the interpretation of the Jews who have become believing, and of the remaining mass of the people (Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Anselm, Toletus, Rosenmüller, Stolz, Reiche, Rückert, Bisping). — ἡ ἱλία and οἱ κλάδοι are the patriarchs and their theocratic bodily descendants, the Jews. As the ἀρχή is related to the φύραμα, so is the ἱλία to the κλάδοι; comp. on the latter, Menander, 711: ἀρχήν ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀπὸ ἱλίος κλάδος. The divergent interpretation, which may deserve to be considered in opposition to this usual one, is, that the ἱλία is the first primitive or mother church consisting of the believing Jews, and that the κλάδοι are the Jews, in so far as they in virtue of their national position were primarily called thereto. This exposition (substantially in Cornelius a Lapide, Carpzov, Schoettgen; Semler and Ammon suppose οἱ κλάδοι to be the Gentile Christians) is still considered possible by de Wette. It is, however, unsuitable; for the (natural) κλάδοι must have proceeded from the ἱλία, must have their origin from it (comp. Ecclus. xxiii. 25, xl. 15), and the broken-off branches (ver. 17) must have earlier belonged to the ἱλία,—which is not the case, if ἱλία is the Christian mother-church of which they were never κλάδοι. The true theocracy (the olive tree, comp. Jer. xi. 16; Hos. xiv. 7; Zech. iv. 11; Neh. viii. 15) did not begin in the Christian mother-church (as its root), but in the patriarchs, and Christ Himself was κατὰ σάρκα from this sacred root, Matt. i. 1 ff. In this view it is clear that the unbelieving Jews, in so far as they rejected Christ, ceased thereby to belong to the true people of God, and fell away from their root. They were now—after the light, and with it judgment, had come into the world (John iii. 19)—broken-off branches, apostate children of Abraham (John viii. 37, 39, 40), children of the kingdom who were to be cast out (Matt. viii. 12).

¹ Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret explain the ἀρχή of Christ, and the ἱλία of the patriarchs; while Origen interprets both figures as referring to Christ.

² The identity of the thought expressed by a twofold figure is also confirmed by the fact, that in what follows Paul pursues only the one figure, and entirely drops the first.
Comp. the figure of the vine in John xv. See also Rom. ix. 6 ff.

Vv. 17–24. In pursuance of the figure, a warning to the Gentile Christians against self-presumption, and an exhortation to humility, down to ver. 24. — τινὲς] some, a portion of the branches; comp. on iii. 3. — ἐξεκλάσθησαν] were broken off (Plat. Rep. p. 611 D), κλάω being the proper word for the breaking of the young twigs (κλάδοι); Theophrastus, c. pl. i. 15. 1. They were broken off on account of their unfitness for bearing. — σὺ δὲ] individualizing address to each Gentile Christian. — ἄγριεστ. Ὑμῖν] although being of the wild olive. ἄγρις is here an adjective, like ἐκ τῆς ἄγριεστος, ver. 24. This view is assured by linguistic usage (Eryc. 4, in Anthol. ix. 237: σκυραίλην ἄγριεστος, Theocr. xxv. 255; see Jacobs, Delect. Epigr. p. 33; Lobeck, Paralip. p. 376) and necessary; for the traditional interpretation: "oleaster, i.e. surculus oleasti," is as arbitrary as the apology for the expression when so explained, on the ground that Paul wished to avoid the prolixity of the distinction between tree and branch, is absurd (in opposition to Hofmann), inasmuch as he would only have needed to employ the genitive instead of the nominative, and consequently to write not a word more, if he wished to be thus sparing. The opinion of Reiche, Rückert, Köllner, Philipp, Krehl, Ewald, van Hengel—that the collective body of the Gentiles is conceived as an entire tree—is inappropriate to the relation portrayed by the figure, because the ingrafting of the Gentiles took place at first only partially and in single instances, while the σὺ addressed cannot represent heathendom as a whole, and is also not appropriate to the figure itself, because in fact not whole trees, not even quite young ones (in opposition to de Wette), are ingrafted either with the stem, or as to all their branches; besides, ver. 24 contradicts this opinion. Matthias also takes the right view. — ἐν αὐτοῖς] may grammatically be equally well understood as among them (the branches of the noble olive tree generally) — so Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, and

1 On vv. 17, 18, see Matthias in the Stud. u. Krit. 1866, p. 519 ff.

2 Without indicating the great multitude of them, in order not to promote Gentile-Christian self-exaltation (ver. 18).
many others, including Rückert, Fritzsché, Nielsen, Tholuck, Philippi, Maier, Reithmayr, Hofmann—or as: in the place of the broken-off branches (Chrysostom, Beza, Piscator, Semler, and others, including Reiche, Köllner, de Wette, Olshausen), which, however, would have to be conceived of, not as ordinarily, in locum, but in loco eorum (Olshausen has the right view). The first rendering is preferable, because it corresponds to the notion of the συνκομινομένος. — τῆς μίκης κ. τ. πιπότ. τ. δ. of the root (which now bears thee also among its own branches, ver. 18) and fatness (which now goes jointly to thee) of the olive tree. On the latter, comp. Judg. ix. 9. The assumption of a hendiadys (of the fat root) (Grotius and others) is groundless and weakening. The sense without figure is: "Thou hast attained to a participation in holy fellowship with the patriarchs, and in the blessings of the theocracy developed from them,"—both which the unbelieving Jews have forfeited.—Has Paul here, ver. 17 ff., had in view the process, really used in the East, of strengthening to renewed fertility olive trees by grafting scions of the wild olive upon them (see Columella, v. 9. 16; Pallad. xiv. 53; Schulz, Leit. d. Höchsten, V. p. 88; Michaelis, orient. Bibl. X. p. 67 ff., and note, p. 129; Bredenkamp in Paulus, Memorab. II. p. 149 ff.)? Answer: The subject-matter, which he is setting forth, required not at all the figure of the ordinary grafting of the noble scion on the wild stem, but the converse, namely, that of the ingrafting of the wild scion and its ennoblement thereby. The thing thus receiving illustration had taken place through the reception of Gentile members into the theocracy; and the thing that had taken place he was bound to represent (figuratively depict) as it had taken place. "Ordine commutato res magis causis quam causas rebus aptavit," Origen. But that, while doing this, he had before his mind that actual pomological practice, and made reference to it (Matthias: in order to exhibit the παραξηλωθηναι of the unbelieving Jews,

1 τίς μίκης would only represent the adjectival notion, if καί—omitted by B C N* Copt. Dam.—were not genuine, as Buttmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 356, pronounces it. Tisch. 8 omits it. But D* F G and Codd. of It. omit τίς μίκης καί (manifestly through a copyist's error); therefore τίς μίκης without καί appears as an incomplete restoration.
ver. 13), is not to be assumed for this reason, that here, con-
formably to the following καὶ συγκομιδῶς κ.τ.λ., there is
conceived as the object of the ingrafting the ennobled
fertilization of the graft itself; whereas, in the practice re-
ferred to, the ingrafted scion was not to receive the fatness
from the noble tree, not to become fertilized, but to fertilize;
for "foecundat sterilis pingues oleaster olivas, et quae non
novit munera, ferre docet," Palladius.

Ver. 18. μη κατακτ. τῶν κλάδων.] Boast thyself not against
(comp. Jas. ii. 13, iii. 14; also in the LXX., not in classical
Greek) the branches. These are not the broken-off branches, of
which he has just been speaking (Chrysostom, Theodoret,
Theophylact, Erasmus, Calovius, and many others, including
de Wette, Rückert, Ewaiid), but, according to vv. 16, 17, the
branches of the olive tree generally (of which some have been
broken off); without figure, therefore: the people Israel, but
by no means merely those now composing the non-Christian
Israel (Hofmann). The latter, because the Christian Israelites
also still belonged to the branches of the olive tree, must, as
well as the broken-off κλάδων, have been more precisely de-
signated (against which Hofmann urges subtleties); more-
over, the following warning would not be suitable to the
broken-off ones, because they no longer stand in any connec-
tion with the root. The κλάδων standing on the root of the
patriarchs are the Israelites, whether believing or unbelieving;
but under the broken-off ones, which are therefore no longer
borne by the root, we are to think not generally of all those Jews
who at the time had not yet become believers in Christ (vv.
13, 14)—otherwise the apostolic mission to the Jews would in
truth have no meaning (in opposition to Hofmann's denial of
this distinction)—but only of those who had rejected the Christ
preached to them (Acts xxviii. 23, 24), and therefore were
already no longer in living communion with the patriarchal
root, excluded in God's judgment from the theocracy borne
by this root (ix. 7, 8). Hence, too, we are not, with Fritzsche,
to think in τῶν κλάδων merely of the converted Jews, as indeed
to give a particular warning against pride towards Jewish-
Christians was foreign here to the object of the apostle.— ei
But if the case occur, that thou boastest against them, then know, reflect: it is not thou who bearest, etc.; without figure: Thy theocratic position is not the original theocratic one, but only a derived one, proceeding from the patriarchs and imparted to thee, conditioned by the relation into which thou hast entered towards them; thou therefore standest likewise only in the relation of a branch to the root, which is borne by the latter, and not the converse, and which may not therefore bear itself proudly towards its fellow-branches, as though it were something better. In these words there lies a warning hint beforehand of the possibility which Paul afterwards, vv. 21, 22, definitely expresses.—The ov συ την πλῆκτ ἡστ ἡστ Χτ. is to be taken declaratively. See Winer, p. 575 [E. T. 773]; Buttmann, p. 338. Comp. on 1 Cor. xi. 16. The fact itself is quite independent of the case supposed in εἰ Χτ.Λ., but it is brought to mind.

Ver. 19. Οὖν therefore; since this reason (οὐ σὺ τὴν πλῆκτ Χτ.Λ.) forbids thee κατακανακτοθαῖς, thou wilt have something else to allege.—ἐξεκλήν. Χτ.Λ.] branches were broken off (see critical notes), in order that I, etc. This ἵνα ἐγώ has the stress of arrogant self-esteem, which, however, is not to be extended also to κλάδου forming the simple subject, and not even standing in the first place (Hofmann: “branches which were so are broken off”).

Vv. 20, 21. By καλῶς Paul admits the fact; but in what follows he points out its cause, as one which must prevent haughtiness, and inspire fear and anxiety respecting the duration of the state of grace; assigning the reason in ver. 21. — καλῶς] Good ! recte ais. Demosth. 998. 24; Plat. Phil. p. 25 B; Eur. Or. 1216; Lucian, Deor. jud. 10.— The τῇ ἀπώτης and τῇ πιστεῖ placed first with emphatic warning means: on account of unbelief, etc. Comp. ver. 30. See on Gal. vi. 12. — ἔστηκας thou standest, namely, as a branch upon the olive tree. As the figure is present, both before and after-

1 Were we to read, with the Rec., εἰ καλῶς, the article would have to be taken ἐναρκλίζεις of the branches concerned, not the collective branches, from the haughty standpoint of the opponents, as Philippi holds. The simple καλῶς of the apostle does not suit this.
wards, it is opposed to the context to take ἡστηκ. absolutely, as the opposite of πέπτειν (vv. 11, 22, xiv. 4; Fritzsche, Tholuck, Krehl, Philippi—the latter doubtfully). — ἰνθηλοφρονεῖν, to be haughty (1 Tim. vi. 17), is foreign to classical Greek, which has μεγαλοφρονεῖν; yet see scholion on Pind. Pyth. ii. 91: ἰνθηλοφρονοῦντα καὶ καυχόμενον κατακάμπτει ὁ θεός. The adjective ἰνθηλόφρον is found in the classics in a good sense: high-spirited. — φοβοῦ] “timor opponitur non fiduciae, sed supercillio et securitati,” Bengel. Secure haughtiness fears not the possible loss. — τῶν κατὰ φύσιν] those according to nature, not ingrafted. — μῆπτος οἰδὲ σ. φείορ.] to be referred to the underlying conception; it is to be feared¹ (Winer, pp. 469 f., 442 [E. T. 632, 595]; Baeumlein, Partik. p. 288; Ast, Lex. Plat. II. p. 335). The future is more definite and certain than the subjunctive. See Hermann, ad El. 992, Aj. 272, Med. p. 357, Elsm.; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Rep. p. 451 A; Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 140. At the same time the specially chosen mode of expression with μὴπτος (Paul does not say directly οἰδὲ σοῦ φείοτας, as Lachmann reads) is sufficiently mitigating and forbearing.

Vv. 22, 23. An exhortation inferred from ver. 21, and corresponding to μὴ ἰνθηλοφρόνειν, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ in ver. 20. — Behold, therefore, the goodness and the severity of God, how both divine attributes present themselves before thee side by side. That χρηστ. and ἄπορ. should be without the article is, on account of the following Θεοῦ² being anathrurous, quite regular, and does not entitle us artificially to educe (as Hofmann does) the sense of “a goodness” (which is here exhibited), etc.

¹ Observe, however, that μῆπτος κ. τ. λ. is not an actual formal apodosis (in opposition to van Hengel’s difficulty, by which he sees himself compelled to adopt Lachmann’s reading); that, on the contrary, a formal apodosis, as frequently along with conditional protases (see Winer, p. 556 [E. T. 748]; Buttmann, p. 380), is by anacoluthon suppressed, and instead of it the fear μῆπτος κ. τ. λ. is independently introduced, in keeping with the emotional vividness of the discourse. Consequently: “For if God has not spared the natural branches, . . . He will, I am apprehensive, also not spare thee.” Stallbaum, ad Plat. Symp. p. 199 E, rightly observes that the suppression of the apodosis after a conditional protasis has “minimum ofensionis in familiari colloquio.” And such we have here, vv. 19–21.

² Comp. Elwert, Quaest. ad philolog. sacr., Tüb. 1880, p. 7 f.
According to the correct reading (see the critical notes), a point is, with Lachmann, to be placed after ἀποτομήν Θεοῦ; and with the following nominatives, ἀποτομή and χρηστότης Θεοῦ, ἐστί is to be supplied.¹ "Towards the fallen there is severity, but towards thee (directed to thee) goodness." The fallen are the Jews who have refused to believe,—so designated, because they are conceived as branches broken off and thereby fallen from the tree. Comp. ἐστηκας, ver. 20. In allusion to this, the severity of God is also designated as ἀποτομή (only here in the N. T., but see on 2 Cor. xiii. 10; Kypke, II. p. 179; Grimm on Wisd. v. 21). This reference to the figure, which certainly pervades the whole representation, it is arbitrary to deny (de Wette, Fritzsche).—ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃ, τῇ χρηστότῃ.] if thou shalt abide (see on vi 1) by the goodness, i.e. if thou shalt not have separated thyself from the divine goodness (through apostasy from faith), but shalt have remained true to it; comp. Acts xiii. 43. Rightly, therefore, as respects the mode of the ἐπιμένειν τ. χρ., Clemens Alex. Paedag. I. p. 140 Pott.: τῇ εἰς Χριστὸν πιστε. But it is erroneous, because contrary to the context (for the emphasis lies on ἐπιμείνῃ, and τῇ χρηστότῃ is but the repetition of the divine attribute just mentioned) and un-Pauline, to take χρηστότης, with Fritzsche, following Ch. Schmidt, in the sense of human rightness of conduct (iii. 12). Comp. rather on χρηστότ., ii. 4, and on Eph. ii. 7; also Tit. iii. 4.—ἐπέλελ τινQPushButton:  σῦ ἐκκοπήγαγ] for otherwise thou also (like those broken-off branches) shalt be cut off. The threatening tenor of the discourse suggests unsought the stronger word ἐκκοπ., which is also in ver. 24 retained of the wild olive tree. — Since κακείνου δὲ κ.τ.λ. does not depend on the condition previously to be supplied with ἐπέλελ, but has its own conditional sentence, a point is to be placed (in opposition to Hofmann) after ἐκκοπ.; and with κακείνος δὲ a new sentence, still further repressing Gentile self-exaltation, must be begun,

¹ To assume expository nominatives absolute (Jacobs, ad Del. epigr. v. 43), with Buttman, n. 329, is inappropriate, because the appended ἐκκοπήν κ. τ.λ. can no longer be dependent on ἀποτομή, but presupposes an independent sentence.

² Such, with Origen. Lachm. Scholz, Tisch., according to a large preponderance of evidence, is to be the reading, instead of μει ἀπελ.
which usual punctuation Lachmann, ed. maj., has again adopted: And those, too, if they shall not have persisted in unbelief, will be grafted in,—whereby the reception into the true divine community (vv. 25, 31) is figuratively depicted. The kal puts the ἐκεῖνος on a parallel to the ingrafted wild olive branches (ver. 17).— διακρίνων γάρ] if, namely, the cause has ceased to exist, on account of which God had to break off these branches, the power of God (comp. iv. 21, xiv. 4) leaves no doubt, etc. In πάλιν the conception is, that by the ingrafting their restoration to their previous condition is accomplished. Comp. Winer, p. 576.—We may notice that this is a probative passage for the possibility of forfeiture of the state of grace, for the conversio resistibilis and for reiterabilitas gratiae, and also against absolute predestination.

Ver. 24. Γάρ] does not serve to assign the reason of διακρίνων κ.τ.λ., so that the ability of God for that reingrafting would be popularly illustrated from the facility of this process, as according to nature (the ordinary view). Against this it may be decisively urged, that—apart from the difficulty which experience attests in the conversion of unbelieving Jews—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; Rom. ix. 22; Matt. xix. 26; Luke i. 37, et al.); and that πόσον μᾶλλον, as a designation of greater easiness, must have found in the context a more precise explanation to that effect, if it was not intended to express generally, as elsewhere (comp. Philem. 16, and the similar use of πολλῷ μᾶλλον), the greater degree of probability or certainty. Rightly, therefore, have Winzer, Progr. 1828, Reiche, Philippi, and Tholuck, referred the γάρ to the main thought of the previous verse, to ἐγκατεστωθήσονται. Yet they should not have taken this γάρ as purely co-ordinate with the preceding γάρ, but—as must always be done with two such apparently parallel instances of γάρ—as explicative (see on viii. 6), namely, so that after the brief ground assigned for ἐγκατεστωθήσονται (διακρίνων κ.τ.λ.), the same is now yet more fully elucidated in regard to its certainty, and by this elucidation is still further confirmed. To this the con-
firmautory reference to ἐγκεκατ. in Hofmann substantially amounts.

— σὺ] Gentile-Christian. — ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν... ἀγρεμ.} out of the wild olive, which is so according to nature, which by nature has grown a wild olive. — παρὰ φύσιν} for the grafting, as an artificial proceeding, alters the natural development, and is so far contrary to nature (i. 26). The interposition of ἔξεκοπ. brings out more markedly the contrast between κατὰ φύσιν and παρὰ φ. Very violently the simple words are twisted by Hofmann as follows: ἀγρεμαίον is in apposition to ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν; while for the latter there is to be borrowed from ἀγρεμαίον the more general notion of the olive tree, and ἡ κατὰ φύσιν is the tree, which is so for the branch in a natural manner. — εἰς καλλιέρα] into a (not the) noble olive tree. The word is also found in Aristotle, Plant. i. 6, in contrast to ἀγρεμ. — οὖν] the Jews who have refused to believe. — οἱ κατὰ φύσιν} sc. διᾶς,1 those according to nature. In what respect they are so, the context exhibits, namely, as the original branches of the holy olive tree, whose root the patriarchs are, ver. 16. — τῇ ἔλαφῃ ἑλ.] for they have originally grown upon it, and then have been cut off from it; hence it is still their own olive tree.

Vv. 25–32. The formal and unconditional promise of the collective conversion of the Jews, and the confirmatory proof of this promise, now follow down to ver. 32. — γάρ] introduces the corroboration of the previous ἐγκεκατούρθησαν: “they shall be grafted in, I say; for be it not withheld from you,” etc. — οὐ θέλῳ ὑμᾶς ἀγροεῖν] not a mere formula of announcement generally (Rückert), but always of something important, which Paul desires to be specially noticed, i. 13; 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 13. That which is addressed, under the fervent addition of the ἀδελφὸς embracing all readers,

1 Fritzche takes αί as the relative αί: how much more shall these be grafted into the olive tree, who, according to nature, shall become grafted into their own olive tree! Superfluous in itself, and what diffuse and unwieldy circumstance of expression! Hofmann has nevertheless acceded to this reading of αί, in which case, through the punctuation ὑμῶν, αἱ κατὰ φύσιν (sc. ἐγκεκατούρθησαν) ἐγκεκατούρθησαν τῇ ἔλαφῃ ἑλ., nothing is gained. How simply and clearly would the thought thus artificially made out have been expressed, if Paul had only left out that alleged relative αί!
is the whole church, although it stands before the apostle’s eyes such as it was, namely, in its predominantly Gentile-Christian character. Comp. vv. 13, 28, 30. — τὸ μυστήριον] has not in the N. T. the sense in which profane writers speak of mysteries (something mysterious in itself, comprehensible only by the initiated, and to be concealed from the profane). See on μῦνεω and μυστήρη, Creuzer on Plotin. de Puls. p. 357 f.; Lennep. Etymol. p. 441; comp. Lobeck, Aglaoph. I. p. 85 ff. But it signifies that which, undiscovered by men themselves, has been made known to them by divine ἀποκάλυψις, and always refers to the relations and the development of the Messianic kingdom (Matt. xiii. 11). Thus it frequently denotes with Paul the divine counsel of redemption through Christ,—as a whole, or in particular parts of it,—because it was veiled from men before God revealed it (Rom. xvi. 25; 1 Cor. ii. 7–10; Eph. iii. 3–5). Whether the contents of a mystery have already become known through the preaching of the gospel, may be gathered from the scope of the particular passages. That, however, which Paul here means by μυστήριον, is something the ἀποκάλυψις of which he is conscious of having received by divine illumination (just as in 1 Cor. xv. 51), and he declares it as a prophet ἐν ἀποκάλυψις (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 30); without presupposing that the church, personally still strange to him, was already acquainted with the peculiar point of doctrine, as is evinced by ἣνα μὴ ἦτε ἐν ἀνοτοῖς φρόν. He desires, namely, by a disclosure of the μυστήριον, to take care that his readers, from their Gentile-Christian standpoint, should not, under a misapprehension of the divine counsel, hold for truth their own views on the exclusion of the Israelitish people, and therewith be wise in themselves (ἐν ἀνοτ., see the critical notes), i.e. in their own judgment (comp. Jas. ii. 4). What Luther has: “that ye be not proud” (comp. Erasmus, Beza, Calvin, Calovius), is not directly expressed, but is rightly pointed out by Theodoret as a consequence. Comp. Isa. v. 21; Soph. El. 1055 f. — ὅτι κ.τ.λ.] Contents of the μυστήριον, namely, the duration of the hardening of Israel, which will not be permanent. — πῶρασιν] See on ver. 7. — ἀπὸ μέρους] is to be connected with γέγονεν, not, as by Estius, Semler, Koppe, Fritzsche, contrary to the construction,
with τῷ Ἰσραήλ. Hardening has partially befallen the people, in so far as οὐ πάντες ἡπιστευσαν τολλοὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐπιστευσαν (Theodoret). Comp. xv. 15. It is therefore to be understood extensively (comp. οἱ λοιποὶ, ver. 7; τινὲς, ver. 17), not intensively, as Calvin takes it (attaching it to πώρωσι): quodammodo, which was intended to soften the severity of the notion. So taken, it would not modify the conception, but alter it (ver. 7 ff.). Köllner finds in ἀπὸ μ. the statement of a single ground of the divine arrangement, leaving it undecided whether other reasons, and what, were in the mind of the apostle: on the one part the hardening had been decreed by God over Israel only for the end, that first, etc. But in that case ἀπὸ μ. must have referred to an expressed ἔνα or the like. The temporal view, "for a while" (Hofmann), is here as contrary to usage as in 2 Cor. i. 14, ii. 5. Paul would have known how to express this sense possibly by ἕως, or by the classical τέως. — φέγγωνε] from whom? is known from ver. 8. — ἐχρεός οὗ] usque dum intraverit. Then—when this shall have taken place—the hardening of Israel shall cease. Calvin's ita ut is intended, in spite of the language, to remove the idea of a terminus ad quem; and for the same reason Calovius and others employ much artifice in order to bring out the sense, that down to the end of the world the partial hardening will endure, and therefore, too, the partial conversion, but only that which is partial. — τὸ πληρωμα τῶν ἔθνων] In opposition to Gusset, Wolfburg, and others named by Wolf, also Wolf himself, Michaelis, Olshausen, Philippi, who understand only the complementum ethnicorum serving to make up for the unbelieving Jews ("the recruitment from the Gentiles," Michaelis), the usus loquendi is not decisive; for according to usage that, with which something else is made full, might certainly be expressed by the genitive with πληρωμα (Mark viii. 20, and see on Mark vi 43; comp. Eccles. iv. 6). But how enigmatically, and in a manner how liable to misapprehension, would Paul have indicated the supposed thought, instead of simply and plainly writing τὸ πληρωμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἔθνων! especially as already, in ver. 12, the analogous expression τὸ πληρωμα αὐτῶν was used in the sense of "their full
number." Fritzsche also finds too little: *caterva gentilium,* so that only a *great multitude* is meant. Comp. on Eph. iii. 19. We must observe the correlation of *ἀπὸ μέρους* ... *πλήρωμα* ... *πᾶς* : a *part* of Israel is hardened, until the Gentiles collectively shall have come in, and, when that shall have taken place, then *all* Israel will be saved. The conversion of the Gentiles ensues by successive stages; but when their *totality* shall be converted, then the conversion of the Jews in their *totality* will also ensue; so that Paul sees the latter—which up to that epoch certainly also advances gradually in individual cases—ensuing, after the full conversion of the Gentiles, as the event completing the assemblage of the church and accomplishing itself probably in rapid development. All this, therefore, *before* the *Parousia,* not by means of it. Comp. on Acts iii. 20. The expression τὸ *πλήρωμα* τ. ἔθνων is therefore to be taken *numerically* : the *plena copia* of the Gentiles (of whom in the first instance only a *fraction* has come and is coming in), their *full number.* Rightly Theophylact: *πάντες,* but with arbitrary limitation he adds: *οἱ προεγνωσμένοι ἔθνοι.* Just so, in substance, Augustine, Oecumenius, and many others, including even van Hengel: "plenus numerus gentilium, *quotquot comprehendebant proposita Dei,*" comp. Krummacher: "only the *elect* among the Gentiles." The collective multitude of the Gentiles in the strict sense Hofmann seeks to get rid of, by making τὸ *πλήρωμα* serve only to emphasize the fact that τὰ ἔθνη is to be thought of "in the full compass of the notion," so that by τὸ *πλήρη* τ. ἔθνων no other full amount is intended than that which would be expressed by τὰ ἔθνη *itself.* Thus there would result as the sense: until *no*

1 There would have been no offence taken at the full sense of the *πλήρωμα* τῶν ἔθνων, as well as of the correlate ἡς Ἰσραήλ, ver. 26, and there would have been no occasion to seek artificial limitations of the fulness of these notions, had it been sufficiently considered that Paul is speaking *apocalyptically,* in virtue of his *prophetic contemplation* of the last sacred-historical development before the *Parousia.* The prophet (comp. *e.g.* Acts ii. 17, xi. 28) contemplates and speaks of the grand things in the perspective opened to his view in the *bulk* and *summarily,* without being answerable for such utterances according to strict mathematical precision. By a restrictive explaining away and modification of these utterances the prophetic character and spirit suffers a violence foreign to it, against which the simple and clear words do not cease to offer resistance.
people of the Gentile world is any longer found outside the church. This is decidedly at variance with ver. 12, and with the whole context down to its evident concluding verse (ver. 32), according to which not the peoples as such (in the lump, as it were), but all persons who compose them, must be the subjects of the entrance into the church and of the divine mercy. The above interpretation is a process of rationalizing, artificial and far-fetched, and contrary to the language and the context, by interpreting what is said of the individuals as applying to the nations; just as Beyschlag, p. 75, understands the two great groups of mankind to be thought of here and in ver. 26. — εἰς Θέαμα] namely, into the community prefigured by the holy olive tree, i.e. into the people of God. There is not yet mention of the kingdom of Messiah; its establishment is later. The passage Col. i. 13 is wrongly employed with a view to supply εἰς τ. Βασιλ. Θεοῦ. See in loc.

Ver. 26 f. Καὶ ὁστῶ] And so, namely, after the πληρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν shall have come in. The modal character of the ὁστῶ therefore lies in the succession of time conditioning the emergence of the fact (comp. 1 Cor. xi. 28), as it also in the classics, in the sense of so then, embraces what has been previously said. ¹ See Schweighäuser, Lex. Herod. II. p. 167; Thucyd. iii. 96. 2; Xen. Anab. iii. 5. 6; Dem. 644. 18, 802. 20. Theodoret rightly says: τῶν γὰρ ἐθνῶν δεξαμένων τὸ κήρυγμα πιστεύουσι κάκεινοι, and that, according to ver. 11, under the impulse of powerful emulation. We may add that this great final result is brought into more important prominence, if we take καὶ ὁστῶ κ.τ.λ. independently, than if we make it form part of the statement dependent on ὁτι (Lachmann, Tischendorf, Fritzsche, Ewald, Hofmann, and others). — πᾶς Ἰσραήλ] This notion, so definitely expressed, of the totality of the people is in no way to be limited; the whole of those are intended, who, at the time that the fulness of the Gentiles shall have

¹ Hofmann, in connection with his incorrect explanation of ὁτι προφανῶν, ver. 25, refers ὁτι to the temporal limitation of the Jewish hardening; through the fact that the latter took place in the first instance only and thus in its time ceases, there is given to the people the possibility (?), etc. In this way this definitely prophetic element, which lies in the καὶ ὁστῶ joined to what immediately proceeds, is removed, and resolved into something entirely self-evident!
come in, will compose Israel. All Israelites who up to that time shall be still unconverted, will then be converted to salvation, so that at that term entire Israel will obtain the saving deliverance; but comp., as to the quite unlimited expression, the remark on ver. 25. Limitations from other interests than that of exegesis have been suggested: such as that the spiritual Israel, Gal. vi. 16, is meant (Augustine, Theodoret, Luther, Calvin, Grotius, and others, including Krummacher); or only the select portion of the Jews (Calovius, Bengel, and several others, including Olshausen: “all those members of the Israelish people who from the beginning belonged to the true λειμμα”); or that πᾶς is to be taken comparatively only of the greater number, of the bulk (Oecumenius, Wetstein, Rückert, Fritzsche, Tholuck). To this comes in substance also Hofmann’s explanation: “that the people, as a people, will be

—On the history of the exposition of this passage, see, moreover, Calovius, p. 190 ff., and Luthardt.
converted;" but πᾶς Ἰσραήλ is, in fact, not "Israel as a whole," but rather the entire Israel, as is also meant in 2 Chron. xii. 1 and in all O. T. passages, in contrast to ἀπὸ μέρους, ver. 25. Comp. πᾶς οἱκὼς Ἰσρ., Acts ii. 36, πᾶς ὁ λαὸς Ἰσρ., and the like. This also against Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 404. — σωθησθαι] will be saved, unto Messianic salvation, by their conversion to Christ. — καθὼς γέρον]. For πᾶς Ἰσρ. σωθήσῃ. Paul finds a Scripture warrant, not merely a substratum for his own ideas (Tholuck), in Isa. lix. 20, 21 (not quite closely after the LXX., and, from ἐκατόν onwards, with a bringing in of xxvii. 9; see Surenhus. καταλλ. p. 503 f.); to the prophetic sense of this passage the future salvation of all Israel corresponds as result. — ἐκ Σιών] for from God will the deliverer come; the theocratic central-point and dwelling-place of the divine kingdom is the holy mount of Zion. Comp. Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 7, et al. See also ix. 33. The LXX. have, following the original, ἐνεκέν Σιών (ἰοίν, i.e. for Zion). Our ἐκ Σιών

1 Not, however, as though Paul had derived his prophecy from Isa. l.c., for the εἰς πάντες . . . καὶ οὕτω he could not derive thence. Rather has he— after having ἐκκαθάρισεν recognised the declared µοντηρα— now also recognised an O. T. prophecy in reference to that constituent of it which is contained in πᾶς Ἰσραήλ σωθήσεται; this, therefore, pertains no longer to the ἐκκαθάρισμος, by which the µοντηρα itself was disclosed to him, but is to be ascribed to his own apprehension of the meaning of Scripture. The Messianic prophecy of Isa. lix. 20, 21 (also with the Rabbins a solemn Messianic utterance; see Schoettg. Hor. II. pp. 71, 187), refers merely to the Israelites turning from apostasy, and appears therefore incapable of warranting πᾶς Ἰσραήλ σωθήσεται. We have, however, to observe that, according to the apostle's view and exposition in ver. 17 ff., it is only those who reject Christ among the Jews who have fallen away from the true theocracy (from the olive tree); consequently, if these are converted, entire Israel is reconciled, because they who remained and do remain in the theocracy are those who have accepted and accept the preaching of Christ— of whom the σωθήσεται is therefore self-evident. This mode of apprehending the quotation, corresponding to the contextual view of the state of the matter, excludes the far-fetched and artificial expedient which Fritzsche offers, when he brings out from the ananhórous ἐκκαθάρισμα, and from τῆς ἐκκαθάρισμα having the article (aliqua peccata—all sins), the result that in the first half only the elect Israelites, but in the second the entire people, are meant.— Following Calvin and others, Glückler again believes that ver. 27 is borrowed from Jer. xxxi. 31–34; but this must be rejected, because καὶ οὕτω . . . ἐκκαθάρισος stands in Isa. lix. 21, while ἐκκαθάρισον stands literally in Isa. xxvii. 9. Philippi also thinks that the contents of the passage in Jeremiah floated before the mind of the apostle. If this were the case, why should he not have cited this well-known leading passage in reference to the new covenant?
is a variation of memory, occasioned by the reminiscence of other passages (comp. Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 7, cx. 2); for ἐφευρέω Σ. would have been quite as suitable to the apostle's purpose (in opposition to Reiche, Fritzsche, van Hengel); hence to discover intentional reasons for this deviation (Philippi: in order to bring into stronger relief the claim of the people as contrasted with the Gentiles) is groundless. Nor was this deviation more convenient (Hofmann) for the apostle, namely, in order to designate Christ's place of manifestation; but it involuntarily on his part found its way into the citation freely handled.— ὁ ἰησοῦς [i.e. not God (Grotius, van Hengel), who first emerges in ver. 27, but the Messiah. In the Heb. we find ἀρσία, a deliverer, without the article, by which, however, no other is intended. The future coming of the deliverer which is here predicted is, in the sense of the fulfilment of this prophecy, necessarily that whereby the πᾶς Ἰσραήλ σωθήσεται will be effected; consequently not the Parousia, because the conversion of all Israel must be antecedent to this, but rather that specially efficacious self-revelation of Christ in the preaching of His gospel (comp. Eph. ii. 17), to be expected by the future, whereby He will bring about that final sacred-historical epoch of the people, the conversion of its totality. Errorneously, however, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Beda have supposed it predicted that Elijah or Enoch would appear before the end of the world as converter of the Jews.— ἀποστρφ. ἀφεσ. ἀπὸ Ἰακ. He will turn away, i.e. (comp. Bar. iii. 7; 1 Macc. iv. 58) remove, do away with impurities from Jacob. By this, in the sense of the apostle, is meant the atoning, reconciling work of the Messiah (comp. John i. 29: αἱρεῖν τ. ἀμαρτ.), which He will accomplish in Israel by its conversion. Hence there follows, as the correlative to this in ver. 27, the forgiveness of sins on the part of God, procured through Him, and that as the actually saving essence of the covenant, which the people possesses from God. Compare the original text, which, however, instead of κ. ἀποστρφ. ἀφεσ. ἀπὸ Ἰακῶβ has ἄφηναν ἠμαρτήσατε, and for those turning from apostasy

1 How happy a final result! Instead of a rejection of the people of God (ver. 1), the covenant of God with them now subsists in its entire fulfilment!
in Jacob. Paul, however, because following generally in this quotation the LXX., retains also its deviation from the original text, but not as if this could have been more welcome to him for his object, for in that respect he might have just as well made use of the words of the original.— αὐτή] points to the following (comp. 1 John v. 2), so that the sense of ver. 27 is: "And when I shall have forgiven their sins, this, this remission of sins conferred by me, will be my covenant to them, i.e. they will therein have from me the execution of my covenant." Both in the original and in the LXX. αὐτή points to the following, in which the words of the covenant (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμὸν...οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπη ἐκ τοῦ στόμ. κ.τ.λ.) are adduced; but instead of them, Paul, for the object which he has in view, puts ἐταυν ἀφέλωμαι κ.τ.λ. from Isa. xxvii. 9, where likewise a preceding demonstrative (τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ) points forward to ἐταυν. Hence we may not, with others (including Kollner and Hofmann), refer αὐτή to the preceding, in which case ἀποστρ. ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακ. is supposed to point to the moral conversion, and ἀφελ. τ. ἀμαρτ. αὐτ. to the forgiveness, on the ground of which that conversion takes place (see Hofmann). According to this view, the essence of the covenant would lie in sanctification, not in reconciliation, which would be conceived rather as antecedent to the covenant,—a view which runs counter to the N. T. doctrine (Matt. xxvi. 26; Heb. ix. 15 ff., x. 29, xii. 24, xiii. 20).— ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη] The covenant which proceeded from me, which was made on my part. See Bernhardy, p. 255 f.; Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 182 f.; van Hengel, in loc.

Remark.—The conversion of entire Israel promised by Paul as a μνημένως revealed to him, has not yet taken place; for the opinion, that the promise had been fulfilled already in the apostolic age through the conversion of a great part of the people (comp. Euseb. H. E. iii. 35; Judaeantes in Jerome; Grotius, Limborch, Wetstein), is set aside, notwithstanding Acts xxii. 20, by the literal meaning of πᾶς Ἰσραήλ and of πλήρωσις τῶν ἱδών. The fulfilment is to be regarded as still future, as the last step in the universal extension of Christianity upon earth. In respect of time no more special definition can be given, than that the conversion of the totality of the Gentiles must precede
it; whence only this is certain, that it is still a time very distant. Paul has certainly viewed the matter as near, seeing that he conceived the Parousia itself to be near (not merely, perhaps, its possible, but its actual emergence—in opposition to Philippi).—a conception which was shared by him with the whole apostolical church, although it remained without the verification of the event, as this was conceived of. But the promise of the conversion of the people of Israel is not on that account itself to be regarded as one, the fulfilment of which is no longer to be hoped for,—as though, with the non-verified conception of the time of the event, the event itself should fall to the ground (Ammon, Reiche, Köllner, Fritzscbe); for it is the fact in itself, and not the epoch of it, which is disclosed by the apostle as part of the μεταφυσιον which was revealed to him; and therefore this disclosure rested on the ἀπαξιάλυφε received, not on individual opinion and expectation. The duration of time until the Parousia was not subject-matter of revelation, Acts i. 7, and the conception of it belongs, therefore, not to that in the apostolic teaching which has the guarantee of divine certainty, but to the domain of subjective hope and expectation, which associated themselves with what was revealed,—a distinction which even Philippi does not reject. The latter, however, endeavours to remove from the category of error the apostolic expectation of the nearness of the Parousia, because it was not cherished with that divine certainty; but cannot thereby prevent it, where it is presupposed so definitely, as e.g. xiii. 11, or is expressed so unconditionally, as e.g. 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, from being characterized by an unprejudiced mind as a human error, which did not, however, exclude occasionally other moods, as in 2 Cor. v. 8, Phil. i. 23. Of such human mistakes and vacillations, which lie outside the range of revealed truth, that truth is independent (against Hoelemann, neue Bibelstud. p. 232 ff., and others).—We may further notice that our passage directly controverts the Ebionitish view, now renewed in various quarters (Chr. A. Crusius, Delitzsch, Baumgarten, Ehrard, Auberlen, and others; expositors of the Apocalypse), of an actual restoration of Israel to the theocratic kingdom in Canaan, as to be expected on the ground of prophetic predictions (Hos. ii. 2, 16 ff., iii. 4, 5; Isa. xi. 1, xxiv. 16, chap. lx.; Jer. xxxiv. 33, et al.). Israel does not take in the church, but the church takes in Israel; and whenever this occurs, Israel has in the true sense again its kingdom and its Canaan. Comp. Tholuck on ver. 25; Kahnis, Dogm. I. p. 576 f.;

Ver. 28 ff. Yet a final summary gathering up of the sacred-historical relation of Israel to God, and (vv. 29–32) discussion of it; in which, however, the reference, bearing on the apostle's object, to the statement καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται does not require the parenthesizing of καθὼς γέγραπται κ.τ.λ. (Ewald), as in ver. 28 the substantive verb is easily and obviously supplied.—The unbelieving Israelites as such are the subject (αὐτῶν, ver. 27).—κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγ. The relation is thereby designated, according to which they are ἐχθροί. The gospel was preached to them; but they rejected it, in which relation they are hated of God. In conformity with the message of salvation, which reached them, but was despised by them (comp. ver. 25), they must necessarily be ἐχθροί; since in fact, not accepting the δικαιοσύνη proffered in the gospel, they remained under the wrath of God (ver. 7). According to the context, we must think of the ἀπείθεια of the Jews, ver. 30; and therefore neither of their exclusion from the gospel (Fritzsche), nor even of the diffusion of the latter (Rückert). — ἐχθροί not my enemies (Theodoret, Luther, Grotius, Semler, and others), nor yet enemies of the gospel (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Michaelis, Morus, Rosenmüller). That, on the contrary, Θεοὶ (see on Gal. iv. 16) is to be supplied, as Θεοὶ with ἀγαπητοί, is evident generally from the connection with vv. 27 and 29; and that ἐχθροί is to be explained not in an active (Olshausen, van Hengel, Ritschl, and older interpreters), but in a passive sense (to whom God is hostile), is shown by the contrast of ἀγαπητοί. Comp. on v. 10. — δόματι for your sake, because you are thereby to attain to salvation, ver. 11. — κατὰ τὴν ἐκλ. is usually taken: as fellow-members of the nation elected to be the people of God; comp. ver. 2. But ἐκλογή—differently from the προβεγγ., ver. 2—has already been clearly defined in vv. 5, 7 as the elect λαός, and hence, with Ewald, is here also to be taken in this sense. Consequently: in conformity with the fact, however, that among them is that elect remnant. This be-
lieving ἔκλογή is the living testimony of the undying love of God towards the people. Comp. ver. 5.— διὰ τοῦ παρ.] for the fathers’ sake. Calvin aptly remarks: “Quoniam ab illis propagata fuerat Dei gratia ad posteros, secundum pactum formam: Deus tuus et seminis tui;” comp. ver. 16; Luke i. 54, 55.

Ver. 29. Confirmation of the second half of ver. 28 by the axiom: “Unrepent., and so subject to no recall, are the displays of grace and (especially) the calling of God.” The application to be made of this general proposition is: Consequently God, who has once made this people the recipient of the displays of His grace and has called them to the Messianic salvation, will not, as though He had repented of this, again withdraw His grace from Israel, and leave and abandon His calling of Israel without realization.— On ἀμεταμέλητος, comp. 2 Cor. vii. 10.

Vv. 30, 31. Τάρ] not referable to ver. 28 (Hofmann), introduces that, which, according to the economy of salvation under the divine mercy, will emerge as actual proof of the truth of ver. 29.— ἡπειθήσατε] have refused obedience, which came to pass through unbelief. For the elucidation of this, see i. 18 ff.— νῦν δὲ] contrast to the time before they become Christian (ποιεῖ), Eph. ii. 8.— ἡλείθυτε] For the reception into Christianity with its blessings is, as generally, so in particular over-against the preceding ἡπειθήσατε, on God’s part solely the work of mercy. — τῇ τοιῇ απείθ. through the disobedience of these; for they are ἐχθροὶ δι’ ὑμᾶς, ver. 28. Comp., besides, vv. 11 f., 15, 19 f. The non-compliance of the Jews with the requirement of faith in the gospel brought about the reception of the Gentiles. The latter, the converted Gentiles, are individualized by the address to the Gentile-Christian community of the readers (ὑμεῖς).— ἡπειθήσαν] namely, through rejection of the gospel.— τῷ ὑμετέρῳ δέκει is, on account of the parallelism, to be joined to the following (Ἰω κ. τ. λ.), and the dative to be taken in the sense of mediate agency, like τῇ τοιῇ. απείθ.: in order that through the mercy that befell you (which may excite them to emulation of your faith, ver. 11), mercy should also accrue to them.
The position of τ. δυ. δι. before the introductory conjunction is for the sake of emphasis; comp. 2 Cor. xii. 7; Gal. iv. 10, et al.; Winer, p. 522 [E. T. 688]. Hence the parallelism is not to be sacrificed by placing a comma after ἔλεευ. Nevertheless such is the course followed—and with very different views of the dative, arbitrarily departing from the datival notion in τῇ τοῦτ. ἄνειθείᾳ—by the Vulgate (“in vestram misericordiam”), Peschito, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Wolf, Morus, Lachmann, Glöckler, Maier, Ewald (“so these also became now disobedient alongside of [bei] your mercy”), Buttmann in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 367 (“in favour of your mercy, that you might find mercy”), and others.— ἦν] the divinely ordained aim of the ἄνειθησαν. On the emphatic υπερμέτρος in the objective sense, see Winer, p. 145 [E. T. 191]; Kühner, II. 1, p. 486.

Ver. 32. Establishment of ver. 30 f., and that by an exhibition of the universal divine procedure, with the order of which that which is said in ver. 31 of the now disobedient Jews and their deliverance is incorporated. Thus ver. 32 is at once the grand summary and the glorious key-stone—impelling once more to the praise of God (ver. 33 ff.)—of the whole preceding section of the epistle.¹ — συγκλείω εἰς: to include in (2 Mace. v. 5, comp. Luke v. 6), has, in the later Greek (Diod. Sic. xix. 19, comp. xx. 74, frequently in Polybius), and in the LXX. (after the Heb. הַתֵּעֵד with יִ), also the metaphorical sense: to hand over unto or under a power which holds as it were in ward. Comp. on Gal. iii. 22, 23. Correspondent, as regards the notion, is παρέδωκε, i. 24. The compound expression strengthens the meaning; it does not denote simul (Bengel and others).—The effective sense is not to be changed, which has been attempted by taking it sometimes as declarative (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius, Zeger, Glass, Wolf, Carpzov, Wetstein, Ch. Schmidt), sometimes as permissive (Origen, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius, and many others, including Flatt and Tholuck). — εἰς ἄνειθη] towards God; see

¹ "Note this prime saying, which condemns all the world and man's righteousness, and alone exalts God's mercy, to be obtained through faith" (Luther's gloss).
vv. 30, 31. — τῶν πάντων] Of Gentiles (ὑμεῖς) and Jews (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) Paul has previously spoken; hence οἱ πάντες now comprises the totality, namely all Jews and Gentiles jointly and severally,—"cunctos s. universos, i.e. singulos in unum corpus colligatos," Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 521. Comp. on the subject-matter, iii. 9, 19; Gal. iii. 22. So necessarily also the following τῶν πάντων. The view which understands only the two masses of Jews and Gentiles, these two halves of mankind in the gross (usually so taken recently, as by Tholuck, Fritzsche, Philippi, Ewald, Weiss), cannot suit the comprehensive τ. πάντες (as if it were equal to τῶν ἰμιστωροποιημένων), since it is by no means appropriate to the mere number of two, but only to their collective subjects. Not even the Jewish ἐκλογή, vv. 7, 28, is to be excepted (Maier, van Hengel), because its subjects were also before their conversion sinners (iii. 23), and therefore subjected to the power of disobedience towards God; for the οὐκέκλεισε ... ἀνεπιθεῖαι points back, in the case of each single member of the collective whole, to the time before conversion and until conversion. If we should desire to refer οἱ πάντες merely to the Jews (van Hengel by way of a suggestion, and Hofmann), who are meant as a people in their collective shape (consequently not in all individuals; see Hofmann), the close relationship between ver. 30 and ver. 31 would be opposed to it, since the reference of γάρ merely to the apodosis in ver. 31 is quite arbitrary; and, indeed, the bold concluding thought in ver. 32 possesses its great significance and its suitableness to the following outburst of praise, simply and solely through its all-comprehensive contents. And even apart from this, τῶν πάντων in fact never denotes: them as a collective whole, as a people, but, as universally (in 1 Cor. ix. 22, x. 17; 2 Cor. v. 14; Phil. ii. 21; comp. Eph. iv. 13; 2 Macc. xi. 11, xii. 40, et al., and in all the classical writers) all of them, as also only in this sense does the suitable emphasis fall on the repetition in the apodosis. — ἵνα τ. τ. ἔχεισθαι in order that He may have mercy upon all. This divine purpose Paul saw to be already in part attained,—namely, in

1 οἱ πάντες has, as is well known, the sense of in all in the case of numbers. See Krüger, § 50. 11. 13; Kühner, II. 1, p. 545.
the case of all already converted; but its general fulfilment lay, to his view, in the development of the future on to the great terminus expressed in ver. 25 f. We may observe that our passage is at variance not merely with the decretum reprobationis ("hanc particulam universalem opponamus tentationi de particularitate...; non fingamus in Deo contradictorias voluntates," Melanchthon), but also with the view (Olshausen, Krummacher, and older expositors) that Paul means the collective body of the elect. See rather ver. 25 f. The ἀποκατάστασις is not, however, to be based on our passage for this reason, that the universality of the divine purpose of redemption (comp. 1 Tim. ii. 4), as well as the work of redemption having taken place for the justification of all (ver. 18), does not exclude its final non-realization in part through the fault of the individuals concerned, and cannot do away with either the applicability of the purpose-clause exhibited in principle and summarily in prophetic fashion (comp. remark on ver. 25), nor with the divine judgment on final concrete self-frustrations of the counsel of salvation. And this the less, because such misinterpretations of the universalistic axiom are opposed by the apostle’s doctrine of election as a sure corrective. There has been incorrectly discovered in such general expressions a want of consistency on the part of Paul, namely, "undeveloped outlines of a liberal conception" (Georgii in the Theol. Jahrb. 1845, I. p. 25).

Ver. 33. The great and holy truth containing the whole divine procedure in preparing bliss (ver. 32),—with which Paul now arrives at the close of his entire development of doctrine in the epistle,—compels first an enraptured expression of praise to God from his deeply-moved heart, before he can commence the exhortations, which he then (chap. xii.) purposes to subjoin. — ὁ βάθος] θαυμάξοντος ἐστιν ἡ ῥῆσις, οἷς εἰδότος τὸ πᾶν, Chrysostom. — The depth is an expression of great fullness and superabundance, according to the very prevalent mode of expressing also in the classics greatness of riches by βάθος πλούτον (Soph. Aj. 180, and Lobeck, in loc.; but comp.

with Ellendt, I. p. 286), \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \nu \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \sigma \) (Ael. V. H. iii. 18), \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \) (Tyrta. iii. 6), \( \beta \alpha \theta \upsilon \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \sigma \), very rich (Aesch. Suppl. p. 549, Crinag. 17), \( \beta \alpha \theta \upsilon \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \sigma \) (Poll. iii. 109). Comp. Dorville, ad Charit. p. 232; Blomfield, Gloss. ad Aesch. Pers. 471. By this sense we are here to abide, just because \( \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \sigma \) is added, and without deriving the expression from the conception of subterranean treasure-chambers (van Hengel); and we are not to find in it the sense of unsearchableness (Philippi), which is not expressed even in 1 Cor. ii. 10, Judith viii. 14, and is not required by the following \( \omega \varsigma \, \omega \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \). 

\( \kappa \tau \lambda \), since this rather characterizes the \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \, \sigma \phi \iota \varsigma \, \varsigma \, \gamma \nu \omicron \omega \varsigma \omicron \varsigma \omicron \) from the point of view of human knowledge, to which it must necessarily be unfathomable, but in a peculiar relation. In its reference to \( \sigma \phi \iota \varsigma \, \kappa \, \gamma \nu \omicron \omega \varsigma \omicron \varsigma \omicron \), namely, \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \) is the depth of wisdom, i.e. the fulness of wisdom, which is acquainted with the nature and the connection of its objects not superficially, but exhaustively and fundamentally, and is therefore incomprehensible by human judgment. See on \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \) and \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \), as applying to mental depth (Plat. Theaet. p. 183 E; Polybius, xxvii. 10. 3, vi. 24. 9, xxi. 5. 5), Dissen, ad Pind. Nem. iv. 7, p. 396; Blomfield, ad Aesch. Sept. 578; Jacobs, ad Anthol. XI. p. 252. Comp. \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \varphi \rho \omicron \sigma \) Pind. Nem. vii. 1; Plut. Sol. 14; \( \beta \alpha \theta \beta \omicron \upsilon \lambda \nu \lambda \omicron \omicron \), Aesch. Pers. 138. — \( \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \sigma \] is either regarded as opening the series of genitival definitions of \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \): O depth (1) of riches, and (2) of wisdom, and (3) of knowledge of God (so Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Grotius, Bengal, Semler, Flatt, Tholuck, Köllner, de Wette, Olshausen, Fritzsche, Philippi, Ewald, Hofmann, Mangold, and others); or the two other genitives are subordinated to \( \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \sigma \) (Augustine, Ambrosiaster, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Wolf, Koppe, Reiche, van Hengel, and others), in which case, however, \( \beta \alpha \theta \, \pi \lambda \omega \tau \omicron \). is not to be resolved into deep riches, but is to be taken: O depth of riches in wisdom as well as in knowledge of God; comp. Col. ii. 2; Rom. ii. 4. The decision between these two suppositions is given by what follows, of which \( \omega \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \ldots \, \Omega \omicron \upsilon \) is the theme. As vv. 33, 34

\[
1 \text{This idea might have been precluded by the fact that the expression \( \beta \alpha \theta \omicron \) (Eur. Hel. 310) and the like are used.}
\]
describe the Σοφία and γνώσις, and vv. 35, 36 the πλούτος Θεοῦ, the former view, which also primarily and most naturally presents itself, is to be preferred. Πλούτος, however, is usually understood of the divine riches of grace (comp. ii. 4, x. 12; Eph. i. 7, ii. 7); see ver. 32. To this ver. 35 aptly corresponds; and see x. 12. But since no genitival definition is appended, we must content ourselves simply with the sense of the word itself; how superabundantly rich is God! Phil. iv. 19. Comp. Rückert, Fritzsche, Philippi, Hofmann. — Σοφία and γνώσις are certainly to be distinguished (comp. on Col. ii. 3), but popularly, so that the former, the more general, is the wisdom of God (comp. xvi. 27; Eph. iii. 10), ruling everything in the best way for the best end; while the latter, the more special, is the knowledge pertaining to it of all relations, and thus especially of the means which He therein employs, of the methods which He has therein to take. To the latter—the γνώσις—are to be referred αἱ ὀδοὶ αὐτοῦ, i.e. His measures, modes of procedure, αἱ οἰκονομαῖα, Chrysostom (comp. Heb. iii. 10, Acts xiii. 10, according to the Heb. ἡ τρίθη, and also to classical usage); to the former—the Σοφία—belong τὰ κριματα αὐτοῦ, i.e. decisions, resolves formed, according to which His action proceeds (comp. Zeph. iii. 8; Wisd. xii. 12), as He, e.g., has decided, according to ver. 32, that all should be disobedient, in order that all might find mercy. On account of the deep Σοφία of God His κριματα are unsearchable for men, etc. — ἀνεξερεύνητος, unsearchable, is found only in Heraclitus as quoted in Clement and Symmachus, Prov. xxv. 3, Jer. xvii. 9, Suidas; ἀνεξεργάσιος, untraceable (Eph. iii. 8), οὗ μηδὲ ἐχρος ἑτὸν εὑρέω (Suidas), corresponds to the metaphorical ὀδόλ. Comp. Job v. 9, ix. 10, xxxiv. 24; Manass. 6; Clement, ad Cor. i. 20.

Ver. 34. Paul, by way of confirming his entire exclamation in ver. 33 (not merely the second half), continuing by γάρ, adopts the words of Isa. xl. 13 (almost quite exactly after the LXX.) as his own. Comp. 1 Cor. ii. 16; Judith viii. 13, 14; Wisd. ix. 17; Ecclus. xviii. 2 ff.—The first half has been referred to γνώσις, the second to the Σοφία (Theodoret, Theophylact, Wetstein, Fritzsche), and rightly so. Paul goes back with his three questions upon the γνώσις, to which the νοῦς, the
divine reason as the organ of absolute knowledge and truth, corresponds; upon the σοφία, which has no σύμβουλος; and (ver. 35) upon the πλοῦτος, from which results the negation of τίς προέδωκεν κ.τ.λ. Philippi is opposed to this view, but can at the same time (similarly van Hengel and Hofmann) only bring out in a very far-fetched and indirect manner the result, that ver. 35 also sets forth the divine wisdom and knowledge (so far, namely, as the latter is not bound from without). — τίς σύμβ. αὐτοῦ ἐγέν.] Who has become His adviser, His counsel-giving helper? “Scriptura ubique subsistit in eo, quod Dominus voluit et dixit et fecit; rationes rerum universalium singularium non pandit; de iis, quae nostram superantificentiam, ad aeternitatem remittit fideles, 1 Cor. xiii. 9 ss.,” Bengel. For parallels in Greek writers, see Spiess, Logos spermat. p. 240.

Ver. 35. Description of the βάθος πλούτου by words which are moulded after Job xli. 3, according to the Hebrew, not according to the LXX. (xli. 11), whose translation is quite erroneous. — καὶ αὐταποδ. αὐτῷ] and will it be recompensed again to Him? With whom does the case occur, that he has previously made a gift to God, and that a recompense will be made to him in return for it? Change of construction by καὶ ... αὐτῷ, here occasioned by the Heb. בִּשְׂם. But for the Greek usage, comp. Bernhardy, p. 304; Kühner, II. 2, p. 936.

Ver. 36 does not apply to all the three foregoing questions (Hofmann), but simply the last of them is established by the connective ἓν (for truly) as regards its negative contents: “No one has beforehand given to God,” etc.—All things are from God (primal cause), in so far as all things have proceeded from God's creative power; through God (ground of mediate agency), in so far as nothing exists without God's continuous operation; for God (final cause), in so far as all things serve the ends of God (not merely: the honour of God, as many

2 In the LXX. Isa. xli. 14, Cod. A, as also Ν, has our words, but certainly through interpolation from the present passage. According to Ewald, Paul probably found them in his copy of the LXX. just after Isa. xli. 13.
These passages speak quite against the opinion, that in the present passage the relation of Father, Son, and Spirit (Olshausen, Philippi, Thomasius, Jatho, Krummacher, following Ambrosiaster, Hilary, Toletus, Estius, Calovius, and others) is expressed—a view which is also quite remote from the connection. The context speaks simply of God (the Father), to whom no one can have given anything beforehand, etc., because He, as Bengel aptly expresses it, is Origo et Cursus et Terminus rerum omnium. This may be recognised by the exegesis that has the deepest faith in Scripture without any rationalistic idiosyncrasy, as the example of Bengel himself shows. With reason neither Chrysostom, nor Oecumenius, nor Theophylact, neither Erasmus, nor Melanchthon, nor Calvin, nor Beza have expressed any reference to the Trinity in their explanations; but Augustine has this reference, against which also Tholuck, Hofmann, and Gess (v. d. Pers. Chr. p. 158) have been sufficiently unbiased to declare themselves. — δι' αὑτοῦ] God is mediate cause of all things by His upholding and ruling. Comp. Heb. ii. 20. To refer, with others, this statement to creation (Theophylact: δ ὑποτής πάντων; comp. Oecumenius, Rücker, Fritzsche), would fail to bring out at least any popular distinction from εἰς αὑτοῦ, and—which is decisive against such reference—that would be affirmed of the Father which pertains to the Son (Col. i. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 6; John i. 2). Theodoret rightly remarks: αὕτος τὰ γεγονότα

1 With the same warrant, or, in other words, with the same arbitrariness, the Trinity might be found, with Origen, in ver. 38; and in particular, ἀληθῆ might be referred to the Father, σφιχὸς to the Son (Luke xi. 49), and γνώσεως to the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11); in consistency with which, moreover, the ἀληθὲς, belonging to all three elements, might have been explained of the mystery of the Trinitarian relation. This observation is not meant to sound like "Gnostic mockery" (Philippi); such is far from my intention. That the doctrine of the Trinity (that of the New Testament, namely, which is Subordination) was vividly before the consciousness of the apostle, no unpersuaded person denies; but here he has neither stated nor hinted at it, as the third element ἀληθῆ shows sufficiently in and by itself, for all things can have their telic reference to none other than to the Father or (Col. i. 16) to the Son.

2 Theodoret argues from the first two statements the equality of the Father and the Son; he says nothing concerning the Spirit.
All things serve Him (comp. Heb. ii. 10) as their ultimate end. This is explained by Oecumenius, Theophylact, and Fritzsche of the *upholding* (συνέχονται ἐπεστραμμένα πρὸς αὑτόν). On the whole, comp. what Marcus Antoninus, iv. 23, says of φύσις: ἐκ σοὶ πάντα, ἐν σοὶ πάντα, εἰς σὲ πάντα, and Gataker *in loc.* — ἡ δόξα] *sc. elη; as at xvi. 27: the befitting glory.* Gal. i. 5; Eph. iii. 21.
CHAPTER XII

Ver. 2. Instead of the imperatives, which Tisch. also defends, Lachm. has, what Griesb. already approved: σωκῆματίζεσθαι and μεταμορφώσθαι, according to A B D F G, min. Theoph. The preponderating evidence of the codd. is in favour of the infinitives, while that of the vss. (Vulg. It. Syr. etc.) and Fathers is in favour of the imperatives. But, since the frequent practical use of the precept in the direct paraenetic form of expression at any rate suggested—especially considering the closely similar pronunciation of the infinitives and imperatives—the writing of the latter rather than the former, the infinitive reading is to preferred, which also supports by reading μεταμορφώσθαι, although it has σωκῆματιζεσθαι. — ἵματι] is wanting in A B D F G, 47, 67*, Copt. Clem. Cypr. Omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. The preponderance of evidence, as well as the circumstance that ἵματι very readily suggested itself to mechanical copyists for repetition from ver. 1, justifies the omission.— Ver. 5. Lachm. and Tisch. 8: τέ, according to A B D F G P Π, 47*, Antioch. Damasc. Rightly; τέ δὲ καθ' ἑαυτόν, not being understood, was exchanged with ἵππον καθ' ἑαυτόν, as the antithesis of ἵππον καθ' ἑαυτόν. — Ver. 11. τῷ καιρῷ] So Griesb., after Erasm. 2, Steph. 3, Mill, and others. But Erasm. 1, Beza, Elz., Matth., Lachm., Scholz, Tisch., and Rinck have τῷ καιρῷ. The former is found in D F G, 5, and Latin Fathers; the latter in A B D E L P Π, and most min. vss. and Greek Fathers. See the accurate examination of the evidence in Reiche, Comm. crit. p. 70 ff., who decides for καιρῷ, and in Tisch. 8. καιρῷ is certainly the oldest and most diffused reading. Nevertheless, if it were original, we cannot well see why καιρῷ should have been substituted for it; for δειὖ καιρῷ is a very usual Pauline thought (Acts xx. 19; Eph. vi. 7; Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 18; Col. iii. 24, et al.), and would suit our passage very well. It would be far easier to take exception to καιρῷ than to καιρῷ (as in xiii. 11, instead of καιρῷ, the reading καιρῷ is already found in Clement), especially as the principle itself, τῷ καιρῷ δειὖν, might readily seem somewhat offensive to a prejudiced moral feeling. Hardly can καιρῷ, considering its great diffusion, be a

THE SECOND, OR PRACTICAL PART OF THE EPISTLE.¹

Ver. 1 f. General exhortation to sanctification. — ὁ ἄγιον] drawing an inference, not from the whole dogmatic part of the epistle, beginning with i. 16 (Calvin, Bengel, and many others, including Reiche, Köllner, de Wette, Philippi, Hofmann),— as also in Eph. iv. 1 and 1 Thess. iv. 1, the ὁ ἄγιον which introduces the practical portion is not to be taken so vaguely,— but from xi. 35, 36, where the riches of God were described as, and shown to be, imparted apart from merit. This connection is, on account of διὰ τῶν οἰκτίρμων τ. Θεοῦ, more readily suggested and simpler than that with ver. 32 (Rückert, Fritzsche, and several others). — διὰ τῶν οἰκτίρμων τ. Θεοῦ] by means of the compassion of God, reminding you of it. Just so διὰ in xv. 30, 1 Cor. i. 10, 2 Cor. x. 1. The exhortation, pointing to the compassion of God, contains the motive of thankfulness for compliance with it. "Qui misericordia Dei recte movetur, in omnem Dei voluntatem ingreditur," Bengel. — On oἰκτιρμῶν,

¹ See Pet. Abr. Borger, Dissertatio de parte epistolae ad Rom. paraenetica, Lugd. Bat. 1840.— The subdivision of what follows into ἒμπάθεια (chap. xii.), σεληνιά (chap. xiii.), and ἱματιά (chap. xiv. f.) is, considering the miscellaneous character of the contents, an untenable formal scheme (in opposition to Melanchthon, Beza, and others). Paul proceeds from the general to the particular, and vice versa.
see Tittmann, *Synon.* p. 68 ff. On the singular, comp. Pind. *Pyth.* i. 85; *Ecclus.* v. 6; *Bar.* ii. 27; 1 *Macc.* iii. 44. The plural conforms, indeed, to ωτων, but is conceived according to the Greek plural usage of abstract nouns (see Kühner, II. 1, p. 15 f.; Maetzner, *ad Lycurg.* p. 144 f.): the compassions, i.e. the stirrings and manifestations of compassion.—παραστησαι selected as the set expression for the presenting of sacrificial animals at the altar; Xen. *Anab.* vi. 1. 22; Lucian, *de sacrif.* 13; and see Wetstein and Loesner, p. 262. Paul is glancing at the thank-offering (διὰ τοῦ οἰκτήρου τ. Θ.), and raises the notion of sacrifice to the highest moral idea of self-surrender to God; comp. Umbreit, p. 343 ff. — τὰ σώματα νυμῶν not, on account of the figure of sacrifice, instead of υμᾶς αὐτῶν (so usually; still also Philippi), as if σώμα might denote the entire person, consisting of body and soul (but comp. on vi. 12). On the contrary, the apostle means quite strictly: your bodies, reserving the sanctification of the νοῖς for ver. 2, so that the two verses together contain the sanctification of the whole man distributed into its parts,—that of the outer man (set forth as the offering of a sacrifice), and that of the inner (as a renewing transformation). Fritzsche also takes the correct view;¹ comp. Hofmann. Other peculiar references of τ. σώμ. υμ. (Köllner: "the sensuous nature of man, which draws him to sin;" Olshausen: "in order to extend the idea of Christian sanctification down even to the lowest potency of human nature") are not indicated by the text. The following τ. λογικ. λατρ. is not opposed to our view; for, in truth, bodily self-sacrifice is also an ethical act, 1 *Cor.* vi. 20. Comp. on the subject-matter, vi. 13, 19. — θυσίαν ξώσαν as a sacrifice which lives. For the moral self-offering of the body is the antitypical πληρεσθειν of the ritual sacrificial-service, in which

¹The ordinary objection brought against this view in its literal fidelity, that the body could not be sacrificed to God without the soul, is just in itself, but does not exclude the supposition that Paul might formally separate the bodily self-sacrifice and the spiritual renewal. He passes from the organism of the bodily life, in which the inner is made manifest, over to the latter; comp. 1 *Cor.* vii. 34. In passages also of the Greek writers, in which εἷμαι is apparently used for the personal pronoun (as Eur. *Alc.* 647; see Brunck in loc.), εἷμαι is simply body. Comp. also Soph. *O. C.* 355, et al.
the sacrifice *dies*; whereas that ethical sacrifice is no doubt also connected with dying, as to sin namely, in the sense of vi. 2, vii. 4 ff., Col. ii. 20, iii. 5, Gal. ii. 19, but it is precisely out of this *death* that the *being alive* here meant proceeds, which has vanquished death (Gal. ii. 20, et al.). Such a sacrifice is also, in the eminent sense of antitypical fulfilment, ἀγια (as pure and belonging to God in an ethical relation) and εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ (comp. Eph. v. 2). That τ. Θεῷ is not, with Estius, Bengel, and Koppe, to be connected with παραστ., is shown by its very position, as well as by the superfluous character of a τ. Θεῷ with παραστ. — Passages from Porphyry, Hierocles, Philo, Josephus, and the Rabbins, in which likewise moral devotion to God is set forth as self-sacrifice, see in Wetstein and Koppe. On the *asyndeton*, as strengthening the force of the predicative notion, in ἄγια, εὐάρη τ. Θ., comp. Nägelsbach, *z*. Ilias, p. 50, ed. 3. — τὴν λογ. λατρ. λ.μ.] accusative of ἐπεξεργασία,—an appositional definition, and that, indeed, not to the mere ῥυαίαν (to the notion of which the wider notion of λατρεία does not correspond), but to the whole παραστήσας κ.τ.λ., containing, respecting this whole act of presenting offering, the judgment, what it ought to be; see Winer, p. 496 [E. T. 669]; Kühner, II. 1, p. 243 f. Luther aptly remarks: "the which is your reasonable service." Comp. Lobeck, *Paralip.* p. 519; Nägelsbach, *z*. II. iii. 51; Buttmann, *neut. Gr.* p. 134. — λατρεία] *service of worship*, as in John xvi. 2. See on that passage. Comp. ix. 4. λογικός, *rational* (1 Pet. ii. 2; Plato, Locr. p. 99 E, 102 E; Polyb. xxv. 9. 2), is not in contrast to ζῶα διόγεια (Theodoret, Grotius, Koppe, and many others), which at most would only be to be assumed if λατρεία were equivalent to ῥυαία, but generally to the ceremonial character of the Jewish and heathen worship,—designating the λατρεία here meant as a *spiritual service*, fulfilling itself in *moral rational activity*,—of which nature the *opus operatum* of the Jewish and heathen cultus was not. The Test. XII. Patr. p. 547 calls the sacrifice of the angels λατρείαν κ. ἀνάμικτου προσφοράν. On the idea, comp. John iv. 24; Rom. i. 9; Phil. iii. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 5; Athenag. *Leg.* 13. Melanchthon: "*Cultus mentis*, in quo mens fide aut coram intuetur Deum, et vere sentit timorem
et laetitiam in Deo." The opposite is the character of mechanical action, the ἀλογίας τριβή καὶ ἐμπεφραία (Plat. Gorg. p. 501 A).

Ver. 2. Infinitives (see the critical notes): συσχηματίζεσθαι, to become like-shaped, and μεταμορφοῦσθαι, to become transformed. The two verbs stand in contrast only through the prepositions, without any difference of sense in the stem-words. Comp. the interchange of μορφή and σχήμα in Phil. ii. 7, also the Greek usage of συσχηματίζω and μορφοῦ, which denote any kind of conformation according to the context (Plut. Mor. p. 719 B: τὸ μεμορφωμένος καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον, Eur. Iph. T. 292: μορφὴς σχήματα). Here of moral conformation, without requiring us to distinguish μορφή and σχήμα as inner and outer (Bengel, Philippi), or as appearance to others and one's own state in itself (Hofmann). On the interchange of the infinitive of the aorist (παραστῆσαι) and present, comp. on vi. 12. — τῷ αἰῶνι τοῦτῳ] to the present age, running on to the Parousia, ἀνατέλεσθαι (see on Matt. xii 32), the character (ethical mould) of which is that of immorality ( Eph. ii. 2; Gal. i. 4; 2 Cor. iv. 4, et al.). συσχηματίζεσθαι is also found in rhetoricians with the dative (as also 1 Pet. i. 14), instead of with πρὸς or εἰς. — τῷ ἀνακαιν. τ. νοὸς] whereby the μεταμορφ. is to be effected: through the renewal of the thinking power (νοῦς here, according to its practical side, the reason in its moral quality and activity; see on vii. 23; Eph. iv. 23). It needs this renewal in order to become the sphere of operation for the divine truth of salvation, when it, under the ascendancy of ἀμαρτία in the σάρξ, has become darkened, weak, unfree, and transformed into the ἀδόκιμος νοῦς (i. 28), the νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς (Col. ii. 18). Comp. on vii. 23. And this renewal, which the regenerate man also needs on account of the conflict of flesh and spirit which exists in him (viii. 4 ff.; Gal. v. 16 ff.) through daily penitence (Col. iii. 10; 2 Cor. vii. 10; 1 Thess. v. 22, 23), is effected by means of the life-element of faith (Phil. iii. 9 ff.), transforming the inner man ( Eph. iii.

1 According to the latter supposed distinction, Hofmann hits upon the arbitrary definition of the relation of ver. 1 to ver. 2, that ver. 1 contains how the Christian should stand towards God, and ver. 2 how he should present himself to those who surround him.
16, 17; 2 Cor. v. 17), under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Eph. iv. 23, 24; Tit. iii. 5. This influence restores the harmony in which the νοῦς ought to stand with the divine πνεύμα; not, however, annulling the moral freedom of the believer, but, on the contrary, presupposing it; hence the exhortation: to be transformed (passive). As to the ἄνακαίνωσις τ. νοῦς ύμ. as its direction (Hofmann), but (comp. Phil. i. 10 and on Rom. i. 20) specifies the aim of the μεταμορφ. τ. ἄνακ. τ. ν. ύμῶν. To the man who is not transformed by the renewal of his intellect this proving—which is no merely theoretical business of reflection, but is the critical practice of the whole inner life—forms no part of the activity of conscience. Comp. Eph. v. 10. The sense: to be able to prove (Rückert, Köllner), is as arbitrarily introduced as in ii. 18. He who is transformed by that renewal not merely can do, but—which Paul has here in view as the immediate object of the μεταμορφοφθαι κ.τ.λ.—actually does the δοκιμάζειν, and has thereby the foundation for a further moral development; he does it by means of the judgment of his conscience, stirred and illuminated by the Spirit (2 Cor. i. 12). On τὸ θέλημα Θεοῦ, what is willed by God, comp. Matt. vi. 10; Eph. v. 17, vi. 6; Col. i. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 3.—τὸ ἀγαθὸν κ. εὐάρ. κ. τέλ. is, by the Peschito, the Vulgate, Chrysostom, and most of the older interpreters, also by Rückert and Reiche, united adjectively with τὸ θέλ. But as εὐάρ. would thus be unsuitable to this, we must rather (with Erasmus, Castalio, and others, including Tholuck, Flatt, Köllner, de Wette, Fritzsche, Reithmayr, Philippi, van Hengel, Hofmann) approve the substantival rendering (as apposition to τὸ θέλ. τ. Θεοῦ): that which is good and well-pleasing (to God) and perfect. The repetition of the article was the less necessary, as the three adjectives used substantively exhaust one notion (that of moral good), and that climactically. Comp. Winer, p. 121 [E. T. 159]; Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 373 f.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 528.

Ver. 3. The exhortation now passes on to single duties, amongst which that of humility and modesty, generally (vv. 3–5), and in respect of the individual χαρίσματα in particular (vv. 6–8),
is the first—the first, too, compliance with which was indispensable to a prosperous life of the church. And Paul must have known how very necessary this same injunction was in the Roman community. — γάρ] for. The special requirement which he is now to make serves in fact by way of confirmation to the general exhortation of ver. 2. As to λέγω in the sense of enjoining, see on ii. 22. — διὰ τῆς χάριν τῆς δόθ. μοι] Paul does not command δς έαντοί, but by means of, i.e. in virtue of the divine grace bestowed on him. It is thus that he characterizes—and how at once truly and humbly! (1 Cor. xv. 10)—his apostleship. Comp. xv. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 10; Eph. iii. 7, 8. This χάρις was given to him (μοι), not in common with Christians generally (ιμιν, ver. 6). — παντι ... ιμιν] to every one in your community; none among you is to be exempt from this exhortation; not: to every one who thinks himself to be something among you (Koppe, Baumgarten-Crusius). — μὴ ὑπερφέρων κ.τ.λ.] not loftily-minded ought the Christian to be, going beyond the standard-rule of that disposition which is conformable to duty (παρ' δεὶ φρονοι;) but his disposition should be such as to have wise discretion (1 Pet. iv. 7) for its aim (comp. Hom. II. xxiii. 305: εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονεῖν, Eur. Phoen. 1135: εἰς μάχην φρονεῖν). Paronomasia. Comp. Plat. Legg. x. p. 906 B: σωφροσύνη μετὰ φρονήσεω, Eur. Heracl. 388: τὸν φρονίματον ... τὸν ἀγαν ὑπερφέρων; and see Wetstein.— ἐκάστῳ ὁς] ἐκάστῳ depends on ἐμέρισε (comp. 1 Cor. iii. 5, vii. 17, and on Rom. xi. 31), not on λέγω (Estius, Kollner)—which view makes the already said παντι ... ιμιν to be once more repeated, and, on the other hand, deprives ἐμέρισε of its essential definition. 'Ως designates the scale according to which each one ought φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, and this scale is different in persons differently furnished with gifts, so that for one the boundary, beyond which his φρονεῖν ceases to be εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, is otherwise drawn than it is for another. The regulative standard, however, Paul expressly calls the measure of faith, which God has assigned. This is the subjective condition (the objective is the divine χάρις) of that which every one can and ought to do in the Christian life of the church. According, namely, as faith in
the case of individual Christians is more or less living, practical, energetic, efficacious in this or that direction,—whether contemplative, or manifesting itself in the outer life, in eloquence and action, etc.,—they have withal to measure their appointed position and task in the church. He, therefore, who covets a higher or another standpoint and sphere of activity in the community, and is not contented with that which corresponds to the measure of faith bestowed on him, evinces a willful self-exaltation, which is without measure and not of God—not that spirit wherein the Christian μετρωφροσύνη consists, the φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἐκάστῳ ὡς κ.τ.λ. The πλοτις is therefore to be taken throughout in no other sense than the ordinary one: faith in Christ, of which the essence indeed is alike in all, but the individually different degrees of strength (comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 2), and peculiarities of character in other respects (vv. 4 ff.), constitute for individuals the μέτρον πλοτεως in quantitative and qualitative relation. Comp. Eph. iv. 7. This likewise holds in opposition to Hofmann, who with violence separates πλοτεως from ἐμέρευε, and takes it as an accusative of apposition, like τὴν λογικ. λατρείαν ὑμῶν, ver. 1; holding πλοτεως to be the genitive of quality, which distinguishes the measure within which the thinking of the Christian is confined, from that which the natural man sets up for himself. Comp., in opposition to this strange separation, 2 Cor. x. 13, and in opposition to this artificial explanation of the genitive, 2 Cor. x. 13; Eph. iv. 7, xiii. 16; Plat. Theaet. p. 161 Ε.: μέτρω... τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας. Soph. El. 229: μέτρον κακότητος. Eur. Ion, 354: ἡβης μέτρων. Pind. Isthm. i. 87: κερδέων μ.

Vv. 4, 5 ff. Motive for compliance with the previous exhortation.—For the prevalence of the parallel between a human body and a corpus sociale (1 Cor. xii.) also among the ancients, see Grotius and Wetstein.—τὰ δὲ μὲλη πάντα κ.τ.λ.] i.e. but the members, all of them, have different activity; thus, e.g., the eyes another than the ears, the feet another than the mouth. Wrongly van Hengel takes the expression, as though οὐ πάντα were the reading, so that only some—namely, those we possess in pairs—would be meant, not all. —οἱ πολλοί] the many,
i.e. the multiplicity of Christians taken together, in opposition to the unity of the body which they compose. Comp. v. 15. — ἐν Χριστῷ] The common element in which the union consists; out of Christ we should not be ἐν σῶμα, but this we are in Him, in the fellowship of faith and life with Christ. He is the Head (Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 15; Col. i. 18, ii. 19), — a relation which is understood of itself by the consciousness of faith, but is not denoted by ἐν Χριστῷ (as if this meant on Christ), as Koppe, Rosenmüller, and older interpreters hold. — τὸ δὲ καθ' εἰς] but in what concerns the individual relation. In good Greek it would be τὸ δὲ καθ' ἕνα (see on Mark xiv. 19, and Bernhardy, p. 329; Kühner, II. 1, p. 414); but καθ' εἰς, in which κατὰ has quite lost its regimen, is a very frequent solecism in the later Greek writers (Mark, l.c.; John viii. 9; 3 Macc. v. 34). See Lucian, Soloec. 9, and Graev. in loc.; Thom. Mag. p. 483; Wetstein on Mark, l.c.; Winer, p. 234 [E. T. 312]. Τὸ καθ' εἰς is groundlessly condemned by Fritzsche as “commentitia formula.” If καθ' εἰς and ὁ καθ' εἰς were in use (and this was the case), it follows that τὸ καθ' εἰς might be just as well said as τὸ καθ' ἕνα (comp. τὸ καθ' ἑαυτόν and the like, Matthiae, § 283; Kühner, II. 1, p. 272). See also Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 26 f.

Vv. 6–8. In the possession, however, of different gifts. This ἔχοντες δὲ χαράματα κ.τ.λ. corresponds to τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα τῷ τῆν αὐτῆν ἔχει πρᾶξιν, ver. 4. — As regards the construction, the view adopted by Reiche, de Wette, and Lachmann makes ἔχοντες a participial definition of ἐσμέν, ver. 5; accordingly, εἴτε προφητείαν and εἴτε διακονίαν depend on ἔχοντες as a specifying apposition to χαράματα; whilst the limiting definitions κατὰ τὴν ἀναλ. τ. πιστ., ἐν τῇ διακ., ἐν τῇ διδασκ., ἐν τῇ παρακλ. κ.τ.λ. are parallel to the κατὰ τὴν χάριν δοθ. ἡμῖν, and with εἴτε ὁ διδάσκαλον the discourse varies, without however becoming directly hortatory. Comp. also Rückert. But usually κατὰ τὴν ἀναλ. τ. πιστ., ἐν τῇ διακ. κ.τ.λ., are regarded as elliptical hortatory sentences, whilst ἔχοντες is by some likewise attached to the foregoing (Theodoret, Erasmus, Luther, Castalio, Calvin, Estius, and others, including Flatt, Tholuck, Reithmayr), and with others ἔχοντες begins a new sentence (so...
Olshausen, Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Philippi, van Hengel, Hofmann, following Beza). The usual construction is the only correct one (in which, most suitably to the progressive δέ, a new sentence commences with ἐχοντες), because, under the mode followed by Reiche and de Wette, the alleged limitations ἐν τῇ διακ., ἐν τῇ διδασκ., and ἐν τῇ παρακλ., either express nothing, or must be taken arbitrarily in a variety of meaning different from that of the words with which they stand; and because ἐν ἀπλότητι, ἐν σπουδῇ, and ἐν διαφόροις, ver. 8, are obviously of a hortatory character, and therefore the previous expressions with ἐν may not be taken otherwise. By way of filling up the concise maxims thrown out elliptically, and only as it were in outline, it is sufficient after κατὰ τὴν ἀνάλογ. τ. πιστ. to supply: προφητεύωμεν, after ἐν τῇ διακοιν.: ὁμεν, after ἐν τῇ διδασκ.: ἐστο, the same after ἐν τῇ παρακλ.:; and lastly, after the three following particulars, ἐν ἀπλότητι κ.τ.λ., the imperatives of the corresponding verbs (μεταδίδοτο κ.τ.λ.). Comp. the similar mode of expression in 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11.—χαρίσματα] denotes the different peculiar aptitudes for the furtherance of Christian life in the church and of its external welfare, imparted by God’s grace through the principle of the Holy Spirit working in the Christian communion (hence πνευματικά, 1 Cor. xii. 1). On their great variety, amidst the specific unity of their origin from the efficacy of this Spirit, see esp. 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.—Paul here mentions by way of example (for more, see 1 Cor. xii.), in the first instance, four of such χαρίσματα, namely: (1) προφητεία, the gift of theopneustic discourse, which presupposes ἀποκάλυψις, and the form of which, appearing in different ways (hence also in the plural in 1 Cor. xiii. 8; 1 Thess. v. 20), was not ecstatic, like the speaking with tongues, but was an activity of the νοῦς enlightened and filled with the consecration of the Spirit’s power, disclosing hidden things, and profoundly seizing, chastening, elevating, carrying away men’s hearts, held in peculiar esteem by the apostle (1 Cor. xiv. 1). Comp. on 1 Cor. xii. 10. Further, (2) διακοιν.: the gift of administration of the external affairs of the church, particularly the care of the poor, the sick, and strangers; comp. 1 Cor. xii.
28, where the functions of the diaconia are termed ἀντιλήψεως. Acts vi. 1 ff.; Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rom. xvi. 1. The service of the diaconate in the church, which grew out of that of the seven men of Acts vi., is really of apostolic origin: Clem. Cor. I. 42, 44; Ritschl, altkath. Kirche, p. 359; Jul. Müller, dogmat. Abh. p. 560 ff.

(3) The διασκαλία, the gift of instruction in the usual form of teaching directed to the understanding (ἐξ οἰκελας διανοιας, Chrysostom, ad 1 Cor. xii 28), see on Acts xiii. 1; Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xiv. 26. It was not yet limited to a particular office; see Ritschl, p. 350 f. (4) παράκλησις, the gift of hortatory and encouraging address operating on the heart and will, the possessor of which probably connected his discourses, in the assemblies after the custom of the synagogue (see on Acts xiii. 15), with a portion of Scripture read before the people. Comp. Acts iv. 36, xi. 23, 24; Justin, Apol. I. c. 67. — κατὰ τὴν ἀναλ. τ. πλοτ.] Conformably to the proportion of their faith the prophets have to use their prophetic gift, i.e. (comp. ver. 3): they are not to depart from the proportional measure which their faith has, neither wishing to exceed it nor falling short of it, but are to guide themselves by it, and are therefore so to announce and interpret the received ἀνακάλυψις, as the peculiar position in respect of faith bestowed on them, according to the strength, clearness, fervour, and other qualities of that faith, suggests—so that the character and mode of their speaking is conformed to the rules and limits, which are implied in the proportion of their individual degree of faith. In the contrary case they fall, in respect of contents and of form, into a mode of prophetic utterance, either excessive and overstrained, or on the other hand insufficient and defective (not corresponding to the level of their faith). The same revelation may in fact—according to the difference in the proportion of faith with which it, objectively given, subjectively connects itself—be very differently expressed and delivered. ἀναλογία, proportio, very current (also as a mathematical expression) in the classics (comp. esp. on κατὰ τ. ἀναλογ. Plato, Polit. p. 257 B, Locr. p. 95 B; Dem. 262. 5), is here in substance not different from μέτρον, ver. 3; comp. Plato, Tim. p. 69 B:
Hofmann groundlessly denies this (in consequence of his incorrect view of μέτρον πίστεως, ver. 3), yet likewise arrives at the sense, that prophetic utterance must keep equal pace with the life of faith. Paul might, in fact, have written συμμέτρως τῇ πίστει, and would have thereby substantially expressed the same thing as κατὰ τ. ἀναλ. τ. πίστως or ἀναλόγως τ. π. The old dogmatic interpretation (still unknown, however, to the Greek Fathers, who rightly take τ. πίστεως subjectively, of the fides qua creditur) of the regula fidei (πίστεις in the objective sense, fides qua creditur), i.e. of the conformitas doctrinarum in scripturis (see esp. Colovius), departs arbitrarily from the thought contained in ver. 3, and from the immediate context (κατὰ τ. χάρ. τ. δοθ. ἡμῶν), and cannot in itself be justified by linguistic usage (see on i. 5). It reappears, however, substantially in Flatt, Klee, Glöckler, Kullner, Philippi ("to remain subject to the norma et regula fidei Christianae"), Umbreit, Bisping, although they do not, like many of the older commentators, take prophecy to refer to the explanation of Scripture. — ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ[1] If it be the case that we have diaconia (as yaplapAt), let us be in our diaconia. The emphasis lies on ἐν. He who has the gift of the diaconia should not desire to have a position in the life of the church outside of the sphere of service which is assigned to him by this endowment, but should be active within that sphere. That by διακονία is not intended any ecclesiastical office generally (Chrysostom, Luther, Reithmayr, Hofmann), is shown by the charismatic elements of the entire context. On ἐν ἐν, versari in, comp. 1 Tim. iv. 15; Plato, Prot. p. 317 C, Phaed. p. 59 A; Demosth. 301. 6, et al.; Krüger, ad Dion. Hist. p. 269, 70.— εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων] Symmetrically, Paul should have continued with εἴτε διδασκαλίαν (sc. ἔχοντες), as A. actually reads. Instead of this, however, he proceeds in such a way as now to introduce the different possessors of gifts in the third person, and therefore no longer dependent on the we implied in ἔχοντες. The change of conception and construction may

[1] Comp. Luther's gloss: "All prophecy, which leads to work and not simply to Christ as the only consolation, however valuable it is, is nevertheless not like faith."
accordingly be thus exhibited: “While, however, we have different gifts, we should, be it prophecy that we have, make use of it according to the proportion of our faith,—be it diaconia that we have, labour within the diaconia,—be it that it is the teacher, (he should) be active within the sphere of teaching, etc.” After ὁ διδάσκων, simply εἶτι is to be supplied: if it, viz. one charismatically gifted, is the teacher. The apostle, in the urgent fulness of ideas which are yet to be only concisely expressed, has lost sight of the grammatical connection; comp. Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 331. Hofmann’s expedient, that here εἶτε…εἶτε are subordinated to the preceding ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, and ὁ διδάσκων and ὁ παρακαλῶν are to be taken as a parenthetical apposition to the subject of the verb to be supplied (“be it that he, the teacher, handles teaching,” etc.), is an artificial scheme forced upon him by his incorrect view of διακονία, and at variance with the co-ordinated relation of the first two cases of εἶτε.

Ver. 8. Ὁ μεταδίδων κ.τ.λ.] The detailed exposition with εἶτε ceases as the discourse flows onward more vehemently, but the series of those charismatically endowed is continued, yet in such a way that now there are no longer mentioned such as possess a χάριμα for a definite function in the church, but such as possess it generally for the activity of public usefulness in the social Christian life. Hence, because with ἐν ἀπλότητι κ.τ.λ. the continuance of the exhortations is indicated, we are to place before ὁ μεταδίδων not a full stop, but a comma, or, better, a colon. The reference of these last three points to definite ministerial functions (such as that ὁ μεταδίδ. is the διακονὸς who distributes the gifts of love; ὁ προϊστάμ. the president of the community, bishop or presbyter; ὁ ἑλέων he who takes charge of the sick) is refuted, first, by the fact that the assumed references of μεταδίδ. (according to Acts iv. 35, we should at least expect διαδίδων) are quite incapable of proof, and indeed improbable in themselves; secondly, by the consideration that such an analysis of the diaconal gift would be out of due place, after mention had been already made of the διακονία as a whole; and thirdly, by the consideration that the position of the προϊστάμενος, as the presbyter, between two
diaconal functions, and almost at the end of the series, would be unsuitable. But if we should wish to explain προστάταμ. as guardian of the strangers (my first edition; Borger), there is an utter want of proof both for this particular feature of the diaconia and for its designation by προστάταμ. (for the προστάτης at Athens, the patron of the metoeci, was something quite different; Hermann, Staatsalterth. § 115. 4). — ὁ μεταδίδων] he who imparts, who exercises the charisma of charitableness by imparting of his means to the poor. Eph. iv. 28; Luke iii. 11. To understand the imparting of spiritual good (Baumgarten-Crusius), or this along with the other (Hofmann), receives no support from the context, especially seeing that the spiritual imparting has already been previously disposed of in its distinctive forms. — ἐν ἀπλωτῇ] in simplicity, therefore without any selfishness, without boasting, secondary designs, etc., but in plain sincerity of disposition. Comp. 2 Cor. vii. 2; ix. 11, 13, and the classical collocations of ἀπλῶς καλ ἀληθῆς, ἀπλ. κ. γενναίος κ.τ.λ. On the subject-matter, comp. Matt. v. 2 ff. — ὁ προστάταιμος] the president, he who exercises the χάρισμα of presiding over others as leader, of directing affairs and the like (comp. προτάσταιμος τῶν πραγμάτων, Herodian, vii. 10. 16), consequently one who through spiritual endowment is ἵγεμονικός καλ ἀρχικός (Plato, Prot. p. 352 B). This χάρισμα προστατικόν had to be possessed by the presbyter or ἐπίσκοπος for behoof of his work (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 28); but we are not to understand it as applying to him exclusively, or to explain it specially of the office of presbyter, as Rothe and Philippi again do,¹ in spite of the general nature of the context, while Hofmann likewise thinks that the presbyter is meant, not as respects his office, but as respects his activity. What is meant is the category of charismatic endowment, under which the work destined for the presbyter falls to be included. — ἐν στοιχείῳ] with seal; it is the earnest, strenuous attention to the fulfilment of duty, the opposite of φαινότητα. — ὁ δεόν] he who is merciful towards the suffering and unfortunate, to whom it is his χάρισμα to administer comfort, counsel, help. — ἐν ἰδαπάτῃ.]

¹ So also Jul. Müller, Dogmat. Abb. p. 582.
with cheerful, friendly demeanour, 2 Cor. ix. 7, the opposite of a reluctant and sullen carriage. Comp. Xen. Mem. ii. 7: ἄραπος δὲ ἀντὶ σκυθροσέσων. — Observe, further, that ἐν ἀπλότ., ἐν στουδῇ, and ἐν ἄραπο. do not denote, like the preceding definitions with ἐν, the sphere of service within which the activity is to exert itself, but the quality, with which those who are gifted are to do their work; and all these three qualities characterize, in like manner, the nature of true σωφρονεῖν, ver. 3.

Vv. 9–21. Exhortations for all without distinction, headed by love!

Ver. 9. 'Ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκρ.] sc. ἔστω. The supplying of the imperative (comp. ver. 7), which is rare in the classical writers (Bernhardy, p. 331; Kühner, II. 1, p. 37), cannot occasion any scruple in this so briefly sketching hortatory address. ἀνυπόκριτος is not found in classical Greek, but it occurs in Wisd. v. 19, xviii. 16, 2 Cor. vi. 6, 1 Tim. i. 5, 2 Tim. i. 5, Jas. iii. 12, 1 Pet. i. 22. Antoninus, viii. 5, has the adverb, like Clem. Cor. II. 12. — The absolute ἡ ἀγάπη is always love towards others (see esp. 1 Cor. xiii.), of which φιλαδελφία is the special form having reference to Christian fellowship, ver. 10. As love must be, so must be also faith, its root, 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 5. — The following participles and adjectives may be taken either together as preparing for the εὐλογεῖσθε τοὺς διόκ. in ver. 14, and as dependent on this (Lachm. ed. min.); or, as corresponding to the personal subject of ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκρ. (so Fritzsche), see on 2 Cor. i. 7; or, finally, by the supplying of δοστε as mere precepts, so that after ἀνυπόκρ. there should be placed a full stop, and another after διόκοντες in ver. 13. So usually; also by Lachmann, ed. maj., and Tischendorf. The latter view alone, after ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκρ. has been supplemented by the imperative of the substantive verb, is the natural one, and correspondent in its concise mode of expression to the whole character stamped on the passage; the two former modes of connection exhibit a formal interdependence on the part of elements that are heterogeneous in substance. — ἀποστροφοῦντες] abhorring. The strengthening significance of the compound, already noted by Chrysostom,
Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, has been ground-
lessly denied by Fritzsche; it is quite appropriate in passages
like Herod. ii. 47, vi. 129; Soph. Oed. C. 186, 691; Eur. Ion.
488; Parthen. Erot. 8.—τὸ πνεῦμα and τὸ ἀγαθόν are to be
taken generally of moral evil and good; abhorrence of the one
and adherence to the other form the fundamental moral
character of unfeigned love. The evil and good which are
found in the object of love (Hofmann) are included, but not
specially meant. Comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 6.

Ver. 10. Τῇ φιλαδελφῇ In respect of (in point of) brotherly
love (love towards fellow-Christians, 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb.
xiii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7). On its relation to ἀγάπη,
comp. generally Gal. vi. 10.—φιλόστοροι fondly affectionate;
an expression purposely chosen, because Christians are brothers
and sisters, as the word is also in classical Greek the usual one
for family affection. Comp. also Cicero, ad Att. xv. 17.—τῇ
τιμῇ in the point of moral respect and high estimation.—
προηγούμενοι not: excelling (Chrysostom, Morus, Kollner), nor
yet: anticipating (Vulgate, Theophylact, Luther, Castalio, Wolf,
Flatt), but, in correspondence with the significatio of the word:
going before, as guides, namely, with the conduct that incites
others to follow. Without the support of usage Erasmus,
Grotius, Heumann, Koppe, and Hofmann take προηγεῖσθαι as
equivalent to ἡγεῖσθαι ὑπερέχουσας (Phil. ii. 3), se ipso potiores
dicere alios, which would be denoted by ἡγεῖσθαι πρὸ ἑαυτῶν
ἄλλ. (Phil. ii. 3). In Greek it does not elsewhere occur
with the accusative, but only with the dative (Xen. Cyr.
ii. 1. 1; Arist. Plut. 1195; Polyb. xii. 5. 10) or genitive of
the person (Xen. Hipp. 4. 5; Herodian, vi. 8. 6.; Polyb. xii.
13. 11); with the accusative only, as in Xen. Anab. vi. 5. 10,
προῆγ. ὃδον.

Ver. 11. Τῇ σπουδῇ in respect of zeal, namely, for the
interests of the Christian life in whatever relation.—τῷ πν.
ζέωντες seething, boiling in spirit, the opposite of ἦκιντοι τῇ
σπουδῇ; hence τῷ πνεύμ. is not to be understood of the Holy
Spirit (Oecumenius and many others, including Holsten,

That this fervent excitement of the activity of thought,
feeling, and will for Christian aims is stirred up by the Holy Spirit, is obvious of itself, but is not of itself expressed by τῷ πνεύματι. Ζέω of the mental aestuare is also frequent in the classics; Plato, *Rep.* iv. p. 440 C, *Phaedr.* p. 251 B; Soph. *Oed. C.* 435; Eur. *Hec.* 1055; and Plutk in loc. See also Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* IX. p. 203; Dorville, *ad Charit.* p. 233. — τῷ καυρῷ δουλ.] consigns— without, in view of the whole laying out of the discourse as dependent on ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκρ., ver. 9, requiring a connective δὲ (against van Hengel)—the fervour of spirit to the limits of Christian prudence, which, amidst its most lively activity, yet in conformity with true love, accommodates itself to the circumstances of the time,¹ with moral discretion does not aim at placing itself in independence of them or oppose them with headlong stubbornness, but submits to them with a wise self-denial (1 Cor. xiii. 4–8). Comp. on the δουλ. τῷ καυρῷ (tempori servire, Cicero, *ad Div.* ix. 17, *Tuscul.* iii. 27. 66) and synonymous expressions (καυρῷ λατρεύειν, τοῖς καυρ. ἀκολούθειν), which are used in a good or bad sense according to the context, Wetstein and Fritzsche in loc.; Jacobs, *ad Anthol.* X. p. 261. On the thing itself, see Cic. *ad Div.* iv. 6: “ad novos casus temporum novorum consiliarum rationes accommodare.”

Ver. 12. In virtue of hope (of the future δέξα, v. 2) joyful. The dative denotes the motive (Kühner, II. i. p. 380). — τῷ ἹΗ. ἐνρμ.] in the presence of tribulation holding out, remaining constant in it. On the dative, comp. Kühner, l.c. p. 385. Paul might have written τῷ θαύμῳ ἐνρμ. (1 Cor. xiii. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. x. 32, et al., and according to the classical use); he writes, however, in the line of formal symmetry with the other expressions, the dative and then the absolute ἐνρμέν. (Matt. x. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 12; Jas. v. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 20). — τ. προσευχῆς προσκ.] perseveringly applying to prayer, Col. iv. 2; Acts i. 14.

Ver. 13. Having fellowship in the necessities² of the saints

¹ How much was Paul himself in this matter, with all his fervour of spirit, a shining model! 1 Cor. ix. 19 ff.; Phil. iv. 12, 13; 1 Cor. iv. 11 ff., viii. 13; Acts xx. 35, xvi. 3, xxi. 23 ff. To the δοξάω τῷ καυρῷ, in the noble sense here meant, belongs also the having as though one had not, etc., in 1 Cor. vii. 29 ff.
² The reading minos yields no sense, although Hofmann commends it and
(comp. xv. 27), i.e. so conducting yourselves that the necessities of your fellow-Christians may be also your own, seeking therefore just so to satisfy them. Comp. on Phil. iv. 14. The transitive sense: communicating (still held by Rückert and Fritzsche, following many of the older interpreters), finds nowhere, at least in the N. T., any confirmation (not even in Gal. vi. 6). The διώκει are the Christians in general, not specially those of Jerusalem (Hofmann), who are indicated in xv. 25, but not here, by the context. — τὸν φίλον ἡμῶν] studying hospitality. Comp. Heb. xiii. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 9. A virtue highly important at that time, especially in the case of travelling, perhaps banished and persecuted, Christian brethren. Comp. also 1 Tim. v. 10; Tit. i. 8. That those in need of shelter should not merely be received, but also sought out, belongs, under certain circumstances, to the fulfilment of this duty, but is not expressed by διώκοντες (as Origen and Bengel hold). Comp. ix. 30; ὁρεῖν διώκειν, Plato, Theaet. p. 176 B; τὸ ἁγαθὸν διώκειν and the like, Ecclus. xxvii. 8, et al.; ἀδικίαν διώκειν, Plat. Rep. p. 545 B.

Ver. 14. Τούς διώκειν υμᾶς] who persecute you (in any respect whatever). The saying of Christ, Matt. v. 44, was perhaps known to the apostle and here came to his recollection, without his having read however, as Beich here again assumes (comp. on ii. 19), the Gospels.

Ver. 15. Χαίρειν] i.e. χαίρειν υμᾶς δεί, infinitive, as a briefly interjected expression of the necessary behaviour desired. See on Phil. iii. 16. On the subject-matter, comp. Ecclus. vii. 34. Rightly Chrysostom brings into prominence the fact that κλαίειν κ.τ.λ., γενναίας σφόδρα δεῦται ψυχής, ὅτε τῷ εὐδοκιμοῦντι μὴ μόνον μὴ φθονεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνῆ- δεσθαι.

Ver. 16. These participles are also to be understood imperatively by supplying ἔσεσθε (comp. on ver. 9), and not to be joined to ver. 15, nor yet to μὴ γίνεσθε φρόν. παρ' ἑαυτ. — τὸ seeks to acquire for it, by a comparison of Gal. ii. 10 and Phil. i. 4, the sense of renderings of assistance, which is a linguistic impossibility. Yet even Theodore of Mopsuestia wished to assign to this reading, which is found in some copies, the sense: οὐ δία μᾶς μην μηνοῦντες πάντως τῶν ἀγίων.
avtò eis ἀλλ. φιλοσοφίαν] characterizes the loving harmony, when each, in respect to his neighbour (eis, not év as in xv. 5), has one and the same thought and endeavour. Comp. generally xv. 5; Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 11. According to Fritzsche, τὸ ἀντίο refers to what follows, so that modesty is meant as that towards which their mind should be mutually directed. But thus this clause of the discourse would not be independent, which is contrary to the analogy of the rest.

— μὴ τὰ ἴσηνα φιλοσοφίαν] not aiming at high things,—a warning against ambitious self-seeking. Comp. xi. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 7.— τοῖς ταπεινοῖς] is neuter (Fritzsche, Reiche, Kölner, Glöckler, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Borger, Reithmayr, Philipp, Maier, Bisping, following Beza and Calvin): being drawn onward by the lowly; i.e. instead of following the impulse to high things, rather yielding to that which is humble, to the claims and tasks which are presented to you by the humbler relations of life, entering into this impulse towards the lower strata and spheres of life, which lays claim to you, and following it. The ταπεινά ought to have for the Christian a force of attraction, in virtue of which he yields himself to fellowship with them (οὖν), and allows himself to be guided by them in the determination of his conduct. Thus the Christian holds intercourse, sympathetically and effectively, in the lower circles, with the poor, sick, persecuted, etc.; thus Paul felt himself compelled to enter into humble situations, to work as a handicraftsman, to suffer need and nakedness, to be weak with the weak, etc. With less probability, on account of the contrast of τὰ ἴσηνα, others have taken τοῖς ταπειν. as masculine,—some of them understanding ταπεινὸς of inferior rank, some of humble disposition, some blending both meanings—with very different definitions of the sense of the whole, e.g. Chrys.: εἰς τὴν ἔκεισαν ἐντελείαν κατάβητι, συμπεριφέρου, μὴ ἀπλῶς τὸ φρονήσας συνταπεινοῦ, ἄλλα καὶ βοήθει καὶ χείρα ὀνείρου κ.τ.λ.; similarly Erasmus, Luther, Estius, and others; Grotius (comp. Ewald): "modestissimorum exempla sectantes;" Rückert (comp. van Hengel): "let it please you to remain in fellowship with the lowly;" Olshausen: Christianity enjoins intercourse with publicans and sinners in order to
gain them for the kingdom of Christ;\(^1\) Hofmann: "to be
drawn into the host of those who occupy an inferior station and
desire nothing else, and, as their equals, disappearing amongst
them, to move with them along the way in which they go."

— συναπαύειν.] has not in itself, nor has it here, the bad sense:
to be led astray along with, which it acquires in Gal. ii. 13,
2 Pet. iii. 17, through the context. — φρονεῖν παρ' ἐαυτῷ.] wise
according to your own judgment. Comp. Prov. iii. 7; Bern-
hardy, p. 256 f. One must not fall into that conceited self-
sufficiency of moral perception, whereby brotherly respect for the
perception of others would be excluded. Similar, but not
equivalent, is ἐν ἑαυτῷ, xi. 25.

Vv. 17–19. The participles—to be supplemented here as in
ver. 16—are not to be connected with μὴ γινέσθαι φρόνεῖν παρ' ἐαυτῷ.
— μὴ δεῖνι] be he Christian or non-Christian. Opposite:
πάντων ἄνθρωπων. The maxim itself taught also by Greek
sages, how opposed it was to the ἀδικεῖν τῷ ἀδικοῦντι of
common Hellenism (Hermann, ad Soph. Philoct. 679; Jacobs,
ad Delect. Epigr. p. 144; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Crit. p. 49 B,
ad Philo'b. p. 49 D) and to Pharisaism (see on Matt. v. 43);
— προνοοῦμενοι] reminiscence from the LXX., Prov. iii. 4. For
this very reason, but especially because otherwise an entirely
unsuitable limitation of the absolute moral notion of καλά
would result, ἐνόμων κ.τ.λ. is not to be joined to καλά (Ewald,
Hofmann); it belongs to προνοοῦμ. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 21;
Polycarp, ad Phil. 6. Before the eyes of all men—so that it
lies before the judgment of all—taking care for what is good
(morality and decency in behaviour). Verbs of caring are
used both with the genitive (1 Tim. v. 8) and with the accusa-
tive (Bernhardy, p. 176), which in the classics also is very
frequently found with προνοεῖναι. Rightly Theophylact re-
marks on ἐνόμων πάντων ἄνθρ. that Paul does not thereby exhort
us to live πρὸς κενοδοξίαν, but ὅπως μὴ παρέχωμεν καθ' ἡμῶν
ἀφορμᾶς τῷ θεολογεῖν, he recommends that which is
ἀσκανδάλιστον κ. ἀπρόκλητον. — εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ εἰ υἱῶν μετὰ
κ.τ.λ.] to be so punctuated. For if the two were to be

\(^1\) Certainly not here, for the discourse concerns the relations of Christians to one another (not to those who are without).
joined together ("as much as it is possible for you," Glöckler),
the injunction would lose all moral character. Still less are
we to suppose that el διωνατον belongs to the preceding (Eras-
mus, Cajetanus, Bengel), which indeed admits of no condition.
Grotius' view is the correct one: "omnia amici este, si fieri
potest; si non potest utrimque, certe ex vestra parte amici
este," so that el διωνατον allows the case of objective impos-
sibility to avail (how often had Paul himself experienced this!);
το εξ υμων (adverbially: as to what concerns your part, that
which proceeds from you; see generally on i. 15, and Ellendt,
Lex. Soph. II. p. 225) annuls any limitation in a subjective
respect, and does not contain a subjective limitation (Reiche),
since we for our part are supposed to be always and in any
case peaceably disposed, so that only the opposite disposition
and mode of behaviour of the enemy can frustrate our sub-
jective peaceableness.— Δυνατον] urgent and persuasive.
Comp. 1 Cor. x. 14, xv. 58; Phil. ii. 1, iv. 1.— διαλλα δοτη
και.] The construction changes, giving place to a stronger
(independent) designation of duty. See Winer, p. 535 [E. T.
place to wrath (και εξοχην, that of God), i.e. forestall it not by
personal revenge, but let it have its course and its sway.1 The
morality of this precept is based on the holiness of God; hence,
so far as wrath and love are the two poles of holiness, it does
not exclude the blessing of our adversaries (ver. 14) and inter-
cession for them. The view, according to which το υργατον is
referred to the divine wrath (comp. v. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 16)—as
the absolute η χαρας is the divine favour and grace (comp. v.
9; 1 Thess. i. 10, ii. 16)—is rightly preferred by most inter-
preters from the time of Chrysostom down to van Hengel,
Hofmann, Delitzsch; for, on the one hand, it corresponds
tirely to the profane (Gataker, ad Anton. p. 104; Wetstein
in loc.) and Pauline (Eph. iv. 27) use of τονον (or χαραν) διδωνας
— which primarily denotes to make place for any one (Luke

1 Quite analogous to the sense and sequence of thought of our verse is Synops.
Sohar, p. 95: "Homo non debet properare, ut vindictam sumat (comp. μη
λαιρων λαταιντεαν); melius est, si vindictam commitis alii" (Deo), comp. διαλλα
dive και. το υργατον.
xiv. 9), then to give any one full play, time and opportunity for activity (Eph. l.c., comp. Ecclus. xiii. 21, xix. 17, xxxviii. 12, xvi. 14; Philo in Loesner, p. 263); and on the other hand it is most appropriate to the following scriptural proof. 1 Non-compliance with the precept occasions the ὀργαία χαὶ ἀμαλάντες, Eph. iv. 26. Comp. on the thought 1 Pet. ii. 23; 1 Sam. xxiv. 13, 16. Others interpret it of one's own wrath, 2 which is not to be allowed to break forth. So de Dieu, Bos, Semler, Cramer, and Reiche: "Wrath produces terrible effects in the moment of its ebullition; give it time, and it passes away." The Latin use 3 of irae spatium dare agrees indeed with this interpretation, but not the Greek use of τὸ πονὸν δίδώνας—not even in the well-known expression in Plutarch (de ira cohib. p. 462) that we should not even in sport δίδωνα τὸ πονὸν to anger, i.e. give it full play, allow it free course. Since this "giving way to wrath" (justly repudiated by Plutarch as highly dangerous) cannot be enjoined by Paul, he must have meant by τ. ὀργα ἡ divine wrath. For the interpretation given by others of the wrath of an enemy, which one is to give place to, to go out of the way of (Schoettgen, Morus, Ammon), must be rejected, since this, although it may be linguistically justified (Luke xiv. 9; Judg. xx. 36), and may be compared with Soph. Ant. 718 (see Schneidewin in loc.) and with the Homeric εἰκεν ὑμᾶς, yet would yield a precept, which would be only a rule of prudence and not a command of Christian morals. This applies also in opposition to Ewald: to allow the wrath of the other to expend itself, which, as opposed to personal

1 Yet it must be admitted, that either of the two other explanations (see below) would not be opposed to the sense of the following passage of Scripture, if only one of them were otherwise decidedly correct.

2 So Zyro in a peculiar manner in the Stud. u. Krit. 1845, p. 891 f.: "Give place to wrath, when it comes and seeks to get possession of your mind, and go from it (turn your back upon it)." This would be psychologically inappropriate (for wrath is in man, an emotion which indeed is stirred up from without, but does not come thence, comp. Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; John xi. 38, 39), and at the same time how strange in point of expression!

3 Livy ii. 56, viii. 32; Seneca, de ira, iii. 39. Comp. especially Lactantius, de Ira, 18: "Ego vero laudarem, si, cum fuisse iratus, dedisset irae suae spatium, ut, residente per intervallum temporis animi tumore, haberet modum castigatio."
revenge, has no positive moral character (it is otherwise with Matt. v. 39); not to mention that the injury, the personal avenging of which is forbidden, by no means necessarily supposes a wrathful offender. — γεγ. γάρ] Deut. xxxii. 35, freely as regards the sense, from the Hebrew (to me belongs revenge and requital), but with use of the words of the LXX., which depart from the original (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησες ἀνταποδώσω), and with the addition of λέγει κύριος. The form of this citation, quite similar to that here used, which is found in Heb. x. 30, cannot be accidental, especially as the characteristic ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσ. recurs also in the paraphrase of Onkelos (πέρας κυρί). But there are no traces elsewhere to make us assume that Paul made use of Onkelos; and just as little has the view any support elsewhere, that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews followed the citation of Paul (Bleek, Delitzsch). Hence the only hypothesis which we can form without arbitrariness is, that the form of the saying as it is found in Paul and in Heb. x. 30 had at that time acquired currency in the manner of a formula of warning which had become proverbial, and had influenced the rendering in the paraphrase of Onkelos. The λέγει κύριος Paul has simply added, as was frequently done (comp. xiv. 11) with divine utterances; in Heb. x. 30 these words are not genuine.

Ver. 20. Without ὅω (see the critical notes), but thus the more in conformity with the mode of expression throughout the whole chapter, which proceeds for the most part without connectives, there now follows what the Christian—seeing that he is not to avenge himself, but to let God’s wrath have its way—has rather to do in respect of his enemy.—The whole verse is borrowed from Prov. xxv. 21, 22, which words Paul adopts as his own, closely from the LXX. — ἐφώμιζε] feed him, give him to eat. See on 1 Cor. xiii 1; Grimm on Wisd. xvi. 20. The expression is affectionate. Comp. 2 Sam. xiii. 5; Bengel: “manu tua.” Ecclus. vii. 32 — ἀναβακας πυρὸς σωρεύς. ἐπὶ τὴν κεφ. αὐτοῦ] figurative expression of the thought: painful shame and remorse will thou prepare for him. So, in substance, Origen, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, Erasmus, Luther, Wolf, Bengel, and others,
including Tholuck, Baumgarten-Crusius, Rückert, Reiche, Köllner, de Wette, Olshausen, Fritzsche, Philippi, Reithmayr, Bisping, Borger, van Hengel, Hofmann; comp. Linder in the Stud. u. Krit. 1862, p. 568 f. Glowing coals are to the Oriental a figure for pain that penetrates and cleaves to one, and in particular, according to the context, for the pain of remorse, as here, where magnanimous beneficence heaps up the coals of fire. Comp. on the subject-matter, 1 Sam. xxiv. 17 ff. See the Arabic parallels in Gesenius in Rosenmüller's Repert. I. p. 140, and generally Tholuck in loc.; Gesenius, Thesaur. I. p. 280. Another view was already prevalent in the time of Jerome,* and is adopted by Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Photius, Beza, Camerarius, Estius, Grotius, Wetstein, and others, including Koppe, Böhme, Hengstenberg (Authent. d. Pentat. II. p. 406 f.),—namely, that the sense is: Thou wilt bring upon him severe divine punishment. Certainly at 4 Esr. xvi. 54 the burning of fiery coals on the head is an image of painful divine punishment; but there this view is just as certainly suggested by the context, as here (see esp. ver. 21) and in Prov. i.e., the context is opposed to it. For the condition nisi resipiscat would have, in the first place, to be quite arbitrarily supplied; and how could Paul have conceived and expressed so unchristian a motive for beneficence towards enemies! The saving clauses of expositors regarding this point are fanciful and quite unsatisfactory.

Ver. 21. Comprehensive summary of vv. 19, 20.—“Be not overcome (carried away to revenge and retaliation) by evil (which is committed against thee), but overcome by the good (which thou showest to thine enemy) the evil,” bringing about the result

1 Not for softening (from the custom of softening hard meats by laying coals upon the vessel), as Gläckler, following Vorstius and others, thinks, nor for inflaming to love (Calovius and others). The Jesuit Sanctius (see Cornelius a Lapide in loc.) even found in the figure an indication of the blush of shame. So again Umbreit, p. 358; comp. also van Hengel.

*“Carbones igitur congregabias super caput ejus, non in maledictum et condemnationem, ut pierrige existimani, sed in correctionem et poenituidinem,” Jerome.

* Augustine, Propos. 71: “Quomodo quisquam diliget eum, cui propter eam album et potum dat, ut carbones ignis congregat super caput ejus, si carbones ignis hoc loco aliquem gravem poenam significant!”
that the enemy, put to shame by thy noble spirit, ceases to act malignantly against thee and becomes thy friend. "Vin-
cit malos pertinax bonitas," Seneca, de benef. vii. 31. Comp. de ira, ii. 32; Valer. Max. iv. 2, 4. On the other hand, Soph. El. 308 f.: ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς | Πολλή 'στ' ἀνάγκη κάπιτη-
δενεὶν κακά. We may add the appropriate remark of Erasmus on the style of expression throughout the chapter: "Comparibus membris et incisis, similiter cadentibus ac desinentibus sic totus sermo modulatus est, ut nulla cantio possit esse jucundior."
CHAPTER XIII.

Ver. 1. ἄρα] Lachm. and Tisch. 8: ἢτά, which Griesb. also approved, according to preponderant evidence. But ἄρα also retains considerable attestation (D* E* F G, min., Or. Theodoret, Dam.), and may easily have been displaced by a ἢτά written on the margin from the following. After οὖν Elz. has Ιδιείδαι, which, according to a preponderance of evidence, has been justly omitted since Griesb. as a supplement; and τῷ also before the following Θεῦ is too feebly attested.— Ver. 3. τῷ ἄγαθῶ ζηγγυ, ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ] commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm., Tisch., Fritzsche, according to A B D* F G P, 6. 67**, several vss., and Fathers. But Elz., Matth., Scholz have τῶν ἄγαθῶν ζηγγυ, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν. A presumed emendation in case and number.— Ver. 5. ἀνάγκη ἢτοτάσσεται] D E F G, Goth. It. Guelph. Ir. have merely ἢτοτάσσεται. Commended by Griesb. A marginal gloss, as the reading ἀνάγκη (or ἢτόγχη) ἢτοτάσσεται (Lect. 7, 8, Aug., Beda, Vulg.: necessitate subditi estote; so Luther) plainly shows.— Ver. 7. οὐ] is wanting in A B D* K*, 67**, Copt. Sahid. Vulg. ms. Tol. Damasc. Cypr. Aug. Ruf. Cassiod. Omitted by Lachm., Tisch., Fritzsche. Rightly; for there was no ground for its omission, whereas by its insertion the logical connection was established.— Ver. 9. After ξίλεις Elz. has ὁ ὕποπομαρτυρήτως, against decisive evidence. Inserted with a view to completeness.— ἰν τῷ] bracketed by Lachm., is wanting in BFG, Vulg. It. and Latin Fathers. But its striking appearance of superfluosness might so readily prompt its omission, that this evidence is too weak.— Ver. 11. The order ἂν ἢμᾶς is decisively supported. So rightly Lachm. and Tisch. 8. Yet the latter has instead of ἢμᾶς: ἢμᾶς, according to A B C P K*, min. Clem., which, however, appeared more suitable to ἐθέσεις and more worthy of the apostle.— Ver. 12. καὶ ἰδον.] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἰδοὺ δὲ, which also Griesb. approved, according to important witnesses; but it would be very readily suggested by the preceding adversative connection.
Vv. 1–7. The proud love of freedom of the Jews (see on John viii. 33; Matt. xxii. 17), and their tumultuary spirit thereby excited, which was peculiarly ardent from the time of Judas Gaulonites (see Acts v. 37; Josephus, Ant. xviii. 1. 1) and had shortly before broken out in Rome itself (Suetonius, Claud. 25; Dio Cassius, lx. 6; see Introd. § 2, and on Acts xviii. 2), redoubled for the Christians—among whom, indeed, even the Gentile-Christians might easily enough be led astray by the Messianic ideas (theocracy, kingdom of Christ, freedom and καιρονομία of believers, etc.) into perverted thoughts of freedom and desires for emancipation (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 1 ff.)—the necessity of civil obedience, seeing that they, as confessing the Messiah (Acts xvi. 6, 7), and regarded by the Gentiles as a Jewish sect, were much exposed to the suspicion of revolutionary enterprise. The danger thus lay, not indeed exclusively (Mangold, Beyschlag), but primarily and mostly, on the side of the Jewish-Christians, not on that of the Gentile-Christians, as Th. Schott, in the interest of the view that Paul desired to prepare the Roman church to be the base of operations of his western mission to the Gentiles, unhistorically assumes. And was not Rome, the very seat of the government of the world, just the place above all others where that danger was greatest, and where nevertheless the whole Christian body, of the Jewish as well as of the Gentile section, had to distinguish itself by exemplary civil order? Hence we have here the—in the Pauline epistles unique—detailed and emphatic inculcation of obedience towards the magistracy, introduced without link of connection with what precedes as a new subject.1

1 For good practical observations on this passage, see Harless, Staats u. Kirche, 1870.

It is vain to seek for connections, when Paul himself indicates none. Thus, e.g., we are not to say that the mention of private injuries leads him to speak of behaviour towards the heathen magistracy (Tholuck and older expositors). He does not in fact represent the latter as hostile. Arbitrarily also Th. Schott (comp. Borger) thinks that the discourse passes from subordination under God, to whom belongs vengeance, to subordination under the executors of the divine iustitia. As though Paul in xil. 19 could have thought of such an iustitia! Just as arbitrary, without any hint in the text, is the view of Hofmann: Paul makes the transition from the social life of men in general to their conduct in political organization, which also belongs to the good, wherewith one is to overcome the evil.
Baur, I. p. 384 f., thinks that Paul is here combating Ebionitic dualism, which regarded the secular magistrate as of non-divine, devilish origin. As if Paul could not, without any such antithesis, have held it to be necessary to inculcate upon the Romans the divine right of the state-authority! Moreover, he would certainly not merely have kept his eye upon that dualism in regard to its practical manifestations (Baur's subterfuge), but would have combated it in principle, and thereby have grasped it at the root.— The partial resemblance, moreover, which exists between vv. 1-4 and 1 Pet. ii. 13, 14 is not sufficient to enable us to assume that Peter made use of our passage, or that Paul made use of Peter's epistle; a view, which has been lately maintained especially by Weiss, Petrin. Lehrbegr. p. 416 ff., and in the Stud. u. Krit. 1865, 4; see, on the other hand, Huther on 1 Pet. Introd. § 2. Paul doubtless frequently preached a similar doctrine orally respecting duty towards the heathen magistracy. And the power of his preaching was sufficiently influential in moulding the earliest ecclesiastical language, to lead even a Peter, especially on so peculiar a subject, involuntarily to echo the words of Paul which had vibrated through the whole church. Compare the creative influence of Luther upon the language of the church.

Ver. 1. Πᾶσας ψυχὰς In the sense of every man, but (comp. on ii. 9) of man conceived in reference to his soul-nature, in virtue of which he consciously feels pleasure and displeasure (rejoices, is troubled, etc.), and cherishes corresponding impulses. There lies a certain pathos in the significant: every soul, which at once brings into prominence the universality of the duty. Comp. Acts ii. 43, iii. 23; Rev. xvi. 3. — ἐξουσίας ἰρεπεκ.] magistrates high in standing (without the article). ἰρεπεκ: (see Wisd. vi. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 13; 1 Tim. ii. 2; 2 Macc. iii. 11) is added, in order to set forth the ἐξουσίας. — ἰντὸ and ἰντὸ being correlative—as corresponding to the standpoint of the magistracy itself (comp. the German: hohe Obrigkeit); the motive of obedience follows.— There is no magistracy apart from God expresses in general the proceeding of all magistracy whatever from God, and then this relation is still more precisely defined, in respect of those magistracies which exist in concreto as
a divine institution, by ἵπτο Θεοῦ τεταρμύ. εἰς; comp. Hom. II. ii. 204 ff., ix. 38, 98; Soph. Phil. 140, et al.; Xen. Rep. Lac. 15. 2. Thus Paul has certainly expressed the divine right of magistracy, which Christian princes especially designate by the expression “by the grace of God” (since the time of Louis the Pious). And ai δὲ ὁδας, the extant, actually existing, allows no exception, such as that possibly of tyrants or usurpers (in opposition to Reiche). The Christian, according to Paul, ought to regard any magistracy whatever, provided its rule over him subsists de facto, as divinely ordained, since it has not come into existence without the operation of God’s will; and this applies also to tyrannical or usurped power, although such a power, in the counsel of God, is perhaps destined merely to be temporary and transitional. From this point of view, the Christian obeys not the human caprice and injustice, but the will of God, who—in connection with His plan of government inaccessible to human insight—has presented even the unworthy and unrighteous ruler as the ὁδα έξοντ’α, and has made him the instrument of His measures. Questions as to special cases—such as how the Christian is to conduct himself in political catastrophes, what magistracy he is to look upon in such times as the ὁδα εξοντα, as also, how he, if the command of the magistrate is against the command of God, is at any rate to obey God rather than men (Acts v. 29), etc.—Paul here leaves unnoticed, and only gives the main injunction of obedience, which he does not make contingent on this or that form of constitution.¹ By no means, however, are we to think only of the magisterial office as instituted by God (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and others), but rather of the magistracy in its concrete persons and members as the bearers of the divinely-ordained office. Comp. oi κραυνε, ver. 3, and vv. 4, 6, 7; Dion. Hal. Antt. xi. 32; Plut. Philop. 17; Tit. iii. 1; also Martyr. Polyc. 10.—Observe, moreover, that Paul has in view Gentile magistrates in concreto; consequently he could not speak more specially of that which Christian magistrates have on their part to do, and which Christian subjects in their duty of obedience for God and right’s sake are to expect and to

require from them, although he expresses in general—by repeatedly bringing forward the fact that magistrates are the servants of God (vv. 3, 4), indeed ministering servants of God (ver. 6)—the point of view from which the distinctly Christian judgment as to the duties and rights of magistrate and subject respectively must proceed.

Ver. 2. "Since it is instituted by God. — δ ἀντιστασισ.] Note the correlation of ἀντιστασις, ὑποτασσω, and τεταρτα. The latter stands in the middle.— εἰπροίς] Dativus incommodi: their resistance to the divinely-ordained magistracy will issue in their own self-destruction; comp. ii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 29. According to Hofmann (who in his Schriften I. II. 2, p. 443, even imported a contrast to ὑποτασσω, as in xiv. 6, 7), εἰπροίς is to be viewed as in contrast to the Christian body as such; the punishment to be suffered is a judgment which lights on the doers personally, and is not put to the account of their Christian standing. This explanation ("they have to ascribe the punishment to themselves solely") is incorrect, because it obtrudes on the text a purely fictitious antithesis, and because the apostle lays down the relation to the magistracy quite generally, not from the specific point of view of Christian standing, according to which his readers might perhaps have supposed that they had become foreign to the political commonwealth. Had this comprehensive error in principle been here in Paul's view, in how entirely different a way must he have expressed what he intended than by the single expression εἰπροίς, into which, moreover, that alleged thought would have first to be imported! — κρίμα] a judgment, is understood of itself, according to the connection, as a penal judgment. Comp. ii. 2, 3, iii. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 29; Gal. v. 10; Mark xii. 40. From whom they will receive it, is decided by the fact that with οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι, according to the context, τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοπραγμένῃ is again to be supplied. It is therefore a penal judgment of God, as the executors of which, however, the ἄρχοι are conceived, as ver. 3 proves. Consequently the passage does not relate to eternal punishment (Reiche and others), but to the temporal punishment which God causes to be inflicted by means of the magistrates. Philippi prefers to leave κρίμα without more special definition (comp.
also Rückert); but against this is the consideration, that ver. 3 can only arbitrarily be taken otherwise than as assigning the ground of what immediately precedes.

Ver. 3. Οἱ ἡγε... κακῶ[Ground assigned for 'εαυτὸς κρίμα λήψωται.] The good work and the evil work are personified. We are not here to compare ii. 7 or ii. 15 (Reiche, de Wette). — φόβος] a terror, i.e. formidandi. For examples of the same use, see Kypke, II. p. 183. Comp. Lobeck, Paralip. p. 513; just so the Latin timor, e.g. Propert. iii. 5. 40. — δὲ] the simple μεταβατικόν. The proposition itself may be either interrogatory (Beza, Calvin, and others, including Lachmann, Tischendorf, Ewald, Hofmann), or as protasis in categorical form (see on 1 Cor. vii. 18, and Pflugk, ad Eur. Med. 386). So Luther and others, including Tholuck and Philippi. The former is more lively, the latter more appropriate and emphatic, and thus more in keeping with the whole character of the adjoining context. — ἔπαινον] praise, testimony of approbation (which the magistrate is wont to bestow; see also Philo, Vit. M. i. p. 626 C); not any more than in ii. 29, 1 Cor. iv. 5, reward (Calvin, Loesner, and others). Grotius rightly remarks: "Cum haec scriberet Paulus, non saeviebatur Eomae in Christianos." It was still the better time of Nero's rule. But the proposition has a general validity, which is based on the divinely-ordained position of the magistracy, and is not annulled by their injustices in practice, which Paul had himself so copiously experienced. Comp. 1 Pet. ii. 14.

Ver. 4. Ὁσε... ἡγαθῶν] Establishment of the preceding

1 For if resistance to the ἐργασία were not to draw the divine punishment after it, the relative position of rulers and subjects would necessarily be such, that in good behaviour people would have to stand in fear of them (which would in fact annul the divine ordinance); the converse, however, is the case with them, viz., they are a terror to evil deeds. The γὰς consequently establishes neither, generally, the duty of obedience to the magistracy (Philippi), nor the sense imported by Hofmann into ἐργασία. If the bearers of magisterial power were a terror to good works, the maxim of resistance (to obey God rather than men) would assert its right, and we should have to say with Neoptolemus in Soph. Philoct. 1235 (1251): ἵνα τῇ δακρύῳ τὸ χιλιάριν τοῖς τοῖς ἀρχιτοῖς βιωμένωσι. 2 Beyond the work, and to the intention, the prerogative of the magistrate does not extend. Comp. Harless i.e.
thought—that the well-doer has not to fear the magistrate, but to expect praise from him—by indicating the relation of the magistracy to God, whose servant (διάκονος, feminine, as in xvi. 1; Dem. 762. 4, and frequently) it is, and to the subjects, for whose benefit (defence, protection, blessing) it is so. The σόλον is the ethical relation of the Θεός διάκονος. ἔστι, and εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν adds the more precise definition. — οὔ γὰρ εἰκῇ] for not without corresponding reason (frequently so in classical Greek), but in order actually to use it, should the case require. — τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ] What is meant is not the dagger, which the Roman emperors and the governing officials next to them were accustomed to wear as the token of their jus vitae et necis (Aurel. Vict. 13; Grotius and Wetstein in loc.); for μάχαιρα, although denoting dagger = παραξίφος in the classics (see Spitzner on Hom. Η. xviii. 597; Duncan, Lex. ed. Rost, p. 715), means in the N. T. always sword, viii. 35, according to Xen. τ. ε. xii. 11 (but comp. Krüger, Xen. Ἀνα. i. 8. 7), differing by its curved form from the straight ἔφος; and also among the Greeks the bearing of the sword (Philost. Βιτ. Απ. vii. 16) is expressly used to represent that power of the magistrates. They bore it themselves, and in solemn processions it was borne before them. See Wolf, Curr. On the distinction between φορέω (the continued habit of bearing) and φέρω, see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 585. — Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονος κ.τ.λ.] ground assigned for the assurance ὅπερ εἰκῇ τ. μ. φ., in which the previously expressed proposition is repeated with emphasis, and now its penal reference is appended. — ἐκδίκος εἰς ὀργήν κ.τ.λ.] avenging (1 Thess. iv. 6; Wisd. xii. 12; Ecclus. xxx. 6; Herodian, vii. 4. 10; Aristaenet. i. 27) in behalf of wrath (for the execution of wrath) for him who does evil. This dative of reference is neither dependent on ὅπερ, the position of which is here different from the previous one (in opposition to Hofmann), nor on εἰς ὀργήν (Flatt); it belongs to ἐκδίκος εἰς ὀργήν. Εἰς ὀργήν is not "superfluous and cumbrous" (de Wette), but strengthens the idea.—We may add that our passage proves (comp. Acts xxv. 11) that the abolition of the

1 The same opinion gave rise to the omission of εἰς ὀργήν. in D* FG, 177. et al. Clar. Boern. And the fact that it is found in E Ν* 1. 3. 4. et al. Chrys. Theo-
rigid 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; on which account its application is to be upheld as a principle with reference to those cases in law, where the actual satisfaction of the divine Nemesis absolutely demands it, while at the same time the right of pardon is still to be kept open for all concrete cases. The character of being unchristian, of barbarism, etc., does not adhere to the right itself, but to its abuse in legislation and practice.

Ver. 5. The necessity of obedience is of such a character, that it is not merely externally suggested (by reason of the punishment to be avoided), but is based also on moral grounds; and these two considerations are exhibited by διά as the result of all that has been hitherto said (vv. 1-4). It is clear, accordingly, that ἀνάγκη is not specially the moral necessity, but is to be taken generally, as it is only with the second διά that the moral side of the notion is brought forward. — διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν on account of the magistrate's wrath, ver. 4. — διὰ τὴν σωφροσύνην on account of one's own conscience, διὰ τὸ πληροῖν τὰ προστάτευμα, Theodoret. It is with the Christian the Christian conscience, which as such is bound by God's ordinance. Hence 1 Pet. ii. 13: διὰ τὸν κύριον. Aptly Melanchthon: "Nulla potentia humana, nulli exercitus magis muniunt imperia, quam haec severissima lex Dei: nescia est obedientia conscienciam." Both definitions given with διά belong, however, to ἀνάγκη (sc. ἐστίν), which bears the emphasis, like Heb. ix. 23.

Ver. 6. For on this account you pay taxes—this is the confirmation of ver. 5, from the actually subsisting payment of taxes; γάρ retains its sense assigning a reason, and the emphatic διὰ τοῦτο (from this ground) is exactly in accordance with the context: οὗτοι μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν σωφροσύνην ἀνάγκη ἐστιν ἱπποτάσσεσθαι. At the basis of the argument lies the view, that the existing relation of taxpaying is a result of the necessity indicated in ver. 5, and condoret, before ἐλαβεῖν, which Rinck approves, is to be explained by an incorrect restoration of the dropped-out word.
sequently the confirmation of it. If διὰ τοῦτο be referred to vv. 1–4: "ut magistratus Dei mandatu homines maleficos puniant, proborum saluti prospiciant," Fritzsch (comp. Calvin, Tholuck, de Wette, Borger), ver. 5 is arbitrarily passed over. It follows, moreover, from our passage, that the refusal of taxes is the practical rejection of the necessity stated in ver. 5. Others take τελείηre as imperative (Heumann, Morus, Tholuck, Klee, Reiche, Köllner, Hofmann). Against this the γάρ, which might certainly be taken with the imperative (see on vi. 19), is not indeed decisive; but Paul himself gives by his ὅν, ver. 7, the plain indication that he is passing for the first time in ver. 7 to the language of summons, which he now also introduces, not with the present, but with the aorist. — καί] also denotes the relation corresponding to ver. 5. It is not "a downward climax" (Hofmann: "even this most external performance of subjection"), of which there is no indication at all either in the text or in the thing itself. The latter is, on the contrary, the immediate practical voucher most accordant with the experience of every subject. — τελείηre] Paul does not in this appeal to his readers' own recognition of what was said in ver. 5 (the summons in ver. 7 is opposed to this), but to what subsists as matter of fact. — λειτουργοὶ γάρ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. justifies the fundamental statement, expressed by διὰ τοῦτο, of the actual bearing of the payment of taxes: for they are ministering servants of God, persevering in activity on this very behalf (on no other). The thought in ver. 4, that the magistracy is Θεοῦ διάκονος, is here by way of climax more precisely defined through λειτουργοὶ (which is therefore prefixed with emphasis) according to the official sacredness of this relation of service, and that conformably to the Christian view of the magisterial calling. Accordingly, those who rule, in so far as they serve the divine counsel and will, and employ their strength and activity to this end, are to be regarded as persons whose administration has the character of a divinely consecrated sacrificial service, a priestly nature (ix. 16; Phil. ii. 17, et al.). This renders the proposition the more appropriate for confirmation of the διὰ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ., which is a specifically religious one. — λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ] is predicate, and
the subject is understood of itself from the context: they, namely magisterial persons (οἱ ἀρχοντες). Incorrectly as regards linguistic usage, Reiche, Köllner, Olshausen take προσκαρπ. to be the subject, in which case certainly the article before the participle would be quite indispensable (Reiche erroneously appeals to Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14). — εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο] Telic direction not of λειτουργ. (Hofmann), but of προσκαρπ.: for this very object, by which is meant not the administration of tax-paying (Olshausen, Philippi, and older interpreters), but the just mentioned λειτουργεῖν τῷ Θεῷ, in which vocation, so characteristically sacred, the magistracy is continually and assiduously active, and the subject gives to it the means of being so, namely, taxes. Thus the payment of taxes is placed by Paul under the highest point of view of a religious conscientious duty, so that by means of it the divine vocation of the magistracy to provide a constantly active sacrificial cultus of God is promoted and facilitated. If εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο was to be referred to the administration of taxes, this would not indeed be “nonsensical” (Hofmann), but the emphatic mode of expression αὐτὸ τοῦτο would be without due motive, nor could we easily perceive why Paul should have selected the verb προσκαρπ., which expresses the moral notion perseverare. The reference of it to the nearest great thought, λειτουργεῖν κ.τ.λ., excludes, the more weighty and appropriate that it is, any other reference, even that of Hofmann, that αὐτὸ τοῦτο points back to the same proposition as διὰ τοῦτο. — Instead of εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, Paul might have said αὐτῷ τοῦτο (xii. 12); he has, however, conceived προσκαρπ. absolutely, and given with εἰς the definition of its aim. Comp. on the absolute προσκαρπεῖν, Num. xiii. 20; Xen. Hell. vii. 5, 14.

Ver. 7. Hortatory application of the actual state of the case contained in vv. 5, 6: perform therefore your duties to all (comp. on 1 Cor. vii. 3), etc.—a brief summary (ἀρκεῖον... ὅφειλα) and distributive indication of that which is to be rendered to all magisterial persons generally (πᾶσι), and to individuals in particular (tax officers, customs officers, judicial and other functionaries), both really (φόρος, τέλος) and personally (φόβος, τιμῇ). — πᾶσι] to be referred to magistrates, not
to all men generally (Estius, Klee, Reiche, Glöckler, comp. also Ewald); this is manifestly, from the whole connection—and especially from the following specification, as also from the fact that the language only becomes general at ver. 8—the only reference in conformity with the text. — τῷ τὸν φόρον] sc. ἀπαστοιχία, which flows logically from ἄποδοτε πᾶσι τ. ὁφ. (Winer, p. 548 [E. T. 737]; Buttmann, p. 338), and is also suitable to τ. φόβοι and τ. τιμῆν; for, in fact, the discourse is concerning magistrates, who—and that not merely as respects the notions of that time—do certainly, in accordance with their respective positions of power and performances of service, demand fear and honour. — φόρος and τέλος are distinguished as taxes (on persons and property) and customs (on goods). See on Luke xx. 22. — φόβος, τιμῆ, fear (not merely reverence), veneration. The higher and more powerful the magisterial personages, the more they laid claim, as a rule, to be feared; otherwise and lower in the scale, at least to be honoured with the respect attaching to their office.

Vv. 8-14. General exhortation, to love (vv. 8-10), and to a Christian walk generally (vv. 11-14).

Ver. 8. Μηδενι μηδὲν ὁφελεῖτε negatively the same thing, only generally referred to the relation to everybody—and there with Paul returns to the general duty of Christians—which was before said positively in ver. 7: ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τάς ὁφει-λάς. By this very parallel, and decisively by the subjective negations, ὁφελεῖτε is determined to be imperative: “Leave toward no one any obligation unfulfilled, reciprocal love excepted,” wherein you neither can, nor moreover are expected, ever fully to discharge your obligation. The inexhaustibility of the duty of love, the claims of which are not discharged, but renewed and accumulated with fulfilment, is expressed. Comp. Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Augustine, Beza, Grotius, Wetstein, Bengel (“amare debitum immortale”), and many others, including Tholuck, Rückert, Reithmayr, de Wette, Philippi, Ewald, Umbreit, Hofmann. The point lies in the fact that, while ὁφελεῖτε applies to those external performances to which one is bound (“obliga- tio civilis,” Melanchthon), in the case of the ἀπαστοιχία it means
the higher moral obligation, in virtue of which with the *quotidie solvere* is connected the *semper debere* (Origen). The objections of Reiche to the imperative rendering quite overlook the fact, that with *ei μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλω ἀγαπῆ* the *δοφεῖτε* again to be supplied is to be taken not objectively (remain owing mutual love!), but subjectively, namely, from the consciousness of the impossibility of discharging the debt of love. But Reiche’s own view (so also Schrader, following Heumann, Semler, Koppe, Rosenmüller, Böhme, Flatt, and by way of suggestion, Erasmus), that *δοφ* is *indicative*: “all your obligations come back to love,” is decidedly incorrect, for *ου* must then have been used, as e.g. in Plato’s testament (Diogenes Laert. iii. 43): *δοφελῶ δ’ οὐδὲν οὐδὲν*. The passages adduced on the other hand by Reiche from Wetstein are not in point, because they have *μὴ* with a *participle* or *indefinite*. Fritzsche (comp. Baumgarten-Crusius and Krehl): Be owing no one anything; only “mutuum amorem vos hominibus debere censete.” Thereby the whole thoughtfulness, the delicate enamel of the passage, is obliterated, and withal there is imported an idea (censete) which is not there.—*οὐ γὰρ ὀγαπ. κ.τ.λ.*] A summons to unceasing compliance with the command of love having been contained in the preceding *ei μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλων ἀγαπᾶν*, Paul now gives the ground of this summons by setting forth the high moral dignity and significance of love, which is nothing less than the fulfilment of the law. Comp. Gal. v. 14; Matt. xxii. 34 ff. —*τὸν ἐρεσον* belongs to ὀγαπῶν: the other, with whom the loving subject has to do (comp. ii. 1, 21; 1 Cor. iv. 6, vi. 1, xiv. 17; Jas. iv. 12, et al.). Incorrectly Hofmann holds that it belongs to νομον: the further, the remaining law. For the usage of ἐρεσος and ἀλλος in the sense of otherwise existing (see thereon Krüger, *Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 2; Nägelesbach, *z. Ilias*, p. 250 f.) is here quite inapplicable; Paul must at least have written καλ τὰς ἐρεσος ἐντολάς (comp. also Luke xxxiii. 32; Plato, *Rep.*

---

1 Who objects with singular erroneousness to the ordinary connection with ἀγαπ., that Paul would surely (!) have written *ἰ γὰρ τὸν ἐρεσον ἀγαπῶν τὸν νῦμον φιλάν*. As though the very order ἀγαπῶν τὸν νῦμον were not the most common of all (viii. 38, 37; 1 Cor. ii. 9; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 28, et al.)! Quite as common is the use of νῦμον without the article for the (comp. ver. 10) Mosaic law; see on ii. 12.
p. 357 C, and Stallbaum *in loc*). But most intelligibly and simply he would have written τὸν πάντα νόμον, as in Gal. v. 14. It is impossible to explain the singular ὁ ἕτερος collectively (with an irrelevant appeal to Rost, § 98, B. 3. 5); ἕτερος νόμος could only be another (second) law (comp. Rom. vii. 23), and ὁ ἕτερος ν., therefore, the definite other of two; Kühner, II. 1, p. 548. — πεπλήρωκε [present of the completed action, as in ii. 25; in and with the loving there has taken place (comp. on Gal. v. 14) what the Mosaic law prescribes (namely, in respect of duties towards one's neighbour, see vv. 9, 10; inasmuch as he who loves does not commit adultery, does not kill, does not steal, does not covet, etc.). But though love is the fulfilment of the law, it is nevertheless not the subjective cause of justification, because all human fulfilment of the law, even love, is incomplete, and only the complete fulfilment of the law would be our righteousness. Rightly Melanchthon: "Dilectio estimpletio legis, item est justitia, si id intelligatur de *idea*, non de tali dilectione, qualis est in hac vita."

Ver. 9. Ἀνακεφαλαίονται] συντόμως καὶ ἐν βραχεῖ τὸ πᾶν ἀπαρτίζεται τῶν ἐντολῶν τὸ ἔργον, Chrysostom. But ἀνά is not to be neglected (is again comprised; see on Eph. i. 10), and is to be referred to the fact that Lev. xix. 18 recapitulates, summarily repeats, the other previously adduced commands in reference to one's neighbour. Comp. Thilo, *ad Cod. Apocr.* p. 223.—The arrangement which makes the fifth commandment follow the sixth is also found in Mark x. 19, Luke xviii. 20 (not in Matt. xix. 18), Jas. ii. 11, in Philo, *de decal.*, and Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* vi. 16. The LXX. have, according to Cod. A, the order of the Masoretic original text; but in Cod. B the sixth commandment stands immediately after the fourth, then the seventh, and afterwards the fifth; whereas at Deut. v. 17, according to Cod. B, the order of the series is: six, five, seven in the LXX., as here in Paul. The latter followed copies of the LXX. which had the same order. The deviations of the LXX. from the original text in such a case can only be derived from a diversity of tradition in de-

1 [Beckoning according to the Lutheran mode of division.]
termining the order of succession in the decalogue, not from speculative reasons for such a determination, for which there is no historical basis. — On ἀγαπ. ὑπερ ἑαυτόν, see on Matt. xxii. 39.

Ver. 10. Since all that the law forbids us to do to our neighbour, is morally evil, Paul may now summarily conclude his grounding of the commandment of love, as he here does.

— ἐργάζεσθαι with τίνι τι instead of τίνα τι is also found, though not frequently, in the Greek writers; comp. 2 Macc. xiv. 40; Eur. Hec. 1085 and Pfugk in loc.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 277. — πληρώμα τοῦ μισοῦν ἡ ἀγάπη ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἄλλον τὸν πεπληρῶκε, ver. 8. Other interpretations of πληρώμα ("id quod in lege summum est," Ch. Schmidt, Rosenmüller; "plus enim continet quam lex, est everriculum omnis injusitia," Grotius; see on the other hand Calovius) are opposed to the context. Comp. Gal. v. 14, where the point of view of the fulfilment of the law by love is still more comprehensive. Observe, moreover, that πληρώμα is not equivalent to πληροφορία, but in the love of one's neighbour that whereby the law is fulfilled has taken place and is realized.— The commentary on this point, how love works no ill to one's neighbour, is given by Paul in 1 Cor. xiii. 4–7.

Ver. 11. For compliance with the preceding exhortation to love, closing with ver. 10, Paul now presents a further weighty motive to be pondered, and then draws in turn from this (vv. 12 ff.) other exhortations to a Christian walk generally. — καὶ τοῦτο [our and that, i.e. and indeed, especially as you, etc. It adds something peculiarly worthy of remark—here a further motive particularly to be noted—to the preceding. See on this usage, prevalent also in the classics (which, however, more

1 This also against Hofmann, who thinks that the order of succession in our passage might be founded on the fact that the relation of man and woman according to the order of creation is earlier than that of man and man, etc. An arbitrarily invented reason, which indeed must have occasioned the transposition of the fourth commandment to a place after the sixth.

2 Of the reading συνορ (Lachm., Tisch.), although preponderantly attested, we must judge as in Gal. v. 4. In the Greek writers also the emendation συνορ is very frequently found in the codd. instead of ἑαυτόν, where by the latter the second person is meant. See especially Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 4. 9.
frequently use καὶ ταῦτα), Hartung, I. p. 146; Baeumlein, *Partik.* p. 147. Comp. L Cor. vi. 6, 8; Eph. ii. 8; Phil. i. 28; Heb. xi. 12. That to which here τοῦτο points back is the injunction expressed in ver. 8, and more precisely elucidated in vv. 8–10, μηδὲν μηδὲν ὑπεληπτε, εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ. The repetition of it is represented by τοῦτο, so that thus εἰδότες attaches itself to the injunction which is again present in the writer's conception, and hence all supplements (Bengel and several others, ποιεῖτε; Tholuck, ποιῶμεν) are dispensed with. The connection of τοῦτο with εἰδότες (Luther, Glöckler) complicates the quite simple language, as is also done by Hofmann, who makes τὸν καιρὸν the object of τοῦτο εἰδότες, and brings out the following sense: “and having this knowledge of the time, that, or, and so knowing the time, that.” Even in Soph. O. T. 37 ἐκ ταῦτα is simply and indeed; the use of τοῦτο as absolute object is irrelevant here (see Bernhardt, p. 106; Kühner, II. 1, p. 266), because τοῦτο in the sense of in such a manner would necessarily derive its more precise contents from what precedes. That which Hofmann means, Paul might have expressed by κ. τοῦτο εἰδ. τὸν καιρὸν; Kühner, II. 1, p. 238.—εἰδότες] not considerantes (Grotius and others), but: since you know the (present) period, namely, in respect of its awakening character (see what follows).—ὅτι ὅρα κ.τ.λ.] Epexegesis of εἰδότα, τὸν καιρὸν: that, namely, it is high time that we finally (without waiting longer, see Klotz, *ad Devar.* p. 600) should wake out of sleep. ἡδη does not belong to ὅρα, but to ἡμᾶς εἰς ὑπνοῦν ἔγγ., and by ὑπνος is denoted figuratively the condition in which the true moral activity of life is bound down and hindered by the power of sin. In this we must observe with what right Paul requires this ἐγερθῇναι εἰς ὑπνοῦν of the regenerate (he even includes himself). He means, forsooth, the full moral awakening, the ethical elevation of life in that final degree, which is requisite in order to stand worthily before the approaching Son of man (see immediately below, τῶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.); and in comparison with this the previous moral condition, in which much of a sinful element was

1 Hofmann (citing ver. 42) professes to have compared Wunder in loc., who, however, makes no remark upon the καὶ ταῦτα of the passage, p. 18, ed. 3.
always hindering the full expression of life, appears to him still as ὑπνος, which one must finally lay aside as on awakening out of morning slumber. The Christian life has its new epochs of awakening, like faith (see on John ii. 11), and love to the Lord (John xiv. 28), and the putting on of Christ (ver. 14). This applies also in opposition to Reiche, who, because Christians were already awakened from the ethical sleep, explains ὑπνος as an image of the state of the Christian on earth, in so far as he only at first forecasts and hopes for blessedness,—quite, however, against the Pauline mode of conception elsewhere (Eph. v. 14; 1 Thess. v. 6 ff.; comp. also 1 Cor. xv. 34). — νῦν γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Proof of the preceding ὡρα κ.τ.λ. The νῦν is related to ἡδη not as the line to the point (Hofmann, following Hartung), but as the objective Now to the subjective (present in consciousness); comp. on the latter, Baeumlein, Partik. p. 140 ff. νῦν is related to ἀριτ (comp. on Gal. i. 10) as line to point. — ἡμῶν] Does this belong to the adverb ἐγγύτερον (Beza, Castalio, and others, including Philippi, Hofmann), or to ἡ σωτηρία (Luther, Calvin, and others, following the Vulgate)? The former is most naturally suggested by the position of the words; the latter would allow an emphasis, for which no motive is assigned, to fall upon ἡμῶν. — ἡ σωτηρία] the Messianic salvation, namely, in its completion, as introduced by the Parousia, which Paul, along with the whole apostolical church, regarded as near, always drawing nearer, and setting in even before the decease of the generation. Comp. Phil. iv. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 7; see also Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 426. Not recognising the latter fact,—notwithstanding that Paul brings emphatically into account the short time from his conversion up to the present time of his writing (νῦν),—commentators have

1 νῦν, as well as ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν and ἡ σωτηρία, the latter in the final-historical sense, is to be left textually in the clear and definite literal meaning, in contradiction to which inexact and vacillating generalizations of the concrete relation expressed by Paul, which mix up the nearness of time with the ethical approach, appear inadmissible. This applies also against Hofmann, according to whom the expectation of the near return of Christ is not found at all in the Epistle to the Romans (see Hofmann on Col. p. 181); and Paul is here supposed to say that salvation came near to them, at the time when they became believers, through the very fact of their becoming believers (!), but that now, after that they are believers (!), it stands so much (!) the nearer to them.
been forced to very perverted interpretations; e.g. that deliverance by death was meant (Photius and others), or the destruction of Jerusalem, a fortunate event for Christianity (Michaelis, following older interpreters), or the preaching among the Gentiles (Melanchthon), or the inner σωτηρία, the spiritual salvation of Christianity (Flacius, Calovius, Morus, Flatt, Benecke, Schrader, comp. Glückler). Rightly and clearly Chrysostom says: ἐπὶ θύραις γαρ, φησίν, ὁ τῆς κρίσεως ἐστηκε καιρός. Comp. Theodore of Mopsuestia: σωτηρίαν δὲ ἡμῶν καλεί τὴν ἀνάστασιν, ἐπειδὴ τότε τῆς ἁληθινῆς ἀπολαύσεως. But the nearer the blessed goal, the more wakeful and vigilant we should be. — ἧ δὲ ἔπιστρ.] than when we became believers;¹ 1 Cor. iii. 5, xv. 2; Gal. ii. 16; Mark xvi. 16; Acts xix. 2, and frequently.

Ver. 12. To ἐν πρὸς corresponds here as correlate ἦ νῦν, i.e. the time before the Parousia, which ceases, when with the Parousia the day arrives. νῦν and ἡμέρα are accordingly figures for the αἰών οὐς and μέλλων, and ἡμέρα is not equivalent to αἰὼν καιρὸς (de Wette), but the day brings the σωτηρία. Comp. Heb. x. 25.— The image is appropriate; for in regard to the knowledge, righteousness, and glory which will have a place in the future αἰὼν, this approaching blessed time will be related to the imperfect present time as day to night. Theodore of Mopsuestia aptly remarks: ἡμέραν καλεῖ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας καιρὸν...νῦκτα δὲ τὸν πρὸ τοῦτον χρόνον. — προέκοψεν] not: is past (Luther), but: has made progress, processit (see Gal. i. 14; Luke ii. 52; 2 Tim. ii. 46; Lucian, Soloe. 6; Joseph. Bell. iv. 4. 6), so that the day is no longer distant. It is very possible that Paul conceived to himself the time of the approach of the Parousia as the time of twilight, with which conception both the preceding ἐν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξῆς κ.τ.λ. and the following ἀποθάμεθα aptly agree.— ἀποθάμεθα] as one puts off garments. This way of conceiving it (in opposition to Fritzsche and Hofmann) corresponds to the correlate ἐνδυσάμεθα, comp. on Eph. iv. 22. The ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, i.e.

¹ Incorrectly Luther: "than when we believed it." He appears, with Erasmus, to have thought of the belief, that salvation was to be obtained under the law, by works.
the works, whose element, wherein they are accomplished, is darkness (comp. Eph. v. 11), the condition of spiritual want of knowledge and of the dominion of sin, are regarded as night-clothes, which the sleeper has had on, and which he who has risen is now to put off. — ἐνδυσάμεθα of the putting on of arms (ἐνλα, as vi. 13), which in part are drawn on like garments. Comp. Eph. vi. 11; 1 Thess. v. 8.— τοῦ φωτός not glittering arms (Grotius, Wetstein), but in contrast to τοῦ σκότους: arms (i.e. dispositions, principles, modes of action) which belong to the element of (spiritual) light, which one has as περισσόμενοι by virtue of his existence and life in the divine truth of salvation. τοῦ φωτός has the spiritual sense, as also previously τοῦ σκότους, as being in the application of that which was said of the vv% and ἡπατα; but the metaphorical expressions are selected as the correlates of νύξ and ἡμέρα;— The Christian is a warrior in the service of God and Christ against the kingdom of darkness. Comp. Eph. vi. 11, 12; 2 Cor. vi. 7, x. 4; 1 Thess. v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 18; Rom. vi. 13. For profane analogies, see Gataker, ad Anton, p. 58.

Ver. 13. ¹ Ζε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ as one walks in the day (when one avoids everything unbecoming). This in a moral sense, Paul desires, should be the ruling principle of the Christian, who sees the day already dawning (ver. 12). — ἐσοχημόνως becomingly, 1 Thess. iv. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 35, xiv. 40. It is moral decorum of conduct.— κώμοις κ.τ.λ. The datives are explained from the notion of the way and manner in which the ἑρματαιν, i.e. the inner and outward conduct of life, ought not to take place (Kühner, II. 1, p. 382), namely, not with revellings (κώμοις; see respecting this, on Gal. v. 21; Welker in Jacobs, Philostr. i. 2, p. 202 ff.) and carousals (comp. Gal. v. 21), etc. The local view (Philippi) is less in keeping with the particulars mentioned, and that of dativus commodi (Fritzche, comp. van Hengel) less befits the figurative verb. — κολταῖς congressibus venereis (comp. on ix. 10), Wisd.

¹ This verse, which once struck Augustine's eye and heart on his opening the Bible, decided him, already prepared by the preaching of Ambrose, to final repentance and to baptism. Confess. viii. 12, 28 f. See Bindemann, d. heil. Augustinus, i. p. 281 f.
iii. 13, and see Kypke, II. p. 185. — ἀσελγείας] wantonnesses (especially of lust). See Tittmann, Synon. p. 151. On the sense of the plural, see Lucian, Amor. 21: ἵνα μὴ δὲν ἄριστος μέρος ἀσελγείας. — ζηλος] jealousy (1 Cor. i. 11, iii. 3); neither anger (Fritzsche, Philippi, and others), which is not denoted by ζῆλος (not even in 1 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20), nor envy (Photius, Luther, and others), which is less in accordance with the preceding (κοιτ. κ. ἀσελγ.), whilst strife and jealousy follow in the train of the practice of lust.— The three particulars adduced stand in the internal connection of cause and effect.

Ver. 14. Ἐνδύσασθε τ. κ.π. 'I. Χρ.] This is the specifically Christian nature of the εὐχαριστίας. But the expression is figurative, signifying the idea: Unite yourselves in the closest fellowship of life with Christ, so that you may wholly present the mind and life of Christ in your conduct. In classical Greek also ενδύσασθαι τινα denotes to adopt any one's mode of sentiment and action. See Wetstein and Kypke. But the praesens efficacia Christi (see Melanchthon) is that which distinguishes the having put on Christ from the adoption of other exemplars. Comp. Gal. iii. 27; Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 12; and on the subject-matter, viii. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 17; Photius in Oecumenius: τῶς δὲ αὐτῶν ἐνδυτέων; εἰ πάντα ἡμῖν αὐτὸς εἶν, ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔσωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν φανόμενος. Observe further, that the having put on Christ in baptism was the entrance into the sonship of God (Gal. iii. 27), but that in the further development of the baptized one each new advance of his moral life (comp. on ver. 11) is to be a new putting on of Christ; therefore it, like the putting on of the new man, is always enjoined afresh. Comp. Lipsius, Rechtfertigungsl. p. 186 f. — καὶ τῆς σαρκός κ. τ. λ.] and make not care of the flesh unto lusts, i.e. take not care for the flesh to such a degree, that lusts are thereby excited. By μὴ the πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι εἰς ἐπιθ. together is forbidden, not (as Luther and many) merely the εἰς ἐπιθ., according to which the whole sentence would resolve itself into the two members: τῆς σ. πρόνοιαν μὲν ποιεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ μὴ εἰς ἐπιθ. In that case μὴ must have stood after ποιεῖσθε (see xiv. 1); for a transposition of the negation is not
to be assumed in any passage of the N. T.—τῆς σαρκὸς] is emphatically prefixed, adding to the putting on of the Lord previously required, which is the spiritual mode of life, that which is to be done bodily. The σάρξ is here not equivalent to σῶμα (as is frequently assumed; see on the other hand Calovius and Reiche), but is that which composes the material substance of man, as the source and seat of sensuous and sinful desires, in contrast to the πνεῦμα of man with the νοῦς. Paul purposefully chose the expression, because in respect of care for the body he wishes to present the point of view that this care nourishes and attends to the σάρξ, and one must therefore be on one’s guard against caring for the latter in such measure that the lusts, which have their seat in the σάρξ, are excited and strengthened. According to Fritzsche, Paul absolutely forbids the taking care for the σάρξ (he urges that σάρξ must be λιβιδινοσα caro). But to this the expression πρόωναι πνειείσθε is not at all suitable. The flesh, so understood, is to be crucified (Gal. v. 24), the body as determined by it is to be put off (Col. ii. 11), its πράξεις are to be put to death (Rom. viii. 13), because its φρόνημα is enmity against God and productive of death (viii. 6, 7). The σάρξ is here rather the living matter of the σῶμα, which, as the seat of the ἐπιθυμίας, in order to guard against the excitement of the latter, ought to experience a care that is to be restricted accordingly, and to be subordinated to the moral end (comp. on σάρξ, 1 Cor. vii. 28, xv. 50; 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, vii. 1, 5, xii. 7; Gal. ii. 20, iv. 13, 14). In substance and in moral principle, the ἀφειδθα σώματος (Col. ii. 23) is different from this. Chrysostom aptly observes: διὸπερ γὰρ οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα ἑκόλωνεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ μεθύειν, οὐδὲ τὸ γαμεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀσελγεῖν, οὕτως οὐδὲ τὸ προνοεῖν τῆς σαρκὸς, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἰς ἐπιθυμίας, οὖν τὸ τὴν χρείαν ὄπερβαίνειν. Moreover it is clear in itself, that Paul has added the second half of ver. 14 in view of what is to be handled in chap. xiv., and has thereby prepared the way for a transition to the latter.
CHAPTER XIV.

VER. 3. *καὶ δὲ [Lachm. and Tisch.: ὅ δὲ, according to ABCD* κ* 5. Clar. Goth. Clem. Damasc. Mechanical repetition from ver. 2. — VER. 4. διότι θάρει ἵστην] A B C D* F G Ν have διότι θάρει (commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm. and Tisch.); D*** Bas. Chrys.: διότι θάρει (so Fritzsche). The original is certainly διότι θάρει; for διότι θάρει is found elsewhere in the N. T. only in 2 Cor. xiii. 3, and was there also in codd. exchanged for more current and better known expressions. — ἐ Ὄ ος [A B C* P Ν, Copt. Sahid. Arm. Goth. Aeth. Aug. et al.: ἐ Θάρει (so Lachm. and Tisch.); instead of Θάρει, A C P Ν, Vulg. codd. of It. Goth. and some Fathers have ἐ μὴ μὴν θάρει; so Lachm. (bracketing θάρει, however) and Tisch. 8. But the testimony in favour of the mere ἐ μὴ μὴν is older, stronger, and more diffused; as is frequently the case, θάρει was here awkwardly inserted to connect the thought. — VER. 6. *καὶ μὴ φρονίζω τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, κυρίῳ κυρίῳ φρονίζω] is wanting in A B C* D E F G Ν, 23. 57. 67.** Copt. Aeth. Vulg. It. Euf. Ambrose. Pel. Aug. Jer. al. Lat.; Chrys. and Theodoret have it in the text. Condemned by Mill, omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. Rightly, since the evidence for omission is so decisive, and since the interpolation was so very readily suggested by the sense of a want of completeness in the passage, in view of the following contrast, that the explanation of the omission from homoeoteleuton (Rückert, Reiche, de Wette, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Philippi, Tischendorf, and several others)—however easily it might have been occasioned thereby (especially as *καὶ before ἐ Ὄ ος), which Elz. has not, is undoubtedly genuine)—appears nevertheless insufficient. Among the oldest witnesses, Syr. is too solitary in its support of the words not to suggest the suspicion of an interpolation in the text of the Peschito. — VER. 8. ἄποπησομαι] Lachm. both times has ἄποπησομαι, according to A D E F G P min. But Paul has in no other place ἄποπησομαι with pres. indic. (in
Gal. i. 8 only K and min. have the indic.), and how easily might a slip of the pen take place here! — Ver. 9. Before ἀνίσταν Elz. and cholz have καὶ, against decisive testimony.—After ἀνίσταν Elz. has καὶ ἀνίστη (which is wanting in A B C n*, Copt. Arm. Aeth. and Fathers), and afterwards, instead of Ιησου, ἀνίστην (against largely preponderating evidence). Further, F G, Vulg. Boern. Or. Cyr. (twice) Pel. Ambr. Fulgent. have not Ιησου at all, although they have ἀνίστη (therefore ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη); D E, Clar. Germ. Ir. Gaul. have even Ιησου καὶ ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη, but D** LP κ** Syr. p. and several Fathers: ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη διακο. The origin of all these variations is readily explained from ἀνίσταν καὶ Ιησου (Lachm. and Tisch.), the best attested, and for that very reason, among the many differences, to be set down as original. First, Ιησου was glossed by ἀνίστη, comp. 1 Thess. iv. 14. Thus there arose, through the adoption of the gloss instead of the original word, the reading ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη; and by the adoption of the gloss along with the original word, in some cases ἀνίσταν καὶ Ιησου in some cases ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη (so Matth.)—whence there then arose, by an accidental or designed repetition of the ΛΝ, the ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη of the Recepta (very feebly attested, and diffused by Erasmus). Finally, the transposition Ιησου καὶ ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη was formed, after ἀνίσταν καὶ ἀνίστη was already read, by mistaken criticism, inasmuch as there was a desire to restore the original Ιησου, but the non-genuineness of ἀνίστη was as little known as the proper place for Ιησου, and hence the latter, explained of the earthly life of Jesus, was placed before ἀνίστη. — Ver. 10. xρινον] A B C* D E F G n* and several vss. and Fathers: Θεου. So Lachm. and Tisch., also Fritzscbe. Rightly; xρινον was introduced from the preceding, and perhaps also (comp. Rufinus) through comparison of 2 Cor. v. 10. — Ver. 12. δόειν] Lachm.: δοκεῖ, according to B D* F G 39. Chrys. But this compound is the usual expression with λόγον. — Ver. 14. αὐτοῦ] Elz.: αὑτοῦ, instead of αὐτοῦ (see exegetical notes). So again Tisch. 8, but only according to B C N, Chrys. Dam. Theophyl. A reflexive more precise definition. — Ver. 15. δι] Lachm. and Tisch.: γάρ, which Griesb. also commended, according to decisive testimony. — Ver. 18. Instead of the Rec. ἐν τούτῳ, Lachm. and Tisch. have ἐν τούτῳ, according to A B C D* F G P n*, 5. Vulg. It. Copt. Sahid. Ruf. Aug. But the Rec., sufficiently attested by D*** E L n**, and almost all min., Syr. utr. Goth. Chrys. Theodoret, Tert., is the more to be defended, since ἐν τούτῳ might very easily have intruded through the immediately preceding ἐν αἰώνα αἰώνιον. It was less likely that τούτῳ should
be converted into τοῦτοις on account of the plurality of the particulars contained in ver. 17. The latter is rightly retained by Beng. Matth. Reiche, Fritzsche, van Hengel, and various others. — Ver. 19. διώκομεν] The reading διώκομεν, adopted by Tisch. 8, although in A B F G L P N, is an old error of the pen, attested by no version, abandoned rightly also by Lachm. ed. maj. (in the ed. min. he had adopted it, written ἄρα, and taken the sentence interrogatively). — After ἀλλὰ λ. D E F G, Vulg. It. and a few Fathers have φυλάξκομεν. A supplement. — Ver. 21. ἐκάθις. ἐκ εἰς] omitted by Tisch. 8, is wanting in AC 67.** Syr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. and some Fathers, including Origen. The former is suspicious as an addition from ver. 13, the latter as a gloss. However, in the case of synonyms, one or the other was often omitted, as e.g., in ver. 13, πρόσχωμαι (and therewith ἐκ) is wanting in B, and the evidence in favour of omission is not here sufficiently strong to condemn the words. Instead of προξ. ἐκάθις, ἐκ εἰς, Κ* has merely λείψανος, a gloss in itself correctly according to ver. 15. — Ver. 22. After υἱὸν Lachm. and Tisch. 8 have τινα, according to A B C N, Copt. Ruf. Aug. Pel. A double writing of IN, or explanatory resolution, to which the weight of evidence of almost all vs. and Greek Fathers especially is opposed. — On the doxology, xvi. 25–27, not belonging to the end of chap. xiv., see critical notes on chap. xvi.

As elsewhere (Acts xv. 1, 5; Gal. iii. 1 ff.; Col. ii. 16 ff.), so there were even in the predominantly Gentile-Christian community at Rome, among the Jewish-Christian minority belonging to it, persons who sought still to retain the standpoint of pre-Christian legalism. But these Jewish-Christians in Rome had not, as elsewhere, come forward as the defenders of circumcision, or generally in an aggressive anti-Pauline attitude. Hence Paul speaks of them in so forbearing and mild a way, and keeps direct polemics entirely in the background. They were men not of hostile, but only of prejudiced minds, whose moral consciousness lacked the vigour to regard as unessential a peculiar asceticism, according to which they ate no flesh (ver. 2), and drank no wine (ver. 21), and still held to the observance of the Jewish feast-days (ver. 5), passing judgment withal, as is usually the case with men of a separatist bias, on those who were more free, but only earning the contempt of these in

return. In presence of this asceticism, and in respect of its main feature, namely, abstinence from flesh and wine, the question arises: Was it based generally (Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Jerome, Calovius, and many others, including Reiche and Köllner) on the Mosaic-Jewish ordinances respecting meat and drink? or, in particular (Clement of Alexandria, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, Michaelis, Anm., Flatt, Neander, Reithmayr, Tholuck, Philippi), on the dread of heathen sacrificial flesh and sacrificial wine (comp. the apostolic decrees, Acts xv.)? or on both (Erasmus, Toletus, and others, including Rücker, Borger, de Wette)? Against the first of these three possibilities it may be urged that vv. 2 and 21 do not allow us to assume any limitation of the abstinence at all, but require it to be understood of flesh and wine generally; while, on the other hand, the law does not forbid all flesh and does not forbid wine at all, and the Rabbins forbid only the flesh slaughtered by the Goyim and the wine of the Goyim (see Eisenmenger, entdeckt. Judenth. II. pp. 616 ff., 620 ff.). To assume now, with Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact, that those persons had abstained from all flesh for the reason that they might not be blamed by the others on account of their despising swine's flesh, or from contempt towards the Gentiles (rivés in Theodoret), would be completely arbitrary, indeed opposed to the text; for they themselves were on one side the censurers, on the other the despised, ver. 3. Against the second opinion, that the abstinence in question referred only to the flesh offered in sacrifice to idols (Acts xv.) and the wine of libation (see Mischn. Surenh. IV. pp. 369, 384; Eisenmenger, i.e. p. 621), it may be urged that the whole section contains not a word on the sacrificial character of the flesh and wine, while yet we are bound to conclude from 1 Cor. viii. and x. that Paul would not have passed by this essential aspect of the matter without touching on it and turning it to account. Hence also the third view, which combines these, cannot be approved. In fact, the Jewish-Christian abstinence in question appears rather to be a supra-legal anxiety, such as was nothing rare in Judaism at that time (Philo, in Eusebius, Praep. ev. viii. fin.; Josephus, Vit. 2, 3;
Grotius on ver. 2; Ritschl, in the *theol. Jahrb.* 1855, p. 353), under the influence of *Essenic* principles (see Ritschl, *altkath.* K. pp. 184, 187). It appears certainly as an ἐθελοθρησκεία, brought over from Judaism into Christianity by persons of Essenic tendencies, and fostered by the ethics of Christianity, which combated the flesh.¹ By its adherents, however, among the Jewish-Christians of Rome at that time, it was not maintained in opposition to justification by faith, but was so practised without pretentiousness and polemics (and in particular without separation from a common table with the Gentile Christians), that the wisdom of the apostolic teaching deemed it inappropriate to enter into special conflict with such a remnant of an Essenic Ἰουδαϊκή, or to speak of it otherwise than with the most cautious forbearance. Baur, I. p. 381 ff., declares those persons to be *Ebionite* Christians (according to Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxx. 15, the Ebionites abstained from all use of flesh, because flesh originated from generation; see Ritschl, p. 205). But against this view it may at once be urged,² that complete abstinence from wine on the part of the Ebionites is nowhere expressly attested; and further, that, if the weak brethren at Rome had been persons who regarded the use of flesh as on principle and absolutely sinful, as was the case with Ebionitism, Paul would not have expressed himself so mildly and tolerantly respecting an error which would have been fundamental, dualistic as it was and opposed to justification by faith. Moreover, the Ebionites date only from the destruction of Jerusalem (see Ullhorn, d. *Homi.* u. *Recong.* d. Clem. p. 387 ff.); hence the Roman weak brethren could only be termed Ebionitic in so far as their abstinence had the same root with the asceticism of the Ebionites, viz. Essenism. That among the numerous Roman Jews, who had arrived as prisoners of war from Palestine, there were various Essenes who thereafter became

¹ Respecting the Apostle Matthew, Clement of Alexandria, *Paedag.* ii. 1, p. 174 Pott., informs us that he ate only vegetables, no flesh; and of James, the brother of the Lord, Augustine, *ad Faust.* xxii. 3, relates that he had used neither flesh nor wine. Comp. Hegesippus in Eusebius ii. 23. But see Ritschl, p. 224 f. The Peter of the Clementines also practises this abstinence.

² Whether the Ebionites of Epiphanius may be derived from Essenism (the ordinary view, ably defended by Ritschl in opposition to Schliemann) or not.
Christians, cannot be subject to any well-founded doubt (comp. Ritschl, p. 233 f.). And the less reason is there to call in question not merely the Ebionitic, but also the Essenic, root of the phenomenon (Th. Schott). To refer it to the general interest of world-denying holiness does not suffice for the explanation of the several passages, and in particular does not explain the observance of days and the impure character which was attributed to the use of flesh (ver. 14). Hence, too, we are not, with Hofmann, to abide by the mere general conclusion, that doubt prevailed as to whether it was compatible with the holiness of the church of God to use such food as man had not assigned to him from the beginning, and as the Christian should for this very reason rather dispense with than enjoy for the sake of good cheer. Thus the matter would amount to an odd theoretic reflection, without any connection with historical concrete antecedent relations,—a view with which we can the less be content, since the observance of days cannot exegetically be got rid of as a point which had likewise occasioned dispute (see on ver. 5). Eichhorn takes the weak brethren to be earlier, mostly Gentile-Christian adherents of ascetico-philosophic, chiefly Neo-Pythagorean principles. There was certainly at that time diffused among the Gentiles, through the influence of the Neo-Pythagorean philosophy, an abstinence quite analogous to that Jewish one, as we know from Senec. Ep. 108, Porphyr. De abstīn., and others (see Grotius on ver. 2, and Reiche, II. p. 463 f.); but, on the other hand, that view is at variance partly with ver. 5 (comp. Col. ii. 16, 17), partly with xv. 8, 9, where Paul sedulously brings into view the theocratic dignity of the Jews, while he bids the Gentiles praise God on account of grace—which is most in harmony with the view that the despised weak ones are to be sought among the former. It may be also conjectured a priori that our ascetics, if they had arrived at their habit by the path of philosophy, would hardly have behaved themselves in so passive and unpretentious a manner and have been merely regarded by Paul just as weak ones.1 We may add that vv. 5, 6 do

1 Against Eichhorn's view also, as it seems to me, the passage in Origen militates: ὥσπερ εὶς τὰς ἀδιαφόρους τῶν αἰτίων τῶν ἤμοιοι ἐνάχθησαν τῶν ἄνω τῶν
not justify us in assuming two parties among the Roman weak brethren, so that the kriónvtēs ἡμέραν παρ ἡμέραν, ver. 5, are to be distinguished from the lāxhva ἐσθιοντες, ver. 2,—the former as the stricter and probably Palestinian, the latter as the freer and probably Hellenistic, Jewish - Christians (so Philippi). As the observance of the feast days, especially of the Sabbaths, was essentially bound up with the Essenic tendency, the assumption of such a separation cannot be justified exegetically (from the kriónv). Just as little is there exegetical ground for the view that the community addressed and instructed in xiv. 1 ff. is notified as being Jewish-Christian in its main composition; whereas xv. 1 ff. betrays a Gentile-Christian minority, which had been more exclusive and intolerant towards the weak than the great body of the church, the relation of whom to the weak the apostle has in view in chap. xiv. (Mangold, p. 60 ff.)

Vv. 1-12. Summons to brotherliness towards the weak ones (ver. 1). First point of difference between the two parties, and encouragement in relation to it (vv. 2-4). Second point of difference, and encouragement in relation to it (ver. 5). The right point of view for both in their differences (ver. 6), and reason assigned for it (vv. 7-9); reproof and disallowance of the opposite conduct (vv. 10-12).

Ver. 1. Ἀἐ] passing over from the due limitation of care for the flesh (xiii. 14) to those who, in the matter of this limitation, pursue not the right course, but one springing from weakness of faith.—τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστεί] That πίστις here also denotes faith in Christ, is self-evident; the infirmity, however, is not conceived of—according to the general ἰδέα ὅτι ἐπετείνα τῆς πίστεως (Mark ix. 23; 1 Cor. xiii. 2)—in a general sense and without any more precise character, but, in conformity with the context (see vv. 2, 14, 22, 23), as a

Ποθείροντες καὶ τῶν ἰν ἐκ ἁμαρτών. Ἑκεῖνοι μὲ παρὰ λαθραὶ τὰ ποιμ. μετανοοῦντες μὲν ἄξιον λασθανοῦνται... ἐκεῖνοι δὲ καὶ τῶν τε ἐπικεφαλεῖσαν, πανοικοῦντες, ἑξετάζουσαν τὸν οὐχ αἱ ἑκατογενέστερον κ. τ. λ. (c. Cel. 4), where Origen distinguishes expressly the Pythagorean abstinence as something fundamentally (ideally) different from the Christian, and traces the latter to an idea, which quite merited the lenient treatment of the apostle and makes the continuance of this asceticism in the Christian Church very readily intelligible.
want of that ethical strength of faith, in virtue of which one may and should have, along with his faith, the regulative principle of moral conviction and certainty corresponding to its nature and contents. In this more definite and precise sense those ascetics were weak in faith. Had they not been so, the discernment of conscience and assurance of conscience, analogous to faith, would have enabled them to be free from doubt and scruple in respect to that which, in the life of faith, was right or wrong, allowable or not allowable, and to act accordingly; and consequently, in particular, to raise themselves above the adiaphora as such, without prejudice and ethical narrowness. It is therefore evident that the *ἀρθίνεια τῆς πίστει* carries with it defectiveness of moral *γνώσις*, but this does not justify the explaining of *πίστις* as equivalent to *γνώσις* (Grotius and others), or as equivalent to doctrine believed (Beza, Calvin). — *προσλαμβάνεσθε* take you, namely, to the intercourse of Christian brotherly fellowship. The opposite would be an *ἐκκλείσας θέλειν* (comp. Gal. iv. 17), whereby they, instead of being attracted, might be forced to separation. So in substance, Erasmus, Grotius, Estius, Semler, Reiche, Köllner, Fritzsche, Rückert, de Wette, Tholuck, Philippi, Hoffmann, etc. But others take it as: interest yourselves in him, "of furthering, helpful support" (Olshausen, comp. Chrysostom), which, however, *προσλαμβάνεσθαι τινα* does not mean. Acts xxviii. 2 is appealed to, where, however, *προσ* is to take to oneself,—a meaning which is here also required by *προσλαμβάνεσθε*, ver. 3, as well as by xv. 7, comp. also xi. 15.—μὴ εἰς διακρίσεως διαλογ. not to judgments of thoughts. Διακρίσεως διαλογ. is a result, which in the case of the enjoined *προσλαμβάνεσθε* must not be come to, so that thus μὴ εἰς διακρ. διαλ. contains a negative more precise definition of *προσλαμβάνεσθε*, in the sense, namely: not in such a manner that the *προσλαμβάνεσθαι*, which you bestow on the weak, issues in judgments passed on the thoughts. Those persons formed their ideas under the influence of conscience; such scruples should be indulgently treated by the stronger, and criticisms passing judgments on them should not be instituted, whereby the *προσλαμβάνεσθαι* would be abused. Thus διάκρισις, διίδικατιο, retains its usual signi-
fication (Heb. v. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 10; Plato, Legg. vi. p. 765 A, xi. p. 937 B; Lucian, Herm. 69); and διάκρισις likewise (Matt. xv. 19; Mark vii. 21; Luke ix. 46, et al.; Rom. i. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20). Nothing is to be supplied, but εἰς is simply to be taken in the sense of the result (as just previously εἰς ἐπιθ., xiii. 14), not even as usque ad (Reiche). Substantially in agreement with this view of διακρίσις. διάλογος are Chrysostom, Grotius, and others, including Köllner, de Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, Reithmayr, Fritzsche, Krehl, Tholuck, Hofmann, likewise Reiche, who, however, makes the prohibition apply to both parties, which is opposed to the text, since the exhorted subject is the church, in contradistinction to its weak members, while the weak alone are the object of the exhortation. Augustine aptly, Propos. 78: "non dijudicemus cogitationes infirmorum, quasì fieræ unde aniussentiam de alieno corde, quod non videtur." Others take διακρίσις as doubts, which are not to be excited in the thoughts of the weak. So Luther, Bengel, Cramer, Ernesti, Morus, Böhme, Ammon, Flatt, Klee, Olshausen, Philippi, Umbreit. But διάκρισις never means doubt,¹ and therefore is not to be explained with Ewald, who takes the words as an addition by way of exclamation: "may it not come from doubts to thoughts! may such an one not become uncertain in his conscience!" Following the Vulgate, Beza, Camerarius, Er. Schmid, Toletus, Estius, Glückler, and others, διάκρισις has also been explained as dispute, which is not unfrequently its meaning in the classics (Plato, Legg. vi. p. 768 A; Polybius, xviii. 11. 3). But dispute concerning thoughts would be at least far from clearly expressed by the mere genitive (instead of περὶ διάλογος); and the notion δισεξπετασία (ζήτησις, συζήτησις) is nowhere denoted in the N. T. by διάκρισις. Rückert takes it as separation: "But be on your guard lest the consequence thereof may possibly be this, that thoughts and sentiments are severed, become more abruptly parted." Διάκρισις may certainly bear this meaning (Job xxxvii. 16; Plato, Phil. p. 32 A); but in that case the article

¹ Neither in the N. T. nor elsewhere in Greek. Thedoret on ver. 22 f. is appealed to, but there διάκρισις is to be taken as distinction; as also in Oecumenius on ver. 20.
must have stood before διάλογος, and the climactic sense (more abruptly) would be gratuitously imported.

Ver. 2. More particular discussion of the subject, and in the first place, exhibition of the first point of difference between the two parties. — ὅς μὲν] without a corresponding ὅς δὲ, instead of which there is at once put the definite ὅ δὲ ἀκρότ.: the one (i.e. the strong) believes, etc.; but the weak, etc. Comp. Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. ii. 3. 15; Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 507.

—πιστεύει φασεῖν πάντα may mean: he is convinced that he may eat all things, so that the notion ἔχειν is implied in the relation of the verbal notion to the infinitive (Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 753 f.; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 235); so Tholuck, Borger, and older interpreters. But more agreeable to the τῇ πιστε, ver. 1, and to the contrast ὅ ἀκρότ., is the rendering: he has the confidence, the assurance of faith, to eat all things; Winer, p. 302 [E. T. 405]. Comp. Dem 866. 1, and generally Krüger, § 61. 6. 8. To supply ἀστε (van Hengel) is in accordance with the sense, but unnecessary. — λάχανα] excludes, according to the connection, all use of flesh, not merely that of Levitically unclean animals, or of flesh sacrificed to idols, or on feast and fast days,—limitations of which nature are introduced by most interpreters (including Reiche, Köllner, Neander, Tholuck, Philippi). The weak in faith eats no flesh, but vegetables are his food. Comp. Wieseler in Herzog's Encyklop. XX. p. 595.

Ver. 3. Prohibition for each of the two parties. The self-consciousness of strength misleads into looking down with contempt on the weak; the narrowness of weakness is unable to comprehend the free thinking of the strong one, and judges it. — κρινότω] defined by the connection as a condemning judgment, pronouncing against the true Christian character, as in ii. 1 and frequently. — δ Θεός γὰρ κ.τ.λ.] ground assigned for μὴ κρινέω; hence αὐτόν is to be referred to τὸν ἐσθιόντα (i.e. him who eats all things), not with Reiche (following Calvin and others) to both, the strong and the weak, against which ver. 4 is also decisive. — προσελάβετο] has taken him to Himself, namely, into His fellowship (comp. ver. 1) through Christ; not: into His house as servant (see on ver. 4), as
Vatablus, Reiche, and Hofmann hold.— In ὁ Ὑδὼς γὰρ κ.τ.λ. is contained the contrariety to God of this κρίνειν, and its consequent impiety; and

Ver. 4 then adds what a presumptuous intermeddling such a κρίνειν is. In this the emotion rises to an animated apostrophe, addressed to the weak in faith who passes judgment, not to both parties, as Reiche and Tholuck think; for κρίνειν corresponds to the κρινέω of ver. 3.— σὺ τίς εἶ] comp. ix. 20. It discloses the presumption, without however standing in the relation of apodosis to the preceding ὁ Ὑδὼς αὐτὸν προσέλαβε τοῦ (Hofmann), which is nowise indicated and is forbidden by the fact that the following relation of domestic slave points to Christ as Master.— ἄλλοτριον οἰκέτην] who is not in thy domestic service,¹ but in that of another. This other is Christ (see ver. 6), not God, who is rather distinguished from the master by δυν. γὰρ κ.τ.λ. — τῷ ἱδῷ κυρίῳ] to his own master. The dative denotes the relation of subordination to the interest of the ἱνὼς κύριος (Bernhardy, p. 85). His own master, and no other, is interested therein; whence the incompetence of the κρίνειν is obvious.— The figurative standing and falling is either explained of standing firm (Ps. i. 4; Luke xxii. 36), and of being condemned (causa cadere) in the divine judgment (Calvin, Cornelius a Lapide, Grotius, Estius, Wolf, and others, including Reiche, Köllner, Borger, Tholuck, Philippi), or, as in 1 Cor. x. 12, of continuance and non-continuance in the state of true Christian faith and life. So in substance, Erasmus, Beza, Vatablus, Toletus, Bengel, Semler, and others, including Flatt, de Wette, Fritzsche, Rückert, Maier, Baumgarten-Crusius, Umbreit, van Hengel, Hofmann. The use of πάντως would not tell against the former (Hofmann), for it would have its warrant as contrast to the σωζόμενοι in the

¹ oinos is nowhere else found in Paul; in the N. T. it occurs in Luke xvi. 13, Acts x. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 18. It is a more restricted notion than ἐξέλεγκτος; the oinos is a house-servant (Dem. 1359 ult.; oinos ἀδελφος), more closely bound to the family than other slaves; hence: oinos vs. καὶ δούλος, Plat. Legg. vi. p. 763 A, comp. ix. p. 853 E; so, too, oinos, housemaid; both together, oinos, domestics. The fact that these words are used in the classics also of the members of the family themselves (as Xen. Anab. iv. 5. 35, vi. 7), is here irrelevant; but see Wesseling, ad Herod. p. 621.
divine judgment figuratively set forth by the standing (Soph. Trach. 84, and see Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. p. 568); but the second explanation is to be preferred, partly because the unwarranted κρίνειν denied to the more free the possession of a right Christian frame of life, partly because of the following διωστεῖ γὰρ κ.τ.λ. For to make to stand in the judgment, i.e. without figure, to acquit and pronounce righteous,¹ is not the work of divine power, but of grace. But according to His power (against Reiche's objection to this, see Eph. iii. 20) God effects an inner strengthening, so that the Christian stands in that which is good, and even he who thinks more freely does not succumb to the dangers to which the nature of his Christian faith and life is exposed by the very fact of his freer principles, but perseveres in the true Christian state. For this Paul looks to God's power, and promises it. When Tholuck, on the ground of the reading ὅ κύριος, finds the thought, that the Judge will even find out sufficient reasons for exculpation, this is a pure importation into the text.— διωστεῖ] See on 2 Cor. xiii. 3. Comp. Clem. Hom. i. 6.

Ver. 5. Second point of difference, as is evident from the contents themselves, and in particular from the general laying out of the representation, which is quite similar in form to ver. 2. Hence we are not here to find, with Hofmann (who defends the reading ὅ μὲν γὰρ), merely the first member of a chain of thought which is intended to make good the correctness of the proposition διωστεῖ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.,² so that Paul does not pass over to another controverted point. The fact that he does not thereupon enter at length on the question of days, but returns immediately in ver. 6 to the question of food, indicates that the latter formed in the church the controversy most prominent and threatening in an ascetic

¹ Not, according to the mediate turn, departing from the preceding and hence unwarranted, which Philippi now gives to the sense of the figurative expression: to uphold in judgment, so far as God upholds in that which is good, which alone subsists in the judgment.

² This was in fact only an auxiliary sentence, which, as obvious in itself, might have been omitted. Were the reading ὅ μὲν γὰρ correct, Paul would be introducing that which he has to say of the second matter of controversy, in the form of a confirmation of that which is just adduced respecting the first.
Moreover, what he had said on the point of food might so readily of itself find its application in an analogous manner to the question of days, that an entering into equal detail in regard to both points was not required.

— κρίνει ἡμ. παρ’ ἡμέραν.] he sets his judgment on day before day, i.e. he is for preferring one day to another, so that he esteems one holier than another. This refers to the Jewish feast and fast days still observed by the weak in faith. The classical ἡμέρα παρ’ ἡμέραν, in the sense alternis diebus (Bernhardy, p. 258; Lobeck, ad Aj. 475), does not apply here (in opposition to Fritzsche, who imports into our passage the notion that the people had ascetically observed, in addition to the Sabbath, the second and fifth days of the week). Of so surprising a (pharisaical, Luke xviii 12) selection of days there is no single trace in the Epistles to the Galatians (not even τίμημα, iv. 10) and Colossians, and hardly would it have met with such lenient treatment at Paul's hands. But the Jewish observance of days, continued under Christianity, so naturally agrees with the Essenic-Jewish character of the weak in faith generally, that there is no sufficient ground for thinking, with Ewald, of the observance of Sunday (at that time not yet generally established), and for seeing in vv. 5 and 6 only an example illustrating the preceding, and not a real point of difference (comp. Hofmann). On κρίνει τι, in the sense of to declare oneself for something, i.e. aliquid probare, eligere, comp. Aesch. Agam. 471 (κρίνει δ’ ἀφθονον ἀλβον), Suppl. 393 (κρίνε σήματο πρὸς θεόν; Plat. Rep. p. 399 E; Xen. Hell. i. 7. 11; Isocr. Paneg. 46. On παρά, in the sense of preference, Xen. Mem. i. 4. 14, and Kühner in loc.; but in Soph. Aj. 475, παρ’ ἡμέρα is (in opposition to Valckenaeer, Schol. II. p. 153 ff.) to be otherwise understood; see Lobeck ad loc. — κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν] not omnem diem judicat diem (Bengel, Philippi), but corresponding to the first half of the verse: he declares himself for each day, so that he would have each esteemed equally.

1 It must have been a matter of practical offence, especially at the agapeae.

2 Comp. Col. ii. 15; Gal. iv. 10. To think merely of fast days (Mangold, comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 414) is an arbitrary limitation, without any ground in the text.
holy, not certain days before others. — ἐκαστος κτλ.] Here too, as in the case of an adiaphoron, no more than in ver. 2, an objective decision, who is or is not in the right; but rather for both parties only the requisite injunction, namely, that each should have a complete assurance of faith as to the rightness of his conduct, without which persuasion the consciousness of the fulfilment of duty is lacking, and consequently the adiaphoron becomes sinful (vv. 20, 23). — πληροφ.] Comp. iv. 21. — ἐν τ. ἱδίῳ νοτ] i.e. in the moral consciousness of his own reason (vii. 23), therefore, independently of others' judgment, assured in himself of the motives of action.

Ver. 6. The right point of view, according to which each must have his own full persuasion, expressed not imperatively, but indicatively, as the Christian axiom in these matters, which conditions and regulates that πληροφορία. — ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κτλ.] he who directs his carefulness to the day, exercises this carefulness in his interest for the Lord, namely, in order thereby to respond to his relation of belonging to the Lord. Τὴν ἡμέραν with the article denotes textually the day concerned, that which comes into consideration conformably to the κρίνειν ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, not the day as it happens (Hofmann). By κύριος most understand God, others (as Estius, Rückert, Köllner, Fritzsche, Philippi) Christ. The former appears to be correct, on account of εἰκῆς y. τ. Θεο; but the latter is correct, on account of ver. 9. The absence of the article is not at variance with this. See Winer, de sensu vocum κύριος et ὁ κύρ., Erl. 1828; Gramm. p. 118 [E. T. p. 154]; Fritzsche, ad Marc. p. 573. — κυρίες ἐσθλει] using his Christian freedom in regard to the use of flesh in the interest of the Lord, which definite ethical direction of his ἐσθλει he attests by his εἰκαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ therein. This refers to the prayer at table, and, as is also the case with the subsequent εἰκ. τ. Θ., not to that offered after the meal (Hofmann), but to that before it; comp. Matt. xv. 36, xxvi. 26; Acts xxvii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 30, xi. 24; 1 Tim. iv. 4. The thanksgiving to God consecrating the partaking of food presupposes the conviction that one does the ἐσθλει in the capacity of belonging to Christ, and conformably to this specific relation; for anything that is opposed to
Christ the Christian cannot thank the Father of Christ. — 

kai o mē ēσθ. κ.τ.λ.] The opposite of the preceding point (the observance of days) Paul has not added (see critical notes), because he has not at the beginning of ver. 6 planned his language antithetically; and it is only on the mention of the second more important point that the conception of the opposite occurs to him, and he takes it up also. To append the antithesis also to the first clause of the verse, was indeed not necessary (Philippi); but neither would it have been confusing (Hofmann), especially as the selecting of days and its opposite, as well as the eating and not-eating, were for those respectively concerned equally matters of conscience. — 

κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίεις] for the Lord he refrains from the eating (of flesh), persuaded that this abstinence tends to serve the interest of Christ. — 

καὶ εἴχαρ. τῷ Θεῷ] That which was previously conceived as the reason (γάρ) is here conceived as the consequence (καὶ); and so he utters his thanksgiving table-prayer to God, namely, for the other, vegetable food, which forms the meal to be enjoyed by him. He is enabled to do so by the conviction that his οὐκ ἐσθίει has its holy ethical reference to the Lord.

Vv. 7–9. Proof for the threefold κυρίῳ, ver. 6, and that generally from the whole subjective direction of the life of Christians towards Christ. Paul does not mean the objective dependence on Christ (Rückert, Reiche, Ernesti, Urspr. d. Sünde, II. p. 19), because it would not prove what was said in ver. 6, but would only establish the obligation thereto. — 

διὰ τοῦ ἀποθνῄσκει] so that he believes that his life belongs to himself, that he lives for his own interest and aims. 2 Cor. v. 15. Comp. the passages in Wetstein and Fritzsche. The dative is thus to be taken in the ethically telic sense, and so, too, in 

διὰ τοῦ ἀποθνῄσκει; for also the dying of the Christian—in so ideal a manner is Paul conscious of the moral power and consecration of fellowship of life with Christ—is a moral act (Bengel: "eadem ars moriendi, quae vivendi") in the relation of belonging to Christ, in which the Christian at death feels and knows that he has stood with his life, and is now also to stand in his dying. Such is the conscious ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθνῄσκεῖν, Rev. xiv. 13. Comp. Phil. i. 20; Rom. viii. 38. —
Ver. 8 contains the positive counterpart, proving the negative contents of ver. 7, and is likewise to be understood as a subjective relation.——On τέ γάρ ... τέ, for as well ... as also, see Hartung, Partikell. I. pp. 88, 115; Baeumlein, Part. p. 219. — τὸν κυρίου ἐσμέν] the Lord’s property are we. This now derives the sum of the entire specifically Christian consciousness from its previously adduced factors.—In the threefold emphatic τὸ κυρίῳ (τὸν κυρίου) observe the “divina Christi majestas et potestas” (Bengel), to which the Christian knows himself to be completely surrendered.

Ver. 9. Objective historical relation, on which this subjective attitude towards Christ, ver. 8 (ἐάν τε οὖν κ.τ.λ.), is founded.—ἐζησεν] became alive, to be understood of the resurrection life. Comp. Rev. ii. 8, xx. 4, 5; Rom. v. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 10. The aorist denotes the setting in of the state; Kühner, ad Xen. Mem. i. 1. 18. Wrongly Olshausen (so also Schrader) thinks that the earthly life of Jesus is meant, so that there occurs a hysteron proteron; in which view he overlooks, first, that the mutual reference of the two elements in protasis and apodosis is only formal,1 and secondly, that it was not Jesus’ life and death, but rather His death and life (resurrection), which led to His attainment of the heavenly κυρίότης. Comp. viii. 34, vi. 9, 10; Phil. ii. 8, 9; Luke xxiv. 26; Matt. xxviii. 18. —Ζωὴ] destination in the divine counsel. This aimed, in the death and resurrection of Christ, at the establishment of His munus regium, and that over the dead (in Scheol, Phil. ii. 10) and living; hence Christians are conscious of belonging to Him in living and dying (ver. 8). Unsuitably to ζησεν, since the raising up of the Lord is certainly, in the apostle’s view, the work of God (i. 4, iv. 24, vi. 4, viii. 11, and many

1 Paul, namely, does not say: Christ died, in order that He might be Lord over the dead, and lived, in order that He might be Lord over the living; but He died and became alive (both together had the end in view), in order that He might rule over dead and living (both together). Fritzsche also, although rightly understanding Ζωῆς of the resurrection life, argues the mutual reference of καθήμεν and νεκροί, and of Ζωῆς and Ζωήν: By the death of Jesus, God desired to make known that He was Lord over the dead, and by the new life of Christ, that He was Lord over the living. But this merely declarative view is quite arbitrary; moreover, the Ζωῆς in Ζωῆς would be quite another than the Ζωή of the Ζών.
other passages), Hofmann sees in *ina Christ's own purpose* expressed.

Ver. 10. Ἐν δὲ *discloses the contrast to the κυριότης of Jesus.* — The first αὐδ addresses the weaker, the second the freer Christian, as is clear from ver. 3. — γὰρ *justifies the censure of presumption which lies in the preceding questions: for all, etc., and therefore in both cases thou as well as he. — παραστησάς, we shall stand before; "stare solent, quorum causa tractatur," Grotius; Acts xxvi. 6; Matt. xxi. 33. — ἐντὸς βῆμα τ. θεοῦ (see critical notes): for God will cause the judgment to be held (John v. 22) by Christ (ii. 16; Acts x. 42, xvii. 31). So the judgment-seat upon which Christ will sit (2 Cor. v. 10; Polycarp, ad Phil. 6; Matt. xxi. 31) is God’s. — Note how decisive is the testimony of such passages against any limitation of the universality of the final judgment.¹

Ver. 11. Scripture proof for the πάντες παραστησάμεθα κ.τ.λ., ver. 10. The *point of its bearing on the matter lies in the universality,* as is clear from the reference of πᾶν and πᾶσα, ver. 11, to πάντες above, ver. 10. Thus the proposition of ver. 10, πάντες γὰρ κ.τ.λ.—although in and by itself it required no scriptural proof—receives, nevertheless, a hallowed confirmation, which makes the injustice of the previously censured judging and despising the more apparent, because it encroaches on the universal final judgment of God.—The citation is Isa. xlvi. 23, quoted very freely with deviations, partly of memory, partly intentional, from the LXX., and abbreviated. In Isaiah, God certifies upon His oath that all men (including the Gentiles) shall render to Him adoring homage. This divine utterance—Messianic, because promising the universal triumph of the theocracy—is here taken by Paul in the light of that highest final historical fulfilment which will take place at the judgment of the world. — ξῆς ἔγω] Instead of κατ’ εμαντοῦ ὅμως, as the LXX. following the Hebrew have it, Paul uses, by a variation of memory, a frequently-occurring verbal formula of the divine oath: ξῆς ἔγω (Num. xiv. 21, 28; Deut. xxxii. 40, et al.; Dan. xii. 7; Ruth iii. 13; Judith ii. 12).—

¹ This applies also in opposition to Gerlach, d. letzten Dinge, p. 108 ff. Comp. i. 6, 16, iii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 10; Gal. vi. 7 ff.; Acts xvii. 31.
λέγει κύριος] is added by Paul according to the elsewhere familiar O. T. formula. Comp. xii. 19. — ὅτι] that, because in ζῶ εἰσίν is involved the assurance on oath, that, etc. Comp. 2 Chron. xviii. 13; 1 Sam. xiv. 44; Judith xi. 7 and Fritzsche in loc. — ἐποι] to me, as the Judge (so in the sense of the apostle), for homage and submission. — ἐξομολογ. τ. Θεοῦ] departing from the LXX., which, following the Hebrew, has ὁμαίη τοῦ Θεοῦ, for the reading of Cod. Δ of the LXX. (also on the margin), ἐξομολογήσεται instead of ὁμαίη, was probably—seeing that the Septuagint has very frequently undergone similar alterations of the text from N. T. citations—first introduced from our passage, and not a reading which Paul found in his copy of the LXX. (Fritzsche), as is too rashly inferred from Phil. ii. 11. The variation itself is—as was allowed by the freedom in the handling of Messianic proof-passages—intentional, because Paul required, instead of the oath of God, a more general conception, which, however, lies at the basis of that special conception; for the swearing is the actual acknowledgment and glorification of God as the Judge. The correct explanation is: and every tongue shall praise God (as the Judge), and therewith submit to His judicial authority—parallel in sense to ἐνθετον πᾶν γῆν. ἐξομολογήσεθαι with the dative always denotes to praise (xv. 9; Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; frequently in the LXX. and Apocrypha, see Biel and Schleusner, s.v.): it only denotes to confess, as in later Greek, with the accusative of the object, Matt. iii. 6; Jas. v. 16; Tob. xii. 22. Hence the explanation of Er. Schmid, Reiche, Kollner, following Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, is erroneous: to confess sins, which would only then be admissible if the parallelism obviously suggested the supplying of τὰς ἀμαρτίας. — With the reading τοῦ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 10, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Philippus, have found in τοῦ Θεοῦ a proof for the divinity of Christ. There would rather be implied the idea, that it is God, whose judgment Christ is entrusted by the Father to hold; and this thought is contained also in the reading τ. β. τ. Θεοῦ, ver. 10. 

Ver. 12. What follows from the preceding (from πάντες
— The emphasis is neither on πειλ ἐκαστόν (so usually) nor on τῷ Θεῷ (Philippi), but on the ἐκαστος for that purpose prefixed, which corresponds to the emphatic πάντες, πᾶς, πᾶσα, vv. 10, 11; hence it alone bears the stress, not sharing it with πειλ ἐκατ. and τῷ Θεῷ (Hofmann). Each of us, none excepted, will respecting himself, etc. How at variance with this, therefore, to judge or to despise, as though one were not included in the subjection to this our universal destiny of having to give a personal account to God! — δώσει purely future in sense, like the preceding future.

Vv. 13–23. Christians ought not, therefore, mutually to condemn one another, but rather to have the principle of giving no offence, ver. 13. Further elucidation of this principle, and exhortations to compliance with it.

Ver. 13. Μηκέτι (no more, as hitherto) ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν is deduced (οὖν) from ἐκαστος ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.; but κρίνωμεν here refers, as ἀλλήλ. shows, to both parties. — κρίνατε] antan-clasis: the same word, in order to make the contrast striking (for to the κρίνειν which is against one's duty that which is in accordance with duty is opposed), is repeated, but with the modification of reference and of sense, that it addresses the freer Christians (for it was they who gave the offence), and means in general: let this be your judgment, your moral maxim in this point. On the infinitive with the article after a preparatory demonstrative, comp. 2 Cor. ii. 1; Xen. de Rep. Lac. 9. 1, and see Haase in loc.; Breitenbach, ad Xen. Oec. 14. 10. — πρόκομμα and σκάνδαλον: both quite synonymous in the metaphorical sense: moral stumbling-block, an occasion for acting contrary to conscience. But πρόκομμα refers to the original proper sense of the two words. Comp. on ix. 32, 33, xi. 9; LXX. Lev. xix. 14; Judith v. 1. The twofold designation is an earnest and exhaustive expression of the idea; hence to attempt a real distinction between the synonyms, which differ only figuratively (stone ... trap), is arbitrary.

Ver. 14. Discussion of the preceding injunction, giving information regarding it. Paul grants, namely, in principle, that the freer brethren are right, but immediately adds an exception which arises in practice and, in assigning the reason
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for this addition, declares (ver. 15) the not attending to the exception a proof of want of love. — καὶ πέτευσμαι ἐν κυρ. Ι.] More precise definition of the preceding οἴδα. — ἐν κυρ.] i.e. in my fellowship with the Lord; οὐκ ἄρα ἀνθρωπίνης διάνοιας ἡ ψυχᾶς, Chrysostom. — κοινόν] corresponding to the βέβηλον of the Greeks: profane, ἀκάθαρτον (Chrysostom), Acts x. 14, 28, xi. 8; Heb. x. 29. Thus the eating of flesh was held to be unholy and unclean, and therefore a thing at variance with the holiness of a Christian's position. Comp. Ezek. xlii. 20; 1 Macc. i. 47, 62. — δὴ αὑτῶν] Since the reflexive αὑτῶ (with the rough breathing) is generally doubtful in the N. T. (comp. Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 97 f.), and here the personal αὑτῶ (with the soft breathing) is quite sufficient and appropriate in sense, the latter is to be preferred (Bengel, Matthaei, Lachmann, Tischendorf, 7, Hofmann); not, however, to be referred to Christ (Theodoret, Bisping, Jatho, and others), but to be explained: through itself, i.e. through its nature. In δὴ αὑτῶ is thus implied the objectively existing uncleanness, in contrast (see below) to that which subjectively accrues per accidens. On account of the laws relating to food of the O. T., Olshausen thinks that the thought of the apostle is intended to affirm that "through Christ and His sanctifying influence the creation has again become pure and holy." This arbitrary importation of a meaning (followed by Bisping) is overthrown by the very circumstance that the abstinence of the Roman ascetics was by no means founded on the law—which did not in fact forbid the use of flesh generally—but was of a supra-legal Essenic character. Moreover, Paul was clear and certain, so far as concerns the O. T. laws of food, that they had outlived the time of obligatoriness appointed for them by God, and were abolished by God Himself, inasmuch as in Christ the end of the law had come, and the temporary divine institute had given place to the eternal one of the gospel as its fulfilment, Matt. v. 17. Comp. on x. 4; Col. ii. 16 ff.; also on Acts x. 15, 16. — εἰ μὴ] not equivalent to ἀλλά, but nisi, which, without taking δὴ αὑτῶ also into account, applies merely to οὐδὲν κοινόν. Comp. on Matt. xii. 4; Gal. ii. 16. — ἐκείνῳ κοινόν] ἐκ. with emphasis, as in 2 Cor.
x. 18, Mark vii. 15, 20, and very frequently in John. The uncleaness is in such a case subjective, coming into existence and subsisting actually for the individual through the fettered condition of his own conscience.

Ver. 15. Τάρ] According to this reading critically beyond doubt (see the critical notes)—which, however, Philippi, on account of the sense, regards as “absolutely untenable”—the apostle specifies the reason, why he has expressly added the exception εἰ μὴ τῷ λόγῳ κ.τ.λ. The γάρ belonging to the principal sentence is, according to a very prevalent usage (see Baemlein, Partik. p. 85), taken into the prefixed accessory sentence, so that the argumentative thought is: “not without good moral ground do I say: εἰ μὴ...κοινῶν; for it indicates a want of love, if the stronger one has not regard to this relation towards the weaker.” — διὰ βρῶμα on account of food, i.e. because of a kind of food, which he holds to be unclean and sees thee eat.— λυπεῖται not: is injured, which would consist in the ἀπόλλυσις (Philippi, contrary to N. T. usage), but of moral affliction, i.e. vexation of conscience, which is occasioned by the giving of a σκάνδαλον (ver. 13). Analogous is Eph. iv. 30. To understand it of the making reproaches on account of narrow-mindedness (Grotius, Rosenmüller, Ewald), is gratuitously to import the substance of the thought, and does not correspond to the connection (vv. 13, 14, 20, 21).— οὐκέτι κατὰ ἡγέμ. περινατεῖν] i.e. in that case thou hast ceased to bear thyself conformably to love. This is the actual state of things which subsists, when what is expressed in the protasis occurs; the λυπεῖται, namely, is conceived as the fault of the subject addressed.¹ On εἰ...οὐκέτι, comp. vii. 20, xi. 6; Gal. iii. 18. To take the apodosis interrogatively (Hofmann), is—considering the definite character, quite in keeping with the context, of the λυπεῖται which is occasioned by the offence given—quite unwarranted, and does not suit the words.²—

¹ Note that the present λυπεῖσαι and σκόπησεις coincide in time, as indeed the two regarded practically coincide in reality. For that, which causes to the weak one distress of conscience διὰ βρῶμα, is simply the unsparing conduct of the strong one no longer under the guidance of love.

² According to Hofmann, οὐκέτι κ.τ.λ. is designed simply to submit to the person addressed the question whether he really allows himself to be induced—
The ἀπόλλυσις is the possible result of the λυπηράς: destroy him not, bring him not into destruction, namely, through his being seduced by thy example to disregard his conscience, and to fall out of the moral element of the life of faith into the sinful element of variance with conscience. That we are to explain it of the eternal ἄπώλεια, is clear from ἕπερ οὗ Χ. ἄπέδεω; for in order to redemption from this Christ offered up His life—therefore thou oughtest not to thrust back into ἄπώλεια thy (so dearly bought) brother through the loveless exercise of thy free principles. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 11, 12. "Ne pluris feceris tuum cibum, quam Christus vitam suam,” Bengel.

Ver. 16. Ἡ βλασφημίας[σα] namely (comp. 2 Thess. ii 3; 1 Tim. iv. 12), through your fault.— ὑμῶν τὸ ἄγαθόν] your good κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν, i.e. ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ver. 17. So also Ewald and Umbreit. It is the sum of the μελλόντα ἄγαθά, Heb. ix. 11, x. 1. How easily it might come to pass that a schism, kept up by means of condemnation and contempt, on account of eating and drinking, might draw down on that jewel of Christians—the object of their whole endeavour, hope, and boast—calumnious judgments at the hands of unbelievers, as if maxims respecting eating and drinking formed that on which the Christian was dependent for attaining the blessing of the kingdom! In opposition to the context in ver. 17, following the Fathers (in Suicer, Thes. I. p. 14), de Wette holds that faith is meant; ¹ Luther, Calovius, and others, including Philippi: the gospel; Origen, Pelagius, Beza, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, and many others, including Flatt, Borger, Fritzsche, Tholuck, Nielsen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Reithmayr, Maier, Bisping, with irrelevant appeal to 1 Cor. x. 30: Christian freedom; van Hengel generally: quod in vobis Romanis through the weakness of his fellow-Christian in falling into concern on account of a particular food—to alter his conduct so as to behave with a want of love. In that case, the apostle must at least have expressed himself by the future πάθωνται (wilt thou then no longer behave in conformity with love?), or by διότι συμπάθην, or, most clearly, because implying a negative answer: μὴ οἰκοτί ὁ ἄγ. πάθωνται (thou wilt not thus cease, etc.); comp. x. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 4.

¹ Among the Fathers, Chrysostom’s view is very vacillating and indefinite: ἢ τοῦ πάθους, ἢ τῆς μιᾶς ἐλπίδα τοῦ ἵππου, ἢ τῆς ἀπερίφευγης εὐμετάβασις μὴ χρῆς ἡμᾶς εἰλικρινῶς, μὴ τοὺς εὐφαντὶς βλασφημῶς. Theodoret explains definitely of faith; so also Photius.
bonum est; better Hofmann: that which, as their essential good, gives Christians the advantage over non-Christians,—a view, however, which leaves the precise definition of the notion unsettled. With ὑμῶν, Paul, after having previously addressed a single party in the singular, turns to all; hence we are not, with Fritzsche, to think in ὑμ. of the strong believers only (and in βλασφ. of the weak believers). Note, further, the emphasis of the prefixed ὑμῶν (comp. Phil. iii. 20): the possession belonging to you, to you Christians, which you must therefore all the more guard against slander from without.

Ver. 17. Motive for complying with the μὴ βλασφημ. κ.τ.λ., with reference to the contents of the possible slander.— ἡ βασιλ. τ. Θεοῦ is not anywhere (comp. on Matt. iii. 2, vi. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 20; Col. i. 13), and so is not here, anything else than the Messiah’s kingdom, the erection of which begins with the Parousia, belonging not to the αἰῶν οὐδός, but to the αἰῶν μὴλῶν (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 24, 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5); not therefore the (invisible) church, the regnum gratiae, or the earthly ethical kingdom of God (Reiche, de Wette, Philippi, Lipsius, following older expositors), res christiana (Baumgarten-Crusius), and the like. “The Messianic kingdom is not eating and drinking;” i.e., the essential characteristic of this kingdom does not consist in the principle that a man, in order to become a member of it, should eat and drink this or that or everything without distinction, but in the principle that one should be upright, etc. Less accurate, and, although not missing the approximate sense, readily liable to be misunderstood (see Calovius), is the view of the Greek Fathers, Grotius, and many others: the kingdom of God is not obtained through, etc. Comp. on John xvii. 3.—βρῶσις, eating, i.e. actus edendi, different from βρῶμα, food, ver. 15 (comp. Tittmann, Synon. p. 159), which distinction Paul always observes (in opposition to Fritzsche); see on Col. ii. 16.—δικαιοσύνη κ. εἰρήνη] can, according to the entire context (comp. esp. ver. 15), and specially according to ver. 18 (δουλεύων τῷ Χ.) and ver. 19 (τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης), be taken only in the moral sense, and

1 μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, Theodore of Mopsuestia.
therefore as ethical uprightmess and peace (concord) with the brethren; not in the dogmatic sense: righteousness and peace (of reconciliation) with God (Calvin, Calovius, and many others, including Rückert, Tholuck, and Philippi; de Wette blends the two meanings). But that these virtues presuppose faith in Christ as the soil from which they sprang, and as the fundamental principium essendi of the kingdom, is self-evident from the whole connection. — χάρα ἐν πνεύμ. ἀγ.] forms one phrase. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 6. It is the holy joyfulness, the morally glad frame of heart which has its causal basis and subsistence in the Holy Spirit, who rules in the Christian; comp. Gal. v. 22, also Phil. iv. 4. It is present even in tribulation, 2 Cor. vi. 10, and does not yield to death, Phil. ii. 17. The transitive explanation of the joy which the Christian diffuses over others (Grotius, Koppe, Reiche, and others) is supported neither by the simple word nor by N. T. usage elsewhere.

Ver. 18. Not an explanation, why he has mentioned by name these three particulars, as those in which the kingdom consists (Hofmann), but a confirmation of the contents of ver. 17; and how greatly must this confirmation have conducd to the recommendation and support of the precept μὴ θλασφήμ. κ.τ.λ. of ver. 16 as established by ver. 17! — ἐν τούτοις] (see the critical notes) refers to the just mentioned three great moral elements. He who in these (not therefore possibly in βρῶσις and πόσις, and the like unspiritual things) serves Christ, etc. On ἐν with δουλεύω, denoting its moral life-sphere, comp. vii. 6. — εὐάρεστ. τ. Θεῷ] “testimonium, quod expresse affirmat bona opera renatorum placere Deo,” Melanchthon. — δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρ.] approved by men; such is the relation according to its moral nature,—a fact not annulled by abnormal manifestations, in which misapprehension, perversion of the moral judgment, and the like are at work. “Paulus hic de sincere judicio loquitur,” Calvin.

Ver. 19. Exhortation, inferred from the doctrinal proposition, ver. 17; not a question (Buttmann). — τὰ γὰρ εἰπ.] what

1 So δόκιμος in all N. T. passages (not: worthy, esteemed, and the like); see Buttmann, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1860, p. 368, who however prefers the reading δόκιμος in B G* 77 (a copyist's error).
belongs to peace, composes the substance of peace, not different in matter of fact from τὴν εἰρήνην. See Bernhardy, p. 325 f.; Kühner, II. 1, p. 230. — τῆς οἰκοδομῆς] figurative designation of perfecting (here active) in the Christian life. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 8, xiii. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 4. According to the context in each case, the individual, as here, or the church, or the whole Christian body, is a building of God (of which Christ is the foundation, 1 Cor. iii. 11; Eph. ii. 20, 21), on which the work of building is to proceed until the Parousia. — εἰς ἀλληλα.] οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἑαυτόν] 1 Thess. v. 11.

Ver. 20. Prohibition of the opposite of τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλληλα. — κατάλυμε] pull down. Comp. 2 Cor. v. 1; Gal. ii. 18; Matt. xxvi. 61. — τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ] here, according to the context, the building of God, by which, however, is represented not what is mentioned in ver. 17 (the δικαιοσύνη κ.τ.λ., so Fritzche, Baumgarten-Crusius); nor yet the faith of one's fellow-Christian (Theodoret, Reiche), or his eternal salvation (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact); nor all blessings vouchsafed through Christ (Köllner, comp. Borger); but, according to ver. 15, the Christian as such, in so far as his Christian life, his Christian personality, is God's work (viii. 29, 30; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. ii. 10). Aptly Estius says: "fratrem, quem Deus fecit fidelem." Accordingly, what was expressed in ver. 15 by μὴ ἐκείνου ἄπόλλυμε, ὑπὲρ σοῦ Χ. ἀπέθανε, is here expressed by μὴ κατάλυμε τὸ ἔργον τ. Θεοῦ; but it is differently conceived and presented, in such a way that the brother is thought of there in his relation of redemption to Christ, here in his relation of spiritual origin to God. The importance of the latter conception is rightly pointed out by Calovius: "non levis est culpa, sed horribilis θεομαχία, opus Dei destruere." — ἐπάντα μὲν καθαρὰ κ.τ.λ.] the same thought as in ver. 14, repeated in order to enter further into the μὴ ἐνεκεν βρώματος. "All (all food) indeed is clean (not immoral to enjoy in and by itself), but it is sinful for the man who eats amidst offence," who nevertheless uses a food, although he experiences moral offence in the using it—so that he thus against his conscience imitates the freer Christian. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 9, 10. This reference of the ethical dative τὸ
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And the weak in faith (Chrysostom, Luther, Beza, Carpzov, Semler, and others, including Rückert, Köllner, Philippi, Tholuck, Hofmann) is confirmed by the parallel in vv. 13, 14, and admirably suits the connection, inasmuch as ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ. unfolds the way and manner in which ἐνεκεν βρῶματος destruction may befall the work of God. Hence we must reject the explanation (Pelagius, Grotius, Bengel, and others, including Reiche, de Wette, Nielsen, Baumgarten-Crusius, Fritzsche, Reithmayr, Krehl, Umbreit, van Hengel) of the strong in faith, who acts wrongly in eating under offence given, i.e. although to the offence of the weak. For in that case we should have here no reference at all relevant to the κατάλυσις of the ἔργον τ. Θεοῦ, but only the vague remark that it is wrong to eat to the offence of others. — ἀλλὰ] after μὲν; see Vigerus, ed. Herm. p. 536; Hartung, Partikell. II. p. 403 f.; Baeumlein, p. 170. — κακὸν] not hurtful (Rückert), nor yet bad in the sense of what is not good for him (Hofmann), but sinful, the ethical contrast of καθαρά. The subject (it) is to be understood of itself from what precedes, namely τὸ καθαρὸν, the pure in itself. Others supply πᾶν (Reiche), τὸ βρῶμα (Grotius), τὸ ἐσθιεῖν (Rückert), τὸ πάντα φαγεῖν (Fritzsche, Philippi). Hofmann also renders incorrectly, as though it ran, κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθιεῖν. — διὰ] as in ii. 27.

Ver. 21. Maxim for the strong in faith, which results from the preceding ἀλλὰ κακὸν κ.τ.λ.: "It is excellent, morally right and good, to eat no flesh, and to drink no wine, and (generally) to do nothing whereby thy brother takes offence," etc. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 13. On μὴ, as joined to the infinitive with the article, see Baeumlein, p. 296. The article belongs only to μὴ φαγ. κρ. With the second μηδὲ, the general πουεῖν is simply to be supplied¹ (Winer, p. 542 [E. T. p. 729]; Buttmann, p. 336), and ἐν φίλου also refers back to the eating of flesh and drinking of wine. Rückert and Köllner (following Luther,

¹ The εὐρυγματική breviloquence, which leaves the reader to supply, after special notions (such as φαγεῖν and ἐσθιεῖν here), a more general word, is found also from Homer onward among the Greek writers (see Nägelsbach, a. Ilias, p. 179, ed. 3). Comp. generally, Krüger, § 62. 3.
Grotius, Flatt) are mistaken in holding that καλὸν is to be taken comparatively, and that the comparison lies in ἐν ἢ κ.τ.λ.; in which case we should have very arbitrarily to assume that the apostle, instead of following it up with an ἢ κ.τ.λ. (see on Matt. xviii. 8), had been led away from the construction. According to Hofmann, we should read μηδὲ ἐν. But this would in fact denote, not, as Hofmann thinks, nor yet anything at all, but neque unum, or ne unum quidem (see on 1 Cor. vi. 5; John i. 3), which would be unsuitable here. Quite unfounded with all is the objection against the reading ἐν ἢ, that προσκόπτεω with ἐν is not elsewhere found; for προσκόπτεω is to be taken by itself (absolutely), and ἐν ἢ means whereby, as ἐν is also to be understood in Ecclus. xxx. 13; see Fritzsch on Ecclus. p. 167. On the absolute προσκόπτω. comp. Ecclus. xxxiv. 17, xiii. 23, also John xi. 9, 10. — The following threefold designation of the same thing, namely, of the giving occasion for conduct opposed to conscience (comp. ver. 13), is explained by the urgency of the sorrowful thought.—ἀδηεὐ[ί] not: becomes weak, but, as it always denotes: is weak, i.e. morally powerless to withstand temptation and to follow his moral conviction,—not different in substance from the two preceding figurative designations already employed in ver. 13.—Further, that in ver. 21 not a merely problematic extension of abstinence is expressed, as those suppose who hold the abstinence on the part of the weak not to refer to all flesh, and to refer to wine either not at all, or only to the wine of libation (see introd. to the chapter, and on ver. 2), is evident from ver. 2, where abstinence from all flesh is expressed; and hence here, alongside of the μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα, the μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον admits of no other conclusion than that the weak in faith drank no wine, but held the use of it likewise (see ver. 14) to be defiling.

Vv. 22, 23. Σὺ πίστιν ἐχει[ν] may be viewed either concessively (Luther, Beza, and many others, including Scholz, Tischendorf, Fritzsch, Tholuck, Hofmann) or interrogatively (Calvin, Grotius, Calovius, and most moderns). Comp. on xiii. 3. The latter (already in Oecumenius, and probably also Chrysostom) corresponds better to the increasing animation of
the discourse. Paul hears, as it were, how the strong in faith opposes him with an ἔχει πίστιν ἐχει, and he replies thereto: Thou hast faith? Thou partakest of the confidence of faith grounded on Christ, respecting the allowableness of the eating and drinking (vv. 2, 21), which is here in question?—Have it for thyself (ἀρχείναν τὸ συνείδος, Chrysostom) before God, so that God is the witness of thy faith, and thou dost not make a parade of it before men to the offence of the weak. “Fundamentum verae prudentiae et dissimulationis,” Bengel. — ἔχει not: thou mayest have it (Reiche), which deprives the imperative expression of its force. — καὶ ἀσκοῦντα for thyself alone; see Kühner, II. 1, p. 414. Comp. Heliodorus, vii. 16: καὶ ἀσκοῦντα ἔχει καὶ μηδὲν φράτε, also the classical αὐτὸς ἔχε, keep it for thyself. — κατακεκρίται forms a twofold consideration, which must influence the strong one not to abuse his strong faith to the prejudice of the weaker; namely, (1) he has in truth on his side the high advantage, which is expressed by διακρινόμενοι... ἔχε, on the other hand, (2) the danger is great for the weak one, if he through the example of the strong one is tempted to a partaking contrary to his conscience (δὲ διακρινόμενοι κ.τ.λ.). How shouldest thou not content thyself with that privilege, and spare this peril to the weak! On the formal mutual relation of κρίνω, διακρίνω, and κατακρίνω, comp. 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32, where, however, the definition of the sense is not as here. — κατακρίνω not equivalent to κατακρίνων, as, since Chrysostom, most interpreters think; against which the climax κρίνως, διακρινόμενος, κατακρίτα is decisive. It means: he who does not hold judgment upon himself, i.e. he who is so certain of his conviction, that his decision for this or that course is liable to no self-judgment; he does not institute any such judgment, as the anxious and uncertain one does. — ἐν ὅ δοκιμάζει in that which he approves, i.e. “agendum eligi” (Estius). Luther aptly renders: in that which he accepts. Comp. 2 Macc. iv. 3; Dem. 1381. 6; Plato, Legg. p. 579 C; Diod. Sic. iv. 7. — Ver. 23: But he who
wavers (διακρίν., qui dubius haeret., see on iv. 20), as to whether, namely, the eating is really allowed or not, is, if he shall have eaten, condemned, eo ipso (comp. on xiii. 8; John iii. 18) liable to the divine penal judgment, the opposite of μακάριος; comp. ἀπόλλυμε, ver. 15. The matter is apprehended from the point of view of morally ideal strictness. Actual self-condemnation (Chrysostom, Theodoret, Grotius, and others, including Hofmann) would have required a more precise designation.

— δτὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως] sc. ἔφαγε. — πῶν δὲ κ.τ.λ.] may be still connected with δτὶ: because he ate not from faith, but all, that comes not from faith, is sin. If it is taken independently, however, the sense is more emphatic. In the conclusion, which proves the κατακέρτωσις, πῶν δὲ ... ἀμαρτ. ἐστὶν is the major, and οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως sc. ἔφαγε the minor premiss.—πίπτως is here also none other than faith according to its moral quality ("conscientiam informans et confirmans," Bengel), i.e. faith in Christ, so far as it brings with it the moral confidence as to what in general, and under given circumstances, is the right Christian mode of action. Respecting the conduct of the Christian, Paul lays down the axiom which regulates it generally, and more especially in adiaphora, that all which does not proceed from that confidence of faith as the moral spring of action is sin; to express a moral fundamental law beyond the Christian sphere of life, is foreign to his intention. Hence it was an alien proceeding to draw from the present expression, indirectly or directly,—in disregard of the natural law of conscience (ii. 14, 15),—the inference that the works and even the virtues of unbelievers were all of them sins (Augustine, c. Julian. iv. 3, et al.; Luther; Form. Conc. p. 700; Calovius, and others). Very correctly Chrysostom: ταῦτα δὲ πάντα περὶ τῆς προκειμένης ἐπιθέσεως εἴρηται τῷ Παύλῳ, οὐ περὶ πάντων. But against the abuse of this passage, as though it made all accountability dependent only on subjective moral conviction, see Jul. Müller, von d. Sünde, l. p. 285, ed. 5; comp. also Delitzsch, Psychol. I. p. 139.

1 In this view, the objective will of God would cease to be the standard of accountability. The bloody deed of Sand, e.g., would have been exempted from responsibility.
CHAPTER XV.

Various writers formerly, from the days of Semler, disputed, not that Paul was the author of chap. xv. and xvi. (as to the doxology, xvi. 25–27, see, however, the critical notes on chap. xvi.), but that chap. xv. and xvi. along with chap. i.–xiv. compose one epistle. Semler himself thought that Paul had given to the bearers of the letter—of which Phoebe was not the bearer—a list, which they might exhibit, of the teachers whom they were to visit on their journey by way of Cenchreae (where Phoebe dwelt) and Ephesus (where Aquila dwelt), and to whom they were to hand a copy of the letter. This list was in his view chap. xvi., of which, however, vv. 25–27 had their original place after xiv. 23 (which also Paulus, Griesbach, Flatt, Eichhorn assumed); and chap. xv. was an open letter to those same teachers, with whom the travellers were to confer respecting the contents.—Paulus (de originib. ep. ad Rom., Jen. 1801, and in his Kommentar z. Gal. u. Rom. 1831, Introd.) held chap. xv. to be an appended letter for those who were enlightened, and chap. xvi. to have been a separate leaf for the bearer of the letters, with commendations to the overseers of the church and commissions to those whom they were particularly to greet from Paul. Griesbach (curae in hist. text. Gr. epp. P. p. 45, and in his Opusc. ed. Gabl. vol. ii. p. 63; comp. in opposition to him, Gabler himself in the Preface, p. xxiv.), whom in the main Flatt followed, saw in chap. xv. an appendix for the further discussion of the last subject, subjoined after the conclusion of the letter, while chap. xvi. consisted originally of various appended leaflets. A similar hypothesis was constructed by Eichhorn (Einleit. III. p. 232 ff.), who, however, regarded xvi. 1–20 as not belonging to Rome at all, but as a letter of commendation for Phoebe, probably destined for Corinth, but taken along with

her to Rome. Among all the _grounds_ by which these varied assumptions have been supported, there are none which are valid, not even those which appear the least to rest on arbitrary assumption. For the statement that Marcion did not _read_ chap. xv. and xvi. amounts to this, that he, according to his fashion (see Hahn, _De Marcion's_, p. 50 ff.), _excised_ them.¹ See, besides, Nitzsch in the _Zeitschr. f. histor. Theol._ 1860, I. p. 285 ff. Further, that Tertullian, _c. Marc._ v. 14, designates the passage xiv. 10 as to be found _in clausula_ of the epistle, is sufficiently explained from the fact that he is arguing against _Marcion_ and hence refers to _his_ copy. Comp. also Rönsch, _d. N. T. Tertullian's_, p. 350. Again, the repeated formulae of conclusion before the final close of the letter (xvi. 20, 24; xv. 33 is merely the concluding wish of a section) are most readily and naturally understood from the repeated intention of the apostle actually to conclude; which was to be done first of all at xvi. 16, but was frustrated through the intrusion of the further observation ver. 17 ff. and was deferred till ver. 20, after which, however, some further commissions of greeting were introduced (vv. 21–23), so that not until ver. 24 did the last wish of blessing—and now, for the complete conclusion of the whole, the ample doxology, vv. 25–27—finish the epistle. Most plausible are the two difficulties felt in reference to chap. xvi.; namely, (1) that Paul would probably not have had so many acquaintances in Rome, where he had not yet been at all, as he greets in chap. xvi., especially seeing that, in the epistles subsequently written _from_ Rome, he mentions none of them; and (2) that Aquila and Priscilla could hardly at that time have been in Rome (xvi. 3), because they not long before were still dwelling in Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 19), and were at a later period likewise in Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19). This has been regarded as the most serious difficulty by Ammon ( _Praefat._ p. 24)—who held chap. xvi. to be a letter of

¹ Origen on xvi. 25: “Caput hoc (viz. xvi. 25–27) Marcion, a quo scripturae evangelicae et apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est (xiv. 23): omne antem, quod non ex fide est, peccatum est, usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit,”—which _dissecuit_ cannot denote a mere _mutilation_ (Reiche and others), but must be equivalent in sense to the preceding _abstulit_. The validity of this testimony cannot be overthrown by the silence of Epiphanius on this omission of Marcion, as a merely negative reason against it. Marcion's stumbling-blocks, as regards chap. xv., were probably vv. 4 and 8 in particular. Altogether Marcion allowed himself to use great violences to this epistle, as he, for example, _extruded_ x. 5–xt. 32; Tertullian, _c. Marc._ v. 14. Comp. generally, Hilgenfeld, in the _Zeitschr. f. hist. Theol._ 1855, iii. p. 428 ff.
commendation written by the apostle for Phoebe to Corinth after the imprisonment at Rome—and recently by Dav. Schulz (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1829, p. 609 ff.), Schott (Isag. p. 249 ff.), Reuss (Gesch. d. h. Schrift. § 111), Ewald, Laurent, Lucht. Schulz regards chap. xvi. as written from Rome to Ephesus; while Schott's judgment is as follows: "Totum cap. xvi. com-compositum est fragmentis diversis\(^1\) alius cujusdam epistolae bre-vioris (maximam partem amissae), quam Paulus Corinthi ad coetum quendam Christianum in Asia Minori versantem dederat, ita ut, qui schedulas singulas haec fragmenta exhibentes sensim sensimque reprehendisset, continua serie unum adjiceret alteri." Reuss (so also Hausrath and Sabatier) sees in xvi. 1–20 a letter with which Phoebe, who was travelling to Ephesus, was entrusted to the church there; while Ewald (comp. Mangold, also Ritschl in the Jahrb. f. D. Theol. 1866, p. 352) cuts out only vv. 3–20, but likewise regards this portion as having originally pertained to an epistle of the apostle to the Ephesians, which, according to ver. 7, was written from the Roman captivity; as, indeed, also Laurent (neutest. Stud. p. 31 ff.) extracts from vv. 1–24 a special commendatory letter for Phoebe, written by the apostle's own hand to the Ephesians, assuming at the same time marginal remarks;\(^2\) and Lucht assigns the commendation of Phoebe, and the greetings by name in vv. 3–6, to a letter to the Ephesians, but the greetings following in ver. 7 ff. to the editor of the Epistle to the Romans. But (1) just in the case of Rome it is readily conceivable that Paul had many acquaintances there, some of whom had come from Asia and Greece, and had settled in Rome, whether permanently or temporarily (several perhaps as missionaries); while others, like Aquila, had been banished as Jews under Claudius, and then had returned as Pauline Christians. (2) It is by no means necessary that Paul should have known the whole of those saluted by sight; how many might, though personally unknown, be saluted by him! (3) The fact that Paul at a later period, when he himself was a prisoner in Rome and wrote thence (in my judgment, the Epistle to the Philippians here alone comes into consideration; see Introd. to Eph. and Col.; the Pastoral Epistles, as non-apostolic, must be disregarded), does not again mention any one of those here saluted, may have arisen from the

\(^1\) These being vv. 1–16, vv. 17–20, vv. 21–24, vv. 25–27.

\(^2\) And that to such an extent, that of the 16th chapter nothing further is supposed to have been written by Paul for the Romans than vv. 21, 23, 24. See, in opposition, Ritschel, l.c., and Lucht, p. 22 f.—Weisse would have chap. xvi. together with chap. ix.–xi. directed to Ephesus.
altered circumstances of the time; for between the composition of the epistle to Rome and the apostle's sojourn in Rome there lies an interval of three years, during which the majority of those referred to might have obtained other places of destination. Besides, the salutation which Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians offers to others (iv. 22) is merely a quite summary one. (4) There exists no ground at all for denying that Aquila and Priscilla might, after the writing of our First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19), have returned from Ephesus to Rome and have informed the apostle of their sojourn and activity there. (5) The greeting from all churches in ver. 16 is suitable enough for an epistle addressed to the church of the capital city of the empire; and the first-fruits of Asia, ver. 5, was everywhere a distinguishing predicate, so that it does not presuppose one living precisely in Ephesus. (6) Were vv. 3–20 a portion cast adrift of an epistle to the Ephesians, or even a separate small letter to the Ephesians, it would not be easy to see how it should have come precisely to this place; it must have from the outset lost every trace of the tradition of its original destination to such an extent, that no occasion was found even afterwards, when an epistle to the Ephesians was already in ecclesiastical use, to subjoin it to that epistle. From all this there just as little remains any sufficient ground for severing, in opposition to all testimony, chap. xvi., as there is for severing chap. xv., having otherwise so close an external and internal connection with chap. xiv., from the Epistle to the Romans, and giving up the unity of the latter as handed down.

It was reserved at last for the criticism of Baur to contest the apostolic origin of chap. xv. xvi. (in the Tüb. Zeitschr. 1836, 3, and Paulus, I. p. 394 ff., ed. 2; comp. also in the theol. Jahrb. 1849, 4, p. 493 ff.; Schwegler, nachapostol. Zeitalt. p. 123 ff.; Volkmar, in the theol. Jahrb. 1856, p. 321 ff., and Röm. Kirche, 1857, p. 3). Baur finds in the last two chapters a making of advances towards the Jewish Christians, such as does not suit the tenor of the rest of the epistle. In this view he objects particularly to vv. 3, 8, 14 in chap. xv.; vv. 9–12 is a mere accumulation of Bible passages to pacify the Jewish Christians; ver. 15 is irrelevant, ver. 20 no less so; the state-

— Hilgenfeld has not adhered to Baur's view.
ment of ver. 19: from Jerusalem to Illyricum, is unhistorical, derived from a later interest; vv. 22, 23 do not agree with i. 10–13; vv. 24, 28, intimating that Paul intended to visit the Romans only on his route to Spain, are surprising; vv. 25, 26 have been taken by the writer from the epistles to the Corin-
thians for his own purpose, in order to win over the Jewish
Christians; the long series of persons saluted in chap. xvi.—a
list of notabilities in the early Roman church—was intended to
afford proof that Paul already stood in confidential relations
to the best known members of the church, in connection
with which several names, among them the συγγενείς of the
apostle as well as Aquila and Priscilla, and their characteriza-
tion are suspicious; vv. 17–20 are unsuitably placed, and with-
out characteristic colouring; the position of the final doxology
is uncertain; the entire complaisance towards the Jewish
Christians conflicts with Gal. i. and ii. But this same (so-
called) complaisance (according to Volkmar, "with all manner
of excuses and half compliments") is assumed utterly without
ground, especially seeing that Paul had already in an earlier
passage expressed so much of deep and true sympathy for his
people (comp. ix. 1 ff., x. 1, 2, xi. 1, 2, 11 ff., et al.); and what-
ever else is discovered to be irrelevant, unsuitable, and unhis-
toric in the two chapters is simply and solely placed in this
wrong light through the interest of suspicion; while, on the
other hand, the whole language and mode of representation are
so distinctively Pauline, that an interpolation so comprehensive
would in fact stand unique, and how singular, at the same time,
in being furnished with such different conclusions and fresh
starts! See, further, Kling in the Stud. u. Krit. 1837, p. 308 ff.;
Delitzsch in the Luther. Zeitschr. 1849, p. 609 ff.; Th. Schott,
p. 119 ff.; Wieseler in Herzog's Encyklop. XX. p. 598 f.; Man-
—Nevertheless Lucht, l.c., has once more come into very close
contact with Baur, in proposing the hypothesis that the genuine
epistle of Paul, extending to xiv. 23, existed in an incomplete
state; that thereupon, one hand, summing up the main points of
the epistle in the (un-Pauline) doxology, added the latter after
xiv. 23; while another further continued the theme broken
off at xiv. 23, and subjoined an epilogue, along with greetings,
to the Romans. In this way two editions arose, of which one
(A) contained chap. i.–xiv. and xvi. 25–27; while the other
(B) contained chap. i.–xiv. and xv. 1–16, 24; A and B were
then supplemented from one another. That which Paul him-
self had appended after xiv. 23, was removed from it by the
Roman clergy, and laid up in their archives (out of consideration for the ascetics, namely); but subsequently it, along with fragments of an epistle to the Ephesians, which had also been placed in the archives, had been worked in by the composer of chap. xv. and xvi. This entire hypothesis turns upon presuppositions and combinations which are partly arbitrary in themselves, and partly without any solid ground or support in the detailed exegesis.

Ver. 2. After ἕκαστος Elz. has γάρ, against decisive witnesses.

— Ver. 4. Instead of the second προγράφη, B C D E F G Ψ*, 67**, 80, most vss., and several Fathers have ἐγράφη. Approved by Griesb., adopted by Lachm., Tisch., Fritzschke. Rightly; the compound is an intentional or mechanical repetition. — Not so strongly attested (though by A B C* L Ψ) is the διὰ repeated before τῆς παρακλητικοῦ in Griesb., Lachm., Tisch. 8, which, since the article again follows, became easily added.

— Ver. 7. ιναὶς] Elz.: ιναίς, against A C D* E F G Ψ, min., most vss., and several Fathers. A correct gloss, indicating the reference of ιναὶς to the Jewish and Gentile Christians. — Ver. 8. γάρ] approved by Griesb., adopted also by Lachm. and Tisch. But Elz. and Fritzschke have οί, against which the evidence is decisive. Moreover, λίγω οί is the customary form with Paul for more precise explanation, and hence also slipped in here. — γεγυνηθεῖσα] Lachm: γεγυνηθεῖσα, according to B C* D* F G, Arm. Ath. But how readily one of the two syllables Εη might be passed over, and then the familiar (comp. also Gal. iv. 4) γεγυνηθεῖσα would be produced! — Ver. 11. After πάλιν Lachm. has λίγω, according to B D E F G, 1, and several vss.; manifestly an addition in accordance with ver. 10. — ἰσωικαὶ] Lachm. and Tisch.: ἰσωικαὶ συγγραμματεῖα, according to ABCD EΨ, 39, Chrys. ms. Dam. Both readings are also found in the LXX., and may be borrowed thence. The circumstance that after αἴτησε the form ἰσωικαὶ, as more conformable, readily offered itself, speaks in favour of ἰσωικαὶ συγγραμματεῖα. — Ver. 15. ἀδικόπαθει] is wanting indeed in A B C Ψ*, Copt. Aeth. Cyr. Chrys. Ruf. Aug. (omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8), and stands in 3, 108, after μίσουσι; but why should it have been added? On the other hand, its omission was readily suggested, since it had just appeared for the first time in ver. 14, and since it seemed simply to stand in the way of the connection of ἀνεδικόμενος; hence also that transposition in 3, 108. — Ver. 17. καίγοντο] Rightly Lachm. and Tisch.: τὴν καίγοντο. The reference of the preponderantly attested article was not understood. — Ver. 19. ἀγιόν] So A C D E F G, min., and most vss. and Fathers. Adopted also by Griesb., Lachm., and Scholz.
But Elz. (so also Matth., Fritzsche, Tisch. 8), in accordance with Ν and D** LP, most min., Syr. Chrys., and others, has Θεόν. In B, Pel. Vigil. there is merely θεόναρος. So Tisch. 7. Since there is absolutely no reason why άγ. or Θεόν should have been omitted or altered, probably the simple θεόναρος is the original, which was only variously glossed by άγ. and Θεόν. — Ver. 20. φιλοτιμούμενον] Lachm.: φιλοτιμούμαι, according to B D* F G P. To facilitate the construction. — Ver. 22. τά τολλάί] B D E F G: τολλάκες, so Lachm. An interpretation in accordance with i. 13. — Ver. 23. τολλάτοι] Tisch. 7: ἐπανώ, according to B C, 37, 59, 71, Dam. A modifying gloss, according to an expression peculiarly well known from the book of Acts. — Ver. 24. After Σκανίας Elz. and Tisch. 7 have ἔλαμβαναι τῆς ἱματίας, which is omitted by Griesb., Lachm., and Tisch. 8. A contrast to ver. 22, written at the side, and then introduced, but rejected by all uncials except L Ν**, and by all vss. except Syr. p.; attested, however, among the Fathers by Theodoret, Theophylact, and Oecumenius, and preserved in nearly all the cursives. This old interpolation occasioned the insertion of an illustrative γάρ after ἐκκείνω (so Elz., Tisch., and also Lachm.), the presence of which also in principal witnesses (as A B C Ν), in which ἐκκείνω. σφ. ἱμ. is wanting, does not point to the originality of these words, but only to a very early addition and diffusion of them, so that in fact those witnesses represent only a half-completed critical restoration of the original text, whilst those which omit both (as F G) still contain the original text or a complete purification of the text. — Instead of ἐφ' ἱματίας, Lachm. and Tisch. 7 have ἀφ' ἱματίας, according to D E F G, min., which presents itself as genuine, and is explained by ἐφ' ἱματίας on account of the passive. B has ἀφ' ἱματίας. — Ver. 29. Χριστοῦ] Elz.: τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Χ., against decisive evidence. A gloss. — Ver. 31. δικαίωσις] Lachm.: δικαίωσις, according to B D* F G, which, however, Paul, considering the delicacy of designation here throughout observed, can hardly have written; it appears to be an explanation. — The repetition of ἓν before ἓν δικαίωσίς (in Elz.) is, according to A B C D* F G N*, 80, justly also omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. — Instead of ἓν εἰς Lachm. has ἓν εἰς, according to B D* F G, 213. Both prepositions are suitable to the sense; but the omission of the article in the majority of witnesses enables us to perceive how ἓν εἰς arose. This omission, namely, carried with it the alteration of εἰς into εἰ (66, Chrys. really have merely εἰ), and then εἰ arose through an only partial critical restoration. — Ver. 32. ἔλαμβανω] A C N*, Copt. Arm. Ruf.: ἔλαμβανον with omission of the subsequent καί. Too weakly supported; an emendation of style, yet
adopted by Tisch. 8.— Instead of Θεοῦ, B has κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (so Lachm); D E F G, It.: Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; N: Ἰησοῦ Χρ. But the apostle never says διὰ δυνάμεως Χριστοῦ, but always τ. Θεοῦ (comp. i. 10; 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1, viii. 5, et al.), as throughout he uses δυνάμεως constantly of God, when there is mention of His omnipotence or gracious will; where said of Christ, the δυνάμεως is for him only the moral will (Eph. v. 17). Hence those readings are to be regarded as unsuitable glosses after w. 29, 30.— καὶ συναναγιμ. ὑμῖν] has been omitted by Lachm. on the authority of B only, in which he is followed by Buttmann. From i. 12 συμμαρακληθήσεται would have been employed as an addition, and not συναναγιμ.; D E have ἀνα-φανερώθη μεθ' ὑμῖν (2 Tim. i. 16).— Ver. 33. The omission of the δοξά (bracketed by Lachm.) is too weakly attested.

Vv. 1-13. More general continuation of the subject previously treated: Exhortation to the strong to bear with the weak, according to Christ's example (vv. 1-4); a blessing on concord (vv. 5, 6); and a summons to receive one another as brethren, as Christ has received them, Jews and Gentiles (vv. 7-12). Blessing (ver. 13).

Ver. 1. Connection: To the preceding exposition of the perniciousness of the eating indicated in xiv. 23, Paul now subjoins the general obligation, which is to be fulfilled by the strong, over against (ἐν) that imperilling of the weak. The contrast of διαφορά and ἀπίστωσις is just as in chap. xiv.; the τῇ πιστεί of more precise definition in xiv. 1 is so fully understood of itself after the preceding discussion, that we have here no right either to generalize the contrast (Hofmann: of the soundness and frailty of the Christian state of the subjects generally), or to single out the διαφορά as a peculiar

1 According to Lucht, p. 160 ff., the entire passage vv. 1-3 is post-apostolic, not merely in the mode of its presentation, but also in that of its view. In comparison with chap. xiv., all is delineated too generally and abstractly; the example of Christ has in no other place been applied by Paul as it is here in vv. 3-7; the citations are after the manner of a later point of view; the argument in vv. 9-12 is not free from Jewish-Christian prejudices, etc. All of them grounds, which do not stand the test of an unprejudiced and unbiased explanation of details—evil legacies from Baur's method of suspicion.

2 In opposition to Hofmann, who, assigning to the concluding verses of the epistle (xvi. 25-27) their place after xiv. 23, places ἐπιλέγω in connection with τῇ διεναρθημ. ν. τ. λ., xvi. 25; see on xvi. 25-27.
extreme party, which in their opposition to the weak had gone further and had demanded more than the remaining members of the church who did not belong to the weak (Mangold, employing this interpretation in favour of his view as to the Jewish-Christian majority of the church, as if the τωςατωls had been a Gentile-Christian minority). Against this, ἡμεῖς is already decisive, whereby Paul, in agreement with xiv. 14, 20, has associated himself with the strong, making his demand as respects its positive and negative portions the more urgent.

— τὰ ἀθέμοιματα] the actual manifestations, which appear as results of the ἀθέμενοι τῇ πλεῖον (xiv. 1). The word is not found elsewhere. These imbecillitates are conceived as a burden (comp. Gal. vi. 2) which the strong take up and bear from the weak, inasmuch as they devote to them, in respect to these weaknesses, patience and the helpful sympathy (2 Cor. xi. 29) of ministering love. Thus they, in themselves strong and free, become servants of the weak, as Paul was servant of all, 1 Cor. ix. 19, 22.— ἡμή ἦσαν ὑπέρ τῆς ἀθένειας not to please ourselves (1 Cor. x. 33); “quemadmodum solent, qui proprio judicio contenti alios secure negligent,” Calvin. This is moral selfishness.

Ver. 2. εἰς τὸ ἄγαθ. for his benefit. Comp. 1 Cor. x. 33; 1 Thess. ii. 4. A more special definition thereof is πρὸς οἰκοδομήν, in order to build up, to produce Christian perfection (in him). See on xiv. 19. According to Fritzsche, εἰς τὸ ἄγαθ. is in respect of what is good, whereby immoral men-pleasing is excluded. But its exclusion is understood of itself, and is also implied in πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. On the interchange of εἰς and πρὸς, comp. iii. 25, 26.

Ver. 3. Establishment of this duty by the pattern: for Christ also, etc.— ἄλλα, καθὼς κ.τ.λ. but, as it is written, the reproaches of those reproaching thee fell on me. After ἄλλα a comma only is to be placed, and nothing is to be supplied, neither sibi disiplicuit with Erasmus, nor fecit with Grotius and

1 ἡμεῖς can the less indicate, as the subjects of the present exhortation, persons who were distinct from those addressed by προελαμβάνετε, xiv. 1 (Mangold), because in fact προελαμβάνετε recurs in ver. 7. How frequently does Paul give different forms to the same injunctions! Mangold also lays an incorrect stress on the ἐκ, with which chap. xv. opens, as though, according to our view, ἐκ should have been used.
others, nor ἐγένετο (Borger) and the like. Had Paul desired to express himself in purely narrative form, he would have written instead of σε: Θεόν, and instead of εἰς: αὐτόν. But he retains the scriptural saying, which he adduces, literally, enhancing thereby the direct force and vivacity of the discourse. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 31; Winer, 534, 556 [E. T. pp. 719, 749].—The passage is Ps. lxix. 10 (literally after the LXX.), where the suffering subject is a type of the Messiah (comp. xi. 9; John ii. 17, xv. 25, xix. 28).—That the reproaches of the enemies of God fell on Christ, i.e. that the enemies of God vented their fury on Christ, proves that Christ was bent on pleasing not Himself (for otherwise He would have abstained from taking these His sufferings upon Himself; comp. Heb. xii. 2, 3, Phil. ii. 6–8), but men, inasmuch as He in order to their redemption surrendered Himself, with full self-renunciation of His αὐτάρκεια, to the enmity against God of His adversaries. Calvin and others: “Ita se Domino devovisse, ut descinderetur animo, quoties sacrum ejus nomen patere impiorum maledictaei videret,” so that the idea of self-denying devotion to the cause of God (so also de Wette and Philippi) is expressed. But according to the connection, it is the devotion of Christ, not for the cause of God, but for the salvation of humanity (see ver. 2), into fellowship of suffering with which He entered, that is to be proposed as an example. Comp. Matt. xx. 28.—οὖνδισμός belongs to later Greek. See Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 512.

Ver. 4. In O. T. words Paul had just presented the example of Christ as an encouragement, and not without reason: for all that was previously written, etc. This reason¹ might, in truth, cause the example of Christ set before them to appear all the more inviting and involving the more sacred obligation to follow it. — προεγράφη] προ clearly obtains its definition

¹ Even if the closing verses of chap. xvi. had their critically correct position at the end of chap. xiv., we still could not, with Hofmann, put the γάρ, in our passage into relation to the designation of God contained in those concluding verses. This—even apart from the fact that xvi. 25–27 is an independent doxology—would be impossible on account of the already interposed vv. 2 and 3, and after the καὶδις γέγραπται just preceding (to which every reader must have referred the προεγράφη, ver. 4). Comp. 1 Cor. x. 11.
through the ἐμετέρας in the second clause, prefixed with emphasis; hence: all that was written before us, before our time,¹ by which is meant the collective contents of the O. T. Wrongly, therefore, Reiche and Hofmann think that it refers to the Messianic oracles written before their fulfilment. On διδασκ. comp. 2 Tim. iii. 16 — διὰ τῆς ὑπομ. κ. τ. παρακλ. τ. γραφ.] through the perseverance and the comfort which the Scriptures afford to us. That τ. ὑπομ. is to be connected with τῶν γραφ. (in opposition to Melanchthon, Grotius, Ammon, Flatt, van Hengel, and others), is clear from the fact, that otherwise τ. ὑπομ. would stand severed from the connection, as well as from ver. 5: ὅ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομ. κ. τ. παρακλ. The ὑπομονὴ is here also, according to ver. 3, and conformably to the connection with παράκλησις, self-denying endurance in all sufferings (see on v. 3), opposed to ἐαυτῷ ἀφέσκευ; and the γραφαί are conceived as "ministerium spiritus" (Melanchthon). Incorrectly Hofmann understands the ὑπομονὴ τ. γραφ. as the waiting upon Scripture (namely, upon that which stands written in it), upon its fulfilment. Thus there is substituted for the notion of ὑπομονῇ that of ἀποκαρδιακία (viii. 19), or ἀναμονὴ (Symmachus, Pa. xxxviii. 8, lxx. 6), which even in 2 Thess. iii. 5 it by no means has (see Lünemann); and how strangely would the only once used τῷ γραφ. be forced into two entirely different references of the genitive! — τῷ θείῳ ζεχώμεν denotes having the hope (i.e. the definite and conscious Christian hope of the Messianic glory); for to promote the possession of this blessed hope by means of patience and comfort in Christians, is the object for which the contents of the O. T. were written for the instruction of Christians. Accordingly neither is ζεχώμ. to be taken as teneamus, with Beza and others; nor is ἐπίρ., with Reiche and others, of the object of hope. Against the latter (see on Col. i. 5) militates the fact that ἐπίθεα ἐξευμ never denotes anything else than the subjective spem habere. Acts xxiv. 15; 2 Cor. x. 15; Eph. ii. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 13; 1 John iii. 3, et al.; Wisd. iii. 18; Xen. Mem. iv. 2.

¹ The compound is then followed (see critical notes) by the simple expression, —a frequent interchange also in the classics; see Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaed. p. 59 B.
28; Polyb. i. 59. 2. Comp. Lobeck, _Aglaoph._ I. p. 70. But that the δικαιοσύνη refers to the conversion of the world of nations is a misunderstanding of Hofmann's, which is connected with his erroneous reference of γάρ, ver. 4 (see on ver. 4). It is the hope of eternal salvation which, warranted and fostered by the influence of Scripture imparting patience and consolation, can and should merge and reconcile all separate efforts of aινιαρέσκευα, which divide men, into the mutual unanimity of Christian sentiment. Comp. Eph. iv. 3, 4.

Ver. 5. _Δέ_ leading over to the wish that God may grant them the concord which it was the design of the previous exhortation, vv. 1–4, to establish.—The characteristic designation of God as the author of the perseverance and of the consolation, is intended not merely to supply an external connection with ver. 4, but stands in an internal relation to the following τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, since this cannot exist if men's minds are not patient and consoled, so that they do not allow themselves to be disturbed by anything adverse in the like effort which must take place in their mutual fellowship (ἐν ἀλληλοις). Through this identity (_τὸ αὐτὸ_, comp. on xii. 16) of purpose and endeavour there exists in a church ᾧ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία, Acts iv. 32.—On the form ὑπ' ῥήματι, instead of the older Attic ὑπ' ῥήμα, see Lobeck, _ad Phryn._ p. 346; Kühner, I. p. 644.—κατὰ Χρ. _I._ conformably to Christ. Either Christ is conceived as the regulative ideal of the frame of mind, according to which each is to adjust himself for his part in the common τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν; or: according to the will of Christ (comp. John xvii. 21), like κατὰ Θεόν, viii. 27. The first is to be preferred, since the model of Christ, ver. 3 (comp. ver. 7), is still the conception present to the apostle's mind. Comp. Col. ii. 8; Phil. ii. 5; κατὰ κύριον, 2 Cor. xi. 17, is somewhat different.

Ver. 6. Ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι] By this the preceding ὀμοθυμαδὸν is not explained (Reiche)—which is an impossible notion—but ὀμοθ. specifies the source of the ἐν ἐνὶ στ., and is to be closely

---

1 Calvin aptly remarks: "Solus sane Deus patientiae et consolationis auctor est, quia utrumque cordibus nostris instillat per Spiritum suum; verbo tamen suo velut instrumento ad id utitur."
joined with it: *unanimously with one mouth*, not: *unanimously, with one mouth*. It is otherwise, e.g., with Dem. 147. 1: όμωθυμαδών ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης, where the explanatory addition has a place. If God is so praised, that each is led by the like disposition to the like utterance of praise, then all dissension is removed, and the unanimity of the fellowship has found in this σὺμφανος ὑμνηδία (Theodore of Mopsuestia) its holiest expression. On ἐν ἐνι στόματι (instrumental), comp. the classical ἐδικτός στόματος, Plato, 640 C, p. 364 A; Legg. i. p. 634 E; Rep. Anthol. xi. 159. — τὸν κυρίον κ.τ.λ.] belongs simply to πατέρα, not also to Θεόν (in opposition to Grotius, Bengel, and others, including Rückert, Reiche, Tholuck (?), Fritzsche), and καλ adds exegetically the specific more precise definition. So throughout with this description of God habitually used by the apostles, as 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3. This is clear from the passages, in which with πατ. the genitive (Ἰησοῦ Χ.) is *not* subjoined, as 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20; Col. iii. 17; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9. See on 1 Cor. v. 24; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Eph. i. 3. It ought not to have been objected, that the form of expression must either have been τὸν Θεόν ὑμῶν κ. πατέρα Ἱ. Χ. or τὸν Θεόν τὸν πατ. Ἱ. 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. Comp. Dissen, ad Dem. de cor. p. 373 f.; Kühner, ad Xev. Mem. i. 1. 19, ad Anab. ii. 2. 8. Rightly Theodoret: ἡμῶν Θεόν ἐκάλεσα τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ δὲ κυρίου πατέρα.

Ver. 7. Διοι] in order, namely, that this object, ver. 6, may be attained, that its attainment may not be hindered on your part. — προσέλαβεν.] See on xiv. 1. That not the strong alone (Hofmann), but both parties, and thus the readers collectively, are addressed, and that subsequently ὑμᾶς refers to both (not merely or principally to the Gentile-Christians, as Rückert and Reiche think), follows from ἀλληλούς; and see vv. 8, 9. — προσέλαβεσεν] "sibi sociavit," Grotius. Comp. xiv. 3. — eis

1 Hofmann incorrectly (in accordance with his incorrect reference of ver. 1 ff. to xvi. 25–27) renders: "for the sake of the hope," which you may learn from Scripture.
belongs to προσελάβη. ἵμας, beside which it stands, and to which, in accordance with vv. 8, 9 ff., it is alone suitable. Hence it is not to be connected with προσελαμβ. ἄλλη. (Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and others); and just as little with the latter immediately, but with προσελάβη. ἵμας only mediately (as Hofmann splits the reference). But it means: that God might be thereby glorified, not: "ut aliquando divinae gloriae cum ipse simus (sitis) particeps," Grotius (so also Beza, Piscator, Calovius, Klee, Benecke, Glöckler), which is condemned by vv. 8, 9 ff. as opposed to the context. Comp. Phil. ii. 11; Eph. i. 12.

Vv. 8, 9. A more precise explanation—which furnishes a still more definite motive for compliance with the προσελαμβ. ἄλλη.—respecting ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβη. ἵμ. εἰς δόξ. Θεοῦ, first in respect of Jewish-Christians (ver. 8), and then of Gentile-Christians (ver. 9), and that in such a manner that the connection of the former with Christ appears as the fulfilment of their theocratic claim, but that of the latter as the enjoyment of grace;—a distinction so set forth, not from the Jewish-Christian narrowness of the author (Lucht), but designedly and ingeniously (comp. xi. 28, 29), in order to suggest to the Gentile-Christians greater esteem for their weaker Jewish brethren, and humility.

— λέγω γὰρ] I mean, namely, in order more particularly to explain myself respecting the προσελάβετο ἵμας κ.τ.λ.; otherwise in xii. 3. But comp. 1 Cor. i. 12; Gal. iv. 1, v. 16. Frequently thus in the Greek writers,—διάκονον γεγέν. περ. διάκ. 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. Comp. Matt. xx. 28, xv. 24. — ὑπέρ ἄληθ. Θεοῦ] more particularly explained at once by what follows; hence: for the sake of the truthfulness of God, in order

1 The contrast of Jewish and Gentile Christianity is so essentially and radically connected with the difference respecting the use of food, that it is wholly groundless to ascribe the treatment of that contrast in our passage to the supposed editor of the epistle (Lucht), who has worked up the Pauline portion of the letter, following xiv. 23, into conformity with a later, entirely altered state of things.
to justify and to demonstrate it through the realization of the hallowed promise given to the fathers; comp. 2 Cor. i. 20. Thus the προσελάβετο ὕμας in respect of the Jewish-Christians redounded eis δόξαν Θεοῦ; but it redounded to this quite otherwise in respect of the Gentile-Christians, ver. 9. — ὑπὲρ ἀληθοῦς contrast to ὑπὲρ ἀληθ. Θεοῦ, ver. 8: on behalf of mercy, i.e. for mercy, which God has evinced towards them by His making them joint partakers in redemption. The references of ὑπὲρ in the two cases are thus not alike. — δοξάσαι, ordinarily understood as dependent on λέγω, may neither denote: have praised (namely, at their adoption), as Reiche, Rückert, de Wette, Bisping would explain it, which not merely introduces an irrelevant idea, but also runs counter to the usage of the aorist infinitive (even 2 Cor. vi. 1, see in loc.); nor: have to praise (Tholuck, Philippi, and most), for there is no mention of a duty according to the parallelism of the two verses, since λέγω γὰρ has not here the sense of commanding (see on xii. 3, ii. 22); nor, finally, is it an infinitive without reference to time (I say, that the Gentiles praise), as Winer, p. 311 f. [E. T. p. 417], and Fritzche, after the Vulgate, Luther, and others, take it, which would have required the present infinitive, because λέγω does not here express the notion of willing, hoping, and the like (see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 749), but simply that of affirming with statement of the object. Moreover, the aorist infinitive necessarily leads to this, that δοξάσαι is parallel to the preceding βεβαιώσασαι, and consequently is not governed by λέγω at all, but is connected with eis τὰ, as Castalio and Beza have rightly perceived; comp. also Bengel ("glorificarent") and van Hengel. Hence: "in order that He might ratify the promises of the fathers, but that the Gentiles, on behalf of mercy, might praise God." The former, namely, ὑπὲρ ἀληθελας Θεοῦ eis τὰ βεβαιώσασαι κ.τ.λ., was the proximate design of Christ's having become minister of the circumcised; and the more remote design, which was to be attained through the passing of salvation from the Jews to the Gentiles (comp. Gal. iii. 14), consisted in this, that on the other hand the Gentiles should praise God on account of mercy. Incorrectly, Hofmann takes δοξάσαι as optative:

ROM. II.
Paul wishes that the Gentiles, etc. In this way the εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ, ver. 7, would be something which was still only to set in, although it had set in long ago (comp. ix. 24, 25, and see xv. 16–24). Without ground, Hofmann imports into the simple τὰ ἔθνη the idea of "the Gentile world as a whole;" it can in fact according to the context denote only the Gentile portion of those, whom Christ προσελάβερα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ.— Observe, moreover, how logically correct is the contrast of ὑπὲρ ἰδιωτ. and ὑπὲρ ἰδέας (in opposition to Olshausen, Fritzsche); for although God had promised the future πρόσληψις of the Gentiles also (in the prophets), He nevertheless cannot have promised it to the Gentiles themselves, as He has given the Messianic promise to the Jews themselves and chosen them for His people, in accordance with which, He, by virtue of His truthfulness, was bound to His word, and consequently the Jews, not the Gentiles, were de jure the children in terms of the covenant and heirs of the kingdom; comp. ix. 4, 5; Acts iii. 25; see also Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 397. — καθὼς γέγρα. This praising by the Gentiles takes place in conformity with (as a fulfilment of) Ps. xviii. 50, which passage is quoted after the LXX. The historical subject of the passage, David, is a type of Christ; hence neither the Gentile-Christian (Fritzsche), nor the apostle of the Gentiles as the organ of Christ (Hofmann, comp. Reiche), nor any messenger of salvation generally to the Gentile world (Philippi), is in the sense of the apostle the subject of the fulfilment of the prophecy, but only Christ can be so. The latter says to God that He, as present among the Gentiles (whom He has made His own through their conversion), will magnify Him. This, however, is a plastic representation of the praise of the Gentiles themselves, which in fact takes place ἐν ἄνωματι κυρίου Ἰσχοῦ and δὲ αὐτῶν (Col. iii. 17). Comp. already Augustine: "tibi per me confitebantur gentes." Bengel aptly says: "Quod in psalmo Christus dicit se facturum, id Paulus gentes ait facere; nempe Christus fact in gentibus, Heb. ii. 12." — διὰ τοῦτο included as a constituent part of the citation, but without reference to the matter in hand in Paul's text. — εἰ δὲ νεωτ.] to whom He, through the Spirit, by means of the preaching of the gospel has come, and has placed
them in communion with Himself.—As to εἰςομολογ. with the
dative, comp. on xiv. 11. It presupposes, as well as γὰλω
and the corresponding verbs, vv. 10, 11, the divine ἔλεος,
which had been vouchsafed to the Gentiles, as motive.

Ver. 10. Πάλαι] Again, namely, in another passage con-
taining the same thing. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 20; Matt. iv. 7,
v. 33. — λέγετι] sc. ἡ γραφή, which is to be taken from
γέγραπται, ver. 9. — The passage is Deut. xxxii. 43, closely
following the LXX., who, however, probably following another
reading (ὡς ἐκαίνιν in Kennicott), deviate from the Hebrew.1

Ver. 11. Ps. cxvii. 1 (closely following the LXX., but see
the critical notes) contains a twofold parallel summons to the
praise of God, addressed to all Gentile peoples.2 In this case
ἀλείψ and ἐπαναλέιψ are not different in degree (Philippi),
but only in form, like praise and bepraise [loben and beloben].

Ver. 12. Isa. xi. 10, with omission of ἐν τῷ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ
after ἔσται, literally after the LXX., who, however, translate
the original inaccurately. The latter runs: "And it comes to
pass at that day, that after the root-shoot of Jesse, which stands
as a banner of peoples (Ἰφιστάτησιν), Gentiles shall inquire;" see
Umbreit in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 553, and the explana-
tion in reference thereto, p. 880 f.; Drechsler and Delitzsch,
in loc. But the words of the LXX., as Paul has quoted them,
run as follows: "There shall be the root-shoot of Jesse and (i.e.

1 The original, according to the present reading, does not mean: "Rejoice, ye
tribes, His people" (de Wette and others; comp. Luther: "all ye who are His
people"), since γῆ cannot denote the tribes of the Jewish people; but, as the
Hiphil מִצְרֵי allows, either with the Vulgate: "laudate, gentes, populum ejus" (so
p. 219 f.); or: "make to shout for joy, ye Gentiles, His people," which, how-
ever, does not fit the connection; or (with Aquila and Theodotion, comp.
Hofmann), Shout for joy, ye Gentiles, ye who are His people. The latter is to be
preferred, because מִצְרֵי in the sense of Kal, in the few passages where it is so
found, is not joined with the accusative, but either is joined with the dative
(?)—as Ps. lxxxii. 2—or stands absolutely (Ps. xxxii. 11).

2 The Messianic fulfilment of this summons is recognised by Paul in the magni-
fying of God on the part of the Gentiles converted to Christ from all nations.
This fulfilment he looks upon already as present (for see ver. 7), not merely as a
fact of the future, "when the Gentile world as a united whole" magnifies God
(Hofmann).
and indeed, explanatory) He who arises (raises himself) to rule over Gentiles; on Him shall Gentiles hope." This passage and its entire connection are Messianic, and that indeed in so far as the idea is therein expressed, that the promised descendant of David, the ideal of the theocratic king, will extend His kingdom over Gentiles also, and will be the object of their desire (according to the LXX. and Paul: of their believing hope). This prophecy likewise Paul sees fulfilled through the magnifying of the divine mercy by the already converted Gentiles (vv. 7, 9). Observe that ἐθνῶν and ἐθνη are without the article, and hence do not denote "the Gentile world" (Hofmann). — ἡ πέτα is here, according to the Heb. שׁלֶש, the root-shoot; comp. Ecclus. xlvii. 22; Rev. v. 5, xxii. 6; 1 Macc. i. 10; Ecclus. xl. 15. He is the root-shoot of Jesse, because Jesse is the root from which He springs, as the ancestor of the Messianic king, David, Jesse's son, sprang from it. This descendant of Jesse is the Messiah (comp. Isa. xi. 1, liii. 2), who (according to the original text) is a banner for peoples, and consequently their leader and ruler. Christ has entered on this dominion at His exaltation, and He carries it out by successive stages through the conversion of the Gentiles. — εἰς ἀνεμόνῃ of the resting of hope upon Him (Hemsterh. ad Xen. Ερίκ. p. 128), 1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17; LXX. Isa. xlii. 4. Comp. πιστεύων ἐν αἰωνίοι, ix. 33, x. 11. The contents of the hope is the attainment of eternal salvation, which will be fulfilled in them at the Parousia.

Ver. 13. As vv. 1-4 passed into a blessing (vv. 5, 6), so now the hortatory discourse, begun afresh in ver. 7, passes into a blessing (δέ), which forms, at the same time, the close of the entire section (from chap. xiv. onwards). — ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀνεμώνῃς God, who produces the hope (of eternal glory), namely, through His Spirit; see the closing words of the verse. This description of God (comp. on ver. 5) attaches itself formally to ἀνεμώνῃς, ver. 12, but rests upon the deeper substantive reason, that the becoming filled with joyfulness and peace here wished for is not possible without having hope as its basis,

1 An attachment which, since ἡμᾶς then addresses the church, does not suit the view which holds the latter to be a Jewish-Christian one (Mangold).
and that, on the other hand, this becoming filled produces the
rich increase of hope itself (eis tò περισσ. κ.τ.λ.). — πάσος
χαράς κ.τ.λ.] with all, i.e. with highest joyfulness. Comp.
Theile, ad Iac. p. 8; Wunder, ad Soph. Phil. 141 f. χαρά
and eipήνη (peace through concord), as xiv. 17. — ἐν τῷ
πιστεύων] in the believing, to which without χαρά and eipή
the fruits would be wanting, and without which no χαρά and
eipή could exist. Comp. xiv. 17. — eis tò περισσ. κ.τ.λ.]
Aim of the πληρώσας κ.τ.λ.: in order that ye, in virtue of
the power (working in you) of the Holy Spirit, may be abundant
in hope, may cherish Christian hope in the richest measure
(comp. 1 Cor. xv. 58; 2 Cor. viii. 7; Phil. i. 9; Col. ii. 7).

Vv. 14—33. The apostle has now come to an end with all
the instructions and exhortations, which he intended to impart
to the Romans. Hence he now adds, up to ver. 33, an
epilogue (which, however, he then follows up in chap. xvi. with
commendations, greetings, etc.). In this epilogue, which in
substance corresponds to the introduction, i.e. 8—16, and by no
means applies only to the section respecting the weak in faith
(Melanchthon, Grotius), but to the whole epistle, he testifies
his good confidence towards the readers, and justifies his in a
partial degree bold writing by his Gentile-apostolic calling (vv.
14-16) and working (vv. 17—21), which latter had also been
usually the hindrance to his coming personally to Rome (ver. 22).
This observation leads him to his present plan of travel, the
execution of which will bring him, in the course of his intended
journey to Spain, to Rome, after he has been at Jerusalem
(vv. 23—29). For this impending journey he finally begs the
prayers of the Romans on his behalf (vv. 30—33), and then
concludes with a blessing (ver. 33).

Ver. 14. Πέπεσμας δέ] but I am of the conviction; viii. 38,
xiv. 14. The δέ is the simple μεταβατικόν, leading over to
the concluding portion of the epistle. — καὶ αὐτῶς ἐγώ] et ipse

1 According to Lucht, vv. 14—33 contain much that is Pauline and various
matters historically correct, but also incorrect statements, and, on the whole, a
non-Pauline tendency. The parallels with passages in the Epistles to the
Corinthians are to be explained simply by dependence on the latter, etc., p. 185 ff.
These are self-deceptions of a fanciful criticism, against which it is vain to
contend.
ego; comp. on vii. 25. The apostle is, independently of the general advantageous estimation in which the Roman church stood with others (i. 8), also for his own personal part of the conviction, etc. The emphasis lies on αὐτός. If the thought were: “even I, who have hitherto so unreservedly exhorted you” (Philippi, comp. de Wette, Fritzsche, and older interpreters), ἐγώ would have the emphasis (comp. καὶ ἐγώ αὐτός, Acts x. 26); but καὶ αὐτός corresponds entirely to the following καὶ αὐτός, ἐπίσης, i.e. even without first of all requiring influence, exhortation, etc., on the part of others. Comp. afterwards καὶ ἀλλήλους. Thus, accordingly, Paul denotes by καὶ αὐτός ἐγώ the autonomy of his judgment, but with a subtle indication of the judgment of others as coinciding therewith. Comp. Bengel: “Non modo alii hoc de vobis existimant.” Paul intends therewith to obviate the idea as if he for his part judged less favourably of the church, with reference to the fact, not that he had written this letter generally (Hofmann), but that he had written it in part τολμηρότερον. This is shown by the contrast, ver. 15.— ἀγαθωσινής] goodness, excellence generally (that you also of yourselves are very excellent people), not equivalent to χρηστότης (as Thom. Mag. p. 391 states), not even in Gal. v. 22. Comp. 2 Thess. i. 11; Eph. v. 9; Eccles. ix. 18. The word is not found in the Greek writers.—The three predicates, μεστόι κ.τ.λ., advance in co-ordination from the general to the particular. — καὶ ἀλλήλης] also to admonish you among one another, without having need for a third, who should admonish you. On νοοθετεῖν, in which the notion of its being well-meant, though not involved in the word of itself, is given by the connection or (as in Isocr. de pace, 72) by express contrast, see on 1 Cor. xiv. 14, Eph. vi. 4. Paul does not express in this verse something more than he strictly means (Reiche), but that which he really believes of the Roman church, taken as a whole; at which favourable conviction he—apart from the universally-diffused good report of the church (i. 8)—has arrived by means of experiences unknown to us, and perhaps also in virtue of his feeling assured that he might draw from the individuals and influential persons with whom he was acquainted a conclusion
respecting the whole. But the fact that he does express it,—this commendation,—rests on his apostolic truth, and on that wisdom of teaching which by good and real confidence attracts a zeal of compliance.

Ver. 15. More boldly, however (than so good a confidence appears to imply), I wrote to you in part, etc. "Quasi dicit: ἀπείροντα καὶ αὐτῶν ὄφρων," Grotius. — τολμηρότερον adverbially, Thuc. iv. 126. 3; Polyb. i. 17. 7; Lucian, Icarom. 10. The comparative sense is not to be obliterated (Bernhardy, p. 433; Winer, p. 228 [E. T. p. 304]), but may not be derived from the lesser right of the apostle to write to a church not founded by him (Hofmann); comp. Bengel, who introduces the further idea: "cum potius ipsius ventris deberebem." It must, in fact, especially seeing that the more precise definition ἀπὸ μέρους is added, be necessarily a specification of the mode, expressing the how of the ἔγραφα. The repetition of ἀδελφοί flows from the earnestness of feeling. Comp. 1 Cor. i. 10, 11; Gal. v. 11, 13; Jaa. v. 7, 9, 10. — ἀπὸ μέρους belongs not merely to τολμ. ("paulo liberius," Grotius, following the Peschito), but, as its position shows, to τολμ. ἔγραφα together: partly, i.e. in particular places, I wrote more boldly. This refers to passages like vi. 12 ff., 19, viii. 9, xi. 17 ff., xii. 3, xiii. 3 ff., 13, 14, xiv. 3, 4, 10, 13, 15, 20, xv. 1, et al. In ἀπὸ μέρους is implied the contrast, that he has not written τολμηρότερον all that he has written (comp. xi. 26; 2 Cor. i. 14), but only a part thereof. Hofmann has now exchanged his earlier incorrect view, "provisionally and in the meantime" (Schriftbew. II. 2, p. 95), for another also incorrect (similarly Th. Schott), namely piecemeal, in contrast to a complete exposition of Christian truth, thus equivalent to ἐκ μέρους, 1 Cor. xiii. 10 (not also in 1 Cor. xii. 27). Besides, this arbitrarily imported contrast would suit no epistle less than the Epistle to

1 This lesser right is assumed quite without warrant. Paul certainly wrote to other churches of Gentiles not founded by him (Colossians, Laodiceans); and how could he, as the apostle of the Gentiles, be of opinion that he thereby was taking any special liberty? He had to glorify his office (xi. 13), in doing which his care for all churches (2 Cor. xi. 28) certainly suggested no limitation of epistolary intercourse to such as he himself had founded, as if it were a boldness in him needing excuse, when he also wrote to others.
the Romans, which treats the whole gospel in the most complete manner. According to Lucht, the expression in this passage is only the product of a post-apostolic effort to wipe away the "bad impression" of the epistle on the highly esteemed church, which had in fact been founded by Peter (comp. Theodore of Mopsuestia). — ὁς ἐπανάμιμησεν ἡμᾶς] as again reminding you,¹ i.e. in the way and manner of one who reminds you, etc. See Bernhardy, p. 476; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 263; Kühner, II. 2, p. 649 f.; 1 Thess. ii. 4; Heb. xiii. 17. ἐπανάμιμησεν denotes in memoriam revocare. See Plat. Legg. iii. p. 688 A; Dem. 74. 7. Comp. ἐπανάμιμησα, Dion. Hal. Rhet. x. 18. Theodore of Mopsuestia: εἰς ἒπόμενον ἑγεμ. ἐν μεταβολή. — διὰ τὴν χάρ. i.e. in order to comply with the apostolic office, with which God has favoured me. See ver. 16.

Ver. 16. Εἰς τὸ ἐκαίνις κτ.λ.] Specification of the object aimed at in τὴν δοθεῖσαν μοι ἢ τ. Θε. — λειτουργήσας] Comp. on xiii. 6. Paul sets forth the service of his apostolic office, in the consciousness of its hallowed dignity, not merely as a public οἰκονομία (Ewald: "steward of the people"), but as a priestly service of offering, in which Ἡσυχ. X. expresses the λειτουργία as ordained by Christ. That Christ should be conceived of as He to whom the offering is presented (Reiche), is contrary to the conception of offering, which always refers to God as the receiver of it. Comp. xii. 1; Eph. v. 2; Phil. ii. 17. But neither is Christ to be conceived of (as by Bengel and Rückert) as high priest (a conception not of Paul, but rather of the Epistle to

¹ In opposition to Baur's erroneous explanation of ἐπανάμιμησεν, "further there is to remind," and its reference to what follows, see Mangold, p. 69, who, however, on his part, in virtue of the assumption of the Jewish-Christian character of the church, limits the ἀντί προς arbitrarily to those portions of the epistle (especially chap. ix. and x.) in which, in the interest of the Gentile-Christian apostolate, Jewish-Christian pretensions had been combated. It is just such entirely doctrinal discussions as chap. ix. x. which answer least to the character of ἔπαμεν, which presupposes the ready possibility of offence being given. The exculpation implied in ver. 15 is not calculated for a Jewish-Christian church (Mangold, p. 72), but rather for a church as yet strange to the apostle and held in very good repute, towards which he felt himself not in a like relation as e.g. to the Galatians and Corinthians, but in one more delicate and calling for more forbearance. Artfully and gently, too, is the ὁς ἐπανάμιμησεν κτ.λ. added, as if what was written ἔπαμεν was only meant to be a help to their memory. Ἐπαναμεθρίτως ἐπὶ ἱερί ἐκμακροθηκὼς φρονίμως ἀπελευθέρως, Plat. Legg. v. p. 732 R.
the Hebrews, and applying to Christ as the sole Atoner, in which case the idea of inferior priests is out of place), but as Lord and Ruler of the church, who has appointed His apostle, i. 5. Lucht oddly thinks that the writer did not venture to call Paul, in consequence of his disputed position, ἀπόστολος, but only λειτουργός. — εἰς τὰ ἔθνη] in reference to the Gentiles; for these, as converted by the apostle, are to form the offering to be presented. — In the sequel, ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εἰαργα. τ. Θεοῦ contains the more precise explanation of λειτουργ. Ι. X., and τὰ γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν κ.τ.λ. that of εἰς τὰ ἔθνη; hence the latter belongs not to ἱερουργ. (Th. Schott, Hofmann), but to what precedes, and is not (with Buttmann) to be omitted on the authority of B. — ἱερουργ. τὸ εἰαργα. τ. Θεοῦ] in priestly fashion administering the gospel of God, i.e. “administrans evang. a Deo missum hominibus, eoque ministerio velut sacerdoto fungens,” Estius; comp. Chrysostom, Erasmus, and most older interpreters, also Rückert, Tholuck, Fritzsche, de Wette, Philippi. This usage of ἱερουργ. is confirmed by passages like Herodian. v. 3. 16; Joseph. Antt. vi. 6. 2; also by 4 Macc. vii. 8, where ἵσσειν ἄμαρται is to be connected with ἱερουργοῦντας τῶν νόμων (in opposition to Hofmann, who will not admit the priestly notion in the word), not with ἅπεραστικώντας (see Grimm, Handb. p. 329 f.); comp. Suicer, Thes. s.v.; Kypke in loc.; also ἱερουργός, Callim. fr. 450; ἱερουργημα, Joseph. Antt. viii. 4. 5; ἱερουργυλα, 4 Macc. iv. 1; Plat. Legg. p. 774 E; Pollux, i. 29. Without warrant, Hofmann insists on adhering to the conception of “administering holy service.” The gospel is not indeed the offering (Luther and others), which is presented, but the divine institute, which is administered—is in priestly fashion served—by the presenting of the offering. As to εἰαργα. Θεοῦ, see on i. 1. — ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν] the offering of the Gentiles, i.e. the offering which the Gentiles are, Heb. x. 10; Eph. v. 2. The Gentiles converted, and through the Spirit consecrated as God’s property, are the offering which Paul, as the priest of Jesus Christ, has brought to God. Observe, however, the stress laid on the prefixed γένηται: in order that there may prosper (see on this use of γίνεσθαι as regards offerings, Kühner, ad Xen. Anal. vi. 4. 9), in
accordance with which εὐπρόσφ. is then attributive (as well-pleasing), and ἄγαμος ὑπ. τ. ἁγ. is subordinated to the latter as its ground: sanctified through the Holy Spirit, which is received through the gospel in baptism, Gal. iii. 2, 5; Tit. iii. 5; Eph. v. 26. A contrast to the ceremonial consecration of the Levitical offerings. Comp. xii. 1.

Ver. 17. How readily might what was said in ver. 16 carry with it the appearance of vain self-boasting! To obviate this, the apostle proceeds: I have accordingly (in pursuance of the contents of ver. 16) the boasting (ἡν καίχησιν, see the critical notes) in Christ Jesus in respect of my relation to God; i.e., my boasting is something which, by virtue of my connection with Christ (whose λειτουργός I am, ver. 16), in my position towards God (for I administer God's gospel as an offering priest, ver. 16), properly belongs to me. The ἐγώ is prefixed with emphasis: it does not fail me, like a something which one has not really as a possession but only ventures to ascribe to himself; then follows with ἐν Χ. Ἰ. and τὰ πρ. τ. Θ., a twofold more precisely defined character of this ethical possession, excluding everything selfish.⁰ Accordingly, we are not to explain as though ἐν Χ. Ἰ. bore the main stress and it ran ἐν Χριστῷ οὖν τὴν καίχησιν ἐγώ κ.τ.λ. (which is Fritzsche's objection to the reading τὴν καίχησιν); and καίχησις is neither here nor elsewhere equivalent to καίχημα (materies gloriandi), but is gloriation (comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 31), and the article marks the definite self-boasting concerned, which Paul makes (vv. 16, 18). Reiche connects ἐν Χ. with τ. καίχησιν, so that τὰ καυχάσθαι ἐν Χ. is to be explained as the boasting oneself of Christ (of the aid of Christ). Comp. also Ewald. Admissible linguistically, since the construction καυχάσθαι ἐν (v. 3, ii. 17, 23; Phil. iii. 3) allowed the annexation without the article; but at variance with the sequel, where what is shown is not the right to boast of the help of Christ (of this there is also in ver. 16 no mention), but this, that Paul will never boast himself otherwise than as simply the instrument of Christ, that he thus has Christ only to thank for the καυχάσθαι, only through Him is in the

¹ Not exactly specially "the consciousness of superior knowledge or singular spirituality," Hofmann. Comp. generally 1 Cor. xv. 10.
position to boast. — τὰ πρὸς τ. Θεόν] Comp. Heb. ii. 17, v. 1. Semler and Rückert take the article in a limiting sense: at least before God. But the "at least" is not expressed (τὰ γε πρ. τ. Θ., or πρὸς γε τ. Θ., or τὰ πρ. τ. Θ. γε), and Paul has indeed actually here and elsewhere frequently boasted before men, and with ample warrant, of his sacred calling.—We may add that this whole assertion of his calling, vv. 17-21, so naturally suggested itself to the apostle, when he was on the point of extending his activity to Rome and beyond it to the extreme west of the Gentile world, that there is no sufficient ground for seeking the occasion of it in the circumstances and experiences of the Corinthian church at that time (so especially Rückert, comp. also Tholuck and Philippi); especially since it is nowhere indicated in our epistle (not even in xvi. 17), that at that time (at a later epoch it was otherwise, Phil. i. 15 ff.) anti-Pauline efforts had occurred in Rome, such as had emerged in Corinth. See Introd. § 3.

Ver. 18. Negative confirmation of what is asserted in ver. 17. The correct explanation is determined partly by the connection, to be carefully observed, of οὐ with καταργ., partly by the order of the words, according to which οὐ καταργάσατο must have the emphasis, not Χριστός (Theodoret and others, including Calovius, Olshausen, Fritzsche, Tholuck). Hence: "for I will not (in any given case) embolden myself to speak about any of those things (to boast of anything from the sphere of that) which Christ has not brought about through me, in order to make the Gentiles obedient to Him, by means of word and work." That is, affirmatively expressed: for I will venture to let myself be heard only as to such things, the actual fulfilment of which has taken place by Christ through me, etc.; I will therefore never pride myself on anything which belongs to the category of those things, which have not been put into execution by Christ through me.¹ This would be an untrue

¹ The objection of Hofmann: "The non-actual forms no collective whole, as a constituent element of which a single thing might be conceived," is a mere empty subtlety. Had Paul, e.g., boasted that Christ had wrought many conversions through him when he was in Athens, he would have spoken about something which would have been a single instance out of the category of the non-actual, namely, of that which Christ has not wrought. The view of Hofmann
speaking of results, as if the Lord had brought them about through me—which nevertheless had not taken place. — eis ἐντακ. ἐθνῶν] namely, through the adoption of faith in Him; comp. i. 5.— λόγῳ κ. ἔργῳ] applies to κατεργά. . . . ἐθνῶν.

Ver. 19. In virtue of what powers Christ, by means of word and work, has wrought through the apostle as His organ: (1) ἐν δύναμι. σημείων κ. τερ.—this refers back to έργῳ; (2) ἐν δυν. πνεύματος,—this applies to λόγῳ and ἔργῳ together, and is co-ordinated to the above ἐν δυν. σημ. κ. τερ., not subordinated, as Beza, Glöckler, and others think, whereby the language would lose its simplicity and half of its import (the δύναμις πνεύμα would pass into the background). According to Hofmann, who reads in ver. 20 φιλοτιμοῦμαι (see the critical notes), a new sentence is meant to begin with λόγῳ κ. ἔργῳ, the verb of which would be πιστουπέρ. This yields, instead of the simple course of the language, a complicated structure of sentence which is in nowise indicated by Paul himself, as he has not written ἐν λόγῳ κ. ἔργῳ (conformably to the following). Besides, the εἰσαγγελίζωσθαι by word and deed (thus the preaching through deeds), would be a modern conception foreign to the N. T. The ἔργα accompany and accredit the preaching (John x. 38, xiv.11), but they do not preach. Comp. Luke xxiv. 19; Acts vii. 22; 2 Cor. x. 11. If πιστουπέρ is to be read, then with Lachmann a new sentence is to be begun with ver. 20, so that all that precedes remains assigned to the efficiency of Christ, which is not the case with the view of Hofmann, although it is only in entire keeping with the language of humility which Paul here uses. The genitives are those of derivation: power, which went forth from signs and wonders (which Paul, as instrument of Christ, has performed), and power, which went forth from the (Holy) Spirit (who was communicated to the apostle through Christ) upon the minds of men. Comp. on ἐν δυν. πνεύμα, 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5.—

himself amounts to the sense, that the apostle wished to set aside all his own, which was not a work of Christ performed through him, with the object of converting the Gentiles. But thus, through the contrast of his own and the work of Christ, the emphasis would be transposed, resting now on ἄρτις, as if it ran ἢ ἐν ἄρτις αὐθεντ. ἐν ἀντὶ.
CHAP. XV. 19.

σημεῖα κ. τέρατα] not different in substance; both miracles, both also denoting their significant aspect. See Fritzsche, p. 270 f. The collocation corresponds to the Heb. וְיָשָׁר מִין, hence usually (the converse only in Acts ii. 22, 43, vi. 8, vii. 36, comp. ii. 19) σημεῖα stands first, and where only one of the two words is used, it is always σημεῖα, because מִין was the striking word giving more immediately the character of the thing designated. Contrary to the constant usage of the N. T., Reiche understands not outward miraculous facts, but mental miracles, which the preaching of the gospel has produced in the hearts of the newly-converted. Even 2 Cor. xii. 12 is not to be thus understood; see in loc. Miracles belonged to the σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου (2 Cor. i.e.), hence there is already of itself motive enough for their mention in our passage, and there is no need for the precarious assumption of a reference to pseudo-apostolic jugglers in Rome (Ewald). — εν δυνάμ. πνεύμ. ἀγ.] is related, not “awkwardly” (Hofmann), to διὸν οὐ κατειργ. Χριστός; for Christ has, for the sake of His working to be effected through the apostle (δι' ἐμοῦ), given to him the Spirit. Very unnecessarily, and just as inappropriately,—since we must comprise all the preceding elements,—Hofmann forces εν δυν. πν. ἀγ., by means of an hyperbaton, into special connection with ὅστε. — ὅστε κ.τ.λ.] Result, which this working of Christ through Paul has had in reference to the extension of Christianity. — ἄπος Ἰερουσαλ. From this spot, where Paul first entered the apostolical fellowship, Acts ix. 26 ff. (he had already previously worked three years, including the sojourn in Arabia, at Damascus; see on Gal. i. 17, 18), he defines the terminus a quo, because he intends to specify the greatest extension of his working in space (from south-east to northwest).¹ — καὶ κύκλῳ enlarges the range of the terminus a quo:

¹ Yet he does not say “from Arabia” (Gal. i. e.), because it was very natural for him significantly to place the beginning at that spot where all the other apostles had begun their work and the apostolic church itself had arisen—in doing which, however, he, by adding καὶ κύκλῳ, does nothing to the prejudice of history. The less is there to be found in ἄπος Ἰερουσαλ, an inconsistency with the statements of the Epistle to the Galatians. This in opposition to Lucht, who sees also in μετὰ τ. Ἰερουσ., an incorrect statement, and attributes to both points a special design.
and round about, embracing not merely Judaea, but, in correspondence to the magnitude of the measure of length, Arabia and Syria also. Of course, however, κύκλῳ is not included in the dependence on ἐπὶ, but stands in answer to the question Where? inasmuch as it adds to the statement from whence the working took place, the notice of the local sphere, which had been jointly affected by that local beginning as its field of action: from Jerusalem, and in a circuit round, Paul has fulfilled the gospel as far as Illyria. Flacius, Calovius, Paulus, Glöckler, following Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others, refer κύκλῳ to the arc which Paul described in his journey from Jerusalem by way of Syria, Asia, Troas, Macedonia, and Greece to Illyria. According to this, κύκλῳ would specify the direction in which he, starting from Jerusalem, moved forward. So also Hofmann. This direction would be that of a curve. But κύκλῳ never denotes this, and is never merely the opposite of straight out, but always circumcirca (comp. Judith i. 2; Mark iii. 34, vi. 6, 36; Luke ix. 12; Rev. iv. 6; very frequently in the Greek writers); and the addition, “and in the arc of a circle,” would have been very superfluous and indeed like an empty piece of ostentation, seeing that in truth the straight direction from Jerusalem to Illyria passes for the most part through water. No reason also would be discoverable for Paul’s adding the καί, and not merely writing κύκλῳ, in order to express: from Jerusalem in a circular direction as far as Illyria.—μὴ χρη τοῦ Ἰλλυρ.] The idea that Paul, as has recently been for the most part assumed, did not get to Illyria at all, but only to the frontier of this western region during a Macedonian bye-journey, throws upon him an appearance of magnifying his deeds, for which the silence of the Acts of the Apostles, furnishing, as it does, no complete narrative, supplies no warrant. Now, since in ver. 23 Illyria may not, without arbitrariness, be excluded from the regions where he has already laboured, because this country would otherwise have still afforded scope for labour, we must assume that Paul had really made an intermediate journey to Illyria. From what starting-point, cannot indeed be shown; hardly so soon as Acts xviii. 11, but possibly during the journey mentioned in Acts xx. 1–3
(see Anger, temp. rat. p. 84), so that his short sojourn in Illyria took place not long before his sojourn in Achaia, where he at Corinth wrote the Epistle to the Romans. Tit. iii. 12 can only be employed in confirmation of this by those who assume the authenticity of the Epistle to Titus, and its composition thus early (see Wieseler, Philippi). — \( \text{παραγόντας τὸ εὐαγγ. τ. Χ.} \) have brought to fulfilment (comp. Col. i. 25) the gospel of Christ. This \( \text{παραγόντας} \) 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. Analogous is the conception: \( \text{ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦξανε}, \) Acts vii. 7, xii. 24, xix. 20. So long as the news of salvation has not yet reached its full and destined diffusion, it is still in the course of growth and increase; but when it has reached every quarter, so that no place any longer remains for the labour of the preacher (ver. 23), it has passed from the state of growing increase into the full measure of its dimensions. This view of the sense is alone strictly textual (see ver. 23), while closely adhering to the literal signification of \( \text{εὐαγγ.} \), which denotes the message itself, not the act of proclamation (Th. Schott, Mangold); and hence excludes the many divergent interpretations, namely: (1) That of Beza, Piscator, Grotius, Bengel, de Wette, Rückert, in substance also Köllner, Tholuck, van Hengel, and permissively, Reiche, that \( \text{εὐαγγ.} \) is equivalent to \( \text{munus prædicandi evang.} \), which it does not mean; similarly Ewald: the executed commission of preaching. (2) That of Luther, Flacius, Castalio, and others: "that I have fulfilled everything with the gospel," which is opposed to the words as they stand, although repeated by Baur. (3) That of Theophylact, Erasmus, and others, including Reiche and Olshausen: \( \text{πράγμα τὸ εὐαγγ.} \) denotes completely to proclaim the gospel. But the "completely" would in fact have here no relevant weight at all (such as at Acts xx. 27); for that Paul had not incompletely preached the gospel, was understood of itself. Others arbitrarily take it otherwise still, e.g. Calvin: "praedicationem ev. quasi supplendo diffundere; coeperunt enim alii priores, sed ipse longius sparsit;" Krehl: that I have put the gospel into force and validity; Philippi: that I have realized the
gospel, have introduced it into life (the gospel appearing as empty, before it is taught, accepted, understood); Hofmann, with comparison of the not at all analogous expression πληρῶν τὸν νόμον: the message of salvation misses its destination, if it remain unproclaimed—whereby πληρῶν would be reduced simply to the notion of κηρύσσειν.—The whole of the remark, ver. 19 f., connected with ver. 24, is to be explained, according to Baur, I. p. 307, simply from the intention (of the later writer) to draw here, as it were, a geographical line between two apostolic provinces, of which the one must be left to Peter. In opposition to such combinations, although Lucht still further elaborates them, it is sufficient simply to put into the scale the altogether Pauline character and emotional stamp of the language in vv. 19–33, in its inner truth, simplicity, and chasteness.

Vv. 20, 21. But prosecuting it as a point of honour to preach in this way, the oβρεω is now first negatively stated: not where Christ was named, then positively: but, agreeably to the word of Scripture, etc. Hence οὐχ ἢ στοι, not ἢ πον ὡκ. — φιλοτιμήσει, to prosecute anything so that one seeks one's honour in it, comp. 2 Cor. v. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 11; see Wetstein and Kypke. This full signification (not merely the more general one: zealously to prosecute) is to be maintained in all passages, including the classical ones, and admirably suits the context. The matter was a special point of honour with the apostle in his working;[1] 2 Cor. x. 15, 16. — ᾧνομάζεις] His name, as the contents of confession, has been named, namely, by preachers and confessors. See ver. 21. — ἰνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.] i.e., in order not simply to continue the work of conversion already begun by others. Comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10. The reason why Paul did not desire this, lay in the high consciousness of his apostolic destination (Acts xxvi. 17, 18), according to which he recognised the greatest and most difficult work, the founding of the church, as the task of the apostle, and found his apostolic honour in the solution of this task.[2]

[1] Lucht here conceives the writer to be dependent even on a mistaken understanding of 2 Cor. x. 15, 16.
[2] The objection of Baur, ii. p. 399, that in truth, if this had been really Paul's
Others, as Reiche, specify as the reason, that he had sought on account of his freer system of doctrine to avoid polemical controversies. This would be a principle of practical prudence, corresponding neither to the apostolical idea, nor to Paul's magnanimous character in following it out. — καθὼς γέρν.] Isa. lii. 15, closely cited after the LXX., who took υἱοί in each case as masculine. The passage runs according to the original: “What was never told to them, they see; and what they have never heard, they perceive;” and the subject is the kings, who become dumb before the glorified Servant of God, not the nations (Hengstenberg, Christol. II. p. 305; Philippi). But the actual state of the case—seeing that, along with the kings, their peoples also must see the glory of the Servant of God—allowed the apostle here to put the nations as the subject, the Gentile-peoples, to whom, through him, the Servant of God as yet unknown to them is made known, i.e. Jesus Christ, in whom the Messianic fulfilment of that prophetic idea concerning the Servant of God, as the ideal of Israel, had appeared realized.¹ — πρῶτα αὐτῶν] addition of the LXX. — διψεῦσα] they shall see, namely mentally, in knowledge and faith, it (that which the preaching now brings before them). — οὗ οἶκ θαῦμα.] namely, the news of Him (the gospel). — ἀναθέμαι] shall understand it (this news). Comp. Matt. xiii. 23, xv. 10.

Ver. 22. Διό] because, namely, my apostolic mode of working, just described (vv. 20, 21), did not yet permit me to depart from the districts mentioned, inasmuch as there was still work to do in founding. Comp. Beza: “dum huc et illuc avocor, interpellatus et ita prohibitus.” Incorrectly Bengel, Reiche, and others: because in Rome the foundation was laid by others. Ver. 23 is decisive against this. — τὰ principle, the Epistle to the Romans itself would stand in contradiction to it, is invalid, since that principle referred only to his working as present in person; whence he thought of visiting the Romans only as ἰδιωτικῶς (ver. 24), on his intended journey to Spain. But to address letters to a church of a Pauline stamp, which had nevertheless been founded by others, such as, in fact, he wrote to the Colossians and Laodiceans, was not excluded by the above principle, the point of which was rather the personal presence at the founding of churches, and the oral proclamation of salvation.

¹ Comp. Schultz, alttestam. Theol. II. p. 263 ff.
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πολλά] more than πολλάκις; i. 13 (πολλά): in the most cases (πλείστα, Plat. Hipp. maj. p. 281 B), as a rule, not "so often" (Th. Schott). The Vulgate renders correctly: plerumque. See Schaefer, ad Bos. Ell. p. 427; Ast, ad Plat. Legg. p. 62 f. Paul has had other hindrances also, but mostly such as had their ground in the above regulative principle of his working. Hofmann understands ἐνεκοττε, of external hindrances; so that Paul means that he, even if he would, could not come otherwise than in pursuance of that principle, to Rome (whither that principle did not lead him). This is in variance with the following νυν δὲ κ.τ.λ., which in μηκέτι τοπον ἑχων ἐν τ. κλ. τ. expresses the removal now of the hindrance meant by ἐνεκοττε. — τού ἔθεω] genitive dependent on the verb of hindering. See Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. i. 7. 20; Fritzsche, ad Matth. p. 845.

Vv. 23, 24. But since I have now no longer room (scope, i.e. opportunitatem, see on xii. 19; Kypke, II. p. 190) in these regions (from Jerusalem to Illyria, ver. 19). Paul had in all these countries founded churches, from which Christianity was now spreading through other teachers, and especially through his own disciples, over the whole; and consequently he considered his apostolic calling to be fulfilled in respect of the region mentioned. His further working was to belong to the far west, where Christ was not yet named; hence he meditated, in the next instance, transferring his activity in founding churches to Spain—a design, indeed, which Lucht denies that the apostle entertained, and imputes it to a later conception of his task, in accordance with which the plan of a journey to Spain was invented. Probably the comprehensive maxim, that

1 With the omission of ιευκτεναι σφέ ὕμα, after Ιουβαίος, and of γὰρ after ιαμά, (see the critical notes), the course of the passage flows on simply, so that νυν δὲ, ver. 23, is connected with ιαμά, and all that intervenes is parenthetical. If ιευκτεναι σφέ ὕμα only be struck out and the γὰρ be retained, with Lachmann, Hofmann, Tischendorf, 8, a striking interruption of the construction results. To parenthesize ιαμά γὰρ . . . ιαμά, (Lachmann, followed by Buttmann, i.e. p. 262, comp. also Hofmann) is not suitable to the contents of the continuation, ver. 25. Ewald extends the parentheses from ιαμά γὰρ even to ιαμά, ver. 27. But considering the entirely calm tenor of the whole passage, the probability of such large parentheses, with all their intermediate clauses, is just as slight as the probability of an anacoluthia (Tisch. 8).
he had no longer a sphere of activity where Christianity might be planted at the principal places of a district by his personal exertions, was connected with the expectation of the nearness of the Parousia, before which the πλήρωμα of the Gentiles, and in consequence of this also all Israel, had to be brought in (xi. 25). — ἐπιτροπή adv. not summum desiderium (Beza), but see on iv. 11. The word is not found elsewhere; but comp. ἐπιτρόπησε, 2 Cor. vii. 7. — τοῦ ἰδείω] genitive dependent on ἐπιτροπή. — ἀπὸ πολλὰ ἥτ.] now for many years; comp. Luke viii. 43. — ὡς ἄν] simulatque, so soon as. See on 1 Cor. xi. 34; Phil. ii. 23. It is a more precise definition to what follows, not to the preceding ἰδείω πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Hofmann), because otherwise Paul must have had in mind the plan of the journey to Spain for many years, which cannot be supposed either in itself or on account of Acts xvi. 9. This applies also against Tischendorf in his 8th edition. — Σπανίαν] The usual Greek name is Ἰβηρία (Herod. i. 163; Strabo, iii. 4. 17, p. 166), but Σπανία (although in the passages in Athenaeus and Diodorus Siculus the variation Ἰαυρία is found) was probably also not rare, and that as a Greek form (Casaubon, ad Athen. p. 574). The Roman form was Ἰταλία (1 Macc. viii. 3). It is the entire Pyrenaean peninsula. See Strabo, i.e. — That this project of a journey to Spain was not executed, see Introd. § 1. Primasius aptly remarks: "Pro miserat quidem, sed dispensante Deo non ambulavit." Already at Acts xx. 25 a quite different certainty was before the apostle's mind, and in his captivity he no longer entertained that plan of travel, Phil. ii. 24. — διατυποσκόμισε] "quia Romæ jam fundata est fides," Bengel. — ἄφι ημῶν] (see the critical notes): from you away. — προσεμφόρει ἐκεῖ] comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 2 Cor. i. 16, and on Acts xv. 3. As was his wont on his apostolical journeys, Paul hoped ("quasi pro jure suo," Bengel) to obtain an accompaniment on the part of some belonging to the church from Rome to Spain, by which we must understand an escort all the way thither, since Paul would without doubt travel by sea from Italy to Spain, the shortest and quickest way. ἐκεῖ, in the sense of ἐκεῖστε, according to a well-known attraction. See John xi. 8, et al.,
and on Matt. ii. 22.— "non quantum vellem, sed quantum licebit," Grotius. It is a limitation of compliment. Comp. Chrysostom. But the reservation of later complete enjoyment (Hofmann) is an idea imported: πρῶτον denotes in the first place (before I travel further), as Matt. vi. 33, vii. 5, viii. 21, and frequently.— ἐμπληθῶ] of spiritual satisfaction through the enjoyment of the longed-for personal intercourse (ὑμῶν). Comp. Hom. II. xi. 452; Kypke, II. p. 191. The commentary on this is given at i. 12.

Ver. 25. Νυνὶ δὲ is not, like the above νυνὶ δέ (ver. 23), to be regarded as resumptive, as Buttmann and Hofmann, in consequence of the reading ἐνηκοντομένη κ.τ.λ., ver. 24, take it,—a view with which what was previously said of the journey to Spain by way of Rome does not accord; and the passage itself assumes a very stiff, contorted form. Observe, rather, that the first νυνὶ δέ, ver. 23, was said in contrast to the past (ἐνηκοντομένη κ.τ.λ.), but that the second νυνὶ δέ, ver. 25, commencing a new sentence, is said in contrast to the promised future. "So I design and hope to do (as stated in ver. 24): but at present a journey to Jerusalem is incumbent upon me; after its accomplishment I shall then carry out that promised one by way of Rome to Spain (ver. 28)." This νυνὶ δέ is more definite than if Paul had said, "but beforehand" (which Hofmann with this view requires); for he thinks that now he is just on the point of travelling to Jerusalem, whereas "but beforehand" would admit a later term of the πορεύομαι. — διακονῶν τοῖς ἄγγελοῖς in service for the saints (Christians in Jerusalem), consequently not delaying the Romano-Spanish journey in his own interest. The present participle (not future, as Acts xxiv. 17, and see Bornemann, ad Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 17) designates the very travelling itself as part of the service. See Markland and Matthiae, ad Eur. Suppl. 154; Heindorf, ad Phaed. p. 249 f.; Dissen, ad Pind. p. 81.—The intention, ascribed to the apostle, of protecting himself in rear by the collection—

1 Hofmann imports the connection: The participial sentence, ver. 23, is intended to express, "under what circumstances Paul is now setting out on a journey to Jerusalem," instead of coming to Rome, whether he would otherwise at this time see himself destined and impelled. This is certainly not expressed.
journey, before he passed into the far west (Th. Schott), is a purely gratuitous assumption.

Ver. 26. More precise information respecting the ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων, is a purely gratuitous assumption. "Placuit enim Macedonia," etc. On εὐδοκ., they have been pleased, comp. Luke xii. 32; 1 Cor. i. 21; Gal. i. 15; Col. i. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 8. — κοινων. τινὰ τοιῆς κ.τ.λ. to bring about a participation, in reference to the poor, i.e. to make a collection for them. The contributor, namely, enters into fellowship with the person aided, in so far as he κοινωνεῖ ταῖς χρείαις αὐτοῦ, xii. 13; κοινωνία is hence the characteristic expression for almsgiving, without, however, having changed its proper sense communion into the active one of communication; "honesta et aequitatis plena appellatio," Bengel. Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 13; Heb. xiii. 16. The added τινὰ, of some sort or other, corresponds to the freedom from constraint, and the consequent indefiniteness, of the amount to be aimed at. On the collection itself, see 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff.; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Acts xxiv. 17. — τῶν πτωχῶν τῶν ἁγίων] the poor among the saints at Jerusalem. These were thus not all of them poor. Comp. Kühner, II. 1, p. 290. Of the community of goods there is no longer a trace in Paul. Philippi incorrectly holds that the πτωχοὶ τῶν ἁγίων are the poor saints generally. Since the genitive is in any case partitive (even in the passages in Matthiae, § 320, p. 791), the expression must at least have been τῶν (not τῶν) ἐν Ἱεροσολύμων.

Ver. 27. Information, why they did so, by way of more precisely defining the mere εὐδοκήσαν previously expressed.1 "They have been pleased, namely, to do it, and (this is the added element) their debtors they are." — The Gentiles have acquired a share (ἐκκοινωνήσαν) in the spiritual possession of the Christians of Jerusalem (αὐτῶν), in so far as the mother church of Christianity was in Jerusalem, so that thus the spiritual benefits of Christianity, which in the first instance were destined for and communicated to the Jews and subsequently passed over also to the Gentiles, have been diffused from Jerusalem forth over the Gentile world (which march of diffusion so begun continues), as indeed in Antioch itself the

1 "Est egregia împrejî simul cum ânumphîm," Grotius.
first church of Gentile Christianity was founded from Jerusalem (Acts xi. 20). — τοῖς πνευματικοῖς] for the benefits of Christianity (faith, justification, peace, love, hope, etc.) proceed from the Holy Spirit, are τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος δώρα: comp. on Eph. i. 3. — τοῖς σαρκικοῖς] for the earthly possessions concern the material and physical phenomenal nature of man, which is his bodily form of existence. Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 11. — The conclusion is a majori, which they have received, ad minus, with which they are under obligation to requite it. Comp. Chrysostom. By λειτουργήσας, Paul places the almsgiving of love under the sacred point of view of a sacrificial service (see on xiii. 6, xv. 16), which is performed for the benefit of the recipients. Comp. 2 Cor. ix. 12; Phil. ii. 30, ii. 25. — That farther, as Chrysostom, Calvin, Grotius, and many, including Rückert and Olshausen, assume, Paul intended “courteously and gently” (Luther) to suggest to the Romans that they should likewise bestow alms on those at Jerusalem, is very improbable, inasmuch as no reason is perceivable why he should not have ventured on a direct summons, and seeing, moreover, that he looked upon the work of collection as concluded, ver. 25. Without any particular design in view (Th. Schott thinks that he desired to settle the true relation between the Gentile Christians and the apostle to the Gentiles), he satisfies merely his own evident and warm interest.

Ver. 28. Τῶν] This work of service for Jerusalem. — ζ. σφραγίσας κ.τ.λ.] and when I shall have sealed to them this fruit, i.e. shall have confirmed the produce of the κοινωνία, ver. 26, to them, secured it as their property. ἥσσαφραγίζοντας in the figurative sense: to confirm, to ratify (see on John iii 33); for by delivery of the moneys they were, on the part of the apostle, confirmed to the recipients as the fruit collected for them, after the manner of the law of possession, as with seal impressed.¹

¹ The act of handing over itself, namely, was the σφραγίς of the collection for the recipients. Before the delivery the moneys were indeed destined for them, but not yet de facto assured to them as property on the part of the apostle, the bearer. Theodore of Mopsuestia well explains the σφραγίζομαι. by ἀναπαράστασις καὶ διαπαράστασις, and adds, by way of assigning the reason: ἡ γὰρ καὶ τῇ γούργῃ τῶν διαμεισμῶν τίλιν ἐν ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ τῇ χρίσει ἀντὶς, ἐπεὶ ἔδειχσαν ἄντεγκρυ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπάρχοντα ὑπόθεσιν. Without any ground in the text, Hofmann introduces bearers appointed
The expression chosen has a certain solemnity; the apostle is moved by the thought that with the close of the work of love to which he refers he was to finish his long and great labours in the East, and was to take in hand a new field in the far West. In these circumstances, an unusual thoughtful expression for the concluding act offers itself naturally. But that which Fritzsche finds in it (rendering of an account and other formalities) neither lies in the simple figurative word, nor was it doubtless intended by Paul, considering his apostolical dignity. Others take σφραγισμός. in the proper sense, either thus: “when I have brought over the money to them, sealed” (Erasmus, Cornelius a Lapide, Estius), which, however, the words do not express at all, and how paltrily unapostolic the thought would be! or, referring αὐτοῖς to the Greek Christians (so already Theodoret): “when I have made them secure with letter and seal respecting the right delivery of their collection” (Glöckler, and so already Michaelis), against which, apart from the unsuitableness of the sense, it is decisive that αὐτοῖς brooks no other reference than αὐτῶν and αὐτοῖς, ver. 27 (comp. τοῖς ἀγίους, ver. 25). This also against Reithmayr, who brings out even a depositing for the almsgivers in God’s treasury!

Ver. 29. Paul is convinced that his advent to the Romans will not be without rich blessing from Christ; he will bring with him a fulness (copia, see on Eph. iii. 19) of Christ’s blessing. On the matter itself, comp. i. 11. — ἐν is to be explained: furnished with. See Bernhardy, p. 209, and on 1 Cor. iv. 21. Quite contrary to the words, Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Calvin, and others: “Scio me...vos inventurum repletos omnibus donis spiritualibus,” Estius.— ρφαγισμός with the same verb ἑλεφόμας; see Kühner, II. 2. p. 656, and ad Xen. Mem. iv. 2. 21. Comp. on 1 Cor. ii. 1; Phil. ii. 2.

on the part of the church, whom the apostle himself conducts to Jerusalem, thereby designating the gift to the recipients as one destined for them with his knowledge and will. Hofmann’s objection, that the interpretation given above rather suggests that it should be termed an unsealing than a sealing, is a cavil running counter to the figurative usage elsewhere of σφραγισμός and σφραγίς, and which might just as aptly be applied to Hofmann’s own explanation.
Vv. 30, 31. Even now (comp. Acts xx. 22, 23, xxi. 10 ff.) Paul anticipates that persecutions await him in Judaea on the part of the unbelieving (ἀπειθούντων, inobedientium, who refuse the ἑικότι πίστεως; comp. xi. 30, 31; John iii. 36; Acts xiv. 2); but even on the part of the Palestinian Christians (τ. ἁγίους), he is not sure of a good reception for his διακονία, because he, the anti-Judaic apostle (comp. x. 21; Acts xxi. 21), had set on foot and conducted a Gentile-Christian collection. Hence the addition of the exhortation (παρακαλῶ) to the readers, subjoined by the continuative δέ, and how urgent and fervent! — διά belonging to παρακ.: by means of a moving reference to Christ, as xii. 1, 2 Cor. x. 1. — The ἀγάπη τοῦ πνεύμ. is the love wrought by the Holy Spirit (Gal. v. 22); it Paul calls in specially by way of inciting his readers to compliance. — συναγων. μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς me in the prayers which you make, hence: in your prayers. A very correct gloss is ἵππον (after προσευχ) in codd. and vss.; not one disfiguring the sense, as Eeiche thinks, who explains: in my prayer. So also Ewald. Paul might certainly, according to the sympathy of the fellowship of love, claim the joint striving of the readers in his prayers; but ἵππον ἑμοῦ, which would otherwise be superfluous, points most naturally to the conclusion that the προσευχαί are those of the readers; comp. 2 Cor. i. 11; Col. iv. 12. The ἵππον ἑμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν is closely, and without the article, attached to ταῖς προσευχαῖς (similarly to προσευχεσθαι ἵππο, Col. i. 9, et al.): in the prayers which you address to God for me (for my welfare). Fervent prayer is a striving of the inner man against the hostile or dangerous powers, which it is sought to avert or overcome, and for the aims, which it is sought to attain. Comp. on Col. i.e. — ἵνα προσβὰ ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.] Aim of the joint striving: in order that I may be delivered from, etc. See on Matt. vi. 13. It did not pass into fulfilment; even now the counsel of his Lord, Acts ix. 16, was to be accomplished. — ἵδιακ. μου ἤ εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ] my rendering of service destined for Jerusalem. See vv. 25, 26. Comp. 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1.

joyfulness. But as a prisoner he came to Rome, whither the will of God (διὰ θέλημα Θεοῦ) led him, nevertheless, otherwise than it had been his desire (comp. i. 10). — συναναπαύσωμαι] refresh myself with you, namely, through the mutual communication of faith, of inward experiences, of love, of hope, etc. Comp. συμπαρακληθήμαι, i. 12. — In the closing wish, ver. 33, the designation of God as ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, the God who brings about peace, was the more naturally suggested, as the forebodings of the opposite of εἰρήνη which he was going to encounter had just been before the apostle's mind. Hence we have neither to assume a reference to the differences in xiv. 1 ff. (Grotius and others), nor to take εἰρήνη of the peace of reconciliation, v. 1 (Philippi), or in the wide sense of salus (Fritzsche). Comp. rather 1 Cor. xiv. 33; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Phil. iv. 9; Rom. xvi. 20; 1 Thess. v. 23.

It would even with the reading Ἰς (see the critical notes), which Hofmann follows, belong to this word, beside which it stands, not to συναναπαύσωμαι. (Hofmann).
CHAPTER XVI.

Ver. 3. πρίγανον] Elz.: Πρίγιγαλλαν, against decisive evidence. After Acts xviii. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 19 (Elz.). — Ver. 5. Ἀδιας] Elz. has Ἀχαῖας, against almost equally decisive evidence; but it is defended by Ammon and de Wette on the testimony of the Peschito, and because 1 Cor. xvi. 15 might certainly give occasion for changing Ἀχαῖας into Ἀς. But the reading Ἀχαῖας might readily also have come into the text through the mere marginal writing of the parallel passage 1 Cor. l.c., especially if it was considered that Paul wrote his letter in Achaia; hence the greatly preponderant external attestation in favour of Ἀς retains its validity. — Ver. 6. ιμαξ] approved by Griesb., adopted also by Lachm. and Tisch. 8, according to A B C* K* min. Syr. utr. Arr. Copt. Aeth. But Elz., Scholz, Tisch. 7, Friztsche have ιμαξ. Since Paul in the context sends greeting to persons who stood in a peculiar relation to himself, and thereby the alteration of ιμαξ into ιμαξ was very easily suggested, the more does the external evidence turn the scale in favour of ιμαξ, especially as the reading ἐν ιμαξ in D E F G, Vulg. It. Ruf. Ambrosiast. attests the original ις; ιμαξ (of which it is an interpretation). — Ver. 7. ις . . . γίγον.] D E F G: τοις πρὸ ιμαξ. Gloss, following on a mistaken reference of the relative to ἀναντίων. — Ver. 14. The order of the names: Ἐφραίμ, Παρασίνα, Ἐρμαν] (so Lachm. and Tisch., also Friztsche) is rendered certain by A B C D* F G P*, min. vss. Ruf. — Ver. 16. ἀνασαρ] is wanting in Elz., but is justly adopted by Griesb., following Mill, and by later editors on decisive evidence, and because it might easily give offence. — Ver. 18. καί οὐλογιάς] is wanting in D E F G, min. It. Omitted through the homoeoteleuton. — Ver. 19. ἔφρι ιμαξ] The ordinary reading of τι before ἔφρι ιμαξ has the greatest preponderance of evidence against it. Lachm. and Tisch.: ἔφρι ιμαξ ὑπὲρ χαίρω, as A B C L P K*, min. Dam. Ruf. read. Rightly: the sequence of the words in the Recepta (χαίρω ὑπὲρ first) is the ordinary one. — After ver. 20, ἄμην in Elz. is condemned by decisive testimony. — Ver. 21. ἀνασάλωσα] Decisive witnesses have ἀνασάλωσα. Commended by Griesb., adopted by Lachm., Tisch., and
Fritzsche. The plural came to be introduced on account of the plurality of persons.—Ver. 24 is wanting entirely in ABCN, 5, 137, Copt. Aeth. Vulg. ms. Harl. Ruf.; it is found after ver. 27 in P, 17, 80, Syr. Arm. Aeth. Erp. Ambrosiast. Omitted by Lachm. and Tisch. 8; rejected also by Koppe and Reiche, who think that it is an interpolated repetition of the benediction, ver. 20, which, after the transference of vv. 25–27 to the end of chap. xiv., was added in order not to leave the epistle without a conclusion. But the witnesses for ommission are precisely those which have the doxology vv. 25–27 in the ordinary place, either merely in this place (as BCN, 137), or likewise also after chap. xiv. (as AP, 5); and the witnesses for the transposition of the verse to the end are likewise not those, which have the doxology merely after chap. xiv. or not at all. Hence we may with safety conclude that ver. 24 was omitted or transposed for the reason that copyists stumbled partly at the fact that Paul, contrary to his manner elsewhere, should have joined a blessing and a doxology together, and partly at least at the circumstance that he should have placed the latter after the former (all other epistles conclude with the blessing).

On the doxology, vv. 25–27. This is found (1) at the end of chap. xvi., in BCDEK, 16, 66, 80, 137, 176, codd. in Ruf. codd. in Erasm. Syr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Vulg. ms. and ed. Clar. Germ. Ruf. Ambrosiast. Pel. and the other Latin Fathers. (2) It is found at the end of chap. xiv. in L and almost all min.; further, in the Greek lectionaries, the Arab. vss., in Polyglots, Syr. p. Goth. (?) Slav. ms. and ed. codd. in Ruf. Chrys. Theodoret, Damasc. Theophyl. Oecum. Theodul. (3) It is found at both places in AP, 5, 17, 109, lat. Finally (4), it is not found at all in DEF (where, however, after chap. xiv., a gap of six lines is left), codd. in Erasm. codd. in Jerome, Marcion. See the complete examination of the evidence in Reiche, Comm. crit., and Tisch. 8, also Lucht, p. 49 ff.—Among the critics and

1 A transcript of the first Erasmian edition, which, however, has on the margin the observation, that is τοις παλαιον ἀντιρράφων this doxology stands at the end of chap. xiv.

2 In D, namely, the doxology from the first hand stands after chap. xvi., but the emendator indicates it as to be deleted, without assigning it to the end of chap. xiv.

3 Jerome on Eph. iii. 5: “Qui volunt prophetas non intellexisse, quod dixerint... illud quoque, quod ad Rom. in plerisque codd. inventur, ad confirmationem sui dogmatis trahunt legentes: ei autem, qui potest vos roborare, etc.” But that already before Marcion the doxology was wanting in codd., there is no certain trace.
exegetes, (1) the ordinary position in chap. xvi. has been main-
tained by the Complut. Erasm. Steph. Beza (ed. 3–5), Calvin,
Bengel, Koppe, Böhrme, Rinck, Lachmann, Kollner, Scholz,
Fritzsche, de Wette, Rückert, Reithmayr, Philippi, Tischendorf,
Tholuck, Ewald, van Hengel, and others. (2) The position
after xiv. 23 has been approved by Grotius, Mill, Wetstein, and
Semler, following Beza (ed. 1 and 2); Griesbach and Matthiae re-
moved it to that place in their critical texts; and Morus, Paulus,
Eichhorn, Klee, Schrader, Hofmann, Laurent, and others agree
thereto. (3) The verses were rejected as spurious by Schmidt,
Einl. in's N. T. p. 227, Reiche, Krehl, Lucht.—Now the ques-
tion is: Is the doxology genuine? and if it is, has it its original
position at the close of chap. xiv. or of chap. xvi.? We answer: L
The doxology is genuine. For (a) the witnesses for entire omis-
sion are, as against the preponderance of those who have it in
one of the two passages or in both, much too weak, especially
as the transposition and double insertion are very capable of
explanation (see below). (b) The language and the entire cha-
racter of it are highly Pauline,—a fact which even opponents
must admit, who accordingly assume its compilation out of
Pauline phrases.1 (c) The contents of it admirably suit the
entire contents of the epistle. (d) The internal reasons adduced
against it by its assailants are completely untenable. It is
maintained (see especially Reiche, and comp. Lucht): (a) That
at each place, where the doxology appears, it is unsuitable.
But it appears as disturbing the connection only after xiv. 23,
and it is not at all unsuitable after chap. xvi., where it rather,
after the closing wishes more than once repeated, forms with
great appropriateness and emphasis the main conclusion which
now actually ensues. (b) That it has not the simplicity of the
Pauline doxologies, is pompous, overloaded, etc. It is certainly
more bulky and laboured than others; but no other Pauline
doxology stands at the end of an entire epistle where the great
power of thought in the writing concentrated itself in feeling—
no other at the end of a section, the purport and importance
of which can be compared with that of the entire Epistle to the
Romans. Hence it can by no means appear strange that such
a doxology has obtained the character of overflowing fulness
from the whole recollection of what had been written,—a col-
lective recollection which, so far from being fitted to beget in a
rich and lively disposition only an ordinary and plain thanksgiv-

1 Un-Pauline constituent elements and modes of representation, which Lucht
believes are to be found generally in the two last chapters, have no existence in
reality; the grounds of offence are disposed of by the exposition.
ing to God, is fitted rather to produce an outpouring of fervour and fulness of thought, under the influence of which the interest of easy expression and of simple presentation falls into the background. (γ) That the whole conception is uncertain, many expressions and combinations are obscure, unusual, even quite unintelligible; and (δ) that the conjunction of εἰς ἐν, μου καὶ τ. κόσμου ἕπεμψα ἦν. x. is un-Pauline and unsuitable; as is in like manner φανερωθήσατε, which verb is never used by Paul of the utterances of the prophets,—groundless occasions of offence, which are made to disappear by a correct explanation. On such internal grounds Reiche builds the hypothesis, that in the public reading the merely epistolary last two chapters were omitted; that the public reading thus ended at xiv. 23; and the doxology spoken at the end of that reading was written first on the margin, afterwards also in the text, consequently after xiv. 23, whence copyists, on recognising its unsuitable position, removed it to the end of the epistle. It is thus the work of an anagnostes, who compiled it clumsily from Pauline formulas, and that in imitation of the conclusion of the Epistle of Jude.¹ In opposition to this whole view, it is particularly to be borne in mind: (1) that the assumption that only the doctrinal part of the epistle was publicly read is a pure fancy, and is as much at variance with the high reverence for what was apostolic, as with the circumstance that, according to the lectionaries, these very chapters xv. and xvi. consist wholly of sections for reading; (2) that at least xv. 1–13 would have been included in the reading, and the doxology must thus have obtained its place after xv. 13; (3) that the presumed custom of uttering a doxology when the reading of an apostolic writing was finished, does not at all admit of proof; (4) that a Pauline doxology would have been chosen for imitation more naturally than that of Jude 24, 25, as indeed, conversely, Jude i.e. would more naturally presuppose an acquaintance with our passage; (5) that εἰς ἐν, μου was not at all suitable to the person of an anagnostes; and indeed an imitative reader was hardly in the position and mood to pour forth an expression of praise in so overflowing a gush, and thereby in anacoluthic construction. But when Lucht refuses a Pauline character to the doxology, in respect not merely of form and diction, but also of the thought which it contains, and recognises in it a gnosticizing and conciliatory stamp, this judgment rests on misinterpretations in detail and on presuppositions, which lie altogether outside the range of the N. T., along with a recourse

¹ In the Comment. crit. p. 116, Reiche is of opinion that it may have been added "a homine privato, qui ingenio suo indulgeret."
to the rejection of the genuineness not merely of the Pastoral epistles, but also of the so-called epistles of the captivity.—II.  

The position of the doxology after xvi. 24 is the original one. For (a) the external witnesses for this view are preponderant, not indeed in number, but in value. See above, and compare Gabler, Praef. ad Griesb., Opusc. p. 24. (b) Its position at the end of chap. xvi. was quite fitted to excite offence and to occasion a transposition, partly because no other epistle of the apostle concludes with a doxology; partly because here even the usual formal conclusion of an epistle (the apostolical blessing) immediately precedes; partly because ωμείς σήμεριμα seemed specially to refer back to the section respecting the weak in faith. The latter point was decisive at the same time as to the place to which—the connection between chap. xiv. and xv. as a unity being far from sufficiently appreciated—the doxology was referred, namely after xiv. 23, where there is the last direct mention of the weak; while xv. 1 then turns directly to the strong. Several other defenders of the ordinary position (see especially Koppe, Exc. II. p. 404; Gabler, l.c. p. 26; Bertholdt, Einleit. VI. § 715; Hug, Einl. II. p. 397, with whom Keith may agree) thought, indeed, that the omission of at least chap. xvi. in the reading of the letter had occasioned the beautiful and weighty doxology, which it was desired should not be excluded from the reading, to be placed after chap. xiv.—not after chap. xv., either (Bertholdt, Hug) because chap. xv. has already a conclusion, or because the supposed reference of σήμεριμα to the weak in faith pointed out that place. But the whole supposition that an integral portion of the epistle was omitted in reading is entirely incapable of being established. Not more plausible is the theory to which Rinck has recourse (comp. already Zeger and Böhme): "In codd. ex recensione Marcioni perscriptis libris, ipso fortasse Marcione auctore, clausulum ex fine epistolae assuisses, et postquam quod de rata a correctoribus suppletum esset, alios hanc clausulam iterasse, alios hinc, alios ilinc, alios utrimque ejecisse" (Lucubr. crit. p. 135). Marcion himself and his disciples rejected (Origen, interpr. Ruf.), indeed, the doxology on account of its contents (see especially ver. 26, διὰ τι γραφών προφητικών); but the orthodox certainly did not concern themselves with Marcionitic copies; indeed, Origen says expressly, that in the copies "quae non sunt a Marcione temerata," the doxology is found differently placed either after chap. xiv. or after chap. xvi. Ewald, regarding vv. 3–20 as the fragment of an epistle to the Ephesians, believes that a reader somewhere about the beginning of the second century observed the heterogeneous character of
that portion, but then excised too much, namely chap. xv. and xvi. Such a copy, in his view, Marcion had; but now that chap. xiv. was without a proper conclusion, at least the doxology xvi. 25–27 came to be appended thereto by other copyists. But apart from the above opinion respecting vv. 3–20 in itself (see, in opposition to it, the critical notes on chap. xv.), it would not be at all easy to see why they should not have removed merely vv. 3–20 from the copies, and why, instead of this, chap. xvi. should have been entirely excised, and even chap. xv. in addition. To explain this, the smaller importance of this chapter—which, moreover, is assumed without historical warrant—does not suffice.—Further, if the genuineness of the doxology itself, as well as its customary position, is to be esteemed assured, it follows at the same time from what we have said (1) in respect of the duplication of the doxology after chap. xiv. and xvi. in critical authorities, that it proceeds from those who, while aware of the difference as to the place of the words, were not able or did not venture to decide respecting the original position, and hence, taking the certain for the uncertain, inserted the words in both places; (2) in respect of the entire omission in authorities, that it is the work of an old precarious criticism, which drew from the uncertain position the conclusion of non-genuineness, along with which there operated the consideration, that the doxology was unsuitable after xiv. 23 as interrupting the connection, and after xvi. 24 as having its place even after the concluding wish.

Vv. 1, 2. Recommendation (συνιστήμι, comp. 2 Cor. v. 12, et al.; see Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 438; Bornemann, ad Xen. Symp. iv. 63, p. 154) of Phoebe, who is held to be the bearer of the epistle,—a supposition which there is nothing to contradict. In the twofold predicate, ἄδελφη. Ἑλιον (our, i.e. my and your Christian sister) and ὁδός δίακ. κ.τ.λ., there lies a twofold motive, a more general and a more special one, for attending to the commendation.—διάκονον] feminine, as Dem. 762. 4: διάκονον, ἤ τις ἐκρήγτο. The designation by the word διακόνωσα, not used in classical Greek, is found only subsequently, as frequently in the Constitutt. apost. See, on these ministrae, as they are called in Pliny, Ep. x. 97, the female attendants on the poor, sick, and strangers of the church, Bingham, Orig. I. pp. 341–366; Schoene, Geschichts-
forsch. üb. d. kirchl. Gebr. III. p. 102 ff.; Herzog, in his Encycl. III. p. 368 f. Very groundlessly Lucht, because this service in the church was of later date (but comp. xii. 7; Phil. i. 1), pronounces the words οὐδὲν . . . Κεγχρ. not to belong to Paul, and ascribes them to the supposed editor. Respecting the χήρας, 1 Tim. v. 9, see Huther in loc.— Κεγχρεά, eastern port of Corinth, on the Saronic Gulf. See Wetstein. Comp. on Acts xviii. 18. — ίνα αἰτήν, κ.τ.λ.] Aim of the commendation. — ἐν κυρίῳ characterizes the προσδέχεσθαι as Christian; it is to be no common service of hospitality, but to take place in Christ, i.e. so that it is fulfilled in the fellowship of Christ, in virtue of which one lives and moves in Christ. Comp. Phil. ii. 29. — δέξιον τῶν ἀγίων] either: as it is becoming for saints (Christians) to receive fellow-Christians (so ordinarily), or: "sicut sanctos excipi oporent," Grotius, Chrysostom. The former (so also Fritzsche and Philippi) is the correct explanation, because most naturally suggesting itself, as modal definition of the action of receiving.— καὶ γὰρ αἰτή] nam et ipse, for she also on her part (not αὐτή, haece). — προστάτις] a directrix, protectress (Lucian, bis accus. 29; Dio Cass. xlii. 39; Dindorf, Soph. O. C. 459, and Praef. ad Soph. p. LXL; Lobeck, Paralip. p. 271). She became (i.e. se praestiti, Kühner, ad Xen. Anab. i. 7, 4) a patrona multorum through the exercise of her calling. Paul might, indeed, have written παραστάτης, corresponding to παραστῆτε (Xen. Mem. ii. 1, 32; Soph. Trach. 891, Oed. C. 559; comp. ἐν νόσοις παραστάτης, Musonius in Stob. fl. p. 416, 43); but he selects the word which is conformable to her official position, and more honourable.— καὶ αἰτῶ ἐμοῦ] and of myself, my own person (see on viL 25). Historical proof of this cannot be given. Perhaps Paul had once been ill during a sojourn with the church of Cenchreae.

Vv. 3-16. The apostle's salutations.

Vv. 3, 4. Προσκύνα (2 Tim. iv. 19) is not different from Προσκύνα; comp. on Acts xviii. 2. — Her husband 1 Aquila

1 That Paul names the wife first, is not to be regarded as accidental. Probably the preponderant Christian activity and estimation were on her side. Hence here, where both are saluted (comp. 2 Tim. iv. 19), the precedence of the wife,—a distinction for which in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, where both saluted, no occasion was given. On the precedence given to the wife in Acts xviii. 18, see in loc.
was a native of Pontus (Acts xviii. 1), and Reiche incorrectly conjectures that he was called Pontius Aquila, which name Luke erroneously referred to his native country;¹ for, looking to the close connection in which Aquila stood with Paul, and Paul again with Luke, a correct acquaintance with the matter must be presumed in the latter. This married couple, expelled from Rome as Jews under Claudius, had been converted at Corinth by Paul (see on Acts xviii. 1), had then migrated to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18, 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 19), are now again in Rome, but, according to 2 Tim iv. 19, were at a later period once more in Ephesus. — εἰς Ὑποταγὴν Ἰησοῦ[ Distinctive character of σωφρονῦσ; for labour for the gospel lives and moves in Christ as its very element. Comp. vv. 9, 12. — Ver. 4. The marks of parenthesis are to be omitted, because the construction is not interrupted. — ὑπὲρευξικαὶ. Note the peculiar grounds assigned (quippe qui) for this and several following greetings. — ἵνα not instead of, but for, in order to the saving of my life. — τῶν ἐαυτ. ἐπήθηκαν] have submitted their own neck, namely, under the executioner's axe. In the absence of historical information we can just as little decide with certainty on the question whether the expression is to be taken literally, that is, of a moment when they were to be actually executed but in some way or other were still saved, or (so the expositors) figuratively, of the incurring of an extreme danger to life—as on the question where the incident referred to took place? whether at Ephesus, Acts xix.? or 2 Cor. i. 8? or at Corinth, Acts xviii. 6 ff.? or elsewhere? or, generally, in the midst of labour and tribulation shared with Paul? Wetstein, Heumann, and Semler think of bail (ἐπήθηκαν would then be: they gave pledge; see Lobeck, ad Phryn. p. 468). Possibly; but the nearest conception which offers itself as the words stand is that of τραχυλοκοπεῖν (Plut. Mor. p. 398 D), whether it be thought of as a reality or as a figure. The latter, however, is, as being said of both, the most probable. The readers knew what was meant. — τῶν ἐθνῶν] On account of this sacrifice for me, the apostle of the

¹ Aquila also, the translator of the Bible, was, as is well known, from Pontus (Sinope).
Gentiles. The notice contemplates the inclusion of the Roman church, which in fact was also a Gentile church.

Ver. 5. Καὶ τὴν κατ’ οἶκον. abr. ἐκκλ.] and the church which is in their house. Considering the size of Rome, it may be readily conceived that, besides the full assembly of the collective church, particular sectional assemblies were also formed, which were wont to meet in the houses of prominent members of the church. Such a house was that of Aquila and Priscilla, who had also in Ephesus given their dwelling for a similar object, 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2. Such house-churches are related therefore to the collective community, to which, as such, the epistles are directed, simply as the part, which has in addition its own special greeting, to the whole. Others (following Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, etc., with Koppe, Flatt, Klee, Glöckler) hold that the inmates of the household are intended. An arbitrary assumption of an unexampled hyperbole in the use of ἐκκλησία. That all the following saluted persons, up to ver. 12, were members of the house-church of Aquila and Prisca (Hofmann), is an arbitrary assumption, which is rendered very improbable by the repeated ἀνερχόμενοι, forming in each case a fresh beginning. — Ἕπαινετον] Unknown like all the following down to ver. 15, but see the note on Ρόμφον, ver. 13. The traditions of the Fathers made most of them bishops and martyrs (see Justiniani, Comm., and Braun, Sel. sacr. i. 2. 29 ff.), and the Synopsis of Dorotheus places most of them among the seventy disciples. That Epaphroditus had come to Rome with Aquila and Prisca (Hofmann), is very precariously conjectured from his being mentioned immediately after that couple. — διαφωτίζω τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐκ to first-fruits of Asia (partitive genitive, see on viii. 23) in reference to Christ, i.e. that one of the Asians, who had first been converted to Christ. — Ἀσία is the western portion of Asia Minor, as in Acts ii. 9; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. i. 8.

1 On the accentuation of the name, as well as that of Ἑυφορία, ver. 22, see Lipsius, gramm. Unterr. p. 30. The name itself is also frequently found in the Greek writers.

2 With the reading διαφωτίζω ἐκ to first-fruit it was necessary, in order not to fall into variance with 1 Cor. xvi. 15, to take διαφωτίζω as a first-fruit, one of the first converted,—certainly an explanatory makeshift, which weakens greatly the
Ver. 6. *Now far Mary had toiled much for the Romans* (eis οἷας), was as well known to the readers and to the apostle himself, who awards to her on that account the salutation of acknowledgment and commendation, as it is unknown to us. It may have happened abroad (as van Hengel and others think) or in Rome itself through eminent loving activity, possibly in a special emergency which was now past (hence not κοπιᾷ, but the aorist). Reiche refers ἐκατ. to activity in teaching, for which, however, since the text annexes no definition (as in 1 Tim. v. 17), and since Mary is not more specially known, there is no reason, and generally, as respects public teaching (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35), little probability. On eis, comp. Gal. iv. 11.

Ver. 7. *Iouvlas* is taken by Chrysostom, Grothius, and others, including Reiche, as feminine (Junia, who is then to be regarded probably as the wife or sister of Andronicus); but by most of the more recent expositors as a masculine name, Junias, equivalent to Junianus (therefore to be accented 'Iouvás). No decision can be arrived at, although the following description, ver. 7 (in opposition to Fritzsche), commends the latter supposition. — συγγεεστι is explained by many (including Reiche, de Wette, Hofmann) as member of the same race or people (according to ix. 3). But the explanation kinsmen is to be preferred, partly because the word itself, without other definition in the context, immediately points to this (Mark vi. 4; Acts x. 24, et al.); partly because it is only in this sense that it has a significance of special commendation; especially as in Rome there were many Jewish-Christians, and hence one does not see how the epithet was to be something characteristic in the particular case of those named, if it signified only kindred in the sense of belonging to the same people. We know too little of the apostle's kindred (comp. also Acts xxiii. 16), to reject this explanation on account of vv. 11, 21, or to venture to employ it in throwing suspicion on the genuine-significance of the notice, and by which 1 Cor. i.c. would also be affected. Not less forced would be the combination, by which we should regard Epaphnetus as an inmate of Stephanas' house, who had been converted at the same time with him (Tholuck, yet only permissively, following older interpreters).
ness of the chapter (Baur). But Reiche's reason—that Andronicus and Junias are expressly designated as Jews, because it would just be non-Jews who were saluted—is quite futile, since the nationality of those previously saluted is unknown to us, and Aquila and Prisca were likewise Jews. Just as groundlessly, Hofmann thinks that in an epistle to the Gentile-Christian church the kinsmen of the apostle would be Jews. This is purely arbitrary, and yields, besides, for the designation of the persons intended an element, which, in the case of the actual relatives of the Jewish-Christian apostle, is quite obvious of itself, and the mention of which, moreover, in presence of the Gentile-Christians, would have been somewhat indelicate.—Where and in what manner they had been imprisoned with Paul, is, owing to the incompleteness of the information in the book of Acts (comp. on 2 Cor. vi. 5), entirely unknown. Clement, 1 Cor. v., states that Paul had seven times borne fetters. Ewald, in connection with his view that we have here a fragment of an epistle to the Ephesians, assumes that Andronicus and Junias, while Paul was imprisoned in Rome, lay at the same time confined in Ephesus; and Lucht perceives only the anachronism of a forger.—τετέλομοι ἐν τ. ἀνωτ. ἔπιομος, like insignis, a vox media (comp. Matt. xxvii. 16), here in the good sense: distinguished, i.e. most honourably known by the apostles. Comp. Eur. Hec. 379: ἔπιομος ἐν βροτοῖς, Hippol. 103; Polyb. x. 3. 3, xv. 34. 3; Lucian, merc. cond. 28. So Beza, Grotius, and others,

1 Probably Mary also—the name already points to this—was a Jewess; indeed, Epaenetus himself appears to have been a Jew (against Hofmann), since he is characterized generally as the first-fruits of Asia, not as ἀντικ η τῆς Ἰουδαίας of this country, and according to history, the Christian first-fruits of a country inhabited also by Jews were, as a rule, Jews. Comp. Acts xvii. 6, xxviii. 24 ff.

2 The expression itself places the relation of their captivity under the figurative conception of captivity in war (vii. 23; 2 Cor. x. 5; Eph. iv. 8). Comp. Lucian, Asim. 27; Photius, Bibl. p. 133, 8. As the Christians, and peculiarly the teachers and overseers in the service of Christ, their commander-in-chief, are συντροφίας amongst one another (see on Phil. ii. 35, Phil. 2), so also are they, in captivity with one another, συνημματίσται (see on Col. iv. 10, Phil. 23). An arbitrary play of interpretation occurs in Hofmann: those whom Christ has won from the world and made His own, just as the apostle himself. Aptly Chrysostom points out the fellowship of suffering with Paul, implied in συμπάθαλις, as the most glorious crown of these men.
including Koppe, Flatt, Reiche, de Wette, Frötsche, Philippi, van Hengel, Hofmann, and rightly; for ἀπόστολος is used by Paul only in 1 Cor. xv. 7 in the wider sense (comp. Acts xiv. 4, 14), nevertheless even there with such restriction that James and the twelve are included in the reference. Hence we must not, especially considering our entire ignorance of the two persons, explain, with Origen, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Estius, Wolf, and many others, including Tholuck, Kollner, Rückert, Reithmayr, Ewald: distinguished among the apostles (in other words, distinguished apostles). That Andronicus and Junias were held in peculiar honour by the apostles, does not exclude their repute with the Christians generally, but rather points, for their especial commendation, to closer relations which they had with the apostles. Lucht misinterprets the expression of ἀπόστολος of the original apostles in contrast to Paul. — ἡμῶν "That they had been converted exactly at Pentecost (Grotius, Koppe), is just as little capable of proof, as that they had been the first preachers of the gospel in Rome (Wolf). — γενώνασιν ἐν Χ.] not: became apostles in Christ (Reithmayr, following Origen), but: became Christians, entered the fellowship of Christ, attained to the ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι. They were thus ἀρχαῖοι μαθηταί (Acts xxii. 16). "Venerabiles aetas, in Christo maxime," Bengal. On γίνεσθαι ἐν, see Nägelsbach, z. Philias, p. 295, ed. 3; comp. on Phil. ii. 7.

Vv. 8, 9. Ἀπολλὼν] the abbreviated Ἀμπλιατον, as codd., vss., and Fathers actually read, a name which (in form like Donatus, Fortunatus, etc., see Grotius) was frequent; see Gruter, Ind. — ἐν κυρίῳ] gives to the ἄγαστ. μ. the specific Christian character; comp. on ver. 2. — ἵμαν] ἵμαν refers, since Paul speaks always of himself in the singular here, to the readers along with himself, comp. ver. 1, not to those named in vv. 3–8 (van Hengel). He was probably a stranger who was at this time in Rome, and united his activity with that of Roman Christians towards the extension and furtherance of the gospel, whereby he was a fellow-labourer of the apostle and of the readers. — The name Στίχων: Inscr. 268.

Ver. 10. Apelles (comp. Hor. Sat. I. v. 100) is not to be confounded with the celebrated Apollos (Acts xviii. 24; 1 Cor.
i. 12, iii. 4), as Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Grotius, and others have done. Whether he was a freedman remains an open question, owing to the frequency of the name, which also occurs of freedmen. — τὸν ἐπομοῦν ἐν X.] i.e. the tried Christian. Christ, the personal object of his believing fidelity, is conceived as the element wherein he is approved. Comp. φρόνιμος ἐν X., 1 Cor. iv. 10, and similar passages. — τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβοῦλον] those of the people (perhaps: slaves) of Aristobulus, comp. 1 Cor. i. 11. That Paul means the Christians among them, is self-evident; in the similar salutation, ver. 11, he adds it redundantly. Aristobulus himself was therefore no Christian; unless he (so Grotius) had been already dead, in which case he might have been a Christian.

Vv. 11, 12. Narcissus is by Grotius, Michaelis, and Neander, held to be the powerful freedman of Claudius (Suet. Claud. 28; Tacit. Ann. xi. 29 ff., xii. 57). It is possible, although Narcissus, according to Tacitus, Ann. xiii. 1, was already dead (see Wieseler, Chronol. p. 371 ff.). A decision, however, cannot be arrived at; but, considering the frequency of the name, the suspicion of an anachronism (Lucht) is groundless. — The three women, ver. 12, perhaps deaconesses, are otherwise unknown. Note how Persis is distinguished above the two previously named women; as also how delicately Paul has not added μοῦ, after τὴν ἑγαπητὴν, as with the men's names, vv. 8, 9, although he means his sentiment of love towards Persis. Observe, also, the distinction between κοπιώσας (present) and ἐκοπιώσαν. The particular circumstances of the case are unknown to us.

Ver. 13. Rufus may be the son of Simon of Cyrene, Mark xv. 21. Comp. in loc. The fact that in Mark, who probably wrote in Rome, the man is assumed to be well known, would agree with the eulogy here: τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν κυρίῳ, the elected one in the fellowship of the Lord, i.e. who is distinguished as a Christian.¹ For if these words denoted merely the Christian,

¹ On ἐξαυτις, exquisitus, in the sense of excellens (comp. 1 Tim. v. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 4; 2 John i. 13; Wisd. iii. 14; Bar. iii. 30), because it is just the selected that is wont to be the eminently qualified, see Schlesner, Thea. II. p. 289. But Hofmann explains as if it ran τίς ἰησοῦς μου: who is to me a choice Christian
who in fellowship with the Lord is chosen to blessedness” (Reiche), they would not—as is, nevertheless, the case with all the remaining predicates—express a special element of commendation. — kai ἐμοῦ] pregnant, delicate, and grateful hint of the peculiar love and care which Paul (where and how, is entirely unknown) had enjoyed at her hands. Comp. ver. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 18; Philem. 11; and see on 1 Cor. i. 2.

Vv. 14, 15. Hermas was not, as already Origen declared him to be, the composer of the book ὁ πομῆν,² which, according to the Canon Muratorianus, is said to have been composed by a brother of the Roman bishop Pius I., and in any case belongs to no earlier period than the second century. — κ. Τ. σὺν αὐτῷ ἀσελφ.] It is possible, but on account of the more general designation deviating from ver. 5, not probable, that those named here as well as in ver. 15 were members, well known to the apostle, of two ἐκκλησίαι in Rome (so Hofmann), according to which view by the brethren with them would be meant the remaining persons taking part in these assemblies, for the most part doubtless unknown to him. It is possible also that some other Christian associations unknown to us (Fritzsche and Philippi think of associations of trade and commerce) are intended. We have no knowledge on this point. Reiche thinks of two mission-societies. But πάντες, ver. 15, points to a considerable number, and there is no trace in the Book of Acts of so formal and numerous mission-societies; they were doubtless still foreign to that period. Probably also Paul would have given some thoughtful indication or other of this important characteristic point.—The whole of the names in vv. 14, 15 are found in Gruter and

brother; he calls the ordinary interpretation unapostolic (wherefore?), and groundlessly appeals to τιν ἄγαμον, ver. 12. In the case of the latter the loving subject is, according to a very common usage, self-evident.

¹ Hofmann entertains the conjecture, which is in no way capable of proof, that Rufus lived with his mother in Jerusalem when Paul himself sojourned there; and that then Paul dwelt in the house of the mother, and enjoyed her motherly care.—If, again, the demonstration of love intended falls in a later period of the apostle’s life, his expression in our passage is the more courteous; hence it by no means requires the above precarious combination.

² The critical discussions as to this work, quite recently conducted by Zahn, and Lipsius in particular, have no bearing here.
elsewhere.—Julia appears to have been the wife of Philologus; the analogy of the following Nηρέα κ. τήν άδελφήν αὐτοῦ makes it less probable that the name denotes a man (Julias, comp. on ver. 7).

Ver. 16. The series of greetings which Paul has to offer from himself is concluded. But he now desires that his readers should also exchange greetings among one another, reciprocally, and that with the loving sign of the holy kiss. The subject of this greeting is thus every member of the church himself, who kisses another (see on 1 Cor. xvi. 20), not Paul, so that meo nomine should be supplied (Bengel, Koppe). This is forbidden by ἄλληλοιν. Comp. 1 Cor. l.c.; 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Justin, Ap. i. 65. The case is otherwise with 1 Thess. v. 26 (see Lünemann in loc.).—The ancient custom, especially in the East, and particularly among the Jews, of uniting a greeting with a kiss, gave birth to the Christian practice of the άγνον φίλημα (1 Pet. v. 14: φιλήμα άγάπης; Const. ap. ii. 57. 12, viii. 5. 5: το ἐν κυρίῳ φίλημα, Tertullian, de orat. 4: osculum pacis), termed άγνον, because it was no profane thing, but had Christian consecration, expressing the holy Christian fellowship of love.¹ — πᾶσαι] From many churches greetings had been doubtless entrusted to the apostle for the Romans, since he had certainly not previously withheld from them his project of travelling to Rome (perhaps also, of writing thither beforehand). Concerning the rest, what Erasmus says holds good: "Quoniam cognovit omnium erga Romanos studium, omnium nomine salutat." The universal shape of the utterance by no means justifies us in pronouncing this greeting not to be the apostle's, and deriving it from 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 20 (Lucht); it rather corresponds entirely to that cordial and buoyant consciousness of fellowship, in which he did not feel himself prompted narrowly to examine his summary expression. Others arbitrarily limit πᾶσαι to the Greek churches (Grotius), or simply to the churches in Corinth and its ports (Michaelis,

¹ That Paul actually desires that the reciprocal greeting by a kiss on the part of all should take place after the reading of the epistle, ought not to have been disputed (Calvin, Philippi). A ceremony indeed he does not desire; but he summons not merely to love, but to the kiss of love.
Olshausen, and others), or at least to those in which Paul had been (Bengel).

Vv. 17–20. A warning, added by way of supplement, against the erroneous teachers who were then at work. This very supplementary position given to the warning, as well as its brevity, hardly entering at all into the subject itself (comp. on the other hand, the detailed treatment in chap. xiv. xv. of a less important contrast), evinces that Paul is not here speaking, as Wieseler, following older interpreters, holds, against such as already were actually making divisions in Rome. He would have treated so dangerous an evil in the doctrinal connection of the epistle and at length, not in such a manner as to show that it only occurred to him at the close to add a warning word. Hence this is to be regarded as directed against an evil possibly setting in. Doubtless he was apprehensive from the manifold experience acquired by him, that, as elsewhere (comp. Gal. iii. 6, 11 ff.; Col. ii. 8 ff.; Phil. iii. 2 ff., 18, 19; 2 Cor. xi. 13 ff.), so also in Rome, Jewish zealots for the law might arise and cause divisions in their controversy with Pauline Christianity. This occasioned his warning, from which his readers knew to what kind of persons it referred,—a warning, therefore, against danger, such as he gave subsequently to the Philippians also (Phil. iii.), to whom the evil must have been all the nearer. Paul might, however, the more readily consider it enough to bring in this warning only supplementarily and briefly, since in Rome the Gentile-Christian element was the preponderant one, and the mind of the church in general was so strongly in favour of the Pauline gospel (vv. 19, 20, vi. 17), that a permanent Judaistic influence was at present not yet to be apprehended. How, notwithstanding, an anti-

1 The brief indications, vv. 17, 18, do not suggest philosophical Gentile-Christians (Hammond, Clericus), but (see on ver. 18) Judaizers, against whom Paul offers his warning. Hofmann prefers to abide by the generality of the warning, whether the troubles might be of Gentile origin or might arise from doctrines of Jewish legalism. But this view does not satisfy the concrete traits in vv. 17, 18, 20. See the correct interpretation already in Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The latter says: λίγαν δι' αὐτήν ἀντὶ τούτων, ὁ έν αὐτήν εἰρήνης πρεσβύτερος τῶν ἅπαντων παρατήρησεν τινά ἄνων πεπονθέντας τὰς ἑαυτοῦ ἔργα παρατηρήσεις πάντα ἔκδεικνύειν.
Pauline doctrinal agitation took place later in Rome, see Phil. i. 15 ff. Moreover, the precautionary destination of our passage, and that in presence of the greatness of the danger, is sufficient to make us understand its contents and expression as well as its isolated position at the close. At least there does not appear any necessity for setting it down as an original constituent portion of an epistle addressed to a church founded by Paul himself, namely, to the church of the Ephesians (Ewald, Lucht).

Ver. 17. Σκοπεῖν] to have in view, in order, namely, to guard against; comp. βλέπετε, Phil. iii. 2; but σκοπεῖν, speculari, is stronger, comp. also Phil. iii. 17. — τὰς διψοις.] comp. Gal. v. 20; 1 Macc. iii. 29; Dem. 423 4; Plat. Legg. i. p. 630 A; Dion. Hal. viii. 72. The article denotes those anti-Pauline divisions and offences, ἱκάνδαλα,—i.e. temptations to departure from the true Christian faith and life, well known to the readers,—which at that time arose in so many quarters in Pauline churches, and might readily threaten the Romans also. — ἔκκλιναι ἀπ' αὐτῶν] turn away from them, shun them, go out of their way. Comp. 1 Pet. iii. 11; Ps. cxxix. 102; Ecclus. xxii. 11; Thucyd. v. 73. 3; more usually with the accusative. Grotius rashly concludes: "non fuissetunc conventus communes aut presbyterium Romae; alioquin voluisset tales excommunicari." Paul rather counsels a rule of conduct for each individual member of the church, leaving the measures to be adopted on the part of the church, in case of necessity, to the church-government there (which was one regularly organized, in opposition to Bengel, see xii. 6 ff.). The disturbers, besides, against whom they are warned, are in fact viewed not as members of the church, but as intruders from without. Comp. Acts xv. 1; Gal. ii. 4.—The reference to the doctrine received certainly implies a church having Pauline instruction, but not exactly one founded by Paul himself (Ewald), like that at Ephesus. Comp. vi. 17; Col. i. 23.

Ver. 18. Reason assigned for the injunction of ver. 17. — οἱ τῶν τῶν] "hi tales; notatur substantia cum sua qualitate," Bengel. — oδ δοῦλοι.] Note the position of the negation; the thought is: to the Lord they refuse service, but their own
belly they serve. Thereby they belonged to the category of the ἐχθροὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τ. Χρ., Phil. iii. 18.—On τῇ κοιλῇ δουλεύειν, τῇ γαστρὶ δουλεύειν, abdomini servire (Seneca, de benef. vii. 26), as a designation of selfishness, bent only on good cheer in eating and drinking, comp. on Phil. iii. 19; Jacobs, ad Anthol. IX. p. 416. For this object the sectaries sought to make use of the influence and following which they obtained. Comp. Lucian, de morte Peregr. 11 ff. Behind their teaching, although this was not itself of an Epicurean nature (Hofmann), there lurked, hypocritically concealed, the tendency to epicurean practice. — διὰ τῆς χρηστολ. κ. εὐλογ. by means of the kind (having a good-natured sound) and fair-set language, which they hold. On χρηστολ. comp. Jul. Capitol. vit. Pertin. 13; Eustath. p. 1437, 53, and the classical λόγοι χρηστοί, λέγειν χρηστά κ.τ.λ.; on εὐλογία, language finely expressed (here: fine phrases), Plat. Rep. p. 400 D; Lucian, Lexiph. 1; Aesop. 229. The two words characterize contents (χρηστολ.) and form (εὐλ.); hence it is preferable to take εὐλογ. in the above signification than in the ordinary one of praise, extolling (Philippi). Comp. Luther: stately language.— τῶν ἄκακων of the guileless (Heb. vii. 26), who themselves have nothing evil in their mind, and are prepared for nothing evil. See Wetstein in loc.; Ruhnken, ad Tim. p. 56; Schaefer, ad Greg. Cor. p. 342.—The assertion that Paul appears too severe in the accusation of his opponents (Rückert) cannot be made good. He writes from long and ample experience.

Ver. 19. Not a second ground assigned for, or justification of, the warning of ver. 17 (Tholuck, de Wette, Philippi; comp. also Reithmayr and Hofmann); for this use of a second really co-ordinated γάρ is nowhere to be assumed in the N. T. See on the contrary, on viii. 6. Nor is it to be taken, with Fritzsche: “nam vos innocentibus qui facile decipiuntur hominibus annumerandos esse, ex eo intelligitur, quod vos Christo obedientes esse nemo ignorat;” for the latter is exactly the opposite of ready liability to seduction. Nor with Rückert: for the general diffusion of the news that you are such good Christians will soon bring those men to Rome, that they may sow their tares; which is not expressed. Nor yet again with
Calvin and others, Reiche, and Köllner: for you are indeed good Christians, whereat I rejoice; but I desire, etc.—against which the expression, especially the want of μεν and the presence of οὖν, is decisive. In order to a correct understanding, one should note the emphatically prefixed ἵματον, which stands in correlation—and that antithetic—with τῶν ἄκακων. Hence (as also Philippi admits, comp. van Hengel): "not without reason do I say: the hearts of the guileless; for you they will not lead astray, because you do not belong to such as the mere ἄκακοι, but distinguish yourselves so much by obedience (towards the gospel), that this has become universally known; respecting you therefore (here, too, ἐφ' ἵματον stands first emphatically; see the critical notes) I rejoice, yet desire that you may be wise and pure,"—a delicate combination of warning with the expression of firm confidence. Strangely, Lucht, comparing Acts xx. 29, assigns ver. 19 to an epistle to the Ephesians. — εἰς τὰ ἄγαθα, in reference to the good, which you have to do. By this general expression Paul means specially fidelity towards the pure gospel. — ἀκεραίους εἰς τὰ κακά, pure in reference to evil, so that you keep yourselves unmixed with it, free from it. Comp. Phil. ii. 15, Matt. x. 16; and see respecting ἀκεραίος generally, Ruhnken, ad Tim. p. 18.

Ver. 20. Encouraging promise; hence συντρίψει is not with Flatt to be taken as optative, contrary to linguistic usage nor is the erroneous gloss of the reading συντρίψας (A, 67**, Theodoret, Oec., Jer., Ambros., Rup.) to be approved.—Paul regards the sectaries, because they are servants not of Christ, but of their belly (ver. 18), as organs of Satan (comp. 2 Cor. xi. 15); hence his figurative expression of the thought, founded on Gen. iii. 15: "The God of peace will grant you (when the authors of division appear amongst you) shortly the complete victory over them."—As Θεός οἱ εἰρήνης (pacificus) God appears

1 In the reading of the Recepta defended by Hofmann, χαίρειτε καὶ ἔστω ὑμῖν χαίρειτε would not have to be supplied after ψ (as Hofmann very oddly thinks); but ψ ἐστιν ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἦστας would, according to a well-known usage (see Bernhardy, p. 329; Krüger, § 68. 41. 9; Schaefer, ad Bos. Efl. p. 277; Kühner, II. 1, p. 434), be a more precise definition to χαίρειτε: I rejoice, as to what concerns you. In this case, ἐστὶν ἑαυτῶν would be by no means dependent on the notion χαίρειτε, but the latter would stand absolutely.
in contrast to those ποιοῦντες τὰς δικαστασίας (ver. 17). Comp. on xv. 33.—The bruising of Satan and treading him under feet takes place in God's power; hence ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ. Comp. 1 Macc. iii. 22 (and Grimm in loc.), iv. 10, et al.—ἡ χάρις κ.τ.λ.] The grace of our Lord, etc.; therewith, as with the usual concluding blessing of his epistles, Paul would close. But he has as yet delivered no special greetings from those around him at Corinth, whether it be that they are now for the first time entrusted to him, or that he now for the first time observes that he has not yet mentioned them in what precedes (as after ver. 16). This induces him now further to add vv. 21—23 after the conclusion already written down in ver. 20; then to repeat the above blessing in ver. 24; and finally, after recalling anew all which he had delivered to the Romans, in a full outburst of deeply moved piety to make the doxology, vv. 25—27, the final close of the entire letter.

Ver. 21. Τιμῶθ.] It may surprise us that he is not brought forward at the head of the epistle as its joint writer (as in 2 Cor. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1), since he was at that time with Paul. But it is possible that he was absent just when Paul began to compose the epistle, and hence the apostle availed himself in the writing of it of the hand of a more subordinate person, who had no place in the superscription (ver. 22); it is possible also that the matter took this shape for the inward reason, that Paul deemed it suitable to appear with his epistle before the Roman church, to which he was still so strange, in all his unique and undivided apostolic authority.—Λεύκου] Not identical with Luke, as Origen, Semler, and others held;¹ but whether with Lucius of Cyrene, Acts xiii. 1, is uncertain. Just as little can it (even after Lucht's attempt) be ascertained, whether Ἰδοὺν is the same who is mentioned in Acts xvii. 5. Σωσίπατρος may be one with Σώπατρος, Acts xx. 4; yet both names, Σωσίπ. and Σώπ., are frequently found in the Greek writers. —συγγενεῖς] as vv. 7, 11. Why it should be reckoned

¹ Considered probable also by Tiele in the Stud. u. Krit. 1858, p. 753 ff.—In the Consitt. ap. vii. 46, 2, Lucius is mentioned as the name of the bishop of Cenchreae appointed by Paul.
more than improbable" (Hofmann) that Paul had at that
time three kinsmen in Rome (vv. 7, 11), and three in his
neighbourhood at the time of writing, it is not at all easy to
see.

Ver. 22. Tertius, probably an Italian with whom the
readers were acquainted, was at that time with Paul in Corinth,
and wrote the letter, which the apostle dictated to him. The
view that he made a fair copy of the apostolic draught (Beza,
Grotius) is the more groundless, since Paul was wont to
dictate his epistles (1 Cor. xvi. 21; Gal. vi. 11; Col. iv.
16; 2 Thess. iii. 17). In his own name Tertius writes his
greeting; for it was very natural that, when he called the
apostle's attention to his personal wish to send a greeting,
his own greeting (which Grotius and Laurent, without suffi-
cient ground, relegate to the margin) would not be dictated
by the apostle, but left to himself to express. In ver. 23,
Paul again proceeds with his dictation. Quite groundlessly,
Olshausen (following Eichhorn) thinks that Paul wrote the
doxology immediately after ver. 20, and did so on a small
separate piece of parchment, the other blank side of which the
scribe Tertius used, in order to write on it in his own name
vv. 21-24. But how incontestably ὁ συνεργός μου, ver. 21,
points to Paul himself! — ἐν κυρίῳ] To be referred to ἀνεμ.;
the Christian salutation, offered in the consciousness of living
fellowship with Christ. Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

Ver. 23. Γάιος] Perhaps the same who is mentioned in
1 Cor. i. 14; it may at the same time be assumed, that the
person mentioned in Acts xx. 4 (not also he who appears in
Acts xix. 29) is not a different one, against which the circum-
stance that he was of Derbe is no proof. But considering the
great frequency of the name (see also 3 John 1; Constit. ap.
vi. 46. 1; Martyr. Polyc. 22), no decision can be given.
Origen: "Fertur traditione majorum, quod hic Cajus fuit
episcopus Thessalonicensis ecclesiae." — ἕβος, guest-friend, is
in the Greek writers not merely the person entertained, but
also, as here, the entertainer (see Sturz, Lex. Xen. III. p. 218;
Duncan, ed. Rost. p. 799). Paul lodged with Caius, as during
his first sojourn in Corinth with Aquila, and then with Justus
(Acts xviii. 1-7). — καὶ τῆς ἐκκλ. δ.λ. [CHAP. XVI 28. 383] Whether this be a reference to the circumstance that Caius gave his house for the meetings of the church (Grotius), or to the fact that, while the apostle lodged with him, there were at the same time very numerous visits of persons belonging to the church of Corinth, whom Caius hospitably received,—a view which corresponds better to the thoughtfully chosen designation—in any case ξίνος does not stand to τῆς ἐκκλ. δ.λ. in the same strict relation as to μον. Comp. ver. 13, τὰν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ έμοῦ. If the lodging of those coming from abroad (Hofmann, following Erasmus and others) were meant, τῆς ἐκκλ. δ.λ. έμος would have been understood of the collective Christian body, and the hyperbolical expression would appear more jesting than thoughtful. Comp. rather on ἐκκλησία δ.λ., 1 Cor. xiv. 23, also v. 11, xv. 22. Nor is the expression suitable to the Roman church, in so far, namely, as Paul converted many of its members during their exile (Märcker), because it would be too disproportionate. — "Εραστος] Different from the one mentioned in Acts xix. 22 and 2 Tim. iv. 20; for the person sending greeting here was not, like Timothy, a travelling assistant of the apostle, but administrator of the city-chest, city-chamberlain in Corinth (arcarius civitatis, see Wetstein); unless we should assume— for which, however, no necessity presents itself—that he had given up his civic position and is here designated according to his former office (Pelagius, Estius, Calovius, Klee, and others, comp. also Reiche). For another, but forced explanation, see Otto, Pastoralbr. p. 55. The name Erastus was very frequent. The less are we, with Lucht, to discover an error in Acts xix. 22 and 1 Tim. iv. 20. Grotius, moreover, has rightly observed: "Vides jam ab initio, quamquam paucos, aliquos tamen fuisse Christianos in dignitate positos." Comp. 1 Cor. i. 26 ff. — Respecting Quartus absolutely nothing is known. Were ἄδεχαφος a brother according to the flesh, namely of Erastus, Paul would have added αὐτοῦ (comp. ver. 15); hence it is to be understood in the sense of Christian brotherhood, and to be assumed that the relations of this Quartus suggested to the apostle no more precise predicate, and were well known to the readers.
Ver. 24. In 2 Thess. iii. 16, 18, the closing blessing is also repeated. Wolf aptly observes: "Ita hodienum, ubi epistola vale dicto consummata est, et alia paucis commemorandamenti se adhuc offerunt, scribere solemus: vale iturum."

Vv. 25-27. As a final complete conclusion, we have now this praising of God, rich in contents, deep in feeling (perhaps added by the apostle's own hand), in which the leading ideas contained in the whole epistle, as they had already found in the introduction, i. 1-5, their preluding keynote, and again in xi. 33 ff. their preliminary doxological expression, now further receive, in the fullest unison of inspired piety, their concentrated outburst for the ultimate true consecration of the whole. No one but Hofmann, who assigns to these three verses their place after xiv. 23 (see the critical notes), could deny that they form a doxology at all. According to him, ῥῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ is to be connected with ὀφέλομεν, xv. 1, and to be governed by this verb (thus: to Him, who is able . . . we are debtors, etc.). This is, however, nothing less than a monstrousity of exegetical violence, and that, first, because the verses carry on their front the most immediate and characteristic stamp of a doxology (comp. especially Jude 24, 25), in which even the ἐμὴν is not wanting (comp. ix. 5, xi. 36); secondly, because the fulness and the powerful pathos of the passage would be quite disproportionate as a preparatory basis for the injunction that follows in xv. 1, and would be without corresponding motive; thirdly, because in ver. 25 ἡμᾶς stands, but in the supposed continuation, xv. 1, ἡμέν, which is an evidence against their mutual connection; and lastly, because the δὲ, xv. 1, stands inexcusably in the way. This δὲ, namely, could not be the antithetic δὲ of the apodosis and after participles, especially after absolute participles (Klotz, ad Devar. p. 372 ff.; Kühner, II. 2, p. 818; Baeumlein, Partik. pp. 92 f., 94), but only the resumptive (Kühner, II. 2, p. 815; Baeumlein, p. 97); and then Paul must have written not ὀφέλομεν δὲ, but either αὐτῷ δὲ ὀφέλομεν, which αὐτῷ would reassume the previously described subject, or he must have put his δὲ in ver. 27 along with μόνῳ σοφῷ Θεῷ, and therefore somewhat thus: μόνῳ δὲ σοφῷ Θεῷ . . . ὀφέλομεν.
Ver. 25. Στήριξαι to make firm and steadfast. Luke xxii. 32; Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 17, et al. The description of God by τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στήριξαι corresponds to the entire scope of the epistle. Comp. i. 11 (in opposition to Lucht). — ὑμᾶς ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας, 1 Thess. iii. 13. — κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγ. μου is closely connected with στηρ. (to strengthen in respect of my gospel), so that we are not to supply in fide (Koppe, de Wette, van Hengel) or the like (Reiche: “in the religious and moral life”); but the sense is not different from στηρ. εν τῷ εὐαγγ. μου (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Pet. i. 12), namely: so to operate upon you that you may remain steadfastly faithful to my gospel, and not become addicted to doctrines and principles deviating from it. More far-fetched is the explanation of others (taking κατὰ in the sense of the rule): “so to strengthen you, that you may now live and act according to my gospel,” Köllner (comp. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, Wolf, Koppe, Tholuck); or (κατὰ of the regulative modal character): after the fashion of my gospel (Hofmann).—The expression τὸ εὐαγγ. μου, the gospel preached by me, cannot, seeing that in Rome Pauline Christianity was in the ascendant, be accounted, on an impartial consideration of the apostolic consciousness, and in comparison with ii. 16 (see also 2 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Gal. ii. 2), as in itself surprising, least of all when we attend to the added: καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This, namely, far from aiming at a conciliatory comparison with the preaching of the other apostles (Lucht), is a more precise definition of τὸ εὐαγγ. μου, proceeding from the humble piety of the apostle. As he wrote or uttered the latter expression, he at once vividly felt that his gospel was withal nothing else than the preaching which Christ Himself caused to go forth (through him as His organ); and by making this addition, he satisfies his own principle: ὥσπερ τολμήσω λαλεῖν τι δων ὦν κατευγράσατο Χριστὸς δι’ ἐμοῦ λόγῳ κ. ἔργῳ, xv. 18. Comp. on the thought, Eph. ii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 3. This humility, amidst all the boldness in other respects of his apostolic consciousness, suggested itself the more to his heart, because in connection with a praise of God. With this view of the genitive agree substantially Rückert, de Wette, ROM. II.
Fritzsche, Baumgarten-Crusius, Ewald. The more usual explanation: the preaching concerning Christ (Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, and many others, including Köllner, Tholuck (?), Reimart, Philippi), yields after τὸ ἐκλάμαμ, μοῦ somewhat of tautology, and forfeits the thoughtful correlation between μοῦ and Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The personal oral preaching of Christ Himself during His earthly life (Grotius, Wolf, Koppe, Böhme, Hofmann), to which Paul never expressly refers in his epistles (not even in Gal. v. 1), is not to be thought of. — κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρ. κ.τ.λ.] co-ordinated to the preceding κατὰ ..., Χριστοῦ, and likewise dependent on στηρίξας. In the exalted feeling of the sublime dignity of the gospel, in so far as he has just designated it as the κήρυγµα of Jesus Christ, the apostle cannot leave the description of its character without also designating it further according to its grand and sacred contents (not according to its novelty, as Hofmann explains, which lies neither in the text nor in the connection), and that with a theocratic glance back upon the primitive counsel of salvation of God: as revelation of a secret kept in silence in eternal times (comp. Col. i. 26; Eph. iii. 9, i. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 7). Note the bipartite character of the designation by the twofold κατὰ, according to which Paul sets forth the gospel, (1) ratione subjecti, as his gospel and κήρυγµα of Christ, and (2) ratione objecti, as the revelation of the primitive sacred mystery.— The second κατὰ is to be taken quite like the first (comp. Col. ii. 8); but Paul designates the divine decree of the redemption of the world as μυστήριον (comp. generally on xi. 25), in so far as it, formed indeed by God from eternity (hidden in God, Eph. iii. 9), and in the fulness of time accomplished by Christ, was first disclosed through the gospel, i.e. laid open to human contemplation (Eph. iii. 4, 8, 9, vi. 19); hence the gospel is the actual ἀποκάλυψις of this secret. The article was not

1 The bestowal of blessing on the Gentiles (Eph. iii. 6) is an essential feature of the contents of the μυστήριον; but to refer the latter in our passage to this alone (Beza, Bengel, Philippi, Tholuck, and others) is not justified by the context.

2 This disclosure made to men through the preaching of the gospel (i. 17; Gal. iii. 23) is meant according to the context, and not "mihi data patefactio" (van Hengel), which Paul elsewhere, when he means it, actually expresses. Comp. Gal. i. 16; Eph. iii. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 10; Eph. iii. 5; Gal. i. 12.
requisite with ἀποκ., since the following genitive has no article, and, besides, a preposition precedes (Winer, p. 118 f. [E. T. p. 155]; comp. 1 Pet. i. 7). But μυστηρίου, if it was to be in itself the definite secret, must have had the article (Eph. iii. 3, 9; Col. i. 26); hence we must explain "of a secret," so that it is only the subsequent concrete description which expresses what secret is meant: "in respect to the revelation of a secret, which was kept silent in eternal times, but now has been brought to light," etc. Among the varying explanations, the only one linguistically correct is that of Fritzsche (comp. Kölner, Rückert, Tholuck, and Philippi), who makes κατὰ ἀποκ. μυστ. dependent not merely on στηρίζει, but on τῷ δὲ δυναμ. ὑμᾶς στηρ. taken together, and takes κατὰ as in consequence of, thus namely: "qui potest vos corroborare in . . . secundum patefactionem arcani, h. e. postquam facta est patefactio arcani, i. g. ἐπεὶ ἄπεκκαλόφθη μυστήριον;" more exactly Rückert, Philippi, Tholuck: in correspondence with the revelation, etc. But no necessity exists for taking κατὰ here in another sense than previously (as e.g. there is such a necessity, obviously, with κατ᾽ ἐπιταγὴν immediately below); on the contrary, after the words, "who is in a position to strengthen you in respect of the gospel," the idea "secundum patefactionem arcani" would be superfluous and self-evident, and therefore the weighty mode of its expression would be without motive and turgid. It would be otherwise if κατὰ ἄποκαλυψιν κ.τ.λ. were intended to establish not the ability of God, but His willingness. Incorrectly, in fine, Olshausen and older expositors think that τὸ γεγενημένον should be supplied: "which preaching has taken place through revelation of a secret," etc. This Paul would have known how to say properly, had he meant it.—χρόνος aiων.] Period in which the σενάντα took place; Acts viii. 11, xiii. 20, Josh. ii. 20; Winer, p. 205 [E. T. p. 273]; Kuhner, II. 1, p. 386. From the very beginning down to the time of the N. T. proclamation reach the χρόνος aiων, which are meant and popularly so designated. Bengel: "tempora primo sui initio aeternitatem quasi praeviam attingentia." Comp. 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2. As at almost every word of the doxology, Lucht has taken offence at the expression
And Reiche incorrectly understands the course of eternity down to the time of the prophets. For by ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίων. k.t.l. Paul wished to designate the New Testament gospel (κήρυγμα Ἡσυχοῦ Χριστοῦ), which therefore had not been preached before Christ; but he thinks of the prophetical predictions as the means used (ver. 26) for the making it known, and justly, since in them the publication has not yet taken place, but there is contained merely the still obscure preindication and preparatory promise (i. 2) which were only to obtain their full and certain light through the far later ἀποκάλυψις of the mystery, and consequently were to serve as a medium of faith to the preaching which announces the secret of salvation. Comp. Weiss, bibl. Theol. p. 293. Suggestively Bengel remarks: "V. T. est tanquam horologium in suo cursu tacito; N. T. est sonitus et pulsus aeris." The silence respecting the secret was first put an end to by the preaching of the N. T., so that now the ἰδαίμονες came in its place; and up to that time even the prophetic language was, in reference to the world, as yet a silence, because containing only συνεκασμένος (Theodoret) what afterwards ("a complemento," Calovius) was to become through the evangelical preaching manifest, brought clearly to light (comp. i. 19, iii. 21; Col. iv. 4; 1 Pet. i. 10, 11, 20; Tit. i. 2, 3; 2 Tim. i. 10).

Ver. 26. Contrast of ἡμέρας αἰῶνος. σεσυγγυ. — But which has been made manifest in the present time, and by means of prophetic writings, according to the commandment of the eternal God, in order to produce obedience of faith, has been made known among all nations. In this happy relation of the present time, with regard to that which the ἡμέρας αἰῶνος lacked, how powerful a motive to the praise of God! — φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν] Comp. Col. i. 26, νῦν δὲ ἐφανερώθη, in the same contrast; but here the stress lies, in contradistinction to the immediately preceding σεσυγγυς, on φανερωθ. Reiche's observation,

1 The fashion, in which he professes to explain the separate elements from a Gnostic atmosphere, is so arbitrary as to place itself beyond the pale of controversy. Thus, e.g., ἡμέρας αἰῶνος is held to refer to the Gnostic aeons, σεβηγμά, to the Gnostic Sige, δὲ γραφ. προφ. to the γνώμων of allegorical explanation of Scripture.
that the ϕανέρωσις is never attributed to the prophets, is not at all applicable; for it is not in fact ascribed to the prophets here, and ϕανέρωθα is not even connected with διὰ γραφ. προφ., which τε undoubtedly assigns to the following participle γνωρισθα. The mystery has, namely, in the Christian present been clearly placed in the light, has been made an object of knowledge (comp. on i. 19), a result obviously accomplished through the gospel (comp. Col. i. 26; Tit. i. 3); and with this ϕανέρωσις, in and by itself, there was connected in further concrete development the general publication of the secret, as it is more precisely designated by διὰ τε γραφ. . . . γνωρισθα. This general publication was, namely, one which took place (1) by means of prophetic writings (comp. i. 2), inasmuch as, after the precedent of Jesus Himself (John v. 39; Matt. v. 17; Luke xxiv. 27, 44), it was brought into connection with the prophecies of the O. T. testifying beforehand (1 Pet. i. 11), the fulfilment of the same was exhibited, and they were employed as a proof and confirmation of the evangelical preaching (comp. also Acts xvii. 11), and generally as a medium enabling the latter to produce knowledge and faith. (2) It took place at the command of God (x. 17; Tit. i. 3), whose servants (i. 9) and stewards of His mysteries (1 Cor. iv. 1) the apostles are, conscious of His command (Gal. i. 1, 15). (3) It was made in order to produce obedience towards the faith (comp. on i. 5),

1 Ti is wanting indeed in D E 34, 87, Syr. Erp. Copt. Aeth. Arm. Slav. Vulg. Clar. Germ. Chrys. and some Latin Fathers; but this is to be regarded as a hasty deletion, occasioned by the fact that, without precise consideration of the sense and of the following connection, διὰ γραφ. προφ. was mechanically attached to ϕανέρωθα as nearest in position, and the necessity in point of construction for its belonging to ϕανέρωθα, widely separated by the intervening notices, was not perceived. In order theretoon to supply the want of connection between the two participles, which arose through the omission of the τε, an et was inserted before νυν in versions (Syr. Erp. Aeth.).

2 This, too, against Hofmann, who makes διὰ γραφ. προφ. be added to νυν by means of τε, in the sense of "just as also." But the τε must have added to the νυν something homogeneous, supplementing (Baehlelin, Partik. p. 311; Kühner, II. 2, p. 787), not a notion dissimilar to it. Generally, it would not be easy to see why Paul should not have placed his τε only after νυν λαβεργιαν, and thereby have given to the second participial sentence—which, according to Hofmann's explanation, follows without connecting particle—a connecting link in conformity with the sense.
and that (4) among all nations.— τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ] αἰών is not a faint allusion to χρόνος αἰωνίου (Reiche); but stands in a very natural and apt relation of meaning thereto, since it is only as eternal (Baruch iv. 8, 22; Hist. Susann. 42) that God could dispose of the eternal times and of the present, so that what was kept silent in the former should be made known in the latter.— εἰς π. τ. ἔθνη] Consequently the publication was not confined to the Jews, but was accomplished among all Gentile peoples; comp. i. 5. As to εἰς of the direction, comp. John viii. 26, and see on Mark i. 39, xiv. 9.

Ver. 27. Μόνος σοφὸς Θεός διὰ Ἡσυχοῦ Χ.] to Χ closely connected (without a comma after Θεοῦ): to the through Jesus Christ only wise God, i.e. to the God who through Christ has shown Himself as the alone wise, so wise, that in comparison with Him this predicate can be applied to no other being (comp. Luke xviii. 19; John xvii. 3; 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16, i. 17; 2 Macc. i. 25), the absolutely wise. Comp. Plato, Phaedr. p. 278 D; Diog. Laert. i. 12; Philo, de migr. Abr. I. p. 457. 4. The connection: “to the alone wise God be the glory through Christ” (Pesch., Chrysostom, Luther, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, Morus, van Hengel, and several others), is inadmissible because of φλ, which indeed is omitted by Beza and Grotius after the Complut. edition, but is critically so certified (it is wanting merely in B) that it can only appear to have been omitted with a view to relieve the construction; although Rückert also sees himself forced to omit it, and Ewald (comp. Märccker, p. 8), while retaining the φλ so translates as if it ran φλ διὰ Ἡ. X. ἕ δόξα. Thus, too, Hofmann connects the words, seeking through the dative μόνος σοφὸς Θεός to bring them into government with ὑφέλθαμεν, xv. 1 (see on vv. 25-27). Instances of such a prefixing of parts of sentences having an emphasis before the relative are found, indeed, in the Greek writers (Schaefer, App. ad Dem. IV. p. 462; Stallbaum, ad Plat. Phaedr. pp. 238 A, 363 A; comp. on Acts i. 2); yet in the N. T. we have no passage of this kind (wrongly Hofmann adduces 1 Pet. iv. 11, Heb. xiii. 21, as bearing on this); and it would not be easy to perceive any special reason why Paul should have so uniquely laid stress on διὰ Ἡ. X. — The de-
scription of God, begun on the side of His power in ver. 25, passes over at the conclusion of the doxology into the emphasizing of His wisdom, to which the representation of the gospel as ἀποκάλυψις μυστηρίου...γνωρισθέντος involuntarily led him in a very natural process of thought; for so long as the mystery was covered by silence, the wisdom of God in its highest potency was not yet brought to light,—a result which took place by the very means of that ἀποκάλυψις. Comp. xi. 32—34. This at the same time applies against Reiche, who believes μένῳ σοφί to be unsuitable here and to be taken from Jude 25 var. (the spurious addition σοφί, Jude 25, as also in 1 Tim. i. 17, has manifestly flowed from our passage).— διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] i.e. through the appearance and the whole work of Jesus Christ. Thereby God caused Himself to be practically recognised as the alone wise. Comp. xi. 33 ff.; Eph. iii. 8 ff. Similarly, in Jude 25, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ. is connected, not with the following δέξα, but with the preceding σωτηρί ήμῶν. Too narrowly, Fritzsche limits διὰ Ἰ. Χ., in accordance with Col. ii. 3 (but see in loc.), to the contents of His teaching. It is precisely the facts which bring to light the wisdom of the divine measures in the execution of the plan of redemption through Christ,—the death and the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus (iv. 24, 25, viii. 34, et al.),—that form the sum and substance of the conception of our διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.— φ] In the lively pressure of the great intermediate thoughts connected with the mention of the gospel, vv. 24, 25, the syntactic connection has escaped the apostle. Not taking note that τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ and the resumptive μόνῳ σοφί Ἥθε are still without their government, he adds, as though they had already received it at the beginning of the over-full sentence (through γάρις δὲ τῷ δυναμένῳ κ.τ.λ. or the like), the expression,—still remaining due,—of the praise itself by means of the (critically certain) relative, so that now the above datives are left to stand as anacoluthic. Comp. Acts xxiv. 5, 6, and the remark thereon. See also Winer, p. 528 [E. T. p. 710]; Buttmann, neut. Gr. p. 252. Others, indeed, think that Paul allowed himself to be induced by the intermediate thoughts to turn from the doxology to
God at first designed, and to direct the tribute of praise to Christ instead, the Mediator and Revealer of the wisdom of God, so as thereby mediately to praise God Himself. See especially Philippi, also Reithmayer, Baumgarten-Crusius, and Tholuck (doubtfully). Such doxologies as if to God, are found addressed to Christ doubtless in Heb. xiii. 21, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Rev. i. 6, and later in Clement et al., but in the really apostolical writings nowhere at all (see on ix. 5); and that Paul here still, even after the intermediate observations, retained the idea of praising God, so that that $ must accordingly be referred not to Christ, but to God, is quite clearly proved by the resumptive μόνε ὑψός Θεός. For a formally quite similar anacoluthon¹ in the doxology, see Martyr. Polyc. 20: τῇ δυναμένῳ πάντας ἡμᾶς εἰσαγαγεῖν ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι κ. δωρεᾷ εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ βασιλείαν διὰ τοῦ παιδός αὐτοῦ μουσικῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗ ἠδόξα, τιμή, κράτος, μεγαλωσύνη εἰς αἰώνας. — η ἠδόξα] sc. εἰ, not ἐστι, according to 1 Pet. iv. 11 (Hofmann), where the connection is different and ἐστιν must be written (Lachm.), and its emphasis is to be noted. The article designates the befitting honour, as in xi. 36.

¹ For the suggestion that in this passage from the Martyr. Polyc. αὐτός is dependent on the preceding αὐτοῦ (Hofmann), is simply a violent and very unsuitably devised evasion. Dressel has the unbiased and correct punctuation.
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From the Right Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol.

'A useful, valuable, and instructive Commentary. In all the interpretation is set forth
with clearness and cogency, and in a manner calculated to commend the volume to the
thoughtful reader. The book is beautifully got up, and reflects great credit on the
publishers as well as the writers.'

From 'The London Quarterly Review.'

'The second volume lies before us, and cannot fail to be successful. We have care-
fully examined that part of the volume which is occupied with St. John—of the Acts we
shall speak by and by, and elsewhere—and think that a more honest, thorough, and, in
some respects, perfect piece of work has not lately been given to the public. The two
writers are tolerably well known; and known as possessing precisely the qualities,
severally and jointly, which this kind of labour demands. We may be sure that in them
the highest Biblical scholarship, literary taste, and evangelical orthodoxy meet.'

From 'The Record.'

'The first volume of this Commentary was warmly recommended in these columns
soon after it was published, and we are glad to be able to give as favourable a testimony
to the second volume. . . . The commentators have given the results of their own
researches in a simple style, with brevity, but with sufficient fulness; and their exposi-
tion is, all through, eminently readable. . . . The work is one which students of even
considerable learning may read with interest and with profit. The results of the most recent
inquiries are given in a very able and scholarly manner. The doctrines of
this Commentary are evangelical, and the work everywhere exhibits a reverence which
will make it acceptable to devout readers.'