

1890

The composition of the early Roman church

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/47481>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

Introduction to
The Epistles to the Romans

F. H. Wallace

Class of 1890

J. H. Wallace

THE BOOK OF ROMANS.

I. INTRODUCTION.

The Book of Romans is placed first among the writings of Paul in the Bible, not because it was the first production of his pen,- on the contrary others of the epistles had been written, read and no doubt learned by heart, long before Paul had thought of writing to the Roman Church. But its place in the Bible is won by its merit. It is first in doctrinal importance. Without question it is the longest, most important and systematic of Paul's views ever presented by him. It has incited the most scholarly to study, and its doctrines have been the cause perhaps of more literature than has any other book of the Bible. Its truths are great, and its principles the most inspiring. The princes of the earth can sit at the feet of the ancient, heaven-taught Jew and learn wisdom. Not extravagant have been the encomiums pronounced upon it.

LUTHER:- "It is the masterpiece of the New Testament, and the purest gospel, which can never be too much read or studied, and the more it is handled, the more precious it becomes.

MELANCTHON founded on it the doctrinal system of the Reformed Church,- the Loci Communis. 1521.

COLERIDGE:- "The profoundest Book in existence."

THOLUCK:- "A Christian philosophy of human history."

CALVIN:- "Every Christian should feed upon it as the daily bread of his soul."

Quoted from Lange, Farrar and others.

MEYER:- "The greatest and richest of all the apostolic works."

GODET:- "The cathedral of the Christian faith."

But there is here no exaggeration. The lowly have read it and rejoiced. The Gideons have girded on their swords in behalf of its truths. Reformations have been fought and won and successfully actualized in life through the influence of this blessed Book.

The most contrary theological systems have been builded from its teachings. We have Augustinianism and Calvinism,- systems of men whose benevolence was withered up; whose love and charity were narrow; having dispositions like that of the owl, most pleasant when it was night. We have the Jansenites on the one side, and the Jesuits on the other, and the Pope on both sides. We have Antinomianism with its soothing, poisoning balm, and John Fletcher ready with the antidote. We have John Calvin, whose "hardy spirit like that of Dante, peered unblanched into the abyss of reprobation," and the noble far-thinker, Arminius, with the basis of the Declaration of Independence applied to theology. We have the whole army of Popes, together with the hosts of saints in good and regular standing, with its benighted but earnest ritualists crying out, "Oh wretched man that I am", and we have in God's good providence, a man trained under the regal regime, initiated into all the mysteries of the system, even while performing what many

had undertaken as a meritorious duty and privilege, on his knees not before God, but on Pilate's staircase before the Pope:— We have Martin Luther crying out as he found that for which he had craved so many years, "The just shall live by faith."

II. THE CHURCH AT ROME.

1. THE FOUNDING.

Human nature till Darwin appeared has always manifested the tendency to prove its ancestry of the highest and purest of stock. King Solomon is not the only one who heard the people talking about the good old times. All of us love to dream of the earth when it was in its childhood days, and we ~~reign~~^{join} with this couple the thought of childlike simplicity and innocence; and we think of the time when Jehovah used to visit this planet which he had made, when he walked in the garden in the cool of the day, and in all literalness made this abode of ours his footstool.

Then the Adams and the Enochs and the Saints talked face to face with Jehovah, for he was the one who with his ~~own~~^{own} hand made them, and created all else for them.

(And so with the Greeks. They too, loved to sing of the ages past and gone. For them the fact was one of encouragement and

pride that the Gods did not disdain to create, then to dwell with men.

But the gods did not create the individual, and then leave him to his fate. Their interest was centred in mankind. They builded for him cities, and with him went out to war. They made alliances with the daughters of men and these mythical heroes were the guardians of the state. So Greece has its Cadmus, and Rome its Romulus. Truly there were "giants in the earth" in those days."

But the care of the gods did not stop here. Not only were governments founded under their guardianship, but churches as well. Prometheus half God and half man brings to ignorant and dependent humanity the very fire of Zeus.

Aeneas, "beloved of gods and men", under the fostering care of the "ever watchful Aphrodite", must reach Italy, and together with Romulus be the ancestors of Rome temporal. But if Rome temporal shall have such illustrious and heaven protected founders, what shall we say of Rome spiritual? As spiritual things are higher than temporal, so to the aristocracy of the Church must the founder of the spiritual nation be far more of a friend of the gods than a Romulus. He must be a man who has sat at the feet of a God,- who received his commission from Him to feed the sheep and protect the lambs. So from the very make-up of the human mind with its constant tendency for story telling, and its love for the magical and romantic, the Church at Rome must have as its hero,

a Peter or a Paul or both. A theological Prometheus half God and half man, not only must bring down the fires of heaven, but (he) must build the altars as well on which the fire is to burn.

However, that the Church at Rome did have an early origin none can dispute. Many a Roman to get rid of the argument that "Jerusalem is mother of us all", would have tidings of the gospel sounding through the streets of Rome, and startling the haughty patrician and bigoted Stoic, even in the days of Christ.

The Clementine Homilies advances this view. Even the Emperor Tiberius must hear of Christ and be favorably impressed with his teaching and work. All this, however, savors of the romantic spirit so common especially among our forefathers. No historical evidence whatever can be advanced in its support.

(See Neander, Kirchengesch, I, 51.)

But there is no doubt but that Christianity was introduced very early into Rome.

As Renan has well said:-

"The capital of the Empire heard the name of Jesus long before ^{the} intermediate countries had been evangelized, just as a mountain top is lighted up when the valleys situated between it and the sun are still enveloped in darkness." P. 91.

Its fame was known throughout the world. Rom. 1, 8.

It had a large number of teachers before Paul wrote to Rome. XVI.

The congregations met in many places. XVI, 5, 14, 15.

He had longed to see them for many years. 15, 23. 1, 13.

In short, "The letter gives us the idea of a church of some years' standing, of stability and of importance." Beet.

12. THE JEWS IN ROME.

(For a description of the Jew see Farrar's St. Paul, pp 585f)

While there had been some diplomatic intercourse between Jerusalem and Rome, B. C. 144, 141, 129 & 101, still the importance of the Jews at Rome dates from their transportation to Rome as prisoners by Pompey, B. C. 63. Julius Caesar, inspired with wonder at the manly independence with which they held aloof from idolatry, while all other nations fell into it, protected them and allowed them to settle in the district ^{*}beyond the Tiber afterwards assigned them by Augustus.

* (see Farrar, Seekers after God, pg. 168.)
 (" Renan, St. Paul, pg. 93.)

The favor shown them is evidenced by the fact that "no party in the state bewailed the death of Julius Caesar with greater ostentation or with more reason." Dods.

The close relations of friendship existing between Augustus and Herod the Great, also was advantageous to the Jews, who thus were ensured of the royal protection.

"The number of the Ambassadors sent by the authority of the nation (after the death of Herod, with a petition to Augustus) was 50, to which they joined 8,000 Jews that were at Rome already"
 Josephus. Beet.

So we may well rest assured that "during the ministry of Christ there were many thousands of Jews at Rome." Beet.

And they made their presence in Rome "tremendously felt". "Rome, so tolerant and so indifferent in her own religious beliefs, was sometimes startled into amazement by the raging violence of their internal disputes. Cicero, (who had described them as influential and prosperous in his time) x x x prided himself on his courage in defending Flaccus against their charges, and was obliged to deliver his speech in a low tone of voice, for fear of exciting a riot among thousands of them who besieged the court to denounce their enemy. Sober Quiritus had listened with astonishment to their wild wailing round the funeral pile of their patron, Julius Caesar." Sueton, Caes. 84.

Farrar, St. Paul, pg. 586.

They were so numerous and so tumultuous in the reign of Tiberius A. D. 19 that he banished them and by conscriptions and deportations tried to decrease their number.

Gaius, because of his attachment to Elder Agrippa, allowed them to remain unmolested as regards their religious and political rights. Under most of the reign of Claudius, too, they were protected, owing to the presence of the Herodian princes; and even during the reign of Nero, and consequently while St. Paul was a prisoner at Rome, the intercessions of the powerful Roman lady, Poppaea, were not without avail.

They were banished again A. D. 49 by Claudius, because they "ceased not to rise at the instigation of Christus", Suetonius. While this will bear another interpretation with scarcely no

violence (see Renan, pg. 92-3 & Godet) still the weight of evidence is in favor of the fact that religious difference was the cause of the tumult. However we interpret it, the fact remains that the Romans considered the Jews too numerous and too dangerous to be allowed to remain. Sejanus adopted the most cruel methods with them, but still Seneca could testify to their influence by saying, "The conquered race gave laws to the conquerors." And Tacitus speaks of the number martyred by Nero as a vast multitude.

-3.

CONSTANT INTERCOURSE BETWEEN ROME AND THE REST
OF THE WORLD.

That the majority of the inhabitants of Rome, were but "step-sons of Italy" is a truth accepted by all.

As one reads the historians of the day he is fully assured that all roads led to Rome.

Tacitus mourns because "all things hateful and shameful were sure to flow to Rome from all parts of the Empire.", and again he contemptuously exclaims:- "Rome is the sewer of the universe."

Being a cosmopolitan city, "Orbis in urbe erat" (Ovid) we need not wonder at the diversity of religious beliefs. As along the banks of the Nile it was much easier to find a god than a man, much more so in Rome. See Juvenal.

Syria in particular sent its emigrants ^{hither} (to Rome) (Juv. & Horace.)

Renan says:- "Rome was the meeting point of all the Oriental forms of worship; the point of ^{the} mediterranean with which Syria had most connection. They arrived in enormous bands. With them landed troops of Greeks and Asiatics, all "speaking Greek."

St. Paul, pg. 92.

As the East had Christian churches established as early as A. D. 45, and Greece by 50 and 55, if Christianity became any sort of a factor it would be a wonder if it did not reach Rome.

The Jews ^{here} in Rome certainly would trade in Palestine. They were in constant communication with Jerusalem. "They were in the habit of contributing sacred sums of money from their first fruits,

and sending them to Jerusalem by the hands of those who were to conduct the sacrifices." (Philo. Beet. Pg. 21.)

Their Mecca was at Jerusalem. The Daniels all looked toward Jerusalem when praying. To it they made frequent pilgrimages. Cursed be the Jew who did not "prefer Jerusalem above his chief joy!" Jehovah dwelt in Mt. Sinai, so it need occasion no surprise at all when we read that at the day of Pentecost were found at Jerusalem, "sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes." (Acts. 2,10)

Note. OBJECTIONS:

GODET: Against the fact that the Jews from Rome to

I, the feasts at Jerusalem heard the gospel, were converted and brought the news home.

(1) Why not have the Church at Corinth, Ephesus, and Thessalonica founded in this way? Yet as a matter of fact, when Paul preached to them it seemed as a new gospel.

(2) Acts. 28. Paul called together the rulers of the synagogue. The rulers showed great ignorance of Jesus and Christians.

If this religion had excited such debates as to banish them under Claudius, how is it that the rulers were so ignorant of it?

II. "We may safely assume that the church was just as much founded by Gentile Christians from Antioch, as by Jewish Christians who witnessed the first Pentecost at Jerusalem." pg: 32 Lange.

Many an Aquila & Priscilla while in exile ministered unto Paul was instructed in the church principles, and then returned to help spread the glad tidings in Rome.

Note. (That Aquilla and Priscilla were not converted by Paul but were Christians before leaving Rome. See Renan, St. P. P.359, Note, 49.)

Thus Christianity might be brought by them to Rome. Perhaps also some of the Christians dispersed at the time of the death of Stephen (Acts 8, 4; 11, 19.) also came ^{hitherward} (to Rome)

Roman Legion. also must be considered a factor under the providence of God in spreading the gospel. We do know that the soldiers on returning to Rome brought with them the ideas and civilization of the countries in which they had been stationed. We also know that they frequently accepted the religion of these countries. Surely it is not too much to suppose that some of Rome's myriads heard of the crucified Christ, accepted Him as their Saviour, and carried the news back with them to Rome. We have a historical case of the same kind where the Swiss and German soldiers carried the seeds of the Reformation into Italy.

Again: The policy of the Emperors in alternately banishing ^{the} and allowing Jews to return would tend to bring the gospel to Rome. We have a definite historic case of this kind, mentioned in Acts 18, 2; Rom. 16, 3.

"Of a truth, the haughty patricians who, in their promenades on the Aventine, cast their eyes across the Tiber, did not imagine that the future was getting itself ready in this pile of wretched houses at the foot of the Janiculum". Renan pg. 95.

"On that day of the reign of Claudius on which some Jews, initiated into the new creed set foot on land opposite the Emporium, - on that day no one knew in Rome that the founder of a second Empire, another Romulus, was lodged at the post on his bed of straw." pg. 95.

4. (a) PETER DID NOT FOUND THE CHURCH AT ROME.

1. We mean that Peter was not present in person for any length of time (if at all) before 63 or 64. Of course in case Peter's preaching at the day of Pentecost (Acts 2, 10) was the occasion of the gospel reaching Rome, he must indirectly be regarded as the founder.

It is very essential to discuss this question here. If Peter founded the Church we should expect a different type of Christianity; a larger proportion of Jews than Gentiles (if in fact any Gentiles) and finally, allowing a mixed population in the church, our view of the Book of Romans must be modified accordingly.

Doubtless a few slender threads, perhaps founded on fiction, first gave impetus to the story that Peter was the founder of the Church at Rome.

Justin Martyr: Apol. 1. c. 26. "Justin takes a statue raised to a Sabine god (Semo Sancus) in an island of the Tiber, for a statue erected to the Magician Simon of the Book of the Acts. This statue was rediscovered in 1574, with the inscription "Semoni Sanco, Deo Fidio." Eusebius (11, 14,) has followed Justin".
Godet.

Thus as Simon came to Rome, Peter must come also in order to combat him. Doubtless also the statement of Suetonius that Chrestus raised a sedition in Rome was a potent factor in the forming of the legend that Peter was the occasion of the founding of the Church.

Of course it was to the interest of the Catholic Church to

preserve and foster this myth, and that she has done so none will deny. In fact Christian tradition seems to acquire definiteness in proportion as it is removed from the event of which it speaks.

To show how easy it is to be mistaken, we have but to quote a few of the Fathers. Thus Irenæus:- "Matthew wrote his gospel while Peter and Paul were in Rome preaching the gospel and founding the church there." If this be true certainly Paul has as much honor as Peter.

Eusebius says:- "Peter having founded the church at Antioch, departed for Rome, preaching the gospel."

Both of them are incorrect. All acknowledge that Peter did not found the church at Antioch, (Acts 11, 19) and all admit that both did not preach at Rome together at least before 64-8. The first mention of Peter's being in Rome is found in Dionysius of Corinth in the latter half of the second century, and of course after that it was received. The news was too good to be disbelieved.

Dionysius:- "For both (Peter and Paul) taught alike in our Corinth, when they planted us; and both alike also in Italy in the same place, after having taught there, at the same time suffered martyrdom."

Quoted by Schaff. Apos. Church, pg. 366.

But Peter never saw Corinth. The whole fable arose from a statement of Paul's in 1 Cor. 1, 12, about the party of Cephas.

Eusebius has Peter come to Rome under Claudius, A. D. 42 and preside over the church from 20 to 25 years. He is followed by Jerome who would first have him for a season as Bishop of Antioch

and then for 25 years Bishop of Rome.

Note. It was Paul who was the great pioneer to the West, and he himself had not visited Europe in 42. In Acts (VI-XIII) we are told carefully and fully all the steps and the providential openings which led Paul to leave Asia and go to Europe. Certainly if the author of the Acts had known that Peter had gone, he would have mentioned it, and not have laid so much emphasis on Paul's visit.

"He himself (Paul) in fact stood in need of a spiritual direction from Christ to pass over to Europe (Acts 16; 9,) ; and so another official herald of the faith can hardly before the time have penetrated so far as Italy." Meyer, pg. 17.

But Acts 12, 3-17, Acts 11, 28; 12, 1, A.D. 44, leaves him a prisoner in Palestine by Agrippa. Now this shuts off his Bishopric at Antioch, and at least shortens the time for being Bishop at Rome. Now he did not escape from Agrippa till 44, or 4th year of Claudius when he (Acts 12, 17) departed "to another place." But he was back in Jerusalem in 50 (Acts 15, 7; Gal. 2, 9). Now if Paul had gone to Rome between 44 and 50, we have no record of it in the Acts or Romans, and if he founded a church it must have been annihilated by the edict, for the Jews (Acts 28,) knew nothing of Christianity, which they would if Peter had founded the church, and especially a Jewish church.

At 50-52 he was at Jerusalem, and was a laborer among the Jews and expected to be so for some time, according to the agreement with Paul and Barnabas (Gal. 2, 7, 9,); soon after he is at Antioch, A. D. 54 (Gal. 2, 11); at the writing of the first Epistle

to the Corinthians (A.D. 57) he had no fixed abode (1 Cor. 9, 5.)
 In 58 he cannot have been at Rome or Paul would have saluted him.
 In 61 Paul came to Rome, and no mention of Peter is made.
 In 61-3 Paul wrote his epistles from Rome in which he mentions by
 name his companions and helpers, but no Peter, neither is he re-
 ferred to in Acts 28, 15, nor in Philippians of A.D. 64.

It is not to the credit of some Catholic Historians to accept the
 half way position that Peter was in Rome, 44-9; 52-8 60-1; 64-8,
 for he must have kept out of the way of Paul or his companions, of
 the epistle to the Romans, and have left no trace of his residence.
 Such a travelling Pope is no worthy predecessor of ^{Leo XIII} ~~Pius IX.~~

We also have the testimony of early writers that Peter did not
 reach Rome till late. Thus Lactantius asserts that Peter did not
 arrive at Rome till the reign of Nero; also Origen who says that he
 arrived there at the close of his life. The same can be said of
 the Praedicatio Petri, printed with the works of St. Cyprian.
 The most liberal of Roman Catholic theologians before the time of
 the Vatican Council also accepted this view.

(See Farrar Early Days of Christianity, pg. 63 f.)

(Also on the Primacy of St. Peter, do., pg. 593 f.)

"In Irenaeus, Adv. Hoer. III 3, 3, and Eusebius himself,
 (H. E. 3, 2, 4.) Livius appears rather to have been the 1st Roman
 Bishop, who, according to Apos. Const. . (VII. 46, 1.)
 was even appointed by Paul himself." Weiss, pg. 295.

Clement, the third Bishop of Rome, knows nothing of Peter's being first Bishop, and from his glowing description of Paul in the 5th Chap. of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, it is pretty evident that he ascribes greater importance for the Roman Church to this apostle than to Peter, of whom he had less to say.

Schaff Apos. Ch. pg. 372.

And we may add that the Book of Acts mentions neither as the founder of the Roman Church.

(B.) FROM THE WRITINGS OF PAUL.

The main argument is based on the character of Paul. His spirit was one of independence. He was a pioneer in the work. He wished to explore new country. He would not use other men's patterns nor ride in their coaches.

We find statements to this effect in Rom. 15, 20. He says he would not build upon another man's foundation and gives us to understand that it was contrary to apostolic practice.

Note.

BEET says that 15, 20 "proves nothing either way." pg.21.

"His maxim not to build upon another man's foundation seems to have kept him from Rome." Beet, pg. 22.

We do not see that this argument has much weight as Beet puts it. Surely his epistle was meant to build on some foundation. He certainly felt that he had a right to teach them. Also on reaching Rome, and while in imprisonment there he had no hesitancy whatever in preaching both to Jews and Gentiles.

We can easily see why this is the case. The apostles had different views regarding Christian truth and while Luther and Melanchthon might be co-workers because of the mantle of charity and earnest personal affection, still their followers would fight. And in 2 Cor. 10, 15-16 while he is on this third journey he speaks while in Macedonia of "preaching the gospels even unto the parts beyond you, (why not Rome?) and not to glory in another's province in regard to things ready to our hand."

From the above we can be fully assured that Paul would not have preached at Rome if the pioneer work had been done by Peter. But if Peter was the founder of the² church, Paul in his letter would have acknowledged it. But we search in vain for any mention of a visit of any of the apostles, even of himself.

Consequently neither Peter nor Paul were the founders.

Note. "The absence of any reference to him (Peter) here and in other epistles written from Rome, makes it unlikely that he had much to do with the founding of the Church, still, Peter's silence about Paul in his first Epistle which was written to churches founded by Paul, shows that this argument must not be taken as conclusive." Beet, pg. 21.

SCHAFF:- The first Epistle of Peter written to establish and confirm them (Paul's converts) in the doctrine and the grace which had been communicated to them from the first^{and therefore} as Paul and his followers had founded those churches, to testify Peter's essential agreement in faith with the Apostle of the Gentiles."
History of the Apostolic Church, pg. 357.

"Manche, besonders Katholiken, betrachten den Petrus als ersten Gründer der Römischen Gemeinde, indem sie ihn schon in der ersten Zeit des Claudius nach Rom kommen lassen. Allein aus unserem Briefe selbst lässt sich mit Sicherheit entnehmen, dass zur Zeit der Abfassung desselben weder Petrus noch ein anderer Apostel in Rom gewesen war."
pg. 411 Bleek, Einleitung in das N. T.

Again, if an apostle had visited Rome between 45 and 59, and by hypothesis it must have been Peter, a church would have been organized. But Paul addresses no church.

As J. E. Ch. Schmidt says:- Daher ist derselbe auch nicht, wie die Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Korinther, Galater, an die ἐκκλησία zu Rom gerichtet, oder wie der Philipperbrief an die Gläubigen ἑνὶ ἑπιστοκόρῳ καὶ διακόνῳ, sondern bloss (1,7) "an alle zu Rom befindlichen Geliebten Gottes, berufenen Heiligen," wie auch im Briefe selbst keine Hinweisungen auf bestehende feste Gemeinde einrichtungen sich finden." &c. Bleek, pg. 412.

Thus we see that we have no ground either from history, the writings of the Fathers or from the Bible that Peter founded the Church at Rome.

5. PAUL DID NOT FOUND IT.

On the other hand we have evidence that Paul did not directly found the church. That he had never seen Rome when the Epistle was written can be shown from 1, 10, 13; 15, 23-29, and we know his whereabouts from this time to his imprisonment at Rome. While in his letter he addresses Christians at Rome, and when he is near the city as a prisoner, the brethren come out to meet him.

6. But while neither Peter nor Paul were directly connected with the Roman Church, still the result of their labors in other quarters was here felt also. And we believe that it had numerous

adherents and quite early. How founded and by whom we cannot say; all we can affirm is that it was not an apostle. The Book of Acts mentioning none, tacitly gives us to understand that the growth was silent and unknown, and Ambrosiaster (false Ambrose) (Hilary) exults in the fact that the Church at Rome was Christian "without having seen a single miracle or any of the apostles." The names of all the pioneers we never shall know till the time of the "revealing of the sons of God."

"Aquila and Priscilla are the two earliest members of the Church at Rome known to us. They are scarcely recollected by her. Legendary record, always unjust, for it is always influenced by political motives, has excluded these two obscure artisans from the Christian pantheon, in order to attribute the honor of founding the Church of Rome to a more illustrious name, more befitting the haughty pretensions to universal dominion, which the capital of Europe, when it had become Christianized could not surrender. In our mind, it is not at the theatrical Basilica which they have consecrated to St. Peter; it is at the porta Portese, that antique ghetto, that we in reality see the starting-point of western Christianity. It should be the footsteps of these poor Jewish vagrants, who brought the religion of the world with them,- these men of suffering, dreaming in their musing of the Kingdom of God, that they should seek out and kiss. We do not dispute Rome her essential title. Rome was probably the first point in the western world, and even in Europe, where Christianity established itself.

But instead of these lofty Basilicas, instead of these insulting devices Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat, it would be better to rear a modest chapel to the two good Jews from Pontus who were driven out by the police of Claudius for having belonged to the party of Chrestus." Renan, pp. 978.

BLEEK.ORIGIN.

As to the origin of the Roman Church, it seems to me that Bleek has about the right idea:

"Wahrscheinlich ist es ursprünglich nicht durch einzelne hervorragende Lehrer dahin gekommen, welche eigens als Missionare zur Verkündigung des Evangeliums dahin gegangen waren, sondern von verschiedenen Seiten durch Bewohner Roms, judische oder heidnische, welche selbst auswärts mit dem Evangelium bekannt geworden und zu demselben bekehrt waren und bei ihrer Rückkehr wieder Andere für dasselbe gewonnen halten. Das mag namentlich mit manchen Juden der Fall gewesen sein, welche, durch das Edict des Claudius aus Rom vertrieben, nachdem dieses aufgehoben oder in Vergessenheit gekommen war, wieder dahin zurückkehrten oder damals zuerst dahin einwanderten, die an verschiedenen Orten, theils durch Paulus und dessen Freunde oder in Paulinischen Gemeinden, theils aber auch in anderen Kreisen, z. B. in Jerusalem zum Christenthum bekehrt worden waren." pg. 411.

Or as SCHAFF says:-

"We regard it (the origin of the Roman Church.) as similar to the rise of the Church at Antioch, which was originally an assembly of the apostles and emigrant members of the Church of Jerusalem, * and was afterwards placed on a firmer foundation, and permanently organized by Barnabas, Peter and Paul." Acts 11, 19-26. Gal. 2, 11

* NOTE. This does not prove that the Church was Jewish. If we continue the comparison between Antioch and Rome, the conclusion would be just the opposite. For it was Gentiles who were converted and it was Gentiles who were first called Christians.

Acts 11, 19-26.

II. 2.

AS TO THE COMPOSITION OF THE CHURCH THERE ARE THREE VIEWS.

JEWS.

1. That held by the Tubingen School, also Davidson and Wordsworth, (Baur, Schwegler, and Thiersch)- that the composition of the Church at Rome was most entirely of Jewish Christian, and followers of Ebionitic tendency.

Of course the theory being established, the facts must be made to fit the theory.

We must believe that the Church at Rome, (according to this theory) was but Jewish; that they received Christ as the Messiah who was to come, but still were narrow and bigoted in the extreme, slaves still to the law of Moses, and we must add, if we make this church like other Jewish churches, haters of a free and universal gospel, and consequently enemies of Paul.

Baur regards this Epistle as intended for a defence of Paul's missionary operations against the peculiar prejudices of the Jewish Christians; or, in Schwegler's rather more comprehensive terms, an apology for Paulinism in general, and a systematic refutation of the primitive Judaistic Christianity, or Petrinism. Consequently the gist of the Book is Chap. 9-11, and Chaps. 1-8, merely introductory.

But Paul definitely states the theme of the Epistle in 1, 16; that is, the "gospel is the power of God to justify and save all sinners through faith."

Thiersch also believes in the Jewish composition of the church

but makes sad work of it in his attempted proof. He says:-

THIERSCH:- Die Kirche im Apost. Zeitalter.

"Sein Grundsatz, nicht auf einen fremden Grund zu bauen, bestimmt ihn zu dem Vorhaben, die römische Gemeinde nur auf der Durchreise zu sehen und von ihr nach Hispanien geleitet zu werden." pg. 162.

But while the Romish Christians were followers of Peter, still, "Sie stand nicht in feindlicher Auflehnung gegen ihn (Paul); doch erkannte sie sein Apostolat nicht an, denn sie war in seine Lehre noch nicht eingeweiht; sie betrachtete vielmehr seine Lehre, und noch mehr seine Art zu wirken, mit ähnlichem Vorurtheil, wie es ihm in Jerusalem begegnete. Was es für sie auf dem Herzen hat, ist somit eine Apologie seiner Lehre und seiner Wirksamkeit." Pg. 162.

It seems to me that the author is very illogical in his position. He did not intend to build upon another's foundation, but still he gave a defence of his teaching, in order as he says: "Diesen israelitischen Christen von ihren etwas zurückgebliebenen Standpunkt zu einer reicheren Einsicht in das Erlösungswerk emporzuhelfen." 163.

The contradictions are too plain to need any comment.

2. GENTILE.

This view is supported by Neander, (Meyer,) De Wette, Olshausen, Tholuck, Reuss, (Weiss,) &c.

In support of this view many strong arguments can be adduced.

In 1, 5 Paul in claiming Apostleship among all the ^{ἔθνη} adds "Among whom ye are also called to be Christ's."

1, 12. He wished to have fruit in them even as in the rest of the Gentiles.

He is a debtor to the Greeks and barbarians and he is not ashamed to preach even among the wise, consequently not afraid to preach the gospel at Rome (among the Greeks and barbarians.)
1, 14, 16.

In 4, 16, he calls Abraham the father of us all and classes in the Gentiles in the connection.

6, 19, characterizes their past life as a bondage to ^{ἀκαθαρσία,} _{καὶ ἀνομία}

"In chap. 11, 1. he must be speaking to Gentiles. If to the Jews there was no need of appealing to himself alone that the Jews would not be cast off. The whole conclusion of first part of chap. 11 seems to be for the Gentiles and 13 expressly declares that Paul is speaking to that part of the church which is Gentile. In verse 14 he emphasizes those that are of my flesh as if in opposition to the rest." Weiss.

In 11, 13, he calls them *ἑθνεσιν*

In 11, 25-32 plainly the Gentile "brethren" are included.

15, 15 is conclusive, and 15, 21 is the conclusion. It was work not built upon another's foundation.

"In his argument Paul sets out from promises that were incontrovertible only to the consciousness of Pauline Gentile Christians (III. 27-30)".

"But the way in which the exhortation to the majority of the church to bear the infirmities of the weak (15. 1 ff.) supported by a glance of the relation of Jews and Gentiles to salvation (15, 8 f.), shows beyond a doubt that it consisted mainly of Gentiles." "Finally he once more justifies himself for writing to them by an appeal to his apostleship to the Gentiles." (15, 15 f.)

Weiss.

COMPOSITION.

REFUTATION OF JEWISH COMPOSITION.

That the tendency was not strong can be seen from a study of the Epistle. The main thought of the book is not an attack on the Jews, on the contrary Paul freely joins in praising them for their faith 1, 8, and says that the $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\delta\alpha\chi\eta\varsigma$ which they had obeyed was his gospel. 6, 17. Also 15, 15 implies that they had accepted his teaching.

And 1, 12 would be the height of nonsense if written to a bigoted Jew:- I with you may be comforted in you, each of us by the other's faith, both yours and mine.

16, 17, also tells them to shun those who are an "occasion of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which ye learned",- implying teaching directly opposed to Ebionite.

16, 19 described as yet free from these Jewish errors "for your obedience is come about unto all men."

"In the whole Epistle to the Romans there is not a syllable which maintains disputes as to the relations of the law and the gospel, such as those which prevailed in Galatians."

Olshausen, Vol. III. p.451.

As regards the quotation from the Old Testament (the phrase $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\rho\alpha\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ occurring nineteen times in Romans) we know that the Epistle to the Galatians was written to Gentiles,- this is admitted by all, and yet it abounds in Old Testament quotations and references.

We have a concrete example in Romans 7, 1, where Paul speaks to "such as know the law." "If the church had been a Jewish Christian one, the $\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$ would in its case have been so entirely self-evident that we should not be able at all to see why Paul should have specially noticed it. But as converted Gentiles the readers had become acquainted with the law." Meyer, pg. 258, note 2.

In the apologetic portion 9-11, the argument is rather about Jews than addressed to them, "and the moral precepts of the practical chapters seem to have in view the liberal Gentiles far more than the Ebionizing Jews." Farrar. St. Paul, pg. 449.

Then when we reach the salutations we are confronted with arguments in favor of Gentile composition.

If the composition were Jewish we should expect some reference to synagogues, but the fact of the case is that no such reference is made, but in every case the Christians in the houses are saluted. This would prove that the Jewish element had become in a great measure estranged from their customs, and were willing to leave synagogues and meet with Gentiles, - or else it would prove that the Gentiles were all there were to salute.

Then when we consider the salutations themselves, we notice the preponderance of the Gentile names.

A priori owing to the position and importance of Rome, it is no more inconceivable that the Church was founded by Gentiles from Antioch than by Jews from Jerusalem.

It is, however, much more probable to suppose that when Paul founded churches in Europe, Macedonia and Greece, that some earnest workers journeyed to Rome and spread the gospel there among their Gentile brethren. "As Paul had been so eminently successful in Greece, it was very natural that apostolic men from his school should bear evangelic truth further westward, to the metropolis of heathendom." Meyer.

If we cannot see how the Jews, if in a minority could associate with Gentiles, neither can we conceive the opposite:

As Neander says:-

Neander. History of the Planting of Christianity.

"If we suppose those Jewish Christians who taught the continued obligation of the Mosaic Law to have formed the original body of the Church, it will not be easy to explain how Gentile Christians who adopted the Pauline principles (and who must have evidently been a minority), could join themselves to such."

Vol. 1. pg. 281.

Then when we consider the salutations themselves, we notice the preponderance of the Gentile names.

A priori owing to the position and importance of Rome, it is no more inconceivable that the Church was founded by Gentiles from Antioch than by Jews from Jerusalem.

It is, however, much more probable to suppose that when Paul founded churches in Europe, Macedonia and Greece, that some earnest workers journeyed to Rome and spread the gospel there among their Gentile brethren. "As Paul had been so eminently successful in Greece, it was very natural that apostolic men from his school should bear evangelic truth further westward, to the metropolis of heathendom." Meyer.

If we cannot see how the Jews, if in a minority could associate with Gentiles, neither can we conceive the opposite:

As Neander says:-

Neander. History of the Planting of Christianity.

"If we suppose those Jewish Christians who taught the continued obligation of the Mosaic Law to have formed the original body of the Church, it will not be easy to explain how Gentile Christians who adopted the Pauline principles (and who must have evidently been a minority), could join themselves to such."

Vol. 1. pg. 281.

If the Jewish tendency were strong the Church must have been divided, - then how explain Acts 28, 21-26.?

It seems to me that one must read deceit and dissimulation into this passage in order to find it afterwards.

BAUR and his followers must resort to this method, or else this account is a death-blow to the Jewish composition of the church.

ACCORDING TO BAUR, it is a fiction of the writer, and therefore untrustworthy. Starting with the statement that the Church was Jewish, all statements contradicting this assertion are written from partisan motives, and therefore highly colored, or else the writer intentionally deceived and consequently the account is false.

It seems to me also that Meyer's position is wholly wrong. "The Jewish leaders are here speaking as officials, and, as such, are not included without special immediate occasion to express their views before the captive stranger as to the position of the Christian body which existed in Rome itself." "Not dishonesty but prudence and caution are evinced in their conduct." - Meyer, Romans, pg. 20.

1. Paul does not ask concerning the Christian body in Rome, consequently any statement of the Jews regarding the Christians is wholly gratuitous, and a reason must be shown for the attempt at reserve.

2. Certainly in vs.22, the Christian "sect" appears as one which had every where fallen into disrepute and the natural inference is that they had not as yet come into contact with it.

3. They ask to hear from Paul what he thinks. Whoever heard before or since this of a bigoted Jew desiring to hear the sect of the Nazarenes spoken about, and their own religion libelled?

4. Surely at the later conference their actions betray sincerity and a desire to learn the truth. They heard Paul all day long, and then "some believed the things which were spoken," and some disbelieved.

The message certainly sounded new to them. They surely acted as if they knew personally nothing about this new religion, and also as no Jew ever acted after having come in contact with Christianity.

This view of Meyer's when analyzed is fully as bad as the Baur's. "As to precise relation in which this sect stands to them in Rome itself they do not feel themselves called upon to say anything for the present, and with discreet reserve are wholly silent respecting it." pg. 20.

Consequently knowing fully the state of the Christian Church, having doubtless frequently had occasion to combat it,- hating it

from their souls, nevertheless at the invitation of the arch-heretic, they pull a mask over their faces and meet him, (but why should they?); assert ignorance of this sect, and like children thirsting for knowledge, ask for information; and there they listen all day long to his instruction in spite of their intense prejudice, love for Judaism, and hatred of Christianity, and then to cap the climax- some believe and some disbelieve,- a dispute is gotten up, and they depart in an uproar, and the curtain falls!

Surely it takes an exegete to invent a theory!

If posted regarding Christianity in Rome why inquire about its doctrines ?

Why go to see Paul ?

Why "speak with reserve"?

What object for deceiving ?

We may rest assured that wherever bigoted Jews met Christians there was trouble. Consequently if the Jewish element were strong in the Church or if there had been much secession from Judaism, we should have had no such account as given in Acts 28.

We think that the true interpretation is to be taken from the face of the account, and not in any hidden or distorted meaning.

1. The Jews certainly express ignorance of the sect.

Now such an ignorance is probable for many reasons.

a. Taking for granted that the original element of the Church before the persecution by Claudius to be Jewish, we have no ground for asserting its continuance.

1'. The Church certainly was scattered and dispersed from Rome. Aquilla and Priscilla will serve as illustrations.

This would destroy for the time being at least the effect of the early work.

This would not only drive out the Christians, but also their persecutors as well. The cause of the contention and the contending parties both alike would disappear from the field. But this edict did not apply to Gentiles, consequently if any Christians did remain in Rome they were not Jews.

b. The Christians on their entrance once more into Rome (if indeed many returned) might have learned wisdom from the past and have separated themselves from the Jews. We do not see the necessity for this, however. Without the least doubt the church was so small at the time of the expulsion that most of the work had to be done over again.

MEYER says:- "It is highly probable that a Christian Church was founded at Rome only subsequent to Paul's transference of his missionary labors to Europe; since there is no sort of indication that on his first appearance in Macedonia and Achaia he anywhere found a congregation existing," Romans, pg. 17.

But allowing that such was the case, we can see no objection. For surely if Aquila and Priscilla are good specimens, they were Pauline Jews, and accepted Christianity first, and preferred it to Judaism, - consequently for the good of the cause and to avoid contention, (even if not driven out) they would be willing to leave. We have a parallel case at a later date in Jerusalem. The Christians separated themselves from the Jews that they might not be confounded with them, and might be allowed to live in Aelia. That such a separation was made can be seen from Nero's persecution. The Jews were not persecuted, but a distinct and separate body called Christians.

We think this account favors the supposition already supported by many arguments that the composition of the Church was mostly Gentile. The supposition of Farrar will not help the difficulty as regards Acts 28.

"Perhaps the two parties owed their immunity from dissension to the passage of the Gentiles into the church through the portals of the synagogue; or perhaps still more to the plasticity of ecclesiastical organization which enabled the foreign and Graeco-Roman converts to worship undisturbed in their own little congregations which met under the roof of an Aquila or an Olympas. If the Jewish and Gentile communities were separated by a marked division, collisions between the two sections would have been less likely to occur."

St. Paul, pg. 452.

In such a case the Jews would not have been in ignorance of Christianity, and they would not have been obliged to play a part or pretend to be unprejudiced when all the while deceit and hatred were in their hearts.

Again the fact that the Jews acted as if they never had heard of Paul's letter is an argument for Gentile Christianity.

Acts 28, 22, they desire to hear all about the matter, and in verse 23 they listen all day to him. Surely they had not come in contact with Christians and were in ignorance of their doctrines.

Again, this ignorance on the part of the rulers shows that they had not been alarmed by any considerable amount of secession from Judaism. People who would encompass heaven and earth to win a proselyte, surely would not stand idly by and see their system destroyed by desertions from their ranks. This statement is substantiated by an appeal to the Epistle. We read of no great contentions and divisions; Either the accessions from Judaism were very small, or else they were all of the stamp of Aquila and Priscilla, and it is our opinion that among the Jews the Aquilas and Priscillas were and are exceedingly scarce in the world.

Paul's answer to them on that occasion only proves the point. Wherever Paul went, he preached first to the Jews, and invariably was repulsed and invariably he said as he here said: "Be it known unto you that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles." Acts 28, 28. If the Jews would not believe with a Paul as a preacher they surely would not turn for a less eloquent and inspired man.

This view is confirmed by the salutations at the close of the Book. He seems to be intimately acquainted with some of them. He knew in whose houses the Christians met, and to what households they belonged and when converted. 16, 7. We expect the Apostle to the Gentiles to know these facts not regarding Jews, but regarding former heathen.

If there were many Jews in the church, what became of them ?

"It is a most remarkable fact that, when St. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Colossians (63), two only of the Judaic Christians showed him any countenance, - namely: Mark and Jesus, whose surname of Justus, if it be intended as a translation of *δικαιος* shows that he, like James the Just, was a faithful observer of the law. (Col. IV. 11)" Farrar, Paul, pg. 579. 5.

This surely is saying very little for a church with such a founder as St. Peter!

Then other arguments are adduced. Weiss says that the Epistle of Clement shows that the character of the Church was essentially Gentile, and we know that before many years had passed, the church (even) was hostile to Judaism. As Neander says:-

"In the controversy of the churches in Lesser Asia, the Bishops of Rome were the opponents of the Jewish Christian, Easter; this was closely connected with the formation of the Christian cultus on Pauline principles, and an appeal could here be made to ancient tradition. To the marks of an anti-Jewish tendency belongs also the custom of fasting on the Sabbath." pg. 282.

Neander History of the Planting of Christianity.

BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES WITH THE LATTER MUCH IN THE MAJORITY.

Our point will be proven if we can show that there were any Jews in the Church.

1. Passages in the Epistle.

In Chap. II especially verses 17, 27 the address seems too direct not to apply directly to the Jews.

So also in III, 19, his remarks are to those "under the law".

Chap. IV, 1, 12, Abraham is called the "Father of us all",- this at least would include the Jews.

In Chap. VII Paul seems to be "addressing Jews as those who, like himself, had once been under the domain of the law, but had been delivered from it." Mc'Clin. & Strong.

See especially verses 4 and 6.

In Chap. 11, 13, he says:- I am speaking to you, the Gentiles" implying that he had been speaking to some who were not.

IV, 1 f. he recommends indulgence toward the weak, (i.e Jews) in faith, who, like the Jewish Christians in Corinth, (1 Cor. 8.), abstain from meat and wine, and observe the Jewish feasts.

That Rome had its Judaizers can be seen from Rom. 16, 17 f.

and from the Epistle written from Rome: Phil. 1, 15; 2, 20, 21;

Col. 4, 11; 2 Tim. 4, 16.

in order to bring them into union and harmony, as, from a different fundamental thought, he did in the Epistle to the Ephesians.

In the greeting and introduction we find Jewish and Gentile Christians spoken of with equal regard. The theme of the Epistle,

1, 14-17, expressly applies the gospel alike to Jews and Greeks.

In exposition of the unrighteousness of the human race, the Gentiles and Jews are placed together in the light of searching truth,

1, 18; 3, 20. Likewise, justification by faith is applied in the most positive manner to Jews as well as Gentiles. 3, 21; 5, 11.

Also the participation in the death of Adam and in the new life in Christ, 5, 12; 8, 39. So, likewise, the two economies of judgment and mercy in the history of the world, 9-11. Even in the

exhortation the distinction again appears; the weak in faith and the free; the severe and the scornful; the weak and the

strong, 14-15, 7; yet here the other opposition between the

and the Pauline Christians is also taken into account." pg. 33.

4. That the influence of Judaism on the Church at Rome was tremendous seems to be substantiated by several facts.

1. It was an open door through which proselytes might enter.

The Pharisees at Rome like those at Jerusalem encompassed heaven and earth in order to make a convert.

PROSELYTISM could go uninterrupted in the Jewish quarter of the city. "A Roman who respected himself never entered these abject districts. The police only entered there when the disturbances were bloody, or took place too frequently. In ordinary times, the religion was not only practiced there without obstacle, but propaganda was made there with every facility."

Renan, pg. 93-4, and note 25.

"The poor Jewess seized an opportunity while begging with a trembling voice to whisper a few words of the law into the ear of the high Roman lady, and often gained over the matron who extended her hand to her full of small pieces of money."

That these proselytes were numerous and often of exalted rank can be seen from Tacitus, Cicero and Horace.

Note. We have the names of Fulvia and Valeria, "Fulvia, a woman of great dignity, and one who had embraced the Jewish religion."

Joseph, Antiquity, quoted by Beet.

5. But if Judaism was able to make converts how much more so Christianity?

There was the natural hatred of the Romans for the Jews. The haughty Roman shrank back from the Jew as if he were pollution incarnate. A race of filthy beggars was abomination to a Roman:

(For quotations from many writers, see Farrar's St. Paul, pp. 719-20)

Consequently it is but natural that the proselytes to Judaism should again change to some extent their views and become Christians. In the light of this fact much of the Epistle to the Romans

can be interpreted.

The Roman Church would appear at once Jewish and Gentile; Jewish, for the Apostle everywhere argues with them as Jews; Gentile, for he expressly addresses them as Gentiles."

Jowett. quoted by Farrar.

But we do not believe that the Gentiles to any very large extent entered Christianity through the door of Judaism. A Roman who would enter the sheepfold not by the door (direct access) but should take the trouble to climb up some other way (via. Judaism) must have been regarded by his fellow Christians at least as wasting a good deal of valuable time. And we have good authority for affirming that they did not wait for the troubling of the Jewish waters.

As Meyer says:-

MEYER:- "Christianity which took root first among the Jews, found an easier entrance in Rome among the heathen, because in Rome, the popular heathen religion had already incurred the contempt of both the cultivated and ignorant classes. (see Gieseler's Church History, 1, § 11-14); the inclination to Monotheism was very common, and the multitude of those who came over to the Jewish faith was very large. But how much more must this liberal religion so elevated above the bonds of a repulsive legal rigorism, as it was preached by Aquila and other Pauline teachers, receive attention and support at the hands of those Romans who were discontented with heathendom."

Then if we consider the soothing balm and sweet peace which Christianity afforded to the tired and sin sick Roman,- a peace which Judaism failed to bestow, we shall not wonder at the number of converts.

Take but one illustration.

"The system of slavery was in itself irredeemably degrading, and we cannot wonder, but only rejoice, that from Caesar's household downwards, there were many in this condition who found in Christian teaching a light and peace of heaven. However low their earthly lot, they thus attained to a faith so sure and so consolatory that in the very catacombs they surrounded the grim memorials of death with emblems of peace and beauty, and made the ill-spelt jargon of their quaint illiterate epitaphs the expression of a radiant happiness and an illimitable hope." Farrar, St. Paul, pg. 585.

6. How was it then that the Jewish and Gentile Christians could live so harmoniously side by side ?

We believe there would be less cause for trouble as a rule, from the side of the Gentiles than from the side of the Jews. The Galatian and Corinthian Churches were at peace till Judaizers appeared.

The Gentiles naturally would feel the force of Paul's question "What advantage then hath the Jew ?"

The Gentiles would see that they had served "them who by nature were not gods," consequently as a rule, the Jewish Christians

as long as they were friendly and not domineering, would be treated with all due respect. But the trouble would come from the side of the Jews. Religion without ceremonies and rites would have for them little meaning. Hence the conversion to Christianity must be sound indeed to prevent the Jew from sighing for the "flesh pots of Egypt."

Consequently it must be that the Church at Rome (if we are to take the tone of the Epistle as an indicator) was Pauline in its tendency. We must bear in mind that the "difference between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians must not be confounded with the difference between non-Pauline and Pauline Christians." Lange.

Accepting this statement we are also ready to accept that of HILGENFELD:-

"Die romische Christen- gemeinde, Juden Christlich, -
essenischen stammes, aber schon damals durch Heidenchristen, and
Paulinisch gesinnte, vermehrt, hat die umfassendste Darlegung der
Paulinischen Lehre erhalten."

Quoted by Farrar, Mes. of the Books, pg. 270.

What a world this would be if there were no backslidings! No demon would have the opportunity for taking unto himself seven other spirits and reentering the heart of man to destroy it. Never would it be written of one that he had permitted the fire on the altar to die out, and then that "his latter end was worse than the first." But even as Adam fell so must Rome also! The very evils against which Paul contended so valiantly, and which for the time he utterly vanquished have returned, and "Jerusalem is in bondage with her children." As Felix once had "left Paul bound" so now the church at Rome has done the same.

"The influence of St. Paul was eminent in the earlier and purer ages of the Christian Church. It paled, and became almost lost, when the spiritual ascendancy of the church was regarded as less the source of its glory than its earthly supremacy over kingdoms and empires. Then another Peter came to reign supreme over the bodies and souls of men; not the Peter of the New Testament, but the so-called fisherman, draped in scarlet and gold, and sparkling with mundane jewelry; in whose false glare Christianity was practically lost, and the old heathenish polytheism, slightly disguised with the superficial addition of a little tinsel borrowed from traditional Christianity, reigned unchecked for centuries."

F. A. Malleson: The Acts & Epistles, St. Paul, pg. 592.

"Direct offspring of Jerusalem, the Roman Church will always have an ascetic, sacerdotal character, opposed to the Protestant tendency of Paul. Peter will be its veritable chief. Then, with the political and hierarchical spirit of old heathen Rome penetrating it, it will truly become the New Jerusalem; the city of the Pontificate, of the hieratic and solemn religion, of material sacraments which are self-justifying; the city of ascetics after the manner of James Obliam, with his callous knees and the flash of gold on his forehead. It will be the church of authority. If we consult it, the only sign of the apostolic mission will be to show a letter signed by the apostles, to produce a certificate of orthodoxy. The good and the evil done by the Church of Jerusalem to growing christianity will be done to the church universal, by the church of Rome. In vain will St. Paul address her his beautiful epistle, to explain to her the mystery of the cross of Jesus, and of safety through faith alone. This epistle will be but slightly understood by the church of Rome. But Luther, fourteen centuries and a half later, will understand it, and will open a new era in the secular series of the alternative triumphs of Peter and Paul."

Renan, pg. 99.

PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. PLACE.

That the Epistle was not written before Paul reached Ephesus is seen from Rom. 15, 19-23, in which Paul states that he had fully preached Christ from Jerusalem round about even to Illyricum, and that his ministry in the East was ended, and that he intended going westward. Now of course as he spent three years in Ephesus this Epistle could not have been written at that place except at the very last, else his statement, "but now, having no more any place in these regions," &c., Rom. 15, 22-4, would not be true.

Now we read Acts 19, 21-2, 2 Cor. 2, 12, 13, and Chap. 20; 24, 17; that Paul after leaving Ephesus purposed going through Macedonia and Achaia on his way to Jerusalem, and we also learn from Rom. 15, 26; 1 Cor. 16, 1-6, 2 Cor. 8, 1-4 that the object of the journey was the collection of funds for the relief of the necessities of the Church at Jerusalem.

When Paul wrote to the Romans, all the collections had been taken. Rom. 15, 26, and he was about to start for Jerusalem 15, 24, 32. That the Epistle was not written during his stay at Ephesus is proven by 2 Cor. 8, 1-4, - the collection in Macedonia had yet to be taken up. That it was not written while in Macedonia 2 Cor. 9, 1-6; 9, 4; 12, 20, will abundantly prove, for at this time the collection in Achaia was not taken up. Neither was it written before reaching Corinth, for he expected a large collection from that place. 1 Cor. 16, 1-2,

Thus the view of Dr. Paulus who asserts that the Epistle was written from Illyricum is shown worthless. Paul clearly states that the collections were all taken when he wrote the Epistle, and surely this was not the case when he was in Illyricum.

The question is thus narrowed down to some place in Achaia or else while on his journey to Jerusalem.

That it was not written after he reached Jerusalem is evident for two reasons.

1. He was on his way to Jerusalem with the collection, 15, 25, 6.
2. He was a free man. 15, 23-5; 3, 15; 31, 2; states that he had not reached Jerusalem. After reaching Jerusalem he neither longer had the collection nor his own liberty.

Consequently the place of writing must be either Achaia or on the journey to Jerusalem. That it was written before his return journey was begun:-

1. If it had been written after he had started for Syria he would have made mention of the fact in the Romans. He prays for deliverance from the Jews at Jerusalem and asks for a prosperous journey, and that he may safely return to them. Now if he knew at the time of writing this, of the plot of the Jews mentioned in Acts 20, 3, he must have stated that fact.

Note.

Weiss says:- The fears to which he gives expression in 15, 30 f. are a strong argument in favor of the assumption that he already had intelligence of the plots that led him afterwards to give up the direct sea route to Syria and to take the land route through Macedonia." Introduction, Vol. 1. pg. 294.
This does not necessarily effect the place of composition.

But that it was written before the return journey was undertaken can be proven by many other considerations.

1. An Epistle of this length doubtless was written from a place where Paul remained for some length of time. We know that it was his custom to write Epistles from places where he made extended stops. Now we have shown that the Epistle was written on the third journey, after leaving Ephesus, and after having traversed Macedonia and Achaia.

That it was not written before reaching Corinth is evident from the fact that this was one of the principal places from which he intended to gather a collection. 1 Cor. 16, 1-6, but when Romans was written the collection had been taken. This would prove that it was written at least near Corinth.

Now remembering that such an Epistle would require time for composition, let us look for a place where Paul made a long visit. We find in Acts 20, 3, that he spent three months in Achaia. Now the work of the collection would take but a short time so that he could have stayed nearly three months in one city had he chosen. Now we find in 1 Cor. 16, 6, 7, that he ^{had} hopes of staying at Corinth during the winter, and to "tarry a while with them".

Again it is but natural that Paul did stay here for this length of time.

1. It was the capital of the province.
2. The church was one which he had founded. (This was the third time he had visited them, 2 Cor. 12, 14.)

Again, it was essential that the Epistle be written when an occasion would offer for sending it. It must go by the hand of a disciple. What more likely place than from the first city of the province, which had a flourishing Christian Church, and which was in constant communication with Rome?

The mention of Cenchraea, the sea port of Corinth, also favors the supposition that Corinth was the place (Rom. 16, 1.) as also does the name of Gaius, 16, 23, compare 1 Cor. 1, 14. and that of Erastus, 23. 2 Tim. 4, 20, and Acts 19, 22.

Note. There is an offset to this argument. The fact that there are so few greetings would favor the view that the Epistle was written from Cenchraea and not from Corinth.

Or as Bleek says:-

BLEEK. EINLEITUNG IN DAS NEUE TESTAMENT.

Rom. 16, 23. Grüsst Paulus die Leser unter anderen von Erastus den Paulus vor seiner Abreise aus Ephesus nach Macedonia vor-ansandt hatte, mit Timotheus (Apg. 19, 22) Den Erastus bezeichnet Paulus in unserm Briefe geradezu als ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως. (Rom. 16, 23) was wahr scheinlich macht, dass es eine bedeutende und bekannte Stadt war, wo der Apostel sich aufhielt, und für längere Zeit; dabei aber gerade an Corinth zu denken, veranlasst uns 2 Tim. 1, 4, 20. Ἐραστοῦ ἔμεινεν ἐν Κορίνθῳ.

The argument for Erastus being valid that for Sopater and Timothy is equally so. For Timothy and Erastus are joined together. (Acts 19, 22, and Sopater and Timothy, (Acts 20, 4.)

"Timotheus bei ihm war; denn dieser war auch bei Abfassung des 2 Kor. 1, 1, bei ihm in Macedonia auf der Hinreise und eben so auf der Ruckreise nach Asia. (Apg. 20, 4.)"
Bleek, pg. 410.

We may add that at the "end of the Epistle in the Peshito.-
Syriac Version, it is stated that it was written at Corinth."
Harmon's Introduction.

TIME OF COMPOSITION.

"The date of this Epistle is fixed with more absolute certainty, and within narrower limits than that of any other of Paul's writings." M^cc. and Strong.

1. As it was written after he left Ephesus it must have been later than the Pentecost of 57.

2. When 1st and 2nd Corinthians were written 57-8, it had not been written, for the collections were not yet taken. (1 Cor. 16, 1-4; 2 Cor. 8 and 9.), but when Romans was composed this work had been done. Consequently the date is later than the first part of 58.

3. Paul had not yet seen Rome, Rom. 1, 10-13; consequently before 62.

4. As it was written before reaching Jerusalem, the date must have been earlier than the Pentecost of 59.

5. It was earlier than Easter of 59 for on that day he sailed from Philippi for Jerusalem, Acts 20, 6.

We have thus narrowed the time down to the latter part of 58, or the spring of 59.

6. We infer in Rom. 15, 28, 30-32 that Paul's work was all done and that he intended very shortly to sail for Jerusalem.

Consequently the date must be either the latter part of the winter of 58 or from that time to about March of 59. We think that the latter date is not far out of the way, especially if with Weiss we infer that he already was aware of the plot of the Jews mentioned in Acts.

THE OCCASION.

1. FROM A STUDY OF THE EPISTLE ITSELF.

We are not at once struck with a particular leading aim applicable to the people to whom he is writing. No one in reading Corinthians or Galatians can be at a loss for a moment as to the condition of those churches, or as to the occasion of Paul in writing. But not so with Romans.

As MEYER says:- "Of all the Apostle's letters, our present Epistle has least arisen out of the necessity of dealing with special causal circumstances." pg. 21.

We fail to find any indication of a raging controversy in the Church as at Galatia or Corinth. For all we can see as far as an occasion demanded, the epistle could just as well have been written two years before or perhaps even afterward.

In fact the evidence for an occasion is so faint that Beet fails to find any at all. He says:- "We cannot detect in this Epistle x x any definite occasion which prompted its composition. It was not written to correct any special error or to give information on any special subject." Romans, pg. 22.

While we cannot admit all of this, still we can allow that the occasion was not a controversy raging in the church. The tone of passionate intensity so striking in Galatians is gone. He does not appear as face to face with a foe in mortal combat. He is not arguing to vindicate his apostolic authority, nor as a shepherd defending his flock from the bear is he fighting for the very existence of the church. No where does he attempt to vindicate his

authority. No where does he express even a hint that the Church at Rome would apostatize as did the Church at Galatia. The controversy, to be sure, was to come when some were to "preach Christ of contention, hoping to add affliction to his bonds." But this was in the future and even out of sight of the seer of God. Consequently the treatment is general. The exhortations come in as brotherly reproof, not thundering denunciation.

"That the Judaizing element was not strong in the Church can be seen from the fact that he only opposes legalistic anxiety in reference to fast days and the eating of food,- not arrogant Judaistic dogmas." Lange.

We may be sure of one thing, and that Paul always tells the truth. If the Church were in the condition of that at Galatia, he would not speak of their faith as known throughout the world, nor wish to be strengthened by their faith, neither above all would he have spoken of them as "full of all goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another." 15, 14.

To sum the matter all up, we can say with Farrar:- "He wrote during one of those little interspaces of repose and hope which occur in even the most persecuted lives."

2. Paul expressly asserts that "for many years" he had desired to visit them, but had been hindered. Rom. 1, 13; 15, 23. He had frequently said, "I must see Rome." Acts 19, 21. But in spite of all his efforts thus far other matters had prevented, (Rom. 15, 22) and he was still distant from the object which

he longed to see.

But he was strong in hope. When he had carried his loving gift to Jerusalem, then he would put off this visit no longer. He would see Rome. Yes, he did see it. He has said "If by any means now at length I may be prospered by the will of God to come unto you." Rom. 1, 10. His prayer was answered, but little did he think of the manner of the answer!

That he should wish to see the capital of the world is not a matter of surprise. It was more to the old world than London, Paris and Berlin combined. It was the city. Roman citizenship even Paul had found to be an honor and a protection to any man.

We have already spoken of the intercourse between Rome and the rest of the world. This fact alone was enough to fire the zeal of any enlightened man. Paul in his travels no doubt had abundant opportunity to hear the praises of the Imperial City sung. He seemed familiar with its vices even in detail. "Crushed under the ignominies inflicted on her by the despotism of madmen and monsters; corrupted by the pollutions of the stage, and hardened by the cruelties of the Amphitheatre; swarming with parasites, imposters, prisoners, and the vilest slaves; without any serious religion; without any public education; terrorised by insolent soldiers and pauperised mobs, the world's capital presents at this period a picture unparalleled for shame and misery in the annals of the world." (See Farrar's St. Paul pp. 186-7 for excellent discussion)- and Paul seemed perfectly acquainted with all of this yet never having seen it.

But he had more than a curiosity in wishing to see the palaces of the Caesars, and the triumphal arches and all the splendor and pomp of this magnificent city. He was thinking about the welfare of God's kingdom. A church situated in the metropolis if it were loyal and active would be known in all the world, I, 8. It would make as good a center of operations for the King of Kings as for the King of Rome. As surely as all roads led to Rome, so surely did all lead away again. It was like the Mission Rooms of the M. E. Church, - having connections everywhere. It was on the road to Spain, Gaul, Britain, Germany, in fact the very ancient Hub of the universe. No wonder that Paul wished to have an influence over the church there! Rom. 1, 11, 15, 29.

4. As Paul looked out with the eye of the seer and thought of the thousands and thousands out of every tribe and nation who were to be gathered round the throne of God, no wonder that the heart of the Apostle to the Gentiles glowed within him as he looked forward into the future and saw the part which the Church at Rome was to play in the work of evangelizing the nations.

No wonder that the Epistle is a master-piece in every sense. No wonder at the outburst of thanksgiving, - anthem on anthem of praise and rapture, - gushing forth from the soul of the Apostle. No wonder that he should pray "by any means" to be allowed to visit Rome.¹

And how appropriate it was that Paul who was a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before Gentiles and Kings (Acts 9, 15) should be the one to write to the Romans. We can truly say with

Lange that "the origin of the Epistle to the Romans must be traced to the close connection between the call and consciousness of Paul as the Apostle to the Gentiles, and Rome as the great metropolis of the Gentile world." pg. 36, Romans.

All these are reasons why we should expect a letter from Paul if not a visit.

5. But everything seemed to focus at the time when Paul was at Corinth. On the one side was inclination, but on the other was duty. The great Apostle had obeyed the "Man of Macedonia" and had planted churches through that region and Greece, and during all this time the Man of Rome and Spain never left his sight. And now for the third time he was at Corinth. To reach Rome was much easier than to reach Jerusalem. On the one hand was a pleasant and safe voyage with Rome at the goal and the whole Gentile world already established; on the other side was peril by land and sea; fanatical Jews, in short, nothing but danger. No wonder that he preferred the former. But his heart's prayer for Israel was that she might be saved, and now turning away from Rome, with a heavy heart he starts on his journey with his gift to ungrateful and hostile Jerusalem. At such a time the least he could do was to send them his blessing in the form of a letter.

6. That the Apostle was already familiar with the life of the church at Rome the salutations seem to show. Doubtless, however, there was much in his mind which was not perfectly clear. (From the Epistle itself it would be hard to prove the composition of the Church, either Jew or Gentile, which was it?)

How did the Christians at Rome regard Paul and his work ? Had they heard of the destroyer going to Damascus ? Had they heard how God had made the wrath of men to praise him ? Had his apostleship become known ? Was he received on an equality with Peter, who had been on the Mount with Christ ? While not embroiled like the church at Galatia, still had they received the Holy Ghost since they believed ? Were they steadily advancing in the Christian way ?

7. These we believe to be some of the occasions which prompted Paul's writing. Still others might be mentioned. Paul in his storm-tossed life had learned the value of personal friendship. How much more did he desire it for his Master's sake! Having the prayers and assistance of the Church of Rome like a valiant general he would have a fortress in the very heart of a hostile country from which he could sally forth. Paul counted on their assistance when he should pass through to Spain. Rom. 15, 24.

8. While thinking and planning for the future Paul had determined not to rest till he had seen Spain. This was his goal, and the letter which he should write to Rome not only would apprise them of his intended visit, not only would indicate his love for them, but as he was hastening on as a messenger of God, it would render a prolonged stay in Rome unnecessary.

9. On the other hand the Gentile Christians no doubt had begun to be impatient. Doubtless they knew that Paul had been preaching in Europe. If Corinth was important, how much more so Rome? Human nature even among Roman Christians was frail, and Paul's delays in all probability, were the occasion of much questioning to the Church at Rome.

10. Finally we may say that Paul being unable to visit them at the present time, and to preach to them as he desired, resolved, nevertheless, to express to them his views on the great subjects burning in his soul, to the end that they might be established. From the names in the 16th chapter and the facts connected therewith, we know that he had many friends at Rome. Consequently a written statement of his gospel would be at least crumbs of comfort and could be made to answer as a substitute for a personal visit.

1.

OBJECT.

"The highest works of genius, in all writings, whether sacred or secular, are essentially many sided. Who will pretend to give in a few words the central conception of the "Prometheus Vincetus" or of "Hamlet"? Farrar, Mes. of the Books, pg. 269.

And yet how many have forgotten this! How many have fixed upon one side issue of the Book and around this have had to build up the whole epistle.

Shakespeare must have been thinking of the hypotheses of Writers on Introduction to the Book of Romans when he said:-

"There is no damnéd error but some sober brow will bless it, and approve it with a text hiding the grossness with fair ornament."

We have the view of Baur and the Tübingen School. Of course insisting as they do on the Jewish Composition of the Romish Church with its Ebionistic tendency, the Epistle can be none other than a polemic. The object of the Epistle then, is a "systematic and radical refutation of Jewish exclusiveness." The gist of the book is considered to be Chapters IX - XI, and the first eight chapters serve merely the purpose of an introduction. But the Apostle states 1, 16, the theme of the gospel, and he everywhere enlarges upon and substantiates this main proposition.

And we may say of the Epistle as a whole that in no other of Paul's writings is the polemic spirit so much in the back ground. When it does appear it is but for a moment. Rom. 16, 17-20

(And Farrar gives this very fact as an argument why this chapter should be rejected.)

As regards even the weak in the faith Paul could not present his gospel except in opposition to Jewish ceremonialism and bigotry. But this does not prove his object as polemical.

Note. See Olshausen on Romans for refutation in full.
Also see pp

That Paul was influenced by personal motives we cannot accept, if by "personal", "selfish" is meant. Surely he was not blind to the advantages of a church at Rome or of the assistance which such a church could render to him in the furtherance of his missionary plans.

Neither can we hold the view of Mangold that Paul is justifying his apostleship among the Gentiles. For if the church were Gentile they did not need any justification, and we have shown that it was not Jewish. (See Lange Romans pg. 38 f. for systematic refutation.)

We can say against all these views which affirm polemical or apologetic motives to Paul that he never does what he is supposed to do. The only justifiable supposition is that at Rome there is very little to attack. "On the contrary he freely joins in the universal praise of the Church, thanking God for it, and unmistakably implies that the *τύπος διδασχῆς* they had obeyed was his free doctrine. (VI, 17.) He most distinctly takes for granted that they know and share his doctrine 15, 24 f.; and 1, 12 in particular would be a *caputatio benevolentiae* if Paul regarded the church as occupying a standpoint in any way hostile to his

views, or as having not yet understood them." Weiss, Vol. I
pg. 302.

We may say with Farrar:-

"We have no trace here of the ultra liberalism of Corinth, or the dreamy asceticism of Colossae, or the servile Phariseeism of Galatia, x x clearly he is not here dealing with any special dissensions, heresies, or attacks on his authority." St. Paul, pg.451

HUG has a grain of truth in his hypothesis. He says:

Paul wished "in a conciliatory sense to obviate misunderstandings between Jewish and Gentile Christians."

"It was at any rate probable that, even if he had not been represented to them in the most unfavorable light, he would have been spoken of as one who was prepared to abandon not only the peculiarities, but even the exclusive hopes and promises of Judaism. To a great extent this was true; and, if true, how serious, nay, how startling, were the consequences which such a belief entailed! They were views so contrary to centuries of past conviction, that they at least deserved the most careful statement, the most impregnable defence, the most ample justification from the ancient scriptures. Such a defence, after deep meditation on the truths which God's Spirit had revealed to his inmost soul, he was prepared to offer in language the most conciliatory, the most tender, in language which betrayed how little the unaltered fixity of his convictions had quenched the fire of his patriotism, or deadened the quickness of his sensibility. He expresses an inextinguish-

able love for his countrymen, and a deep sense of their glorious privileges, at the very moment that he is explaining why those countrymen have been temporarily rejected, and showing that those privileges have been inexorably annulled.

Note. 1. Dr. Davidson:- "We see a constant conflict between his convictions and feelings; the former too deep to be changed, the latter too strong to be repressed, too ardent to be quenched by opposition of the persons he loved." Quoted by Farrar.

2. For an example of the Jewish estimate of his own privileges see notes 2 & 3. Farrar, pg. 453.

He declares his readiness to be even anathema from Christ for the sake of Israel, in the very verses in which he is showing, to the horrified indignation of his Jewish readers, that not the physical but the spiritual seed of Abraham, are alone the true Israel of God." Farrar.

We do not see anything "conciliatory" in this. To be conciliatory one must use more than soft words. He must make concessions. It is said of Philip II of Spain that his dagger followed swift upon his smile. To smile and flatter and kill is not the way to make a friend. That Publicans and harlots were to be admitted into the kingdom before the Pharisee surely was no soothing balm for the bigoted Hebrew (Matt. 21, 31, 32) Neither that all were the seed of Abraham and that finally part of the Jews were to be saved "according to the election of Grace", and then when "the fullness of the Gentiles be come in" finally "There shall come out of Zion a deliverer; He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob". Rom. 11, 26. (This is Baur's view.) - this pleased not the

Priests and Levites who "passed by on the other side" when Gentiles were near. Again, to have the Book as a whole conciliatory, and then have chapters IX - XI the nucleus (Baur and even Farrar) it ought to have been written to Jews whereas the supposition is equally correct that it was written about Jews.

Note 3. Paul has three statements regarding the law that might horrify any Jew.

1. That "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified before God; for by the law is the full knowledge of sin. 3, 20.

2. That "the law came in as an addition that transgression might abound." 5, 20.

3. That the Christian "is not under the law, but under grace" and that therefore sin is not to lord it over him. 5, 14.
See Farrar pg. 480, St. Paul.

A very ingenious hypothesis has been advanced of late.

WEISS says that this Epistle can only be explained by the "characteristic necessity of Paul's nature, to bring as it were the spiritual product of the last years to his own consciousness, and to fix it in a written form." Vol. I, pg. 306.

"These years of strife with Judaism had not only obliged him to develop his free gospel of salvation logically on all sides, making himself acquainted with its ultimate principles and results as well as its interior connection, but also to recognize the true point of opposition directed against him, and to bring it within his own range of thought." pg. 306.

So Farrar prefers the supposition that "Paul is not so much addressing a special body as purposely arguing out a fundamental problem, and treating it in an ideal and dramatic manner." St. Paul, pg.450.

We do not believe this view to be correct for many reasons.

1. Why address such a communication to the Church at Rome?

It was not one of his founding; he had never visited it. What reason for sending them an epistle whose only impulse for writing was the "characteristic necessity of Paul's nature?"

Why not leave it in the care of the Church at Corinth? He was personally acquainted there,- had founded their Church, and was the spiritual father of all of them. Or why not send it to Galatia?

2. Again, we do not believe that Paul had to wait till he wrote this Epistle in order to "recognize the true point of opposition directed against himself and to bring it within his own range of consciousness."

All the time previous to this he had been in ignorance of the reasons of the intense persecution directed against him! That his gospel had been attacked and even his own apostolic authority denied, had up to this time been not a certainty, but only a surmise!

What in this Epistle there is which brings out the "true point of opposition," the ingenious exegete very wisely abstains from trying to show.

3. The view of Farrar that Paul has an imaginary set of nine pins before him which he proceeded to knock down with his big theological ball, is an outrage on the Apostolic era. That such things can happen in Germany in the 19th century when perhaps every living question has been discussed "ⁱⁿ⁻ad finitum" is not a matter of doubt, but that it should be so in the lifetime of the Apostle Paul, is inconceivable. We may rest assured that Paul had both too much to do as well as too good an opinion of himself to be indulging in this kind of work. No man will be under the necessity of fighting an imaginary foe or blessing an imaginary congregation whose heart was as large as Paul's, whose life was as consecrated and whose hands were as busy.

Furthermore, how Farrar can reconcile this statement of his with that of the conciliatory tendency before mentioned I have not been able to discover. The two views are mutually contradictory and self destructive.

4. If the views of Weiss and Farrar just stated be correct, our high estimation of the ability of St. Paul will have to be reconsidered.

After such statements as these we shall certainly look for an answer to every conceivable kind of objection theoretical as well as practical; and for an enlarged and new statement of the truths of the Christian religion.

But what are the facts in the case ?

Let us first look at the doctrinal side. In the first place

Paul says very little that is new in the Epistle. The doctrines in nearly every case such as he had announced in at least one other Epistle.

The main thesis of the book surely is not new. It was the hope of the Gentiles. The success of Paul's work depended upon its truth. If justification by faith be not a fact, then at least is Paul's efforts vain and the religion of the Gentiles vain, and all are still in their sins. This subject was a part of Paul himself. He could not help but preach it. If not, what could he preach? The law? The Gentiles knew no law and if it were brought to their knowledge Paul had shown in Galatians that it was of no avail. It cannot be the argument that Abraham was justified by faith, - that faith was an essential factor even in the Old Testament, for all that is abundantly proven in the Epistle to the Galatians.

Neither can it have been the proposition that "As through one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous." Rom. 5, 19, - for we read in 1 Cor. 15, 22, "For as in Adam all die so also in Christ shall all be made alive."

Note. This verse (1 Cor. 15, 22) includes the same thoughts as are expressed in the greater part of the Epistle to the Romans.

1. All are guilty before God.
2. All need a Savior.
3. Christ died for all.
4. We are all one body in Him.

Bp. Wordsworth's Epistles, pg. 200.

Quoted by Farrar, St. Paul, pg. 456, Note 3.

Moreover he had previously announced that the law was but a schoolmaster leading them to Christ; that as soon as the time appointed came, they were no longer kept in ward because faith made them free. Gal, 3, 23, 4.

And being now Christ's, they are of Abraham's seed and heirs according to promise. Gal. 3, 29.

And are blessed with the faithful Abraham because we have the same faith, 3, 9, consequently we shall live, for the just shall live by faith. 3, 11.

So also as regards adoption. Gal. Compare Rom. XIV with Corinthians regarding the eating of meat. We may add that the Epistle contains nothing new either as a polemic against Israel or apologetic in substantiating his own position as an apostle.

"A comparison of the Corinthian Epistles with Galatians and Romans shows unanswerably that the doctrine of justification, with all its presuppositions and consequences, developed in the great struggle-period of his life, by no means exhausted the entire range of his Christian views or determined it exclusively; x x x The doctrine of the person of Christ, and of the saving significance of his death, of the church and its development toward the consummation at hand, is in these epistles only touched upon in incidental utterances capable of much richer and fuller development; and his views of the reorganization of the life relations of the natural man, by the spirit of Christ, are visibly checked in their development by the preponderance of the purely religious interest and by the conceptions of the close proximity of the second coming. Weiss, Vol. I. 214.

FARRAR:- "If the Epistle to the Romans be a complete statement of what may be called the Apostle's Soteriology, it contains little or none of the Eschatology which distinguishes these Epistles to the Thessalonians, or the Christology of the Epistle to the Colossians, or the Ecclesiology of the Epistle to the Ephesians."

St. Paul pg. 454, 2.

NOTE.

1. For what there is that is new in the Epistle, see pg. 87.
2. This view ignores entirely the condition of affairs at Rome. See pg. 72 f.

We believe that Paul had definite objects in view when he wrote to the Roman Church.

1. We must admit that much of the contents of the Book is general and not specific, but this does not necessarily imply that the motive was general.

Weiss forgets this distinction when he says:-

"Whatever opinion may be held as to the aim of the Epistle to the Romans, it must be admitted that it goes far beyond its proximate purpose; moreover, its doctrinal discussions have frequently no relation whatever to the simple motive that called them forth." Weiss, pg. 211.

Paul could give to the Church at Rome his system of theology as applicable to their individual cases, and still while the motive was special, the treatment could be of the most impersonal kind.

And in fact we notice that this in many parts is the case. So much is this a characteristic of the Epistle that Olshausen, Vol. III, pg. 450-451, says:- "The whole exhibition of doctrine in the Epistle is purely objective in its character, nor is there, except in passing, any intentional and conscious regard to anything save the truth of the gospel." &c. &c.

But if this is so we cannot see why Paul "in passing" should make such appropriate suggestions, nor why the whole content of the Epistle is so eminently applicable to the Roman Church. Neither can we see why he should repeat much which he had previously written to the Church at Galatia. That he should appear in many places to be writing to an ideal congregation may largely be due to the fact that no great dangers threatened the church. See how he comes down from generals to particulars when an error is even hinted at! But this is not the only reason. The church at Rome was not in its spiritual infancy. Their faith was known in all the world. Paul wished to see them not only to give comfort, but also to receive it. They were full of all goodness,- able to admonish one another,- and in this regard they excelled the Nineteenth Century.

Consequently such a church was in no need of a primer of the way of life, a hand-book for probationers. The peripatetics and ex-stoics needed a "Philosophy of the plan of Salvation." If we believe the statements that the Church at Rome had made vast progress in the Christian way, there is no inconsistency whatever in Paul's writing to them in the manner that he did.

But another object which Paul had, will also throw light on the general manner of treatment.

The very contents of the Epistles, no matter to whom addressed, demanded in many parts a calm and ideal manner of treatment.

SCHAFF states one object of the letter to be the "positive exhibition of saving truth, of the great central doctrine of justifying, sanctifying, and saving faith in Jesus Christ, as the only ground of salvation for lost sinners, Jews as well as Gentiles."

Hist. of the Apost. Church, pg.297.

Such a system of doctrine would of necessity require a didactic style. The reading would be heavy and the argument close; and as the Apostle laid down his promises and defended them and from them drew his conclusions, we cannot see how he could do otherwise than shut out of his mind everybody and everything.

Paul showed his regard for the Romans and his knowledge of their need, in choosing the subjects he did, not in the manner of writing on these subjects.

"The very value of the Epistle as a systematic exposition of the Gospel of Protestantism, depends on the calmness and lucidity with which the Apostle appeals to an ideal public to follow him in the discussion of abstract truths."

This is the Epistle according to St. Paul.

Regardless of the manner, his aim was to show "Christ as the common foundation on which Jew and Gentile could stand, the bond of human society, the root of human righteousness."

Maurice- Quoted by Farrar, St. Paul pg. 456.

Or, as a Muratorian fragment puts it, (which will also illustrate the style):-

"First of all (he wrote) to the Corinthians forbidding schismatic factiousness; to the Galatians forbidding circumcision; but to the Romans at greater length, according to the general tenor of the Scriptures, but showing that the foundation of the Scriptures is Christ." Muratorian fragment.

Farrar, Mes. of the Books, pg. 269.

There were doubtless other objects which Paul had in mind. If a man's religion was in proportion to his knowledge we should expect Beelzebub to be a fine Christian gentleman. But such is not the case. The same might apply to the Church at Rome. The religion might have been genuine, the faith strong, and the good works many, and at the same time the teaching might have been imperfect. We have a case of the kind at Ephesus. Acts 19, 1-2.

Or, if we accept the sixteenth chapter as part of the Epistle we can easily see why Paul should write. His disciples had been teaching the Christians at Rome. If the local preachers could edify the Church at Rome, how much more so the Bishop? That they should have asked instruction from him is by no means inconsistent, judging from the knowledge of the church which Paul displays in chapters 13, 14 and 16. At any rate a soul stirring letter from such an apostle would gladden the heart of any Christian church.

We have hints in the Epistle of trouble in the Church at Rome, not, however, by any means, of as serious a nature as at Corinth or Galatia.

Perhaps Paul had opponents of his doctrine of justification by faith at Rome. Whether there were at Rome any who maintained that Paul taught the greater the sin, the greater God's glory, (III, 8.) we do not know. But it is quite certain that some of the Gentiles were inclined to treat the prejudices of their weak Jewish brother at least with contempt or disdain. 15, 3.

"It was the aim of St. Paul to win the former of these parties to Christian truth, and the latter to Christian love; and to remove the stumbling-blocks out of the way of both, by setting before them the grand summary of the doctrine and practice of Christianity which is contained in the Epistle."

We have no objection to considering this as one object of a part of the Epistle.

But we believe that truth is so constituted in regard to error that like day and darkness, when the first appears the latter must vanish. So in the Epistle. By the directness of attack Paul seems to be controverting prevalent errors in the Church. If so, then doubtless this is an object of his writing. Paul denies and controverts propositions:-

a. That the connection with Abraham by natural descent and by the blood of circumcision together with the observance of the law is sufficient to secure the favor of God.

The Rabbis taught that God had promised Abraham that his descendants, though wicked, should be saved on account of his merit.

"Great is the virtue of circumcision; no circumcised person can enter hell", was a favorite maxim of theirs. Also:- "All Israel has part in Eternal life."

b. That the blessings of the Messianic reign were to be confined to the Jews and those who would consent to become proselytes.
3, 9, 29. 15, 7-11.

c. That subjection to heathen magistrates was inconsistent with the dignity of the people of God, and with their own duty to the Messiah as their King.

(Mostly from Hodge on Romans.)

That Paul was talking to hostile Jews in these last cases we do not believe. They were doubtless part of the Church, and the most we can say is either that he wished to correct some few of their errors, or that being already convinced, he set before them fully his own views (as a temperance orator will set forth all his arguments pro & con, to an audience containing many reformed drunkards.)

That the danger of apostasy was not in the least to be thought of can be seen from the mild tone of the Epistle. The troubles are not dogmatic to any large extent, nor are the practices immoral. A word of exhortation is all that is needed, - not thundering denunciation.

The regular Judaizers had not yet appeared. (see Philippians.)

We may sum up the whole discussion in the one sentence which Meyer gives, but which he nowhere tries to justify, viz:-

MEYER:-

"Paul wished to lay before the Romans in writing, for their Christian edification (1, 11, 15, 25) his evangelical doctrine,- the doctrine of the sole way of salvation given in Christ, viewed in its full specific character as the superseding of Judaism, in such a way as the necessities and circumstances of the church demanded, and as he would have preached it among them, had he been present in person." pg. 22.

There is still another object which Paul might have had in writing a letter.

We know that up to this time, while he had written many letters and had given much valuable information, still he had never worked out a system of theology, had never pushed his views to their logical results.

He was going up to Jerusalem. That dangers threatened him he himself openly acknowledges. What if he should never return? Such was more than probable. What a loss the Christian Church would suffer if the Book of Romans never had been written! Is it not lawful for us to suppose that Paul wished to leave behind a copy of his will, his last words of doctrine, or love and advice, and his triumphant song of joy and praise?

Thus he was writing also for us. The very Christ who had called him and had been by his side all these years was now at his

side.

Paul is calm and logical and intensely profound. He was writing not only for the Stoics, but for Augustine and Martin Luther as well. Let us think then that Paul, knowing that Christianity was the triumph over every foe, and that it had come to stay, wished to deliver to the head of the Gentile nations his wonderful gospel, to be in turn spread abroad with a true missionary spirit through all lands and for all time.

ST. PAUL.

"Christ! I am Christ's! and let the name suffice you;
 Aye, for me, too, He greatly hath sufficed;
 Lo, with no winning words I would entice you;
 Paul has no honor and no friend but Christ.

Yes, without cheer of sister or of daughter,
 Yes, without stay of father or of son,
 Lone on the land, and homeless on the water,
 Pass I in patience till the work be done.

Yet, not in solitude, if Christ anear me,
 Waketh Him workers for the great employ,
 Oh, not in solitude, if souls that hear me
 Catch from my joyance the surprise of joy.

Hearts I have won of sister or of brother,
 Quick on the earth or hidden in the sod;
 Lo, every heart awaiteth me, another
 Friend in the blameless family of God.

Yea, through life, death, through sorrow and through sinning,
 He shall suffice me, for he hath sufficed;
 Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning,
 Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ."

Frederic. W. H. Myers, 1868.

Quoted by Lange, Romans, pg. 53.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1.

As has been previously remarked the introduction to the Book of Romans is by far the longest and most solemn of those found in any of his epistles. We have not here, "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ to the Roman Christians, greeting;" but a statement of the deepest truths regarding his appointment to the work of an Apostle; of its universality, and that the gospel which he is to preach is that which was prophesied by holy men concerning Christ. Then 8-15 follows thanksgiving for their steadfastness, with the assurance that they were continually before him in prayer, and that he had many times tried to visit them in order to receive and impart blessings but "was hindered hitherto;" and ^{that} he was not ashamed of them on account of race or training and did not remain away from Rome upon personal motives or race prejudice.

16, 17, after this introduction follows the fundamental thesis of the Epistle, that is, "The just shall live by faith."

Having stated his theme, the Apostle first proceeds to show that all men are in need of the benefits offered. In other words, sin is universal. 1, 18-3, 20.

The Gentiles surely are sinners because they commit "ungodliness and unrighteousness", even while seeing God in nature, and recognizing his voice in their own consciences. Therefore, while committing the most monstrous and heinous of sins they are without excuse and condemned already, and given over to the powers of darkness to work all manner of evil,- abandoned of God.

"Who follows pleasure, pleasure slays,

God's wrath upon himself he wreaks."

Quoted by Farrar.

1. 18-32.

And not only are the Gentiles guilty, but much more the Jews. For they break the command "Judge not that ye be not judged", forgetting that the measure which they meter upon the Gentiles, shall be meted to them in return because they practice the same things." And having the law, and approving the things that are excellent and being in a position to guide the blind and instruct the ignorant, with all these qualifications because of their hard and impenitent heart, storing up for themselves "wrath in a day of wrath."

Being but a Jew outwardly, their conscientious observance of legal ordinances will be of no avail, because God loves that religion whose praise is not of men, but of God, and that circumcision which is of the heart.

2 chap.

And the advantages which naturally fell to the Jewish race, - guardianship of the law and the greater light, only adds to their condemnation because with these privileges there is none among them righteous, - there is no fear of God before their eyes. These vices, law, which you accept, condemns, - therefore, "prepare to meet thy God. "

3. 1- 20.

But while the state of the heathen world is one of desolation and woe and while the Jew is lost in his self righteousness which is "enmity toward God,"- "Apart from the law a righteousness of God has been manifested ~~xxx~~ even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe." And there is no distinction with God, for he is the Father of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. And through faith which is the means of justifying the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith, instead of nullifying the law, in reality establishes it. 21-31.

The truth of the above can be seen in the case of Abraham who found reconciliation with God not by works but faith. For Abraham was pronounced blessed while in uncircumcision because he "waxed strong through faith" and gave glory to God and "was fully assured that what He had promised He was able also to perform." And this blessed news was not for Abraham alone, but for our sakes,- all who believe that Christ was raised from the dead for the justification of guilty sinners.

4.

"Being therefore justified by faith," the results of this new life are manifested in the life of the man. He has peace and hope.

"Our peace, is an immediate sentiment which requires no external proof, and our hope is founded on the love of God assured us in three ways,- namely: by Christ's death for us while we were yet

enemies to God, on the strength to endure afflictions and see their blessed issue, and above all on union with Christ in death and life." 5, 1-11. Farrar St. Paul, pg. 476.

-- in fact the results of this justification are just as effective through Christ, as the condemnation was effective through the fall of Adam. 5, 12-21.

But shall we impose on the grace of God? That his grace may be more manifested shall we continue in sin? God forbid! The life hid with Christ, joined in intimate fellowship with his suffering, death, yea resurrection, cannot commit sin. Therefore we reckon ourselves as dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus, being assured that we are his servants whom we obey. VI.

Some of us have tried other ways for obtaining justification, for example, that of the law, but all in vain. But having put off the flesh, we have "died to that wherein we were holden" and are made free to serve in newness of the Spirit, and are loosed from the fetters of the law. "The new life of the Christian involves totally new relationships; that death naturally ends all legal obligations; and that our connection with the risen Christ is so close that it may be compared to a conjugal union."

Farrar, St. Paul, pg. 487.

VII. 1-6.

I do not mean to imply that the law was tyrannical and unholy in itself,- on the contrary it is "holy and righteous and good."

"Howbeit I had not known sin except through the law." #

But now knowing sin and knowing the commandment,- still being carnal and sold under sin, while the spirit is willing, the flesh

is weak, what I hate that I do." For to will is present with me,
but to do that which is good is not.

Note. "The angel has us by the hand, and the serpent by the
heart."

O wretched man, &c.

VII 7-25.

Note. "And: law was given them to evince

Their natural pravity by stirring up

Sin against law to fight; that when they see

Law can discover sin but not remove,

Save by those shadowy expiations weak

The blood of bulls and goats, they may conclude

Some blood more precious must be paid for man."

Milton, Paradise Lost, 12, 285.

Farrar, Més. of the Books.280.

Following close upon the question is the triumphant answer-
"Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus
Christ."

"If so be that Christ dwell in us, we are no longer under
the dominion of sin;- to be sure the body will die but not so the
spirit, for it is "life because of righteousness."

Thus being led by the spirit of God we are the sons of God,
no longer having the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but the
spirit of adoption. We are sons, heirs, joint-heirs, with the
full prospect with Him reigning, if we are willing with him
to suffer.

VIII. 1-17.

Let us then in this world suffer, for this is not to be compared with the "glory which shall be revealed to usward."

And though we together with the whole creation groan and travail in pain, still let us, while yet distant from our prize, with patience, hope for its realization and attainment. 18-25.

And we have good grounds for hope, for we are not left alone in our weakness. The Spirit of God helpeth us and instructeth us, and maketh intercessions for us. And we have further encouragement in the fact that all things work together for good to the Christian; that He will not cast off the faithful whom he foreknew, but on the contrary if they shall continue true to their trust, they shall receive the richest blessings of God:- election, predestination, calling, justification, and final glorification. 26-30. Then having such a bountiful God for us, what matters who is against us? Having such an intercessor,- one who showed his love for us by a voluntary death on our behalf, what trial or torture severe enough to separate us from Him. "In spite of all the anguish that persecution can inflict, in spite of all the struggles which rebellious flesh may cause, we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us." Therefore neither height, depth, death, life, principalities or powers, nor demons of hell, can separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

"Jesus lives! no longer now
 Can thy terrors, Death, appal us;
 Jesus lives! by this we know,
 Thou, O Grave, canst not enthrall us.
 Alleluia!"

The major chord of exultation and rapture suddenly changes into a minor strain of sadness, as the Apostle remembers that to the blessed privileges of Christ's redemption this saving faith, his own people, the ones fostered and favored by the Almighty, were aliens, having rejected the offers of salvation. He here discusses the relation of Judaism to Heathenism and then of Christianity to both. God was faithful, His promises were true and sure. Any failure of fulfilment was not due to the unfaithfulness of God but to the obstinacy and sinfulness of the Jews. But this state of affairs was not so utterly hopeless. The rejection was not universal, and finally after the conversion of the Gentiles, the Jews also were to come in.

IX- XI.

Note. LUTHER:- The 9th chap. of the Epistle to the Romans is the 9th. Learn first the eight chapters which precede it."

The remainder of the epistle is practical. It applies the teaching given and adds advice for their instruction and guidance.

We might call it a hortatory conclusion regarding the fruits of
XII. XV, 13.
faith. He exhorts them to put on the Christian virtues, of holiness, unity and love, on the latter of which he dwells at length.

XII.

Then follows the solution of a number of questions which perplexed them, such as obedience to an earthly ruler; love of one's neighbor and exemplifying one's profession by putting off the works of darkness, XIII.

Ceasing from judging a brother and through mutual forbearance and mutual charity not injuring him by false example, not living for self, but on the other hand the strong helping the weak, that all, both Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, strong and weak, may praise God together.

XV, 13.

CONCLUSION.

Chiefly personal.

He now further unfolds his plans regarding his operations; entreating their prayers on his behalf, his intended visit to Jerusalem, and his proposed stop at Rome on his way to Spain.

XV. 14-33.

Then follows the recommendation of Phoebe to the care of the Church, 1, 2, followed by salutations of twenty-six of the brethren, 3-16, adds a warning against all who foster division, 17-20. Adds salutations from all friends who are with him followed by a closing wish, 21-24, and finally concluding with the doxology, 25-27.

* One of the Chief Characteristics of the Epistle to the Romans is that in it we read Paul's own life experience. Much of it is after the manner of a Methodist Class Meeting and Love Feast combined.

Paul sings:- "Once I was blind, but now I can see,
The light of the world is Jesus."

We see the spirit of the man in the Epistle. Is it abrupt and dogmatic and impetuous? So was he! A Pharisee of the Pharisees, zealous and blameless. Phil. 3, 3-6. While a Jew fulfilling all his obligations; untiring in his efforts after righteousness. Woe to the Christians of Damascus as Paul comes "breathing threatening and slaughter." But a change came; Paul had fathomed the meaning of that saying of his:- "In the twinkling of an eye we shall be changed." Now his self-righteousness had vanished like chaff before the hurricane. He was dead and is alive, all his Jewish advantages and merits were but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, his Lord. Christ was indeed a second Adam, a new progenitor of the race. It was Christ who rescued a helpless and wretched man. Rom. 7, 13-25.

No wonder then that Paul's experience is engraven on the pages of the Book of Romans. His text is "The want of salvation before Christ, and the supply of salvation in Christ;" Bitter experience has shown him that this salvation comes not from faith in legal ordinances, but from a simple trust and loving and intimate communion with God in Christ Jesus. Rom. 8.

See pg. 1-3; also 66, also 77 to 84.

But another characteristic of the man is seen evidenced in his Jewish nature and training. No matter how great the change and how abrupt the transition, still it is the same man,- Paul. The Christ whom he persecuted is the Messiah of the Old Testament. The Nazarene whom he would kill is the One whose coming prophets had foretold, who was Immanuel,- God with us. No wonder, then, that he clung to the Old Testament,- no wonder that he preached "concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses and from the prophets from morning till evening." Acts 28, 23.

And with this Old Testament searching Paul found another important fact so clearly brought out in the Romans.

From the law he had been looking for righteousness. Of a righteousness apart from the law he knew nothing. Imagine his astonishment on finding not only that the law killeth and multiplieth transgressions, but that through faith in Him who raised Christ from the dead was salvation and the very righteousness for which he sought. The Pharisee and ritualist could not deny his nature. He could not give up the Law and the Prophets. While accepting Christ as his Savior by faith, he searched the Scriptures no longer to see if these things were so, but to find the cause of his mistake and difficulty. Great was his joy on discovering that Abraham father of all Jews, had found this Pearl of great price, not through the law, but "while yet in uncircumcision" that he should be "heir of the world" and "our father" to as many as are accounted righteous through faith.

Another Characteristic of the Book of Romans is a correction of an idea stated in Thessalonians, and chapters IX-XI contain the thought.

It was the early Apostolic belief that all Israel would be saved. The apostles had such ardent faith in the power of the Divine Word, that they expected to see in their natural lifetime the coming again of the Son of Man. And they confidently expected that when he did come, all Israel would go out to meet him to spread palm branches and to cry, this time with the deepest sincerity, "Hail to the King of Israel." "Hosanna to the Son of David."

But their hopes were destined to be cast down. After Paul had fought with the wild beasts and had been beaten with many stripes; had been cast into prison; had narrowly escaped death times too numerous to mention, the truth began to dawn on him that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel." And as the strain between Judaism and Christianity became intense, then it was that Paul abandoned the hope of God's Kingdom, embracing all the Jews. The Gentiles were crowding into the kingdom: the Jews were his sole enemy. No wonder then, that at this very time he should have believed that out of his own people a false Messiah should arise, who should lead away many of his countrymen.

The Great Anti-Christ like the true Son of God was to be a Jew. And the Day of the Lord, coming like a thief in the night, was to find many of the Jews asleep.

But when the Book of Romans was written, a change had come over the mind of the Apostle. The horizon had broadened on his view.

He took in the whole world now, and he saw new factors coming into play.

Judaism, which had swept over the fair fields of Christianity like a tornado had not spread universal desolation in its track. Churches were being planted, and souls were being saved. Even among the Jews themselves some progress was being made. And when Paul reached Corinth, after having successfully accomplished three missionary journeys, - as he looked back over the past and saw the small beginning like a grain of mustard seed, and now saw the great tree spreading its branches on high, "he thanked God and took courage." As has been previously stated "He wrote during one of those little interspaces of repose and hope which occur in even the most persecuted of lives." He was at Corinth; the church there he himself had founded. Paul saw that he had not labored in vain. His heart was encouraged. Then at this very time he was engaged in a work which he hoped would be the means of gladdening the heart of many a Jew. He was taking up a collection for them, and that, too, from among the very nations which they despised, - a collection for the Jews from the Gentiles. A man whose natural temperament is gloomy and morose is not apt to have a very charitable view of mankind in general. A solemn, unbenevolent, uncharitable and stingy Scotch Presbyterian will unchurch nine-tenths of all Christendom.

And we believe that as the persecutions and discouragements through which Paul had passed had had their effect on his theology, so now as the sun came out and warmed his heart and made all things

look beautiful, the great man of faith taking hold of the promises of God, and having the utmost confidence in the infinite love of God, expressed the confident belief that all Israel would be saved.

Then again, the Epistle to the Romans proceeds entirely from the anthropological point of view, the nature of man as in need of redemption, and his relation to the law of God. In this respect it is admirably adapted to the peculiar character and turn of the Latin Church, of which Rome was so long the centre. The Oriental Greek Church, in virtue of her propensity to speculation, took more to the later Christological Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians and Colossians, and still more to the writings of John, and developed from them with the greatest precision, fundamental doctrines of the nature of God, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the relations of the two natures in Christ, while to anthropology and soteriology she paid very little attention. Then when it subsequently came the turn of the Western Church to labor in the development of doctrine, she, led by the great Augustine, who so much resembled Paul, drew the material for her system of anthropology and soteriology, and for the more immediately practical doctrines of sin and grace, chiefly from the Epistle to the Romans, and when in the course of the Middle Ages, the Roman Church, as once the Galatians, wandered from the path of the gospel back into Jewish legalism, from justification by faith to justification by works, it was preeminently the renewed study of the Epistle to Romans and to

the Galatians, which armed the Reformers of the sixteenth century for the battle against all Pelagianism, and pointed the way to a deeper understanding of the doctrine of salvation, of the nature of the law and the gospel, of faith and justification. The Epistle to the Romans, too, has ever since continued to be the main bulwark of Evangelical Protestantism."

Schaff. Hist. of the Apostolic Church.
pg. 299.

Many have believed that when James wrote his Epistle he had the Book of Romans in mind. That Paul does lay stress upon faith in contradistinction from works no one will deny.

One of the characteristics is the all importance of faith. Consequently to get the full view of the gospel, even as St. Paul preached it, we must bring in James, even if Martin Luther objects. The relation between Paul and James may be summed up as follows:

"James proceeds from without inward, from phenomenon to principle, from periphery to centre, from the fruit to the tree; Paul, on the contrary, proceeds from within outward, from principle to phenomenon, from centre to circumference, from the root to the blossom and the fruit. Paul's view is unquestionably deeper, more philosophical, and more fundamental than the other, and very far in advance of it; yet the empirical method of James also has its proper office and its practical necessity. It may even serve as a correction to Paul's view, wherever the latter by abuse becomes indifferent to works, and degenerates either into unproductive theoretical orthodoxy, or into licentious practical antinomianism, - two diseased forms of Christianity, which have in fact more than

once arisen from an imperfect understanding of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. On all pseudo-Pauline excesses James imposes a necessary and wholesome restraint."

Schaff, Hist. of the Apostolic Church, pg. 629.
See Mes. of the Books. pg. 412.

The style of the Book of Romans is peculiar.

Paul, who studied at the feet of Gamaliel, did not disdain the use of the most provincial term when it expressed the exact shade of meaning. On the other hand, when he could not find the word he wished, he made it to order. To him we owe a vast theological vocabulary. "His very want of style is his style." He flashes his convictions into his sentences. To be sure one may say of him as did Archdeacon Hare of Luther:- "He did not always weigh his words in jeweller's scales", but this constitutes the very individuality of the style. It is Paul who is writing, Paul who had persecuted, submitted, received persecution, Paul the scholar.

"He has the style of Genius, if he has not the Genius of style"- and if shown anywhere it is in the Romans.

His very character expresses itself in the language.

His natural temperament; the controversies through which he passed, the opposition and affection all manifest themselves in the very wording of the Epistle. "We never find the cold objectivity of the author, because the living warmth of the letter writer throbs in all his Epistles." Weiss, Intro. Vol. 1, pg. 212.

And we may add that his very life is in the Epistle. As we read his words we know the man. We are confident from his language

style and doctrine, that "his life was a battle from which in the intervals of the good fight, his words arose as a song of victory."
Martineau.

We cannot better call attention to the style of Paul as affected by his temperament, the atmosphere of controversy in which he moved, the earnest conviction and deep piety, than by repeating the words of Farrar:-

"The absorption in the one thought before him which makes him state without any qualification truths which, taken in the whole extent of his words, seem mutually irreconcilable; the dramatic, rapid, overwhelming series of questions, which show that in his controversial passages he is always mentally face to face with an objection (Rom. 10.); the centrifugal force of mental activity which drives him into incessant digressions and goes off at a word, due to his vivid power of realization; the centripetal force of imagination, which keeps all these digressions under the control of one dominant thought; x x the vehemence which makes him love the most emphatic compounds; x x the overflowing sympathy with the Jew, the pagan, the barbarian, - with saint and sinner, king and slave, man and woman, young and old. (Rom. 1, 4); the passion, which now makes his voice ring with indignation and now break with sobs; the accumulation and variation of words, from a desire to set forth the truths which he is proclaiming in every possible light; the emotional emphasis and personal references of his style; the depressed humility passing into boundless exultation; "
(Rom. 7, 25.)

"The daring faith which never dreads a difficulty, the unsolved antinomies, which, though unsolved, do not trouble him, the bold, soaring dialectics with which he rises from the forms of one finite and earthly thought, to the infinite and spiritual life embodied in them; the 'language of ecstasy', which was to him, as he meant it to be to his converts, the language of the work day world; that 'transcendental absurd', as it seems to the world, which was the very life both of his conscience and intellect, and made him what he was; the way in which, as with one powerful sweep of the wing, he passes from the pettiest earthly contentions to the spiritual and the infinite; the 'shrinking infirmity and self-contempt, hidden in a sort of aureole of revelation, abundant beyond measure,"- this was due to the fact that his citizenship was in heaven, his life hid with Christ in God."

Farrar Life of St. Paul, pg. 693.

No one can read Romans and not be amazed at the apparently irreconcilable statements to be found therein. Paul knew how to construct a paradox.

The gospel on the one hand is for all, and on the other, God foreknows and predestinates and calls whom he will. Pharoah is raised up for the very purpose that God might show his Power. Jacob is loved and Esau hated that the purpose of God according to election might stand. In close connection we find both phases:-

Predestination, Rom. IX.

Freewill, Rom. IX, 30, X, 21.

Or if we look at it in a different way we have two answers.

1. God predestinates, Rom. IX. Theologic.
2. The rejection of Israel was due to his own hardness and perverseness. Rom. XI, Historic.

Again:

All are to be judged and recompensed according to works.
Rom. 2, 6-10.

But on the other hand, the redeemed receive forgiveness free. The reward is of grace and not of works. Rom. 4, 4; 9, 11; 11, 6.

One has aptly summed all this up in the following very consistent statement:- "Everything is foreseen and free will is given; and the world is judged by grace and everything is according to works." Quoted by Farrar. Mess. of the Books. pg. 280.

Then again, there is almost a universal restoration hinted at. At any rate, creation together with us waits for the revealing of the Sons of God, and for our adoption, even the redemption of the body. Rom. 8, 19-23; 11, 30-36.

But on the other hand a man's hard and impenitent heart heaps up for himself wrath against a day of wrath,- but for them who by patience in well doing seek glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life. Rom. 2, 5-12.

See Farrar's St. Paul, pg. 732.

None of these things troubled Paul in the least. He had too much confidence in the infinite love of God to be non-plussed by anything. He was confident that the judge of the earth would do right, and he was content. And when we stand where Paul stood,

when we are perplexed with difficulties we shall have the same confidence.

Or as one so aptly says:- "In the interpretation of Scripture if we would feel as St. Paul felt, or think as he thought, we must go back to that age in which the water of life was still a running stream."