

## Chapter Five

### **5-Vs. 1: Therefore since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.**

In this chapter Paul speaks of the consequences of justification, the verb *dikaioo* (cf. 4.5) being used with the phrase literally as “from (*ek*) faith.” Having made this clear, he’s able to move on to more specifically how this relates to Jesus Christ. As if to allay any fear and hesitation as to the proposed words, Paul speaks of peace, *eirene* (cf. 2.10).

This introduction of peace is important in that his audience is mindful of Abraham, the image of a restless elderly man wandering from place to place in a land essentially not his own and experiencing lack of fulfillment of his divine mission. Now that Jesus Christ has come, the prospect of wandering is settled, at least on a spiritual level, some comfort for those who find themselves at Rome and elsewhere throughout the empire.

### **5-Vs. 2: Through him we have obtained access to this grace in which we stand, and we rejoice in our hope of sharing the glory of God.**

The sequence of prepositions in the first part of this verse is short but intense, for they show how Paul conceives our relationship with Jesus Christ. It runs as follows: *dia->pros->eis->en* (through->toward->into->in). The outline can be spelled out accordingly: *dia* Jesus Christ leads to *pros-* which is prefaced to *prosagoge* or access which has two other NT references, Eph 2.18 and 3.12, the former being cited here, similar to the verse at hand: “For through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father.” *Prosagoge* has been obtained, *echo* being the common verb to have. This being *dia* Jesus leads to *pros-*, two dynamic ways of expression forward motion ending up into (*eis*) a stationary place or *charis* (grace, cf. 4.16). Due to its importance, Paul emphasizes this stationary place by verb *histemi* (to stand, cf. 3.31).

From this fourfold advancement we’re in a position of rejoicing, *kaukaomai* which strongly implies boasting. “So that no human being might boast in the presence of God” [1Cor 1.29]. Such boasting is situated upon (*epi*) hope (*elpis*, cf. 4.18), hope being not in the present but in the future as a promise as it pertains to participating in divine glory or *doxa* (cf. 4.20). The text lacks the English “sharing.”

### **5-Vss. 3-5: More than that, we rejoice in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, 4) and endurance produces character, and character produces hope, 5) and hope does not disappoint us because God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us.**

If the fourfold outline of the previous verse wasn't sufficient—and Paul suggests that by *ou monon de* ('not only that')--he makes a bold statement concerning our human condition by transferring *kaukaomai* in vs. 2 (i.e., to rejoice) from hope to or *en* (in) suffering, *thlipsis* (cf. 2.9). This is an unnatural change which derives from a certain knowledge not obtainable by human means. *Oida* is the common verb which means seeing in the sense of beholding, of taking in something all at once (cf. 3.19). Such beholding looks at suffering and sees something else, that it produces character or *hupomone*, literally as a remaining under, *hupo-*(cf. 2.7). The verb at work here is *katergazomai* (cf. 2.9), *kata-* suggestive according to a given plan.

The verb *katergazomai* and noun *dokime* or produces and approved character carry over into vs. 4 where the latter, in turn, carries over into hope or *elpis* (cf. vs. 2). As for *dokime*, the verbal root *dokime* is found in 2.18. A reference to the noun is 2Cor 2.9: “That I may test you and know whether you are obedient in everything.”

As for hope, it cannot disappoint or *kataischuno* which literally means to put to shame, *kata-* here as down. “And he who believes in him will not be put to shame” [9.33]. What prevents this down-ness from taking effect, if you will, is divine *agape*, first mention of it in Romans and found next in vs. 8.

First the Holy Spirit (*Pneuma*, cf. 2.29) is within human hearts or *kardia* (cf. 2.15) or more accurately is given...by whom isn't stated directly but presumably by the Father in conjunction with the Son. Once present, the *Pneuma* brings about the pouring out of *agape*, *ekcheo*, the preposition *ek-* as from—to pour out from—found in 3.15 but not mentioned there.

**5-Vss. 6-7: While we were still weak, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly. 7) Why, one will hardly die for a righteous man—though perhaps for a good man one will dare even to die.**

Paul had spend considerable time speaking about Abraham as the father of both Jews and Christians. So when he says not only are we weak (*asthenes*) but are still thus-- *eti* connoting something further or in continuation—such weakness can be associated with Abraham and succeeding generations. “And the weakness of God is stronger than men” [1Cor 1.25].

The element of continuation relative to time signified by *eti* ties in with another *eti* used with *kairos* (cf. 3.36) which is prefaced with the preposition *kata*, here as in accord with. For example, this *kairos* or special time can be read in light of John the Baptist's preaching

who says in Mk 1.15: “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent and believe in the gospel.” Though John doesn't speak of Jesus' death, chances are he knew that he would be sacrificed which is why John's Gospel in 1.29 calls him the lamb of God.

*Asebes* is the adjective for ungodly mentioned in 4.5 where it's noted as being the negative of the noun *sebes* which is reverence to God, family and one's political association. I.e., it is equivalent to the Latin *pietas*.

Vs. 7 has the verb *apothnesko* meaning to die, the preposition *apo-* (from) suggesting a more intense form, if you will. “For if many died through one man's trespass” [vs. 15]. The adverb *mogis* suggests that a decision will be made to go ahead with an action though with considerable *mogos* or toil and pain, this being the noun from which *mogis* is derived. Such a momentous decision is barely made for someone *dikaioi* (righteous, cf. 3.26) and is in reference to someone who is good (*agathos*, cf. 2.7). In this instance a person may (*taxa*: perhaps) have the courage to die, *apothnesko* used a second time with the verb *tolmao*, to dare. “When one of you has a grievance against a brother, does he dare go to law before the unrighteous instead of the saints” [1Cor 6.1]?

**5-Vs. 8: But God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.**

Here divine *agape* (cf. vs. 5) is used with the verb *sunistemi* (cf. 3.5) which means to stand together or stand with (*sun-*), that is, it isn't just bestowed from on high but remains on the human plane. This is expressed by the preposition *eis* or literally “into us.”

The divine act of having *agape* stand with → into us take place in the context of being a sinner, reminiscent of Jn 3.16: “For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son.” This giving of the Son is expressed in his death, *apothnesko* noted in vs. 7, the preposition *apo-* (from) suggestive of a more intense form of dying.

**5-Vs. 9: Since, therefore, we are now justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God.**

The phrase *pollo oun* reads literally “therefore much” and is followed by *mallon* or “rather.” *Mallon* serves to introduced the fact of being justified (*dikaioo*, cf. vs. 1) in (*en*) the blood of Jesus Christ. Jesus as the Lamb of God noted above with regard to Jn 1.29 is presumed but with the expectation that something else is to follow.

What does follow is being saved (*sozo*). “For in this hope we were saved” [8.24]. In the verse at hand, this *sozo* is effected through (*dia*) Jesus Christ with regard to divine wrath,

*orge* (cf. 4.15). Again, the *pollo oun* situates being saved not so much as better than being justified but as following it as well as fulfilling it.

**5-Vs. 10: For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life.**

Again, the phrase *pollo oun* serves to bridge two halves which initially could be taken as separate but in essence are as one. On either side of the phrase is the verb *katallasso* (to reconcile) which implies a change or better, an exchange: the preposition *kata-* prefaced to the verbal root *allasso* (to change)...to change in accord with, if you will. “But if she does, let her remain single or else be reconciled to her husband” [1Cor 7.11]. Such reconciliation concerns us—Paul using first person plural as to show solidarity with his listeners—while being enemies, *exthros* (cf. 11.28).

Paul presents Christ as Son of the Father whose death effected the just mentioned *katallasso*. That continues along for a bit followed by the realization of being saved (*zozo*, cf. vs. 9) literally in (*en*) his life. In other words, the first *katallasso* has to wait, if you will, for the second to bring about this *en* or in-ness. Once they do, the two uses of the verb are fulfilled. Reconciliation is achieved.

**5-Vs. 11: Not only so, but we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ through whom we have now received our reconciliation.**

The words *ou monon de* or “not only so” mean that Paul is about to add something to what he had just communicated which here centers around rejoicing. The verb is *kauchaomai* (cf. 2.23) which infers boasting either in the positive or negative sense. Putting it temporally, such boasting first comes “in” God followed by “through” Jesus Christ, and that is followed by another “through.” This second *dia* is, of course, similar to the first but emphasizes reception of our reconciliation (the common verb *lambano*, cf. 1.5), *katallage* which derives from *katallasso* as in the previous verse. “For if their rejection means the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance mean but life from the dead” [11.15]?

**5-Vss. 12-13: Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned—13) sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law.**

Sin or *hamartia* is mentioned last in 3.20 with Gen 4.7 intimated: “but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.” The two words *hosper* and *houtos* (as and so) are two halves inextricably bound together

through the transmission of sin. The first is the world (*kosmos*, cf. 4.13) into which sin had come. The verb is *eiserchomai* with the preposition *eis*; in other words, two instances of *eis* suggesting that sin had perforated the human condition. Thus the garden of Eden lost its identity and instead, became this *kosmos*. Here two instances of *dia* are operative: sin *dia* one man and death *dia* sin.

Now moving on to the second half, that is, from *hosper* (as) to *houtos* (so), death spread out, *dierchomai*; i.e., the verb *erchomai* as in *eiserchomai* above only with the preposition *dia*- or through, indicative of full penetration. This is enhanced, if you will, by addition of the preposition *eis* or into all men. Although the element of time is operative (first man to the present), the effect of sin remains constant over generations regardless of their number.

As for the law (*nomos*/Torah, cf. 4.16), the sin of the first man—often attributed to his wife—it was present many generations before the Lord gave it to Moses on Mount Sinai. So when sin was absent, it was impossible for a person to be charged with an offense when the *nomos*/Torah wasn't in force. The verb *ellogeo* for counted implies to reckon in, to lay to one's account and has one other NT reference, Phm 18: If he has wronged you at all or owes you anything, charge that to my account.”

**5-Vs. 14: Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam who was a type of the one who was to come.**

*Basileuo* is the verb for reigned meaning to function as a king. “So that, as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness” [vs. 21]. In short, the time period extends from the man's expulsion from Eden through the flood, then through Abraham and finally to Moses who received the *nomos*/Torah on Mount Sinai. A chief mark of earlier generations after Adam was kicked out of Eden is that the life span of people gradually became shorter.

This kingship of death included everyone as well as their sins (*hamartia*, cf. vs. 12), including those whose sins didn't resemble Adam's transgression or *parabasis* (cf. 4.15) which means being outside the Torah or in its vicinity (i.e., *para*-) and not being subject to it. Implied is a residual memory of that tragic event as well as what had preceded, namely, life within Eden itself. Every person resembled Adam, that is, *homoioima* (with the preposition *epi* or upon) being the noun and can imply an accidental resemblance. This resemblance pertains to persons whose sins/transgression (note the plural vs. the singular) were different suggesting that since the *nomos*/Torah had not been given until Moses, there was no occasion for *parabasis* concerning it.

In light of this Paul views Adam as a *tupos* or type of Jesus Christ (name not mentioned) who is to come. “You who were once slaves of sin have become obedient from the heart to the standard of teaching to which you were committed” [6.17]. Although transgression and Adam are pretty much synonymous, Paul doesn't mean that the one to come will be like this. While not spelled out here, this juxtaposition is enough to get the attention of his listeners to see where he's going with such a comparison.

**5-Vs. 15: But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many.**

*Charisma* (cf. 1.11) is the noun for free gift ('free' actually is redundant; by its nature a gift is free) is used twice in the RSV but differs in the Greek. Anyway, it's the exact opposite of the trespass or *paraptoma* (cf. 4.25) attributed to Adam in the previous verse where the noun *parabasis* is used. As it is evident, both nouns have the preposition *para-* (beside) prefaced to them. This distinction paves the way for Paul to flesh out what he had said concerning Adam as a type of Jesus Christ, that is, not replicating his transgression but quite the opposite. The distinction between *charisma* and *paraptoma* is indicated by the two words *hos*→*houtos* or literally, “(not) like” leading to “thus.”

When Paul says that many have died through Adam's transgression, the time period covers many generations. Perhaps he too was thinking of the flood when “everything on the dry land in whose nostrils was the breath of life died” [Gen 7.22]. He compares this with those who acknowledge Jesus Christ who temporally speaking is quite close to his life and in effect amounts to very few people. Here Paul speaks of both grace and the free gift, *charis* and *dorea*, the latter being situated within the *charis* (3.24 has both terms). *Charis* seems a more general term whereas *dorea* can apply to the revelation of Jesus Christ within this grace, if you will, which leads to Paul's words “one man” relative to Jesus.

*Perisseuo* (cf. 3.7) is the verb for abounded and is applicable to both *charis* and the *dorea* of that *charis* which is for many or literally, “into (*eis*) many.”

**5-Vs. 16: And the free gift is not like the effect of that one man's sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brings justification.**

*Dorema* is the noun for the (so-called) free gift, a more concrete term compared with *charisma* of vs. 15 and has one other NT reference, Jms 1.17: “Every good endowment and every perfect gift is from above.” This *dorema* is literally “not as through one sinning” in reference to Adam.

A pair of opposites: *krima*→*katakrima* and *charisma*→*dikaioma* or judgment->trespass and free gift→justification, each part of both being connected by the preposition *eis*, into. Note the contrast between one trespass and many trespasses which shows the transmission of this trespass from the singular Adam to the plural or to humanity.

**5-Vs. 17: If, because of one man's trespass death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ.**

The verb *basileuo* (cf. vs. 14) or to reign covers two opposites, death and life. To the former belongs the singular *paraptoma* (cf. vs. 15) and to the latter abundance or *perisseia* which isn't attributed to the death of Adam despite its all-pervasiveness. This noun has two other NT references, 2Cor 8.2 and Jms 1.21, the latter being cited here: “Therefore put away all filthiness and rank growth of wickedness and receive with meekness the implanted word which is able to save your souls.” Within this *perisseia* are two sub-divisions, if you will. The first is *charis* (cf. vs. 15) and the second is *dorea* (compared with *dorema* of vs. 16) or grace and free gift. And these two are connected intimated with righteousness (*dikaiosis*, cf. 4.25). Such a contrast is, of course, between Adam and Jesus Christ where the word “one” is used for both, a way of specifying the source for death and the source for life.

To the life bound up with Jesus Christ is abundance or *perisseia*

**5-Vs. 18: Then as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one man's act of righteousness leads to acquittal and life for all men.**

The two words *ara oun* read literally something like “consequently then” to show the conjunctive-like connection with the previous verse, Paul's ongoing juxtaposition of the first man Adam and Jesus Christ. The phrase serves to introduce the pair marked off by *hos* and *houtos* or as-so.

As for *hos* (as), the preposition *eis* (into) is with respect to all men followed by another use with respect to condemnation (*katakrima*, cf. vs. 16). As for *houtos*, (so) *eis* is used with respect to all men as well as *dikaiosis* (cf. 4.25) which is found with *zoe* (life), literally as “into justification of life.”

**5-Vs. 19: For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man's obedience many will be made righteous.**

This verse continues with yet another pair, if you will, governed by *hosper* and *houtos* (as and so). *Hosper* is used with respect to *parakoe* or disobedience (the preposition *dia* or through) which results in many (*hoi polloi*) becoming sinners and can leave some wiggle room; i.e., even a few, don't fall into this category. *Parakoe* suggests a hearing that has gone amiss or literally down (*kata-*) and has two other NT references, 2Cor 10.6 and Heb 2.2, the former being cited here: “Being ready to punish every disobedience when your obedience is complete.”

The verb *kathistemi* means “were made” and is comprised of the verbal root *histemi* (to stand) prefaced with the preposition *kata-*, in accord with...to stand in accord with. “This is why I left you in Crete, that you might amend what was defective and appoint elders in every town as I directed you” [Tit 1.5].

As for *houtos* (so), it contrasts as well as parallels the first which belongs to Adam. That is to say, Jesus' obedience or *hupakoe* (cf. 1.6; contrast with *parakoe* above) will make many (again, specifically not all)—set them in accord with or *kathistemi*—being righteous, *dikaios* (cf. vs. 7).

**5-Vss. 20-21: Law came in to increase the trespass; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more 21) so that as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.**

Here Paul speaks of the law (*nomos*/Torah, cf. vs. 13) with regard to what seems antagonistic to it, that is, the intent to increase human trespass or *paraptoma* (vs. 17). If that were so literally, God would be at fault when he gave the Law on Mount Sinai. The verb here is *pareiserchomai* which consists of the root *erchomai* (to come, to go) prefaced with two prepositions, *para-* and *eis-* or beside and into...to come-beside-into. Putting it awkwardly, the idea seems to be that the *nomos*/Torah came *para* Moses (hence the people Israel) after which it went *eis* them immediately. The deficiency seems to lay in the fact that the people lacked insight to maintain this in a sustained manner. *Pareiserchomai* has one other NT reference, Gal 2.4: “But because of false brethren secretly brought in who slipped in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus.”

Actually for the Law to come beside-into is wonderful but deficient by comparison to what Paul is attempting to convey at the end of this chapter, to bring it to a close, that is, to say, through (*dia*) Jesus Christ. This contrast is signified by use of *pleonazo* used twice (increased) with regard to trespass and sin (*paraptoma* and *hamartia*, cf. vs. 14) “Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound” [6.1]?

Vs. 21 has another *hosper-houtos* as and so (cf. vs. 19) with regard to the verb *basileuo* (to reign, cf. vs. 17). That is to say, sin or *hamartia* does it in death and grace or *charis* (cf. vs. 17) does it through (*dia*) righteousness (*dikaiousune*, cf. vs. 17) literally into or *eis* eternal life which is followed by by another *dia*, that is, Jesus Christ.

## Chapter Six

**6-Vss. 1-2: What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? 2) By no means! How can we who died to sin still live in it?**

For an appreciation of this verse, refer to 5.20-21 with regard to the Law/sin and sin/grace.

This new chapter opens with a rhetorical question after Paul has contrasted Adam with Jesus Christ. Adam is a figure of sin, the reason why he was expelled from the garden and Jesus is the New Adam who has rectified what had affected humankind ever since. Since Jesus' death and resurrection effected this remedy, Paul wishes that his listeners get the difference straight in their minds between the figure of Adam and the figure of Jesus Christ. The redemption effected by Jesus Christ isn't to be sustained by our continuance in sin, the verb *epimeno* literally as a remaining-upon, *epi-* suggestive of a kind of permanence. "But God's kindness to you, provided you continue in his kindness" [11.22]. Such remaining-upon may have a good intention but essentially is misguided, that is, for the purpose of God offering more grace (*charis*, cf. 5.21), *pleonazo* (cf. 5.20).

Vs. 2 is a response to the rhetorical question in vs. 1 followed by a second one. Note that Paul uses the first person plural ('we') with regard to having died to sin, *apothnesko* being the verb prefaced with the preposition *apo-* (from) suggestive of a more intense form of dying as noted in 5.8. Such a death obviously precludes living in sin.

**6-Vs. 3: Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?**

Another rhetorical question posed by Paul having in mind "us" or the commonality of baptism, the verb *baptizmo* meaning to dip, to immerse into water. It is the fundamental sign or sacrament of being a Christian. While that is presupposed, Paul stresses the nature of this total immersion by two uses of the preposition *eis* (into): Christ Jesus and his death. If it isn't presupposed which may be the case in some instances, those so uninitiated are to take steps to become baptized.

**6-Vs. 4: We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life.**

The immersion implied with *baptizo* noted in the previous verse is similar to being buried with Christ, *sunthapto*, the *sun-* or with-ness involved followed by *eis* or into death. In other words, without the first, there's no second.

Paul sets up a “so-that” situation. First (i.e., the ‘so’ part) Christ was raised from the dead while the second is comprised of us walking in new life (i.e., the ‘that’ part). The Father’s glory or *doxa* (cf. 5.2) is responsible for this raising, a kind of mediating influence. *Peripateo* means literally to walk around (*peri-*) not just in a circle but covering an entire area. “We who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit” [8.4]. Such circumambulation, if you will, takes place in newness of life, *kainotes* also meaning freshness and *peri-* representative of freedom. “So that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit” [7.6, this the only other NT reference].

**6-Vs. 5: For if we have been united with him in a death like his, we shall certainly be united with him in a resurrection like his.**

Paul’s use of “if” leaves the possibility that some people (‘we’ = solidarity with his audience) may not be united with (*sum-*) Christ, that is, *sumphutos* or natural or with (*sum-*) to the race and the only use of this adjective in the NT. This connaturality, if you will, is to take the form of a death resembling the one Jesus endured, *homoionoma* (cf. 5.14) or in the likeness or resemblance of it. If this *sumphutos* takes hold (the root *phuo* as to bring forth, to produce), it results in “we shall be of the resurrection” as it’s put literally and more directly.

**6-Vs. 6: We know that our old self was crucified with him so that the sinful body might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin.**

*Gignosko* (cf. 2.18) is rendered as “knowing” which makes the verse at hand a continuance, if you will, of the previous one. Although Paul speaks like this, chances are most of his audience (the Romans) didn’t have much a clue as to this crucifixion with Christ or *sustauroomai* (*sus-* or *sun-*, with), the only use of this verb in the NT. As Romans they were familiar with crucifixion as the worst type of capital punishment. This knowledge, coupled with the uncomfortable presence of the old self or *palaios*, highlights its disagree ability. “But now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive” [7.6].

*Hina* or “so that” can’t come fast enough for the Romans who are listening. That is to say, they want to know what Paul is transitioning to, given the disgrace crucifixion has in their minds. So when that which is to be crucified turns out to be literally “the body of sin,” they are relieved. In other words, crucifixion equals this body being destroyed or *katargeo* (cf. 4.15), the verb also meaning to be made useless. Also involved is no further slavery to sin, *douleuo* being one step above the disgrace of being crucified. “So that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit” [7.6].

**6-Vss. 7-8: For he who has died is freed from sin. 8) But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him.**

These two verses continue the theme of dying, again crucifixion not far from the Romans’ minds. *Dikaioo* means to make righteous (cf. 5.9) and implies having been tested which here is not to be tied up with sin.

Paul situates the next verse (8) as a dying with (*sun*) Christ, conditional in that those listening to him must follow through on this dying-with. If they follow through, they will live with him, *suzao*, *su-* being *sun-* or with. “For I said before that you are in our hearts to die together and to live together” [2Cor 7.3]. More specifically, this dying with Christ is contingent upon faith or believing, *pisteuo* (cf. 4.18).

**6-Vs. 9: For we know that Christ being raised from the dead will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him.**

Paul uses the first person plural (‘we’) indicating a type of solidarity with his listeners who may have varying degrees of conviction about what he’s saying. Here it’s with regard to knowing about Christ being raised, *egeiro* (cf. 4.25). This is a passive participle indicating that he didn’t do it on his own, if you will, but another agent was involved (i.e., the Father). As for the verb *eido*, in addition to knowing, it means to see in the sense of behold. “If it had not been for the law, I should not have known sin” [7.7]. Once having been raised, death is powerless over Christ, that is, it lacks *kurieuo* or the ability to exercise lordship. “For sin will have no dominion over you” [vs. 14].

**6-Vs. 10: The death he died he died to sin, once for all, but the life he lives he lives to God.**

Obviously Christ’s death refers to his crucifixion which Paul says is a concern not so much about his physical life but sin. This contrasts with living (*zao*; cf. vs. 2 but not noted there) to God which is in the dative case. In between the two (death/died and life/lives) is the adverb *ephapax* which is indicative of finality concerning death to sin followed by *de* or “but,” the opposite of death which is life.

**6-Vs. 11: So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus.**

*Houtos* or “so” which connects Paul’s listeners with both Christ’s death/died and life/lives. They are to consider this transition as applicable to themselves, *logizomai* (cf. 4.24) being the verb which implies taking into account as well as reckoning. This *logizomai* applies to being dead to sin and alive to God, both in Christ Jesus. Being in him implies having access to one’s memory and keeping it active both individually and collectively.

**6-Vs. 12: Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions.**

The verb for reign is *basileuo* as used in 5.21; compare this verb with *kurieuo* of vs. 9 (has dominion). The former suggests governance by a monarch whereas the latter implies being lord and having legal power. *Basileuo* seems a bit stronger or more comprehensive which is why Paul doesn’t wish this to apply to our mortal bodies, bodies subject to death. Should sin do this *basileuo*, we obey our passions, this obedience equivalent to that of a slave. This is rendered first by the preposition *eis* (into) with regard to the verb *hupakouo* or to give ear (*akouo* or to listen prefaced with *hupo-* or under) followed by *epithumia* (cf. 1.24), literally as a desire-upon (*epi-*). Thus the pronoun pattern: *eis->hupo->epi*.

**6-Vs. 13: Do not yield your members to sin as instruments of wickedness, but yield yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life, and your members to God as instruments of righteousness.**

The previous verse speaks of bodies which are mortal in which sin can reign (*basileuo*) whereas here it is equivalent to yielding or *paristemi*, literally to place beside or near (*para-*). It is used in two ways. The first seems to be the possibility of freely placing bodily limbs beside (*para-*) sin, of being in its vicinity. “Do you not know that if you yield yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves” [vs. 16]. Physical or bodily members (*melos*, cf. vs. 19) are prone to succumb to this placing-beside of wickedness (*adikia*: also as injustice; cf. 3.5), *hopla* being a tool or instrument not unlike *melos*. “Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light” [13.12]. Thus we have the pair *melos/hamartia* (sin) and *hopla/adikia*.

The second possibility with regard to *paristemi* or placing-beside is twofold: 1) it concerns God but is to be done as having come from death to life (no verb in the Greek). 2) It makes one’s physical members or *melos* instruments of divine righteousness, that is, *hopla of dikaiosune* (cf. 5.21). Note that *melos* and *hopla* are interchangeable when it comes to such righteousness.

**6-Vs. 14 For sin will have no dominion over you since you are not under law but under grace.**

Paul implies that if his listeners (i.e., the Romans) are under the law or Torah, they are subject to the dominion of sin, *kurieuo* (cf. vs. 12) applicable to the idea of lordship. Being under grace (*charis*, cf. 5.21) presupposes that they are to leave the law/Torah but must require knowledge of what it means to be under *charis*...in sum, to shift one “under” (*hupo*) for another one. Also is implied that *charis* will *kurieuo*.

**6-Vs. 15: What then? Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means!**

In a sense, sin presented here is a means of getting away with as much as possible and being as least responsible as possible, hence Paul’s exclamation *ti oun* or “What then?” It leads to a second question, more rhetorical in nature, with regard to the possibility of continuing to sin by not being under the law/Torah. Supposedly but mistakenly being under *charis* or grace as in the previous verse allows this shirking of responsibility for one’s actions. Then Paul concludes this chopped up verse, if you will, by *me genoito* or “By no means,” *gignomai* meaning to come into being, hence “May this not come into being.”

**6-Vs. 16: Do you not know that if you yield yourselves to any one as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness?**

Once again Paul parallels sin with slavery, *paristemi* being the verb for yield as in vs. 13, to place-beside (*para-*). The phrase *eis hupakoen* (*hupakoe*, cf. 5.19) reads literally “into obedience” or “into listening-under, *hupo-*.” Such willingness to sin develops what he has just said in the previous verse. Yet instead of leading “into (*eis*) death,” this *hupakoe* can lead *eis* righteousness, *dikaiousune* (cf. vs. 13), the verb “lead” not being in the Greek text. Apparently *eis* is dynamic enough without adding a verb.

**6-Vss. 17-18: But thanks be to God, that you who were once slaves of sin have become obedient from the heart to the standard of teaching to which you were committed, 18) and, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness.**

*Charis* or thanks also means grace as noted several times thus far (cf. vs. 15): “But grace be to God,” if you will. The reason for Paul’s acknowledgment? Apparently he has knowledge that his listeners had undergone some type of repentance in conformity with

their previous commitment, the verb *paradidomai* (cf. 5.2) meaning to hand over, *para-* suggestive of being at the side of the person to whom one entrusts oneself. Some others who aren't mentioned had converted the Romans before Paul's arrival, giving them teaching or *didache* in the faith. "In opposition to the doctrine which you have been taught" [16.17]. Note only this, but Paul takes pains to mention the apparently high standard of such teaching, *tupos* meaning a type (cf. 5.14) and suggestive of something received as being impressed. For this reason Paul is moved by the Romans' obedience (*hupakouo*, cf. vs. 12) or ability to listen-under (*hupo-*) as it pertains to their heart (*kardia*, cf. 5.5) which is with the preposition *ek* or "from the heart."

Vs. 18 uses the past tense with regard to being set free and having become slaves of righteousness. The verb for the first is *eleutheroo* found next in 8.2: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death." As for the second, *dikaiosune* is the noun as in vs. 16 but here is associated with being a slave, *douloo* as in 7.6: "so that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit." This quote is more palatable but doesn't detract from what is being communicated, for slaves were abundant and treated as second class citizens.

**6-Vs. 19: I am speaking in human terms because of your natural limitations. For just as you once yielded your members to impurity and to greater and greater iniquity, so now yield your members to righteousness for sanctification.**

*Anthropinos* is the adjective for human terms as in 1Cor 2.13: "And we impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit." In the verse at hand Paul is quick to use this word since as any reference intimating slaves is used, it raises a red flag for his audience. He's also quick to mention literally "the weakness of your flesh," *astheneia* also meaning feebleness as well as disease; in sum, a deplorable physical condition also referring to poverty. "Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness" [8.26].

Paul is aware of his audience's failure to live up to the Christian message so he speaks freely of their limitations expressed by the verb *paristemi*. It is found last in vs. 16, of the Romans having set themselves beside (*para-*) both impurity or *akatharsia* (cf. 1.24) and iniquity or *anomia* (cf. 4.7) which means to be without law or *nomos*. Not only is Paul aware of such lawlessness, if you will, it's doubled by the way he expresses it, "iniquity into (*eis*) iniquity." To counter this first *paristemi*, Paul offers a second, namely, to put beside (*para-*) with regard to a different, positive use of *eis* or into, that is, with regard to sanctification or *hagiasmos* (cf. vs. 22). But relative to this are one's physical limbs or *melos* (cf. vs. 13) as they become agents for righteousness (*dikaiosune*, cf. Vs. 18).

**6-Vss. 20-21: When you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. 21) But then what return did you get from the things of which you are now ashamed? The end of those things is death.**

A contrast or paradox between being free and enslaved (*doulos*, cf. 1.1 and *eleutheros*, cf. 7.3). The first belongs to and the second to righteousness (*dikaiosune*, cf. vs. 19). Vs. 21 says that the fruit of (*karpos*, cf. 1.13 but not mentioned there) this apparent freedom resulted in shame, *epaischunomai* (cf. 1.16), the root prefaced with the preposition *epi-* or upon as an intensification...to be shamed-upon, if you will. *Telos* (cf. vs. 22) or end in the sense of completion is equivalent to death by reason of the slavery at hand.

**6-Vs. 22: But now that you have been set free from sin and have become slaves of God, the return you get is sanctification and its end, eternal life.**

Paul speaks of freedom (*eleutheroo*, cf. vs. 18) from sin which results in an apparent paradox, that is, becoming enslaved (*douleuo*, cf. vs. 6) to God with the result (*karpos* as fruit, cf. previous verse) being twofold: sanctification (*hagiasmos*, cf. vs. 19) and life which is eternal. Which is the end or *telos*, very different from the *telos* of the previous verse.

**6-Vs. 23: For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.**

A contrast between wages (*opsonion* or supplies as for an army) and free gift or *charisma* (cf. 5.16). A reference to *opsonion* is 1Cor 9.7: “Who serves as a soldier for a living?” To the former belongs death and to the latter, God himself. The latter is specified more in the sense of being eternal life within a specific person, Christ Jesus.

## Chapter Seven

**7-Vs. 1: Do you not know, brethren—for I am speaking to those who know the law—that the law is binding on a person only during his life?**

In Romans Paul is speaking to what seems an audience of both Jews and Christians, some of whom have converted from Judaism. The commonality of the Jewish religion makes him address those familiar with the Law or Torah, *nomos* as used throughout. *Gignosko* is the familiar verb to know (cf. 6.6). Those at Rome realize, of course, that this Torah is binding for life, *kurieuo* in the sense of having dominion as in 6.14. This dominion is literally speaking “upon which time (*chronos*) he lives.” Another reference to *chronos* is 16.25: “According to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret for long ages.”

**7-Vss. 2-3: Thus a married woman is bound by law to her husband as long as he lives; but if her husband dies she is discharged from the law concerning the husband. 3) Accordingly, she will be called an adulteress if she lives with another man while her husband is alive. But if her husband dies she is free from that law, and if she marries another man she is not an adulteress.**

Here through the next few verses Paul uses the example of marriage with respect to the Torah and Christ. *Hupandros* is the adjective for bound, literally as under (*hupo-*) the man (*aner*) and is the only NT use of this term. Such *hupandros* is subject to being rendered ineffective upon the death of the married woman's husband as prescribed in the Torah. The verb here is *katargeo* (cf. 6.6) which also means to be useless.

*Moichalis* is the noun for adulteress as in Mt 12.39: "An evil and adulteress generation seeks for a sign." A woman is not called such when her husband dies.

**7-Vs. 4: Likewise, my brethren, you have died to the law through the body of Christ so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God.**

*Hoste* or likewise shows that Paul takes up the example of the previous verse and applies it to his current audience. Christ's body (*soma*; found last in 6.12 but not noted there) seems to be the agent which causes death to the Torah. That's the first half (death), the second consisting of life or belonging to Christ, *eis to genesthai* or literally "into coming into being." To demonstrate the effectiveness of this death to the Torah, Paul says that such "into coming into being" pertains to Christ who has been raised from the dead. So death to the Torah followed to belonging to Christ results in the bearing of fruit...not just that but to God himself.

**7-Vs. 5: While we were living in the flesh, our sinful passions, aroused by the law, were at work in our members to bear fruit for death.**

*Hote* or while suggests some indefinite time in the past, and Paul uses the first person plural to demonstrate solidarity with his listeners. The phrase "in the flesh" is more than a time in the past but a manner of life at odds with the one existing now. *Hote* pertains to *pathema* or anything that befalls one such as sin. "I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us" [8.18]. Apparently such *pathema* had been latent; they were aroused as from sleep by the Torah, *energeo* meaning to put into action, the preposition *en-* or "in" prefaced to the verb. "For he who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also

for the Gentiles” [Gal 2.8]. Such working-in took place (again, in the past, not the present) within our physical members (*melos*, cf. 6.19) to yield death, the verb *karpophero* as in the previous verse but in the opposite sense.

**7-Vs. 6: But now we are discharged from the law, dead to that which held us captive, so that we serve not under the old written code but in the new life of the Spirit.**

*Nuni de* or “but now” is indicative of a radical shift and equivalent to the following:

1) Being discharged or *katargeo* (cf. vs. 3) meaning to be useless or no longer bound by the Torah.

2) Being dead to our former captivity, *katecho* (cf. 2.18) which means essentially to restrain. In sum, both verbs are prefaced with the preposition *kata-* which here is applicable down-ness.

*Nuni de* leads to serving, *douleuo* (cf. 6.22) also applicable to being a slave, here concerning the new life of the Spirit, *kainotes* (cf. 5.4) prefaced with the preposition *en* or “in the new life” of the Spirit (*Pneuma*, cf. 5.5). Such newness contrasts with the Torah which Paul calls an old written code, *palaiotes* connoting antiquity compared with more recent times, this being the only NT use of the word. Ultimately the written nature of the Torah is traceable to the Lord himself when giving it to Moses on Mount Sinai.

**7-Vs. 7: What then shall we say? That the law is sin? By no means! Yet, if it had not been for the law, I should not have known sin. I should not have known what it is to covet if the law had not said, "You shall not covet."**

This verse contains two rhetorical questions in rapid succession to counter any objections about reverence of Torah. Paul uses two verbs for to know. The first is *gignosko* (cf. vs. 1) and the second, *eido* (cf. 6.9). The former applies to discerning, to forming a judgment and the latter to see in the sense of behold. *Gignosko* is the Torah is the agent responsible for Paul’s knowledge of sin whereas *eido* applies to covertness, *epithumia* (cf. 6.12) literally as desire-upon (*epi-*). Interestingly Paul singles this out among the ten commandments referring to both Ex 20.17 and Dt 5.21, the verb *chamad* being used as applicable to anything desirable which in both instances is the wife of one’s neighbor.

**7-Vs. 8: But sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness. Apart from the law sin lies dead.**

Here sin is almost a person, put this way to make an illustration, that is, as looking for an opportunity within Paul which means he’s speaking from personal experience. As intimated several times throughout Romans, this can refer to his former role as persecutor

of Christians. *Aphorme* is the noun which means a starting point or origin. “We are not commending ourselves to you again but giving you cause to be proud of us” [2Cor 5.12]. In the verse at hand, covetousness (*epithumia* of the previous verse) is this *aphorme* or more precisely, if you will, the *epi-* or upon-ness of it. And the verb which produces it is *katargeo* as in vs. 6.

This verse concludes with a second sentence, quite short, saying that sin is dead apart (*choris*: also as separately, besides) from the Torah.

**7-Vss. 9-10: I was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died; 10) the very commandment which promised life proved to be death to me.**

These two verse which form one sentence consist of Paul recalling aloud his earlier life not for the sake of revealing personal information but for inspiring his listeners. He remembers having been (apparently) alive without the Torah—without observing its commands—this being apart from (*choris*, cf. previous verse) the Torah. As for the commandment’s coming (*entole*, cf. vs. 8 but not noted there), the context seems to be when it came into Paul’s life. And so it’s arrival made sin come alive for Paul, *anazao* more specifically as come alive once again (*ana-*). The only other NT reference is Lk 15.24: “For this my son was dead and is alive again.” Yet in the verse at hand, paradoxically the commandment’s return or perhaps better, Paul’s return to the commandment, made him die. It was the same commandment which had promised life, this being expressed with the verb *heurisko* (essentially as to find; cf. 4.1) including the phrase “into (*eis*) life.”

**7-Vs. 11: For sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me.**

Here sin seems to be personalized and seeks an occasion (*aphorme*, cf. vs. 8) in the commandment, the preposition *dia* or through the commandment. This opportunity isn’t mentioned directly but consists in having deceived Paul, *exapatao* being the verb where the preposition *ex-* or from suggests something done it fully. This too is further emphasized by *dia* just noted. “By fair and flattering words they deceive the hearts of the simple-minded” [16.18]. The picture that comes to mind is sin on the look-out to trap Paul with the intent of killing him, quite dramatic words which must have had powerful effect upon his listeners.

**7-Vss.12-13: So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good. 13) Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin working death in me**

**through what is good in order that sin might be shown to be sin and through the commandment might become sinful beyond measure.**

In order not to mislead his Jewish audience, Paul is quick to add that the Torah and commandment are holy (*hagios*, cf. 1.7). As for the latter, it too is just and good (*dikaios* and *agathos*; cf. 5.19 & 5.7). Here as in vs. 10 *entole* is singular, the reason for which isn't spelled out but inferred. If both pose no problem, Paul asks rhetorically how what is *agathos* can effect death in him, the verb being *katargeo* as in 7.8. Obviously he is quick to say this can't be, placing the blame of sin working death in him, *katargeo* as in 7.8, and does so by that which is *agathos*, namely, the commandment (the law isn't specified here as being *agathos*).

All this can be confusing to Paul's audience. However, he wishes to show the true nature of sin. *Phaino* is the verb also meaning to appear, to come out of hiding: "Not that we may appear to have met the test" [2Cor 13.7]. The purpose of the (singular) commandment? That sin not just remain in and by itself but increase, if you will, beyond measure or *hyperbole*, literally, a casting-beyond (*hyper-*). "And I will show you a still more excellent way" [1Cor 12.31]. Once sin has become full-blown and comes out into the open, everyone can see it and deal with it.

**7-Vss. 14-15: We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. 15) I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate.**

Paul uses the first person plural to identify with his listeners after the strong language he had used just now. *Eido* (cf. vs. 7) connoting to behold is the verb to know, designed to put everyone at ease concerning the Torah as being *pneumatikos* (cf. 1.11), not carnal (*sarkinos*) which Paul claims he is. "I could not address you as spiritual men but as men of the flesh, as babes in Christ" [1Cor 3.1]. In the verse at hand, Paul presses his desperate situation further, aligning himself with being a slave as sold under sin, *pernmi* (or *piprasko*). "Finding one pearl of great value, went and sold all that he had and bought it" [Mt 13.46].

Such vivid and personal words is followed by Paul blurting out that he fails to comprehend (*gignosko*: cf. vs. 7) what he's doing, *katargeo* (cf. vs. 13). Not only that, he does what he hates (*miseo*), going against his own better judgment. "As it is written, 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated'" [9.13]. Chances are that Paul is referring to the weight of memory concerning his former persecution of Christians which his listeners know about. In fact, still they are attempting to reconcile it with his reputation as an apostle. All this communication is done at a distance which can raise further doubts.

**7-Vss. 16-17: Now if I do what I do not want, I agree that the law is good. 17) So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me.**

Paul juxtaposes his behavior, albeit unwillingly, with the Torah as being good (*kalos*, more as beautiful). “That inspired by them, you may wage the good warfare” [1Tim 1.18]. In the verse at hand, *sumphemi* means agree, *sum-* (with) being the preposition as preface and is the only use in the NT. The second sentence spells this out where Paul attributes the presence of sin within himself as the agent responsible, *katargeo* as in vs. 15. The verb *oikeo* means to dwell in the sense of making oneself fully at home. It isn’t an attempt to switch blame (i.e., to sin) and free himself from responsibility. Apparently this dwelling still remains in force, chiefly by reason of painful memories of Paul’s pre-conversion days.

**7-Vss. 18-20: For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I cannot do it. 19) For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. 20) Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me.**

*Oikeo* is the verb for dwell and as noted in vs. 17, implies taking up residence. The nothing of which Paul speaks is equivalent to sin and seems rather stark, that he is like a hollowed-out man, especially when it comes to his will, the verb *ethelo* being used similar to its use in vs. 15. The verb *parakeimai* (cf. vs. 21) isn’t translated directly, if you will, and means to be adjacent, close by as intimated by the preposition *para-*. So Paul ends up by doing evil (*kakos*, cf. 3.8 with the verb *katergazomai*, cf. 5.3) against his will which is caused by sin having taken up residence within him, *oikeo*. Admittedly, this is difficult for his listeners to comprehend, presumably many of them Jews or recent converts from Judaism.

**7: Vss. 21-23: So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. 22) For I delight in the law of God, in my inmost self, 23) but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members.**

After struggling for some time with sin which had taken up residence within him, Paul discovers that it has become a law (*nomos* as used throughout regarding the Torah and is applicable to custom, usage). Such a law comes to greater light when Paul wishes to do what is right, *to kalon*, that which is beautiful, the adjective being found in vs. 16. However, evil (*to kakon*; the adjective *kakos* found in vs. 19) is close at hand by reason of the *oikeo* noted in vs. 19, the verb here being *parakeimai* (cf. vs. 18). Discovery of this inner tension is put in terms of the verb *heurisko* (cf. vs. 10), more to discover or find in the sense of becoming aware of.

Paul spells out further his inner turmoil hoping others can identify with it and therefore be at ease when he comes to them. On one hand he takes delight in the divine Torah, *sunedumai* being the verb, literally as to rejoice with (*sun-*), the only NT use. Such delight-with, if you will, is deep within himself, *kata* (in accord with) *ton eso anthropon*. While this is so, Paul nevertheless sees (*blepo* implies gazing) his physical members at war. “Now hope that is seen is not hope” [8.24]. What Paul is gazing at turns out to be an alternate law or *nomos*, this being at war or *antistrateuomai* which means making a military expedition (*anti-* as against), the only NT use. This other *nomos* is related to the one just mentioned in vs. 21 governing Paul wanting to do what’s right but having evil close by.

No doubt such a war is intense, one *nomos* against another *nomos*, the latter being associated Paul’s mind, *noos* (*nous*, cf. 1.28) which seems to be equivalent to *ton eso anthropon* of the last paragraph. Such a struggle takes Paul captive, *aichmalotizo* being the verb as in 2Cor 10.5: “And take every thought captive to obey Christ.” Such captivity is exterior to his inmost self and law of mind, that is, making sin the jailer present in his members.

**7-Vss. 24-25: Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? 25) Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord! So then, I of myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin.**

Paul concludes this chapter with a short exclamation concerning his wretched condition, *talaiporos* suggestive of enduring trouble and has one other NT reference: “knowing that you are wretched, pitiable, poor, blind and naked” [Rev 3.17]. This leads immediately to a rhetorical question as to his deliverance, *rhuomai* implying to draw out, that is, from being threatened constantly by the *nomos* or law of sin in vs. 23. “The Deliverer will come from Zion” [11.26].

As soon as Paul blurts out his wretched condition and plea for deliverance he gives thanks for Jesus Christ who is allied with his service of the divine *nomos* while at the same time he’s subject to the *nomos* of sin. Here Paul contrasts his mind with his flesh, *nous* and *sarx*. Though these two verses have a note of despair along with hope in Jesus Christ, still they leave Paul’s listeners in a state of suspense: which will win out? And does the same struggle await them?

## Chapter Eight

**8-Vss. 1-2: There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus. 2) For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death.**

*Ara nun* or “now then” turn out to be comforting words by Paul to his listeners in that they shift attention away from the rather harrowing account of his personal struggle in the last chapter. Being either new to the faith or Jews interested in this new religion, his audience needs reassurance so as not to be hindered in this early stage of growth. So when Paul says there is no fear of being condemned, *katakrima* (cf. 5.18), it’s contingent upon being “in Christ Jesus.” Although such phraseology can be taken for granted by reason of its familiarity, certainly it’s new to the his audience, and more than anything Paul wishes to transmit what such “in-ness” is all about.

Paul speaks of the law—the context distinguishes between the notion of Torah and the more general sense of *nomos* as standard—with respect to the Spirit (*Pneuma*, cf. 7.6) as it pertains not just to life (*zoe*, cf. 5.18) but to the just mentioned phrase “in Christ Jesus.” So this threefold notion of in-ness/Spirit/life has set Paul free (*eleutheroo*, cf. 6.22) from the law of sin as well as the law of death. Also their combination makes Paul’s listeners more attentive to know about the freedom from sin it’s supposed to impart.

**8-Vss. 3-4: For God has done what the law, weakened by the flesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, he condemned sin in the flesh 4) in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit.**

These two verses form one lengthy sentence dealing with the limitations of the Torah. It was established by God yet had become weakened (*astheneo*;) by the flesh (*sarx*), this verb also meaning to be sick as noted in 4.19. By juxtaposing law-as-Torah with the person of Jesus Christ Paul is making an enormous distinction. It’s as though God who gave the Torah to Moses on Mount Sinai decided the Torah wasn’t adequate so decided to become present himself, an inconceivable idea. As for *adunatos* or “could not do” relative to Torah, this means the Torah lacks *dunamis* (cf. 1.2) or the capacity of what Paul is about to propose.

For Paul’s listeners as well as Jesus’ contemporaries, it was difficult to comprehend Jesus as being in the likeness (*homoioima*, cf. 6.5) of sinful flesh. It would take some time for them to see how such opposites could hold together and eventually be resolved, such doubt being quite natural.

Vs. 4 continues this extended sentence with a positive assessment of Torah, that is, associating with it a just requirement or *dikaïoma* as precept in 2.26. Such a precept is to be fulfilled (*pleroo*, cf. 1.29) in us, that is, Paul uses the first person plural referring to fellow Christians at Rome engaged in walking (*peripateo*, cf. 6.4) or literally walking around (*peri-*). This is done *kata* the *Pneuma* (cf. vs. 1), a preposition meaning in accord with and can be considered a refinement of the words about the above mentioned in-ness concerning Jesus Christ.

**8-Vss. 5-6: For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. 6) To set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace.**

In vs. 4 we have the preposition *kata* with regard to the Spirit. Here the same preposition is used with regard to *sarx* and again with *Pneuma*, the two being completely different modes of living though that verb is lacking. Both instances use the verb *phroneo* which implies intent. “So do not become proud but stand in awe” [11.20].

The noun *phronema* (cf. next verse) is derived from *phroneo* which suggests intent as applicable to the two uses of *kata* as delineated.

**8-Vss. 7-8: For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; it does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot; 8) and those who are in the flesh cannot please God.**

Here Paul speaks of the mind (*phronema* or intent) as hostile to God, *echthra* being a noun which also means an enemy. “And has broken down the dividing wall of hostility” [Eph 2.14]. Such hostility is intensified, as it were, by use of the preposition *eis*, literally “into God.” Such *eis*-ness prevents submission not so much to God directly but to his mediating agent the Torah, *hupotasso* meaning to arrange under (*hupo-*) or to assign. “For the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will but by the will of him who subjected it in hope” [vs. 2]. Such setting-under is impossible for the flesh’s enmity with God, the verb *dunamai* (*dunamis*) suggesting this capacity simply is lacking. Thus those in the flesh—unlike those in Christ Jesus (cf. vs. 1)—lack the *dunamis* to please God, *aresko* implying to make up. “We who are strong ought to bear with the failings of the weak and not to please ourselves” [15.1].

**8-Vss. 9-10: But you are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you. Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him. 10) But if Christ is in you, although your bodies are dead because of sin, your spirits are alive because of righteousness.**

Paul is confident that his audience has sufficient training in Christian life and doctrine which is why he says that they are in the Spirit or *Pneuma* (cf. vs. 5). However, he modifies it a bit by the small word “if” (*ei*). In that way he leaves the possibility open in case some don’t have the *Pneuma* taking up residence (*oikeo*, cf. 7.19) in them. Concomitant with this *oikeo* of the *Pneuma* is the *Pneuma* of Christ which, if lacking, doesn’t belong to him or literally “not is of him.”

On the other hand, if Christ is in those whom Paul is addressing, their *pneuma* are alive. The noun *zoe* or life (cf. vs. 2) is used, literally as “the spirit life.” Note two uses of the preposition *dia*: through sin and through righteousness (*dikaiosune*, cf. 6.20).

**8-Vs. 11: If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you.**

The word “if” suggests the possibility that the *Pneuma* (cf. vs. 9), may or may not dwell or take up residence (*oikeo*: cf. vs. 9) in Paul’s listeners. In other words, it’s up to them to discern this. Paul can only do so much to bring them to this point. He keeps on using the first person plural when addressing his listeners so as not to create any distance between him and them. Note that the *Pneuma* is “of him” or the unnamed one responsible for having raised Jesus. Should anyone opt for the positive side of this “if,” he will have the same *Pneuma* plus indirect awareness “of him” as bestowing life (*zoopoieo*, cf. 4.17) by means of it’s *oikeo*. And if this applies to *Pneuma*, the same holds true “of him.”

**8-Vss. 12-14: So then, brethren, we are debtors not to the flesh to live according to the flesh – 13) for if you live according to the flesh you will die, but if by the Spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live. 14) For all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God.**

*Opheiletes* (cf. 1.14) or debtor suggests thankfulness to the *Pneuma* for not being in accord (*kata*) with the flesh (*sarx*, cf. vs. 5), this preposition pretty much implying a state of slavery from which a person cannot escape. The alternative? Mortifying deeds of the body, *praxis* (connotes trading or a transaction). “For as in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function” [12.4]. Such mortification is eased or counters the *kata* relative to the flesh as just noted by means of the dative case concerning *Pneuma*. Another mitigating factor is being led by the *Pneuma*, a sign of being children of the one with whom *Pneuma* is identified in vs. 11 (i.e., ‘of him’).

**8-Vss. 15-17: For you did not receive the spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received the spirit of sonship. When we cry, "Abba! Father!" 16) it is the Spirit**

**himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17) and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him.**

Here *Pneuma* with a capital “P” is exchanged, if you will, for *pneuma* with a small “p.” Nevertheless, both fundamentally pertain to wind which enables them to relate with each other more easily. With regard to fear, *palin* or again suggests that Paul’s listeners once had been in fear and were in danger of it controlling their lives again. The second *pneuma* as related to sonship counters this, *huiiothesia* or literally “son placing” as in vs. 23 and Gal 4.5: “So that we might receive adoption as sons.”

A sure sign we have *Pneuma* with a capital “P” is our spontaneous cry of “Abba, Father,” this word often translated as the familiar “daddy.” “Abba, Father, all things are possible for you” [Mk 14.36].

In addition to the *pneuma* of son-placing (literally put) is the *Pneuma* bearing witness with our *pneuma*, the verb being *summartureo* (cf. 2.15) with the preposition *sum-* as “with.” The result of this testimony? That we are God’s children, this being identical to the son-placing at hand. Being so makes us heirs or *kleronomos* (cf. 4.14) which is mentioned three times in vs. 17 with different nuances: by itself, of God and with Christ. This last one has the preposition *sug-* or with prefaced to it. Being such, however, depends upon suffering with Christ, another verb with the preposition “with” or *sum-* prefaced to it. 1Cor 12.26 is the only other NT reference: “If one member suffers, all suffer together.” The *sum-* of this verb leads to *sun-* of the next one, *sumdoxazo* or to be glorified with Christ, this the only NT reference.

**8-Vs. 18: I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us.**

*Logizomai* (cf. 6.11) is the verb for consider which means that Paul is taking into account sufferings or *pathema* (cf. 7.5) of the present described in terms of *nun* (now) plus *kairos* (cf. 5.6), a special event or occasion. Here *kairos*, along with *nun*, is paralleled with some future, unspecified time identified as glory (*doxa*, cf. 6.4) to be revealed, *apokalupto* (cf. 1.19). Note the location of this glory, *eis* or literally “into us.” This preposition is suggestive of both constant and deep penetration which may be said to be outside the bounds of space and time and thus not applicable to *nun kairos*. Actually the verb *apokalupto* implies the presence of something but without knowledge of it.

**8-Vss. 19-21: For the creation waits with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God; 20) for the creation was subjected to futility not of its own will but by the will of him who**

**subjected it in hope; 21) because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God.**

Paul claims that creation (*ktisis*: cf. 1.25 but not noted there) takes on something akin to the role of an observer, that is, it longs to have God's sons revealed (*apokalupsis* being the noun of *apokalupto* of the previous verse; cf. 2.5). Creation involves everything in contrast to human beings or better, everything compared with them. It's endowed with the human quality of anticipation, hence the quality of *apokaradokia* defined here as eager longing. It consists of three words: *apo* or from, *kara* or head and *dokeo*, to think or suppose and has one other NT reference, Phl 1.20: "As it is my eager expectation and hope that I shall not be at all ashamed."

Vs. 20 speaks of a futility to which created had been subjected (*hupotage*: from *hupotasso* as in vs. 7). "Under the test of this service you will glorify God by your obedience in acknowledging the gospel of Christ" [2Cor 9.13]. As for this futility, the noun is *mataiotes* which connotes that which is devoid of truth and thus is perverse: "You must no longer live as the Gentiles do in the futility of their minds" [Eph 4.17]. Paul seems to use *mataiotes* in reference to the Lord's words in Gn 3.17-19 which conclude with "you are dust, and to dust you shall return." This puts into perspective what Paul says next, that all creation is subject to futility because of human disobedience. And such subjection (*hupotasso*) isn't whimsical or done out of revenge but one done out of hope.

The hope which Paul speaks of in vs. 21 rests in the eventual freedom of creation from the bondage of decay, the slavery (*douleia*: cf. vs. 15 but not noted there) of corruption, *phthora*. A reference to the latter is Gal 6.8: "For he who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption." Such freedom (*eleutheroo*, cf. vs. 2) results in a liberty (*eleutheria*; cf. 1Cor 10.29) belonging to God's children and is glorious, the noun *doxa* (cf. vs. 18) being used.

**8-Vss. 22-23: We know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now; 23) and not only the creation but we ourselves who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait for adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies.**

What is the source of Paul's knowledge as to creation groaning in travail to the present? First he perceives this in terms of the two verbs *suntenazo* and *sunodino* both being prefaced with the preposition *sun-* or with (no other NT references). Creation is doing this twofold *sun-*, if you will, right up to the present and shows no sign of letting up. Both verbs suggest a lack of completion going back to the Lord when he says to Adam, "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife" [Gen 3.17] followed by the curse of the ground, etc. Paul picks up echos of this which have been reverberating throughout history and are

destined to do so until what he terms as adoption and redemption occur, *huiiothesia* (cf. vs. 17) and *apolutrosis* (cf. 3.24).

The present consists of waiting or *apekdechomai* which connotes anxious expectation (*apo-* and *ek-* or apart from and from) and is found in vs. 25. Another reference: “But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ” [Phl 3.20]. At the same time the present consists in groaning literally “in ourselves,” *stenazo* as in 2Cor 5.2: “Here indeed we groan and long to put on our heavenly dwelling.” Despite this waiting is the completion or end (adoption and redemption), we or the first person plural have it in essence which Paul puts as first fruits or *aparche* of the *Pneuma*, literally, the beginning (*arche*) from (*apo-*). “If the dough offered as first fruits is holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root is holy, so are the branches” [11.16].

**8-Vss. 24-25: For in this hope we were saved. Now hope that is seen is not hope. For who hopes for what he sees? 25) But if we hope for what we do not see, we wait for it with patience.**

Here Paul counters the somewhat painful waiting of vs. 23 with hope (*elpis*, cf. 5.5) of being saved (*sozo*, cf. 5.9). In other words, he’s doing a kind of balancing act between something accomplished and something not yet realized fully. Such hope can’t been seen (*blepo*, cf. 7.23; implies gazing). It can’t be gazed upon and is equivalent to waiting, *apekdechomai* in vs. 23 concerning son-placing (*huiiothesia*) and here concerning patience, *hupomone* (cf. 5.3) or a waiting-under (*hupo-*).

**8-Vs. 26: Likewise the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words.**

“Likewise” or *hosautos* is a key word in Paul’s argument to his listeners, for it brings in the Spirit (*Pneuma*) noted last in vs. 16 which there is identified with the human *pneuma*. Thus the help at hand is present not just within us but within our within our weakness or *astheneia* noted in 6.19 also as feebleness or disease. The verb for help is *sunantilambano*, literally as to lay hold of-along-with, the verbal root consisting of two prepositions, *sun-* and *anti-* or with and against or in place of. It has one other NT reference, Lk 10.40: “Lord, do you not care that my sister has left me to serve alone? Tell her then to help me.”

The reason for this *sun/anti* type of help, if you will, stems from the fact that we don’t know how to pray, *preoseuchomai*. In usual fashion Paul prefers the first person plural so as not to have his listeners think of him as separate from them. This verb far from implying passiveness but is a dynamic process by reason of the preposition *pros-* signifying

direction towards-which. “Pray at all times in the spirit with all prayer and supplication” [Eph 6.18]. This dynamic aspect is what Paul implies by “(not) as we ought.”

And so the *pros-* of *proseuchomai* is bound up with the *Pneuma* interceding for us, *huperentugchano* which consists of the preposition *huper-* (on behalf of, beyond) prefaced to the verbal root meaning to hit or chance upon. “For us” is not in the Greek text. Such interceding is done in a not unfamiliar fashion, that is, with sighs or *stenagmos* which derives from *stenazo* if vs. 23. It differs from the human sighing, if you will, by being devoid of words (*alaletos*). Paul doesn’t spell out the nature of these non-verbal sighs but intimates them, that they are within us yet beyond us.

**8-Vs. 27: And he who searches the hearts of men knows what is the mind of the Spirit because the Spirit intercedes for the saints according to the will of God.**

Searching or *erauno* (or *ereuno*) implies making an examination while not specifying the agent doing it which turns out to be the Father. “For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God” [1Cor 2.10]. While engaged in this searching—what he does with what he finds there isn’t specified—the Father at the same time knows the Spirit’s mind, that is, the *phronema* of the *Pneuma* (cf. vs. 8 & 26 respectively). Thus *erauno* and *eido* (cf. 7.14) are two separate actions yet closely related. They are, if you will, contingent upon the *Pneuma*’s intercession or *entugchano* (to light upon, to meet someone), this verb being prefaced with the preposition *en-* (in); compare with *huperentugchano* of vs. 26. “Since he always lives to make intercession for them” [Heb 7.25]. Yet the *entugchano* at hand has a specific pattern or *kata*, that is, with respect to the divine will though “will” isn’t in the Greek text. And this *kata* has in mind the saints or those who are *hagios* (cf. 7.12).

**8-Vs. 28: We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose.**

Everything (*pan*) obviously is a broad category though here Paul seems to imply the negative or less desirable aspects of life through which God also works for the good. This is rendered literally as *sunergo*, working with (*sun-*) implying cooperation. “Working together with him, then, we entreat you not to accept the grace of God in vain” [2Cor 6.1]. Such working-with is directed (again literally) “into (*eis*) the good” or *agathos* (cf. 7.13) where it remains with (dative case) persons who have love for God, *agapao*, the verbal root for *agape*. “No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us” [vs. 37].

Those who have *agape* for God are called according to (*kata*) his purpose meaning it doesn't originate with them. *Kletos* is found in 1.7 and *prothesis* means a setting forth (*pro-* or before). "In order that God's purpose of election might continue" [9.11].

**8-Vss. 29-30: For those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son in order that he might be the first-born among many brethren. 30) And those whom he predestined he also called; and those whom he called he also justified; and those whom he justified he also glorified.**

There are six steps following the first of *progignosko* as in 11.2 ('God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew'). All around bound together closely and follow in rapid succession, not being subject to separation:

1) Predestined or *proorizo* with the preposition *pro-* or before (as with *progignosko*), literally to bound beforehand. It's found in the next verse as well as in Eph 1.5: "He destined us in love to be his sons through Jesus Christ according to the purpose of his will."

2) Conformed or *summorphos* or to have or be with (*sum-*) the same form or shape (*morphe*) and has one other NT reference, Phil 3.21: "Who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body." Such being-with the same form applies not to the Son but to the image or *eikon* (cf. 1.23) of him. While the two are virtually indistinguishable, they are in effect separate.

3) First-born or *prototokos* as in Col 1.15: "He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation." This unique position isn't removed from Christ's brethren but literally is "in many brethren."

4) Called or *kaleo* which is dependent directly upon being predestined.

5) Justified or *dikaioo* (cf. 6.7) is dependent directly upon being called.

6) Finally we have glorified or *doxazo* (cf. 1.21) which is dependent directly upon being justified.

**8-Vss. 31-32: What then shall we say to this? If God is for us, who is against us? 32) He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, will he not also give us all things with him?**

These two verses contain three rhetorical questions in rapid succession with several more to follow towards the end of this chapter. The first is in response to the six steps beginning in vs. 29 which stem from *progignosko* or God's foreknowledge. This demonstrates clearly that God is for us (first person plural referring to Paul's listeners), that is, the second rhetorical question. The third rhetorical question is more a statement of what to Paul is so obvious. That is to say, God freely gave us his own Son, *pheidomai* suggesting mercy. "For if God did not spare the natural branches, neither will he spare you" [11.21]. Such

generosity is enhanced by God giving this same Son for us all (again, first personal plural), the verb *paradidomai* (cf. 6.17) meaning to hand over to us, to make this Son being beside (*para-*) us, if you will. *Paradidomai* involves God giving everything with the Son, *charizomai* suggestive of an act done out of love. “Be kind to one another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another as God in Christ forgave you” [Eph 4.32]. As for the “all” at hand, Paul doesn’t spell it out, he being more interested in the *paradidomai*...the handing-beside (*para-*) of Jesus Christ.

**8-Vss. 33-34: Who shall bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies; 34) who is to condemn? Is it Christ Jesus who died, yes, who was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us?**

Paul offers two more rhetorical questions, answering both so as to preclude any objections or doubt about his message by the Romans. The first consists of the pair charge/elect or *egkaleo/eklektos* with references as follows: “If Demetrius and the craftsmen with him have a complaint against anyone, the courts are open.” “Greet Rufus, eminent in the Lord.”

The second pair is condemn/intercedes or *katakrino/entugchano* with references in vss. 3 and 27 respectively. Note that as soon as Paul speaks of Christ’s death he links it with is resurrection...not only that but Christ being at God’s right hand (literally ‘in the right hand of God’). From this in-ness, if you will, Christ is interceding for us, *entugchano* again.

**8-Vs. 35: Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or distress or persecution or famine or nakedness or peril or sword?**

Here we have two final rhetorical questions towards the end of Chapter Eight, bringing it to a climax. Paul speaks of separating us (first person plural again) from Christ’s love or *agape* (cf. vs. 28), the verb being *chorizo*. “Perhaps this is why he was parted from you for a while, that you might have him back forever” [Phm 15]. With regard to *chorizo*, Paul lists seven elements which *agape* can overcome, all of which he had suffered and intimating the possibility of the same for his listeners. *Stonochoria* embraces the other five, if you will, by reason of its generality and means narrowness of space. “For the same of Christ, then, I am content with weaknesses, insults ,hardships, persecutions and calamities; for when I am weak, then I am strong” [2Cor 12.10].

**8-Vs. 36: As it is written, "For your sake we are being killed all the day long; we are regarded as sheep to be slaughtered."**

Bordering upon defiance, Paul backs up his words with Ps 44.22 which reads from the RSV as follows: “Nay, for your sake we are slain all the day long and accounted as sheep for the slaughter.” The words “all the day long” may be taken as a *kairos* event or a special occasion which by reason of its uniqueness, fills the entire day. The verb *logizomai* (cf. vs. 18) translates as regarded which in the case at hand can refer to non-Christian onlookers of what Christians experience as listed in the previous verse.

**8-Vs. 37: No, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him who loved us.**

“No” is rendered as “but” or *alla*, again referring to the six types of afflictions listed in vs. 35. In them we (first person plural) are not just conquerors but more than that, *hupernikao* (only use of this verb in the NT), the preposition *huper-* meaning beyond in the sense of being victorious. Such conquering, however, is mediated. It is effected through Christ’s love, the verb *agapao* (cf. vs. 28) being used.

**8-Vss. 38-39: For I am sure that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor things present nor things to come nor powers, 39) nor height nor depth nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.**

Paul brings the conclusion of Chapter Eight to a crescendo with his confidence or surety rendered by the verb *peitho* or to persuade as in 2.19. To be persuaded as such implies that Paul either had doubts or was completely ignorant, the latter applicable in his case before his conversion. He then ticks off ten obstacles to the *agape* (cf. vs. 35 in a similar circumstance) of God. Note that he makes mention of unseen realities two of which in vs. 38 are principalities and powers, *arche* and *dunamis*. The first meanings the first principle of anything whereas the second (cf. 120) refers to the capacity to do something. “He is the head of the body, the church; he is the beginning, the first-born from the dead” [Col 1.18].

Vs. 39 speaks of a vertical dimension, height and depth, which could be taken as the plane on which such spiritual entities operate, that is, up and down. Certainly any effect, negative or positive, is bound to affect the horizontal plane to which “anything else” may apply. In sum, nothing from these four cardinal points of up-down, left-right, can separate us (first person plural yet again) from God’s *agape* in Christ, the verb being *chorizo* used here as similarly in vs. 35.

## Chapter Nine

**9-Vss. 1-2: I am speaking the truth in Christ, I am not lying; my conscience bears me witness in the Holy Spirit 2) that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart.**

Paul begins an emotional appeal to the Romans or more specifically, Jewish members of his audience along with Christians and those interested in Christianity though we don't have information as to their number or composition. While intriguing, it is of secondary importance to the intent of this document.

Paul starts this chapter with what may be considered his hallmark phrase, the familiar "in Christ" which compels his listeners to figure out what he means by such in-ness. For him it's tantamount to having Christ assume his presence. This is intimated further by the preposition *sum-* (with) prefaced to verb *summartureo* found last in 8.16, that is, Paul's conscience being with Christ. The in-ness at hand is emphasized even further with another "with," the *sun-* of *suneidesis*, conscience, literally as a "knowing-with" (cf. 2.15). Finally this "triple with," if you will, is summed up by an in-ness reference pertaining to the Holy Spirit.

Despite Paul's identity with Christ as just delineated, vs. 2 reveals his sorrow and anguish, *lupe* and *odune* (2Cor 7.10 & 1Tit 6.10); the first is great and the second unceasing or *adialeiptos* and are located in the heart (*kardia*, cf. 6.17). This adjective has as its root the verb *dialeipo* or to leave an interval between and prefaced with alpha privative...not to leave such an interval. The only other NT reference is 2Tm 1.3: "When I remember you constantly in my prayers."

**9-Vs. 3: For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race.**

Paul comes off with an exclamation beginning with *euchomai* which expresses intense longing as well as making a profession. "But we pray God that you may not do wrong" [2Cor 13.7]. This longing consists in Paul being both accursed and cut off from Christ, anathema meaning a curse. "But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed" [Gal 1.8]. The words "cut off" aren't in the Greek but have in their place the preposition *apo*, "from Christ." This *apo*-ness should be taken as opposed to the in-ness spoken of in the previous verse. However, it can be modified. Paul can remain "in Christ" while being "*apo* Christ" at the same time, the latter out of love for his fellow Jews. *Kata sarka* (*sarx*, cf. 8.12) means literally "according to the flesh" which here are his fellow Jews.

**9-Vss. 4-5: They are Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship and the promises; 5) to them belong the patriarchs and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ. God who is over all be blessed forever. Amen.**

The Israelites at Rome are either there forcibly or came to the capitol on their own volition. Regardless, they are not in their homeland which, while important, is secondary to their identity. Paul lists six crucial elements of their common tradition as follows:

1) Sonship or *huiiothesia* (cf. 8.23) or son-placing but here not with regard to Jesus Christ which Paul will develop later. One such reference is Ex 4.22: “Thus says the Lord, ‘Israel is my first-born son.’”

2) Glory or *doxa* (cf. 8.21). “The glory of the Lord settled on Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days” [Ex 24.16].

3) Covenants or *diatheke*, literally as a setting-through (*dia-*). “And this will be my covenant with them when I take away their sins” [11.27 quoting from Isaiah]. Note that *diatheke* is plural, referring to those numerous covenants throughout Israel’s history, the first of which comes into being after the flood associated with Noah (cf. Gen 9.9+).

4) Giving of the law or *nomothesia* which reads literally “setting of the law,” this being the only NT reference and can apply to Moses on Mount Sinai as well as the Ten Commandments (cf. Ex 20.1-17).

5) Worship or *latreia* which fundamentally refers to service by a hired workman and here refers to the Levitical law or formal (liturgical) worship. “Present your bodies as a living sacrifice...which is your spiritual worship” [12.1].

6) Promises or *epaggelia* which also means a profession (cf. 4.20).

**9-Vss. 6-7 But it is not as though the word of God had failed. For not all who are descended from Israel belong to Israel, 7) and not all are children of Abraham because they are his descendants; but "Through Isaac shall your descendants be named."**

The RSV says of these verses, “The promise was not made to Abraham’s physical descendants merely as such but to those whom God chose.”

*Logos* as word (cf. 3.4) implies expression and here can embrace all six elements of Israel’s tradition as outlined in the previous verse. Paul claims that this *logos* hasn’t failed or literally has stumbled, *ekpipto* (to fall from or *ek-*) as in Gal 5.4: “You have fallen away from grace.” Those belonging to Israel and Abraham’s descendants are, as the RSV observation above says, contains those whom God had chosen, 2.28-29 shedding light on this: “For he is not a real Jew who is one outwardly nor is true circumcision something external and physical. He is a Jew who is one inwardly, and real circumcision is a matter of the heart, spiritual and not literal. His praise is not from men but from God.”

Paul quotes from Gen 21.12 in part which in full reads: “But God said to Abraham, ‘Be not displeased because of the lad and because of your slave woman; whatever Sarah says to

you, do as she tells you, for through Isaac shall your descendants be named.” Here Sarah and Isaac stand in contrast to Hagar and Ishmael, the two in constant conflict. By way of note, Ishmael isn’t even mentioned in the Genesis passage, perhaps a way of disparaging him.

**9-Vss. 8-9: This means that it is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned as descendants. 9) For this is what the promise said, "About this time I will return and Sarah shall have a son."**

“This means” literally reads as “this is” in reference to the Genesis quote above relative to divine favor of Sarah and Isaac over Hagar and Ishmael. Paul contrasts two types of descendants, those of God and those of the promise (*epaggelia*, cf. vs. 4), the phrase *eis sperma* or literally “into seed” for descendants. He uses the verb *logizomai* (cf. 8.36) for reckoned as pertaining to descendants, possibly inferring how tradition interpreted this and hands it down to the present.

In vs. 9 Paul quotes again from Genesis with regard to the birth of Isaac who is favored over the yet-to-be-named Ishmael in Gen 21.12, this time a few chapters earlier, that is, 18.10. It runs in full as “I will surely return to you in the spring, and Sarah your wife shall have a son.’ And Sarah was listening at the tent door behind him.” The passage in Romans has *kairos* (it signifies a special event or occasion) for time with the preposition *kata* (in accord with). Thus Paul wishes to stress the proper moment when the Lord (keep in mind the other three mysterious visitors) himself will return (cf. Gen 21.1) after which Sarah conceived and gave birth nine months later to Isaac. With regard to this incident we have no idea how Paul perceived the interaction between the Lord (singular) and the unknown visitors (three), but it’s worth making note of here.

**9-Vss. 10-12: And not only so, but also when Rebecca had conceived children by one man, our forefather Isaac, 11) though they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or bad in order that God's purpose of election might continue, not because of works but because of his call, 12) she was told, "The elder will serve the younger."**

Paul calls Isaac “our forefather” which literally reads as “our father.” Reference in vs. 10 is to Gn 25.21: “And Isaac prayed to the Lord for his wife because she was barren; and the Lord granted his prayer, and Rebekah his wife conceived.”

The next two verses pertain to Isaac and his twin Esau, having struggled together right from their birth which prophesied a tension that would continue through Israel’s history. This struggle was at the service of a divine purpose of election, the words being *prothesis* (cf. 8.28) and *ekloge*, the latter meaning a picking out (*ek-*) or choosing. “So too at the

present time there is a remnant chosen by grace” [11.5]. Though such a setting forth (the *pro-* of *prothesis*) commenced at birth literally, it continues (*meno*, to remain).

Anything Jacob and Esau might do or not do is secondary (*ergon*, cf. 4.6) to the divine call of election at hand. It turned out later, of course, that Jacob was called over Esau as signified by the fact that the first born (Esau) is destined to serve Jacob even if the birth of the former is separated by a nanosecond. Thus the issue of works vs. call is situated in this near-simultaneous birth representative of two distinct forces and the struggle between the two brothers. Nevertheless, Esau and Jacob remain brothers for life and can't be separated. As for Jacob being favored over Esau, Gen 25.23 in full runs as “Two nations are in your womb, and two peoples born of you shall be divided; the one shall be stronger than the other, the elder shall serve the younger.”

**9-Vss. 13-14: As it is written, "Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated." 14) What shall we say then? Is there injustice on God's part? By no means!**

Paul puts the above mentioned distinction (which could be viewed as an ongoing struggle) between Esau and Jacob, the first and second born sons of Isaac, in terms of the words “it is written.” This lends a certain authority to what he's about to say about these two historical characters, this authority being scripture. And so Paul comes off with a whole series of quotes to back up his position. Instead of citing a passage from Genesis, Paul refers to Malachi which reads in full: “‘I have loved you,’ says the Lord. But you say, ‘How have you loved us?’ ‘Is not Esau Jacob's brother?’ says the Lord. ‘Yet I have loved Jacob but I have hated Esau; I have laid waste his hill country and left his heritage to jackals of the desert’” [Mal 1.2-3]. The part Paul quotes has the verb *agapao* (cf. 8.37) and *miseo* (cf. 7.15). To put this hatred in contrast with the verbal root of *agape* intimates the sharpness of preference.

This strong partiality on God's part leads to Paul throwing out a rhetorical question which must have been on the mind of his listeners. Though the Israelites grew up with a divine preferential treatment of Jacob over Esau, nevertheless it raises the question of divine injustice or *adikia* (cf. 6.13) even though secretly the Israelites with Paul favor the former. Paul was obliged, of course, to negate this way of viewing the two brothers.

**9-Vss. 15-16: For he says to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion." 16) So it depends not upon man's will or exertion but upon God's mercy.**

Paul refers to the greatest authority of Israel's tradition, Moses, which reads in full as “I will make all my goodness pass before you and will proclaim before you my name “The

Lord;’ and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy” [Ex 33.19]. Moses is to remain stationary while the divine goodness (the common adjective *tov* or good) is to pass by meaning that he will catch only glimpses of it. Despite all he sees, vision for him is secondary to the Lord speaking with him. Perhaps lying behind Moses’ request was a desire to discover how well the two correspond...whether what he will see as much as he has heard. However, he intimated that the latter will be more fruitful.

While the divine goodness is in the process of passing by, simultaneously the Lord will be proclaiming his name, the verb being *qara*’ which has the connotation of summoning, not just throwing words to the wind, if you will. As for the Lord’s name, the personal pronoun “my” is lacking in Hebrew; also the preposition *b-* is used (in)... “will call in the name.” While engaged in this two-fold gesture of passing by and calling, note two other verbs, *chanan* and *racham* or have mercy and have compassion. *Chanan* involves being gracious whereas *racham* means to behold (and thus connotes vision to some degree) with tender compassion, to obtain mercy; the noun “womb” is derived from it. In the text at hand, *eleo* (cf. vs. 16) = *chanan* and *oikteiro* (no other NT reference) = *racham*.

In light of this, divine mercy (the verb *eleo* which connotes being active, that is, being merciful) is the guiding factor, not human will or *ethelo* (cf. 7.18) which, like *eleo* here, is active, willing. In the verse at hand *ethelo* is followed by the verb *trecho* (cf. 1Cor 9.24) which means to run and isn’t in the English translation: “not of him willing, not of him running.”

**9-Vss. 17-18: For the scripture says to Pharaoh, "I have raised you up for the very purpose of showing my power in you so that my name may be proclaimed in all the earth." 18) So then he has mercy upon whomever he wills, and he hardens the heart of whomever he wills.**

Paul jumps ahead scripturally and historically speaking, if you will, to demonstrate the sovereignty of divine power. The verse from Ex 9.16 is in reference to the plagues which the Lord brought upon Egypt to be followed by Moses leading Israel from that country. It runs in full as “But for this purpose have I let you live, to show you my power so that my name may be declared throughout all the earth.” Paul changes, if you will, “let you live” for “have raised you.” Both are aimed at demonstrating divine *dunamis* (cf. 8.38) for one purpose only, the proclaiming of God’s name throughout the world, the verb here being *diaggello* or literally, to announce through (*dia-*). “But as for you, go and proclaim the kingdom of God” [Lk 9.60].

Despite the universality of this proclamation of God's name, he retains the prerogative to bestow mercy (*eleeo*, the verb as in vs. 15) as well as to harden anyone's heart, the verb *skleruno* with regard to *kardia* (cf. vs. 2). "Do not harden your hearts as in the rebellion" [Heb 2.8 re. Ps 95.7-11).

**9-Vs. 19: You will say to me then, "Why does he still find fault? For who can resist his will?"**

Paul anticipates strong reaction even though he bases his insights upon a sound foundation in scripture, hence he sets forth a flurry of rhetorical questions. Supposedly God finds fault or *memphomai*: to censure, to blame. "For he finds fault with them (etc.)" [Heb 8.8]. The verse at hand contains the small but telling *eti* or "still" implying that God is persisting in this fault-finding. This leads to the possibility of going against God, of resisting his will, *anthistemi* which means to set against (*anti-*), to compare. It implies setting up a formidable roadblock to the divine will or *boulema* which has one other NT reference, 1Pt 4.3: "Let the time that is past suffice for doing what the Gentiles like to do."

**9-Vss. 20-21: But who are you, a man, to answer back to God? Will what is molded say to its molder, "Why have you made me thus?" 21) Has the potter no right over the clay to make out of the same lump one vessel for beauty and another for menial use?**

Paul attempts to stop in its tracks any questioning relative to what appears to be injustice on God's part when exercising his freedom of choice. *Antapokrinomai* implies a certain contradiction by the two prepositions prefaced to the root *krino* (cf. 3.7) which fundamentally means to separate, decide: *anti-* and *apo-* (against and from). It also means to correspond to each other. The only other NT reference is Lk 14.6: "And they could not reply to this." The first analogy that comes to Paul's mind which describes this is the relationship between someone who molds and the object he's molding. It's lifted from Isaiah (29.16) and quoted here in full: "You turn things upside down! Shall the potter be regarded as the clay; that the thing made should say of its maker, 'He did not make me;' or the thing formed say of him who formed it, 'He has no understanding?'" And so it's this lack of understanding Paul is getting at which in Hebrew is *byn* meaning to discern, to separate.

In vs. 21 this ability to separate, if you will, is the source of the questions Paul is attempting to diffuse. In a sense it come down to discerning (that *byn*) between a vessel for beauty and for menial use, the two nouns *time* and *atimia* being used respectively. Cf. 2.7 & 1.26, each prefaced with the preposition *eis* or into.

**9-Vss. 22-24: What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the vessels of wrath made for destruction 23) in order to make known the riches of his glory for the vessels of mercy which he has prepared**

**beforehand for glory, 24) even us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles?**

An extended rhetorical question, to be sure, built upon the just mentioned analogy of a potter which Paul had lifted from Isaiah (and shortly he returns that prophet). He starts off by mentioning the pair divine wrath and power, *orge* and *dunatos* (5.9 & 4.21 respectively) with the verbs *endeiknumi* (cf. 2.15) and *gnorizo*. The latter noun has a sense of causing about it compared, for example, with the more common *gignosko*. “But is now disclosed and through the prophetic writings is made known to all the nations according to the eternal God” [16.26]. Both verbs are contained, if you will, within the divine desiring or *ethelo* (cf. vs. 16) which fundamentally means to will.

It turns out that the divine *endeiknumi* and *gnorizo*...showing-in (*en-*) and making known...have as their aim enduring the vessels described in vs. 21 (i.e., the one for menial use), the common verb being *phero* or to bear, carry. This enduring is done with *makrothumia* (cf. 2.4) which means having a large mind, heart or spirit and is aimed at vessels of wrath (cf. *orge* as it relates to God’s wrath). If it weren’t for such patience, the vessels of wrath would end up or be fitted (*katartizo*) for destruction, literally into destruction, the preposition *eis* with the noun *apoleia*. “This is a clear omen to them of their destruction but of your salvation” [Phl 1.28]. As for the verb *katartizo*, it means to put right, to furnish (*artizo*: to prepare with *kata-* or in accord with). That is, enduring them literally into (*eis*) destruction or *apoleia*, the preposition *eis* which intimates a kind of slow-motion action.

In vs. 23 the divine desiring- showing- making known-and-enduring have as their goal the making known (*gnorizo* again) of the equally divine riches of glory (*doxa*, cf. vs. 4), the adjective being *ploutos* (much, many; cf. 2.4). So this second *gnorizo* brings into being what God has prepared but has not manifested, the verb *proetoimazo*, *pro-* as before and has one other NT reference, Eph 2.10: “For we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus for good works which God prepared beforehand, that we should walk in them.” And this preparing beforehand ends up literally “into (*eis*) glory” (*doxa*).

Finally in vs. 24 this rhetorical question, difficult yet rich to follow, ends up with us (first person plural) which includes both Jews and Gentiles, the two being united by a divine calling (*kaleo*, cf. 8.30).

So in sum we have: desiring->show->make known->endured->make known->prepared beforehand. All these are directed to the of calling both Jews and Gentiles.

**9-Vss. 25-26: As indeed he says in Hosea, "Those who were not my people I will call `my people,' and her who was not beloved I will call `my beloved.'" 26) "And in the very place where it was said to them, `You are not my people,' they will be called `sons of the living God."**

Now Paul cites two passages from Hosea followed by Isaiah to back up what he had just set forth. That requires some doing, for the previous verse are quite dense and require much unpacking for his audience...any audience, for that matter, so appeal to two prophets is a help.

The first Hosea quote (2.23) runs in full as follows: “and I will sow him (reference is to Jezreel or ‘God sows,’ continued from previous verse) for myself in the land. And I will have pity on Not pitied, and I will say to Not my people, ‘You are my people;’ and he shall say, ‘You are my God.” In sum we have a stark, black-and-white distinction between being God’s people and those who aren’t, the latter pretty much synonymous with not-being or at least teetering on the edge. Paul translates this contrast, if you will, to being not beloved -> beloved, the verb *agapao* (cf. 9.15) being used for the Hebrew *racham* from which is derived the noun bowels.

In vs. 26 Paul quotes again from Hosea (1.10) which reads in full: “Yet the number of the people of Israel shall be like the sand of the sea which can be neither measured nor numbered; and in the place where it was said of them, ‘You are not my people’ it shall be said to them, ‘Sons of the living God.” This follows (though not sequentially) the theme of the previous verse. Reference to the sand of the sea brings to mind the Lord’s promise to Abraham: “I will indeed bless you, and I will multiply your descendants as the stars of heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore” [Gen 22.17].

**9-Vss. 27-29: And Isaiah cries out concerning Israel: "Though the number of the sons of Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved; 28) for the Lord will execute his sentence upon the earth with rigor and dispatch." 29) And as Isaiah predicted, "If the Lord of hosts had not left us children, we would have fared like Sodom and been made like Gomorrah."**

The next quote (in two parts) is from Isaiah with the last verse of this chapter containing one more from the same prophet. The first verse (10.22-23) runs in full as follows: “For though your people Israel be as the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will return. Destruction is decreed, overflowing with righteousness. For the Lord, the Lord of hosts, will make a full end as decreed in the midst of all the earth.” Reference to sand of the sea hearkens back to what is said in vs. 26 on this matter. However, here it contains a caution: just a few will be saved, *hupoleimma* being the noun for remnant and the only NT

reference and is derived from the verbal root *hupoleipo*, to leave remaining. Although the number of this remnant is left unrecorded, note that the Hebrew has “will return” whereas the Greek has “will be saved.”

Vs. 28 speaks of the Lord carrying out his sentence which is put as a *logos* (cf. vs. 6) or word-as-expression upon Israel; despite its similarity to sand of the sea, it will be reduced greatly. This will be effected with both rigor and dispatch, two participles being used, *sunteleo* and *suntemno* (the only NT reference), both of which are prefaced with the preposition *sun-* (with). The first applies to a thorough completion and the second a cutting short. “But as it is, he has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself” [Heb 9.26].

The second quote from Isaiah in vs. 29 runs as follows, more similar in the original than with many other quotes: “If the Lord of hosts had not left us a few survivors, we should have been like Sodom and become like Gomorrah” [1.9]. Using the example of these two cities implies a harsh fate since the Lord had destroyed both. As for the remnant noted in vs. 27, that included Lot and his family.

**9-Vss. 30-31: What shall we say, then? That Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness have attained it, that is, righteousness through faith; 31) but that Israel who pursued the righteousness which is based on law did not succeed in fulfilling that law.**

No one could respond adequately to Paul’s rhetorical question, especially when comparing a remnant with Lot (unmentioned) from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Paul adds insult to injury, if you will, by saying that Gentiles hadn’t gone after righteousness yet attained it, *dioko* meaning to go after something earnestly, even desperately. “Contribute to the needs of the saints, practice hospitality” [12.13]. *Dioko* or more accurately, the lack of it, is countered by *katalambano*, the taking hold of righteousness (*dikaiousune*, cf. 8.10). The *kata-* (in accord with) of the verb at hand intimates a seizing with an intent in mind. “Do you not know that in a race all the runners compete, but only one receives the prize” [1Cor 9.24]? Such here has the added element of faith is added (the text reads literally, ‘from or *ek* faith’).

In contrast to the *dikaiousune* “from” faith as it pertains to the Gentiles, vs. 31 speaks of the Jews who equally pursued (*dioko*) it. However, they failed or *phthano* which is similar to *dioko* but usually applies to coming first. “Only let us hold true to what we have attained” [Phl 3.16]. Despite good intent, Israel thus failed...using *phthano*...to fulfill the Torah, this verb lacking in the text but reads literally “into (*eis*) the law.”

**9-Vss. 32-33: Why? Because they did not pursue it through faith but as if it were based on works. They have stumbled over the stumbling stone 33) as it is written, "Behold, I am laying in Zion a stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall; and he who believes in him will not be put to shame."**

“Why?” That’s on everyone’s mind after the dramatic language Paul used. He comes off with a rather blanket statement about the Jews pursuing righteousness through faith (literally ‘from or *ek* faith’). The situation here is one marked by a fictive device which Paul puts in the minds of his fellow Jews, namely, the two words “as if.” Thus we have a tentative or partial knowledge relative to righteousness but apparently not enough to pursue it. That is, they failed to do this literally “from (*ek*) faith.” So according to Paul, the Jews acted on the presumption or preconceived ideas about works (*ergon*, cf. vs. 11) to the exclusion of other contingent elements. Note that like faith, *ergon* has the preposition *ex* (*ek* before a vowel) or literally “from works.”

Apparently not using properly the fictive device “as if” causes the Jews not just to stumble (*proskopto*: *pros-* as direction towards-which and a more forceful type of stumbling; cf. 14.21) but to do so over the stumbling stone itself, an image based on Paul’s reading of Is 28.16. That verse reads in full as follows: “Behold, I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone of a sure foundation: ‘He who believes will not be in haste.’” Note that in the verse Paul uses faith literally is “upon (*epi*) him.” This believing-upon thus precludes being shamed, *kataischuno* (cf. 5.5) which also connotes disgrace, the preposition *kata-* (in accord with) intensifying its meaning.

## Chapter Ten

**10-Vss. 1-2: Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is that they may be saved. 2) I bear them witness that they have a zeal for God, but it is not enlightened.**

Here Paul seems to be speaking not so much to the Jewish community at Rome though they must have been paying attention but to Christians and potential converts either among them or others. That could be the reason why he uses the third person plural, “they.” And so Paul has a desire and prayer, *eudokia* and *deesis*. The first connotes good will (*eu-* adverbial form of ‘good’) or desire and the second connotes making entreaty. “According to the purpose of his will” [Eph 1.5]. And “Making supplication for all the saints” [Eph 6.18]. In the verse at hand, both derive from Paul’s heart or *kardia* (cf. 9.18). Both *eudokia* and *deesis* have a specific twofold direction, if you will, *pros* or in-the-direction of God and literally “into (*eis*) salvation,” the noun *soteria* being used (cf. 1.16).

In vs. 2 Paul takes a somewhat dim view of his desire and prayer which sets the tone for the rest of Chapter Ten. Nevertheless, he bears witness (*martureo*, cf. 3.21) as to the zeal (*zelos*) of the Jews whom he doesn't identify outright but calls them "brethren." "Let us conduct ourselves becomingly as in the day...not in quarreling and jealousy" [13.13]. In the verse at hand *zelos* is used with the genitive, literally as "of God." As for Paul's dim view, it's rendered as this zeal not being enlightened, literally as "not according to (*kata*) knowledge-upon" or *epignosis* (cf. 3.20).

**10-Vs. 3: For being ignorant of the righteousness that comes from God and seeking to establish their own, they did not submit to God's righteousness.**

Paul gets right to the heart of his concern for the Jews at Rome, the same concern he'd apply to Jews anywhere else. That is to say, his "brethren" are ignorant, *agnoeo* (cf. 2.4) about divine righteousness, *dikaiosune* (cf. 9.30). Such righteousness coming from God (literally 'of God') is opposed to that of the Jews which they seek to establish as their own, *histemi* being the common verb to stand and means making permanent. Such misguided seeking (*zeteo*, cf. 3.11) results in not submitting to this divine righteousness. *Hupotasso* is the verb whose use is not unlike the one in 8.20. It implies an arranging or appointing which is done "under" or *hupo-* and in contrast to *histemi* as presented here.

**10-Vs. 4: For Christ is the end of the law, that every one who has faith may be justified.**

Paul states boldly that Christ is the *telos* (cf. 6.22) of the Torah, that is, its completion. To see this, one has to go back to when the Lord gave the Torah to Moses on Mount Sinai and the details spelled out as in Exodus, etc. The problem is, however, to get his audience to recognize this. Paul says that the beginning of moving in that direction is justification which here literally reads as "into (*eis*) justification or *dikaiosune*" (cf. vs. 3). This phrase is used with the present active participle of *pisteuo*, "believing" (cf. 6.8). At the same time this believing "into righteousness" is not contrary to the keeping of Torah; thus keeping and believing are one relative to Christ as *telos* presented here.

**10-Vs. 5: Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness which is based on the law shall live by it.**

The Torah of the previous verse is, of course, synonymous with its recipient who constitute the nation of Israel, Moses. Paul quotes from Lev 18.5 which runs in full as "You shall therefore keep my statutes and my ordinances by which a man shall live: I am the Lord." Here the key word in Hebrew as suggested in the last verse is "keep" or *shamar* which connotes preserving as well as attending so as not to let anything escape. It occurs frequently in Psalm 119 with regard to Torah and is the best place to see it in operation.

So according to Moses, *shamar* = living which is in accord with the Torah's righteousness (*dikaiousune*, cf. vs. 4). The words "based on the law" are rendered literally as "of the law." Also the words "by it" are rendered literally as "in it." Any tendency to make a split between *shamar* relative to Torah and Christ as *telos* of the Torah (cf. vs. 4) are resolved in the concluding words of the Leviticus quote, "I am the Lord" which forms one verse with the rest of the words there.

**10-Vss. 6-7: But the righteousness based on faith says, 'Do not say in your heart, "Who will ascend into heaven?" (that is, to bring Christ down) 7) or "Who will descend into the abyss?" (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead).**

To back up his claim of *dikaiousune* based on faith (i.e., 'from faith'), Paul offers two quotes from Deuteronomy, 9.4 and 30.12-14 which read in full respectively: "Do not say in your heart after the Lord your God has thrust them out before you, 'It is because of my righteousness that the Lord has brought me in to possess this land'; whereas it is because of the wickedness of these nations that the Lord is driving them out before you." And "It is not in heaven, that you should say, 'Who will go up for us to heaven and bring it to us that we may hear it and do it?' Neither is it beyond the sea that you should say, 'Who will go over the sea for us, and bring it to us that we may hear it and do it?' But the word is very near you; it is in your mouth and in your heart, so that you can do it."

The first quote is with respect to Joshua leading Israel across the Jordan to possess Canaan. That land is presented as being wicked (*rashah* is the noun which connotes unrighteousness and guilt) and primes Israel, if you will, for taking it over, *yarash* also meaning to inherit, and inheriting presupposes prior ownership to which one is legally bound to receive. Note that the verb *yarash* has a double meaning here: in addition to possess, it means to drive out, the latter being done by the Lord.

The second quote pertains to God's commandment mentioned in the verse preceding the two at hand, *mitsvah* which can be taken as Torah. It isn't beyond reach or external to persons but is a word or *davar*...word-as-expression and similar to *logos*...which is near, *qarov*. Such nearness is presented here as present in both one's mouth and heart not so much as to speak it but to act upon what one hears.

Paul adds two notes, if you will, after each quote relative to Christ which the RSV puts in parentheses. The first concerns bringing Christ down from heaven which requires an ascent there and the second bringing Christ up from the nether world. The two verbs are *anabaino* and *katago* (*ana-* and *kata-*); the first verbal root means to go or to walk whereas the second, to convey or bring. "Then after fourteen years I went up again to

Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along with me” [Gal 2.1]. And “Give notice now to the tribune to bring him down to you” [Acts 23.15]. The former deals with heaven and the latter with the abyss, both with the preposition *eis* or “into.” A reference to *abyssos* is Rev 9.1: “And he (fifth angel) was given the key of the shaft of the bottomless pit.” A second verb with regard to ascent is *anago* (*ana-* or up), that is, with regard to bringing up Christ from the dead. “Now may the God of peace who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ...equip you with everything good” [Heb 13.20-21].

**10-Vss. 8-10: But what does it say? The word is near you, on your lips and in your heart (that is, the word of faith which we preach); 9) because if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. 10) For man believes with his heart and so is justified, and he confesses with his lips and so is saved.**

Paul quotes or rather re-quotes Dt 30.14 cited above with regard to the rhetorical question posed there. That is to say, the *rhema* or word (not *logos*, word as expression) which means a word that has been spoken as in Lk 2.19: “But Mary kept all these *remata*, pondering them in her heart.” Thus Paul equates *rhema* with the Hebrew *davar* as found in the Deuteronomy text and as there, locates it on a person’s lips and heart minus the mouth. The RSV puts in quotes a brief remark by Paul on this, namely, that the *rhema* proper to faith is what we preach, *kerusso* (cf. 2.21) which also applies to being a herald. His use of the first person plural indicates either having associates or more likely that he’s identifying with the Romans he’s addressing.

In vs. 9 Paul speaks of the condition of salvation, the verb *sozo* being used first in 5.9 but seems, at least in Romans, more associated with something akin to the notion of a remnant in the Isaiah verse (10.22) found in 9.27. In the verse at hand *sozo* is dependent upon two factors: confessing and believing or *homologeō* and *pisteuō* (cf. vs. 4), the former literally as speaking together. “Take hold of the eternal life to which you were called when you made the good confession in the presence of many witnesses” [1Tm 6.12]. *Homologeō* takes place on the lips whereas *pisteuō* is interior, in the heart (*kardia*, cf. vs. 1). Both have their aim awareness of Jesus’ resurrection which is to be proclaimed once *homologeō* and *pisteuō* have taken root.

Vs. 10 sums up this twofold action: belief in the heart->justified and confession on lips->saved. Note that both justification and *dikaiosisune* and *soteria* (cf. vss. 6 & 1 respectively) have the preposition *eis* or “into” suggesting a being-in each.

**10-Vs. 11: The scripture says, "No one who believes in him will be put to shame."**

Paul quotes from Is 28.16 which runs in full as follows, having been quoted in vs. 33: “Therefore thus says the Lord God, ‘Behold, I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, of a sure foundation: ‘He who believes will not be in haste.’” Note the difference between being put to shame and being in haste, *kataischuno* (cf. vs. 33) and *chush*, the latter found in the Isaiah quote and implies alarm.

In the verse at hand, the preposition *epi* or “upon” is rendered literally as “into him.”

**10-Vss. 12-13: For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all who call upon him. 13) For "every one who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved."**

*Diastole* is the noun for distinction and implies a separation and as noted in 3.22 has a musical reference as the distinction between sounds. Such a distinction doesn’t apply between (the genitive is used) Jew and Greek, the latter most likely comprising a significant percentage of Paul’s audience at Rome. For the verb “bestows” the text has the preposition *eis* (into), literally as “into all those calling.” As for calling, it’s *epikaleo* with the preposition *epi-* or “upon” prefaced to the verb, a calling-upon. “But I call God to witness against me.” The same verb is used in vs. 13 quoting from Jl 2.32 quoted here in full: “And it shall come to pass that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered; for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there shall be those who escape as the Lord has said, and among the survivors shall be those whom the Lord calls.” For the Greek *sozo* (cf. vs. 9) the Hebrew has *malat* which means to slip away, to escape. The Hebrew for “delivered” the verb is *palat* which basically is the same as *malat* but connotes making even. The place for both is Mount Zion located within Jerusalem, that is, for survivors which perhaps Paul is intimating.

**10-Vss. 14-15: But how are men to call upon him in whom they have not believed? And how are they to believe in him of whom they have never heard? And how are they to hear without a preacher? 15) And how can men preach unless they are sent? As it is written, "How beautiful are the feet of those who preach good news!"**

These four rhetorical questions are linked together as follows: first comes calling upon (*epi-*) the Lord or *epikaleo* (cf. vs. 12) which is dependent upon belief, literally “into (*eis*) whom they have not believed.” Next comes a belief which is dependent upon having heard about Jesus Christ, that requiring someone who is announcing him, *kerusso* (cf. vs. 8). Finally in vs. 15 preaching is dependent upon someone having been sent, *apostello* being the root for the noun apostle. “For Christ did not sent me to baptize but to preach the gospel, and not with eloquent wisdom lest the cross of Christ be emptied of its power” [1Cor 1.17].

Actually Paul has himself in mind, and most likely his Roman audience is aware of this fact. He quotes from Is 52.7 which runs in full as: “How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who brings good tidings, who publishes peace, who brings good tidings of good, who publishes salvation, who says to Zion, ‘Your God reigns.’” Here the preaching or *kerusso* is fleshed out considerably in five parts: good tidings (*basar*; also the spelling of “flesh” or human nature, as though this word describing human frailty becomes the means by which the divine voice is transmitted and received)->publishes peace (*shamah* or to hear with *shalom*)->brings good tidings->publishes salvation (*shamah* again with *yeshuhah*, verbal root for the proper name Jesus)->speaks to Zion. Note mention of Zion which is in Jerusalem, this intimating for Paul conversion of the Jews.

**10-Vss. 16-17: But they have not all obeyed the gospel; for Isaiah says, "Lord, who has believed what he has heard from us?" 17) So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ.**

“They” for Paul (conditioned by ‘not all’) refer to the Jews as noted above with regard to mention of Zion. Obeying the gospel is essential, *hupakouo* (cf. 6.17) or to listen-under (*hupo-*), this being backed up by a quote from Isaiah which runs in full as: “Who has believed what we have heard? And to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed [53.1]? In the verse at hand, the noun *akoe* is used which means hearing and can tie in with the mention of *shamah* in the Isaiah quote just mentioned as well as the one in vs. 15, making it three. “If the whole body were an eye, where would be the hearing” [1Cor 12.17]? And so Paul omits but intimates the presence of the divine arm operative along with hearing.

In vs. 17 Paul gives a summary, if you will, present in two parts, faith/heard and heard/preaching (of Christ ) or *pistis/akoe* and *akoe/rhema*, *rhema* last noted in vs. 8. The two pairs are linked by the crucial nature of hearing.

**10- Vs. 18: But I ask, have they not heard? Indeed they have; for "Their voice has gone out to all the earth and their words to the ends of the world."**

Paul asks rhetorically about the Jews though they aren’t mentioned specifically, perhaps so as not show a certain delicacy and respect for their tradition. He acknowledges that they have heard in the manner outlined already, that is, they have paid attention to the *akoe* (hearing) which here is embodied in a quote from Ps 19.4 running in full as follows: “Yet their voice goes out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world.” Note that this verse is part of the previous one: “there is no speech, nor are their words; their voice is not heard.” Here reference is to the heavenly luminaries in the firmament above earth, visible only at night, not during the day, and by nature they are silent. Nevertheless,

they have a voice or *phthoggos* which applies more to a clear, distinct musical sound...the so-called music of the spheres? The only other NT reference is 1Cor 14.7: "If even lifeless instruments such as the flute or the harp do not give distinct notes, how will anyone know what is played?"

In the verse at hand, it's easy for these heavenly luminaries to have their musical voices, if you will, extend to (literally into, *eis*) the entire earth by reason of their location in the dome of the sky. In addition to their *phthoggos*, they have *rhema* (vs. 17)...words...which become such as they echo down from above. Note, however, that such *rhema*-having-become-*phthoggos* reach not so much the earth by their ends or borders which would be the four corners of this earth designated as *oikoumene* more properly the inhabited world. "And again, when he brings the first-born into the world he says, 'Let all God's angels worship him'" [Heb 1.6].

**10-Vss. 19-21 Again I ask, did Israel not understand? First Moses says, "I will make you jealous of those who are not a nation; with a foolish nation I will make you angry." 20) Then Isaiah is so bold as to say, "I have been found by those who did not seek me; I have shown myself to those who did not ask for me." 21) But of Israel he says, "All day long I have held out my hands to a disobedient and contrary people."**

Paul concludes Chapter Nine with three biblical quotes in rapid fire succession preceded by a rhetorical question as to Israel not understanding (*gignosko*: cf. 7.15) with regard to God choosing the Gentiles. All are quoted in full, the last two forming one unit, if you will:

1) Dt 32.21: "They have stirred me to jealousy with what is no god; they have provoked me with their idols. So I will stir them to jealousy with those who are no people; I will provoke them with a foolish nation." In the verse at hand, the verb *parazelloo* is used for stirring to jealousy. "In order to make my fellow Jews jealous and thus save some of them" [11.14]. The preposition *para-* prefaced to the verbal root suggests making this jealousy to be beside someone which turns out to be useless by reason of those who do not comprise a nation or as the original says, "no people." Slightly less bad but not by much is a nation which is foolish, *asunetos*, literally, uncompounded, this being the only NT reference. Such uncompounded-ness is an instrument by which God makes Israel angry, *parorgizo*, that is, places wrath beside or in the company of Israel. The only other NT reference is Eph 6.4: "Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger."

2) Is 65.1: "I was ready to be sought by those who did not ask for me; I was ready to be found by those who did not seek me. I said, "Here am I, here am I" to a nation that did not call on my name." In the verse at hand, *apitolmao* means to be bold, *apo-* or from intensifying the verbal root, this being the only NT reference. Two difference categories of nations are intimated: those who didn't seek the Lord and those who didn't ask for him. In

other words, there appears to be no connection between them and the Lord which means somehow this bond is established. And that connection, while Paul doesn't say outright here, is Jesus Christ.

3) Is 65.2 "I spread out my hands all the day to a rebellious people who walk in a way that is not good, following their own devices." At the very end of this chapter Paul shifts attention to Israel where God is seeking her actively. However, she turns out to be a people both disobedient and contrary, *apeitheo* (cf. 2.8) and *antilego*. The first means not to be persuaded and the latter, to speak against; two similar prepositions are used here, *apo-* and *anti-* or from and against. A reference to the latter verb is Tit 1.9: "He must hold firm to the sure word as taught so that he may be able to give instruction in sound doctrine and also to confute those who contradict it."