

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY ON SCRIPTURE

NEW TESTAMENT VI

# ROMANS



EDITED BY  
GERALD BRAY

GENERAL EDITOR  
THOMAS C. ODEN



InterVarsity Press  
ivpress.com

NEW TESTAMENT VI

# ROMANS



EDITED BY  
GERALD BRAY

GENERAL EDITOR  
THOMAS C. ODEN

  
IVP Academic  
An imprint of InterVarsity Press  
Downers Grove, Illinois

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO ROMANS . . . . . *xvii*

---

COMMENTARY ON ROMANS . . . . . 1

---

APPENDIX: EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS  
AND THE DOCUMENTS CITED . . . . . 369

---

SUBJECT INDEX . . . . . 375

ANCIENT CHRISTIAN COMMENTARY  
PROJECT RESEARCH TEAM

GENERAL EDITOR  
*Thomas C. Oden*

---

ASSOCIATE EDITOR  
*Christopher A. Hall*

---

TRANSLATIONS PROJECTS DIRECTOR  
*Joel Scandrett*

---

EDITORIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR  
*Susan Kipper*

---

TRANSLATION EDITOR  
*Dennis McManus*

---

GRADUATE RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

|                            |                         |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>Vincent Bacote</i>      | <i>Jeffrey Finch</i>    |
| <i>Brian Brewer</i>        | <i>Konstantin</i>       |
| <i>Thomas Buchan</i>       | <i>Peter Gilbert</i>    |
| <i>Jill Burnett</i>        | <i>Patricia Ireland</i> |
| <i>Hunn Choi</i>           | <i>Sergey Kozin</i>     |
| <i>Meesaeng L. Choi</i>    | <i>Thomas Mauro</i>     |
| <i>Joel Elowsky</i>        | <i>Wesley Tink</i>      |
| <i>Bernie Van De Walle</i> |                         |

---

COMPUTER & TECHNICAL SUPPORT  
*Michael Kipper*

---

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT  
*Judy Cox*

## INTRODUCTION TO ROMANS

To help the modern reader to explore Romans through the eyes of the ancient Christian writers, we will examine four preliminary issues:

- ☐ Who wrote the epistle to the Romans?
- ☐ Why is the epistle to the Romans important?
- ☐ How were the quotations used here selected?
- ☐ How are references presented so as to enable the reader to easily locate the original text and examine it in its context?

### **Who Wrote the Epistle to the Romans?**

On the question of the authorship of Romans, virtually all commentators, both ancient and modern, agree: the author of the epistle was the apostle Paul. Furthermore virtually all agree that Paul wrote it in the later stages of his missionary career, after his famous journeys through Asia Minor and Greece but before his fateful journey to Jerusalem, where he was arrested, put on trial and sent to Rome after having appealed to Caesar. The epistle itself gives us enough information to be able to reconstruct this much, and it seems very likely, also on the basis of internal evidence, that Paul was in Corinth when he wrote it. The exact date of composition is unknown, but it was probably around A.D. 55-57.

### **Why Is the Epistle to the Romans Important?**

The all but unanimous agreement about the authorship of the epistle is matched by an equally widespread consensus concerning its importance. Along with 1 Corinthians, it is one of the longest of Paul's epistles, and furthermore it was written to the church of the capital of the Roman Empire. The epistle is important because of what it tells us about the early days of the Roman church. Paul had not yet visited Rome when he wrote the epistle, but it is clear that he was intending to go there, and to some extent the epistle was a letter introducing him to the leaders of the church at Rome.

Who these leaders were is not clear, although a number of names are given to us in the final chapter. This is a matter of considerable historical interest, because for hundreds of years many scholars in the Western tradition have maintained that the apostle Peter was the first bishop of Rome. Why does Paul nowhere mention him? And if Peter had already brought the Christian gospel to the city, why was it necessary for Paul to write such a letter?

Until the fourth century there is little mention of Peter in any of the commentaries or remarks on the epistle that have come down to us. It was largely after the founding of Constantinople (A.D. 330) that Roman writers began to play on the Petrine origins of their church, probably in an attempt to ensure that Roman primacy would continue to be recognized by the other churches, even after the city had ceased to be the only imperial capital. From the commentaries that have survived, it is obvious that this issue caused

some consternation. For if Peter had founded the Roman church, why was it so divided between Jewish and Gentile believers? Why did the Romans need basic Christian teaching from Paul when they had the senior apostle as their bishop? In any case Paul's epistle is the earliest evidence we have for the Christian community in the capital of the Roman Empire. There is no direct evidence in the letter to the Romans of Peter preceding Paul in Rome.

In this epistle Paul develops his views about the relation of Jews and Christians within the history of the covenant. The epistle is therefore also important because of what it tells us about the situation of both Jews and Gentiles within the church. The basic issue can be sketched as follows. Jesus Christ had come as the Savior of humankind, but he had come in the first place to the Jews. His life, ministry and death all took place within an essentially Jewish context. The apostles and their earliest followers were also Jews who believed that in Christ the promises of the Old Testament had been fulfilled for the benefit of the covenant people. But Paul and the other apostles had been led to preach the gospel to Gentiles as well. These Gentiles did not become Jews and saw no need to submit to a legal and ceremonial system that the apostles themselves admitted had been made obsolete by the coming of Christ. How could such people be integrated into a close-knit fellowship of believers, most of whom shared the same cultural assumptions of a Jewish minority living in a hostile pagan environment? Surely Gentiles could not go on living as they had done before if they claimed to worship the one true God.

From the Gentile side, however, the Jewish voices appeared to be arrogant and unreasonable. They were proud of their ancestry. Some claimed to be superior to the new converts, many of whom would have had little or no understanding of the gospel's Old Testament background. How would Gentiles ever feel at home in the church if physical descent from Abraham was a significant advantage, regardless of the spiritual state of those who claimed it? Was it not more important to believe what Abraham believed than to claim physical descent from him?

This was the situation confronting the apostle Paul. He addressed it by saying that each side was partly right and partly wrong and by pointing out that there was a common basis that could unite both into a single church. The Jews were right to emphasize their ancestry and their traditions because these things pointed toward the coming of Christ. Correctly understood and applied, these traditions gave Jews a great advantage in living the Christian life. But Gentiles were also right to insist that claiming descent from Abraham meant nothing if those who did so did not also believe what Abraham believed and did not relate to God in the same way as he had done—by faith.

Faith, says Paul, is the key theological principle that unites both Jews and Gentiles because it is by faith that we are justified, or made right with God. The epistle to the Romans is important because it gave Paul the opportunity to expound the fundamental principles of Christianity. Justification by faith, not by ancestry or the works of the law of Moses, is the starting point for Paul's whole argument. Once this is properly understood the barriers between Jews and Gentiles will melt away, because faith is a matter of the heart, not of the blood. Anyone with faith in Jesus as Lord and Savior is welcome in the Christian community, regardless of his or her background. Naturally, if people who have this faith also happen to have a good knowledge of the Bible (as most Jews did), this is a wonderful gift and will be of great benefit to them. But it is possible to know the Scriptures inside out without believing them, and in that case the knowledge such

people have not only is useless but could be harmful as well, insofar as it cuts them off from Christ instead of drawing them to him.

Closely tied to the question of justification is another one, which preoccupies Paul in the later chapters<sup>1</sup> of the epistle. This is the great matter of election and/or predestination. Israel was the chosen people of God, called out from among the nations and given the special privilege and responsibility of being keepers of the divine revelation. The coming of Christ, which implied the opening of salvation to the Gentiles, threw this traditional Jewish belief into confusion. Had Israel ceased to be special in God's sight? Had the promises made to the Jews in the Old Testament been rescinded? Were Gentiles chosen by God, or could they decide for themselves whether or not to follow Christ?

Paul tackled these issues head-on. First, he said that God's plans and promises could never be altered. Therefore the Jews were still God's chosen people. However, the mark of their election was not circumcision or some other outward sign or ritual. It was faith—the same faith that Abraham had. Jews who shared this faith shared in Abraham's election, but others did not. Gentiles who shared Abraham's faith were added to the number of the elect, but the rest were not. The only difference was that at the end of time, after the full number of the elect Gentiles had been gathered in, God would show mercy on the Jews and "all Israel" would be saved. The precise meaning of this continues to be debated. Some scholars think that it includes Gentile believers as well as Jews. Some think that it refers to all Jews, whether they are conscious believers or not. Others think that it refers to those Jews who are elect but who have not yet made a profession of faith in Christ. When they believe, then they will be joined to the existing company of Jewish and Gentile believers, and so "all Israel" will be saved. Whatever the right interpretation is, it is clear that God has not abandoned the Jewish people but still has a purpose for them that will be revealed in due time.

Paul developed his doctrine of election and predestination at great length, but in doing so he shifted the emphasis away from the traditional Jewish understanding of these concepts. For the Jews, election was primarily a matter of national destiny. It was Israel that was chosen, and individual Jews shared in the blessings that special status conveyed by emphasizing how they belonged to the nation. That is why circumcision was so important to them—it was their way of proving that they belonged to the chosen people. For Paul, however, election was primarily a matter of personal faith. You and I are elect if we share the faith of Abraham. Not all of Abraham's descendants inherited the promises; even Abraham's son Ishmael and his grandson Esau were cast out. This shift of emphasis from the national to the personal was fundamental to Paul's gospel, since it was only on that basis that the Gentiles, who were not a nation, could become God's people as the prophet Hosea had foretold.

The fathers of the church understood all this very well, but it must be said that they had great difficulty with the idea that individuals were predestined by God for salvation and even greater difficulty with its logical corollary, that other individuals were chosen by God for damnation (or reprobation, as it is sometimes called). To some this seemed like a denial of human free will, which they were determined to uphold even though the apostle Paul makes it quite clear in Romans 7 that the will of a sinful person is not free—it is in

---

<sup>1</sup>We speak of chapter and verse divisions for convenience, but they were not in the original text. Chapter divisions were made about A.D. 1200 and verse divisions much later.

bondage to sin. Only Augustine (354-430) was prepared to accept the logical consequences of Paul's teaching on this matter, and this led to his famous quarrel with Pelagius. Pelagius was only teaching what many of his contemporaries believed: that people were free to choose or to reject Christ. It was not easy for Augustine to overcome this belief. The Eastern (Greek) church has never accepted this aspect of Augustinian theology, and even the Western (Latin) church has often had to contend with serious opposition. Since the sixteenth century the debate between Jansenists and Molinists in the Roman Catholic Church and between Calvinists and Arminians in the Protestant churches has brought this issue to the fore repeatedly and has demonstrated how difficult it is to resolve the problem.

It is fair, however, to say that this difficulty was felt most acutely by Gentile Christians, and not by Jews like the apostle Paul. He had no trouble believing in election, since it was the only way he could explain the extraordinary survival of the Jewish people. Furthermore, Paul believed that the Gentiles were being grafted into this people and added to its history, a point that was not fully grasped by them until Augustine rewrote their history in his *City of God*. Paul wanted Gentiles to think of Abraham as their ancestor and of Israel as their people because they were united to believing Jews on the common basis of faith in God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

To sum up the debate between the Jews and the Gentiles in the church, it can be said that on the whole the apostle Paul favored the Gentile position as being fundamentally more correct. Once the Jewish Law was seen in relation to the history of grace and Gentiles were admitted to the church on the same basis as Jews, it was hard to see how any absolutely special status could be given to the latter. Unfortunately, special status in the sight of God was what the Jewish case was all about. What Paul was prepared to concede to them was respect. He asked the Gentiles to show consideration for the sensitivities of those who had been chosen even before the coming of Christ and warned them not to be proud, because if the Jews, to whom the promises had been given, were cast out, how much more easily could the same fate befall those who had not been so chosen.

In rendering a modern translation of references to the Jews by Paul and early Christian exegetes, I have sought to avoid the erroneous implication that the modern nuances of racial anti-Semitism were in any way a premise or an insinuation in early Christian texts. When the term "the Jews" is used, as it so often is by Paul in his letter to the Roman Christians, many of whom were Jews, his reference was not to all Jews of all times but to Judaizing Christians who wanted to return Gentile Christians to Jewish practices, or to the pride of Jews over the Law that prevented their becoming open to the gift of forgiveness in Christ, or to those Jewish religious leaders who aggressively opposed the truth of Christianity. These were not racial but religious issues and controversies. In order to avoid these misleading implications we have at times rendered references to the Jews as to the covenant people or the people of Israel or sons of Abraham.

Wherever references to humanity, humankind or the human race are rendered "man" in English translations, I have sought within reason to avoid sexist implications, but this has not always been possible or advisable in a way that will be found acceptable to all audiences. We are pledged not to distort the text by this attempt at avoidance.

A number of other theological themes are tackled in the epistle, most notably the question of eschatology, which is the hope of a future fulfillment in Christ. This idea permeates the epistle, and the apostle Paul repeat-

edly invokes it as a motive for Christians to continue in faith and responsible behavior in the present. It is sometimes said nowadays that this hope of an imminent second coming of Christ gradually faded away toward the end of the New Testament period, but the evidence of the Fathers does not support this. They regarded the persecutions they had to suffer and the rapid spread of the gospel across the Roman world as signs that the prophecies of the end were about to be fulfilled. If anything, because the eschaton was growing nearer every day, the need for constant vigilance was even greater in their time than it had been at the beginning.

Closely tied up with this idea was the question of the relationship between the primitive church and the state, which Paul deals with briefly in Romans 13. The apostle maintains that the secular authorities were appointed by God and that it is the duty of Christians to obey them in all things lawful. In saying this he was opening up a new area for theological exploration. In Old Testament Israel there was no real separation between the spiritual and the temporal, even though there was a clear distinction in function between the priest and the king. Pagan rulers were appointed by God to fulfill prophecies, as in the cases of Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, but apart from Jeremiah's counsel to the exiles (Jer 29) there is little concept of living permanently under a religiously hostile secular government. From the standpoint of Israelite history, Paul's teaching is extraordinary, and it was soon to be tried to the utmost. It is astonishing to note how the Fathers unanimously support the apostle's position, even under the most extreme provocation from the Roman authorities. Persecution, they came to believe, was a blessing sent from God, and therefore the rulers who brought it were to be thanked, not cursed.

Other matters discussed at length in Romans concern issues of personal holiness, which figure prominently in almost all of Paul's epistles. This was a strong point of the Jews, who had grown accustomed to living separate lives in a pagan environment, although they had to learn that true holiness was a matter of inward conviction, not of outward display. The Gentiles had to learn what it meant to be holy, and in many ways it must have been far more difficult for them to cut themselves off from their pagan neighbors and relatives. But because the call to holiness was the essential preparation for the coming eschaton and the inheritance of eternal life, it could not be shirked. This hope governs everything Paul writes to the Romans, and it is echoed by the Fathers at every turn.

Finally, if faith produces hope for the future, hope must be worked out in a Christian life lived in love. Faith, hope and love are as much pillars of Romans as they are of 1 Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor 13:12). Paul concludes his discussion of Christian behavior on that note: Love of one's neighbor is the true fulfilling of the law, and this remains an obligation for Christians every bit as much as it had always been an obligation for Jews. The person equipped with faith, hope and love will never have to fear for what may happen to him or her, for it is certain that person will inherit the kingdom of God and reign with Christ forever.

### **How Were the Patristic Quotations Used Here Selected?**

The epistle to the Romans has always been among the best known and most frequently quoted New Testament texts. From the patristic period alone there are literally thousands of quotations and allusions, all of which can now be recovered without difficulty, thanks to the possibilities that have been opened up by computer research. The combined resources of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and of the *Centre de Textes et Documents* (Cetedoc) have made it possible to obtain a virtually complete collection of patristic refer-

ences to Romans which, if they were all reproduced, would take up several volumes. Fortunately, for our purposes the abundance of patristic comment on Romans makes it unnecessary to deal with as much of this sort of material as would be necessary in the case of Mark, for example. Many references are merely passing allusions to the text that shed little or no light on its meaning. Sometimes they are nothing more than quotations that are intended to reinforce a point that has been made on the strength of some other part of Scripture, and more often than we today would like, they are taken out of context.

Indirect allusions to the text of Romans (as distinguished from precise quotations) are almost all that we have to go on for the very earliest period (before A.D. 200), and so a selection of quotations from authors like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus and Tertullian has been given in order to give readers a flavor of how Romans was used before commentary writing became common. These allusions must be used with a certain degree of caution, since in almost every case the writer was making some other point and merely using Romans in order to bolster that argument. For the purposes of this collection an effort has been made to ensure that such references do in fact have a genuine link with Paul's epistle, but even so, readers will be well advised to treat this material with discretion.

We possess a large number of commentaries on the epistle, many of which have survived more or less intact. The first and in some ways greatest of these is the massive work of Origen (c. 185-c. 254), who wrote no fewer than fifteen books on this one epistle. Even in ancient times, this was felt by many to be a bit too much, and in about A.D. 400 a Roman theologian by the name of Rufinus translated the work into Latin, abridging it to a mere ten volumes and adapting it to the needs of Latin-speaking readers. In this form the text has come down to us, although there are enough Greek fragments surviving to enable us to confirm that Rufinus in most cases did not substantially distort the content of Origen's original work.

Origen was prone to two things that modern readers find difficult—digression and allegory. He often interrupts the flow of his commentary to explain (at great length) such matters as the nature of Old Testament priesthood and sacrifice. This is understandable, given the fact that most of his original audience would have had little or no understanding of classical Judaism, but these digressions do take us a long way from Romans. For our purposes it has been necessary to leave most of this material out, although one or two samples have been included in brief form so that the flavor of the original can be grasped.

Allegory is much easier to quote, and it is only fair to Origen that readers should be exposed to his technique in this matter. In principle, Origen did not allegorize those parts of Scripture whose literal sense was clear and acceptable to the moral conscience.<sup>2</sup> Romans, as it happens, tends to fall into this category almost entirely, so there is relatively little allegory, at least when compared with what Origen wrote in his commentaries on parts of the Old Testament. Nevertheless there are times when the influence of Platonism was too strong for him to resist, and we find him, for example, lapsing into allegorical interpretations based on a Platonic body-soul-spirit distinction. We also find frequent references to natural law as opposed to the law of Moses, because Origen preferred the universal character of the former. By interpreting a phrase like "sin against the law" as a reference to natural and not Jewish law, he could extend culpability for sin to the Gentiles and assume a scenario in which the gospel's message of salvation would speak equally to both.

---

<sup>2</sup>Origen looked for a spiritual interpretation of passages of Scripture that portrayed God in anthropomorphic terms.

The specific contribution of Rufinus is most noticeable in the references that occur from time to time to Latin texts and versions of the Scriptures. Origen may have known of some of these, but it is extremely unlikely that he would have made use of them in his original commentary. We may therefore assume that whenever "Origen" refers to something Latin, it is really Rufinus who is speaking. Beyond that it is difficult to say for sure what comes from Rufinus and what does not. No doubt he touched up Origen's text as he went along, but on the whole it seems that the author's original intention has been preserved in translation, so that we can confidently assert that the text as we have it is largely the authentic voice of Origen. There is a good modern German translation (in five volumes, with a sixth containing the Greek fragments still forthcoming) but nothing in English. For this reason quotations from Origen in this book are longer and more frequent than they might otherwise be, since many readers will not have immediate access to the material elsewhere.

After Origen's time, more than a century passed before the next commentary of any significance appeared. A certain Euthalius the Deacon (fourth century?) attempted one but did not get further than a prologue and a list of headings, which does not tell us a great deal. Eusebius of Emesa (d. c. 359) and Acacius of Caesarea (d. 366) both produced commentaries, but these survive now only in fragments. In this edition they have both been cited fairly often, and it is hoped that the selection offered will give a reasonable picture of their work.

The next full-length commentary to appear is by common consent the greatest of them all. It was the work of an unknown scholar, writing in Rome sometime between 366 and 384. He wrote in Latin, and throughout the Middle Ages his identity was merged with that of Ambrose of Milan (d. 397). It was not until Erasmus (1466-1536) examined the text that it became clear that this attribution was a mistake. In reality the commentary on this and on the other Pauline epistles was the work of a much greater scholar than Ambrose, whom Erasmus somewhat punningly chose to call Ambrosiaster, the name by which he has been known ever since.

Ambrosiaster wrote a literal commentary, and he was fully aware of the problems posed by historical and textual criticism. His work can easily stand comparison with modern writings on the subject, so close were his methods to those generally employed today. Who Ambrosiaster was is a matter of speculation, the most intriguing suggestion being that he may have been a monk known as Isaac the Jew, who was a converted Jew in Rome. If that is true, it would certainly explain Ambrosiaster's deep and sympathetic knowledge of Judaism, though we are constrained by lack of evidence from making any definite decision on the question. Whoever he was, he was soon being widely read and imitated, though never altogether successfully. It is a great pity that his work is not available in English translation, and so it is unknown to most readers. For that reason this edition contains rather more of Ambrosiaster than might otherwise be the case, since in effect it is introducing him to a wider reading public for the first time.

Contemporary with Ambrosiaster are a number of Greek commentators whose work survives only in fragments. They are Diodore of Tarsus (d. c. 390), Apollinaris of Laodicea (310-c. 392), Didymus the Blind of Alexandria (313-398) and Severian of Gabala (fl. c. 400). With the exception of Didymus, these all represent the Antiochene school of biblical exegesis, which concentrated heavily on the literal interpretation of the texts and which is full of historical details, textual criticism and so on. The fragmentary nature of the surviving material means that it is impossible to do full justice to them, but the selection presented here will

at least give some idea of how these commentators went about their task. Didymus was a partial exception in the sense that he wrote from Alexandria, which was the great rival of Antioch and where an allegorical interpretation of Scripture was more favored. Nevertheless Didymus himself resisted this tendency to a large extent, and the style of his commentary is not noticeably different from that of the others.

The next full-length work to appear in Greek was the sermon series of John Chrysostom (347-407), the famous preacher who became patriarch of Constantinople but who was exiled by the court because of his boldness in criticizing its corruption. Chrysostom has left us thirty-two homilies that compose a verse-by-verse exposition of Romans. Each homily concludes with a long section relating to practical application, most of which has had to be omitted from the present edition. It is, however, readily available in English translation, so that anyone interested in reading the complete text will not have any difficulty finding it. As is to be expected from homilies, Chrysostom's style is more powerfully rhetorical than that of the others. At the same time he was a good historian and critic, and his conclusions about the authorship and dating of Romans are what most commentators would still propose. For a series like this one, which aims to reach pastors and ordinary Christians rather than professional exegetical scholars, he is often the most user-friendly commentator of them all.

About the same time as Chrysostom or slightly later came Theodore of Mopsuestia (350-428), another Antiochene whose work survives only in fragments. Theodore was a truly great commentator, and if his work had survived in toto he would rank with Ambrosiaster or even higher. His feeling for Paul's language and meaning was deep, and his critical sense was acute. His judgments were almost always felicitous, and it is our good fortune that so many of them have survived in the *catenae*<sup>3</sup> even though the complete text has disappeared.

In the Latin-speaking world, the years around 400 saw a sudden explosion of interest in commentary writing. We have already mentioned Rufinus's translation of Origen, but to that must be added the work of an unknown commentator, who may have been Constantius of Aquileia (fl. c. 405). This is only a guess, but to avoid the vagueness of the word *Anonymous* and to indicate that we are speaking of a single text, we have chosen to use the name "[Pseudo-]Constantius" to indicate selections from this commentary. In general it is brief and to the point, which makes it easy to extract material from.

Similar to this work and evidently dependent on it is the commentary written by the archheretic Pelagius (c. 354-c. 420), which has survived because for many centuries it was thought to have been the work of Jerome. It is important because it allows Pelagius to speak for himself on subjects that were to land him in controversy with Augustine and eventually to lead to his condemnation. What we find is a man of moderate and even mainstream views, though it has to be remembered that the text as we now have it was reworked in the sixth century by both Primasius and Cassiodorus. Pelagius's original text was in specific ways presumably explicitly heretical, but what we have now is unexceptional, even if it is still possible to detect points of disagreement with Augustine.<sup>4</sup> There is a good recent edition and translation into English,

---

<sup>3</sup>"Chains" of quotations selected and anthologized, rather like the present volume.

<sup>4</sup>The corpus of Pelagius is highly controverted. Until 1934 all we had was a corrupted text of his Pauline commentary and fragments quoted by Augustine. R. F. Evans argues that the Pauline commentary was the original work of Pelagius. Since the Pelagian corpus has been so corrupted by a history of redactors, the reader is well advised to not too easily equate the fourth-century Pelagius with later standard stereotypes of the archheresy of Pelagianism. Cf. Adalbert Hamman, *Supplementum to Migne PL 1* 1959 cols. 1101-1570.

with a full explanation of the history of the commentary (see the bibliography).

By any standard of measurement, Augustine of Hippo (354-430) was the greatest of the Latin fathers, and his reading of Romans was particularly original. He was the most austere of the Fathers in fully accepting the implications of the apostle Paul's teaching on the vexed questions of election and predestination, and this became the hallmark of his later writing. In particular this issue led him into conflict with Pelagius. It is therefore especially disappointing to have to record that although he began to write a commentary on Romans, he never got beyond the introduction. The most systematic exposition of the epistle that we have from him is a series of propositions that deal with the main points of the epistle in a very brief form. These propositions are interesting because they were written at an early stage in Augustine's career, when his views were still not all that different from those of Pelagius.

But of course this only makes the absence of a later, more mature commentary all the more frustrating. What we have are extracts from other works, including a number of letters in which Augustine treats particular verses from Romans without going into the argument of the epistle as a whole. In this edition we have quoted fairly extensively from the Propositions but have also given a wide sampling of his other writings, in order to do justice to the development of his thought. However, the reader is bound to feel somewhat disappointed, in that what would probably have been the most interesting commentary of all was never written.

After Augustine's time there were further commentaries in Greek, of which the most notable was written by Theodoret of Cyr (393-466). This survives, almost uniquely among the Antiochene commentaries, although it is unfortunately not available in English translation. Theodoret was dependent on Theodore of Mopsuestia, and from him we can catch a glimpse of the greatness of the Antiochene tradition. He eschews allegory, concentrates on historical and grammatical details and stays close to the apostle's original intention. His comments are usually helpful and retain their freshness even after the passage of time. Because of all this, we have chosen to offer a fairly extensive selection of his work, so that both he and the tradition he represents may be made more familiar to modern readers.

After Theodoret's time there is the fragmentary Greek commentary of Gennadius of Constantinople (d. 471) and the very incomplete Latin homilies of Luculentius (fifth-sixth centuries), which bring us near the end of the patristic period. Neither of these is especially remarkable, but both are quoted from time to time to give readers some impression of how Romans was being read at the beginning of the Middle Ages.

In addition to the commentaries that are available, there is a wide choice of other patristic works in which particular passages or verses of Romans are mentioned and commented on. In making a selection of them for this volume, two considerations have guided our choice. The first of these is the prominence and representativeness of the writer or source being used. There is little point in quoting obscure authors or writings simply in order to demonstrate a knowledge of their existence. But given that this is often the only way that gives us access to Syriac and Coptic sources, an exception to this rule has been made for them. Otherwise we have preferred to rely on mainstream writers, whose works have entered the spiritual tradition of the church, and who may therefore be taken as more fully representative of patristic thought as a whole.

**How Are the References Presented so as to Enable the Reader to Easily Locate the Original Text and Examine It in Its Context?**

Gaining access to writings that were produced long ago in ancient languages is never an easy matter, and translations into English do not always help us very much. A number of such translations were made in the nineteenth century, which was a great age of patristic scholarship, but the style of the English is often dated. Modern readers do not want to plow through long sentences full of subordinate clauses and polysyllabic words whose meaning is clear only to those with a classical education. It is also the case that the Fathers wrote to be read aloud, not silently, and they are therefore much more rhetorical in their style than we would be. Sometimes this is attractive, but more often than not the modern reader finds it high-blown and irritating. It can also become unnecessarily repetitive and even disjointed in places, as speech often is.

In this edition, all that has been smoothed out. Contemporary style has been preferred, even when this has meant recasting the literal wording of the original text. Because we are presenting extracts, not complete texts, it has sometimes been necessary to supply bridging material that is not explicitly in the original text but that is either implied by it or is contained there at much greater length. Rather than quoting an entire page merely to retain a particular sentence, we have at times taken the liberty of condensing such paragraphs into a sentence or two, using ellipses so as not to detract from the essence of what the Father in question was really trying to say. Existing English translations have been consulted and used to some extent, but we have felt free to alter them to fit the style and needs of the present edition, so that it is only very occasionally that their wording has been preserved intact. In particular we have tried to establish some consistency in the rendering of theological terms, and whenever possible we have opted for the variants that are normally used by theologians today. All this may cause a certain amount of irritation to the professional scholar, but it should be remembered that the purpose of this commentary is to allow the Fathers to speak to the present generation, not to give people the impression that it is necessary to have a classical Greek or Latin education in order to understand them.

When selections are taken from complete commentaries organized sequentially on a verse-by-verse basis, such as those of Origen, Theodoret or Ambrosiaster, only brief forms of references are given. In many cases these commentaries are untranslated, and we have translated in this series only the portion of them relevant to our editorial premises. It is assumed that anyone wishing to consult the original will have only to look up the relevant chapter and verse of the commentary in question. Hence where the *ad loc*<sup>5</sup> reference appears, the reader may proceed directly to the commentary referred to and consult the specific Scripture text under discussion. This reference will apply only to line-by-line commentaries. Apart from line-by-line commentaries, however, quotations are referenced according to source, either in the original language or translation. Where possible, reference is also made to the best available English translation, though the reader must be warned that what is found in this book is at most a dearchaized adaptation of that and probably not a direct quotation.

Each selection is referenced first by its title and in some cases by its book, chapter and section reference (and subsection where necessary), and then it is footnoted by an abbreviated citation (normally citing the

---

<sup>5</sup>Indicating that the reader can refer to the location of the verse in the line-by-line commentary.

book, volume and page number), usually in its original source and in some cases in translation. For the convenience of computer users, many of the digital database references are provided in the appendix, either to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graeca* or to the Latin Cetedoc. Some previous English translations have been dearchaized or amended for easier reading. We have in some cases edited out superfluous conjunctions for easier reading.

Furthermore, each group of verses is preceded by a short overview that gives the reader some idea of what the following discussion is about. Where there are notable differences of opinion among the Fathers or where one of them has presented a particularly significant argument, this is also noted, so that readers may be alerted to the particular importance of the selection that follows. The function of the overview in a given pericope is to provide a brief appraisal of all the comments to follow and to show that there is a reasonably cohesive thread of argument among passages taken from diverse sources and generations. We concede that the overview might reasonably be stated by other perceptive interpreters in various ways using other editorial criteria.

Where a selection has no heading, the previous heading applies. In some cases there may be several selections grouped under a single heading. Or when the selection is either very short or very obvious, no heading is included. Headings were selected<sup>6</sup> to identify either a key phrase of the text being commented upon, a key metaphor in the comment or some core idea of the selection.

It remains to be said only that the main purpose of this volume is to edify the communion of saints so that Christians today may be encouraged to examine and appropriate what the writers of an earlier time, many of whom have been canonized by the tradition of the church and all of whom are still worth reading, had to say about one of the greatest letters ever written—the apostle Paul’s epistle to the Romans. May God by his grace open the hearts and minds of all who read these texts, and may we, together with them, come to that perfect peace and joy that is the inheritance of the saints in light.

Gerald Bray

Feast of St. Augustine of Hippo

---

<sup>6</sup>By the general editor.



---

# THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

---

## 1:1-7 PAUL AND THE GOSPEL

*<sup>1</sup>Paul, a servant<sup>a</sup> of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God <sup>2</sup>which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures, <sup>3</sup>the gospel concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh <sup>4</sup>and designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord, <sup>5</sup>through whom we have received grace and apostleship to bring about the obedience of faith for the sake of his name among all the nations, <sup>6</sup>including yourselves who are called to belong to Jesus Christ;*

*<sup>7</sup>To all God's beloved in Rome, who are called to be saints:*

*Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.*

<sup>a</sup> Or slave

---

**OVERVIEW:** The first seven verses of Romans 1 serve as an introduction to the whole epistle, and the Fathers made many comments on them that nowadays would normally be found in a general preface. They were especially fascinated by the name Paul itself and sought to discern why it had been changed from Saul. The Fathers were also interested in the fact that Paul called himself a servant (slave), which is not surprising given the fact that they were living in a slave-holding society. Nor were they slow to link the apostle's sense of his calling to God's foreknowledge and predestination. This tendency to move from particular details to universal concepts is typical of the ancients generally, and so we must not be surprised to discover that verses like these could be used as a basis for profound theological reflections.

All the Fathers accepted the validity of Old Testament prophecy concerning the coming of Christ, but they were capable of seeing this from

many different angles. Some stressed the importance of the gospel as distinct from the coming of Christ in the flesh; others focused on the role of the prophets, and Augustine was concerned to point out that there had been Gentiles as well as Jews who had foretold his coming. Especially from the fourth century onward, the Fathers all emphasized that Christ was the eternal Son of God, because this had by then become the main point in dispute with the Arians. But John Chrysostom was bold enough to point out that in the order of revelation believers came to know the human Christ before they understood that he was God. Romans 1:4 received an enormous amount of attention from the Fathers, because it seemed to suggest that Jesus of Nazareth was merely a man who was "designated" Son of God after his resurrection. All of them took great pains to insist that this was not what Paul meant. Of particular interest in this respect is the

lengthy passage from Origen, which obviously has been touched up by Rufinus. In the authentically Origenist part we find that the great biblical scholar was prepared to admit that Joseph could be called the father of Jesus—in an allegorical sense. This use of allegory is the exact opposite of what a modern commentator would suppose, since for moderns it is not the fatherhood of Joseph but the doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ that causes problems and might be regarded as an allegorical reading of those Old Testament texts that are quoted as prophecies of his coming.

Paul received his commission by grace, not because he had any special entitlement to it. Moreover, the word *apostle* had more than one meaning, and it was was not always restricted to a special office as it is in Romans 1:5. Since the gift of God is given to all, all believers from all nations are called to the obedience of faith, even though not all are Jews and not all are apostles. God's love has presented us with grace, and grace with peace. Paul prayed that all who are called might receive the grace of God, by which all believers enjoy salvation, and peace, by which God gives to all the restoration of excellent behavior.

### 1:1 A Servant of Jesus Christ

**CALLED TO BE AN APOSTLE.** ORIGEN: The first question which occurs to us concerns the name Paul itself. Why is he, who in Acts<sup>1</sup> was called Saul, now called Paul? In Holy Scripture we find that among the ancients, many names were altered, e.g., Abram was renamed Abraham,<sup>2</sup> Sarai became Sarah,<sup>3</sup> and Jacob became Israel.<sup>4</sup> In the Gospels too, Simon was changed to Peter,<sup>5</sup> and the sons of Zebedee became known as sons of thunder.<sup>6</sup> But these things occurred by divine command, and we read nothing of the sort in the case of Paul. Because of this, some people have imagined that the apostle took the name of Paul, the proconsul of Cyprus, whom he converted to the Christian faith,<sup>7</sup> in the same way that rulers

are in the habit of adding the names of conquered peoples to their titles, e.g., Parthicus would indicate someone who conquered the Parthians, Gothicus a victor over the Goths, and so on. In the same way the apostle would have called himself Paul to indicate that he had conquered the proconsul Paul.

We cannot exclude this reason completely, but given that no such custom can be found in Holy Scripture, we ought rather to seek a solution from the examples which we do have. And indeed we find in the Scriptures that some people have two or even three different names, e.g., Solomon is also called Jedidiah,<sup>8</sup> Zedekiah is also called Mattaniah,<sup>9</sup> Uzziah is also called Azariah,<sup>10</sup> and there are many others in the books of Judges, Samuel and Kings who have double names. But even the Gospels do not abandon this custom, e.g., Matthew was called Levi<sup>11</sup> . . . and Thaddeus sometimes appears as Lebbaeus.<sup>12</sup> Obviously the Gospel writers did not get the names of the apostles wrong, but given that it was the custom of the Hebrews to have two or three names, they gave different names to one and the same man. It seems to us that it is in accordance with this custom that Paul appears to have a second name, and that as long as he was ministering to his own people he was called Saul, which was probably the name his parents gave him, but that when he was writing laws and commandments for the Greeks and other Gentiles, he was called Paul. Scripture makes it clear when it says: "Saul, who is also called Paul,"<sup>13</sup> that the name Paul was not then being given to him for the first time but was already habitual.

But why does Paul call himself a slave, when elsewhere he says: "For you did not receive the spirit of slavery to fall back into fear, but you have received the Spirit of sonship, by which we cry Abba! Father!"<sup>14</sup> . . . We may understand this as an expression of humility . . . and that would not

<sup>1</sup>Cf., e.g., Acts 9:1. <sup>2</sup>See Gen 17:5. <sup>3</sup>See Gen 17:15. <sup>4</sup>See Gen 32:28; 35:10. <sup>5</sup>See Mk 3:16; Lk 6:14. <sup>6</sup>See Mk 3:17. <sup>7</sup>See Acts 13:4-12.

<sup>8</sup>2 Sam 12:25. <sup>9</sup>2 Kings 24:17. <sup>10</sup>2 Kings 15:32. <sup>11</sup>Lk 5:27. <sup>12</sup>Cf. Mt 10:3. <sup>13</sup>Acts 13:9. <sup>14</sup>Rom 8:15.

be wrong. Nor is the reality of Paul's freedom compromised by this in any way. As he himself says: "Though I am free from all men, I have made myself a slave to all."<sup>15</sup> . . . For he serves Christ not in the spirit of slavery but in the spirit of adoption, for Christ's service is more noble than any freedom.

"Called" is the name given to everyone who believes in Christ and is therefore a general term, although it is applied to each one according to what God has foreseen and chosen in him. He may be called to be an apostle or a prophet or a teacher; as free from a wife or as bound in marriage, and this is determined by the diversity of grace given to everyone, as it is written: "Many are called but few are chosen."<sup>16</sup>

In Paul's case, he was not called to be an apostle in the general sense, but he was also chosen according to the foreknowledge of God to be "set apart for the gospel of God," as he says elsewhere: "God set me apart before I was born and called me through his grace."<sup>17</sup> Heretics wrongly claim that he was set apart from his mother's womb on account of the goodness of his nature, just as from the opposite side of the fence we read in the Psalms of those "sinners who were separated from the womb"<sup>18</sup> because of their evil nature.

But we say that Paul was chosen neither by accident nor because of some natural difference, but he himself attributed the causes of his election to him who knows everything before it happens. . . . For God foresaw that Paul would labor more abundantly than anyone else in the gospel . . . and for that reason Jesus set him apart in his mother's womb for the gospel. Had he been chosen by fate, as the heretics maintain, or by some inherently better nature, he would not have been afraid of being condemned if he failed to preach the gospel.<sup>19</sup>

God's foreknowledge, by which those who will labor and succeed are known, comes first, and his predestination follows afterwards, so that foreknowledge cannot be regarded as the cause of predestination. With men, merits are weighed

according to past actions, but with God they are weighed according to future behavior, and anyone who thinks that God cannot see our future just as easily as he can see our past is an unbeliever.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.<sup>20</sup>

**CALLED AS SERVANT AND APOSTLE.** EUSEBIUS OF EMESA: Some people argue quite pointlessly as to whether the participle *called* is meant to modify *servant* or *apostle*. It applies to both, since everyone is called, and called equally, both to faith and grace and to election and the apostolic order. PAULINE COMMENTARY FROM THE GREEK CHURCH.<sup>21</sup>

**FROM RESTLESSNESS TO REST.** AMBROSI-ASTER: Saul changed his name to Paul, and the change was permanent. Because Saul means restlessness or trial, when he came to faith in Christ he called himself Paul, i.e., rest, because our faith is peace. For whereas previously he had inflicted trials on the servants of God because of his desire to fulfill the law, later he himself endured trials on account of the hope which before he had denied because of his love of Judaism.

In calling himself a "servant of Jesus Christ," Paul shows that he has been delivered from the law, and he puts both names, Jesus and Christ, in order to signify the person of God and man, for in both he is Lord, as Peter the apostle testifies, saying: "He is the Lord of all."<sup>22</sup> And because he is Lord, he is also God, as David says: "For the Lord himself is God."<sup>23</sup> The heretics deny this. Marcion, it seems, denied Christ and his body out of hatred for the law, although he confessed Jesus. The Jews and Photinus denied that Jesus was God out of their zeal for the law. For whenever Scripture says either "Jesus" or "Christ," it sometimes means the person of God and sometimes the person of the man, e.g.: "there is one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things."<sup>24</sup>

<sup>15</sup>1 Cor 9:19. <sup>16</sup>Mt 22:14. <sup>17</sup>Gal 1:15. <sup>18</sup>Ps 58:3. <sup>19</sup>1 Cor 9:16.

<sup>20</sup>CER 70-88. <sup>21</sup>NTA 15:46. <sup>22</sup>Acts 10:36. <sup>23</sup>Ps 100:3. <sup>24</sup>1 Cor 8:6.

“Called to be an apostle.” Because Paul acknowledged the Lord and confessed him he became the perfect servant and shows that he was promoted, saying that he was called to be an apostle, i.e., a messenger sent by the Lord to do his work. By this he shows that he had merit with God because he served Christ and not the law.

“Set apart for the gospel of God.” The gospel of God is good news, by which sinners are called to forgiveness. For since as a Pharisee the apostle held a teaching post among the Jews, he now says that he has been set apart from the preaching of Judaism for the gospel of God, so that abandoning the law, he might preach Christ who justifies those who believe in him, which the law could not do. This does not go against the law but affirms it, since the law itself says that this will happen in the future, in the words of Isaiah the prophet: “There will come from Zion one who will break and remove the captivity of Jacob, and this will be a testimony of me, when I shall take away their sins.”<sup>25</sup> COMMENTARY ON PAUL’S EPISTLES.<sup>26</sup>

**SET APART.** APOLLINARIS OF LAODICEA: Paul was set apart and dedicated to evangelism, like the offerings which the law says were set apart for God and for the priests.<sup>27</sup> PAULINE COMMENTARY FROM THE GREEK CHURCH.<sup>28</sup>

**CALLED FROM HEAVEN.** SEVERIAN: Paul here preaches the divinity of Christ to a world which was ignorant of it. Many people saw the Lord, and others believed in him without seeing, but Paul was called from heaven: “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?”<sup>29</sup> He was more highly favored than the other apostles, for the Lord called Peter and James and John and made them his disciples; he did not immediately make or call them apostles. But he made Paul an apostle as soon as he called him. Thus the gospel is preached according to the plan of God. PAULINE COMMENTARY FROM THE GREEK CHURCH.<sup>30</sup>

**THE NAME OF PAUL.** CHRYSOSTOM: Moses

wrote five books, but nowhere did he put his own name to them . . . nor did Matthew, John, Mark or Luke. But St. Paul everywhere in his epistles puts his own name.<sup>31</sup> Why? Because the others were writing to people who were present, and it would have been superfluous for them to have announced themselves when they were present. But Paul sent his writings from a distance and in the form of a letter, and so he had to add his name.

Why did God change his name and call him Paul instead of Saul? It was so that even in this respect he might not come short of the apostles but that he might also have the same preeminence that the chief of the disciples had<sup>32</sup> and on that basis be more closely united with them. Paul also calls himself the “servant” of Christ, and there are many kinds of servitude. One is related to creation, “for all things are thy servants.”<sup>33</sup> Another comes from faith<sup>34</sup> and a third is civil subjection, as it says: Moses my servant is dead.<sup>35</sup> Indeed, all the Jews were servants, but Moses in a special way, since his light has shone most brightly in the community. Paul was a servant in all of these senses, and therefore he puts this term first, in the place of greatest dignity.

He says of himself, in all of his epistles, that he is “called,” thereby demonstrating his own candor in admitting that it was not because he sought that he found but that when he was called, he came near and obeyed.<sup>36</sup> HOMILIES ON ROMANS I.<sup>37</sup>

**A SERVANT FIRST.** THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA: All things are servants of Christ, and he is Lord of all. Therefore Paul calls himself a servant first of all, thereby encouraging the rest to do likewise. He also recalls the unique lordship of the Son but not in such a way as to deny the lordship of the Father, which is confessed by everybody. In saying that he was set apart, he showed

<sup>25</sup>See Is 27:9. <sup>26</sup>CSEL 81.1:9, 11. <sup>27</sup>See Ex 29:24, 26, 28. <sup>28</sup>NTA 15:57. <sup>29</sup>Acts 9:4. <sup>30</sup>NTA 15:213. <sup>31</sup>See 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1; Phil 1:1. <sup>32</sup>Mk 3:16. <sup>33</sup>Ps 119:91. <sup>34</sup>See Rom 6:17-18. <sup>35</sup>Josh 1:2. <sup>36</sup>See Acts 9:1-19. <sup>37</sup>NPNF 1 11:338.

that he was not only called but also chosen from among many as useful for the preaching of the gospel. PAULINE COMMENTARY FROM THE GREEK CHURCH.<sup>38</sup>

**CALLED AND SET APART.** [PSEUDO-]CONSTANTIUS: Just as the names of other saints both in the Old and in the New Testament, e. g., Abraham and Peter and the rest, were changed in accordance with the advance and increase of their merits, so also Paul, as he grew in the grace of God, changed his name. He was a servant not out of fear but out of love, as he himself says: "It is no longer I who live, but Christ lives in me."<sup>39</sup> He reveals that he was not only "called" to the grace of apostleship but "set apart" for preaching to the Gentiles, as he himself records: "We to the Gentiles and they to the circumcision."<sup>40</sup> Called therefore by Christ to the apostleship, he was set apart for preaching to the Gentiles by the Holy Spirit, so that it might be revealed that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all of one substance. THE HOLY LETTER OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.<sup>41</sup>

**CALLED FORTH.** AUGUSTINE: By these two words, *called* and *set apart*, Paul distinguishes between the church, which is acceptable to God, and the synagogue, whose glory has faded away. The church (i.e., *ecclesia*) is so called because it "calls forth": the synagogue, because it "gathers together." RUDIMENTARY EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 2.1-3, 5.<sup>42</sup>

**PAUL'S NEW NAME.** PELAGIUS<sup>43</sup>: Do we wonder why he writes *Paul*, given that he was called Saul before? Doubtless he did this following the habit of the saints. When they advanced in virtue they were addressed with a different name, so that they might be new people even in name, e.g., Abraham, Sarah and Cephas.<sup>44</sup> . . . Paul earned the office of an apostle by faithful and matchless service. He was set apart in Acts 13:2. *Gospel* . . . means "good news", i.e., of Christ's birth, suffering, resurrection and ascension into heaven. PELAGIUS'S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.<sup>45</sup>

**THE SALUTATION OF GRACE.** THEODORET OF CYR: Civil governors and military commanders put their titles at the beginning of their letters in order to boast and show off. But St. Paul says that he was born out of due time, that he is the chief of sinners and that he is unworthy of his apostleship. Nevertheless, when writing his letters, he starts with the words imposed on him by grace, for the benefit of those who receive them. For when the recipients realized the importance of the person who was writing to them, they would read the letter with greater earnestness and attention. INTERPRETATION OF THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS.<sup>46</sup>

## 1:2 *The Promised Gospel*

**THE PROMISE OF THE GOSPEL.** ORIGEN: You the reader must decide whether this is to be understood simply of the gospel which was promised by God through the prophetic Scriptures or whether this is said in order to distinguish it from another gospel, which John calls "eternal" in the book of Revelation.<sup>47</sup> This gospel will be revealed when the shadow passes and the truth comes, when death will be swallowed up and eternity restored. It seems that those eternal years of which the prophet spoke also belong to this eternal gospel: "I had the eternal years in mind."<sup>48</sup>

It must be understood that what was predicted by the prophets concerning Christ was also predicted concerning the gospel, although the Evangelist Mark seems to make a distinction between Christ and the gospel when he says: "Whoever has left father or mother . . . for my sake or for the gospel."<sup>49</sup> But if promises referring specifically to the gospel are what is required, you will find an abun-

<sup>38</sup>NTA 15:113. <sup>39</sup>Gal 2:20. <sup>40</sup>Gal 2:9. <sup>41</sup>ENPK 2:19-20. <sup>42</sup>ERIE, Migne PL 35 col. 2089. <sup>43</sup>Though he was officially a heretic, Pelagius's commentaries were widely read and preserved for future generations under other names. They were repeatedly edited for orthodoxy and recycled, so that what we have may be regarded as representative of much patristic thought and exegesis, excluding that which is ecumenically censured as Pelagianism. <sup>44</sup>Gen 17:5; Jn 1:42. <sup>45</sup>PCR 59. <sup>46</sup>IER, Migne PG 82 col. 48. <sup>47</sup>Rev 14:6. <sup>48</sup>Ps 77:5 (LXX 76:5). <sup>49</sup>Mk 10:29.

dance of them in the prophets, to wit: "The Lord will give his word with great power to those who preach the good news,"<sup>50</sup> and: "How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news."<sup>51</sup> COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.<sup>52</sup>

**PROMISED BEFOREHAND.** AMBROSIAS:TER:

"Which he had promised." In order to prove that the hope of faith was fulfilled and completed in Christ, Paul says that Christ's gospel was already promised by God beforehand, so that on the basis of the promise Paul could teach that Christ was the perfect author of [eternal] life.

"Through his prophets." In order to show even more clearly that the coming of Christ was a saving event, Paul also indicated the people through whom God gave his promise, so that it might be seen from them just how true and magnificent the promise is. For nobody uses great forerunners to announce some minor thing.

"In the holy scriptures." Paul added this on top of his argument in order to give greater confidence to believers and show his approval of the law. The Scriptures are holy because they condemn sins and because in them is contained the covenant of the one God and the incarnation of the Son of God for the salvation of mankind, by the evidence of numerous signs. COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLES.<sup>53</sup>

**THROUGH HIS PROPHETS.** SEVERIAN: Paul says "his prophets" because there are also prophets of idols, and by the word *his* he distinguishes one type of prophet from another and one gospel from another. For there are many gospels, but they are moral and temporary, whereas that of Christ proclaims in the holy Scriptures the enjoyment of eternal blessedness. These prophets are *his* because they are not of another god but of the Father of Christ. PAULINE COMMENTARY FROM THE GREEK CHURCH.<sup>54</sup>

**WORD AS ACT.** CHRYSOSTOM: When God is about to do some great thing, he announces it a long time before in order to accustom men's ears

to it, so that when it comes they will accept it. The prophets not only spoke, but they wrote what they spoke; nor did they merely write, but by their very actions they represented what would come, e.g., Abraham when he offered up Isaac;<sup>55</sup> and Moses when he lifted up the serpent,<sup>56</sup> and when he spread out his hands against Amalek,<sup>57</sup> and when he offered the paschal Lamb.<sup>58</sup> HOMILIES ON ROMANS I.<sup>59</sup>

**WHETHER THERE ARE PROPHETS AMONG THE GENTILES.** AUGUSTINE:

The prophets arose from the Jewish people, and Paul testifies that the gospel, in which believers are justified by faith, had been promised earlier through them. . . . For there are Gentile prophets as well, in whom also are found some things which they heard of Christ and prophesied. This sort of thing is even said about the Sibyl [Virgil, *Eclogues* 4.4] . . . but the writings of the Gentiles, so very full of superstitious idolatry, ought not to be considered holy just because they say something about Christ. RUDIMENTARY EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 3.<sup>60</sup>

**NO OTHER CHRIST.** PELAGIUS: Paul preaches no other Christ than the Christ whose gospel the prophets promised would go forth from Jerusalem.<sup>61</sup> He declares that they are prophets of God and that the Scriptures which prophesied about Christ are holy. This entire passage contradicts the Manichaeans,<sup>62</sup> for it says that the gospel was promised beforehand through God's prophets and in the Holy Scriptures and that according to the flesh Christ came from the lineage of David, i.e., from the Virgin Mary, just as Isaiah had foretold.<sup>63</sup> PELAGIUS'S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.<sup>64</sup>

**WHY SCRIPTURE IS HOLY.** THEODORET OF

CYR: The Old Testament is full of predictions of

<sup>50</sup>Ps 68:11 (LXX 67:11). <sup>51</sup>Is 52:7. <sup>52</sup>CER 1:90, 94. <sup>53</sup>CSEL 81.1:13.

<sup>54</sup>NTA 15:213. <sup>55</sup>See Gen 22:1-19. <sup>56</sup>See Num 21:9; Jn 3:4. <sup>57</sup>See Ex 17:8-13. <sup>58</sup>See Ex 12:1-30. <sup>59</sup>NPNE 1 11:339. <sup>60</sup>ERIE, Migne PL 35 col. 2089. <sup>61</sup>Is 2:3; Mic 4:2. <sup>62</sup>Who demeaned the flesh. <sup>63</sup>Is 7:14.

<sup>64</sup>PCR 59.

Christ's coming. Paul did not call them "holy" by accident but, first of all, in order to teach that he recognized that the Old Testament was divinely inspired, and secondly, in order to exclude all other writings. For only the divinely inspired Scriptures are of any use. Indeed, Paul says that they are the image of the promise which was to come. *INTERPRETATION OF THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS*.<sup>65</sup>

### 1:3 *The Gospel Concerning His Son*

**SON OF GOD AND OF DAVID.** *IGNATIUS*: I glorify God . . . that you are fully persuaded that our Lord was truly of the seed of David according to the flesh and the Son of God according to the will and power of God. *EPISTLE TO THE SMYRNEANS I*.<sup>66</sup>

**NEVER A TIME WHEN HE DID NOT EXIST.** *ORIGEN*: Without any doubt, he was made that which he had not previously been according to the flesh. But according to the Spirit he existed beforehand, and there was never a time when he did not exist. *COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS*.<sup>67</sup>

**CONCERNING THE SON.** *AMBROSIAS*: "Concerning his Son." It was fitting, since God promised his own Son to the world, that he should promise him through great men, so that from them it might be known how very powerful the one who was being preached was and so that he might include his future coming in the Holy Scriptures. And what is preached by the Holy Scriptures cannot be shown to be false.

"Who was descended from the seed of David according to the flesh." He who was the Son of God according to the Holy Spirit (that is, according to God, because God is Spirit and without any doubt he is holy), is said to have been made the Son of God according to the flesh by Mary, as it is written: "The Word became flesh."<sup>68</sup> Christ Jesus is both Son of God and Son of Man. As he is truly God, so also he is truly man. For he would not be truly man if he were not of flesh and

soul. Otherwise he would be incomplete. For although he was the Son of God in eternity, he was not known by the creation until, when God wanted him to be revealed for the salvation of mankind, he made him visible and corporeal, because God wanted him to be known through his power to cleanse humans from their sins by overcoming death in the flesh. Therefore he was made of the seed of David. As he was born a king from God before the beginning of time, so also he would acquire birth from a king according to the flesh, being made from a virgin by the work of the Holy Spirit,<sup>69</sup> i.e., born. Thus by the reverence reserved for him because of this fact, he who by his birth was distinguished from the law of nature would be recognized as being more than a man. This had been predicted by Isaiah the prophet: "Behold a virgin will conceive in her womb."<sup>70</sup> Hence when the newborn child appeared to be worthy of honor, a certain providence of God was discerned concerning a future visitation of the human race. *COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLES*.<sup>71</sup>

**A GENERATION ACCORDING TO THE SPIRIT.** *CHRYSOSTOM*: Paul is here hinting that there is also a generation of Christ according to the Spirit. Why then did he begin from the flesh, and not from the higher principle? First, it was because that was where Matthew, Luke and Mark started from too. Anyone who wants to lead men by hand to heaven must lead them upward from below. This was the way the actual dispensation [of grace] was ordered. First, they saw Christ as a man on earth, and then later they understood that he is God. His disciple therefore followed the same order in which Christ himself had framed his teaching. Thus the generation according to the flesh comes first, not because it was first in actual fact but because he was leading his hearers upward from one thing to the other. *HOMILIES ON ROMANS I*.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>65</sup>IER, Migne PG 82 col. 49. <sup>66</sup>ANF 1:86. <sup>67</sup>CER 1:94. <sup>68</sup>Jn 1:1.

<sup>69</sup>See Mt 1:20-23. <sup>70</sup>Is 7:14. <sup>71</sup>CSEL 81.1:15. <sup>72</sup>NPNF 1 11:340.

**ACCORDING TO THE FLESH.** PELAGIUS: Many are sons by grace, but Christ is a son by nature. . . . By adding “according to the flesh” Paul has countered both Photinus and Arius. For if it is true that Christ was made according to the flesh, he most certainly was not made according to the substance of the Word. PELAGIUS’S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.<sup>73</sup>

### 1:4 *Divine and Human, the Son of God*

**DESIGNATED SON OF GOD.** ORIGEN: Let no one think that we are reading more into this text than the meaning itself permits. For although in Latin translations one normally finds the word *predestined* here, the true reading is *designated* and not *predestined*. For *designated* applies to someone who already exists, whereas *predestined* is only applicable to someone who does not yet exist, like those of whom the apostle said: “For those whom he foreknew he also predestined.”<sup>74</sup> . . . Those who do not yet exist may be foreknown and predestined, but he who is and who always exists is not predestined but designated. These things are said by us concerning those who speak blasphemously about the only begotten Son of God and ignoring the difference between *designated* and *predestined* think that Christ is to be numbered among those who were predestined before they existed. But he was never predestined to be the Son, because he always was and is the Son, just as the Father has always been the Father. . . . The apostle makes an essential distinction when he says that “from the seed of David according to the flesh” Christ was made, but as “the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness” he is designated.

And when he says “Son of God” it is not without reason that he adds “in power,” indicating by this that in substance he is the Son according to the Spirit of holiness. For Christ is called “the power of God and the wisdom of God.”<sup>75</sup> . . . But we want to know what to make of the soul of Jesus, if what is born of the seed of David is according to the flesh and what is designated in power is according to the Spirit of holiness the Son of God

and in the substance of God. The soul, however, is not mentioned either with the flesh, with the Spirit of holiness or with the substance of God’s power, although the Savior himself speaks of it elsewhere: “My soul is very sorrowful, even unto death”<sup>76</sup> and: “Now is my soul troubled.”<sup>77</sup> Here he means the soul which he laid aside of his own free will, which went down to hell and of which it is said: “Thou dost not leave my soul in hell.”<sup>78</sup> It is certain that this soul was not born of the seed of David, for he says that what was born of the seed of David was according to the flesh.

The soul cannot be included with the things which are according to the flesh, nor in that which is designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness. I think that the apostle is here following his usual custom, knowing that the soul is always midway between the spirit and the flesh. Either it joins itself to the flesh and is made one with the flesh or it associates itself with the spirit and is made one with the spirit. From this it may be concluded that when the soul is united with the flesh, men become carnal, and that when it is united with the spirit, men become spiritual. For this reason, Paul does not mention the soul independently but only as flesh or spirit. For he knows that the soul must necessarily attach itself to one or other of these, as it does in those to whom he says: “But you are in the flesh and not in the spirit,”<sup>79</sup> and: “Whoever joins himself to a harlot is one body with her,” calling the harlot here “flesh” or “body,” but “whoever joins himself to the Lord is one spirit with him.”<sup>80</sup>

Some people come to us raising the most serious problems as to how Christ can be descended from the seed of David when it is clear that he was not born from Joseph, in whom the line of David descends from one generation to the other. Unpleasant as it is to have to argue according to the literal sense of the text, some of our people answer by saying that Mary was already engaged

<sup>73</sup>PCR 59-60. His creatureliness did not encompass the essence of the Word. <sup>74</sup>Rom 8:29. <sup>75</sup>1 Cor 1:24. <sup>76</sup>Mt 26:38. <sup>77</sup>Jn 12:27. <sup>78</sup>Ps 16:10. <sup>79</sup>Rom 8:9. <sup>80</sup>1 Cor 6:16-17.

to Joseph and that before they came together, she was found with child by the Holy Spirit. According to the law, she was therefore already united to Joseph's tribe and family.<sup>81</sup> . . . Whether you think this line of argument is valid is up to you, dear reader, to decide!

In our opinion, these things must be understood according to the spiritual or allegorical sense, according to which there is no reason why Joseph should not be called the father of Christ, even though he was not his father. For in the generations recorded by Matthew it is stated that Jehoshaphat begat Joram and Joram begat Uzziah,<sup>82</sup> but in 2 Kings it is said that Jehoshaphat begat Ahaziah and Ahaziah begat Joash and Joash begat Amaziah, and Amaziah begat Azariah, who was also called Uzziah.<sup>83</sup> . . . Matthew therefore left three generations out! The explanation for this is surely not to be sought on the historical level but in conjunction with the spiritual understanding. . . . It is therefore enough for us to say, in answer to our opponents, that just as Jesus is called the son of Joseph even though he did not descend from him, and Uzziah is called the son of Joram even though Joram was not his father, so can we also reckon that Christ was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. What we accept as reason and proof in the case of Joram and Joseph must, we think, be allowed to stand in the case of David as well.

How it is that he who is said to have been made from the seed of David according to the flesh should be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead is not hard to understand for anyone who has read that it is written: "For it was fitting that he, for whom and by whom all things exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering."<sup>84</sup> Now the end of Christ's sufferings is the resurrection, and after the resurrection "he will never die again; death no longer has dominion over him."<sup>85</sup> And again: "Even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard him thus no longer."<sup>86</sup> Thus everything which is in Christ is now the Son of God.

How this all relates to him who is designated Son of God in power is hard for us to understand unless we accept that, because of the indissoluble union of the Word and the flesh, everything which pertains to the flesh may be attributed to the Word also, and everything which pertains to the Word may be attributed to the flesh also. For we often find Jesus referred to in either nature as both Christ and Lord. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.<sup>87</sup>

**BECAUSE OF HIS RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD.** AMBROSIAS: When Paul speaks about the Son of God he is pointing out that God is Father, and by adding the Spirit of holiness he indicates the mystery of the Trinity. For he who was incarnate, who obscured what he really was, was then predestined according to the Spirit of holiness to be manifested in power as the Son of God by rising from the dead, as it is written in Psalm 84: "Truth is risen from the earth."<sup>88</sup> For every ambiguity and hesitation was made firm and sure by his resurrection, just as the centurion, when he saw the wonders, confessed that the man placed on the cross was the Son of God.<sup>89</sup> . . . Note that Paul did not say "because of the resurrection of Jesus Christ" but "because of his resurrection from the dead," because the resurrection of Christ led to the general resurrection. For this power and victory in Christ appears to be all the greater, in that a dead man could do the same things as he did when he was alive. By this fact he appeared to dissolve death, in order to redeem us. Thus Paul calls him our Lord. COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLES.<sup>90</sup>

**ACCORDING TO THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS.** CHRYSOSTOM: What is being said here has been made obscure by the complex syntax, and so it is necessary to expound it. What is he actually saying? "We preach," says Paul, "him who was made

<sup>81</sup>See Num 36:8-9 <sup>82</sup>Mt 1:8. <sup>83</sup>2 Kings 8:25; 14:1; 15:1, 7, 30, 32, 34.

<sup>84</sup>Heb 2:10. <sup>85</sup>Rom 6:9. <sup>86</sup>2 Cor 5:16. <sup>87</sup>CER 94-104. <sup>88</sup>Ps 85:12 (LXX 84:12). <sup>89</sup>See Mt 27:54. <sup>90</sup>CSEL 81.1:16.

of David.” But this is obvious. How then is it obvious that this incarnate person was also the Son of God? First of all, it is obvious from the prophets [cf. v. 2], and this source of evidence is no weak one. And then there is the way in which he was born [cf. v. 3], which overruled the rules of nature. Third, there are the miracles which he did, which were a demonstration of much power, for the words *in power* mean this. Fourth, there is the Spirit which he gave to those who believe in him, through whom he made them all holy, which is why he adds: “according to the Spirit of holiness.” For only God could grant such gifts. Fifth, there was the resurrection, for he first and he only raised himself, and he also said that this was a miracle which would stop the mouths even of those who believed arrogantly, for he said: “Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up.”<sup>91</sup> HOMILIES ON ROMANS I.<sup>92</sup>

**IN POWER.** [PSEUDO-]CONSTANTIUS: By saying “in power” Paul shows that Christ was conceived not in the normal human way, but that he was procreated from a virgin, without intercourse with a man. He also tells us the time from which he was called to the apostolate, viz., from that time when Christ the Lord was raised from the dead. THE HOLY LETTER OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.<sup>93</sup>

**HUMAN AND DIVINE.** AUGUSTINE: Paul had to oppose the unbelief of those who accept our Lord Jesus Christ only according to the man whom he put on but do not understand his divinity, which sets him apart from every other creature. RUDIMENTARY EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 4.<sup>94</sup>

**WEAKNESS AND POWER.** AUGUSTINE: Christ is the son of David in weakness according to the flesh but Son of God in power according to the Spirit of sanctification. . . . Weakness relates to David but life eternal to the power of God. RUDIMENTARY EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 5.<sup>95</sup>

**THE ASSUMPTION OF HUMANITY BY THE WORD OF GOD.** AUGUSTINE: Jesus was predestined, so that he who was to be the Son of David according to the flesh should nonetheless be in power the Son of God, according to the Spirit of sanctification, for he was born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary. This is that unique act, performed in an ineffable manner, the assumption of a man by the Word of God, so that he might truly and properly be called at once the Son of God and the Son of Man—the Son of Man because of the man who was assumed, the Son of God because of the only begotten God who assumed him. ON PREDESTINATION 15.31.<sup>96</sup>

**THE GLORIFICATION OF CHRIST.** AUGUSTINE: With respect to this predestination Christ was glorified before the foundation of the world, so that as a result of his resurrection from the dead he might have glory at the Father’s right hand, where he now sits. Thus, when he saw that his predestined glorification had come, in order that what had already been done by predestination might now also take place in fact, he prayed: “Father, glorify thou me in thy own presence with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made.”<sup>97</sup> COMMENTARY ON JOHN 105.8.<sup>98</sup>

**THE RESURRECTION.** PELAGIUS: Christ was predestined as to the spirit of sanctification, so that because of his incorruptibility he might rise again before anyone else and open the way of resurrection for the children of God. . . . The nature of the resurrection (not of all who rise from the dead but of those who belong to Christ) is prefigured by Christ. PELAGIUS’S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.<sup>99</sup>

**SONSHIP IN POWER AND SONSHIP BY GRACE.** CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA: As Christ was predestined to be the Son of God in power, so we too

<sup>91</sup>Jn 2:19. <sup>92</sup>NPNF 1 11:340. <sup>93</sup>ENPK 2:20. <sup>94</sup>ERIE, Migne PL 35 col. 2090. <sup>95</sup>ERIE, Migne PL 35 col. 2091. <sup>96</sup>FC 86:255. <sup>97</sup>Jn 17:5. <sup>98</sup>NPNF 1 7:398. <sup>99</sup>PCR 60.

have been predestined to be sons of God, not however in power but by grace, having been made worthy of such a calling and having received it only by the will of God the Father. There is a big difference here between Emmanuel and us. For even if he was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and so we can say that the Son of God was one of us in his humanity, still, in power and in truth he is the natural Son, and it is through him that we are made sons as well. . . . We stand in the same relation to him as images do to their original. COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.<sup>100</sup>

**RESURRECTION THE PIVOT.** THEODORET OF CYR: Before his crucifixion and death the Lord Jesus Christ did not appear to be God either to the Jews or even to the disciples. For they were offended by human things, as when they saw him eating and drinking and sleeping and urinating, and not even his miracles made them change their minds. So, for instance, when they saw the miracle which he performed with the sea, they said: "Who is this, that even the sea and the winds obey him?"<sup>101</sup> . . . But after he rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, and the Holy Spirit came, and after miracles of every kind which they performed by calling on his adorable name, all those who believed recognized that he was God and the only begotten Son of God. INTERPRETATION OF THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS.<sup>102</sup>

**CONFIRMATION AS THE SON OF GOD.** JOHN OF DAMASCUS: By his miracles and resurrection and by the descent of the Holy Spirit, it was made plain and certain to the world that Christ was the Son of God.<sup>103</sup> ORTHODOX FAITH 4.18.<sup>104</sup>

## 1:5 *Grace and Apostleship*

**TO FAITH THROUGH GRACE.** ORIGEN: Paul says that he has received grace and apostleship through Christ, the mediator between God and men<sup>105</sup>—grace with respect to his patience in many labors and apostleship with respect to his

preaching authority. For Christ was himself called an apostle, i.e., one who was sent by the Father, because he said that he had been sent to preach the gospel to the poor.<sup>106</sup> And everything which is his, he gives to his disciples also. Grace is said to be spread on his lips. For he gives grace to his apostles, by which those who are struggling may say: "I worked harder than any of them, though it was not I but the grace of God which is with me."<sup>107</sup> . . . It was only through the grace which had been given to the apostles that the Gentiles, who were strangers from the covenant of God and from the life of Israel,<sup>108</sup> could believe in the gospel. Through this grace it is said that they came to faith because of the preaching of the apostles, and it is recorded that by the grace given to them the sound of the name of Christ went out into all the world, reaching even those who were at Rome. COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.<sup>109</sup>

**ITS POWER MADE CREDIBLE THROUGH DEEDS.** AMBROSIASTER: After the resurrection Christ was revealed as the Son of God in power. He gave grace to make sinners righteous and appointed apostles, of whom Paul says here that he is one, so that the apostleship might be granted by the grace of God's gift and not because the apostles were Jews. They received this authority from God the Father through Christ the Lord, so that as representatives of the Lord they might make his teaching acceptable by signs of power. Unbelieving Jews, who had been jealous of this power when they saw it in the Savior, were all the more tormented at seeing it admired by the masses in his servants. For power bears witness to the teaching, so that although what is preached is incredible to the world, it might be made credible by deeds. He says that the apostles have been sent to preach the faith to all nations, that they might obey and

<sup>100</sup>Migne PG 74 cols. 773-76. <sup>101</sup>Mt 8:27. <sup>102</sup>IER, Migne PG 82 col. 52. <sup>103</sup>See Mt 3:16; Mk 1:10; Lk 3:22; Jn 1:32. <sup>104</sup>FC 37:381. <sup>105</sup>1 Tim 2:5. <sup>106</sup>See Lk 4:18. <sup>107</sup>1 Cor 15:10. <sup>108</sup>Eph 2:12. <sup>109</sup>CER 1:106.

be saved, that the gift of God may appear to have been granted not only to the Jews but to all the nations, and that this is the will of God, to have pity on all in Christ and through Christ, by the preaching of his ambassadors. COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLES.<sup>110</sup>

**NOT OF OURSELVES.** CHRYSOSTOM: See the candor of the servant. He wants nothing to be his own but everything to be his master's. And indeed it was the Spirit who gave him this freedom. . . . Paul says: "We have not achieved the apostleship by ourselves." It was not by much labor and toil that we were given this dignity, but we received grace, and the successful result is a part of the heavenly gift. . . . It was the apostles' duty to go about and preach, but conviction belonged to God, who worked in them. HOMILIES ON ROMANS I.<sup>111</sup>

**GRACE, THEN APOSTLESHIP.** AUGUSTINE: Paul preserves the main point of his case very well, so that no one would dare say that he has been led to the gospel because of the merits of his previous life. How could one claim this, when even the apostles themselves . . . could not have received their own apostleship unless they had first . . . received grace, which cleanses and justifies sinners? RUDIMENTARY EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 6.<sup>112</sup>

**SENT BY THE HOLY SPIRIT.** PELAGIUS: Paul received grace in baptism and apostleship when he was sent by the Holy Spirit,<sup>113</sup> for *apostle* means "sent" in Greek. The purpose of this was that the Gentiles might submit not to the law but to faith. PELAGIUS'S COMMENTARY ON ROMANS.<sup>114</sup>

### 1:6 *Belonging to Christ*

**DIFFERENT CALLINGS.** ORIGEN: Paul is said to be called to be an apostle, and the Romans are also called, though not to be apostles. Rather they are called to be holy in the obedience of faith. We have already spoken above about the

different callings.<sup>115</sup> COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.<sup>116</sup>

**CALLED AND SENT.** AMBROSIASTER: This is by the mission of us who are preaching the name of Christ to all the nations, among whom you too have been called, because the gift of God has been sent to all, so that when they hear that they have been called along with others, they will know that they must not act as if they are under the law, since the other nations accepted the faith of Christ without the law of Moses. COMMENTARY ON PAUL'S EPISTLES.<sup>117</sup>

**INCLUDING YOURSELVES.** APOLLINARIS OF LAODICEA: Paul says this in order to show that the Romans too, made up as they were of all the nations inhabiting the world, rightly accepted the preaching of his message. PAULINE COMMENTARY FROM THE GREEK CHURCH.<sup>118</sup>

**THE ROMANS WITH OTHERS.** CHRYSOSTOM: Paul does not say that God called the others along with the Romans but the Romans along with the others. HOMILIES ON ROMANS I.<sup>119</sup>

**SALVATION TO JEWS AND OTHERS.** AUGUSTINE: Paul teaches here that this salvation had come not only to the Jews, as some Jewish Christians thought. RUDIMENTARY EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 6.<sup>120</sup>

**APPOINTED.** THEODORET OF CYR: Paul tells them here that he is not doing anything improper, nor invading fields assigned to others, for God had appointed him to preach to the Gentiles. INTERPRETATION OF THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS.<sup>121</sup>

### 1:7 *Grace and Peace to the Saints*

<sup>110</sup>CSEL 81.1:16-17. <sup>111</sup>NPNF 1 11:340. <sup>112</sup>ERIE, Migne PL 35 col. 2092. <sup>113</sup>Acts 13:2. <sup>114</sup>PCR 60. <sup>115</sup>See 1 Cor 12:28. <sup>116</sup>CER 1:106-8. <sup>117</sup>CSEL 81.1:19. <sup>118</sup>NTA 15:57. <sup>119</sup>NPNF 1 11:341. <sup>120</sup>ERIE, Migne PL 35 col. 2092. <sup>121</sup>IER, PG 82 col. 52

BUY THE BOOK!

[ivpress.com/romans-accs](http://ivpress.com/romans-accs)