

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

The Authorship of Romans xv. xvi.

PROFESSOR W. H. RYDER.

ANDOVER, MASS.

THESE two chapters are found, without important omissions, in all Greek manuscripts and all manuscripts of versions which are now extant.

The form and order of the *Textus Receptus* appears in \aleph BCDE, in a few cursives, in the Latin of the bilingual texts, d, e, f, the manuscripts of the Vulgate, Peshitto, Bohairic, etc.

On the other hand, the long doxology (16²³⁻²⁷) is found between chs. 14 and 15 in L and more than two hundred cursives, in manuscripts of the Harkleian Syriac, in Greek Lectionaries, and in Chrysostom, Theodoret, and John of Damascus.

Cursive 66 inserts the word $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ after 16²⁴, then adds the long doxology with a note in the margin, saying: "In the ancient copies the end of the epistle is here, but the rest [the long doxology] is found at the end of the fourteenth chapter."

The Vulgate codex Amiatinus has fifty-one titles of sections. The fiftieth reads, "The peril of him who grieves his brother by his meat," etc.; the fifty-first, "On the mystery of the Lord, kept secret before his passion but after his passion revealed," suggesting that the Latin manuscript to which these titles were first added placed the doxology after ch. 14. Similar titles in Codex Fuldensis also omit the contents of 15-16²⁴.

The uncials AP, the cursives 5, 17, and the Armenian version contain the doxology in both places, while F and G omit it in both places; but Gg have a blank space after 14, and f adds at 16²⁴ the doxology taken from the Vulgate.

The manuscripts, then, which preserve the Greek text in common use place the doxology after ch. 14. This is also the order in Greek service books, in the writings of Greek fathers, and, to some extent, in Syriac and Latin versions. But the more carefully edited Greek manuscripts place it at the close of the epistle. Those authorities

which insert the doxology in both places, and those which exclude it from both, give evidence that their scribes were acquainted with manuscripts which thus differed in locating the passage. This seems to prove that the order of L and the cursives was found in manuscripts before the date of A and P.

We have, further, the direct testimony of Origen that both forms were current in his day. His commentary follows the order of \aleph BCDE, but in his remarks upon the section 16²⁵⁻²⁷ he says: "Marcion . . . entirely removed this paragraph (*caput hoc*), and not only this, but also from this place (*et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco*), where it is written, 'but everything which is not of faith is sin,' even to the end, he cut away all. In other copies, however, that is in those which have not been corrupted by Marcion, we find this same paragraph differently placed. For in some codices, after the place which we mentioned above, that is, 'but whatever is not of faith is sin,' then follows immediately (*statim cohaerens habetur*), 'but to him who is able to establish you.' But other codices have it at the end, as it is now placed."

This passage is preserved only in the Latin of Rufinus, but it is perfectly clear and consistent with itself and with the other facts already noted and the inferences which they suggest. We learn thus that, one hundred years before our oldest manuscripts were written, some codices contained the doxology after ch. 14 and others after 16, and that, if one form was a literary revision of the other, that revision was made before Origen's time, and, apparently, without his knowledge. The two forms may have existed therefore in Greek manuscripts before the Syriac and Latin versions were made. The fact, then, that the Peshitto and, in general, the copies of Latin versions which have come down to us place the doxology at the end of 16 simply shows that the translators or copyists preferred that order, as did Origen. That they were led to their decision by critical, historical study is improbable in itself, and is made still more doubtful by the fact that Origen makes no appeal to that kind of evidence in stating his own decision. The question of the original position of the doxology presents itself to us, then, as one of inherent probability simply; and I venture to affirm that it is far more probable that the doxology was transferred from the earlier place, where it seems sadly to break the connection, to the far more appropriate place at the close of the epistle, than that the converse transposition was made and so extensively adopted; that the form, therefore, which places the doxology between 14 and 15 is the earlier, and the other is due to a liter-

ary revision made before 200 A.D., perhaps twenty-five or even fifty years before.¹

But the paragraph from Origen makes another statement of even greater interest in its bearing upon the subject of our discussion. Origen affirms that Marcion removed entirely this section, viz. the doxology, and not only this but also cut away all that follows the words, "But everything which is not of faith is sin." This, certainly, is the only meaning that can be given to the Latin text. Dr. Hort would change *caput hoc* to *caput hic*, and *ab eo loco* to *in eo loco* (as one manuscript of Origen has it), making Origen say that Marcion removed the *caput*, viz. the doxology *here*, at the end of the epistle, but also *in* the place where it is written, "But everything that is not of faith is sin." But as Sanday remarks, the words, *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*, are meaningless unless they apply to the contents of chs. 15 and 16. Moreover, *caput* needs *hoc* to complete its sense.

Origen was then acquainted with a form of the epistle which ended with the fourteenth chapter. This he attributed to mutilation at the hands of Marcion. He gives no reasons for his opinion and makes no appeal to historical evidence or tradition. Was he correct in his inference, or have we reason to believe that Marcion simply used copies which came into his hands in this briefer form? And if this was the form of Marcion's text, is there reason to believe that it is the earlier and, probably, the original form?

It is interesting to observe that, with the exception of Clement of Alexandria and Origen, there is no evidence that any ante-Nicene father quoted from chs. 15, 16, although other parts of the epistle are frequently cited. I can but think that Hort, Sanday, and Gifford treat this fact too lightly when they attribute this omission to mere accident. It is true, indeed, that 1 Cor. 16 is not quoted in these early writings, unless the "Maranatha" of Didache 10 is such a quotation. But that chapter, like Rom. 16, deals almost entirely with merely personal matters. On the other hand, Rom. 15 deals with subjects of general and permanent interest. In the direct arguments against Marcion in Irenæus and Tertullian, as in Epiphanius also, the omission of quotations from these chapters may be due to the purpose to use only texts whose force Marcion and his followers would admit; though it is surprising that none of these writers suggest that Marcion has removed these chapters. This certainly does not account for the neglect of these chapters elsewhere.

¹ Zahn holds that the doxology was originally after 14²⁸ (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1897, i. 269-272).

But is there reason to suppose that the contents of these chapters would offend Marcion and induce him to remove them? Sanday holds that the quotations from the Old Testament in 15 might lead him to omit the section. But Marcion does not seem to have omitted, with any consistency, those parts of the books of the New Testament accepted by him which contained Old Testament quotations. Tertullian in arguing against him cites at least nine times from sentences in Romans which contain or consist of such quotations, and the reconstructed Gospel of Luke, as used by Marcion, does not, in general, omit such sentences. Sanday holds, further, that Marcion must have excluded 15⁴, "which," he says, "directly contradicts the whole of his special system." He adds that Marcion "most certainly could not have used" the sentence in vs.⁸, "I say that Christ has become a minister of circumcision for the truth of God." But it is hardly less surprising to find Paul using the language of vs.⁸, than it would be to find the same sentiment in Marcion. The commendation of the charitable consideration of weak brethren, the emphasis laid upon a ministry to the Gentiles, and the praise of the Christians at Rome must have been entirely congenial to Marcion, and if a few sentences jarred upon his convictions, he could easily remove them, or interpret them consistently with his system. Moreover, the theory that Marcion removed these chapters does not explain the position of the doxology after ch. 14, nor the absence of quotations in the early fathers; for I cannot think that Marcion's excisions from the text of the New Testament books had much influence over the text preserved in the Church. He was, from the first, looked upon as a heretic, and was freely charged with tampering with the text. The tendency must have been to resist rather than to accept changes made by him or his followers. When he and the early fathers agree in the text, they are two witnesses whose combined testimony is very strong. There is, as we have seen, reason to believe that these two witnesses give testimony in favor of omitting Rom. 15, 16, from the epistle as it first circulated.²

These facts which have been noted certainly suggest the hypothesis that the Epistle to the Romans, in its earliest form, ended with ch. 14, or, more probably, with the doxology appended to that chapter.

² In supporting the hypothesis that Tertullian used a copy of Romans which did not contain 15, 16, I have not appealed to the fact that he quotes the sentence, "the judgment seat of Christ," Rom. 14¹⁰, as found in *clausula* (*Contra Marc.* 5, 14), for the term is too indefinite to prove much.

But do the form and contents of 15, 16, give any support to this hypothesis ?

So far as choice of words and of forms of expression is concerned, there is nothing which disproves the Pauline authorship of these chapters. The language is the Hellenistic *patois* of Paul's Epistles, which must, indeed, have been the epistolary style of Paul's associates and correspondents ; for one man could hardly write familiar letters in a style which was unfamiliar to his generation and his circle. There are, however, some minor peculiarities in these chapters which suggest, though they do not prove, another hand.

(1) The quotations in 15¹⁰⁻¹² are each introduced by the phrase *καὶ πάλιν*. Though Paul often groups quotations, this phrase occurs elsewhere, in writings attributed to him, only in 1 Cor. 3²⁰. It occurs several times in Hebrews.

(2) The expression, *λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς* (15⁸), is a singular one for Paul to use. He uses *διάκονος* elsewhere of Christ in a question expressing surprise and repudiation ; *ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος* ; (Gal. 2¹⁷). Paul is not in the habit of applying to Christ terms which denote conventional human relations, such as *διάκονος*, *παῖς*, *ἀπόστολος*, *ιερεύς*, *ἀρχιερεύς*. The Apostle is not always careful to guard against a misunderstanding or misuse of his language, but the phrase *διάκονος περιτομῆς*, without explanation or qualification, seems almost like a challenge to a perversion of the underlying doctrine of the epistle.⁸

(3) The well-developed figure from the ritual of the Old Testament which appears in 15¹⁰ is not quite what we should expect in Paul. The word *ἱερουργεῖν* does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament, though it is found in Philo and Josephus ; nor does Paul use the noun *ιερεύς*. The offering of Gentiles to God as a sacrifice is not a Pauline conception. Christ is a *προσφορὰ καὶ θυσία τῷ θεῷ* (Eph. 5²), and alms are *προσφοραὶ* (Acts 24¹⁷). The bodies of Christians may be offered to God as a *θυσία* (Rom. 12¹ ; compare Phil. 2¹⁷), as also their generous gifts (Phil. 4¹⁸). But in these cases suffering or self-denial is expressed. That a Christian priest should offer other men to God seems remote from Paul's way of thinking.

It is freely admitted that such examples of rare or unparalleled expressions do not go far towards proving diversity of authorship,

⁸ The point is not that the thought expressed in 15⁸⁻⁹ is not Pauline, but that the form in which the thought is expressed is without parallel in Paul's writings, and does not easily harmonize with the use of *περιτομή* in the argument of Rom. 2-4.

though they may furnish some confirmatory evidence of a theory which must find its main support in other facts.

It should be observed that what appears, at first sight, a close connection between the last verses of ch. 14 and the first verses of ch. 15 proves, on more careful inspection, to be more apparent than real. The argument of the epistle closes with 14²³, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Down to this point the whole thought has centred in the doctrine of salvation by faith. Even the hortatory section, 12-14, rests upon this conception of life and duty (12³ 14^{1. 2. 22. 23}). In 15, on the other hand, the appeal is to charity rather than to faith (15¹⁻⁷). In 14 the freedom of faith is emphasized, which may be limited in its application by charity; in 15, the authority of charity is urged without reference to the freedom of faith. The word *πίστις* is not found in 15-16²⁴, and *πιστεύω* only in 15¹³.

There are certain biographical and historical notes which do not fit the time and circumstances under which the main body of the Epistle to the Romans was written.

In 15¹⁹ the author says that his missionary labors had covered a field extending from Jerusalem to Illyricum. We have in the Acts a detailed report of Paul's missionary journeys, which gives no evidence that he ever visited Illyricum. At Berea he was within about sixty miles of its boundary, but he went from there directly to the sea and sailed for Athens (Acts 17^{14. 15}). That the author means simply that he had come within sight of the Illyrian mountains, or had met certain Illyrians residing in Macedonia, as Sanday suggests, seems to attribute to Paul a rather foolish exaggeration. It is, indeed, possible that in his last journey from Ephesus to Greece (Acts 20^{1. 2}), Paul crossed the Illyrian border;⁴ but there is no evidence of this. The author is not referring to the extent of his travels, but of his successful missionary labor. He had "fulfilled the Gospel of Christ" from Jerusalem to Illyricum. Paul's labors in Macedonia are frequently referred to in his epistles, and are described in the Acts, but nowhere else is there a hint that he labored in Illyricum. Moreover, the singular expression *πεπληρωκένας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, a phrase without parallel elsewhere in the New Testament, does not seem to describe the first, brief proclamation of the Gospel, or a mere initiation of converts into the Christian life and society. The word *πληρώω* is used elsewhere of the fulfilment of a prophecy or promise, the perfecting of a revelation as in

⁴ Compare Zahn, *Einleitung* i. 293, 294.

Matt. 5¹⁷ Col. 1²⁸, the complete obedience to a law as in Rom. 13¹, or the completion of an appointed service, as in Acts 12²⁵ 13²⁵ 14²⁸ Col. 4¹⁷. It seems to describe here the perfecting of an evangelical work already begun, somewhat as in 1 (3) Kings 1¹⁴, *πληρώσω τοὺς λόγους σου* means, "I will confirm thy words." While the meaning of the phrase is not quite certain, it seems, as interpreted in vs.²⁰, to describe the labors of an evangelist who had traversed a region where the Gospel had already entered and who sought out neglected places and souls and knit together scattered Christian communities.

The author's report of the aim and method of his ministry, contained in 15^{20, 21}, seems, at first glance, quite like the Apostle's conception and method of work. But upon closer examination the thoughts expressed do not seem to harmonize with the spirit of the Epistle to the Romans; nor are they fitted to secure the favorable interest of the Christians at Rome in the writer or his message. He does not in these verses lay emphasis upon his call to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles, but simply upon his aim to reach the unevangelized from Jerusalem to Illyricum, seeking places where Christ had not been named, avoiding building on another man's foundation. Why should Paul say this to a Christian community at Rome, a community which had received the Gospel from others, and whose members were sufficiently mature in their Christian life and thought to read with interest and profit such a treatise as the Epistle to the Romans? How could he say in such a letter to such a community, "I am zealous to prosecute the work of evangelization, not where Christ is named, that I may not build on another's foundation"? How could he say that this was the controlling purpose in his ministry, when he had already said to these mature Christians, "God is my witness that I am continually praying, if in any way I may be permitted to come to you, that I may impart a spiritual gift to you, that I may have some fruit among you, as also among the rest of the Gentiles" (1^{10, 11, 13})? This whole epistle aims to do, for the Christians at Rome, the very thing which, in these verses, he says he avoids, viz. to build *ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον*. Is there not, also, a lack of taste and tact in thus emphasizing, in a letter to these comparative strangers, the somewhat narrow and personal features of his ministry? The author would be far from saying that this is the only or the most important way of prosecuting evangelical work. He simply says: This is my way. But what is there, in the epistle as a whole, or in Paul's relation with the Romans, to suggest or make

significant such a piece of autobiography? On the other hand, how appropriate and important this is, if it is in the report of some evangelist, some member or presbyter of the Church at Rome, to the church whose missionary he is.

The 23d verse also contains an expression which does not seem to fit Paul's circumstances when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. *Μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις*, the author says. But had Paul no longer a place in Corinth and its vicinity when he wrote to the Romans? It is true, indeed, that when he was prepared to sail from Corinth to Syria, he learned of a Jewish plot which led him to give up the voyage (Acts 20³). But this led simply to a leisurely journey by land, during which there was much preaching and Christian labor. Paul at Corinth was far from feeling that he had fulfilled the Gospel of Christ, and nothing appears in his external relations which could have led him to say that there was no longer place for him in those regions. But an evangelist, with a definite and limited mission, which had been conscientiously and successfully prosecuted, might easily thus express himself.

Still more significant, in its bearing upon this question, is the author's announcement of the ulterior aim of his contemplated visit at Rome. "I have had a desire," he says, "for a number of years to come to you, whenever I make a journey to Spain, for I hope when I pass through to see you and to be sent forward thither by you, if first I may in some measure enjoy your society" (15²⁴). "I shall go forward through you to Spain" (vs.²⁸). The visit to Rome is purely incidental; Spain is the object of his desire. He longs to see his friends at Rome (vs.²³); he will rest himself with them (vs.²⁸); but they must help him forward to the newer regions beyond. There is no thought of a call to labor at Rome. He is not intent on imparting some spiritual grace to the Romans, and on having some fruit among them, as in 1¹⁰⁻¹³. How different the tone of *ἐλπίζω διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς* (vs.²⁴) and *δεῖ με Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν* (Acts 19²¹). It seems almost impossible that Paul should have spoken of his long-desired first visit to Rome in this incidental way, or that, after writing such a letter as Rom. 1-14, he should refer to a contemplated visit as only an occasion for enjoying the society of Christian friends, seeing their faces, having a restful time with them, and then hurrying on, with their assistance, to the distant country of Spain. Moreover, the author says that he has had the desire to visit the Romans on his way to Spain, *ἀπὸ ἱκανῶν* (or *παλλῶν*) *ἐτῶν* (vs.²³). Six or seven years before writing the

Epistle to the Romans, Paul sailed, under the impulse of a vision, from Troas to Macedonia, and began his labors in Europe. Is it likely that for many of these years he had cherished a plan to prosecute this mission to the Pillars of Hercules? It takes time for such great plans to develop even in an Apostle's mind. But a Roman Christian, who had caught the spirit of the Apostle, and to whom Spain would not be the distant land which it must have been to a Palestinian Jew who had been even as far west as Corinth, could easily cherish and express such a plan; and if for a number of years he had been prosecuting this eastern mission, he would say: Through these years the desire has been growing within me to carry this same Gospel to the far West.

The task which makes immediate demand upon the time of the writer of these chapters, viz. to carry to the poor among the saints at Jerusalem a contribution of money collected in Macedonia and Achaia (15²⁵⁻²⁷), reminds us, certainly, of the contribution which was a matter of so much thought and anxiety to Paul (1 Cor. 16¹⁻⁴ 2 Cor. 8-9), and which, according to Acts 24¹⁷, Paul brought with him in his last journey to Jerusalem. The offerings were gathered in the same regions and for the same purpose. But this does not furnish conclusive evidence of their identity. For Jews of the dispersion to send offerings to Jerusalem was a well-established custom. Compare Philo, *Legat. ad Caium*, 40, Josephus, *Antt.*, xviii. 9. 1, and observe the word *προσφοραί* in Acts 24¹⁷. The Christians at Jerusalem had repeatedly received such contributions (Acts 11²². 30 Gal. 2¹⁰ 1 Cor. 16¹). Was it not natural, almost inevitable, that an evangelist, prosecuting his mission from Jerusalem to Illyricum, thus beginning his journey with personal knowledge of the needy condition of Christians at Jerusalem, and passing through regions where, a few years before, Paul had kept this object of charity before the minds of the churches for more than a year (2 Cor. 9²), should follow Paul's example and make a successful appeal for the same object?

The sixteenth chapter presents peculiar difficulties to one who contends for the unity of the Epistle. Some of these have been so frequently and fully discussed that it is necessary only to call attention to them.

It is certainly surprising that Paul should show such intimate personal friendship for so many persons in a distant community which he had never visited. He sends his salutations, in most cases with some affectionate or descriptive term or sentence, to twenty-four persons whose names he mentions, to one woman whom he calls the

mother of Rufus and his own mother, to the sister of Nereus, besides the members of the households of Aristobulus and Narcissus, the brethren who are with Asyncritus and his associates, the saints with Olympas and his companions, and the church which is in the house of Prisca and Aquila. Paul had, indeed, known Prisca and Aquila in Corinth and Ephesus. He may have met others in his missionary labors in Asia and in Greece, though probably the majority of the Church were slaves who could not have travelled freely. Some of them he may have known only through common friends. But too many persons are mentioned, the proofs of personal acquaintance and friendship are too numerous, and the knowledge of the present conditions and relations of these brethren and sisters is too intimate to be satisfied with this explanation. We feel this when we try to conceive of a prominent Christian in Boston, a Secretary of the American Board, for example, sending such greetings to Christians in a city which he had never visited, in Constantinople or Yokohama. It should be noted that the first fourteen chapters of the Epistle give no suggestion of such intimate acquaintance with persons at Rome. Paul had a deep Christian love for these brethren which frequently finds expression; but no other Epistle of Paul gives less evidence of personal knowledge of the individuals or the special conditions of the community addressed. It is in striking contrast in this respect with the letters to the Thessalonians, the Galatians, and the Corinthians, which were written in the same period of the Apostle's life and labor.⁵

There is a consciousness of church organization and life which does not appear in the epistle until we reach this chapter. Indeed, in Rom. 1-14, we have no suggestion of an organized Christian community at Rome; the word *ἐκκλησία* is not found, there is no mention of church officers, no suggestion of government or discipline, and no reference to Christian assemblies. We need not infer from this that there was no organic life among the Roman Christians, though it seems probable that it was not very fully developed. However that may be, these chapters lay no emphasis upon the responsibilities and duties of an organized church. But in the sixteenth chapter the

⁵ Zahn observes that Paul was not in the habit of sending such personal greetings. The epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians close without them. Zahn infers that the long list of salutations here is due to a desire on the part of Paul to gain the good will of a community which he had never visited. A more natural inference is that the chapter of salutations was written by a man whose epistolary habit differed from Paul's.

thought of the significance of the church is a ruling thought. The word *ἐκκλησία* occurs five times in various relations. Phoebe is a *διάκονος* of the church at Cenchreæ; the house of Prisca and Aquila is the meeting-place of a church; all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks; all the churches of Christ send salutations; and Gaius is a host of the whole church. This does not prove, but it does suggest, a later date, when the significance of ecclesiastical connection and organization had come more fully to the consciousness of the Roman Christians.

There are other intimations in the chapter that the church at Rome had been in existence for a considerable time. Mary has already rendered much service to you (vs.⁶), Persis also has labored much in the Lord (vs.¹²), Andronicus and Junias have become distinguished among the Apostles (vs.⁷), Apelles has been tested and proved in Christ (vs.¹⁰). Moreover, false teachers had appeared and had sown divisions and offences (vs.¹⁷⁻¹⁸). These are described as men who *δουλεύουσιν τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ*. Whether their fault was self-indulgence or asceticism, the judgment pronounced upon them is very different from the spirit which pervades the instruction contained in 14. How could the Apostle discuss the question of eating and drinking in the calm and impartial tone which pervades that chapter, if he was writing to people who were in danger of being led away by those who served their own belly? In all these earlier chapters, the Apostle's interest centres in a certain conception of the Christian life. He exhorts his readers to accept this principle and to live by it; but he has no reproofs for them, nor does he express anxieties about them. He says to them, in a generous hyperbole, and without qualification, *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῃ τῷ κόσμῳ* (1⁸). The author of this chapter is acquainted with that commendation and repeats it, though with a significant change: *ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο* (16¹⁹).⁶

The biographical notes in this chapter point to a later date than

⁶ The word *ὑπακοή* is not a favorite with Paul; indeed, it expresses a conception of the Christian life which suggests the bondage of the law rather than the freedom of faith. He usually qualifies or interprets it by some added term, as *ὑπακοὴ πίστεως* (1⁶ 16²⁰), *ὑπακοὴ εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (6¹⁰); or uses it where a figure of speech requires it, as 2 Cor. 10⁵⁻⁶; or of obedience to a human leader (2 Cor. 7²⁶ Philemon 21). Only here and 15¹⁸ is the noun used to denote, without further interpretation, the content of Christian character. It defines the obedience of Christ in Rom. 5¹⁹; compare Phil. 2⁸. The verb is used of obedience to the Gospel in Rom. 10¹⁶ 2 Thess. 1⁸ (compare Rom. 6¹⁷), but more frequently of obedience to parents, masters, etc.

that of the body of the epistle, and to some other author than the Apostle Paul.

First among these are the notes concerning Prisca and Aquila. We are informed in the Acts that Paul made the acquaintance of these people in Corinth, during his first visit in that city (Acts 18²). They accompanied him to Ephesus (vs. 19. 26). They are still in Ephesus, and their house is the meeting-place of a Christian congregation when Paul writes the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. 16¹⁹). As this epistle was written before Pentecost (1 Cor. 16⁶), and Paul was at Philippi on his return from Corinth to Palestine by the next Passover (Acts 20^{6. 16}), it seems probable that something less than a year passed between the date at which Prisca and Aquila formed the centre of an *ἐκκλησία* at Corinth, and the date of the Roman Epistle. That in these few months they should have broken up their home at Ephesus, should have made a new home in Rome, where, apparently, they had not resided before, — for Acts 18² does not say that they came from Rome, but simply from Italy, — and should have gathered another *ἐκκλησία* in Rome, and that the knowledge of this should have reached Paul at Corinth, is not impossible, but is surprising. Moreover, had these three or four years of Christian service at Corinth and Ephesus, with, possibly, a few months at Rome, put all the churches of the Gentiles under special obligation to them?

Again, where can we find an occasion, during the period of Paul's acquaintance with Prisca and Aquila at Corinth and Ephesus, when they could have been called upon to lay down their neck for his life (vs. 4)? Paul was in some danger at Corinth (Acts 18¹⁸⁻¹⁷), and again in Ephesus (Acts 19²⁸⁻⁴¹), in the first case from Jews, and in the second from Gentiles, but in each case he had ample protection from the civil authorities, and it is difficult to see how a Jewish refugee and his wife could have rendered him an essential service.

These are only difficulties, not impossibilities. But it is certainly easier to explain these notes if we suppose that these verses were written a few years later, after Prisca and Aquila had had abundant time to remove to Rome and to gain an influential position among the Christians there, to render a large service to Gentile churches, and in some way, perhaps during the persecution in which Paul had died, to save the life of the author of these chapters.

The description of Andronicus and Junias (vs. 7) presents some difficulties to an early date and a Pauline authorship. The author says that these two brethren have been his fellow-prisoners. Paul

affirms in 2 Cor. 11²³ that he had been "in prisons more abundantly," and these two Christians may have been his companions in some imprisonment. But it is difficult to find a place and time for the common imprisonment of the man now at Corinth and these two at Rome. It is even more surprising to be told that these two Roman Christians were in Christ before Paul. They may have been in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, or they may have been led to Christ by some early evangelist, but such suppositions involve improbabilities. But every difficulty is removed by the supposition that these chapters were written by a convert of a later day, who, with his friends, had passed through a period of persecution at Rome.

One striking feature of this chapter is the number of kinsmen to whom the author refers. Andronicus, Junias, and Herodian are saluted as his kinsmen. His kinsmen, Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, join him in sending salutations. Rufus's mother is his mother, and Quartus is his brother. These terms have often been understood in a figurative sense; *συγγενεῖς* are fellow Jews, as in 9³ and 2 Mac. 5⁶, Rufus's mother has shown a motherly interest in the writer, and Quartus was simply a Christian. But why should Paul call five or six of these Jewish Christians kinsmen and not apply the term to Aquila, a Jew (Acts 18²), or to Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess (Acts 16¹)? When he sends greetings to Rufus and to his and my mother, why should *αὐτοῦ* be interpreted literally and *ἐμοῦ* figuratively? Why is Quartus alone, of all the twenty-five Christian men whose names are mentioned in the chapter, called *ὁ ἀδελφός*?⁷

But if we take these terms literally, the problem of the authorship of at least 16¹⁻²³ (24) is solved. Who were Rufus and his mother? Was not she the wife of Simon, who bore the cross of Jesus (Mark 15²¹)? Their oldest son was Alexander, the second Rufus, the third Tertius, the fourth Quartus. They were Christians living in Rome, or in its vicinity, when Mark wrote his Gospel, and were well known there. Simon had a Jewish name, but living among

⁷ For the omission of the pronoun when an own brother is referred to, compare Jn. 11¹⁹, and in the Greek Old Testament, Gen. 37⁹ 44²⁶.³³ 45³ Job 42¹⁶. The addition of *μοῦ* would not relieve from ambiguity, for the pronoun is used often of a social or tribal relation. In other cases in the epistles where *ὁ ἀδελφός* is used of a Christian brother the phrase does not distinguish one person from several others mentioned. See 1 Cor. 1¹ 16¹² 2 Cor. 1¹ Eph. 6²¹ Phil. 2²⁶ Col. 1¹ 4⁷.⁹ Philemon 1. For a similar omission of the pronoun compare Mt. 15⁴.³ 19¹⁰ Mk. 7¹² Jn. 19²⁶ 1 Cor. 5¹.

Gentiles, he gave his sons Greek and Latin names, first the common names Alexander and Rufus, but as such names had slight significance for him, he called the next two Third and Fourth. Nothing could be more natural than that these sons should have other kinsmen in the Christian community at Rome. Indeed, as Simon, at the time of the crucifixion, resided in Cyrene, one of these kinsmen, Lucius (Rom. 16²¹), may be the Lucius of Cyrene of Acts 13¹, possibly a brother of Simon, who may be the Symeon Niger of the same group at Antioch.

But, finally, we have the direct statement of Tertius that he wrote the epistle (vs.²²). This is generally understood to mean that he is Paul's amanuensis, but *γράφω* is not used in this sense in the New Testament,⁸ except in the Apocalypse, where the relation of the scribe to Him who dictates is peculiar. It describes elsewhere either the act of a man who records his own thought, or of one who employs another to put it on record. The authors of the epistles of the New Testament frequently inserted the verb, whether they wrote by their own hand or by the hand of another. Paul seems frequently to have employed an amanuensis, but nowhere else do we find this amanuensis adding his own personal notes. In this section, whose authorship we have been discussing, it is used of the responsible author (15¹⁵). It certainly seems probable that *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν* (15¹⁵) and *ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν* (16²²) have the same subject. Moreover, *ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ* is a rather solemn and weighty phrase for a mere amanuensis to use. No other writer in the New Testament seems to make a more definite claim to inspiration.

The conclusion is that Paul closed his Epistle to the Romans when he had finished his argument and fully applied his doctrine, viz. at 14²³. He appended, however, the long doxology, 16²⁵⁻²⁷, much as he closed the more abstruse part of the epistle in 11³³⁻³⁶. The letter at first circulated in this form. Marcion may have removed the doxology; perhaps because he did not like the identification of the only wise God with the God of the Old Testament. At an early day there was circulated with this epistle, or appended to it, a letter, or part of a letter, from a Roman evangelist named Tertius to his friends at Rome. He was an officer, or at least a man of standing and influence in the church at Rome. In an Alexandrian or Egyptian recension the long doxology was transferred to the end of this composite document, apparently taking the place of the brief dox-

⁸ It is sometimes so used in the Greek Old Testament, see Jer. 43 (Heb. 36)⁴⁻¹² 27. 28.

ology, 16²⁴.⁹ This writer has the style of Paul, and has Paul's conception of Christian love and morality. But there is no evidence that he apprehended Paul's profound idea of the nature of the Christian life. His use of *ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν* (15¹³) is simply imitative. We have, then, at the close of this epistle, as at the close of the Second Gospel, a fragment welded to the original document; and we have, as in the First Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and perhaps other New Testament books, the writing of a Christian of the first age of the church, of whom we know little except what appears in the spirit of his writing.

If Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans as early as 54 A.D. and suffered martyrdom before 60 A.D., as seems very probable, we may suppose that the Epistle of Tertius was written in 64, or a little earlier, after the church at Rome was well developed, but before the beginning of the Neronian persecution or of the Jewish war.

⁹ The authorities which place the long doxology after 14²² have, in general, two short doxologies, 16²⁰.²⁴. Those which transfer the long doxology to the end of 16 in general omit vs.²⁴. D and its closely related codices EFG omit 20^b, but D is said to have a mark noting its omission. Apparently Tertius's epistle closed with two doxologies as do several New Testament epistles; compare Phil. 4²⁰.²³ 2 Thess. 3¹⁶.¹⁸ 1 Tim. 6¹⁶.²¹ 2 Tim. 4¹⁸.²² 1 Pet. 5¹¹.¹⁴.