

## Paul's Letter to the Romans:



THE PINNACLE OF  
CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

### A New Apostle With The Same Old Gospel Romans 1:1-7: Part One

A few years back, Bob Davis, one of our beloved church members and one of the principal editors over at the Ft. Worth Star Telegram, asked me to write an review article on an upcoming PBS documentary entitled, "**From Jesus to the Christ.**"<sup>1</sup> Bob sent over an advance copy of the series, comprised of three or four videotapes and I was able to watch the series before it aired and then write an assessment based on my own theological gut reaction. It was a tremendous honor for me to be asked to represent orthodox evangelicalism and to have a chance to take a shot at such a wonderfully representative expression of theologically liberal hogwash.

Now the premise of the series was pretty simple. It went something like this:

**Jesus did not invent Christianity.**

**Jesus was simple-minded peasant, who went about doing good works and ministering to the poor.** Something about him, probably his refusal to keep the Sabbath, invoked the ire of Jewish leaders and wound up costing him his life.

**His disciples, who really missed him and wanted to rehabilitate his reputation and good name, tried to do so through a series of collected remembrances that contained a few of the things Jesus said.** Over a period of time, or really whenever it was necessary, they added other popular wisdom sayings of their day and even some miracle stories to help buttress or illustrate the things he taught or might have taught had he lived.

Eventually, the little group of disciples drew other followers and the same frazzled Jewish leadership that had killed Jesus struck hard to suppress them. **They were succeeding too, until one of the principal persecutors, Saul of Tarsus, suffered a crisis of conscience converted to the cause of Jesus and gave the whole Jesus story a new twist.**

Because Saul of Tarsus, Paul, was trained as a Pharisee, he had a special insight and understanding of all the Messianic prophecy and hopes of his day. **What he did was to apply those messianic hopes and dreams to Jesus.** But he went even further and stripped away all of those distinctively Jewish customs or requirements and opened up his new creation to the Gentiles.

**So, according to this PBS series, Paul, not Jesus, was the founder of Christianity.** Paul connected the dots between the messianic hopes of his day to the mysterious person known as Jesus. Paul filled in the gaps. Paul created the theology. **Paul took the enigmatic Jesus and did a makeover. He changed him from Jesus to Christ.**

Now I have to tell you, I do not think I can adequately express my contempt for that whole line of reasoning. I think it ignores the plain teaching of Jesus in the

gospels. I think it ignores the transparently clear connection between dozens of Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah and their obvious fulfillment in Jesus. And even if it doesn't do that, I know this unequivocally; it turns Paul's principal point here in the first seven verses of Romans on its head.

You see in the first seven verses of chapter one Paul introduces himself to the Romans and proposes this simple truth for them to consider, **"Yes it is true I am a new man with new mission but I am not preaching anything new; it is the same old gospel."**

In fact, Paul is going to argue against his being an innovator<sup>2</sup> along three lines:

- 1) He's going to argue that he is a servant, a man under orders, a sent man.
- 2) He's going to argue that the gospel he is preaching is really God's gospel.
- 3) And, he going argue that the gospel he is preaching was promised long before he actually started preaching it.

You can see, I think, that if that really is the content of what he is saying, that he is really saying, **"I may be a new man with a new mission but I am preaching the same old gospel."**

Now let's look at the text together and see if that is, in fact, what he says.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 1:1**...Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle and set apart for the gospel of God-- <sup>2</sup> the gospel he promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures <sup>3</sup> regarding his Son, who as to his human nature was a descendant of David, <sup>4</sup> and who through the Spirit of holiness was declared with power to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead: Jesus Christ our Lord. <sup>5</sup> Through him and for his name's sake, we received grace and apostleship to call people from among all the Gentiles to the obedience that comes from faith. <sup>6</sup> And you also are among those who are called to belong to Jesus Christ. <sup>7</sup> To all in

Rome who are loved by God and called to be saints: Grace and peace to you from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now the first thing I want you to notice about his initial greeting is that it follows the normal framework or form of greeting that was used in most ancient letters. That normal greeting or prescript went something like this, A to B, Tom to Bev, or Tom, a faithful and repentant husband, to Bev, a forgiving and longsuffering wife.<sup>3</sup> That is quite different than the letters we write today. Today we start off our letters with the name of the person to whom it is addressed. In those days, the letter started off with the name of the author and then followed with the name of the person to whom it was addressed. You can see that here if you look at the first word of verse one and then skip down to the first four words of verse seven.

*Paul...to all in Rome.*

That was the typical, standardized way to begin a letter in Paul's day. However, Paul does something after that is not standard at all in ancient letter writing; he adds seventy-one words (in Greek) between the opening and closing phrases. Because of that, the introduction to the Epistle to the Romans is the longest and most formal introduction of any of Paul's letters.<sup>4</sup> In Greek, his introduction extends from verse 1 all the way to verse 7 and is one long sentence. If you really want to get a sense of how strange this is, the next time you write a letter add seventy-one words between the word "**dear**" and the name of the person you are writing to.

Now, more than likely Paul lengthened his introduction because he was unknown to the church in Rome.<sup>5</sup> Obviously, he felt the need to introduce himself in at least a cursory way to the Romans. He probably felt compelled to explain his authority and to give them a sense of the charge he had received. Still,

Paul doesn't spend very much time talking about himself. He only takes two verses to do that and even then he defines himself in terms of gospel.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 1:1**...Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle and set apart for the gospel of God--

Now the first thing you ought to notice is that Paul does not use his Hebrew name, *Saul*, here. Instead he uses his Greek name *Paul*.<sup>6</sup> It's hard to know exactly why he made *Paul* his name of choice but it seems he changed his name or at least changed which name he used publicly sometime around Acts 13:9.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Acts 13:2**...While they were worshiping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, "Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them"...<sup>6</sup> They traveled through the whole island until they came to Paphos. There they met a Jewish sorcerer and false prophet named Bar-Jesus,<sup>7</sup> who was an attendant of the proconsul, Sergius Paulus. The proconsul, an intelligent man, sent for Barnabas and Saul because he wanted to hear the word of God.<sup>8</sup> But Elymas the sorcerer (for that is what his name means) opposed them and tried to turn the proconsul from the faith.<sup>9</sup> Then Saul, who was also called Paul, filled with the Holy Spirit, looked straight at Elymas and said...<sup>11</sup> **Now the hand of the Lord is against you. You are going to be blind, and for a time you will be unable to see the light of the sun.**" Immediately mist and darkness came over him, and he groped about, seeking someone to lead him by the hand.<sup>12</sup> When the proconsul saw what had happened, he believed, for he was amazed at the teaching about the Lord.

There are those that think he changed his name in honor of Sergius Paulus' conversion.<sup>7</sup> Others think that he changed his name in a public statement of humility (Paul means "little"...Saul, a Hebrew word means something like "ask" in Hebrew<sup>8</sup> and something like "swagger"<sup>9</sup> in classical Greek. Some think he changed his name from Saul to Paul simply because Paul was a more Roman name and yet still sounded like Saul.<sup>10</sup> Some think he chose Paul simply because it sounds like Saul. The truth of the matter is, no one knows for sure.

Of course, there was a biblical pattern for men to change or have their names changed sometimes when they approached a new calling in life: Abram's name was changed to Abraham, Jacob's to Israel and Simon's to Peter. Perhaps Paul wanted to distance himself from his previous life as a persecutor of the church. But, it may have been less dramatic than that. It wasn't unusual for Jews having interaction with Gentiles to use a "gentile" name.<sup>11</sup> Some Jews even had three names: one Jewish, one Greek and one Roman. "**Paul**" would have been one of the apostle's Gentile names.

Now what I would like you to notice is that Paul invested the whole of one word to describe the entirety of his personal life to the Romans. And he didn't do that because he was afraid to talk about personal things in his letters. He did talk about himself sometimes; sometimes he even talked about himself at length (Philippians 3, Acts 26 and 28). But as far as his letter to the Romans was concerned, Paul was careful to stick to his calling and to his message. You see he chose not to focus his attention on the fact that he was someone's son, or that he was a Roman citizen, or even that he had been educated as a Pharisee under the best and brightest rabbis in Jerusalem. **Rather, he focused on the fact that he was a new man with a new mission** and he focuses on that mission by describing himself three different ways. He describes himself as one who is:

- 1) a servant of Christ Jesus,
- 2) called to be an apostle
- 3) set apart for the gospel of God--

Let's take a few minutes and look at each of those descriptions.

### ***Paul...a servant***

Now the term "servant" that he uses in verse one is a translation of the Greek word for "**slave**". It was not a very endearing term in the ancient world. In fact, it

was about as endearing to the ancient Greeks as it would be today to an audience of African-Americans. The background and historical experience of many of the Romans would have caused the word “**slave**” to leave a bad taste in their mouth.<sup>12</sup> Certainly, it carried such a negative nuance that it would have caused the ears of any Gentile audience to snap to attention. Still, Paul does not shy away from using the term. In fact, to Jews it was possible to use the term “**slave**” as a term of honor, especially if it was used to mean “**slave of God.**”<sup>13</sup> The Old Testament sometimes applied the term to the collected nation of Israel but usually it applied to only the most devout men, men like Moses, Joshua and David.<sup>14</sup>

Paul, then, was equating his service to Jesus to Moses’ service to Yahweh. Of course, Paul was not doing that so much to elevate himself as he was to elevate Jesus. His inference was not that he was equal to Moses but rather that Jesus is in fact the Lord, the same Lord that Moses served.<sup>15</sup> His implication is that it is an extraordinary honor to be Jesus’ servant. He is approaching something of the spirit that David Brainerd, the famous American missionary to the Indians, had when he wrote this:

“My heaven is to please God, and glorify him, and to give all to him, and to be wholly devoted to his glory; that is the heaven I long for; that is my religion, and that is my happiness, and always was ever since I suppose I had any true religion; and all those that are of that religion shall meet me in heaven. —I do not go to heaven to be advanced, but to give honor to God. It is no matter where I shall be stationed in heaven, whether I have a high or low seat there; but to love, and please, and glorify God is all.”<sup>16</sup>

*Paul...called to be an apostle*

Now the term “**apostle**” that Paul uses next is as dignified as the term “**servant**” is demeaning. It was a term that was applied to envoys or ambassadors and as such meant that the person bearing the term conveyed the weight and authority of the person represented. Sometimes in the New Testament, it is used in a very general sense. For example, Paul refers to Epaphroditus as the apostle of the Philippians to minister to his needs. There it clearly means something like envoy or ambassador. Even the Lord Jesus is referred to as an “apostle” in Hebrews 3:1.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Hebrews 3:1** Therefore, holy brothers, who share in the heavenly calling, fix your thoughts on Jesus, the apostle and high priest whom we confess. <sup>2</sup> He was faithful to the one who appointed him, just as Moses was faithful in all God's house.

The implication there is that He is both our ambassador from God and our high priest before God. However, most of the time when the word “**apostle**” is used it is used in a technical manner to refer to a very special and limited office.<sup>17</sup> The biblical standard for the office is given in Acts 1:21-22. Turn there for a moment.

In this passage the other apostles are trying to determine Judas Iscariot's replacement in their number. Now I want you to notice the requirements they establish for being an apostle.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Acts 1:21...**Therefore it is necessary to choose one of the men who have been with us the whole time the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, <sup>22</sup> beginning from John's baptism to the time when Jesus was taken up from us. For one of these must become a witness with us of his resurrection."

Of course, that standard is not the final standard. If it were, Paul would not have been able to claim the title “**apostle**”. Clearly, he was not with the other disciples from the beginning. But he had seen the Lord face to face.



**<sup>NIV</sup> 1 Corinthians 9:1...**Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you not the result of my work in the Lord?

It seems to me that the standard for being an apostle rests with the Lord Jesus Himself and clearly, Paul was specifically chosen by Jesus to represent Him to the gentiles. I particularly love the Lord's own words to Ananias when he told him to go and speak to the blinded, dumbstruck, hatemonger Saul of Tarsus after his encounter with Jesus on the road to Damascus. Ananias was really afraid to go to Paul until Jesus told him this in Acts 9.

**<sup>NIV</sup> Acts 9:15..."Go! This man is my chosen instrument to carry my name before the Gentiles and their kings and before the people of Israel. <sup>16</sup> I will show him how much he must suffer for my name."**

And you know Paul got that message. Paul understood that he was "**called**" to a very specific task. Whenever he talked about his calling, he always made it a point that he was a man under authority, a man called to do something specific. Listen to how he describes himself to the Galatians.

**<sup>NIV</sup> Galatians 1:1...**Paul, an apostle-- sent not from men nor by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead—

You see he made it a point to make sure his listeners knew he wasn't making anything up. He wasn't an innovator and he didn't claim to be an innovator. He was proclaiming what he was told, the way he was told, to whom he was told. In Galatians 1:11 he makes that crystal clear.

**<sup>NIV</sup> Galatians 1:11...**I want you to know, brothers, that the gospel I preached is not something that man made up. <sup>12</sup>I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it; rather, I received it by revelation from Jesus Christ.

He wants everyone everywhere to know that he is not out there winging it. I think that's the reason he stacks up these three descriptive terms here in Romans 1:1 to introduce himself. So far, we have seen him describe himself as a **"slave"** of Jesus and as an **"apostle"**.

At the end of verse one he goes on to describe himself as a **"set apart"** one. The word he uses to describe himself here is a word related to the idea of exclusivity. It is the same Greek word from which the Hebrews coined the word **"Pharisee"**. Now for us that has a completely negative nuance but it didn't in the first century. It meant, **"to separate"** or **"to be separated"**. Now what Paul is arguing here is that he is separated to a certain task or duty and that task is **"the gospel"**. Now imagine how strange that must have been for Paul, an ex-Pharisee, to say that. For years and years he had prided himself on being **"a separate one"**. Now he is looking at his life and saying, **"O.K. I used to think I was separated now I really am."** It would be kind of like fundamentalist saying, **"I used to be a fundamentalist but now I focus on the basics."**

Of course, you women are perhaps better qualified to understand his point here about being separated than we men are. No doubt you have some **"set apart"** plates in your cupboard somewhere. You probably have some **"set apart"** flatware and even some **"set apart"** drinking glasses. At our house we have some **"set apart"** towels. I don't mind that too much. What I hate is a **"set apart"** desert. That means it is **"set apart"** for company and cannot be touched or even gazed at lovingly until it's proper time.

Paul wants to make sure the Romans understand that he is just such a man. He is a servant of the Lord Jesus to be sure. He is also an envoy or ambassador from

Christ to the world. But he is both of those things in relationship to the gospel. In that sense, and especially when it comes to taking the gospel to the Gentiles he is a **“set apart”** man.

So in verse one he has made the point that he is man with a new mission. He’s a **“slave”**. He’ an **“apostle”** and he’s **“set apart”**. What he’s going to do in the next six verses is stress the point that though he’s a new man with a new mission he’s still preaching the same the same old gospel.

Actually he starts focusing on that even before he leaves verse one. Notice what he’s set apart to. He’s set apart to the **“gospel of God”**.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 1:1**...Paul, a servant of Christ Jesus, called to be an apostle and set apart for the gospel of God—

Now that is a strange use of the word **“gospel”** for us don’t you think. I mean if you saw the words the **“gospel of”** and there was a long blank after those two words what would want to write in that blank? The reason we think that way is we always think about what the gospel is about. It’s about the redemptive work of Jesus Christ on the cross for sinners. But there is also the gospel of...

- ...peace
- ...salvation
- ...of His Son
- ...of God’s grace

Paul even speaks of the gospel as **“my gospel”** and **“our gospel”**. You ought to be able to distinguish in you mind the different emphasis biblical writers are using when they describe the gospel in these ways. Clearly when Paul describes **“my gospel”** he means the gospel he preaches. When he describes the **“gospel of peace”** he means the gospel that produces peace between God and man. When

he describes the “**gospel of Christ**” he means the gospel about Christ and what Christ has done. But here he says the “**gospel of God.**” What do you think he means by that?

I think he means that the gospel starts and finishes with God. It is God’s design. It is the express plan and action of God. It is sourced in God. I suppose that is one of the reasons that I love what Martyn Lloyd-Jones says here:

The gospel! Oh! how easily we use this term! How glibly we repeat it! I am as guilty as anybody else. It ought to be impossible for us to use the word ‘gospel’ without bursting forth, as it were, into a hymn of praise and thanksgiving Good news from God, that is the gospel. And that brings me to the most important thing of all –it is the gospel of *God*. In other words, it is what God has done about man, and about his salvation...I am not going to write to you, says the Apostle, about some human philosophy; I am not going to give you my own ideas as to how life should be lived; I am not going to tell you what man has got to do; I am going to tell you what God *has done*. That’s it! The good news from God!<sup>18</sup>

You see Paul is saying, “**This is not my gospel. It’s the gospel of God. I may be a new man with a new mission but I am not out there making stuff up.**”

Then in verse two, Paul really hammers that idea home.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 1:2...** the gospel he promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures <sup>3</sup> regarding his Son,

Do you see what he is saying? He’s saying, “**This gospel which I certainly did not invent has been the subject of the prophets from the very beginning it has been about His Son.**”

Of course, when Paul is talking about the Holy Scriptures, he is talking about the Old Testament.<sup>19</sup> He is talking about Genesis to Malachi. And he is saying that

the gospel, the gospel that he is preaching, is not new but is contained...is actually promised in the Old Testament.

Don't you think that is wonderful?

Now having said that, I have to confess that there are many people today that say they believe that don't any more believe that than the man in the moon.

Let me see if I can illustrate what I mean. When I was in seminary, I had a Hebrew professor, an imminently likable man that just could not bear the thought of reading Jesus into the Old Testament. I don't know if it was because of his interaction with Jewish scholars or simply because he wanted to understand each book of the Bible as if the rest of the Bible had never been written. Anyway, we were doing a translation of Genesis 3:15 and he made it a point to denigrate the traditional understanding that Genesis 3:15 is the "proto-euangelion" the "pre-gospel."

Let me read Genesis 3:15 to you.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Genesis 3:15**...And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush your head, and you will strike his heel."

You see the church has always understood this passage speaking prophetically to what our Redeemer would do to Satan in His work on the cross. Listen to Luther:

Accordingly, we now find Adam and Eve restored, not indeed to the life which they had lost but to the hope of that life. Through this hope they escaped, not the first fruits of death, but its tithes; that is, although their

flesh must die for the time being, nevertheless, because of the promised Son of God, who would crush the head of the devil, they hope for the resurrection of the flesh and eternal life after the temporal death of the flesh, just as we do.<sup>20</sup>

But this professor wouldn't have any part of that. In fact, he posed an entirely new idea for the passage. He decided that Moses put this verse there principally to explain man's inherent fear of snakes.<sup>21</sup> Can you imagine that?

It was just about enough to cause me to lose my sanctification. I asked him and I really am not very outspoken in such venues but I asked him out loud in front of the whole class if he thought the story of Lot's wife was in the text to explain the presence of so much salt down there at the south end of the Dead Sea. He didn't think that was very funny and he certainly did not like me making fun of what he had said. You see he didn't want anyone to go outside of Genesis to gain an understanding of Genesis and he didn't want anyone else dragging Genesis over to the New Testament either and that was true in spite of the fact Genesis 3:15 is clearly alluded here in Paul's letter to the Romans.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 16:20** The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet. The grace of our Lord Jesus be with you.

To say the least my professor would have been uncomfortable with Paul's understanding of the Old Testament. You see Paul saw Jesus everywhere in the Old Testament. In fact, in Romans Paul quotes directly from the Old Testament some 53 times and he doesn't just quote from one book. He quotes 12 different Old Testament books. Beyond that he alludes to the Old Testament some 24 times and his allusions are drawn from 9 different books. That is a total of some

79 references to the Old Testament in this one book alone.<sup>22</sup> I have provided a handout at the back so you can see the quotes and allusions yourselves.

Now we don't have much time left and I want to leave a little room for questions so let me run through the major points of verses 3 and 4.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 1:2**...the gospel he promised beforehand through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures <sup>3</sup> regarding his Son, who as to his human nature was a descendant of David, <sup>4</sup> and who through the Spirit of holiness was declared with power to be the Son of God by his resurrection from the dead: Jesus Christ our Lord.

Now we will start right here next week and expand on each of these issues but I think you ought to notice here in Paul's description of Jesus a four-fold conclusion.

First, Jesus was human, with a fully human nature.<sup>23</sup> Now that seems to me that that ought to be an incontrovertible point based on clear passages like this one but the early church slugged it out over exactly what this verse and other ones like it meant and whether Jesus was or really ought to be considered actually human. We'll talk about that in more detail next week.

Secondly, by asserting that Jesus could be considered in terms of His human nature Paul is implying that Jesus is more than human. Now in case you don't get my point here let me ask you a question, **"How many people do you know of that can be discussed in any regard other than just their human nature?"** I mean we can hardly say, **"Now what about Eric's human nature?"**

No, we would never say that. We would never say that because the human nature is the only nature he has. But Paul certainly doesn't mind talking about

Jesus in terms of His **“human nature”** and the reason he doesn’t mind doing that is because he knows Jesus has more than one nature. Do you see what I mean?

Thirdly, he asserts that Jesus is the long-promised Messiah and he does that implicitly by making the point that Jesus is a descendant of David. Now what is interesting about that is Jesus didn’t care much for the title, **“Son of David”** or at least he never sought the title.<sup>24</sup> That may have been because of all the Messianic expectation attached to the term **“Son of David.”** Jesus much preferred the title **“Son of Man”** but Paul uses it here to make the point that he was the rightful heir to the throne and was the rightful Messiah of the nation of Israel.

Fourthly and finally, Paul writes that Jesus has either been powerfully declared to be the Son of God by His resurrection from the dead. Or he may be saying that Jesus was declared to be the powerful Son by means of His resurrection from the dead. It can be read either way and we’ll discuss which one makes the most sense and why, next week.

Now before your questions let me just sum up once again what Paul has said in the first three verses. **“O.K., I may be new to you Romans. In fact, I am a fairly new apostle and certainly I have a new mission to go to the Gentiles but let me be clear, crystal clear about this one thing. I am not preaching anything new; the gospel I am proclaiming is God’s gospel the same old one He promised in the prophets of old.”**

---

<sup>1</sup> See <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/religion/> for more information on the PBS Series.

<sup>2</sup> Adolf Schlatter, *Romans: The Righteousness of God*, trans, Siegfried S. Schatzmann, (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995), 7. “The work of God did not begin with Paul, nor with Jesus in the sense that the humanity before him had been God-forsaken.”



<sup>3</sup> C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans: Volume 1, Introduction and Commentary on Romans 1-8* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975; reprint, 1992), 46-7. "If it was, then, the normal Greek prescript, which was the basis of the Pauline, Paul certainly modified and expanded it in a most remarkable manner. Roller was surely right in thinking that the prescript must have struck the recipients of one of Paul's letters as extremely strange, when they read or heard it for the first time. While in ancient Greek private letters to comparative strangers ὁ δέῖνα τῷ δέῖνα χαίρειν form was followed exactly and without any expansion, in intimate letters a certain degree of variation (e.g. the introduction of terms of endearment and the use of direct address in the second person) was not unusual, and in official letters the superscription and the address were often expanded by the introduction of titles. Paul's use of the first and second persons in the superscription and address as well as in the salutation (in Romans both first and second persons appear in the superscription and salutation, but neither of them in the address) is a point of contact with the intimate letter prescript; but the resemblance of the Pauline prescript to that of Greek and Latin official letters is more striking, and probably conveyed to the recipients a suggestion of a solemn and authoritative mandate. So, in addition to the astonishment which the Pauline prescript's extraordinary length and theological weight will have caused, there must also have been surprise at its combination of features associated with the most intimate kind of letter with features reminiscent of a Roman imperial mandate. The most important thing about Paul's adaptation and expansion of the prescript is, of course, his making it the vehicle of a specifically Christian and theological content."

<sup>4</sup> Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988; reprint, 1994), 35.

<sup>5</sup> **NIV Romans 1:13**...I do not want you to be unaware, brothers, that I planned many times to come to you (but have been prevented from doing so until now) in order that I might have a harvest among you, just as I have had among the other Gentiles. See also. **NIV Romans 15:23**...But now that there is no more place for me to work in these regions, and since I have been longing for many years to see you, <sup>24</sup> I plan to do so when I go to Spain. I hope to visit you while passing through and to have you assist me on my journey there, after I have enjoyed your company for a while.

<sup>6</sup> BDAG, Παῦλος, *Paul*, a Roman surname, *that is a last name* (never a praenomen, *that is a first name*), found in literature, inscriptions, papyri.

<sup>7</sup> Aurelius Augustine, *Confessions* (Sage Digital Library), 216. "And yet, even that "least of the apostles," by whose tongue Thou soundest out these words, when Paulus the proconsul — his pride overcome by the apostle's warfare — was made to pass under the easy yokes of Thy Christ, and became a provincial of the great King, — he also, instead of Saul, his former name, desired to be called Paul, in testimony of so great a victory."

<sup>8</sup> BDB...9593. Also HALOT...9275.

<sup>9</sup> Liddell & Scott, 35,940.

<sup>10</sup> Charles Hodge, *Romans from the Crossway Classic Series* edited by Alister McGrath and J.I. Packer, (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossways Books, 1993), 11-12.

<sup>11</sup> James D.G. Dunn, *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 38a: Romans 1-8*, (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publisher) 1998. "Yet, the completeness of the change strongly suggests a transition in Paul's self-perception, at least in terms of the social context within which he had his identity, perhaps a certain freeing of himself from the person he had been perceived to be as "Saul," or a willingness to engage in new relationships other than those enjoyed by "Saul." That "Paul" thus reflects his increasing commitment as "apostle to the Gentiles" is therefore quite likely. And since this commitment comes to the fore more or less clearly in all his letters, the consistent self-designation "Paul" in all his letters can also be seen as an expression of that commitment—and not least in Romans (cf. 1:5–7). Such an implication would obviously be lost on his Roman readers, unless they were familiar with his older persona."

<sup>12</sup> Cranfield, 50.

<sup>13</sup> Dunn, "The Jewish worshiper quite naturally thought of himself as God's slave. The noun is used both in the plural and in the singular for Israel as a whole. And great figures from the past are quite often referred to as Yahweh's slave, particularly Moses and the prophets. As such the idea draws its force from Israel's conviction that it had been chosen by the one God to be peculiarly and particularly his—Israel as belonging exclusively to Yahweh and none other, Israel's great heroes honored by the title precisely because of the unconditional quality of their commitment to Israel's God and of their part in maintaining the covenant between God and his people. The idea itself does not necessarily imply that Paul placed himself in the line of such great figures. But in using it of himself Paul certainly wanted to indicate the same exclusiveness and unconditional character of his belonging and dependence. The phrase is not so much honorific as indicative of dedication."

<sup>14</sup> **NIV 1 Kings 8:56**... "Praise be to the LORD, who has given rest to his people Israel just as he promised. Not one word has failed of all the good promises he gave through his **servant** Moses. **NIV Joshua 24:29**... After these things, Joshua son of Nun, the **servant** of the LORD, died at the age of a hundred and ten. **NIV 2 Samuel 7:8**... "Now then, tell my **servant** David, "This is what the LORD Almighty says: I took you from the pasture and from following the flock to be ruler over my people Israel.

<sup>15</sup> Romano Penna, *Paul the Apostle: Jew and Geek Alike* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1996), 7.

<sup>16</sup> David Brainerd, "Brainerd's Life and Diary" in *Works of Jonathan Edwards Volume 2* ed. by Jonathan Edwards (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1974; reprinted from the 1834 edition), 383.

<sup>17</sup> James Montgomery Boice, *Romans Volume 1: Justification By Faith, Romans 1-4* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991), 27.

<sup>18</sup> D. Martyn Lloyd Jones, *Romans: Exposition of Chapter 1, The Gospel of God* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1985), 59.

<sup>19</sup> Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwin C. Hoskyns, from the 6<sup>th</sup> ed., (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 28. Though Boice and others complain about Barth and his disregard for the passage concerning the OT. I was surprised by his clarity. "Being the Gospel of God it was—promised afore. The Gospel is no intrusion of today. As the seed of eternity it is the fruit of time, the meaning and maturity of history—the fulfillment of prophecy. The Gospel is the word spoken by the prophets from time immemorial, the word which can now be received and has now been accepted. Such is the Gospel with which the apostle has been entrusted. By it his speech is authorized, but by it also that which he says is judged. The words of the prophets, long fastened under lock and key, are now set free. Now it is possible to hear what Jeremiah and Job and the preacher Solomon had proclaimed long ago. Now we can see and understand what is written, for we have an entrance into the Old Testament (Luther)."

<sup>20</sup> Martin Luther, *Luther's works, vol. 1: : Lectures on Genesis: Chapters 1-5 (Ge 3:16)* edited by J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann (Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1958; reprinted 1999), 365.

<sup>21</sup> John Calvin, *Commentary on Genesis*, (Sage Digital Library: Genesis 3:15) All right I admit that Calvin said the same thing but Calvin was not afraid to see Christ in the Old Testament. He had a Christocentric approach to Scripture that was at least nuanced. Read it for yourself in his *Commentary on Genesis*. "I interpret this simply to mean that there should always be the hostile strife between the human race and serpents, which is now apparent; for, by a secret feeling of nature, man abhors them." At least he goes...""We must now make a transition from the serpent to the author of this mischief himself; and that not only in the way of comparison, for there truly is a literal *anagogy*;" Guess what it is?

<sup>22</sup> E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1957; reprinted 1981 and 1991), 150-4.

<sup>23</sup> William S. Plumer, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Press, 1993; reprint of 1971 edition which was a reprint of an 1870 edition), 34. "According to the flesh as to his human nature, or so far as he was a man. Had he not been the son of man and the seed of David he would not have met the demands of prophecy. 2 Samuel 7: 16; Isaiah 11:1. One evangelist fitly traces his genealogy to the first pair to prove that he was the seed of the woman; another to David, thus showing how completely he met the requirements of the Old Testament. And all this was settled by a legal process before his birth-by the very process by which the titles to the lands of the country were determined."

<sup>24</sup> F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* in the Tyndale New Testament Commentary Series (London: Tyndale Press, 1963), 72.