

## Paul's Letter to the Romans:



THE PINNACLE OF  
CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

### No Condemnation! No, Not Any At All...

#### Romans 8:1-4

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 8:1**...Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus, <sup>2</sup>because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law of sin and death. <sup>3</sup>For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, <sup>4</sup>in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.

In Romans 8:1, Paul takes up again the argument he started way back in Romans 5:1.<sup>1</sup> A couple of weeks ago, I pointed out the fact that the first verses of both Romans 5 and Romans 8 are parallel and contain slightly different expressions of pretty much the same thought. What I meant by that was this, **“Therefore, having been justified through faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,”** and **“Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus,”** are two different ways of saying the same thing.<sup>2</sup> That is, Christians, having been justified, have had all fear of God’s judicial wrath removed and are no longer in fear of the consequences of God judging either their sin or sinful actions.<sup>3</sup>

Now I make that point because it is possible to lose sight of the connection in Paul’s argument especially in light of the insertion of Romans 6-7. You see Romans 6-7 are what commentators call a **“digression”** or a **“parenthesis”**.

Basically, a digression or a parenthesis is like a sidebar in a law trial. It's a timeout to discuss some other important issue that has come up in the main argument or discussion. The parenthesis or side trail that occurs in Romans 6-7 does not occur because Paul lost his train of thought or anything like that. He was not a thing like I am sometimes when I start telling a story and lose my way and have to be reminded by my wife or children of what it was that I was talking about in the first place.<sup>4</sup> No, Paul always knew his place and how to get back on track even when he deviated from his main point to take up a secondary issue. Now I mention that for three reasons. First, Paul did indeed pull away from his central argument in chapters six and seven concerning the implications of justification to talk about the inability of the law to justify sinners or to sanctify believers. Secondly, he did return in chapter eight to the argument he started way back in chapter five concerning the implications of standing justified before God. And thirdly, he did so seamlessly without getting lost or confused along the way. Paul was not addled or lost, no not even for a minute.

Now I mention that fact, and there is no charge for this, because you will sometimes read commentators say really stupid things about Paul sometimes forgetting himself and his argument in the middle of his letters. Among such writers, C.H. Dodd stands out, to my way of thinking, as both the most obnoxious and most notorious. For example, listen to Dodd's analysis regarding Paul's two illustrations in Romans 6 and 7. He is speaking, in particular, of Paul's two primary illustrations regarding slavery and widowhood. He writes this:

The two lines of illustration, then, which Paul offers, have not proved very felicitous (*Dodd's way of saying there were unhelpful*). He (that is, Paul) lacks the gift for sustained illustration of ideas through concrete images. It is probably a defect of imagination (*or perhaps concentration*). We cannot help contrasting his labored and blundering allegories with the masterly

parables of Jesus, *which are* unerring in their immediate translation of ideas into pictures, or rather their recognition of the idea in the picture which life itself presents. Paul flounders among the images he has tried to evoke, and then with unconscious humor pleads that he is trying to stoop to the weak nature of his correspondents. We are relieved when he tires of his unmanageable puppets, and talks about real things.<sup>5</sup>

Now, I have to tell you my blood pressure spikes thirty points when I read something that presumptive and that idiotic. I think it is tremendously arrogant to criticize the writing of a man chosen and gifted by God to fulfill a task that not one man in a ten billion could have carried out. I don't think of C.H. Dodd ever proved himself as a commentator to be sufficiently worthy even to empty Paul's chamber pot and I have no doubt Paul could whipped him verbally, logically, philosophically and even physically. While I have no doubt that C.H. Dodd today sees things in a completely different firelight, I make note of Dodd's words not because I want to mock him but rather because they betray a really goofy view of biblical inspiration that sometimes surfaces even today.

You see, and I want you to listen carefully here, Paul's words were no less inspired by the Spirit of God than the words of Jesus. Paul's words here are just as authoritative and just as accurate and just as profound as the words of the Lord Jesus Himself. That does not mean that Paul was divine or sinless or that he was the Lord's equal in other sense. But it does mean that Paul's words, as recorded and received in the Holy Scripture, were divinely inspired and divinely superintended by the blessed Holy Spirit to communicate exactly what the Spirit of God desired. So a criticism against Paul's style or Paul's logic or a charge that he failed to write what he should have or failed to communicate his point intelligently winds up being logically extended beyond Paul to the Spirit of God Himself and I for one think that is both presumptuous and sinful.

Anyway, my point before this last digression or parenthesis was that Paul returns to complete the thought and argument in Romans 8:1 that he had first started way back in Romans 5:1 and his words there, as you are no doubt well aware, are some of the most beloved and most glorious in all of Scripture.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 8:1**...Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus,

Now, these wonderfully gracious words are connected back to the issue of the sinner's justification which really started in Romans 3:21 and culminated in Romans 5:12-21. And though that is true, the logical connection of Romans 8 back to the earlier sections of Romans does not mean that it is totally disconnected from chapters six and seven. No, it doesn't mean that all. You see there is a sense in which chapter eight contrasts and completes what was discussed in chapters six and seven. You'll remember that the big topic in chapter six was the believer's union with Christ and you will remember that the big topic in chapter seven was the inability of the law both to justify sinners and to sanctify believers. In chapter eight, Paul fleshes out the glorious conclusion of our union with Christ and at the same time gives the counterpoint to his discussion of the law. He does that by pointing out that the while the law was impotent to bring about either our justification or sanctification because of human weakness and sin the Holy Spirit is, in fact, able to accomplish and guarantee.

Now, you might be wondering something like this, **"So then, are you saying that Paul is going to make the Holy Spirit the focus of his attention in chapter eight?"** The answer to that is both **"yes"** and **"no."** It is **"yes"** in that the Holy Spirit is mentioned almost as often in chapter eight as the law was in chapter

seven. In chapter 7, the “**law**” was mentioned 23 times, 30 if add the times the word “**commandment**” was used to that list. In chapter 8, the word “**spirit**” is mentioned 21 times. So clearly, the “**spirit**” is as important to the argument of chapter 8 as the “**law**” was to the argument of chapter 7. On the other hand, and you probably won’t find this all that surprising, chapter eight does not focus on the Holy Spirit in an attempt to explain the Holy Spirit or even to develop a theology of the Holy Spirit. Rather, chapter eight is really about the wonderful security that believers have in Christ because of the work of Christ applied through the Spirit of God. Another way to say that is that chapter eight is not about the Holy Spirit but rather about what the Holy Spirit does to secure the salvation of all those in Christ. Listen to how Charles Hodge puts it:

*Paul’s* theme here is the security of believers. The salvation of those who have renounced the law and accepted the gracious offers of the gospel is shown to be absolutely certain. The whole chapter is a series of arguments, most beautifully arranged, in support of **this one point**. They are all traced back to the great source of hope and security, the unmerited and unchanging love of God in Christ Jesus. The proposition is contained *right from the start even* in the first verse. There is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus: they shall never be condemned or perish.<sup>6</sup>

And not surprisingly, Martyn Lloyd-Jones says much the same thing.

I make bold to assert that the great theme of chapter 8 is not sanctification. Sanctification is only a part of it. The great theme is the security of the Christian, the absolute certainty of the ‘**final perseverance**’ of the saints, and of the ultimate, complete and entire salvation of every one who believes in the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>7</sup>

You see the whole of chapter 8 concerns the wondrous security of the saints and I would like to suggest to you that that is precisely why the chapter is so loved by the saints. That fact is born out, I think, even in some of the hymns we sing

though we don't always realize it some of our favorite hymns are built upon the wonderful truths contained in Romans eight.

Listen to this from Charles Wesley.

No condemnation now I dread;  
Jesus and all in him, is mine!  
Alive in him, my living Head,  
And clothed in righteousness divine,  
Bold I approach the eternal throne,  
And claim the crown, through Christ my own.  
Amazing love, how can it be,  
That thou my God, shouldst die, for me?<sup>8</sup>

Now listen to this from Count Nikolaus von Zinzendorf.

Jesus thy blood and righteousness  
My beauty are, My glorious dress;  
Midst flaming worlds, in these arrayed,  
With joy shall I lift up my head.  
Bold shall I stand in thy great day;  
For who ought to my charge shall lay?  
Fully absolved through these I am  
from sin and fear, from guilt and shame.<sup>9</sup>

You see it is those great themes, themes which are so clearly set forth in Romans eight, that stir the hearts of men with gratitude and cause them to want to pen the marvel, the wonder of what Christ has accomplished on our behalf. In that sense, it is possible almost to see Romans eight at potentially present in every great gospel hymn because the great thoughts of the gospel: substitution, atonement, forgiveness, adoption, and glorification. They are all there.

Now what I want to do this morning is to slow down a bit and to spend some time carefully evaluating what Paul says in Romans 8:1-4. We will be taking four weeks to look at Romans 8, which is, of course, longer than we have taken on any

other part of Romans so far. Now, that having been said let's dig into Romans 8:1-4.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 8:1**...Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus,

The first thing I think you ought to note is the word **"therefore"** and as you note it you ought to employ a pretty basic axiom of Bible study that says, **"Whenever you see the word 'therefore' you ought always to ask what it is there for."** Now in one sense we have already answered that question. The **"therefore"** here is there for the express purpose of taking back up or completing the thought Paul had started back in Romans 5:1 where he said **"Therefore having been justified"**. What Paul is about to say then is the result or conclusion of the whole thought and discussion that he has set forth thus far concerning our justification by faith. That is, the **"therefore"** here in Romans 8 is setting up Paul's grand conclusion to his whole argument or presentation on justification through in Christ.

Now you may be thinking to yourself, **"Alright Tom, you've said that two or three times now. But how do you know that is the case?"** That's a very fair question, of course. I know it partly from the parallel structure of the two uses of **"therefore"** in Romans 5:1 and Romans 8:1. I know it from the parallel concepts that are contained in the two phrases **"Therefore, we have peace with God"** and **"There, there is now no condemnation"**. And, I know it finally from the repetition of the word **"condemnation"** in chapter five and chapter eight. Now this, I think in particular is the most compelling argument that Paul is taking back up the argument of chapter five.

You the word “**condemnation**” which is the Greek word *katakrima* is only used three times in Romans. It is used in Romans 8:1 and it is used in Romans 5:16 and in Romans 5:18. Look there for a minute.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 5:16**...Again, the gift of God is not like the result of the one man's sin: The judgment followed one sin and brought **condemnation**, but the gift followed many trespasses and brought justification.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 5:18**...Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was **condemnation** for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men.

<sup>NIV</sup> ROMANS 5:1...THEREFORE, SINCE WE HAVE BEEN JUSTIFIED WE HAVE PEACE WITH GOD...  
AND THIS IS TRUE IN SPITE OF THE FACT, THAT ADAM'S SIN BROUGHT CONDEMNATION.  
<sup>NIV</sup> ROMANS 5:16... THE JUDGMENT FOLLOWED ONE SIN AND BROUGHT CONDEMNATION...  
IT IS TRUE BECAUSE HE ONE MAN CHRIST JESUS BROUGHT TO US "JUSTIFICATION" JUST AS THE ONE MAN ADAM BROUGHT TO US "CONDEMNATION".  
<sup>NIV</sup> ROMANS 5:18... JUST AS THE RESULT OF ONE TRESPASS WAS CONDEMNATION SO ALSO THE RESULT OF ONE ACT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS WAS JUSTIFICATION...  
THE END RESULT THEN IN OUR HAVING BEEN JUSTIFIED IS THAT WE ARE NO LONGER UNDER CONDEMNATION, WHICH IS EXACTLY WHAT PAUL SAYS IN ROMANS 8:1.  
<sup>NIV</sup> ROMANS 8:1...THEREFORE, THERE IS NOW NO CONDEMNATION FOR THOSE IN CHRIST JESUS.

Now the overall argument goes like this:

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 5:1**...Therefore, since we have been justified we have peace with God...

And this is true in spite of the fact, that Adam's sin brought condemnation.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 5:16**... The judgment followed one sin and brought **condemnation**...

It is true because he one man Christ Jesus brought to us “**justification**” just as the one man Adam brought to us “**condemnation**”.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 5:18**... just as the result of one trespass was **condemnation** so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification...

The end result then in our having been justified is that we are no longer under condemnation, which is exactly what Paul says in Romans 8:1.

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 8:1**...Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus,

Now, to me, the logic of that connection is undeniable. That is, the parallel nature of the two phrases starting with **“therefore”**, the parallel aspects **“being at peace with God”** and being out from **“under condemnation”** and the repetition of the word **“condemnation”** itself make it absolutely certain Paul is picking up right where he left off.

Now, let me take a minute or two and expand on this word **“condemnation.”** I think most of the time when we use the word in English we tend to focus on the aspect of **“accusation”** or **“charge”**. In other words, when we use the word **“condemn”** or **“condemnation”** in English we tend to limit it’s meaning to something like **“blame”** or **“attribute guilt”** but the Greek word had an altogether different nuance. Listen to F.F. Bruce.

If **‘condemnation’** were simply the opposite of **‘justification’**, Paul would be saying that those who are in Christ Jesus are justified; but that stage in the argument was reached in 3.21 ff. The word *katakrima* (that is, the word translate condemnation) means probably not **“condemnation”**, but the punishment following sentence—. <sup>10</sup>

Listen also to Leon Morris.

Condemnation is a forensic term which here includes both the sentence and the execution of the sentence. <sup>11</sup>

When Paul uses the word **“condemnation”** here he is not only that there is no more blame, no more accusation, but also that there is no punishment phase left

with regard to our sin. You see, that is the first century meaning of the word “condemnation.” It didn’t refer to just the accusation; it referred and I think referred primarily to the execution of the sentence against someone who was accused. So his point is then that we are out from under the sentence of death. We are eternally out from under the judicial wrath of God and you can see, I think, where that will lead at the end of the chapter. It will lead us to conclusions like this, **“Well, then if God gotten rid of the punishment phase with regard to our sin, who can be against us”** or **“Who then shall be able to bring a charge against God’s elect.”** And the answer is, of course, **“No one, no thing, shall be able to either charge or to separate us from the love of God in Christ.”**

Now I thought, I might take a bit of a digression and point out to you another biblical passage that makes significant use of this exact same word **“condemnation.”** It occurs in a story that you all know and love and it won’t take but a minute to show how it connects with this idea here in Romans 8. That story is, of course, the story of the woman taken in adultery in John 8. Turn there for a minute and let’s take a look at it starting in verse 3.

<sup>NIV</sup> **John 8:3**...The teachers of the law and the Pharisees brought in a woman caught in adultery. They made her stand before the group <sup>4</sup> and said to Jesus, **“Teacher, this woman was caught in the act of adultery. <sup>5</sup> In the Law Moses commanded us to stone such women. Now what do you say?”** <sup>6</sup> They were using this question as a trap, in order to have a basis for accusing him.

Now, John is quite clear that the Pharisees wanted to trap Jesus in His words and you can see that I think if you just consider the nature of their question. Do you see their question, **“Teacher Moses said we should stone such a woman. What do you say?”** Now the reason the question is a trap is because if Jesus answers,

**“No, you shouldn’t stone her”** they can say, **“See, he doesn’t care what the Law of Moses says.”** If on the other hand, he says, **“Yes, stone her”** they can go to the Romans and say, **“He’s preaching revolt against the Law of Caesar and saying that the Jews ought to take up the legal standard of the Law of Moses even when it conflicts with Caesar.”** You see they wanted to trap Him and so they asked Him an impossible question. Look again at verse 6.

<sup>NIV</sup> **John 8:6...**They were using this question as a trap, in order to have a basis for accusing him. But Jesus bent down and started to write on the ground with his finger. <sup>7</sup> When they kept on questioning him, he straightened up and said to them, "If any one of you is without sin, let him be the first to throw a stone at her."

Now, what was Jesus’ answer to their question? Did He say, **“Moses is right”** or did He say, **“No, Rome is right?”** Well, actually what He said was, **“Moses was right.”** Only He added one small qualification, **“Let the one without sin cast the first stone.”** Of course, you know the rest of the story but look at again starting in verse 8, and see if you can see anything that connects it to chapter 8 of Romans.

<sup>NIV</sup> **John 8:8...**Again he stooped down and wrote on the ground. <sup>9</sup> At this, those who heard began to go away one at a time, the older ones first, until only Jesus was left, with the woman still standing there. <sup>10</sup> Jesus straightened up and asked her, **“Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you?”** <sup>11</sup> "No one, sir," she said. **“Then neither do I condemn you,”** Jesus declared. **“Go now and leave your life of sin.”**

You see His question, **“Has no one condemned you?”** contains the verb form of this exact same word we have here in Romans 8:1 and His point was not whether anyone had one accused her, for there is no question that they the whole lot of them had accused her, but whether anyone had carried out the sentence attached to the accusation they had already made and her answer to that was, **“No Lord,**

**no one has condemned me”** which was the same thing as saying, **“No Lord, no one has thrown a single stone.”** And when she says that Jesus adds, **“Ah then, neither do I but now you must live in light of the fact that I do not. So go now and leave your life of sin.”**

You see that is the point Paul is making here in Romans 8:1. There is no penalty attached to our sin. We are, in fact, completely free from the penalty or sentence of sin. Oh, how I wish you could see this sentence in Greek. It is so emphatic, so powerfully emphatic. You see, in Greek, the further you push something forward in a sentence the more emphatic it becomes. You see the word that comes fourth in the verse in English is the word that is first in Greek. The **“not any”** or **“not even one thing”** is the first word in the Greek and the emphasis is something like this, **“Not one thing, no nothing therefore now condemns us who are in Christ Jesus”** and doesn’t that make perfect sense in light of what Paul is going to say at the end of chapter eight. I think that is the reason why I so appreciate the Donald Grey Barnhouse’s translation for this verse in his commentary on Romans. This is what he writes:

The Greek *here* is almost startling in its declaration. Literally it would read something like this. **“Not a whit therefore now of condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus.”**<sup>12</sup>

Now having addressed the importance of the word **“condemnation”** let us look at a couple of other important issues here in Romans 8:1. Now you can see that there is now no condemnation but for whom, for what group of people, is that true. Well look again at verse 1 and we’ll see.

**NIV Romans 8:1...**Therefore, there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus,

Obviously, the answer is that there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus and that harkens back to the idea of our union with Christ in chapter six and our union with Christ which harkens back to chapter five and the idea of our having been justified through faith in Christ's atoning work.

Now I ought to address one other issue. If you have a KJV or NKJV, you will notice that Romans 8:1 is longer in your Bible than it is in the NIV translation that I have been reading. It is also longer than the translation of the NASB or the ESV. The reason for that is that most, really all of the older manuscripts do not contain the words "**who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.**"<sup>13</sup> What most textual scholars think happened is that somewhere along the way some copyist accidentally picked up the end of verse four and copied into the wrong spot at the end of verse one. Now, I have to say that I think it is right not include it and this is one of those places where the inclusion would change the meaning of the verse theologically. Listen to Dr. Boice.

Those who use the Authorized or King James text will notice the addition of the words "who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" following the words "Christ Jesus" in verse 1. This is certainly an error...*and* it is worth pointing this out because, if the clause is retained, it suggests exactly the opposite of what the text actually says...what I am saying is that these words do not belong. If they did our escape from condemnation would last only as long as our next faltering step or sin; then we would be back under condemnation again. Thank God, salvation is not like that! Salvation is from God. It is by God. What this says is that there is no condemnation for those who have been joined to Jesus Christ by God the Father through the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit.<sup>14</sup>

Now what we are going to find in verse two is the real reason why "**we are no longer under condemnation**" and what we are going to find in verse three is exactly how what is described in verse two came about. Let me say that again,

**“In verse two we are going to see the reason, the real reason why we are no longer under condemnation and in verse 3ff. we are going to see what occurred to bring that about.”** In other words it’s going to say, **“Here’s why you are no longer condemned and here’s how that came about.”**

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 8:2**...because through Christ Jesus the law of the Spirit of life set me free from the law of sin and death. <sup>3</sup> For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful man to be a sin offering. And so he condemned sin in sinful man, <sup>4</sup> in order that the righteous requirements of the law might be fully met in us, who do not live according to the sinful nature but according to the Spirit.

Now the only reason that verse two is the least bit difficult is because it uses the word **“law”** twice. First it refers to the **“law of the Spirit of life”** and secondly it refers to the **“law of sin and death”** but I think that is easily simplified by understanding the **“law of the Spirit of life”** as the gospel and the **“law of the sin and death”** as the Law of Moses.<sup>15</sup> That certainly seems to be the point of verse 3. Anyway, listen to what John Stott says here.

The *best* alternative is to understand **“the law of the Spirit of life”** as describing the gospel, just as Paul calls it elsewhere the ministry of the Spirit. This makes the best sense, as it is certainly the gospel, which has freed us from the law and its curse, and the message of life in the Spirit from the slavery of sin and death.<sup>16</sup>

Now in verses 3 and 4, Paul is going to line out what God has done to bring about this wonderful state of **“no condemnation”** and I want you to notice as we explore what God has done that His action is set in contradistinction to what the law was unable to do. Notice that especially in the first part of verse 3...

<sup>NIV</sup> **Romans 8:3...** For what the law was powerless to do in that it was weakened by the sinful nature, God did...

I love that phrase, “**God did...**” Now the question, of course, is, “**What was it that God did?**” I want to suggest to you that what God did can be summed up in five different expressions or perhaps even five separate questions that go like this.

- 1) WHAT WAS IT THAT GOD DID?
- 2) IN WHAT STATE DID HE SEND HIS SON?
- 3) WHY DID GOD SEND HIS SON?
- 4) AND GOD'S PURPOSE IN DOING THAT WAS TO DO WHAT?
- 5) AND WHAT WAS HIS ULTIMATE PURPOSE IN DOING THAT?

- 1) **What was it that God did?** Well the answer to that is that He sent His Son.
- 2) **In what state did He send His Son?** He sent his son in the likeness of sinful human flesh. Now I think it is important that we understand the precision of what Paul says here. Did He send His Son in sinful human flesh? No, He sent His Son in the **likeness** of sinful human flesh and the point is that though Jesus may have looked like any other man but the fact was that He was without sin and in that sense alone was radically different from all other men.
- 3) **Why did God send His Son?** He sent Him to be a sin offering. Now you can see I think how important Jesus' sinlessness is to this whole argument. If He had been sinful, He would have been a useless sin offering. But His sinlessness guaranteed His acceptance as a suitable

sin offering before God. How wonderful this language is, don't you think? God sent Jesus to take our place as substitute offering for sin.

- 4) **And God's purpose in doing that was to do what?** His purpose in doing that was to condemn sin in sinful men. Now let the word "**condemn**" have its full meaning here. What was it we discovered earlier about the word "**condemn**?" What we discovered was that the word condemn doesn't just refer to the accusation against a sinner but to the execution of justice against a sinner. It refers to the fall of the blade, the sting of the whip, the burn of the noose, and the torture of the cross and since that is so let me ask you, "**What is Paul's point here?**" His point is that God poured out the execution of our penalty of sin on Jesus as our representative. I love what Cranfield says here when he says, "**For those who are in Christ Jesus there is no divine condemnation, since the condemnation which they deserve has already been fully borne for them by Him.**"<sup>17</sup>
- 5) **And what was His ultimate purpose in doing that?** His ultimate purpose in doing that was so the righteous demands of the law might be fulfilled in us and that we might be out from under any condemnation of the law at all. But that is not all. No, there is an aspect of our sanctification included here because, you see, our sanctification flows out of our justification. That is, because Christ has removed the condemnation in which we stood before God and has granted to us an entirely new status, God has also granted that we shall live in and move and have our being through the work of the Spirit of God and that means that we will begin to live in holiness before Him. It is not the reason we are out from under God's condemnation rather it is the

result of our being out from under His condemnation and being empowered and indwelt by His Spirit.

But that is enough for one day. He will pick up on that same theme of the believer's sanctification next time and expand it then but for now let ruminate on what we know and have seen again in just these few wonderful verses. There is therefore now, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus...no, no one little bit.

Praise be to God!

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles Hodge, *Romans* from the Crossway Classic Series edited by Alister McGrath and J.I. Packer, (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossways Books, 1993), 226. Hodge makes the point that Paul's argument goes further back than chapters 6 and 7. "To understand this chapter it is very important to decide its precise relationship to the preceding part of the letter. The word **therefore** indicates that what follows is an inference. But from what? From the conclusion of chapter 7, or from the whole previous discussion? The latter seems to be the only correct view of the context, because the fact that there is no condemnation of believers is no fair inference from what is said at the close of the preceding chapter. Paul does not mean to say, as Luther and others explain verse 1, that there is nothing worthy of condemnation in the Christian because with his mind he serves the law of God. Nor does Paul mean, at least in the first few verses, to argue that believers shall not be condemned because they are freed from the dominion of sin. But the inference in verse 1 is the legitimate conclusion of all that Paul had previously established. Believers will be saved because they are not under the law but under grace, which is the main point of all that Paul has said so far. **Now**—that is, under these circumstances, the circumstances set out in the previous part of the letter."

<sup>2</sup> D. Martyn Lloyd Jones, *Romans: Exposition of Chapter 7:1-8:4, The Law: It's Functions and Limits* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1973; reprinted 1974 and 1976), 269. "This is one of the great statements of the Scripture, one of the most important for Christian experience and for the health and well-being of the Christian believer. This is, in a sense, the great good news of the gospel — that it is possible to announce a way of salvation in which there is no longer any condemnation. This is the greatest good news that has ever come into the world; it holds out the greatest possibility for man since the Fall. It is the heart and essence and soul of the Christian gospel. Not only that; as I have already indicated, this is the theme of the whole of this chapter. I would remind you that Paul is not making a new statement here; he has already said it, and particularly so in the 5th chapter of the Epistle. But he states it now in a new way."

<sup>3</sup> Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* in the New International Commentary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1996), 469. Moo notices and highlights better than any other commentator the connection between Romans 8 and Romans 5. He writes: "How does this portrait of the new life and hope of the believer relate to what has come before in Romans? The "therefore" at the beginning of the chapter indicates that Paul is drawing a conclusion. What immediately follows is the assertion that "there is now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (v.1). This language forges a link with Rom. 5:12-21: the word 'condemnation' occurs only here and in 5:16 and 18 in the NT, and "in Christ Jesus" succinctly summarizes the relationship of believers to Christ that is developed in that great paragraph. Nor do these parallels stand alone, in both 5:12-21 and 8:1-13 Paul assures the believer of the reality and finality of life in Christ, and shows how this life is the product of righteousness (cf. 5:17,18,21; 8:10). We are justified, then, in thinking that 8:1-13 or, probably, 8:1-17, restates and elaborates 5:12-21. This restatement is made with particular respect to the threats of sin and the law (cf. v. 2: "the law of sin and death") that occupied Paul in chaps. 6 and 7, and, as we have seen, with a new focus on the ministry of the Spirit. Since the second part of Rom. 8 is closely related to 5:1-11, the result is a "ring composition" in which 8:18-39 picks up 5:1-11, as 8:1-17 does 5:12-21."

<sup>4</sup> Lloyd-Jones, 261.

<sup>5</sup> C.H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans* in the Moffatt NT Commentary Series (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932; reprinted 1947), 103.

<sup>6</sup> Charles Hodge, *Commentary on Romans* on the SAGE Digital Library CDROM, 382.

<sup>7</sup> Lloyd-Jones, 263-4.

<sup>8</sup> Charles Wesley, "And Can It Be That I Should Gain?" from the *Trinity Hymnal* (Atlanta: Great Commission Publications, 1990), 455-6.

<sup>9</sup>Count Nikolaus von Zinzenforf, "Jesus Thy Blood and Righteousness" from the *Trinity Hymnal* (Atlanta: Great Commission Publications, 1990), 520.

<sup>10</sup> F.F. Bruce, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Tyndale Press, 1963), 159. Cf. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*; revised and augmented from Walter Bauer's Fifth Edition, 1958 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), 412. "In this and the cognates that follow the use of the term 'condemnation' does not denote merely a pronouncement of guilt but the adjudication of punishment...οὐδὲν κ. τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ...there is no death-sentence for those who are in Christ Jesus Ro 8:1.

<sup>11</sup> Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988; reprint, 1994), 300. See also Moo, 473, note 17.

<sup>12</sup> Donald Grey Barnhouse, *Romans Volume 3: God's Grace 5:12-21 and God's Freedom 6:1-7:25 and God's Heirs 8:1-39* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1959, 1961 and 1963; reprint 1994), 5.

<sup>13</sup> Lloyd-Jones, 258.

<sup>14</sup> James Montgomery Boice, *Romans Volume 2: Reign of Grace, Romans 5-8* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), 792-3.

<sup>15</sup> Robert Haldane, *Commentary on Romans* (Escondido, CA: Ephesians Four Group, 1999), 428. "To the law of the spirit of life belongs a different meaning, signifying the power of the Holy Spirit, by which He unites the soul to Christ, in whose righteousness as being thus one with Him, it therefore partakes, and is consequently justified. **This law is the Gospel**, whereof the Holy Ghost is the author, being the authoritative rule and the instrument by which He acts in the plan of salvation."

<sup>16</sup> John Stott, *Romans: God's Good News For the World*, (Downer's Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1994), 218. Cf. Charles Hodge, *Romans* from the Crossway Classic Series edited by Alister McGrath and J.I. Packer, (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossways Books, 1993), 228. And Cf. D. Martyn Lloyd Jones, *Romans: Exposition of Chapter 7:1-8:4, The Law: It's Functions and Limits* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1973; reprinted 1974 and 1976), 290. "It is just another way of describing the gospel..."

<sup>17</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), 373.