

Romans 10:5-15

⁵ For, Moses writes that the man who practices the righteousness of the law shall live by it. ⁶ But the righteousness of faith speaks thus, “Do not say in your heart, ‘Who will ascend into heaven?’ that is to bring Christ down,⁷ or ‘Who will descend into the abyss?’ that is to bring Christ up from the dead.”⁸ But what does it say? “The word is near you in your mouth and in your heart,”—that is the word of faith, which we preach.⁹ That if you confess in your mouth Jesus [as] Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be delivered.¹⁰ For in the heart one believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth one confesses unto deliverance.¹¹ For the Writings says “All who believe on him will not be ashamed.¹² For there is not difference Jew and also Greek, For the same Lord [is] of all, being rich to all who call upon him.¹³ “For all who call on the name of the Lord will be delivered.”¹⁴ How then might they call on whom they have not believed? And how might they believe in whom they have not heard? And how might they hear without a preacher?¹⁵ And how might it be preached if one is not sent? Just as it has been written, “How timely [beautiful] are the feet of those who bring good news.”

Exegetical Outline

- I. The Contrast Between the Righteousness of the Law and the Righteousness of Faith (v. 5-8)
 - a. The righteousness of the law lives by that same righteousness (v. 5)
 - b. The righteousness of faith is secure in Christ (v. 6-8)
 - i. There is no need to ascend into heaven
 - ii. There is no need to descend into hell
 - iii. The Word is here
- II. The Result of Belief and Confession Is Deliverance (v. 9-10)
 - a. With the mouth one confesses (v. 9a & 10b)
 - b. With the heart one believes (v. 9b & 10a)
- III. The Result of Calling Is Deliverance (v. 11-13)
 - a. Believers will not be put to shame (v. 11)
 - b. Jesus Christ is Lord to all (v. 12)
 - c. Deliverance has no racial distinction (v. 13)
- IV. Only Through the Messenger Is Deliverance Possible (v. 14-15)
 - a. One must believe to have the opportunity to call (v. 14a)
 - b. One must hear the message in order to believe (v. 14b)
 - c. One must be preached to in order to hear (v. 14c)
 - d. One must be sent to preach (v. 15a)
 - e. Those who are sent are timely and blessed (v. 15b)

Introduction

Amidst a well-known section concerning Israel's present and future relationship to God (chapters 9-11), Paul addresses the idea of present and future deliverance. While the law promised life and blessing to the Israelites, Paul knew that only through faith could true life be obtained. Desiring to speak of deliverance in a two-pronged manner, Paul then says, "one believes unto righteousness" and "confesses unto deliverance" (5:10). This deliverance is then further explained when Paul talks of "calling upon the Lord." Unavoidably the messenger and his feet are exalted for only through them can eternal life make its way out into the world. If those who are sent to bring the good news refuse to be used, eternal and temporal deliverance will never be realized. Therefore, the feet of those who bring good news are beautiful and timely to those who believe the message.

Exegesis of Romans 10:5-15

I. THE TWO MANNERS OF RIGHTEOUSNESS CONTRASTED (v. 5-8)

Paul begins this section by switching from the main subject "completion" (tel o")¹ through Christ to the writings of "Moses" (Mwush"). Some have also noticed that "(i) the [explanatory clause] gar indicates that "either v. 5 by itself or the whole of vv. 5-8 is thought of as being in some way explanatory of v. 4; (ii) there is a contrast between v. 5 and vv. 6-8 (hence the de; in v. 6); (iii) the verse contains a quotation from Lev 18.5."²

¹ Through discourse analysis, one might come to the conclusion the words tel o" and Mwush" are in 'topic comment' form. One might say that this serves to switch from a main point to a sub-point, vice versa, or to make a complete (tel o") subject change. (cf. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, p. 8). Although, some linguists have seen this construction as bi-directional (cf. Garvin, P.L. In *Currents Trends in Linguistics*, ed. T.E. Sebeck, The Hague, Mouton, 1963, p. 508. Thus, it could be not only looking forward, but also looking backward.

² (Cranfield, 520). Schreiner notes, "The gar introducing verse 5 signals a logical relationship between verses 4 and 5. It is likely that the verses 5-8 as a whole function as the ground for verse 4... and that the

Moses wrote in Lev 18:5 and others wrote in Neh 9:29 and Ezek 20:11, 13, 21 of the righteousness³ that comes by means⁴ of the law. This righteousness allows one in the covenant community to remain in the covenant community, however, if one does not obey the statutes of the Lord, he is excommunicated.⁵ The reason Paul quoted Lev 18:5 was to remind his readers what the essence of the law truly was, blessings and cursings, is contingent on one's obedience. Moo states, "It is the one who *does* the works required by the law who must find life through them."⁶

The meaning of the phrase "the righteousness based on the law" (τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου) has three possible meanings: (1) The righteousness, which is made available through faith;⁷ (2) This is being a mild contrast between the righteousness, which is based on faith and the righteousness, which is based on the law;⁸ (3) A negative conception in direct contrast to "the righteousness based on faith (v. 6). Referring to the

progression of thought is as follows: The one who keeps the commands of the Mosaic law will experience eternal life (v. 5). This is the righteousness demanded by the law. But the verse implies that no one keeps the law, and thus righteousness cannot be attained via the law" (Schreiner, 550).

³ BDAG defines *dikaïosunh* as blamelessness and uprightness, whether bestowed by God or attempted by man. Wallace defines this as an accusative or respect of general reference. He translates Rom 10:5, "for Moses writes that, with reference to the righteousness which comes from the law..." (*ESNT*, p. 204).

⁴ The conjunction *ἐκ* + genitive can denote source, separation, temporal, cause, partitive, or means. This instance is probably best classified as source because Paul is stressing the righteousness, which is based on the law (not part of or sourced in). See Max Zerwick and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed., (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988), p. 482).

⁵ Cranfield notes that this is a quote from Lev 18:5, which says, "So you shall keep My statutes and My judgments, by which a man may live if he does them; I am the LORD." After a lengthy explanation of what these statutes are, the Lord says, "so that the land will not spew you out, should you defile it, as it has spewed out the nation which has been before you. 'For whoever does any of these abominations, those persons who do *so* shall be cut off from among their people" (vv. 28-29). This is not is support of Arminianism in the Old Testament. Because God takes away the blessings of the Lord does not mean that there has to be a loss of salvation.

⁶ (Moo, 649).

⁷ In this view, vv. 5-6 are commentary on v. 4. Moo writes, "The 'righteousness of the law' is nothing but the righteousness of faith, for, rightly understood the law itself calls for faith: 'the person who does the law,' mentioned in the quotation from Lev. 18:5, is the person who submits to the law's deepest demand, 'circumcises the heart,' and trusts in the Lord" (Moo, 646). Scholars such as Howard in "Christ the End of the Law: The Meaning of Romans 10:4ff," *JBL* 88 (1969), pp. 333-36 and Fuller, *Gospel and Law*, pp. 66-68, have proposed this meaning.

⁸ This is somewhat unlikely. Paul is not trying to introduce perfectionism into Rom 10. On the contrary, he is contrasting the law, which brings condemnation and wrath and faith, which brings life (Cranfield, 646-47).

first option, Moo writes, “But such a complimentary relationship between vv. 5 and 6 is not likely. Twice already in this passage Paul has contrasted two kinds of righteousness: ‘the righteousness based on faith’ with ‘the law of righteousness’ (9:30-31); ‘the righteousness of God’ with ‘their own righteousness’ (10:3)” (Moo, 646). Thus, the reader expects another contrast. This is further accentuated by the contrast of “doing” or work and “faith” or belief.⁹ Therefore, it is most likely that Paul is making a major contrast between the righteousness based on faith and the righteousness based on the law. However, in Ezek 20:11 it seems that the Lord is warning against temporary wrath and annihilation not the threat of eternal condemnation. What the Israelites missed out on was the promise land. Ezek 20:15-16 says, “Also I swore to them in the wilderness that I would not bring them into the land which I had given them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands, because they rejected My ordinances, and as for My statutes, they did not walk in them; they even profaned My sabbaths, for their heart continually went after their idols.” Instead of blessings, the Israelites received temporal punishment. Just as Moses promised blessing to Israel for their obedience, Paul has promised that “if by the Spirit you are putting to death the deeds of the body, you will live” (Rom 8:13).

Paul begins v. 5b with a quote from the Old Testament.¹⁰ This same verse in the LXX (Lev 18:5) says, “You will do it, which by doing, man shall live in them [statutes and

⁹ Paul contrasts the righteousness of the law and that which comes by faith in Phil 3:9-11, “kai; eureqw' ejn aujtw/ mh; efcwn ejnhn dikaiosunhn thn ek nomou ajl l a; thn dia; pistew" Cristou, thn ek qeou' dikaiosunhn epi; th/pistei.” Then Paul says “that I may know Him and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death if perhaps I might arrive in the out resurrection from the dead (ei|pw" katanthsw eij' thn ejanastasin thn ek nekrwn). The end result that God wishes us to have is an out-resurrection from the dead. This is a greater resurrection that only comes through being conformed to His death.

¹⁰ The *o*ti indicates indirect discourse. (cf. Wallace 453-54).

judgments].”¹¹ In Leviticus, the opposite of “living” was equated with being ostracized or cut off from the land and the nation that had been spewed out beforehand (Egypt and Canaan). Many times this is equated with being eternally cut off from God or eternal condemnation, however, being “cut off” in the Old Testament should be equated not with eternal condemnation but being cut off from the blessings of the house of God. By practicing¹² them, the statutes and judgments of God, the man shall live¹³ by¹⁴ them. Hartley writes, “What is meant by life here? The text is imprecise. Placed in the context of the parenthesis (vv. 24-30), it means that Israel will have a secure, healthy life with sufficient goods in the promise land as God’s people. Later interpreters... have taken ‘life’ to mean eternal life. There is little support in the Pentateuch for such a reading of this text.”¹⁵ It seems clear that “life” in this passage does not refer to eternal life¹⁶, but

¹¹ Compare the LXX “*poihsēte auita; a)poihsa" a)hqrwpo" zhsetai ej auitoi*” and the NT versions “*olpoihsa" auita; a)hqrwpo" zhsetai ej auitoi*.” Except for the *auita*, this is almost an exact quote. It is quite clear that Paul’s audience knew what *auita* referred to (statutes and judgments).

¹² The aorist participle *olpoihsa"* should probably be taken generically (Wallace, 615, fn. 8., for opposing view cf. Boyer).

¹³ Ezek 3:21 states, “But if you do warn the righteous man not to sin and he does not sin, he will surely live because he took warning, and you will have saved yourself.” The Lord promises one will live if he does not sin. This is not a promise of eternal life, but a promise of continued fellowship, security, and prosperity. Lev 25:18 states, “Follow my decrees and be careful to obey my laws, and you will live (dwell) safely in the land.” Deut 12:1, 10 states “These are the decrees and laws you must be careful to follow in the land that the LORD, the God of your fathers, has given you to possess—as long as you live in the land... But you will cross the Jordan and settle in the land the LORD your God is giving you as an inheritance, and he will give you rest from all your enemies around you so that you will live (dwell) in safety.” After promising this inheritance, the Lord warned Israel to remain true to him. Deut 28:58-59, 62 says, “If you do not carefully follow all the words of this law, which are written in this book, and do not revere this glorious and awesome name—the LORD your God—the LORD will send fearful plagues on you and your descendants, harsh and prolonged disasters, and severe and lingering illnesses... You who were as numerous as the stars in the sky will be left but few in number, because you did not obey the LORD your God.” It is clear in the Old Testament that obedience is equated with security, safety, and prosperity. TDNT comments, “The term *hayyim* covers only physical, organic life, yet it contains a value judgment... a reward for keeping the commandments (Dt. 5:16 etc.)... While it is the enjoyment of blessings on the one side, it is fellowship with God on the other, but either way it is understood as God’s gift.”

¹⁴ Cranfield notes that the conjunction *ej* is instrumental. The instrument by which one shall live is the law.

¹⁵ Hartley, John, *Leviticus*, vol. 4, (Dallas: Word Books, 1992), p. 293.

¹⁶ Sanday comments, “*zhsetai* : shall obtain life in its deepest sense both here and hereafter” (p. 286). There is a sense in which we will avoid temporal consequences here and now, just like the Israelites, and we will be rewarded according to our deeds at the Judgment Seat of Christ. In a parable about following

avoiding the temporal consequences of God's judgment and wrath. Although Israel tried to do right, they always seemed to fail. Although, while they obeyed, their nation was characterized by prosperity, security, and safety. Diodore of Tarsus, in a commentary from the Greek church, commented, "Paul says that the man who fulfilled the law would enjoy the good things promised by it, that is to say, *a land flowing with milk and honey*."¹⁷ Gordon J. Wenham argues that present divine blessing comes through obedience to the law.¹⁸ Thus, Paul's use of Lev 18:5 is in reference to sanctification. Ammerman writes, "This can be seen from the theology of Romans 6 and usages of *dikaioσunh*, 'righteousness,' in Romans. Paul argues for obedience in relation to sanctification, just as Leviticus 18:5 does."¹⁹

Though one can live well by living in a righteous manner, this prosperity can not exist without the righteousness, which is based on faith. Thus, Paul contrasts the righteousness based on the law and the righteousness based on faith.²⁰ Once again Paul switches the subject to "faith" (*h̄lpistew*"), however, Paul separates the article and the noun, which commonly denotes highlighting. Paul makes it clear that there is another righteousness, which is "based on" (*ek*)²¹ faith. Some have said that there is another contrast. Paul says "just as" (*oūtw*"),²² which correlates this phrase with the preceding and then instead of

Christ, it is said, "For the Son of Man is going to come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and will then repay every man according to his deeds" (Matt 16:27).

¹⁷ This quote was translated in *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, vol vi*, but was taken from K. Staab, ed., *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben (Pauline Commentary from the Greek Church: Collected and Edited Catena Writings)*, NT Abhandlungen 15:395, Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1933.

¹⁸ Wenham, Gordon, *The Book of Leviticus*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1979), p. 253.

¹⁹ Ammerman, Mark C., *An Exegesis of Deuteronomy 30:11-14 and Romans 10:6-8*, (DTS Thesis, 1983), p. 38.

²⁰ Moo notes, "Our interpretation of v. 5 requires that we give the word *de*; an adversative meaning" (p. 650).

²¹ This conjunction should most likely be seen as source. See fn. 4.

²² This is a correlative adverb (cf. Wallace, p. 663, fn. 14). Thus, this phrase and the preceding are joined and further compared.

saying, “Moses writes” he uses the verb “says” (*legei*). Some have said that “writes” (*grafei*) has a negative meaning and “says” (*legei*) has a positive meaning, however, their case cannot be thoroughly substantiated.²³

Paul then uses the opening words of Deut 8:17 and 9:4 verbatim, “Do not say in your heart” (*mh; eiph' ej th/kardia/sou*). The subjunctive “do not say” acts almost as a prohibition²⁴ and thus would read *you are prohibited from saying in your heart*. The phrase “in your heart” (*ej th/kardia/sou*) directly parallels v.8. Therefore, one might surmise that the same argument, which says that this phrase carries a pejorative meaning in this verse, might also force one to conclude that the same phrase carries a negative meaning in v. 8. In Deut 30:14-15 Moses writes, “But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may observe it. See, I have set before you today life and prosperity, and death and adversity.” The reason the Israelites were blessed is because his word was near to them in their hearts. Paul continues by quoting Deut 30:12, “Who will go up into heaven?” (*ti' ajabhsetai eij' ton ouranon*) To this Craigie states:

“Metaphorically the commandment is not inaccessible because of its height or loftiness, so that some especially qualified person would be needed to make all clear. Somewhat more literally, the implication is that the law was given or revealed to man; it was particularly designed for man’s living and not a part of the mystery of God that man could not approach and that was retained ‘in the heavens.’ There was therefore no ground for excuse in relation to

²³ See Käsemann and his discussion of Paul’s contrast between *pneuma* and *gramma* and how that relates to the contrast between *grafei* and *legei*. Cranfield writes, “That a theologically significant contrast between *grafei* in v. 5 and *legei* in v. 6 (hinting at the opposition between *gramma* and *pneuma*) was intended by Paul strikes us as very improbably” (p. 522-23). Surely Käsemann would not think Paul was referring negatively to his quotation in 4:17 about Abraham, “*7kaqw' gegraptai oti patera polwn ejrw'n teqeika se.*” The fact that Abraham was a father to many nations should be seen as something positive. After all Matt 1:2 records Jesus as being one of those descendents. It seems Käsemann does not have a solid foundation on which to place this argument.

²⁴ This is a prohibitive subjunctive according to Wallace. This is usually signaled by *mh;* + the subjunctive. (cf. Wallace, p. 469).

the law; the question, *Who will ascend to the heavens for us?* would be at best a misunderstanding, and at worst a deliberate evasion of the responsibility imposed upon man by the law of the covenant.”²⁵

By quoting Deuteronomy, Paul was in effect warning his readers to realize that the Word had come to them. There was no need for them to go into heaven. The Word was made flesh in Christ. Cranfield writes, “Israel does not have to climb up to heaven to discover God’s will; for He has graciously shown them what is good by His law, and that law is simple and clear. They do not have to inquire after the will of a harsh or capricious tyrant. They have received the revelation of the merciful will of the God whose grace is the presupposition of all He requires.”²⁶ Thus, “this is to bring down Christ” (τὸ ἄεστὶν Ἰησοῦν καταγαγεῖν²⁷). This very phrase is used three times in vv. 6-8 in order to explain Paul’s interpretation of the OT texts, which he quotes. Thus, there is no need to ascend to heaven to bring Christ down for the Word has already descended.

Paul continues on by saying, “Or ‘Who will descend into the abyss?’” (ἢ τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσον²⁸). Cranfield writes, “Just as there is not point in wanting to mount up to heaven to bring Christ down, now that the Incarnation has taken place, so neither is there any point in wanting to descend into Sheol to bring Christ up

²⁵ Craigie, Peter, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1976), p. 365. Tigay says, “The pithy statement that God’s Instruction is not in heaven is invoked in rabbinic literature to express fundamental concepts of Judaism. In the Talmud it is used to represent the idea that the authority for *interpreting* the Torah is not in God’s hands. Once God gave the Torah to Israel, He gave the authority to decide how it is to be applied entirely to legal scholars, and retained none for Himself.” Tigay, Jeffrey, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Deuteronomy*, (Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society, 1996), p. 286.

²⁶ (Cranfield, p. 523).

²⁷ Aorist infinitive, which should probably be defined as an expegetical infinitive (cf. Sanday and Headlam).

²⁸ Some scholars have noted that Paul may have been quoting Ps 107:26 because v. 7 seems to be different than Deut 30:13. To this Moo states, “But this is unlikely since Paul’s language is generally parallel to that of Deuteronomy and since it is sandwiched between two other references to Deut 30. In fact, the ‘sea’ and the ‘abyss’ where somewhat interchangeable concepts in the OT and in Judaism,” p. 655.

form the dead, since He has already been raised.”²⁹ Moses was emphatic by saying, “It is not in heaven, that you should say, ‘Who will go up to heaven for us to get it for us and make us hear it, that we may observe it?’ Nor is it beyond the sea, that you should say, ‘Who will cross the sea for us to get it for us and make us hear it, that we may observe it?’ But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may observe it” (Deut 30:12-14). The Jews did not have to go to heaven to understand the statutes and judgments of God, they were in their very hands. So too, Paul knew that there was no need to ascend into heaven to bring Christ down or to descend into Sheol³⁰ to bring Christ up, for that had already been accomplished. It seems that the Jews did not understand the law enough to understand that the incarnation and resurrection of Christ had already occurred. In order to explain this phrase, Paul states, “This is to bring Christ up from the dead” (tout̄ ē̄stin Criston ek³¹ nekrown ajagagein³²). The second of three similar phrases, Paul continues his progression towards v. 8. There is no need to ascend into heaven and bring Christ down and there is no need to descend into Sheol and bring Christ up. These have already been accomplished.

There seems to be debate on whether v. 7 is a paraphrase of Deut 30:13 or Ps 107:26 (cf. fn. 28). Even though the documents appear different, the words “sea” and “abyss” were used somewhat interchangeable in Judaism. Also, some Aramaic paraphrases of

²⁹ (Cranfield, p. 525)

³⁰ BDAG defines *apusso* as the “abode of the dead” and where the Antichrist abides. One cannot say that Christ is stuck in Sheol and cannot save his people, He has risen and His Word is alive and revealed from heaven unto men.

³¹ The conjunction *ek* denotes source “out of” or “from” (cf. Wallace, p. 742). It seems that because Paul said “*ēstin Criston ek nekrown ajagagein*” there is implied sense of underworld or world of the dead. Thus when the quote in Deut 30:13 refers to the “sea” it should be taken as the world of the dead.

³² This aorist infinitive should be defined as epexegetical. (See fn. 27).

Deut 30:13 have used language similar to “abyss.”³³ Whether this argument is true, Paul’s point was that there is no need to descend into the world of the “dead” (nekrwn).

In order to contrast the preceding two verses, Paul uses the conjunction “but” (αἰ | α).³⁴ Concerning Paul’s use of the question “What does it say?” (τί | εἶπῃ), Cranfield writes, “The introductory formula ‘But what does it say?’ reiterates the initial introduction to the series of quotations from Deut 30 in v. 6a—the subject of the verb being, then, ‘the righteousness based on faith.’”³⁵ The use of the present “to say” seems to emphasize the results of the past action that are still continuing into the present.³⁶ Once again Paul quotes from the Deut 30. Paul writes, “The word is near you in your mouth and in your heart” (ἐγγυλ' sou to; rhma eḡstin eḡ tw/stomati sou kai; eḡ th/kardia/ sou).³⁷ The word order is somewhat changed from the LXX denoting emphasis on the word “near” (ἐγγυλ'). Cranfield writes, “Yet there is in the gospel that Paul and the other apostles are preaching an added sense in which the word is ‘near.’ For not only does the gospel proclaim and embody the fulfillment of the New Covenant prophecy. In Christ, the culmination of the law, God’s word is near in a way that has never been before.”³⁸ Driver writes, “This instruction has brought so near to thee—viz. by prophets and other teachers, and especially in discourses of Dt.—that thou canst talk of it familiarly with the

³³ (Moo, p. 655). Moo also writes, “In the LXX, *abussos*” almost always translates... which usually refers to deep places of the sea (BDB), but which in later Judaism was also used of the depths of the earth and the place where evil spirits are confined,” p. 655. (cf. TDNT 1, 9).

³⁴ The αἰ | α; here is adversative and contrasts vv. 5-6 with v. 8. (Cranfield, p. 656, also see Wallace, p. 761).

³⁵ (Cranfield, p. 656).

³⁶ Wallace calls this a perfective present because the results of the action have already come to fruition, however, the effects are still continuing in the present. In other words, the word is still near. This promise is just as true now as it was for the Israelites (*ESNT*, p. 532).

³⁷ The LXX reads a little bit differently, “The word is very near to you in your mouth and in your heart and in your hand itself to do it.” (eḡstin sou eḡgu; to; rhma sfodra eḡ tw/stomativsou kai; eḡ th/kardia/ sou kai; eḡ tai' cersin sou auḡto; poiein). The LXX seems to be even more emphatic with its use of *sfodra*.

³⁸ (Cranfield, p. 656).

lips, and meditate upon it in they heart; thou art consequently placed in a position for giving it practical effect.”³⁹ Commenting on the phrase “in your mouth” (עַן תַּו/סְטוֹמַטִּי סוּ), Tigay comments,

“It is readily accessible to you, you know it by heart. Compare Hebrew *be al peh*, ‘by mouth,’ the equivalent of English ‘by heart,’ ‘from memory.’ This manner of speaking reflects a predominantly oral culture in which learning and review are accomplished primarily by oral recitation. Compare 31:19, 21, ‘Write down this poem and teach it to the people of Israel; put it in their mouths... it will never be lost from the mouth of their offspring.’”⁴⁰

The Hebrew culture was an oral culture that passed on their tradition by memory. But, Moses knew that although the Israelites knew the law, they did not always practice it. Therefore, he says in Deut 30:15-16, “See, I have set before you today life and prosperity, and death and adversity; in that I command you today to love the LORD your God, to walk in His ways and to keep His commandments and His statutes and His judgments, that you may live and multiply, and that the LORD your God may bless you in the land where you are entering to possess it.” Israel had a choice set before them: to obey the commandments of the Lord or to disobey them. Thus Moses says, “in your heart” (עַן תַּח/קַרְדִּיָּא/סוּ). Concerning this phrase, Tigay notes, “In your mind, known internally and not merely by rote.” The Israelites had a choice between life and death. Life could be achieved through obedience, but disobedience always wrought death.⁴¹

For the third time, Paul concludes a verse with the words “*τὸ ἔστιν*” (this is), however, this time he concludes with “the word of faith which we preach” (*τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ*

³⁹ Driver, Samuel, *The International Critical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965), p. 331.

⁴⁰ (Tigay, pp. 286-87).

⁴¹ Tigay comments concerning Deut 3:15-20, “Here Moses concludes his summons to the covenant. He offers Israel the choice between life and death (v. 15)... Here Moses urges Israel to *obey* the covenant, for that is the only way, under its terms, to survive,” p. 287.

πιστευ"⁴² ο)κhrυssomen).⁴³ The word of the faith was thus being preached by the apostles. Ammerman comments, "Paul's explanatory clause attributes the old covenant word of Deuteronomy 30:14 to what he preaches: the new covenant word of faith."⁴⁴ Cranfield states, "The relative clause indicates that [the word of faith] *το; ρημα τη*" *πιστευ*" denotes not the confession of faith but the gospel message itself."⁴⁵ Some have concluded that this statement must be true because the explanatory clause (*οτι*) in v. 9, however, with a proper definition of "confess" (*ομολογω*) and "believe" (*πιστευω*) one might come to a different conclusion.

II. THE RESULT OF BELIEF AND CONFESSION IS DELIVERANCE (v. 9-10)

The next verse begins with a conditional explanatory clause (*οτι εαν*). The conjunction "that" (*οτι*)⁴⁶ explains the content of the word that the apostles were preaching. The meaning of v. 8 should thus be judged by this verse. The conditional

⁴² Moo notes, "The genitive *τη*" *πιστευ*" is objective—'the word that calls for faith.' Some commentators think that 'faith' here might have the concrete sense of 'the faith which is believed,' but this is unlikely. Both *πιστι*" and *πιστευω* refer throughout this context to the act of believing rather than to the message that one is to believe," p. 657. It seems that Moo's interpretation is more based on his theological understanding of vv. 5-10 than the normal grammatical translation. It seems that *το; ρημα τη*" *πιστευ*" should be seen as the word, which is characterized by faith or comes from faith and thus should be seen as a genitive of source "faith comes by hearing." This also could be translated "the preached word of the faith," which would see "the faith" as all believers.

⁴³ Dewey notes, "We can now begin to decipher the movements of Philo and Paul. The considerations of Deut 30:11-14 is a canny selection on both their parts. For within a society where there is a decidedly weak sense of active participation (Eisenstadt and Roniger: 206-7), both Philo and Paul take up a tradition that works in the opposite direction. Deut 30:11-14 challenges the listener to an active and immediate response. In a world where the control and labeling of resources are in the hands of a few, both Philo and Paul are declaring that access to power, the most profound and the most extensive, is right before the listener, who has the opportunity to choose to exercise this access." Dewey, Arthur, "A Re-Hearing of Romans 10:1-15," *Semeia*, vol. 65, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), p. 125. Dewey notes that vv. 6d, 7b and 8c all seem to be mission oriented.

⁴⁴ (Ammerman, p. 50). Ammerman comments on p. 51 that the word of faith should be equated with the gospel message.

⁴⁵ (Cranfield, p. 526).

⁴⁶ The *οτι* should probably be seen as epexegetical (cf. Wallace, p. 459-60, or Ammerman p. 52 for an explanation on appositional), however, it could be seen as causal (cf. Cranfield, p. 526).

aspect is apparent because of Paul's usage of "if you confess" (*ejan omol oghsh'*).⁴⁷

Some have seen confession and faith in v. 9 as synonymous.⁴⁸ One might surmise that the parallelism of vv. 9-10 would support this view,⁴⁹ however, the apostle Paul made a definite distinction between the means of confession and the place of faith. In defense of the former, James Edwards shows the parallelism of vv. 9-10 through the following chiasmic structure:

A – that if you confess with your mouth the Lord Jesus (10:9a)
 B – and believe in your heart that God has raised Him from the dead, you will be saved (10:9b)
 B¹ – For with the heart one believes unto righteousness (10:10a)
 A¹ – and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation (10:10b).⁵⁰

Another view says that if confession by the "mouth" (*stomati*) and faith in the "heart" (*kardia*) are distinguished; belief and confession and thus salvation and righteousness should also be distinguished. The word "to confess" (*omol ogew*) means to "agree" or "acknowledge."⁵¹ The instrument by which one acknowledges or agrees is "with your mouth" (*ejan*⁵² *tw/stomati*⁵³ *sou*). Thus, with the mouth one confesses verbally "Jesus as

⁴⁷ This is a third class conditional sentence with a subjunctive verb (Wallace, 471). Wallace states, "the condition as uncertain of fulfillment, but still likely," p. 699.

⁴⁸ It is interesting to note that Joseph of Arimathea is described as "a disciple of Jesus, but secretly, for fear of the Jews." He did ask Pilate for the body of Jesus in order to bury Him in his tomb (Jn 19:38), but previous to this request he did not "confess" Jesus publicly. Also, in John 12:42-43, there were some who "believed in Him, but because of the Pharisees did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue; for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." Some say that they were not true believers, but the exact wording is used in connection with Jesus' disciples in John 2:11 "*episteusan eij' auton*."

⁴⁹ (Nygren, p. 384, also see Bultman in TDNT, 6:209).

⁵⁰ (Edwards, p. 254).

⁵¹ BDAG defines *omol ogew* as to "agree, acknowledge, admit, promise, assure, or to praise." TDNT adds "to make a statement," "bear witness," as an adverb "common consent," in postapostolic writings to "promise" or "concede," or "acceptance" (Clement of Alexandria). Taking these into account, one should come to the conclusion that it means some sort of acknowledgment of something.

⁵² This should most likely be defined as an instrumental conjunction (cf. Wallace, p. 372).

⁵³ TDNT sees *stomati* in the Old Testament as carrying the sense of "word" or "command" in the sense of a "loud voice." For Philo, the *stoma* of God represents his "word."

Lord” (*kurion*⁵⁴ *ih̄soūn*⁵⁵). There is an interesting textual problem here. Some texts merely add “Christ” after Lord, but some add “the word in your mouth that Jesus is Lord.” Although there are old and reliable manuscripts on both sides, it seems that the text should remain as it is seen in the NA26.⁵⁶ The second part of the condition begins with “and believe in your heart” (*kai; pisteush/’ ej̄ th/kardia/sou*). Cranfield writes, “The order of the two conditional clauses, at first sight surprising since confession issues from belief, is no doubt due to the fact that ‘in thy mouth’ precedes ‘in thy heart.’⁵⁷

Whether these two conditions are in the order of occurrence or not, one’s deliverance is still contingent upon both of these conditions. For Cranfield, both of these conditions are

⁵⁴ BDAG defines *kurio* as an address to an owner, super-natural being (God, angel, etc.). There is a sense where this could carry the sense of service and in this context it should probably denote something more than just a title. Cranfield writes, “We take it that, for Paul, the confession that Jesus is Lord meant the acknowledgment that Jesus shares the name and the nature, the holiness, the authority, power, majesty and eternity of the one and only true God,” p. 529. Thus, for Cranfield, “confessing Jesus as Lord” is merely agreeing that Jesus is God. Schreiner comments, “Paul asserts that belief in the lordship of Jesus and his resurrection (which are inseparable, since he was appointed as Lord at his resurrection; cf. Rom 1:4) are necessary for salvation,” p. 560. Schreiner’s definition of Lord seems logical, however, his coupling of confession and faith is somewhat unmerited.

⁵⁵ Wallace sees Rom 10:9 as a debatable passage that illustrates the double accusative of object-complement (declaring or presenting). Thus, what is being agreed upon is that Jesus is Lord or master.

⁵⁶ The first variant “en... *kurion ih̄soūn Criston*” is supported by only \aleph ⁴⁶ and (A). The first manuscript \aleph ⁴⁶ is from the third century and the second (A) is from the fifth century. Metzger states that all of these have very strong character (see Metzger, 37-47) and because \aleph ⁴⁶ (III) is included, one might say that the Alexandrian text-type is solid. This variant also has strong genealogical solidarity, however, its geographic distribution is non-existent. The second variant “*to rh̄ma ej̄ tw/stomati sou oti kurion ih̄soūn*” is supported by (B) and (81). The uncial (B) is a fourth century uncial, which Metzger (p. 42) acknowledges is one of the most important uncials, however, Metzger acknowledges that it was most likely a rejected manuscript (see p. 48). The manuscript (81) was written in 1044 and is one of the most important miniscule manuscripts (Metzger, p. 63). Although the second variant has two Alexandrian manuscripts, only one of them has a strong date and character. Thus, this variant cannot be judged as solid in any category. The third variant “*ej̄ tw/stomati sou kurion ih̄soūn*,” which is the variant chose by Nestle-Aland 26 includes, (IV) D F (IX) G (X) Y (VIII) 33, 1739, 1881. The fourth Century manuscript is said to have “primacy in position” (Metzger, p. 42). One might say that it has strong date and character. 33 is not as strong of a witness in the Pauline Epistles because it favors a Byzantine reading and it is an eleventh Century manuscript, however, it is still an important manuscript because of its character (see Metzger, pp 62). Also, 1739 could also be seen as a fairly important manuscript because of its Alexandrian reading and its seemingly fourth Century archetype (see Metzger, pp 65). Metzger suggests that its ancestor may have come from the fourth Century. The third variant has a solid Alexandrian witness. The third variant has strong date and character, genealogical solidarity, and is the simplest reading of all. Most likely the scribes added *Criston* to the first variant and *to rh̄ma...oti* to the second variant in order to clarify the text. Thus, because the third variant is harder and because it has the best external support, the third variant should be preferred.

⁵⁷ (Cranfield, p. 527).

synonymous, however, the average interpreter must be aware of its Pelagian roots.⁵⁸ Cranfield sites John 9:22 as evidence of the synonymous nature of “to confess” (omologew) and “to believe” (pisteuw). Although, John 9:22 states, “His parents said this because they were afraid of the Jews; for the Jews had already agreed that if anyone confessed Him to be Christ, he was to be put out of the synagogue.” This was obviously a verbal confession that is clearly not required for one to be saved from hell. Therefore, the second condition is “believe in your heart.” BDAG defines “heart” (kardia) as “seat of the physical, spiritual, and mental life.” TDNT states that for the Greeks “heart” (kardia) can carry the meaning of “seat of thought” and it can also mean “seat of the understanding” in the New Testament. Thus, for someone to say that because the location of belief is said to be in the heart that this implies something more than persuasion of the facts, is unfounded. Paul clarifies the statement with the use of the conjunction “that” (ofti).⁵⁹ What is to be believed is the fact that “God raised Him from the dead” (olqeo; aujton hgeiren ek nekrown). The verb “to raise” (hgeiren) should be seen as a once-for-all act.⁶⁰ In other words, the resurrection has already occurred and is complete. Christ’s resurrection from the domain of the dead⁶¹ is complete.

The conditional side of the sentence “if you confess with your mouth Jesus as Lord and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead,” if completed, will result in

⁵⁸ This inseparability of confession and belief was first purported by Pelagius “Testimonium cordis est oris confessio,” p. 82. Pelagius did not believe in eternal security and so theologially relied heavily upon works and perseverance as proof of one’s enduring belief. However, if confession is to be seen as synonymous with belief, the term kurion must carry the exact same meaning as savior or the resurrection and the life (Jn 11).

⁵⁹ This use of oft i should be seen as expegetical (compare fn. 46). The oft i clause seems to further clarify and explain the preceding thoughts.

⁶⁰ The aorist indicative verb should be seen as a consummative aorist, which “stresses the cessation of an act or state,” (Wallace, p. 599).

⁶¹ Wallace in *ESNT* notices that apo and ek can at times be used interchangeably, however, apo nekrown seems to carry a general sense of “away from the dead” rather than ek nekrown, which seems to carry the specific sense of “out from among the dead,” p. 363, fn. 17. Therefore, Christ was not only moved to another location, but he was taken out from the domain of the dead.

one's "deliverance" (σωτηρία). Schreiner notes, "the future tense σωτηρία/should be construed as a genuine future as is typically the case when Paul uses the verb σωζειν (sozein, to save; so Barrett 1991; 188, Cranfield 1979; 530, Dunn 1988b:609)."⁶²

Nevertheless, it seems that Paul distinguishes between "salvation" or "deliverance" and "justification" in Romans. Hart notices,

"Salvation' (soteria) is used five times in Romans, and 'save' (sozo) is used eight times. A surprising observation is that the verb is used only one of the eight times (Rom 8:24) in the aorist tense. The other seven uses are future. This is not what we would expect if the salvation of Romans is equivalent to justification. The verb 'justify' (dikaioo) is used fifteen times, with three occasions using the future (Rom 2:5; 3:20, 30). With the possible exception of 2:13, none of these references are genuine futures to the time of faith, i.e., referring to the future time of resurrection/judgment. Justification is a reality to be rejected or received in this life."⁶³

Therefore, one might surmise that Paul was saying *if you confess Jesus as Lord and believe that God raised him from the dead, you will be delivered from the wrath of God.*⁶⁴

This distinction between deliverance and righteousness is further clarified in v. 10. By preposing "heart" (καρδία) and "mouth" (στόματι) it seems that Paul is making an emphatic contrast. Paul uses the conjunction "for" (γάρ)⁶⁵ in order to further clarify vv. 5-9. Once again the heart or the seat of the understanding is the means by which one

⁶² (Schreiner, p. 561).

⁶³ Hart, John, "Why Confess Christ? The Use and Abuse of Romans 10:9-10," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, 12:23, 1999, p. 15, fn. 35. He goes on to say, "The four present participles (Rom 3:24, 26; 4:5; 8:33) all appear to be gnomic participles, setting out a universal principle of God's activity, not some process (progressive present)." (cf. Wallace, pp. 523-24 for more on the Gnostic Present). Thus, Hart sees "to save" as a logical future (future relative to the event) and the present occurrences of "to justify" as gnomic presents (a timeless fact).

⁶⁴ This is reminiscent of Rom 5:9. Concerning this verse, Hart in *JOTGES* writes, "Bringing forward the meaning of wrath in 1:18, the 'saved from wrath' in 5:10 is best interpreted to be a deliverance from God's earthly displeasure against sin. One should carefully note Paul's wording, for he affirms that our justification requires the *death* of Christ, but our deliverance from slavery to sin requires the resurrected *life* of Christ," pp. 18-19.

⁶⁵ Functioning as an explanatory conjunction, γάρ is clarifying vv. 5-10. Thus, righteousness and deliverance are being explained.

believes. This belief or understanding of the message then results⁶⁶ in righteousness (*dikaïosunh*).⁶⁷ Therefore, believing the gospel in the seat of the understanding results in justification righteousness.

By the use of the conjunction “but” (*de*), Paul compares that which is done with the “heart” (*kardia*) and that which is done with the “mouth” (*stomati*). One believes in the seat of his understanding unto righteousness and confesses with the words of his mouth unto deliverance. Therefore, belief results in eternal deliverance from hell and confession with the mouth results in temporal deliverance from the consequences of sin. Once again there is a distinction made between righteousness and deliverance. Bing writes, “It is argued that ‘salvation’ in vv. 9-10 is not justification (signified by ‘believes to righteousness’ in v. 10), but deliverance from the power of sin and its consequences of God’s temporal wrath. They apply here the general meaning of *soteria/sozo* which is often used of temporal deliverance in the Bible... While recognizing that faith brings God’s righteousness here, confession brings deliverance or ‘salvation’ in the sense of God’s help from some problem or danger.”⁶⁸

III. The Result of Calling Is Deliverance (v. 11-13)

⁶⁶ Schreiner notes that the conjunction *ei* most likely conveys the result of belief. He then notes, “The reference to *dikaïosunhn* harks back to *hlek pistew* *dikaïosunh* in verse 6, reminding the reader of the central theme of the pericope: right standing God’s sight is obtained by faith rather than works,” (p. 560). This should probably be prefaced by saying that the phrase “right standing” can carry two meanings: judicial and fellowship. Thus, judicial “right standing” can be seen as obtained through faith, however, fellowship “right standing” is only maintained through works and confession.

⁶⁷ BDAG defines *dikaïosunh* as uprightness. TDNT has several definitions: (1) Secular meaning “virtue” or “allotting what is due”; (3) Rabbinic view “The underlying idea, discernible in the LXX, is that every observance of the law is meritorious”; and (4) Pauline definition “legal righteousness.”

⁶⁸ Bing, Charlie, *Lordship Salvation: A Biblical Evaluation and Response*, (DTS Dissertation, 1991), pp. 112-13. For a discussion on *soteria/sozo* as temporal deliverance see Brunott, *An Interpretation of Romans 10:1-15 and the Problem of Faith and Confession*, (DTS Thesis, 1975), pp. 25-32.

Paul uses the conjunction “for” (*gar*)⁶⁹ once again to clarify the preceding section. Cranfield notices, “*gar* is used because the quotation is being introduced as support for the statement of the previous verse that faith leads to justification (*pisteuetai eij dikaionhn*).”⁷⁰ Indeed Paul is introducing a statement supporting what preceded, however, he is supporting more than just faith. Because there is more to v. 10 than merely believing, Paul is saying *there is no need for those who believe in Him to be put to shame*. The reason is given in v. 13 (Joel 2:32), deliverance is given to all who confess Jesus as Lord (v. 10) and call upon the name of the Lord.

Paul begins with the verb “to say” (*legei*). Concerning this, Wallace states, “The present tense may be used to *emphasize* that the results of a past action are still continuing.”⁷¹ The Scripture that is being cited is Isaiah 28:16, however, Paul added the word “all” (*pa*). Cranfield notes, “[all] *pa*” is Paul’s addition... which makes explicit, and emphasizes, the universal scope of the general statement of the LXX text—the aspect on which he is going to dwell in vv. 12-13.”⁷² Thus, “all who believe on Him will not be ashamed” (*pa* *of* *pisteuwn epi/ autw/ouj kataiscunqhsetai*). The passage in Isaiah refers to the “cornerstone” that is a sure foundation. John Martin comments, “The LORD sets the stone and the sure foundation, that is, only He is the basis for physical and spiritual salvation (v. 16).”⁷⁴ In other words, the Lord is the only source for physical and spiritual deliverance. Just as Romans 5:9 says, “Much more then, having now been

⁶⁹ This is once again an explanatory conjunction. Paul is using this to let his readers know that he is going to summarize the preceding and move forward.

⁷⁰ (Cranfield, p. 532).

⁷¹ (Wallace, p. 532).

⁷² (Cranfield, p. 531).

⁷³ Wallace notes that this is most likely a generic article, which denotes a generic (as opposed to a specific) class of people. Therefore, Paul is limiting his message to the class of the believing (p. 230).

⁷⁴ Walvoord, John F., and Zuck, Roy B., *The Bible Knowledge Commentary*, (Wheaton, Illinois: Scripture Press Publications, Inc.) 1983, 1985.

justified by His blood, we shall be saved from the wrath *of God* through Him.” For the believer, there is no excuse to be put to shame. Hodges notes, “‘There is no need,’ Paul says, ‘for anyone who has believed in Christ to be put to shame. It doesn’t matter whether you are a Jew or a Gentile, because Jesus is Lord of all and lavishly generous to all who call on Him for aid.’”⁷⁵

Paul continues his explanation with the third use of the conjunction “for” (*gar*),⁷⁶ which advances his use of “all” (*pa*).⁷⁷ Cranfield comments, “12-13 consist of three sentences, each of which explains or supports its predecessor (hence the threefold *gar*).”⁷⁸ Because the negative article “no” (*ou*) is emphatically positioned before the conjunction, the gravity of the following should be noted. Paul categorically denies that there “is [a] distinction between Jew and also Greek” (*estin diastolh; ioudaiou⁷⁹ te kai; EII hno*). The use of this phrase is reminiscent of 3:22-23, 29-30, however, the explanation seems to further the argument. The context of chapter three is justification and when Paul refers to the lack of distinction he is referring to condemnation, however, the context of the chapter then seems to be explaining that there is no distinction amongst those that are in the body of Christ. With a proper exegesis of v. 14, it seems that one must believe before he can call. Thus, “those that call upon Him” (*tois epikaloumenous autou*) in v. 12b are Christians.

⁷⁵ Hodges, Zane, *Absolutely Free!*, (Dallas: Redencion Viva, 1989), p. 195. Hodges goes on to say, “In fact, in the words of Scripture itself (Joel 2:32), deliverance is available to all who call upon the Lord for it!”

⁷⁶ Once again Paul is using this explanatory conjunction to clarify the preceding. In other words, it does not matter whether you are Jew or Gentile, the Lord is available to deliver every believer who calls upon Him.

⁷⁷ Schreiner comments, “The *gar* (*gar*, for) at the beginning of verse 12 is explanatory, and the verse conveys more precisely what Paul means in saying that ‘everyone’ who believes will be vindicated by God,” p. 561.

⁷⁸ (Cranfield, p. 532). All three of these *gar* clauses are preceded by two *gar* clauses, which explain what precedes them. Thus, one could make the case that v. 5 (also vv. 6-8) explains (*gar*) 10:1-4 and vv. 10-13 explain (*gar*) v. 5, which builds its case until vv. 14-15 (*ouh*). Thus, vv. 14-15 seem to be the climax of the whole pericope.

⁷⁹ Wallace defines this genitive as a Genitive After Certain Nouns. Wallace states, “The most common instances involve two genitives joined by *kai*, with the meaning ‘between,’” p. 135.

Once again Paul uses the clarifying conjunction “for” (*gar*). Also, Paul once again emphatically separates the article “the” (*o*) from its corresponding noun “Lord” (*kurio*) with the conjunction “for” (*gar*) and the adjective “same” (*ajto*).⁸⁰ Romans 3:29 says, “Or is God *the God* of Jews only? Is He not *the God* of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also.” Just as God is the God of all, Jesus is the Lord of “all” (*pantwn*).⁸¹ This distinction seems to imply that Paul desires this use of “Lord” (*kurio*) to be more than just a mere title. This instance should be defined as “master.” Thus, He is master of all without distinction.

Although this relationship (submitting to the Lordship of Christ) implies hard work, it is not without benefit. Schreiner writes, “The Lordship of Jesus postulated here is a beneficent one, for he is rich ‘to all those who call upon him.’”⁸² Paul states that the Lord is “rich to all who call upon Him” (*pl outwn eij' panta" tou' epikaloumenou' ajton*). The participle “rich” (*pl outwn*) in non-Biblical literature carried the sense of “fullness of good” or “well-to-do,” in the Old Testament “Wealth is a gift of God and an expression of his blessing (Dt. 28:1 ff.),” however, the New Testament seems to contrast the riches that come from the things of God (cf. 2 Cor 6:10) and the wealth of man (cf. Matt 6:25). The riches of God are promised to⁸³ “all who call upon the Lord.” Concerning the use of “all” (*panta*), Cranfield states, “Note the persistent emphasis in vv. 12-13 of the idea of universality.”⁸⁴ It is obvious from the multiple uses of the word “all” that Paul wants to communicate that these principles are universal. Those that are

⁸⁰ This identifying adjective is in the attributive position

⁸¹ The genitive *pantwn* should be defined as a genitive of description, possession, or relationship (cf. Wallace, 79-83). The same Lord is Lord of all, belonging to all, or of all (implying a familial relationship).

⁸² (Schreiner, p. 562).

⁸³ This use of *eij'* should be defined as a preposition of reference or respect. “Rich with respect to all...”

⁸⁴ Notice the use of *pa*" (v. 11), *pantwn* (v. 12a), *panta*" (v. 12b), *pa*" (v. 13), and *pante*" (v. 16). These are universal truths that Paul is trying to communicate.

rich are those “who call upon the Lord” (*epikaloumenou*). Common in the Roman judicial system was the word “to appeal” (*epikalēw*).⁸⁵ In Acts 25:11-12 Paul appealed to Caesar, which only a Roman citizen could do. Therefore, because of his citizenship he had the opportunity to be heard by Caesar. Schreiner comments, “The OT background of the term indicates that it refers to invoking God in prayer.”⁸⁶ Thus, the Lord is rich to all believers who call upon Him through prayer for aid.

With a quote from Joel 2:32, Paul further clarifies (*gar*)⁸⁷ the preceding thought. The context of the Joel 2:32 quote is somewhat important since this verse seems to clarify the preceding eight verses. The second chapter describes the day of the Lord. Before the great and dreadful day of the Lord, “the sun will be turned to darkness and the moon to blood” (2:31). The time preceding the day of the Lord will be characterized by fear, however, the actual day of the Lord will be characterized by judgment. However, “all who calleth in the name of Jehovah is delivered” (2:32b) from that dreadful day when God’s physical wrath will come upon the nations. Northrup writes, “In the niphal when used in the passive sense it means to be delivered. Frequently it is use of the saving of a life in the Old Testament, and that is exactly the meaning here. Those who turn to the

⁸⁵ BDAG defines *epikalēw* as “call out, call upon someone for aid, or calling on a divinity.” For more see TDNT’s treatment of the verb *kaleōw*, which includes a discussion of *epikalēw*. It is interesting to read Ps 116:3-4 “The pangs of death compassed me; the dangers of hell found me; I found affliction and sorrow. Then I called on the name of the Lord: ‘O Lord, save my life.’” This Psalm is a thanksgiving for deliverance from death. This instance of calling upon the Lord is to save one’s physical life. Also, Unnik notes, “There are six instances (25:11, 12, 21, 25; 26:32; 28:19) [in Acts] where it denotes the appeal of Paul to Caesar... Acts 7:59 is a particularly interesting text, because the tense and mood of the verb are exactly identical with that in *epikaloumenoi to onoma*: “And they were stoning Stephen who called on (*epikaloumenon*) [Jesus] and said: ‘Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.’” Unnik, W.C., *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke, vol. II*, “With All Those Who Call on the Name of the Lord,” (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984), pp. 540-41. It is interesting that Paul called upon Caesar for deliverance because he was a citizen of Rome and Stephen called upon Jesus for deliverance because he was already a citizen of heaven. No one would argue that these instances are not speaking of eternal life, but of temporal deliverance.

⁸⁶ Schreiner also notices the LXX usage as more than just prayer, but also worship (p. 562, also see fn. 27).

⁸⁷ This is another explanatory *gar* clause. This is the sixth explanatory *gar* clause in this section.

Lord and call upon Him will be delivered through the tribulation in the Kingdom.”⁸⁸
 Thus, the “deliverance” (swqhsetai) is from temporal physical punishment.

The wording of Joel 2:32 (3:5 in the LXX) and Rom 10:13 is the same except for Paul’s addition of the conjunction “for” (gar), however, this was only added to denote the explanatory force, which it was meant to carry. The phrase “all who call upon” (pa’ o]’ ah epikal eshtai) seems to denote a generic or uncertain subject.⁸⁹ Although the subject is uncertain, nevertheless those who “call upon the name of the Lord, will be saved” (epikal eshtai to; ohoma kuriou swqhsetai). The word “Lord” (kuriou) in Joel refers to Yahweh. Wallace comments, “Thus to confess that Jesus is *the* Lord is to confess that he is Lord mentioned in v. 13. This verse is a quotation of Joel 3:5 (Hebrew; 2:32 in LXX), in which ‘Lord’ is in reference to Yahweh. Such an allusion is hardly accidental, but part of the Pauline soteriological confession. For Paul, to confess that Jesus is Lord is to confess that he is Yahweh.”⁹⁰ While confessing Jesus is Lord can be equated with confessing Jesus is Yahweh, calling upon the name of the Lord should not be equated with eternal salvation. Just as v. 14 says, “How then will they call on Him in whom they have not believed?” From this question, it seems that Paul was making an obvious distinction between calling and believing. Just as “one confesses with the mouth

⁸⁸ Bernard E. Northrup, “Joel’s Concept of the Day of the Lord,” (Dallas Theological Seminary Dissertation, 1961), p. 208.

⁸⁹ Wallace notes, “The construction [subjunctive after o]’ ah] normally indicates a generic (or sometimes an uncertain) subject... hence, the particle of contingency and the need for a subjunctive. The construction is roughly the *equivalent of a third class or fifth class condition*,” p. 478-79. Thus, Wallace defines this instance as a subjunctive in an indefinite relative clause.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 188.

unto deliverance,” “all who call upon the name of the Lord will be delivered.”⁹¹ It seems that for Paul, these are parallel ideas.

IV. ONLY THROUGH THE MESSENGER IS DELIVERANCE POSSIBLE (v. 14-15)

In order to conclude this passage, Paul uses the conjunction “then” (ouh)⁹² and begins a series of questions with the particle “how” (pw”).⁹³ Levenisohn comments, “Romans 10:14 contains a further instance of ouh that MGM classify as adversative; it is used to resume and advance the main topic of chapter 9-11 (the unbelieving Jews), following twelve verse (10:2-13) that strengthen previous assertions!”⁹⁴ The first of four rhetorical questions reads, “How then can they call on in whom they have not trusted?” (Pw" ouh epikal eswntai eij' oñ ouk episteusanÉ). These four rhetorical questions show the gravity of v. 15 (bringing the good news).⁹⁵ The following progression should be noted:

1. (pw" ouh) How then can they call
on whom they have not believed?
2. (pw" de;⁹⁶) And how can they believe
in whom they have not heard?
3. (pw" de;) And how can they hear
without a preacher?
4. (pw" de;) And how can they preach
if they are not sent?

⁹¹ Paul’s use of “will be delivered” (swqhsetai) should be seen as a logical future. Thus, one’s deliverance will be realized in the future of one’s calling upon the Lord.

⁹² This is an inferential conjunction, which “gives a deduction, conclusion, or summary to the preceding discussion.” (Wallace, p. 761).

⁹³ This is an interrogative coordinating conjunction, which carries the sense of “how” or “why.”

⁹⁴ Levenisohn, Stephen, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*, (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), p. 129.

⁹⁵ Wallace notices that the third question is a deliberative rhetorical subjunctive and should be translated “How can they hear without a preacher?” Since all four of these questions are parallel, it seems logical that all four of them should be seen as rhetorical questions (Wallace, p. 467).

⁹⁶ The latter three questions contain the connective conjunction de; that connects the latter questions to the former. Thus, these conjunctions denote continuity of thought.

Paul's logic is clear, *someone has to be sent in order to preach something, someone has to preach a message in order for someone to hear the message, someone has to hear the message to believe it, and finally someone has to believe the message in order to be able to call on the Lord for deliverance.* It has already been explained that riches and deliverance come to those who call upon the Lord, however, that person must first believe the message in order to have the opportunity to call upon the name of the Lord. Just as Paul was able to call upon Caesar for deliverance because he was a Roman citizen, the citizens of heaven have the ability to call upon the Lord for deliverance.⁹⁷

By using subjunctive verbs, Paul wished to show that the one each idea was contingent upon the next (i.e. calling was contingent upon believing and believing was contingent upon hearing). The first two questions contain the relative pronouns “whom” (οἱ and οὗ⁹⁸), which refer back to the Lord in v. 13. The first question employs the conjunction “in” (εἰς),⁹⁹ and some suggest that it is implied in the second. Cranfield comments, “The same construction is implicit in [and how can they believe in who they have not heard?] *pw" de; pisteusws in ou| ouk h̄kousan*, where [in] *eiς* is to be supplied as well as the omitted antecedent of [whom] *ου|*”¹⁰⁰ The final question of v. 14 contains the conjunction “without” (*χωρι;*), which is connected to the word “preacher”

⁹⁷ F.F. Bruce states, “Men and women are urged to call on the name of the Lord and be saved; but they will not call on his name unless they have been moved to believe in him, they cannot hear about him unless someone brings them the news, and no-one can bring them the news unless he is commissioned to do so, (p. 193). While Bruce disagrees with the view that calling and believing are two different things, he does notice that Paul makes a definite distinction in the text.

⁹⁸ Moo notes, “Paul uses the genitive of the relative pronoun (ου) with the verb *h̄kousan*. Since this verb normally takes the genitive to denote the person who is heard (as opposed to the thing that is heard, which is usually with the accusative), commentators suggest that Paul thinks of the preacher himself (Käsemann) or Christ (Godet) as the person who is heard. But the context (see vv. 15, 16, 17) seems to require a reference to the ‘word,’ the gospel. Therefore Paul may use the genitive to suggest that Christ is the one who is heard in the message of the gospel (e.g., S-H; Murray; Cranfield; Dunn),” p. 663, fn. 11.

⁹⁹ *eiς* is used with the accusative, which most likely denotes “reference” or “respect,” (cf. Wallace, p. 369).

¹⁰⁰ (Cranfield, p. 534).

(*khruSSonto*).¹⁰¹ Moo notes, “But a preacher is nothing more than a herald, a person entrusted by another with a message.”¹⁰² This verse communicates the awesome responsibility that humanity has been given. But, “how can they preach if they are not sent?” (*pw" de; khrukwsin eĵan mh; apostalwsinÉ*). Some might think that this has given Israel an excuse. One might ask, “If no one has been sent, how can we be condemned?” however, preachers (i.e. Isaiah) have been sent with the message.

The last statement of v. 15, which is introduced by the conjunction “just as” (*kaqw"*),¹⁰³ is a quote from Is. 52:7. Cranfield writes, “The quotation of Isa. 52:7, which is closer to the MT than to the LXX, so far from being a mere ornament (as it is sometimes regarded as being), is an essential step in the argument. It serves as a statement of the fact that the first and second conditions have been fulfilled.”¹⁰⁴ The quote reads, “How beautiful or timely are the feet of those who bring good news” (*wl' wraioi oilpode" twñ euĵaggeł izomenwn »ta¼ aĵaqa*). Concerning the word “timely” (*wraioi*), Moo writes, “It is also possible that the Greek word *horaioi* should be translated ‘timely,’ rather than ‘beautiful.’”¹⁰⁵ Therefore, those that come bringing good news come at just the right time. Concerning Is. 52:7, Oswalt notes, “Although some commentators struggle with the imagery of *beautiful feet*, it does not take a great deal of imagination to understand the point. How is the glorious news reaching us? Through the feet of this runner! What beautiful feet! There may be some intentional irony since the

¹⁰¹ Wallace notes that the conjunction *cwri"* takes a genitive, which *khruSSonto*" is.

¹⁰² (Moo, 663).

¹⁰³ The comparative (manner) conjunction *kaqw"* suggests an analogy between vv. 15a and 15b.

¹⁰⁴ (Cranfield, p. 535). Moo notes, “Paul’s use of this passage would inevitably suggest an allusion to the preaching of the gospel by himself and other ‘authorized messengers’ sent out by God (e.g., apostles)—especially since the passage was widely viewed as prophetic of the messianic age.

¹⁰⁵ (Moo, p. 664). In Acts 3:2, 10 and Matt. 23:27 the word carries the sense of “beautiful,” however, it generally means “timely” or “in appropriate season,” (cf. BDAG; Käsemann; Dunn).

feet are often considered the least beautiful parts of the body.”¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, these feet carry the messenger, which carries the message. Without the feet, the messenger would not be able to bring the message. Without the messenger being able to bring the message, the message could not be heard and if it could not be heard it could not be believed and if it could not be believed, the Lord could not be called upon. Therefore, the gravity of this statement is revealed. Without the messenger (*twñ eujaggel izomenwn*),¹⁰⁷ there would be no deliverance. Therefore, Paul can truly say that what the messenger brings are “good things” ([*ta% ajsaqa*]).

Conclusion

Knowing the gravity of one’s situation in Adam will cause one to see the feet of them who bring good news as beautiful and timely. Romans 10:5-15 is a passage that speaks of the importance of evangelism and the glory of one’s salvation. Without the messenger there would be no deliverance. Without the gospel there would be temporal or eternal deliverance. It is no wonder why Paul called the mangled feet of the runner beautiful for they carried the most important prize of all eternity, the good news.

Application

This passage was undoubtedly meant to remind the reader of the magnitude of evangelism. Many have said, “Others will go,” but in doing so they have neglected God’s purpose. This passage is not a call to leave your home, but to share the good news where

¹⁰⁶ Oswalt, John, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), pp. 367-68.

¹⁰⁷ BDAG defines *twñ eujaggel izomenwn* as one who brings a divine message (angel, preacher, etc).

you live. If we could see into eternity, we would surely be more thankful for the messenger, his feet, and the message that they carried.

One cannot ignore the dual themes of deliverance. Our deliverance is not only temporal but also eternal. Once we have believed the gospel, we are able to call upon the Lord for deliverance. Just as Stephen called upon the Lord to deliver him from this world, we too can call upon the Lord to deliver us from the trials that we face. Thus, as Christians, there is no reason for us to be put to shame!