

# <sup>1</sup> THE EPISTLE OF THE MOST HOLY ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS EXPLAINED

## ***1. The argument and matter of the New Testament***

The New Testament though it had the same author with the Old, namely Christ Jesus, and the same end and scope to bring us unto Christ, for the Law was our schoolmaster to the same end (Gal. 3:19) yet it differs from the Old: 1. In substance and doctrine; 2. In the ratification and confirmation; 3. In the rites and manners; 4. In the persons to whom it was delivered and committed.

Whereas the Old Testament promised eternal life under the condition of perfect obedience of the Law, the Gospel only required the obedience of faith (Rom. 10:5, 6). The Old Testament was confirmed by the sprinkling of the blood of beasts (Ex. 24:8) but the New was sealed and ratified by the blood and death of Christ (Heb. 9: 14, 17). There were other rites and ceremonies of the old Law, as the sacrifices and oblations, circumcision, the paschal lamb and such like. Christ has instituted new sacraments of the Gospel, Baptism and the Eucharist. The Old Testament was made only with the Hebrews but the New is commended unto the Church of God dispersed over the world and therefore it is called catholic.

The books of the New Testament are: 1. Historical, as of the acts, the sayings and the doings of our blessed Savior in the four Evangelists, or of the Apostles in the book of Acts; 2. Doctrinal, which specially concern doctrine and instruction without a continued historical narration. Such are the Epistles of the holy Apostles; 3. Prophetical, as the book of Revelation. Though the books may be thus divided in general there are both heavenly doctrines intermingled in the historical books as the heavenly sermons of our

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hexapla: That is, a sixfold commentarie upon the most Divine Epistle of the holy Apostle S Paul to the Romans.* Printed by Cantrell Legge, Printer to the Universitie of Cambridge, 1620.

blessed Savior in the Gospel. Prophecies are also inserted both in the historical and doctrinal books as that of the destruction of Jerusalem, the end of the world (Matt. 24), the calling of the Jews (Rom. 11) and the coming of Antichrist (2 Thess. 2).

## ***2. Of the language and tongue wherein the New Testament was originally written***

As the Old Testament was written originally in Hebrew, because it was committed unto the Hebrews (Rom. 3:2) so the New Testament was set forth by the Apostles and Evangelists in the Greek tongue, which was then general and used by the most famous nations because it concerned the Church of God, which was dispersed in all countries.

There are three other languages, wherein the New Testament, or some part thereof, was written. The Gospel of St. Matthew is held to have been written in the vulgar Hebrew tongue, which was then the Syriac<sup>2</sup> which Athanasius thinks was translated into Greek by St. James, some think St. John. Likewise, the epistle to the Hebrews is thought by some to have been first written in the Hebrew tongue. However, neither of these is certain. It is rather that Matthew wrote his gospel in Greek because he cites many places of the Old Testament according to the Septuagint as Isa. 40:3 alleges Matt. 3:3 and Psalm 22:18 cited in Matt. 27:35 and the like is to be seen elsewhere. As also Matt. 27:46 these words, *Eli, Eli, Lamasabacthani* are interpreted by the evangelist in the Greek tongue. This interpretation would have been superfluous if he had written in the Syriac or vulgar Hebrew tongue. For the same reasons it is most probable that the epistle to the Hebrews was not written in the Hebrew, but in the Greek tongue originally because the Apostle followed the translation of the Septuagint. In chapter 7, he

---

<sup>2</sup> Irenaeus 1.3.c.1, *Heierom. prafat in commentar in Matth.*

interpreted the word *Melchizedek* in the Greek tongue, which signifies *the king of righteousness*.

Syriac is another language in which the New Testament was written. The Syrians think that St. Mark translated the New Testament into this language. Nevertheless, this is not like, that this Syriac translation should be so evident for then these ancient fathers, Origen, Clement Alexandrin, Epiphanius, Jerome, Theodoret, Damascene, which were bishops and presbyters in Syria, or Egypt, would have made some mention thereof in their writings, which they do not. Though the Syriac translation could be proved to have been of such antiquity, yet it must give place to the authentic Greek, from which it was translated.

A third tongue is the Latin, by which Bellarmine would prove that St. Mark wrote his Gospel first at Rome and afterward turned it into Greek at Aquileia.<sup>3</sup> This is very improbable because the Greek tongue was more generally used than the Latin, and St. Paul writing to the Romans spoke in the Greek tongue for that reason, so also would Mark have done. If the Greek were translated out of the Latin, why then do not the Romanists use a Latin translation answerable to the Greek? Their vulgar translation differs much from the Greek. Sometimes it adds, such as Mark 1:1, where the name (*Isaiah*) *the prophet* is inserted. Sometimes it leaves out, as Mark 6:11, all the clause is omitted: *verily, verily, I say unto you, it shall be easier for Sodom and Gomorra in the day of judgment, than for that city*. Sometime it chops and changes, as c. 5. 1. *Garasenes* for *Gadarenes*. It remains then that the New Testament was originally written in the Greek tongue for the reasons before alleged.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Adrianus Finus. Lib. 6. flagell. Inde or.c.80. and Damasus pontifical*

### ***3. The Questions Discussed.***

**Question 1:** *Of the word Testament, what it signifies and of what things it must be understood.*

1. The Hebrew word *berith* signifies both συνθηκην, a compact or covenant made between parties, as Aquila translated as Jerome witnessed in Malachi; and διαθηκην, a testament of disposition of one's will, as the word is used by the Apostle (Heb. 9:17).

2. Both these acceptations of the word agree unto the holy Gospel. First, it is a covenant between God and his people, the Lord offering reconciliation on his part, and requiring conditions to be performed on our part. As in the Law, obedience and the perfect keeping of the law was demanded. Now the obedience of faith in Christ, our Mediator and Reconciler is required. It is also a Testament not with any relation to us but only in respect of the Testator, and will-maker Christ Jesus who ratified and confirmed both the Old and New Testament by his death, in the one prefigured and promised, in the other exhibited and performed. The testamentary tables are the Holy Scriptures of both the Old and New Testament. The witnesses are the prophets and apostles, the writers also of this Testament. The seals are the sacraments both of the one and the other.

3. The old and new covenant and testament are one and the same in substance, both in respect of the parties between whom the covenant and convention is made, God, and his Church, and of the end and scope, which is to bring us unto the everlasting inheritance. However, the manner of dispensation is diverse, according to the condition of the times and the quality of the persons.

4. This covenant made between God and man, some distinguish into the covenant of *nature* and *grace*. Indeed, every covenant is rather of grace. The natural covenant made between the Creator and man in Paradise was violated by his transgression and

disobedience. The covenant that now remains is wholly ascribed to grace. It is either of some *temporal* grace and benefit, and that either *general* as was that which the Lord made with Noah not to destroy the world again with water (Gen. 9) or *particular* as was the promise made to Abraham to inherit the land of Canaan (Gen. 15:18) and that was made to Phineas concerning the priesthood (Num. 25:12) either of spiritual graces, as of the remission of sins and the inheriting of eternal life in Christ.

**Question 2:** *Of the diverse significations of the Old and New Testament.*

1. The Old Testament is either taken for the doctrine of the Law, which required exact obedience to the commandments brought upon the transgressors the most grievous culmination of malediction. Yet covertly was propounded to them the doctrine of repentance and faith in Christ under the shadows and rudiments of the Law. These shadows and rudiments were imposed upon that people partly to humble them and to bow down their stiff necks, partly to discern them from other nations, and partly to lead them by the hand to Christ. So in this sense the Old Testament comprehends: 1) the doctrine of legal obedience; 2) the ceremonial and ministerial part of their legal rites and service; 3) the external policy and regiment. In these respects the Old Testament is abolished, as the Lord said, he "will make a new covenant with the house of Israel" (Jer. 31:31).

The Old Testament is also taken for the writings and the tables of Scripture. In this sense the Old Testament is not abolished -- one jot thereof shall not perish (Matt. 5:18).

2. The New Testament is also taken diversely either 1) for the spiritual doctrine which requires obedience of faith in Christ without any legal observations, or 2) for the sacraments, as Christ called the Eucharist the New Testament in his blood in the institution of the last supper, or 3) for the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles. So it is new because: 1) it succeeded the Old; 2) it sets forth the new doctrine of faith without

legal rites; 3) it has new sacraments, a new form of worship, a new kind of church; 4) it is confirmed after a new manner, not by the blood of beasts, but by the most holy blood of the Blessed Mediator.

**Question 3:** *Of the books of the New Testament, their number, and authority.*

1. Concerning the number, and authority of the books of the New Testament there is no question among the Christians, though the obstinate Jews willfully refuse them. They are 27 in number which *Athanasius in Synopsis* divides into these five orders: 1) the four Evangelists; 2) the Acts of the Apostles; 3) the 7 canonical epistles -- one of St. James, 2 of St. Peter, 3 of St. John and one of Jude; 4) the 14 canonical epistles of St. Paul; 5) the prophetic book of the Revelation. All these may be reduced to three kinds - - the historical, doctrinal, and prophetic books as is before showed in the argument.

2. These books of the New Testament were not always received with the same approbation. Some were held with undoubted authority as the four Evangelists, the Acts of the Apostles, the first of St. Peter, the first of St. John and all of St. Paul's epistles excepting only that to the Hebrews. Some were doubted by a few, but of the most received as second of Peter, the second and third of John, James, Jude, Hebrews and the Apocalypse. However, at length these books were received and acknowledged for canonical by a general consent. Other books beside these were privately received by some form of the Church and were called *ecclesiastical* such as the Acts of Paul, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Revelation of Peter and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Some books were foisted in by heretics and more generally rejected by the Church such as the Gospels of Andrew, Thomas and Matthias, the Acts of Peter, Thomas and Matthias and of the other Apostles. These were judged to be Apocryphal and of no authority. This was so because in the writing of those, which succeeded the Apostles, no mention is

made of them. The style is also diverse from the style of the Apostles and the doctrine contained in those books differs from the doctrine of the Apostles.

3. Beside these two latter sorts of books all the rest are undoubtedly held to be canonical and of equal authority. Therefore the distinction of Sixtus Senesis is to taken heed of who called some of the New Testament πρωτοκανονικας, canonical of the first sort, some δευτεροκανονικας, canonical of the second sort, which were sometime doubted. For by this means should they not be of equal and the like authority. Beside, he says, that these latter were held by some of the Fathers to be apocryphal books, understanding apocryphal books for such that a hid or unknown author. Indeed the Apocrypha are so called, not for that their author was unknown, for then should divers of the canonical books should be apocryphal, but because they were of a hid and obscure authority. In this sense none of the Fathers sever held any of the canonical books of the New Testament to be Apocrypha.

4. As the heretics brought in counterfeit books of their own into the New Testament so they rejected diverse parts of the canonical books. Faustus the Manichee held diverse things to be false in the New Testament.<sup>4</sup> The Ebionites received none but the Gospel according to St. Matthew.<sup>5</sup> The Marcionites only allowed St. Luke's Gospel.<sup>6</sup> The Acts of the Apostles and St. Paul's epistles the Tatiane and Severiane heretics rejected.<sup>7</sup> Marcion and Basilides the rejected the epistles to Timothy, Titus and to the Hebrews.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> *Augustin. lib. 33. cont. Faust. c. 3.*

<sup>5</sup> *Iren. 1.1.c.26.*

<sup>6</sup> *Epiphan. hares. 42.*

<sup>7</sup> *Euseb. 1.4.c.29*

<sup>8</sup> *Jerome praefat. ad Titum.*

#### ***4. Places of Doctrine in General***

**Doctrine 1:** *Of the excellence of the New Testament beyond the Old.*

1. It excels in its matter and doctrine. The Law promises life only to those that keep it, the Gospel to those that believe in Christ (Rom. 10:5, 6).

2. In the subject: the Law was written on tables of stone but the Gospel is written by the spirit of God in the fleshly tables of our hearts (2 Cor. 3:2).

3. In the end: the Old Testament was the ministration of death and the killing letter. The other is the ministration of the Spirit that gives life (2 Cor. 3:6, 7).

4. In the condition and quality: the Law imposed the hard yoke and the servitude of ceremonies that was impossible to be borne (Acts 15:10). Christ's yoke is easy (Matt. 11), which of servants adopts us to be the sons of God (Rom. 8:15).

5. In the minister: Moses was the typical mediator of the Old Testament but Christ the Lord and builder of the house is the Mediator of the New (Heb. 3:3).

6. In the fruits and effects: the Old Testament could not purge the conscience from sins but the sprinkling of the blood of Christ purgeth the conscience from dead works (Heb. 9:13, 14).

7. In the manner: the Old Testament was folded up in types and figures, as Moses veiled the glory of his face. We now see the glory of the Lord in the Gospel with an open face (2 Cor. 3:18).

8. In the ratification: the Old Testament was confirmed with the blood of beasts, the New Testament by the death of Christ, (qu. 17. 18).

9. In the seals: the Old Testament was attended upon by bloody sacrifices and other such like hard sacraments such as circumcision that was painful to the flesh. The New has easy and bloodless sacraments as the seals, and fewer in number, namely Baptism and the Eucharist.

10. Another excellency is in persons whom this New Testament concerns itself. The New was not given only to one people, and nation, as the Old was but to the catholic Church of God dispersed over the face of the earth, as the Apostles are commanded to go and teach all nations (Matt. 28:19).

In these respects, the Apostle thus gives preeminence to the New Testament before the Old. Heb. 8:6, "He hath ordained a more excellent office, in as much as he is the Mediator of a better Testament, which is established upon better promises." Not that Christ is not Mediator also of the Old Testament (for without him neither can there be any Church, nor covenant made with the Church) but because Christ, but shadowed forth in the Old Testament is more fully revealed and manifested in the New.

### ***5. Places of Confutation***

**Controversy 1:** *Against those who think it is against the nature of the New Testament to be committed to writing.*

Of this opinion are certain of a fanatical spirit, which to this purpose abuse that place of Jeremiah 32:33, "I will write my law in their hearts," and that of St. Paul in 2 Cor. 3:3, "You are our epistle written not with ink, but with the Spirit." From these passages, they would infer that the New Testament is not to be written but that it consists in revelation and the instinct of the Spirit.

Contra. 1: If the New Testament were not to be extant in writing, then the Apostles had done an superfluous and unnecessary work in the writing of the books of the New Testament, whereunto they were directed by the Spirit of God. St. John is directly commanded to write (Apocalypse 14:13) and St. Paul says that all Scripture is

given by inspiration (2 Tim. 3:6).<sup>9</sup> The Spirit of God then moved them to put in writing these holy books of the New Testament that are part of Scripture.

2. It does not follow that because the Lord wrote the Gospel in our hearts by the Spirit that therefore it is not to be written. For the writing which is preached and read says it is wrought in the heart by the operation of the Spirit. The Apostle says (Rom. 10:17) "that faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word." Again, the Prophet there shows a difference between the Law and the Gospel. The Law gave precepts but could not incline the heart to obedience. However, the Gospel does not only command faith but by the operation of the Spirit works the same thing that it requires.

3. In the other place of the Apostle: 1) They would make the Apostle contrary to himself as though he should speak against the writings of the evangelical precepts. The Apostle did write that very epistle with ink; 2) He speaks not of the Gospel but of the Corinthians by whom he calls his epistle; 3) And by the letter in that place he understands not the writing with ink, or such like, but the external doctrine without the grace and life of the Spirit, such as was the doctrine of the Law.

**Controversy 2:** *Against the Romanists that hold that the writing of the Gospel and other Scriptures is not simply necessary to salvation.*

First, we will examine the arguments that are brought by them to confirm this their unfounded opinion. Bellarmine thus reasoned that the Apostle did teach the Church at the first without Scriptures, therefore they are not simply necessary, but only for the

---

<sup>9</sup> 2 Timothy 3:16

greater profit of the Church. A horse is necessary for one's journey for his more speedy travail, but not simply necessary because he may go on foot.<sup>10</sup>

Contra. 1; True it is, that the writing of the Scriptures are not simply necessary in respect of God, for he by his absolute power could find a way to teach his Church otherwise. Nevertheless, in respect to God's ordinance, which hath appointed the Scriptures for edifying his Church, they are necessary, as bread is necessary for man's sustentation though God can nourish and maintain life without bread.

2. It is not true that the Apostles did teach without the Scriptures for they had the prophetic writings first, and afterward their own. While the Apostles themselves were living and present, the writing of the Gospel was not so necessary as afterward.

3. The writing then of the Gospel was necessary: 1) Both in respect of that age present, for the preventing and stay of heresies, which might be more strongly gainsaid, by an evident and extant rule of faith; 2) in regard of those churches, to whom the Apostle preached not by lively voice, it was necessary that they should have some perfect direction in writing; 3) that in the ages also to come might have a rule for their faith.

Argument 2: The Church may as well now be instructed without the Scriptures as it was for the space of 2,000 years before the Law was written.<sup>11</sup>

Contra. 1. In the first age of the world, the light of nature was not so much obscured as afterward, when the Law was written, and therefore the argument does not follow. The Scriptures were not necessary then, therefore not now. Because the old world lacked the Scriptures to direct them, which were the cause, why they were given over generally to all kind of profaness. Therefore, to prevent the like mischief afterward the Lord thought it good to give his written word to the Church.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Bellar. 1. 4. de verb. c. 4.*

<sup>11</sup> *Bellar. Ibid.*

Argument 3: The Apostles did indeed speak more than they did or could write, but they preached the same things and delivered no other precepts concerning faith and manners but the same that they committed to writing. Many things concerning orders, and especially in particular churches, the Apostles left by tradition but no other precepts and rules of faith other than they had written. The Scriptures are not partial but a total and perfect rule of faith. For the "measure must be equal to that which is measured."<sup>12</sup> It must be neither longer nor shorter. If then the Scripture should come short of faith, it was no perfect rule. No, indeed, it was no rule at all.<sup>13</sup>

Now on the contrary that the Scriptures are necessary thus it is made plain: 1) From the author: the Apostles and Prophets did write by the instinct of the Spirit. But the Spirit did not move to any unnecessary or superfluous work; 2) From the office of the Apostles, that was called to teach all nations (Matt. 18:19). Seeing that they could not do this in their own persons it was necessary that they should preach unto them by their writings; 3) From the end and use of Scripture. For instruction in doctrine in that all of Scripture was written for our learning (Rom. 15:4); or direction into virtuous living; or for deciding questions, and confuting errors it was necessary that the Scriptures should be written for these uses. The Apostles shows in 1 Tim. 3:16 that the man of God may be perfect.<sup>14</sup> The Scriptures then were necessary to be extant for the previously mentioned purposes in so much that the Apostle said, "If any angel from heaven do preach any other gospel...let him be accursed." Whereupon Chrysostom says, "Paul even preferred the Scriptures to the angels descending from heaven."<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> *mensura adaequat a esse debet mensurato*

<sup>13</sup> Pareus

<sup>14</sup> Read 2 Tim. 3:16

<sup>15</sup> Gal. 6.1.

## **6. Moral Observations**

**Observation 1:** *Of the happiness of these times under the Gospel in comparison with the former times under the Law*

In that the Lord hath clearly manifested and opened unto his Church by Jesus Christ the mysteries, which lay hid before, in this appears the singular love of God to his Church and the great preeminence, which the faithful have now in comparison to the people of God under the Law. As our Savior said unto his Apostles, "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and your ears, for they hear: for verily I say unto you, that many Prophets, and righteous men have desired to see the things which you see, and could not see them..." (Matt. 13:16, 17). The use here is to stir us up unto thankfulness to God for this so great mercy showed to his Church.

**Observation 2:** *The dangerous estate of those that are found to be condemners of the Gospel and the New Law.*

The greater light is revealed, and the more knowledge that men have, the greater obedience doth God look for at their hand. Disobedience now to the Gospel of truth is so much more grievous than was transgression under the Law, as the times of light and knowledge in brightness exceed the days of ignorance and blindness. Thus the Apostle reasons, "the night is past, the day is at hand, let us therefore cast away the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light" (Rom. 13:12). So also in Hebrews 2:2 the Apostle says, "if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression...received a just recompense of reward: how much more if we neglect so great salvation...."

## More Special Observations upon the Whole Epistle

### ***1. The Argument and Method of St. Paul's Epistles in General, and Specially of this Epistle***

**1.** Nieephorus *lib.* 2. Chapter 34 makes the end and scope of St. Paul's epistles to consist of these two things: 1. That the Apostle, what he preached being present, he committed to writing to put them to memory when he was absent; 2. In addition, that which he did more obscurely deliver by word of mouth or passed over in silence he did in his writings handle more fully and plainly. But the Apostle had diverse other occasions offered him in his epistles that fell out of his sermons and therefore is to be thought that although his sermons and writings agreed in the substance of doctrine, yet he, as occasion did move him in his epistles otherwise handled matters that he did in his preaching.

**2.** His epistles then may be reduced to these five kinds: 1. Some belong unto doctrine wherein he lays the foundation of the faith and of the apostolical instructions in his epistles to the Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, the first to the Thessalonians, and to the Hebrews; 2. Some refute errors of doctrine and life as 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians in part and 2 Thessalonians; 3. Some are apologetical where the apostle makes an apology and uses defense for himself against false apostles as in 2 Corinthians; 4. Some are especially concerned with ecclesiastical offices as the epistles to Timothy and Titus; 5. Some are written by way of meditation and intercession as the epistle to Philemon.

**3.** The end and scope of St. Paul's writings, as of the rest of Scripture, were these: 1. To set forth the true and sincere doctrine of the faith; 2. To confute and convince errors; 3. To reclaim men from the vice and corruption of life; 4. To instruct them in the works of righteousness. There four are touched by the apostle in 2 Timothy 3:17 where he show

the fourfold use of Scripture. "It is profitable to teach, to improve, to correct and instruct in righteousness"; 5. The edifying of the weak is another end that they fall not away from the faith; 6. and the exhorting of those which are slack that they may go on their Christian course; 7. The comforting of the afflicted that in tribulation they despair not or faint. These three ends also the apostle speaks of in 1 Cor. 14:3, "He that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edifying, to exhortation, to comfort."

### ***1. Of the Occasion, Argument, and Method of this Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans***

**1.** The occasion of the writing of this epistle seems almost to have been the same that the apostle took to write to the Galatians. The believing Jews dispersed among the Gentiles thought that the ceremonies and observations of Moses' law were to be retained. From this great understanding arose great strife between the believing Jews and the Gentiles. The Jewish contingency, despising the Gentiles, thinking themselves to be privileged by the promises made to the seed and prosperity of Abraham and urging the rites of Moses' law as though they helped unto justification. The Gentile contingency insulted the Jews by glorying too much in their Christian liberty, their exemption from Moses' law and by taking the Jews to be rejected by God. The apostle to compound this dissention among them wrote this epistle for that occasion.

**2.** According to this purpose, Paul framed this epistle. First, generally by showing that neither the Gentiles by their natural knowledge, nor the Jews by the works of the Law could be justified. Both were freely justified by faith in Christ. This general theme of justification by faith is extended into the ninth chapter. Then particularly he comes to suppress the intolerance of the Jews showing that the promises were not made to Abraham's physical seed but only to the true Israel, so many as were of the faith of Abraham, c.9.10. He also turned to the Gentiles that they should not as it were insult in

the rejection of the Jews, for it was neither total nor final. God would have mercy on them if they continued in faith, c. 11. The rest of the epistle is spent in Christian exhortation: 1. The mutual offices of charity among brethren, c. 12; of duties toward magistrates, c. 13; and how they should behave themselves toward weak brethren, c.14, 15. After various salutations, the apostle concludes the epistle.

**3.** The method and parts of the epistle are these two: first is the doctrinal up to c. 12; the second exhortation in the 5 last chapters, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

1. In the first part the two chief points of the Christian religion are handled at large, namely justification to c. 9 and of election and reprobation c. 9, 10, 11.

In the doctrine of justification: 1. The manner and form of it is declared; 2. The fruits: first, the true way of justification by works is rejected and refused, c. 1, 2, 3 to v. 21 and then the true way, which is by faith, is affirmed and proved, c. 3:21 - c. 4; the effects of justification follow, as the peace of the conscience, c. 5; the newness of life, c. 6; exemption and freedom from the law, c. 7; constancy and perseverance in affliction, c. 8.

In the doctrine of predestination and election: he treats the rejection of the Jews, c. 9; the vocation of the Gentiles, c. 10; the restoring of the Jews again, c. 11.

2. In the exhortatory part there are first exhortations in general concerning all Christians, c. 12; then particular, as of duties toward magistrates, c. 13, toward the weak, c. 14, 15. Secondly he concludes with salutations both of himself wherein he professes his love toward them and his purpose to come to them, c. 15, v. 15 to the end, then of others, c. 16.

**2. *Of the style and phrase, which St. Paul used in his Epistle.***

1. St. Paul did not use an eloquent or elegant style or enticing speech for this reason, that "your faith should not be in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God, 1 Cor. 3:2. His style is neither base nor barbarous but a mix between the both.<sup>16</sup> By a pithy and sententious kind of writing, full of arguments and forcible persuasions, in grave but in plain words, he delivered high mysteries. There are two kinds of eloquence. One consists in the eloquence of speech and the other the curious choice of words in which heathen orators excel. This we do not find in Paul. There is another kind of eloquence which is grave, sober and consisting rather in the force of persuasion than in the number of words. The former is the kind of eloquence of St. Paul's writing.<sup>17</sup> So that, as Chrysostom says, "his tongue or speech was brighter than the sun, and in the utterance of doctrine he excelled all the rest...."<sup>18</sup> and they all gave place unto him for speech, "whereupon he was of the infidels called Mercury, because of the office of speaking was committed to him."<sup>19</sup> Augustine here concurred with Chrysostom, that though he affected not eloquence, "yet it did follow and accompany his wisdom."<sup>20</sup>

2. There are those, however, who think otherwise of Paul's style:

---

<sup>16</sup> *ex viroq temperatus*

<sup>17</sup> Martyr

<sup>18</sup> Chrysostom, *argum. in epist. ad Roman: Lingu(?)illius supra solem emicuit , doctrina q sermone supra omnes exuberanuit*

<sup>19</sup> Chrysostom, *argum. in epist. ad Roman: unde & Mercurius ab infidelibus putabatur, qui sermoni praesset*

<sup>20</sup> Augustine, *lib. 4. de doct. Christ: ae tamen sapientiam eius comitata est*

1. Origen said that Paul had many *hyperbata* and *anantpodata*, many imperfect transitions and clauses of sentences not answering to one another, but breaking off abruptly. Master Beza in his preface to Oleianes commentary makes mention of a famous man, "of great name in our memory"<sup>21</sup> who concurred with Origen but leaves in doubt whether this defect in style was to be ascribed to Paul himself or to Tertius his scribe.

2. Jerome, although varied and flexible on this matter thought that St. Paul, though eloquent in his own language, had no pure Greek style, but rather what the Cilicians used which was full of Hebraisms.

3. Paul himself seemed to acknowledge his lack of eloquence in 2 Cor. 11:6, "Though I be rude in speaking, yet am I not so in knowledge."

4. Peter said of Paul's epistles that many things therein are hard to be understood. Thus, it is objected against Paul's style.

Contra. 1: The reason why Paul seems sometimes to break off abruptly and leave his sentences imperfect is because of the sublimity and depth of those great mysteries which he handled and whereby he is forced often to break forth into admiration, as Rom. 11:33, "O the deepness of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God, how unsearchable are his judgments...." this proceeds also from the earnestness of the apostle, that sometimes he seemed "to be ravished beside himself."<sup>22</sup> As for his scribe Tertius, it

---

<sup>21</sup> *nostra memoria magnus*

<sup>22</sup> Martyr, *extra seraptus*.

is not to be thought that he wrote any thing other than what Paul edited and therefore the style and manner of writing is not to be imputed to Paul the author, not to the writer. To this Beza clearly infers that "nothing could be more divinely, or elegantly said of so great matters...."<sup>23</sup> This divine kind of writing, which is frequent with the apostle, to fall into speeches of admiration and affection Origen well expressed in this fashion. It agreed with the apostle in treating such divine things as with a man that is brought into the Prince's palace, lead out of one chamber into another, to behold its glory and beauty. While he considers what he sees, he is astonished and begins to wonder, forgetting "whence he came in thither or how he should go out again."<sup>24</sup>

2. As touching Paul's Cilisian speech, it was fit and convenient, since Paul did not write only to the learned but also to the unlearned, that he should conform his speech to the capacity and understanding of all. Because the Hebrew Scriptures were translated into the Greek, which the believing Gentiles were conversant with, it was also proper that the apostle should so frame his Greek style in a way that it might have some resemblance to the Hebrew tongue out of which the Scriptures were translated.

3. Neither does Paul acknowledge any imperfection in his speech or writing. Being persuaded by the Spirit of God, he put his thoughts into words. He confesses this by way of concession because the false apostles objected to the weakness of his speech. He said that much in effect and admitted it to be so, "will ye also deny unto me the knowledge of things?"<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> *Nihil potuisse tantis rebus, non mode divinitus, sed ornatius, aut accomodatius dici*

<sup>24</sup> *Martyr, expraefat: unde illuc venerit, aut qua egressurus sit.*

<sup>25</sup> *Num rerum scientiam etiam mihi adimetis?*

4. Peter does not impute the hardness of Paul's epistles to the obscurity of the style but rather to the sublimity and profundity of the great mysteries that he treats. These must be hard upon our weak understanding. Neither were his epistles hard but only some things in his epistles and not to all but to the unstable and unlearned who perverted those things to their own destruction, 2 Peter 3:16.<sup>26</sup> As he treated high, grave and divine matters, so his speech was grave, divine, piercing. Jerome himself confessed that when he read Paul, "that he perceived thunder rather than words."<sup>27</sup> Origen likewise, though he often stretched Paul's style, yet wrote superbly thereof against Celsus and said, "I know well if he read the apostle well, either he will wonder, that such excellent matter contained in so plain speech; or if he wonder not at it, he will show himself ridiculous."<sup>28</sup>

### ***3. The Questions and Doubts Discussed***

**Question 1:** *Whether Paul was the author of this Epistle.*

The general consent of the Church of God both in times past and now is that Paul wrote this epistle.<sup>29</sup> While many others of the Fathers acknowledge this divine apostle to be the author, better evidence is found in the book itself.

---

<sup>26</sup> Gryneus

<sup>27</sup> Jerome, *non verba, sed tonitru percipere.*

<sup>28</sup> Celsus, lib.3.: *Sat scio, si se attente illorum lectioni dederit, aut admirabitur mentem virir vulrari dictione egregias complecti sententias, aut nisi admiratus fuerit, ipse ridiculus videbitur*

<sup>29</sup> Ireneus, *lib. 5. cont. Valent.*; Jerome, *Epistle. ad Paulin*; Euseb., *Ecclesiast. histor. lib. 3.c.3.*

1. As in all his other epistles, Paul's name is prefixed to the inscription. Only in his epistle to the Hebrews does he conceal his name, as Jerome said, "because his name was envied among them."<sup>30</sup>

2. Beside the inscription of his name, this epistle ends with the usual salutation that Paul annexes to the end of all his epistles, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen," Rom. 16:24. This form of salutation written with Paul's own hand was his sign and mark in every epistle, 2 Thess. 3:18.<sup>31</sup>

3. The style of this epistle and the matter agreeable to other writings of the holy apostle evidently proclaim him to the author.<sup>32</sup>

4. Being resolved that Paul was the author it follows that this epistle is of canonical authority because it was written by the Spirit of God speaking through Paul. Paul said, "I think that I have the spirit of God," 1 Cor. 7:40 and "that Christ spake in him," 2 Cor. 13:3. Paul did not receive his doctrine from man but by "revelation of Jesus Christ," Gal. 1:12.

**Question 2:** *Of the birth, the life, acts, and death of St. Paul.*

1. Jerome thinks that he was born in Giscalis a town in the tribe of Benjamin. When this town, being taken by the Romans he then moved with his parents to Tarsus. This does not agree with Paul's own narrative where he says he was born in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia,

---

<sup>30</sup> *catalog scriptos: propter inuidiam sui apud eos nominis*

<sup>31</sup> Pareus

<sup>32</sup> Gryneus, *c.1.5.1.*

Acts 22:2. If this fact of Paul's early life was not so, his adversaries would have easily trapped him and proven him a liar.

2. As touching his family, he himself testified that he was of Israel, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, of the tribe of Benjamin, Phil. 3:5.

3. Regarding his education, he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, Acts 22:3 who was of great authority among the Jews as is shown in Acts 5 where the whole counsel followed his instruction. By profession he was a Pharisee, Phil. 3:5, which was the most tolerable sect among the Jews.

4. Concerning his life and conversion, even before his conversion he led an unblameable life touching the law. Being very zealous in defending the rites and ceremonies of the Law, he was a fierce persecutor of the Church of Christ, Phi. 3:6. After his conversion he was a zealous preacher of the gospel.

5. Touching his gifts, he was not only learned in their own law but also well studied in human learning as appears by the quotations of secular witnesses such as Aratus in Acts 17, of Menander in 1 Cor. 15, and of Epimenides in Titus 1:1. He excelled in the gift of speaking and had a singular grace of speech as is evident by the apologies and extemporaneous speeches that he made, Acts 22:23. Beside this, he was forceful in persuasion, pithy in argument and ready in disputations as appears in the conflicts, which a various times he had with the Jews and with the philosophers at Athens, Acts 17. His labors and pains corresponded to his gifts. The grace of God was not in vain in him, for he labored (both in writing and preaching) more than all the other Apostles, 1 Cor. 15:10. He caused the gospel to abound from Jerusalem to Illyricum, Rom. 15:19, to Spain, v. 24,

in all Asia Minor and in the most famous countries of Europe. In all these places, he preached the gospel of Jesus Christ.

6. Now concerning the end of this holy apostle, in the twenty-third year of his apostleship after his conversion (which is held to have been in the third year after the ascension of Christ, in the twentieth year of Tiberius) in the second year of Nero, he was carried prisoner to Rome and remained there in custody for two years. From there he was delivered and preached the gospel in the west, as Jerome draws out of this place, 2 Tim. 4:17, that the Lord delivered him out of the lion's mouth, (meaning Nero), that "by me the preaching of the gospel might be fully known, and all the Gentiles might hear. Afterward, in the fourteenth year of Nero, the thirty-fifth year of his apostleship, thirty-seven years after Christ's ascension and seventy years from the nativity of Christ, he was beheaded at Rome. During his imprisonment, he wrote seven of his epistles, but whether in the first or second imprisonment, it is uncertain. Par. Aretius thinks that he wrote them in the time of his first imprisonment but that is not certain.

However, there are other particular matters recorded which happened in Paul's death that are also not certain. Jerome thought that Paul and Peter suffered the same day in Rome. Some add that when he was beheaded, instead of blood there issued forth milk to show his innocence.<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, Nicephorus reports a stranger thing. Before Paul was martyred, he had a conference with Nero. At that time, Paul told the Emperor that he would return to him on the third day after his death. His shadow appeared accordingly, which Nero received a glimpse of, but it fled from him.<sup>34</sup> The first of these is probable, though not necessarily to be believed. The second is possible though of no great

---

<sup>33</sup> Augustine, *in orat.de sanct.*

<sup>34</sup> *Niceph. 1.2.c.36.*

certainty. The third seems fabulous. The saints to increase superstition have devised many such miracles in former times.<sup>35</sup>

**Question 3:** *Of Saint Paul's place of birth.*

1. The absurd opinion of the Ebionites (as Epiphanius reported and refuted their heresy, *haes. 30.*) that Paul was a Grecian, born of Greek parents but coming to Jerusalem he fell in love with a priest's daughter. Desiring to marry her, he became a proselyte and was content to be circumcised. This, however, is contrary to Paul himself who affirmed that he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews and of the tribe of Benjamin, Phil. 3:5.

2. Jerome sometimes seems to be of the opinion that Paul was born in Giscalis, a town of Judea. Taken by the Romans he departed to Tarsus with his parents and thus was counted a citizen of Tarsus.<sup>36</sup> After this, in an epistle to Abgasia he concludes that he was born in Tarsus. Beda is of the same opinion that Paul was born in Gascalis<sup>37</sup> as is Andreas Masius.<sup>38</sup>

3. The more general and received opinion is that Paul was born in Tarsus and not at Giscalis: 1. Giscalis is a town of Galilee, not of Judea, that was taken by Titus the emperor after Paul's death. Paul received the martyr's crown in the thirteenth year of Nero.<sup>39</sup> The Romans before that did not take it. 2. Paul was born a Roman, Acts 22:26,

---

<sup>35</sup> Aretius

<sup>36</sup> *lib. de Ecclesiast. script.*

<sup>37</sup> Beza, *Actor, c. 21.*

<sup>38</sup> *c. 19. Iosua*

<sup>39</sup> Josephus, *i. 4. de bello Judiac.*

28, that is, born in a city privileged with Roman liberties. Gascalis was no such city. Tarsus was as Dio<sup>40</sup> and Pliny<sup>41</sup> testified. 3. Ignatius writing to the inhabitants of Tarsus called them "St. Paul's disciples and citizens. The apostle himself puts the matter beyond doubt when he affirms that he was born in Tarsus in Cilicia, Acts 22:2.

**Question 4:** *Was Paul of noble birth?*

1. Augustine thought that Paul was of noble birth upon the words, Phil. 3:3, "Though I might have confidence in the flesh."<sup>42</sup> He goes on to say that it would have been an insignificant matter for Paul to condemn nobility having none himself. Along with this, he belonged to the sect of the Pharisees that were a noble sect among the Jews and were not a contemptible sort. To this can be added that the high priest would not have given Paul such great authority if he had been of obscure birth or parentage.

2. Chrysostom seems to be of the contrary opinion: "that Paul was a poor handicraft man, a worker of leather."<sup>43</sup> From this is gathered that Paul was not of noble birth because he was skilled in the handicraft of making tents, which he had learned before his apostolic call, as is shown in Acts 18:3. It was not the use of noblemen to follow such undesirable trades. Paul himself said, "Not many noble are called," 1 Cor. 1:25, which is understood mainly of the calling of the Apostles.

---

<sup>40</sup> Dio, *lib. 47*

<sup>41</sup> Pliny, *lib. 5. c. 27.*

<sup>42</sup> Augustine, *serm. 15. de verb. Apost*

<sup>43</sup> Chrysostom, *hom. 4. in 2. Epistl. ad Timoth., fuisse Paulum inopem & coriarium.*

3. This is the resolution, that though Paul was not a noble according to the Roman estimation of nobility, being such an artisan that did not suit Roman nobility, yet among the Jews he was not of common birth. The Jews counted nobility by the standing of the tribe and the antiquity of the family. In this respect was Joseph the husband of Mary considered noble, though a carpenter by trade, being a descendent of the royal family of David. Paul was noble being born of the noble tribe of Benjamin that was famous, because both the first king of Israel Saul was chosen out of that tribe and because the tribe of Benjamin did not succeed from Judah as the other, ten tribes had done. Paul was also of a noble profession among the Jews being a Pharisee.

4. To this will be the objection that Paul was not privileged with the liberty of a Roman citizen. This citizenship was reserved for husbandmen and soldiers but not for tradesmen.<sup>44</sup> The answer is, that this constitution or provision made by Pomulus was afterward abrogated by Numa Pompilius who admitted artificers to the privilege of citizens such as Terentius Varro was Consul and Marcus Scaurus, whose fathers were a butcher and collier respectfully.<sup>45</sup>

**Question 5:** *Whether Paul was raised in the learning of the Greeks.*

1. Chrysostom thought that Paul was utterly ignorant before his conversion of the Greek language and learning and knew only Hebrew.<sup>46</sup> However, it is not likely that Paul being raised in a city of Cilicia, where they spoke Greek, was utterly ignorant of the common speech then used.

---

<sup>44</sup> Halycarnesseus: *lib. 2. &6.*

<sup>45</sup> colliar or collier: someone who makes wood charcoal or someone who delivers coal.

<sup>46</sup> *hom.4. in 2. ad Tomoth*

2. Neither do I agree with Jerome that Paul learned the Greek language at Tarsus where he was brought up, but not very skillful or eloquent in the Greek, "he desiring to interpret himself in the Greek tongue is enwrapped and entangled."<sup>47</sup> In addition, where Paul says he was rude of speech, Jerome says, "not of humility but according to the truth,"<sup>48</sup> and that he used Titus as his interpreter for the Greek language as Peter used Mark.<sup>49</sup>

3. That Paul was neither ignorant of the Greek as Chrysostom thought is apparent by his references to the Greek poets Aratus, Menander, Epimenides and by the commendation with Strabo gives to the Tharsensians that in the study of philosophy and the other arts exceeded them in Athens and Alexandria.<sup>50</sup> Neither was his speaking as unpolished as Jerome thought, for Paul himself said, 1 Cor. 14:18, "I thank my God, I speak languages more than ye all." He confessed by way of concession because the false apostles so objected. Paul did not indeed use undue elegance both because he was to temper his speech to the capacity and understanding of all, and because the divine mysteries which he dealt with, his passionate speeches breaking forth into zeal, did often carry him away from searching after or laboring for curious elocution.

**Question 6:** *Of the years of the reign of the emperors of Rome to Nero under whom Paul suffered.*

---

<sup>47</sup> Jerome, in *3 Philip*, *seipsum in Graeca lingua interpretari cupiens, revoluitur.*

<sup>48</sup> *epist. ad Galatas: Non ex humilitate, sed ex scientia veritate*

<sup>49</sup> Jerome, *epist. ad Hebraeos.*

<sup>50</sup> *Strabon 1.16.*

Because we shall have occasion afterward to address some further questions, we shall have recourse to the years of the Roman Emperors who reigned during Paul's life. It will be worthwhile to make a reasonable computation of their years in that I find a great difference among the chronographers.

1. Tiberius Caesar who succeeded Augustus, in the eighteenth year of whose reign Christ our blessed Savior suffered, according to Suetonius<sup>51</sup> and Orisius,<sup>52</sup> Eutropius,<sup>53</sup> Beda<sup>54</sup> reigned 23 years, according to Sextus Aurelius, 24. as Clemens Alexandrin.<sup>55</sup> 22 years. Dio counted<sup>56</sup> 22 years and 7 months and so many days. Tertullian<sup>57</sup> 22 years, 7 months and 28 days. Josephus<sup>58</sup> reckoned 22 years and 6 months. However, the true account is this. Tiberius reigned a full 22 years beginning from the month of January after he began to reign to the month of January next before he died. He entered his reign 18 August when Augustus died which is 4 months and 13 days from January. He died 16 March, two months and fifteen days after his 22nd year expired in the month of January. In all he reigned 22 years and 7 months. By this computation a difference appears why some allow him 22 years, some 24 and some 23 because some count only the full years, some the months of his first and last years for whole years and some put the odd months together and make one years of them. Hence, then it is evident, because our Blessed

---

<sup>51</sup> *in Timberia, c. 73.*

<sup>52</sup> *lib. 7.c.2.*

<sup>53</sup> *lib. 7.*

<sup>54</sup> *de sex. aetatib*

<sup>55</sup> *i.1. stromat.*

<sup>56</sup> *lib. 58*

<sup>57</sup> *lib. advers. Judaeos, c.5.*

<sup>58</sup> *lib. 18, Antiquities, c. 14.*

Savior is held to have suffered in the 18th year of Tiberius, about the beginning of April that Tiberius reigned after our Blessed Savior's passion 4 years, 11 months and 18 days. For of his 18th year there remained from the beginning of April until 19 August when Tiberius began to reign four months and 18 days. After the 18th year, he reigned four years and almost seven months, for he reigned in all as it was showed before 22 years and 7 months.

2. Caius Caligula reigned according to Suetonius and Eutropius 3 years, 10 months and 8 days. According to Clemens and Tacitus and Sextus Aurelius 4 years. After Beda 4 years, 10 months and 8 days; according to Dio. 3 years, 9 months and 28 days; as Tertullian, 3 years, 8 months and 13 days; as Josephus 3 years and 6 months. The right computation is this: Caligula began his empire March 16. From there to the following January are 9 and half months. Then he reigned from the first of January a full 3 years, dying on the 24th of the following January. Therefore, the full time he reigned was 3 years, 10 months and 8 days. Those that give him four full years count the odd months and days for a whole year.

3. Claudius, who was the next Emperor, according to Tacitus, Suetonius, Clemens Alexandrin Eutropius and Orosius reigned 14 years. According to Dio and Josephus, 13 years, 8 months and 20 days. After Eusebius, 13 years and 9 months, and Beda 14 years, 7 months and 28 days. However, the certain computation is this: Claudius began his empire upon January 24, which to the following January when the Roman year begins are 11 months and 7 days. Then he reigned a full 12 years and in his 13th year, he reigned 9 months and 13 days. From the month of January to the third day before the Ides of October, which was the 13th day of that month, when he died, as Tacitus and Suetonius write. Therefore, the whole time of his reign was 13 years, 8 months and 20 days. Those that give him 14 years count the odd months for a whole year.

4. Unto Claudius succeeded Nero, who according to Tacitus, Clemens Alexandrin and Eutropius reigned 14 years: according to Dio 13 years and 8 months: as Beda, 14 years, 7 months and 10 days; After Suetonius, a little under 14 years; Tertullian counts but 9 years, 9 months and 13 days. However, in this he is error. The most do give to Nero 14 years but not complete. The reason for this uncertainty is that it is not certainly know when Nero died. Onnphrius thinks he died about the 10th day of June, and he began to reign about the 13th day of October when Claudius died. By this account, he should reign but 13 years, 7 months and 28 days. Because most allow him 14 years, we will follow the usual and common reckoning.

This shall suffice to have been inserted here concerning the years of the reign of the Emperors. See more of the years of the Emperors, *Hexapla in Danielum* c.9.question 75. where the account is somewhat different from this in certain months because there Eusebius' computation is followed.

**Question 7:** *In which year after the passion of Christ Paul was converted.*

It follows now that such matters be briefly touched which concern his holy apostle after he was converted to the faith of Christ. First, to the time of his conversion.

1. Whereas it is most evident, that St. Stephen was stoned to death after the most glorious ascension of Christ and that St. Paul's conversion followed the blessed martyr's death. Some think that Stephen was put to death seven years after Christ's ascension and so consequently, St. Paul's conversion happened likewise seven years after. This opinion Nicephorus ascribed to Euodius<sup>59</sup> the successor of St. Peter in Antioch. There is no probability of this opinion. For it is not that, the Church had rest without persecution for seven years after Christ's ascension. The conjecture of some is that seven years represent

---

<sup>59</sup> *lib. 2.c.3.*

seven months by some corruption and fault in the copies for so many months are between the ascension of Christ and the martyrdom of St. Stephen.

2. Eusebius and Beda think that Paul was converted in the first year after the passion of our Blessed Savior upon the twenty-fifth day of January. But because St. Stephen is held to have suffered upon the twenty-sixth day of December in the first year after Christ's passion from which day to the twenty-fifth day of January, when St. Paul, according to the received opinion, was converted is not above a month in which time those things could not be fulfilled which are accorded by St. Luke, Acts 8. St. Paul's conversion could not fall out in the first year after the passion of Christ. This matter is not helped by the author of the scholastical history upon the Acts of the apostles, ch. 46, who thus distinguished that if the first year of Christ's passion be reckoned according to the usual account, that is, from January, when the Roman year began, then St. Paul was converted in the second year. but if from the time of Christ's passion, then it was the first year for still the same doubt remains that in this reckoning there was but one month between the martyrdom of St. Stephen and the conversion of St. Paul.

3. Wherefore the opinion of Oecumenius, upon the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is more probable. St. Paul was indeed converted in the second year counting from the time of Christ's passion so that from the most holy death of our blessed Savior to the conversion of St. Paul, which is held by a general received opinion, to have been upon the twenty-fifth day of January there was one whole year and ten months.

**Question 8:** *At what age was Paul converted?*

1. Ambrose and Theodoret upon the seventh chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians think that St. Paul at the time of his conversion was so young a man that he was not ready

for marriage. In their opinion he could not have been over twenty years old. Their opinion may seem to be grounded upon this reason, because Acts 7:58 St. Luke, speaking of St. Paul says that the witnesses laid down their coats at the feet, νεανίου of a young man, called Saul. But that word has not so much respect to his age and youth, as to his courage and fierceness as the work signifies as Budus shows. Euripides calls bold and intolerant speech, νεανίαν λογόν. St. Paul was not so very a young man appears because he was termed by an other word. Ananias says in 9:13, *We have heard of many, περι του ανδρος τουτου, of this man.*

3. And further, that St. Paul was not so young a man at the time of his conversion, may be showed by these reasons. 1. St. Paul himself says, Acts 26:6, *As touching my life from my youth, and what it was from the beginning among mine own nation at Jerusalem, known all the Jews.* It seems then that he spent his youth among the Jews before his conversion. 2. Those things which St. Paul reported to have been done by him before his conversion, does not agree with St. Paul's youth. Acts 26:9, *I also verily thought in my self, that I ought to do many contrary things against the name of Jesus ... many of the saints I put in prison, having received authority of the high priests, and when they were put to death, I gave sentence.* This judgment of St. Paul and of authority committed unto him were not incident to a very youth. 3. If St. Paul were but above twenty years of age when he was converted it would follow that he exceeded not forty-six years in the fourth year of Nero when he was thought to have written the Epistle to Philemon. But then he called himself *aged Paul.* So from the twentieth year of Tiberius which was the second year after Christ's passion when Paul was converted, unto the fourth year of Nero after but twenty-five or twenty-six years. It would follow also hereupon that St. Paul suffering as Jerome thinks in the thirty-seventh year after the passion of Christ was not above fifty-five years old. Chrysostome thinks that he was above sixty-eight years when he suffered so that this

account he will be found to have been more than thirty years of age when he was converted.

**Question 9:** *How long St. Paul after his conversion was ravished in spirit and taken up into Paradise?*

1. Some are of the opinion that in the space of those three days while Paul continued blind, after Jesus had spoken to him in the way, Acts 9:9, that then he was taken up into the third heaven and heard such things as were not to be uttered. Of which his ravishing in the spirit, St. Paul writes 2 Corinthians 12. Of this opinion are Thomas, Lyranus, Carthusianus upon that place.<sup>60</sup> But this opinion is easily refuted for the Apostle says that thing happened to him fourteen years before he wrote the epistle. This second epistle to the Corinthians is held to have been written in the beginning of the reign of Nero. From there counting fourteen years we still come to the beginning of Claudius' reign. But St. Paul's conversion was eight years before that in the twentieth year of Tiberius for there remained three years of Tiberius' reign and almost four years of Caligula whom Claudius succeeded.

2. It is most like that St. Paul in that three days space had revealed unto him the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and of his gospel which the Apostle says he received by revelation of Jesus Christ, Gal. 1:12. So think Bada in *Actor* ch. 9 and the author of the scholastical history c. 46 in the same book. It is evidently gathered by the history of St. Paul's conversion set forth by St. Luke, Acts 9 how presently upon the conversion St. Paul began to preach in the synagogues that Christ was the Son of God. He would not

---

<sup>60</sup> *Ioannes Drudo. Lib.1.2.scriptur.c.2.*

have preached unto others if he had not been before himself instructed in the ways of Christ.

3. Sixtus Senesis then is greatly deceived, who I. *tom.bibliot.* delivered out of Origen, that St. Paul had learned the history of the Gospel of St. Luke. Both St. Luke's own narration is against it who said that straightway after St. Paul had recovered his sight by the laying on of the hands of Ananias he began to preach in the name of Jesus, Acts 9. St. Paul testifies otherwise of himself, Gal. 1:11, *Now I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, was not after man: for neither received I it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.*

**Question 10:** *At what time Paul was first in bonds, and of his going to Jerusalem, how oft he went hither, before he came into bonds.*

Because St. Paul wrote many of his epistles while he had his liberty, and some after his imprisonment, it shall not be amiss to examine this matter briefly when Paul began first to be restrained of his liberty. Falling out at Jerusalem, it must first be known how often and upon what occasion he went up to Jerusalem. His journeys then to Jerusalem are found to have been these four.

1. First, he went to Jerusalem to see Peter which was three years after his conversion. From Damascus where he was converted, he went into Arabia, and thence to Damascus and so to Jerusalem. But here two doubts are raised. The first is the Luke, presently after Paul escapes from Damascus, makes mention of his coming to Jerusalem, Acts 9:25. The answer is that Luke omitted many things that were done and so passes over for brevity's sake the journey of Paul into Arabia. The other doubt is whether Paul preached during his trip to Arabia. Jerome thinks that he did not but that he was restrained by the Holy

Spirit to preach the word in Arabia as afterward in Asia, Acts 16:7. Pareus is also of the same judgment because Paul speaking before king Agrippa, how he preached in Damascus, and at Jerusalem and in Judea, Acts 26:20 makes no mention of his preaching in Arabia. But seeing that there were three years **runne?** , after Paul went from Damascus to Arabia before he returned to Jerusalem, it would not be like Paul to send all this time idle. In Acts 26:20, though he makes no particular mention of preaching in Arabia, yet he says in general that he preached to the Gentiles. Wherefore I rather subscribe here unto the sentence of Chrysostome who thinks that Paul at this time preached in Arabia and did other memorable things which for modesty's sake he passed over in silence.

2. The second voyage of Paul to Jerusalem was when he with Barnabas carried relief from Antioch unto the brethren of Jerusalem and in Judea, because of the great famine which was through the whole world during the reign of Claudius Caesar, Acts 11:30; 12:35.

3. The third of Paul to Jerusalem was recorded in Gal. 2:1, *Then fourteen years after I went up to Jerusalem.* But here likewise arises a double doubt. First whether his journey and that described in Acts 15 were one and the same. The second, how these fourteen year are to be accounted and when they began. For the first Chrysostome and Jerome upon the second chapter of Galatians seem to be of the opinion that these were two different journeys. There may be some probability to this because Luke says that Barnabas went with Paul, Acts 15. Paul says that beside Barnabas he also took Titus. Luke shows were sent up to decide the question concerning circumcision but Paul says he went up by revelation, Gal. 2:2. Yet it may be answered, that though Luke made no express mention of Titus, he may be included in the general addition. They ordained that Paul and Barnabas *and certain other of them should go...*, Acts 15:2. Paul may have gone

up by revelation with the concurrence of this other occasion. The opinion rather of Theodoret<sup>61</sup> and of Beda<sup>62</sup> seems to be more sound; that both of these were one journey. Both because after this Paul and Barnabas divided themselves, Acts 15:39 and traveled not together afterward to Jerusalem. After this Paul did not return to Jerusalem until he was apprehended and arrested there in Acts 21.

The other doubt is where the beginning of this calculation must begin. Beda and the author of the scholastical history upon the 15th chapter of Acts, and Thomas, Lyrannus, Cajetanus upon the chapter 2 of Galatians think that they are to be counted from the time of Paul's conversion.

But the opinion of Jerome and Anselm are more probable, that these 14 years begin from Paul's first coming to Jerusalem which was three years after his conversion. Paul makes mention of this in Galatians 2:18, for seeing that he had spoken before of his first going to Jerusalem, *After three years I again came to Jerusalem*, and says afterward in chapter 2, *Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem*. These fourteen years must properly begin where the prior three ended, so that the fourteen years were indeed 17 years from his conversion.

But Pererius objects that the seventeenth year would fall in the tenth year of Claudius Caesar which cannot be for the Jews were expelled from Rome by Claudius after this third journey of Paul to Jerusalem. Luke in chapter 15 makes mention of Paul going up to Jerusalem but the Jews departure from Rome by the commandment of Claudius is referenced in 18:2. This dismissing of the Jews from (Rome) Jerusalem was in the ninth year of Claudius as Orosius<sup>63</sup> wrote and Beda.<sup>64</sup> This objection of Pererius

---

<sup>61</sup> 2. *ad. Galat.*

<sup>62</sup> *c.15. Actor*

<sup>63</sup> *lib. 7.c.4.*

<sup>64</sup> *lib. de. 6. aetatib.*

may easily be answered. 1. He relies only upon the credit of these two that this expulsion was in the nine years when it may have been after. 2. To admit that it was in the ninth year, with Paul going up in the 17th year of his conversion might be before. Seeing that he was converted in the 20th year of Tiberius, upon the 25th of January as is commonly held, his going up to Jerusalem may be supposed to have been in the beginning of the same 17th year which falls in the beginning of the tenth year of Claudius. The ejection of the Jews might be in the end of the year. 3. Luke does not say in 18:2 that then the Jews were first expelled but that Aquila was lately come from Rome because Claudius had given commandment. There is no precise time set and there might have been some space allowed for their departure after the commandment was given.

**Question 11:** *Paul's imprisonment first at Cesarea and afterwards at Rome.*

The fourth journey of Paul to Jerusalem was when he was taken by the captain Lysias and sent to Cesarea to Felix the governor. Luke sets forth the history, Acts 21-23. While at Cesarea he continued under Felix two years in prison, Acts 24:28 but there are various opinions concerning this matter.

1. Some think that the two years there mentioned are understood of the time of Felix's government but that cannot be. Paul says in Acts 24:10 that Festus had been a judge for many years unto the nation. He had been their governor more than two years. Josephus writes that Festus was sent to Judea in the 11th year of Claudius<sup>65</sup> and he was displaced from his assignment in the second year of Nero. Festus held his government for five years at the least.

2. Baronius thinks that the two years mentioned must be confined to Nero's reign. In Nero's second year Felix was removed and Paul was brought prisoner to Rome.

---

<sup>65</sup> lib. 20. Antiquities c. 5.

Baronius denies that he was for two years in bonds at Cesarea. Pererius well refutes this assertion because no mention is made at all of Nero by Luke and therefore to his reign, there two years have no relation.

3. The author of the scholastical history will have these two years counted from the time when the Jews first accused Paul before Caesar.<sup>66</sup> But Luke makes no such mention of any such thing.

4. Wherefore, whereas the words ? and thus, *when the two years were expired, Pontius Festus came into room, and Felix willing to get favor of the Jews, left Paul bound.* The best sense is to begin these two years with the first imprisonment of Paul at Cesarea. Of this opinion are Lyrannus, Oecumenius and Beda. And so much may be gathered out of the text because it is said that Felix sent for Paul more often and communed with him hoping that some money should be given him, v.27. This oft communing with Paul shows that Paul was detained for sometime and it is said that he left Paul bound. The two years that expired mentioned in the same place are fitly referred to Paul's bonds.

Now after Paul had been a prisoner at Cesarea for two years he was sent bound to Rome in the second year of Nero and continued there a free prisoner two years in a house which he hired, Acts 28:30. So he came to Rome in the 23rd year of his conversion and the 25th year after the passion of Christ. Afterward he was loosed out of his bonds and dismissed from Rome as shall be shown in the next question. This first two year imprisonment at Rome is the time Luke wrote the history recorded in Acts and thus it ends here. After this imprisonment it was not likely that Luke was Paul's perpetual and inseparable companion.

**Question 12:** *Whether Paul was set a liberty after he was a prisoner at Rome and where he traveled afterward.*

---

<sup>66</sup> Acts of the Apostles, c. 5.

1. This is evident by Paul's own testimony, who in his various epistles while he had been a prisoner of Rome, promised to visit the churches again where he had preached the gospel. Of this return he speaks very confidently as in Phil 1:25, writing from Rome he said, *This I am sure of, that I shall abide, and with you all continue, for your furtherance, and joy in the faith.* Likewise to Philemon he wrote, *Prepare me lodging, for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you.* So also Heb. 13:23, *Know that our brother Timotheus is delivered with whom, if he come shortly I will see you.* And yet more evidently, 2 Tim. 4:16, 17, *At my first answering no man assisted me...notwithstanding the Lord assisted me, and strengthened me, that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles should hear, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion.* All these places do evidently show that Paul was delivered after his first imprisonment at Rome.

2. The reason is thus alleged by Eusebius, that Nero in the beginning of his empire was more gentle and mild.<sup>67</sup> Afterward, when Paul was taken again, Nero then becoming a most cruel tyrant, caused the holy Apostle to be put to death. Thus Eusebius *lib. 2. histor. scholast. c. 21.10* the like purpose also written by Jerome in *Paulo*.

3. Now after Paul was delivered he visited the churches where he had preached and other places likewise where he had not been before. 1. Jerome thinks that he preached only in the West parts, for he had a purpose to go into Spain, Rom. 13:28. But it is not reasonable that he spent all the time of his liberty after his first imprisonment, which was 10 years, only in the West. 2. Cajetanus thinks that he visited Macedonia and Achaia as he had promised in his epistles. This he infers from the words of 2 Tim. 4:13, *The cloak*

---

<sup>67</sup> Neronem in principio inopery mitiorem fuisse

*which I left a Troas with Carpus, when thou commest, bring with thee* and v. 20, *Trophimus I left at Miletus sick*. These things were not done when Paul went first to Rome (says Cajetan) for nothing is mentioned in the account of Acts. These things then occurred before his second coming to Rome. Being 10 to 11 years after the first he would not write for his winter cloak, which he had left behind so long ago. Neither is it likely that *Trophimus*' sickness continued 10 to 11 years. *Cajetan*'s documentation is not found here. It is evident that Paul wrote this epistle during his first imprisonment at Rome because he saus that he was delivered out of the mouth of the lion, v. 17. Furthermore, many acts of the Apostles are not recorded in the history of Acts. *Cajetan*'s opinion is however correct that Paul visited the Eastern churches as he promised and purposed in his Epistles. 3. Paul did not only visit the Eastern churches, but as *Eusebius* says, it is like, that he returned to preach the gospel again everywhere.<sup>68</sup>

4. It is certain Paul did not return to Ephesus for he himself told them that they would see his face no more, Acts 20:38. Whether Paul ever went to Spain will be showed when we come to that place in the 15th chapter.

**Question 13:** *In what year after the passion of Christ, and of Nero his reign, St. Paul was put to death at Rome.*

1. Pererius alleging for his authors, Metaphrastes, Dyonisius Bishop of Corinth, Onuphrius in his Chronicle, and Baronius, thought that St. Paul was martyred in the 13<sup>th</sup> year of Nero's reign, in the 8<sup>th</sup> month; and in the 36<sup>th</sup> year from the passion of Christ.
2. Beda upon the 15 chapter of Acts, assigned Paul's death to the 38<sup>th</sup> years after the passion of Christ.

---

<sup>68</sup> *Euangelium passine praedicandum se denuo recepisse.*

3. Thomas yet goes further, and says it happened in the 40<sup>th</sup> year after Christ's passion.<sup>69</sup> But if either of these two latter opinions were true, St. Paul should not have suffered under Nero, which is against the common received opinion of all.
4. Therefore it is more probable, according to the received tradition, that St. Paul died in the 14<sup>th</sup> year of Nero's reign, and in the 37<sup>th</sup> year after the passion of Christ.<sup>70</sup>

Pererius objects, that Nero died about June 10 of his 14<sup>th</sup> year, whereas St. Paul and St. Peter suffered on the 29<sup>th</sup> of June, and therefore they could not be put to death in Nero's reign, may be thus answered. It is uncertain at what time of the year, or in what month Nero died. Pererius' comment is built only upon the conjecture of Onuphrius, as has been shown before, question 6. toward the end, whose testimony is not sufficient to weigh against the authority of Eusebius, Jerome and others, who place Paul's death in the 14<sup>th</sup> year of Nero.

But Epiphanius thinks St. Paul to have died in the 12<sup>th</sup> year of Nero<sup>71</sup> which was the 35<sup>th</sup> year after the passion of Christ, who herein is against the opinion of all other.

**Question 14:** *Of Paul's person, and of the manner, and place of his death.*

1. Concerning St. Paul's person, Nicephorus thus describes him<sup>72</sup> that he was of small stature, and somewhat stooping, of a whitely face, small head, comely eyes, low eyebrows and a pronounced nose. He had a thick beard, somewhat long, full of grey hairs, as likewise was his head and of comely grace, showing

---

<sup>69</sup> *2.cap.ad Galat.*

<sup>70</sup> *Eusebius in Chronic. and Hierom. Lib. De script. Ecclesiast.*

<sup>71</sup> *In har.27.*

<sup>72</sup> *lib. 2.c.37.*

- some divine thing to be in him. Chrysostom in his homily *de principib. Apostol.* Says, that for his stature, he was but three cubits high, whereas a man's usual stature is approaching four cubits. If this were so, the reason may evidently appear, why the false apostles said that "Paul's bodily presence was weak," 2 Cor. 10:10. They disdained his person for his small stature.
2. For the place where St. Paul was beheaded, the general opinion is, that it was in the way *Hostenses*, where Constantine erected a temple bearing St. Paul's name, and there he was buried. But Pererius by the authority of Gregory thinks that he was put to death, *ad aquas Saluias*, in a place called the Saluian waters. The matter is not great, yet there is more probability for the former opinion.
  3. It is also generally received, that St. Paul and St. Peter were both put to death on the same day at Rome. However, Prudentius in his verses, *de festo Apostolor.* and *August. Tom. 10 ser. 4. de fest. Apost.* Are of the opinion that Paul suffered upon the same day that Peter did, but a year later. The matter is not great, though Galasius condemned them as hereitics which deny that St. Peter and St. Paul suffered in one day together.

**Question 15:** *What moved Nero to put the holy Apostle to death?*

1. Some think that this was the cause. Simon Magnus, to prove himself to the Romans to be a God, by the help of the Devil did fly aloft in the air. By the prayers of Peter the Devil was driven from him leaving the sorcerer to fall, being forsaken of his spirit and so was broken in pieces. For this cause Nero was incensed against the apostle. This is the

testimony of Hegesippus,<sup>73</sup> Ambrose,<sup>74</sup> Arnob.<sup>75</sup> with others. This reason, if this report were true, as it may be doubted, rather shows the reason why Peter was put to death and then Paul.

2. Chrysostome and Theophylact on the fourth chapter of 2 Timothy allege this to be the cause. Paul had converted Nero's butler to the Christian faith, a man whom Nero highly respected. Upon the butler's conversion Nero commanded Paul to be beheaded.

3. Simeon Metaphrastes affirms out of Chrysostome that Nero was enraged against Paul because Paul had converted one of Nero's mistresses which afterward refused to have company with him.<sup>76</sup> But these two seem to be but men's conjectures. If this had been the cause Nero would have had put Paul to death at his first imprisonment. It was then that he had converted members of Caesar's household, whose commendations he sent to the Philippians. After this we gather in c.1.25 that he was set free.

4. Severus Sulpitius gives another reason why Nero put Paul to death. Nero having set Rome on fire blamed the many Christians who lived in the city. Nero took this occasion to persecute the Christians and to persecute them with many torments. Some he caused to be covered with animal skins and to be attacked and eaten by dogs. Some were nailed to crosses. Some were burnt in the night that their fires might subdue the darkness of the night. In this hot persecution moved by this event, Paul was put to death. But Pererius

---

<sup>73</sup> Hegesippus, *lib. 3. c. 2.*

<sup>74</sup> Ambrose, *lib. 5. epist. de tradend. basilic*

<sup>75</sup> Arnob., *lib. 2. advers. Gentil.*

<sup>76</sup> *commentary peregrinat. Petri and Paul*

refutes this opinion with this reason. The city was set on fire in the tenth year of Nero, as Eusebius notes in his Chronicle, but Paul suffered in the fourteenth year of Nero.

5. We need not assign any other cause of Nero's rage against this blessed apostle than this, which Eusebius and Jerome already touched upon and is partly showed before in question 12. Paul's defense at his first imprisonment admitted, and subsequently released, Nero first considering himself as a gentle prince, in the end became a most savage tyrant. When his hatred was such against the Christians Paul could not escape his bloody hands. It was then the cruelty of that bloody tyrant joined with a wicked detestation of the Christian faith that provoked this beastly tyrant to show his rage in putting to death this holy apostle. We need not seek any further reason.

Thus far we have proceeded in such questions as concern the person of this Apostle. Now follow such matters as are to be observed as touching his writings and especially this epistle to the Romans.

**Question 16:** *Of the Epistles of Paul and the number of them.*

1. Paul wrote fourteen epistles with one of them being written to seven churches: 1. to the Romans; 2. to the Corinthians; 1. to the Galatians; 1. to the Ephesians; 1. to the Philippians; 1. to the Colossians; 2. to the Thessalonians; and 1 to the Hebrews. Beside these Paul wrote four letters to private persons: 2. to Timothy; 1 to Titus and 1 to Philemon. Gregory, following Anselm yields this reason for the number: The number of 14 consists of 10 that signify the moral law and of four that note the four Evangelists. Thus in this number Paul shows the harmony of the content of the Law and the Gospel and that Paul had searched such continuity out the secrets both of the Law and the

Gospel.<sup>77</sup> This reason, however is too curious. Cyrillus de Heirosolym<sup>78</sup> gives a better reason why Paul wrote more epistles than the rest of the apostles, not because Peter and John were less or inferior but because he had been an enemy before, it pleased God that he should write the most that we might be better persuaded that he taught the truth.

2. These fourteen epistles are extant but there are other's written by Paul that are not. In 1 Cor. 5:9 Paul makes mention of an epistle that he had written to the Corinthians previously, saying, *I wrote unto you, in an epistle, that you should not company together with fornicators.* Chrysostome is of the opinion that this reference is to verses 2 and 7 of the same chapter but verse 11 following, *But know I have written unto you* that he had written at another time. Indeed, the words of Paul in Eph. 3:3, *As I have written before (or above) in a few words,* may have relation to the beginning of the same epistle, 1:9. Yet in this case it may be gathered that Paul had written an earlier epistle to the Corinthians.<sup>79</sup> This may be the meaning of the words, *This is the third time that I come unto you,* 2 Cor. 13:1 that he may understand of his three epistles that he had written to the Corinthians. That some of the Apostle's writing may be missing in the New Testament, as some of the prophets in the Old Testament, as Solomon is said to have spoken three thousand proverbs and a thousand and five songs, 1 Kings 4:32, whereof the greater part is lost may be granted without any inconvenience seeing that the part of Scripture that the Lord thought good to preserve for the edifying of the church is found to be sufficient.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Legie and Euangeli secreta rimatus esset.*

<sup>78</sup> *Catechism 10: Non quod minor esset Petrus aut Johannes, sed quia anrea fuit inimicus.*

<sup>79</sup> Pareus

3. Yet diverse books were forged and foisted under Paul's name. Augustine cites in the *Apocalypse* or Revelation of Paul<sup>80</sup> where Nicephorus also makes mention<sup>81</sup> which they said was found in Paul's father's house at Tarsus in a marble coffer in the time of Theodosius the Emperor which was proved to be false by the confession of an old man. Such was the book of the Acts of Paul mentioned by the same Nicephorus.<sup>82</sup>

4. As the same sort was the Epistle to the Laodiceans imagined to be Paul's writings: 1. which neither was Paul's writing, but the church rejected it, that their might be but 14 epistles in all to show that the Apostles had attained to the secrets of the Law and Gospel, ten signifying the Law and four the Evangelists. Thus Anselm<sup>83</sup> following Gregory<sup>84</sup> for the Church has no authority to reject any part of the Apostolic writings. 2. Neither was it Paul's writing but now preferred as Bellarmine thinks.<sup>85</sup> 3. Nor was the epistle sometime extant, of Paul's writing, as Epiphanius makes mention in the heresy of the Marcionites. Jerome well says<sup>86</sup>, "Some do read also the Epistle to the Laodiceans, but it is rejected by all<sup>87</sup> for the words are εκ λαοδικεια, from Laodicea, Col. 4:16 which the vulgar Latin corruptly translates, *qua Laodicensium est*, which is of the Laodiceans. 4. Neither was it the same epistle which the Apostle had written from Laodicea, that think that this might have been Paul's first epistle to Timothy. It is evident from Col. 2:1 that Paul had not yet

---

<sup>80</sup> Ioan. c. 16.

<sup>81</sup> *lib. 12. c. 34.*

<sup>82</sup> *lib. 12. c. 46*

<sup>83</sup> *4 epistles. ad. Colossens.*

<sup>84</sup> *lib. 35. morall. c. 25*

<sup>85</sup> *lib.4.de verbo Dei, c.4.*

<sup>86</sup> *Legunt quidam ad Laodicensens, sed ab omnibus exploditur*

<sup>87</sup> *catalog. scriptor.*

seen the Laodiceans. 5. Philastrius makes mention of such an epistle which was believed to be Paul's but it was not publicly received because of some doubtful sentences thrust in by some.<sup>88</sup> But it was not Paul's epistle neither in part nor whole for the reasons before alleged, as Theodoret thinks that it is a feigned and forged epistle. 6. Sixtus Senens. writes that there is a epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans to be found in Paris, in an old book, in the library of Sobon, and at Padway in the library of St. John but this is not Paul's epistle in that it contains nothing worthy of him and whatsoever that epistle contains, is more distinctly handled in the Epistle to the Colossians. Thus there is no reason why Paul should will the Colossians to read the epistle. 7. This epistle then from Laodicea was some epistle which either the Laodiceans wrote to Paul whereunto he partly replied, in the Epistle to the Colossians as

**Question 17:** *Of the order of time, wherein S. Paul's several epistles were written.*

The epistle to the Romans, though it is placed first, is thought to have been written last of all those Paul wrote before he was imprisoned in Rome. His epistles are thought to have been written in this order: 1. 1 Thessalonians, which he sent from Athens by Tychicus. From Thessalonica he traveled to Berea, and from there to Athens, Acts 17:2; 2. In the same year while still at Athens, Paul wrote his second epistle to Thessalonica, explaining in the latter that which he had written in the first concerning the coming of Christ and the end of the world. These letters were written in about the 17<sup>th</sup> year of his apostleship and the ninth year of the reign of Claudius the Emperor.<sup>89</sup> Chrysostom conjectures that the letters to the Thessalonians were written before the epistles to the Corinthians because he says in 2 Cor. 9:2 that Achaia was prepared a year ago, indicating that he had formerly

---

<sup>88</sup> *bares. 59.*

<sup>89</sup> Pareus.

dealt with the Thessalonians to whom he wrote, 2 Thess. 4:9, *As touching brotherly love, ye need not, that I write unto you...yea and that thing ye verily do to all the brethren, which are throughout all Macedonia.* It seems then that he had propounded this matter of benevolence and alms to the Thessalonians, before he had written thereof to the Corinthians.<sup>90</sup>

But here are two doubts raised in this context against this epistle – from where it was sent and by whom. Baronius, to whom Pererius agrees, thinks that it was written from Corinth because Paul makes mention in 3:6 of Timothy's return to Paul, before this epistle was written, who found Paul at Corinth, Acts 18:1, 5. But there it is said that Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia when they found Paul at Corinth. Therefore that might be another return than the one mentioned here when Timothy came from Thessalonica. That Paul was at Athens when he wrote this epistle is evident, 3:1, *We thought it good to remain at Athens alone....* Also holding this opinion are Athanasius in his *Synopsis* and Theodoret, that this epistle was sent from Athens.

But these forenamed Fathers also think that this epistle was sent by Timothy because it follows in 3:2, *And have sent Timotheus our brother...* who they think carried this epistle. It is more probable that it was sent by some other, and most likely Tychicus.<sup>91</sup> The inscription of the epistle is in the names of Paul, Silas and Timothy. It would not be expected that he would send Timothy's salutation, if he were indeed the carrier of the epistle. Salutations and greetings are sent in the name of those who are absent.

The third epistle in order was the former epistle to Timothy which he wrote from Laodicea, the principal city of Phrygia pactiana, while he passed through that country, Acts 18: 2, 3 before he came to Ephesus 19:1. When Paul wrote Timothy he anticipated

---

<sup>90</sup> Chrysostom, *in argum.*

<sup>91</sup> Pareus

seeing him shortly, 1 Tim. 3:14, as he did coming out of Phrygia to Ephesus. This sees to be about the 19<sup>th</sup> year after Paul's conversion.

Next was written the first letter to the Corinthians, which was dated from Philippi, as it is in the Greek subscription, but rather from Ephesus, as the Syrian and Arabian translations has it. For at this time Paul was at Ephesus, 1 Cor. 16:8, *I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost*, and as yet he was not come to Macedonia, where Philippi was, as he saith in verse 5, *I will pass through Macedonia*. It seems then, that this epistle was written while Paul stayed at Ephesus before the commotion made by Demetrius, 1 Cor. 16:5.<sup>92</sup> The writing of this letter was about the 19<sup>th</sup> year after Paul's conversion, in the 54<sup>th</sup> year of our Lord and in the 12<sup>th</sup> year of Claudius.<sup>93</sup>

Then followed the second epistle to the Corinthinas, which was written from Philippi, as the usual subscription shows. After the tumult ceased in Ephesus, Paul departed to go into Macedonia, Acts 20:1, and from there, to Greece, where he stayed 3 months. Paul promised to come to Macedonia in 2 Cor. 9:4 which he at that time performed.

About the same time the epistle to Titus was also written from Nicopolis, which is not far from Philippi in Macedonia, where he sent for Titus to come to him. Purposing to winter there, Titus 3:12, the apostle changed his mind and stayed three months longer in Greece where he wintered, Acts 20:3, most likely at Corinth.<sup>94</sup> Aretius thinks that this epistle war written before the latter to the Corinthians but this is but a small matter. Both epistles were written a short time after the other, but ti seems that Paul came first to Philippi, from where he wrote Corinthians and then to Nicopolis where he wrote Titus.

---

<sup>92</sup> Beza, *annot.*

<sup>93</sup> Pareus

<sup>94</sup> Pareus

The last of all these was the epistle to the Romans. It was written from Corinth in his final journey through Macedonia and Greece, then to Jerusalem, and from there sent captive to Rome. At that time he had received the alms to minister to the saints at Jerusalem, Rom. 15:25. These instructions to gather alms were given before to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 16:2, 2 Cor. 8:6, which alms he now carried to Jerusalem, when he wrote this epistle, as he said in Acts 25:17, that he brought alms to his nation. The Epistle to the Romans was the last written before he came to Rome and thus it was before all the rest that were sent from Rome being imprisoned there, “for he was not yet come to the city of Rome, when he wrote this epistle.”<sup>95</sup>

These seven former epistles were written by Paul before he carried prisoner to Rome. The remaining seven were sent after he came to Rome, for in all of them he makes mention of his bonds. Paul is thought to have been twice in bonds at Rome. Otherwise, being held but once, having come to Rome in the second year of Nero he must either be thought after two years of imprisonment at Rome to have suffered in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of Nero, which is against the opinion of all, or that he remained a prisoner in Rome for 12 years, which is not likely. Whether he wrote these epistles following his first or second imprisonment in Rome is uncertain.<sup>96</sup>

The first written from Rome was the Epistle to the Galatians. In this letter Paul makes mention of the marks of the Lord Jesus, which he did bear in his body, 6:17, meaning his chains, or torments, which he endured. This may have been written at the beginning of his second imprisonment.<sup>97</sup> Chrysostom thinks that the Epistle to the Galatians was written before the letter to the Romans, but that cannot be. When he sent the epistle to the Romans he had not yet seen them, for he said, 1:11, “I long to see

---

<sup>95</sup> Chrysostom, *Romanorum um enim verbem nondum accesserat.*

<sup>96</sup> Pareus

<sup>97</sup> Pareus

you...” and thus had never been to Rome. However, from Rome he sent the Epistle to the Galatians, then being imprisoned as both the subscription to the epistle shows and the mentioning of the marks of the Lord Jesus, 6:17. Aretius thinks that it was written last of all, except the Epistle to the Hebrews because the apostle says 6:17, “From hence let no man put me to business”<sup>98</sup> for “I am now ready to be offered,” but the words are not there. He says, “for I bear in my body the marks....”

The next was the Epistle to the Ephesians where he makes mention also of his bonds, 6:22.<sup>99</sup>

Next was the Epistle to the Philippians where he makes mention of some in Cesar’s household sending salutations, 4:22.<sup>100</sup> Aretius will have this the first epistle sent in his bonds because he makes mention thereof as a new thing, 1:7, but by this reason the Epistle to Philemon should be the first, because in the very first title he says “Paul a prisoner of Jesus Christ.” These epistles, the order whereof cannot be proved otherwise out of the epistles themselves are best held to have been written in the order they are placed.

The last of the epistles written by Paul during his first imprisonment seems to be the Epistle to the Hebrews. Pareus makes it the first epistle written from Rome but because he says, “They of Italy salute you, 13:23, it may seem that he was dismissed from Rome and preached in Italy. Baronius and before him Aretius thinks that it was the last of Paul’s epistles. This however is unlikely because it seems when he wrote this epistle he was delivered from his bonds in Rome and was in Italy. Therefore I think that

---

<sup>98</sup> *ego enim modo immolar*

<sup>99</sup> Pareus

<sup>100</sup> Pareus

for the same reason, that Hebrews was the last epistle Paul wrote during his first imprisonment.<sup>101</sup>

The next was the epistle to Philemon but written in Paul's last imprisonment. Pareus and Aretius think the epistle to the Colossians was written first but Chrysostom gives the priority to Philemon for this reason. In Col. 4:9 Paul makes mention of Onesimus a faithful and beloved brother whom he sent with Tychicus to the Colossians. It appears that Paul first reconciled Onesimus to his master Philemon, whose servant he had been, "Without whose mind he would do nothing," Philemon 14. Paul sent Onesimus to Philemon with the Epistle first, before he would employ him.

Then follows the Epistle to the Colossians where he asks them to be mindful of his bonds. These two last epistles, 1. I neither think with Pererius to have been written in Paul's first imprisonment, because he calls himself in the epistle to Philemon, which was written before this to the Colossians, Paul the aged. Though he writes, v. 21, as hoping to be delivered yet it pleased God otherwise. 2. Neither do I think with Pareus that all but the epistle to the Hebrews written from Rome are to be referred to Paul's last imprisonment because in some of them he writes confidently of his deliverance as in Phil. 1:25, "This I am sure of, that I shall abide...." These two then, with the latter epistle to Timothy, were written in Paul's last imprisonment.

The last was the second epistle to Timothy, which was after the other to the Colossians. Demas had fallen away, 2 Tim. 4:10, who yet continued with Paul when he wrote the Colossians, 4:14.<sup>102</sup> And that this was last of all is evident 2 Timothy 4:6, where he says, "I am ready to be offered up, and the time of my departure is at hand."<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Perer

<sup>102</sup> Aretius

<sup>103</sup> Chrysostom, Pareus.

But Pererius differs significantly as touching the order of the time of the writing of these epistles. His placement of them with the reasons for his opinions shall be briefly examined.

1. The Epistles to the Corinthians he thinks to have been written before the first epistle to Timothy, which is affirmed to have been written in the third place, before either of these epistles. If Paul wrote the first epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus, as Pererius confesses and is evident, 1 Cor. 16:8, then the first epistle to Timothy must be former. When Paul wrote to Timothy he had not yet been to Ephesus but he planned to see Timothy shortly, 1 Tim. 3:14.

2. Next to the epistles to the Corinthians, he places the former to Timothy, which must go one before for the reason alleged.

3. After the epistles to the Corinthians he wrote the letter to Titus, which followed in that order, as has been showed before. He does not think it was written from Nicopolis, which is the most probable, because he says, 3:12, "Be diligent to come to me to Nicopolis, for I am determined there to winter." Although these words may bear that sense, that he had not yet come to Nicopolis, but had it in his mind to be there, yet the subscription to the epistle, affirming tht it had been written from Nicopolis ought to sway that interpretation, the text favoring that sense.

4. The epistle to the Galatians he thinks to have had the fifth place next to that of Titus with Chrysostom. But Theodoret's opinion is rather to be received, who thinks it was written in Rome, and therefore after the epistle to the Romans, as is showed before in loc. 9.

5. The Epistle to the Romans was the last of those which Paul wrote before he was imprisoned at Rome as hath been before shown in loc. 7.

6. Then follow the other epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Hebrews, excepting that Pererius will have the epistle to the Galatians before this to the Romans. The epistle to the Hebrews last of all, but the two espistles to Timothy. The epistles to Philemon and the Colossians were after it. See before loc. 13.

7. Last of all Pererius places the second letter to Timothy that was written last of all when Paul was ready to be offered up, as he wrote in 2 Tim. 4:6, and tht the time of his departure was at hand. Baronius therefore is deceived thinking that it was written before the epistles to the Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and to the Hebrews. Whereas it will be objected that Paul when he wrote this epistle was delivered out of the mouth of the lion, meaning Nero, 2 Tim. 4:17, and therefore this epistle was written in his first anot his second bonds. Chrysostom and Theodoret answer that Paul speaks here of his first imprisonment, that of his first answering from which he was delivered. But in the former places he speaks of his state and condition, where he presently was, every day expecting death, and looking for the time of his dissolution.

**Question 18:** *That it is not a point of curiosity, but a very requisite to know the divers times of the writing of S. Paul's Epistles.*

Not for the reason that Origen supposes, to know how the Apostle profited, "he seemeth to have been more perfect in this epistle than in the rest."<sup>104</sup> To the Corinthians

---

<sup>104</sup> *Videtur hac epistola perfectior fuisse quam cateris*

he wrote, 1 cor. 9, “Lest when I have preached to others, I should be a reprobate, so he says, “as though it were a thing he was not fully resolved of.”<sup>105</sup> To the Philippians he says, 3:12, “Not as though I had already attained unto it.” But in this epistle he speaks as a man thoroughly resolved and persuaded that nothing could separate him from the love of God in Christ, 8:38-39.<sup>106</sup>

Contra: 1. The places alleged prove no such uncertainty of assurance of salvation in Paul. First of all, he speaks not of reprobation before God, but in the opinion of men. Lest they might judge him as a reprobate if his life should be contrary to his doctrine. It is in this sense that uses the word in 2 Cor. 3:17, “though we be as reprobates,” that is, in man’s judgment. In other places he speaks of the full possession of the inheritance, not of perfect assurance. 2. The epistle to the Philippians was written after that to the Romans as has been before shown. Therefore it is impertinently alleged to prove greater perfection to have been in the Apostle when he wrote to the Romans than when he indited the epistle to the Philippians. 3. the same assurance of salvation that Paul professed in Romans 8 he also shows in 2 Cor. 2:9, “the things which eye hath not seen...which God hath prepared for those that love him: But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit....” Here the Apostle is saying of himself that he is persuaded that he is one of those to whom these things were revealed and prepared.

But Chrysostom shows a better reason why it is profitable to distinguish the time of the writing of these epistles. Because the Apostle handles the same things diversely, dealing with circumcision and other ceremonies, to the Romans he says, ch., 14, “He that is weak in the faith, receive unto you.’ But to the Galatians he writes more sharply,5:2, “if ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing.” And to the Colossians he calls them, “the ordinances of the world, the commandments and doctrines of men, Col. 2:20,

---

<sup>105</sup> *quasiret non indubitata esset*

<sup>106</sup> *Sic fere Origen*

22. The reason for these differences, Chrysostom alleges to be this: “because in the beginning the Apostle was too condescend and yeelde somewhat, but no so afterwards: like as physicians and school masters do more gently and tenderly care for their patients, and young scholars at the first, then afterward.”<sup>107</sup>

**Question 19:** *Of the order and placing of Epistles, and why this to the Romans is set first.*

Athanasius in *Synopsis* places the seven canonical epistles before Paul’s, which are fourteen in all. Of them, the Epistle to the Hebrews makes the tenth just before the epistles to Timothy. Luther sets the Epistle to the Hebrews after S. John’s epistles and divides it from Paul’s. Tertullian,<sup>108</sup> and Marcion put them in this order: Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians. But the best order is that which is usually received: Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, to Timothy, Titus, Philemon and to the Hebrews.

And why the Epistle to the Romans is refixed before the rest, the reasons are as follows: 1. Not for that it was the first in time, for the contrary is showed before. 2. Nor so much for the prolixity and largeness of the epistle as the prophecy of Isaiah in this regard is set first.<sup>109</sup> 3. or for the dignity of that nation because the Romans were rulers of the world,<sup>110</sup> for this was but a temporal consideration; 4. or for the dignity and excellency of the Roman church, for he gives the preeminence to the Jews, whom he calls the olive tree and the Gentiles the branches of the wild olive tree, 11:5. 5. But the principal reason was due to the excellency of the matter. This epistle treats the primary

---

<sup>107</sup> *quia condescendere oportuit, successu temporis non item.*

<sup>108</sup> *lib. contr.*

<sup>109</sup> Pareus

<sup>110</sup> Aretius

question of justification by faith (which is also handled in the Epistle to the Galatians, but here in more detail) and of the chief questions of the Christian religion, as of the works of nature, 1:2, the force of the Law, 7, the fruits of justifying faith, 5, of election and reprobation, 9, of the calling of the Gentiles, and the rejection of the jews, 11, of the diversity of gifts, 12, of the duty toward magistrates, 12, of the use of indifferent things, 14 – 15, so that this epistle is as a catechism and introduction to the Christian religion and therefore is worthily set before the rest.<sup>111</sup>

**Question 20:** *Unto whom was the Epistle to the Romans written and from whence.*

It was not written generally to the whole Roman state. The Emperor of Rome with his princes, ministers and officers, were persecutors of the Church of God. This letter was directed to those among the Romans, whether of that nation or strangers, both Jews and Gentiles that had embraced the Gospel of Christ.<sup>112</sup> As now in the Romans Papal state we doubt there are many, which profess the Gospel of Christ and are members of the true Church.

And although this epistle was personally directed to the Romans, yet it entreats the common faith, which concerns the whole church of God and so the general use of this epistle. That which was written unto them was written to us. As that which our blessed Savior said to his Apostles he said unto all, Mark 13:37, so that which the Apostles wrote to individual churches they did write to them all.<sup>113</sup>

This epistle was written from Corinth, as not only the subscription shows, both in the Greek and Syriac, but Origen also collects these three arguments out of the text itself:

---

<sup>111</sup> Aretius, Pareus

<sup>112</sup> Aretius, Faius

<sup>113</sup> Gryneus

1. It was sent by Phebe, a servant of the church of Cenchrea, Rom. 16:1. Cenchrea is nearby Corinth, indeed, “the very haven of Corinth.”<sup>114</sup> 2. He says, “Gaius mine host, and the whole church saluteth you, 16:23. Gaius lived at Corinth, as Paul states, 1 Cor. 1:14, “I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius.” 3. He adds further, Erastus the chamberlain of the city salutes you. This Erastus is the same man Paul left in Corinth, 2 Tim. 4:20.

**Question 21:** *Of the excellency and worthiness of this Epistle.*

Three things commend this epistle: 1. matter; 2. form; 3. the kind and method. Concerning the matter, it contains the chief articles and most weighty points of the Christian faith as is partly addressed in question 6. Origen further advances this point: Many things are knit together in this epistle, as of the Law of Moses, of the calling of the Gentiles, of Israel, which is according to the flesh, and of Israel not according to the flesh: of the circumcision of the heart, and of the flesh, and of the spiritual law, and the law of the letter: the law of the members, and the law of the mind, of the law of sin and of the inward and outward man.<sup>115</sup>

The form and method of this epistle is most exact consisting of the definition of that which is handled and the tractation and explication of such. The most perfect and artificial method is that which begins with the definition. The Apostle shows what the Gospel is, “It is the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth,” 1:16. In this definition are expressed all the causes thereof: the efficient and author, God, the end, salvation, the material cause, Christ Jesus, the formal, faith and belief in us, and on

---

<sup>114</sup> *portus ipsius Corinthi*

<sup>115</sup> Origen, *praefat. In Epist. Ad Romanos.*

God's behalf his efficacious power.<sup>116</sup> In the amplifying and tractation of this definition, all the rest of this epistle is concerned: as this proposition, that we are justified by the gospel, that is, by faith and belief in Christ, if further amplified by the contrary, that we cannot be justified by the works of nature, 1:1-2, or by the Law, 3, but by grace and faith, 4, by the effects of justifying faith, inward the peace of conscience, 5, outward, the fruits of holiness, 6, by the contrary operation of the law, which reveal sin, 7, but the gospel frees from condemnation, 8, by the cause and free election of Gods, 9, by the subject, the Gentiles called, the Jews rejected, 11. See more concerning the method in the general argument of the epistle presented before.

For the kind of epistle: It is principally definitive and demonstrative. Paul defines and determines that we are justified neither by works of nature, nor of the law, but by faith in Christ and proves then same by a most evident demonstration. Beside this epistle contains elements of other epistles that are called *accessaria*, accessory and secondary; as it is both *gratulatorie*, rejoicing for their faith, 1, and it is *reprehensorie*, rebuking the Gentiles for their licentiousness; it is also *exhortatorie*, exhorting to holiness of life, 6:12 and it is *deprecatory*, Paul prays and makes requests praying for an increase of faith in them and for himself, that he might have some good occasion to come unto them.<sup>117</sup>

#### ***4. Places of Doctrine***

***1. Of the godly custom and use of the Church in laying the foundation of religion which is catechizing.***

---

<sup>116</sup> Gryneus

<sup>117</sup> Aretius

This commendable use was taken up by the Apostles themselves. As the Apostle shows (Heb. 6:1) he calls it the doctrine of beginnings and laying of foundations of repentance, faith, baptism, the resurrection and of eternal judgment. Likewise in this epistle the Apostle delivers a perfect form of catechism which consists of three parts: of the misery of man by nature, his reparation and restitution by grace, and then his thankfulness afterward in his obedience of life for the benefits received. What man is by nature he shows in 1:23, what by grace 4:5-8 and the fruits of regeneration chapters 6 and 12. So it is false which Bellarmine affirms that the Apostle delivered no form of catechism to the Church<sup>118</sup> for he doth it most plainly and evidently in this epistle.<sup>119</sup>

### ***5. Places of Controversy***

**1.** *That it is known that this epistle was written by St. Paul and is of divine authority by the epistle itself.*

Bellarmino affirms that to know that any Scripture is divine or canonical, it cannot be concluded out of Scripture itself. Neither were the writings of St. Paul or the Gospel of St. Matthew divine or canonical without the tradition of the Church.<sup>120</sup>

Contra: 1. That the epistles of St. Paul are of divine and canonical authority is evident in the writings themselves. For they being written by Saint Paul, who had the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 7:40), had Christ speaking in him (2 Cor. 13:13), was taught of God from whom he received is doctrine by revelation (Gal. 1:12), it is not to be doubted, but that his holy

---

<sup>118</sup> Bellarmine, *l. 4. de. verb. Dei. c. 4.*

<sup>119</sup> Pareus

<sup>120</sup> Bellar. *lib. 4. de. verb. c. 4.*

proceedings proceeded from the Spirit of God and so are of divine authority. He himself did not doubt to make them canonical as he said (Gal. 6:16) "whatsoever walketh according to this canon or rule...." He denounced *anathema* if any, even an angel should teach any other gospel than he had preached (Gal. 1).

2. Likewise it is evident that St. Paul was the author and writer of them both by the inscription and title, and by the salutation at the end of every of every epistle and the benediction that he used, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all," which he says is the token or mark to know his epistles by (2 Thess. 3:17).

3. The tradition of the Church is an uncertain thing. That which is uncertain cannot be a rule or measure of that which is most certain. The testimony of men cannot assure us of the testimony of God. Christ said (John 5:33, 36), "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth: but I receive not the record of men.... I have a greater witness than the witness of John...."

*2. That St. Paul's epistles are not so obscure that any should be terrified reading from them.*

In the preface to Toletus' commentary the epistles of Paul are affirmed to be hard, quoting Jerome and Origen " against Whitaker that heretike,"<sup>121</sup> as it pleased the railing taxer to call that learned godly man.

Contra. 1: True it is that Peter said some things are hard in Paul's epistles, 2 Peter 3:16. He did not say that *many things* are hard or that the epistles are hard but only some (few)

---

<sup>121</sup> *contr. Whitakerum harerticum*

things in them. This truth is not a hindrance. His epistles may safely be read of all that read them with a humble mind, desirous to profit by them. the danger is only to the unlearned and the unstable which pervert them as they do the rest of Scripture as Peter says in the same place.

2. Even those hard places may be made easy by diligent reading as Chrysostome gives this example. As we know the mind of those whom we love and observe, and are familiar with them, "so you if you will with cheerful attention gives your selves to reading, you shall need no other help..."<sup>122</sup> "Hence so many evils have sprung up because the Scriptures are not known; hence so many heresies..."<sup>123</sup> The ignorance then, not the reading of Scripture breedeth heresies. Thus he concluded, "let us open our eyes to receive the brightness of the Apostolic word..."<sup>124</sup> They do not then cast darkness upon our eyes, but bring brightness and clearness.

### **3. *Against the Ebionites which retained the rites and ceremonies of Moses.***

The Ebionites thought the rites of the Law necessary and mixed together the Law and the gospel. This heresy was a great trouble to the first century church and is principally refuted by Paul's epistles to the Galatians and Colossians. The Ebionite heresy in this epistle is likewise shown to be erroneous and confounded. Paul renounced the works of the Law, whether ceremonial or moral, as having no part in the matter of justification, which he concludes to be by faith, without the works of the law, c. 3. He directly shows

---

<sup>122</sup> Chrysostom, *argum. in epist. ad Rom: ...vtig si lectionicum animi alacritate volueritis attendere*

<sup>123</sup> *vtig si lectionicum animi alacritate volueritis attendere*

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid., oculos ad splendorem Apostolicorum verborum aperiamus.*

in c.4.10 that Abraham's faith was imputed to him for righteousness when he was yet uncircumcised, lest his justification might be thought to have depended upon his circumcision.

**4. *Against the Marcionites which rejected the law of Moses.***

These wicked heretics too much disdained the law of Moses with its rites, (as the other thought of it too much) affirming that it was not appointed nor commanded by the good and gracious God but by the prince of the darkness of this world. These also are sufficiently refuted in this epistle. Paul commended the ceremonies of the old Testament as fit for those times and figures of things to come. He called circumcision the seal of the righteousness of faith, c.4.11, and gave this testimony of the moral law, Rom. 7:12, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, just and good...."

**5. *Against the Romanists which deprave the doctrine taught by Paul in this epistle.***

Bellarmino in his controversies and Stapleton in his *Antidotes* do apparently impugn the holy doctrine of the apostle in this epistle in a variety of points. 1. Justification by the imputation and apprehension of faith, which we call imputative justice, they condemn as a lie and an untruth. The apostle directly teaches, c.4.5., "That to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, faith is counted for righteousness," and, v. 8, "Blessed is he to whom the Lord imputeth not his sin." So it is evident by the apostle that our justification before God is in the not imputing of sin and in the imputing of Christ's righteousness by faith.

2. The Romanists teach that a man as long as he lives in this life can not be certain of faith whether he believes, whether his sins have been remitted, whether he has been

justified, of reconciliation, whether he is in a state of grace, of adoption, whether he is a child of God, of life eternal, or whether he shall be saved. Contrary to the apostle who shows that by faith we may be assured of all these such as the remission of sin.

Otherwise we could not be at peace with God which we obtain being justified by faith, c. 5.1.; of adoption, that by the spirit we can call God, Abba, Father, c.8.15; of everlasting salvation, "for there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," c.8.1.

3. The apostle would have every soul subject to the higher powers, c. 13.1. They exempt all their clergy from the power of the magistrate and so in a manner the one half of the multitude. For if their Cardinals, Prelates, Priests, Monks, Friars, Pardoners, with all their ministers be put together, "they will not want much of the half part."<sup>125</sup> These controversies shall more fully be addressed when we come to deal with them afterward in particular.

**6. *Against Socinius that blasphemously subvereth the doctrine of our redemption by Christ and justification by faith.***

This blasphemous Socinus not many years ago published a book in Polonia in which he made Christ no more the Savior of the world than Moses who taught by his example to live well. And thus, by so doing they shall inherit eternal life. He further most impudently affirmed that we have no need of any Reconciler or Redeemer with God. Christ died for our sins in the same fashion, as did the martyrs, not to make any satisfaction for us but only to give us an example. These and other such wicked assertions has he published in that book.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> *A media multitudinis parte uix aberit*

<sup>126</sup> *Pareus in praefat.*

This wicked heretic opposes himself to the most holy doctrine of Paul who evidently taught that as faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, so it is to us, c. 4.24. When we were enemies we were reconciled unto God by the death of Christ, c.5.10. By Christ's obedience we are made righteous, c.5.19. Such wicked assertions need no confutation -- it is sufficient to propound them. For who cannot, who has the least spark of grace but at the very first naming of them abhor them?

*7. Whether Paul may be thought to be married.*

The Rhemists much dislike our English translation because we read Philip. 4:3, "faithful yoke-fellow." so translating the Greek words συζυγε γνησιτε as though they were intended to prove that Paul had a wife. This they say is contrary to the apostle's words, 1 Cor. 7:8, were he wished the unmarried to abide as he did.<sup>127</sup>

Contra: The Protestants do not at all insist upon whether or not Paul had a wife. Neither do they press this place for that purpose. Yet Clement of Alexandria at this very place inferes so much that the apostle by "yoke-fellow" meant his wife.<sup>128</sup> Eusebius also is of the same mind that Paul was married joining him with Peter and Philip who also were married. However, it does not follow that though Paul was unmarried when he wrote to the Corinthians that he was always so. Though Paul were not married it is sufficient that he had the liberty to take a wife as the other Apostles did, 1 Cor. 9:5.<sup>129</sup> We will

---

<sup>127</sup> *Annot. Philip.4.3.*

<sup>128</sup> *Clement of Alexandria, lib. 4. stromat.*

<sup>129</sup> *Aretius*

somewhat more distinctly yet consider this question of Paul's marriage among the diversity of opinions.

1. Some think that he was a perpetual virgin and never married. Tertullian held this opinion and called Paul, "the evangelical eunuch,"<sup>130</sup> having made himself chaste. Furthermore he found only Peter of the Apostles to have been a husband.<sup>131</sup> Jerome also thought that Paul was a virgin.<sup>132</sup> Epiphanius considered among those who were perpetual virgins Helias in the Old Testament and Paul in the new.<sup>133</sup> Ambrose likewise and Theodoret held that Paul was too young before his conversion to be married and after he was converted it is not likely that he desired marriage which he had neglected before. Of this same judgment are Theophylact, Oecumenius and Beda.<sup>134</sup> The primary reason of Paul's virginity they based upon the words, 1 Cor. 7:8, "I say unto you, and unto the widows, it is good for them, if they abide, even as I." But this only shows that Paul at the time was not married, not that he never married. The conjecture that Paul was not of age to be married before he was converted has no probability seeing he was given great authority by the high priest of whom he received letters to persecute the disciples at Damascus, Acts. 9:1, 2.

2. Another opinion is that Paul had a wife both before his conversion and after: Ignatius, *epist. ad Philadelphens*; Clement of Alexandria, *lib. 3. stromat*; Leo IX, *distinct. 31.c.11*; Cajetanus and Cathariuns, *4. cap. ad Philippens*; and Erasmus. Their grounds are out of

---

<sup>130</sup> Tertullian, *Evangelicum spandonem...castratum*.

<sup>131</sup> *lib. de. Monogom*

<sup>132</sup> Jerome, *epist. 22*.

<sup>133</sup> *Qui perpetuo coluerunt virginitatem*

<sup>134</sup> *epist. ad Corinth, 7.c.1*.

two places, 1 Cor. 9:5, "Have we not power to lead about a wife being a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles?" and Philip. 4:3, "I beseech thee, faithful yoke-fellow, help those (women) which labored with me in the gospel."

But neither of these places prove any such thing. We need not refute Tertullian's reason because of the preceding context, "Have we not power to eat and drink?" Paul was speaking of the women which cared for his meals. Jerome thought because the name "sister" is added, he understood other women than their proper wives. The word *γυνή* signifies both a wife and a woman for their wives were also their sisters by profession. Augustine said the apostle "used not the word of leading to marry, but leading about."<sup>135</sup> The reason why we reject this rendering is because at the same time Paul wrote this epistle he counted himself among those which were unmarried, 1 Cor. 7:8. This place only shows that Paul had the power to carry about a wife as did the rest of the Apostles but not that he used this power. Likewise, he had liberty not to work, as it is indicated in the same place, v. 6, "I only and Barnabas, have we not power not to work?," yet he wrought with his hands notwithstanding.

The other place is rather to be understood of some helper that was closely joined to Paul in the work of the gospel than of his wife. For as Cajetan well noted, seeing that Paul was unmarried before when he was at liberty, and wrote the first epistle to the Corinthians, it is not likely that he took a wife afterward being known a prisoner of Rome when he sent his epistle to the Philippians. Besides, the Syrian translator puts it beyond doubt who used the masculine gender, as Beza noted, which is ambiguous in the Greek.

---

<sup>135</sup> *non decendi, sed circumducendi vocabulo usus est*

**3.** Some others leave the matter in suspense, not determining whether Paul was married or not as did Origen in the beginning of his commentary on this epistle. This is the safest opinion to subscribe to -- whether Paul was at any time married or not seeing that it is not expressed in Scripture. It suffices that he said he had the power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as the rest.

But now Pererius out of the same fathers, as Jerome and Augustine contended that it must be interpreted, a "woman" being a sister for the word  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\eta$  used here signifies both a woman and a wife. This conceit is removed by these sufficient reasons:

**1.** In thus reading, "a woman, a sister" they do invert the order of the words which stand in the original,  $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omega\nu\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\alpha$ , "a sister, a wife." If they will have it, "a sister, a woman," it would be superfluous seeing the word "sister" also includes the other. She could not be a sister but be a woman too.

**2.** It was more seemly, that seeing the apostle had women in their company to minister unto them, it was more fit and convenient that their own wives should go about with them than other women which had not been without offence.

**3.** Likewise, the very phrase about leading about a sister shows some command and authority such as husbands have over their wives and masters over their servants as Peter Martyr well noted. The Apostles had power to lead about their own wives who were not to forsake their husbands but over other women they had not that power.

**4.** If this were to be understood of rich and wealthy women which accompanied the Apostles and ministeres unto them of their substance, they would have been no charge to the churches whether the Apostles came. So this would have been no privilege to the

Apostles to bring such women with them as should support their charges. But the apostle here stood upon this privilege and immunity, if he thought it good to have used it, that he might as the other Apostles have led about a wife.<sup>136</sup> So that whether Paul was married or not, it suffices to say, that he might have taken a wife, if he would.

## **6. Moral observations upon the whole Epistle**

### **1. Of the singular profit that may arise by reading this Epistle to the Romans**

This Epistle has a double use, either to instruct us in the the right judgment of the greatest mysteries of the Christian religion, as of justification by faith, the Law, of Election, of the certainty of salvation, as also to stir us up to works of piety. Origen only commendeth the reading of the latter part of the Epistle from chapter 12 to the end. The other part he thought not to be so necessary as handling only questions about the ceremonies of the Law. I prefer rather the judgment of Chrysostome who often caused St. Paul's epistles to be read in his hearing twice every week.<sup>137</sup> Augustine professed that he was much addicted to the reading of St. Paul.<sup>138</sup> It was an ancient use in times past in the Church, that they who were appointed to the ministry should get the Psalms and the Prophecy of Isaiah in the Old Testament, and the Gospel of St. Matthew with St. Paul's epistle in the New. It shall be profitable for every Christian likewise to follow the same godly use, especially to acquaint themselves with the divine writings of St. Paul. May every one say with Chrysostom, "I am glad, that I may enjoy the spiritual trumpet..."<sup>139</sup>

---

<sup>136</sup> Beza

<sup>137</sup> *argument, in epist.ad Roman and Augustine*

<sup>138</sup> *lib. 7. confess. c. 3.*

<sup>139</sup> *In argum.ad Roman*