



(Romans 15:4) “whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction.” = What timeless instruction (truths/principles) is established by what is written?

---

## **Romans 2**

1. It is not just those who know God’s righteous decrees - yet approve of sin (1:32) who are “without excuse” (1:20) and unable to “escape the judgment of God”, but also those who are hypocrites (i.e., people who “practice the very same things” they condemn in others) (1-3; Paul’s specific audience = Jews, those in covenant/right standing w/God – [17-25 “you”]).

2. Interpreting God’s “kindness and forbearance and patience” toward you when you are in sin as the sign you don’t need to repent – or that you have somehow escaped His wrath and judgment, is the false presumption of a very “hard and impenitent heart” that is “storing up (or accumulating additional) wrath for [itself] on the day of wrath when God’s righteous judgment is revealed” (4-5).

3. Paul did *NOT* preach the faith-alone gospel (i.e., that only faith was needed for justification/salvation [Luther’s premise from 1:17]; **THE CULPABILITY ARGUMENT: 1] our morality [not Christ’s or the Spirit’s] will determine where we spend eternity** – i.e., God’s grace in Christ does not negate human responsibility [6-11] = Notice, no one is excluded – including Christians, “God shows no partiality” [to “the Jew first”– Heb 10:30; Gal 6:7-8 = We sow to the Spirit *not* the Spirit sows for us]; **2] morality that we are responsible for and determines our eternal state is by definition another condition of justification/salvation** [6 “render to each one” = Pays the party responsible for the work - Mat 20:8; “according to his works” = The payment is commensurate to the work/crime - 12-13; Deu 19:21 - e.g., natural theology: Newton’s third law]; **3] culpability confirms capability** [Deu 30:11-14]; **4] if God’s grace thru the work of Christ has removed His people’s responsibility to morality then God has morally compromised Himself since His justice or standard of righteousness has changed** [Psa 62:11-12; Pro 24:12; Jer 17:10, 32:17-19; Deu 24:16 w/e.g., proxy test takers = the immoral act of cheating]. *All performance substitution [negative – Passive Obedience of Christ/positive – Active Obedience of Christ] is sin [Eze 33:1-20]).*

4. **God has not called us to the good life (in the present), but to the good fight that leads to the eternally good life (in the future)** (7; 2Ti 4:7 = Those who replace living for the good life in the present w/living for the good fight, will weather every storm and come out on top w/the eternally good life in the future. The motto of the true Christian is therefore, “**good fight, good life**” and NOT the motto of humanism [“*good life, go die*” - 1Co 15:32-33]. What they don’t realize [8]).

5. According to Paul, the “gospel of God” (1:1) views repentance as: **1] obedience to “the law”** (1-5 w/6-13; Luk 3:1-14, 18 = Notice, John’s message is considered “the good news” - i.e., the gospel), **2] the thing that gives “value”/legitimacy to the sign, of who is - or remains, in covenant relationship with God** (13-29; 26a - “If a man who is uncircumcised [but] *keeps the precepts of the law*” = God-fearer; those Gentiles who followed Judaism but were not circumcised [e.g., Act 10:2; See also Act 13:16, 26]; 26b – “will not his uncircumcision be regarded as circumcision?” = Will it not make him eligible to receive circumcision? Evidence suggests this as the point of transition from God-fearer to proselyte, the demonstration of obedience to the Law. IOW: his probation is now over and he is welcome to enter into covenant relationship w/God; See also Rom 3:1 = The “value” the Jew’s circumcision [or the covenant sign bringing justification] was determined by what he did w/what he had been “entrusted” [“the oracles of God” = His Law]; In re: to our covenant signs, baptism and the LT – See 1Co 10:1-12). **\*Theses verses establish THE REPENTANCE ARGUMENT: you cannot have repentance (the pre-req to faith/belief/God honoring the cov. sign/salvation!) w/o commitment to obeying the Law (Mar 1:5; e.g., Luk 19:1-10).**

6. Paul had a bipartite understanding of the Law (25-26 = Circumcision was a part of the Law. The only way v26 makes sense is if Paul viewed circumcision as a subset within the Law. Otherwise, how can the “uncircumcised man be said to be keeping the “precepts of the Law”? Consider 1Co 7:19; \*This bi-partite understanding is key to deciphering the upcoming terms “under the law” and works of the law”).

7. The “Law” is “a light to those in darkness” and “the embodiment of knowledge and truth”. Who would therefore be so stupid as to want to get rid of it? (20; See Deu 4:6-8; Neh 9:13).

8. Robbing temples may have been an ancient Jewish idiom referring to masturbation or sexual immorality in general based on: **1] the immediate context** (22 = Sexual in nature), **2] no Jew would go near the temple of a false religion or take its idols** (22b “you who abhor idols”), **3] our bodies are considered temples** (1Co 6:15-20).

9. How do you honor God without obedience to the Law if it is only through obedience to the Law that we do that? (23)

10. What causes the world to mock Christianity is not their faith, but their dishonoring of God thru disobedience to His Law (23-24; Contra Deu 4:6-8).