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We are now looking at the opening verses of Romans 1. As a brief review, we suggested an overall outline for you last time, and it broke down into these various divisions:

**The Book of Romans**

1. **Introduction**

First of all, you may see, in Romans 1-17, the introduction to the whole book.

1. **Condemnation**

Then the next section is condemnation, and it is in Romans 1:18 through Romans 3:20. You have all kinds of human beings declared to be under the judgment of God and headed for hell.

1. **Salvation**

Then the next section is salvation, which is found in Romans 3:21 through Romans 8:39, in which the apostle Paul lays out in detail the specific explanation of the gospel of salvation.

1. **Vindication**

Then comes the section on vindication, in Romans 9:1 through Romans 11:36, which explains a very important question which is naturally raised relative to what has happened to the Jewish people and all the promises God made to them.

1. **Exhortation**

Then comes the section of exhortation, in Romans 12:1 through Romans 15:33, in which he gives various admonitions concerning the Christian life.

1. **Conclusion**

Then finally, there is in conclusion Romans 16:1-27.

**The Key Verse**

The main text of this book we said was Romans 1:17, where you have the crucial phrase: "The just shall live by faith." That is the key verse of this whole book.

**The Theme**

The theme of Romans is found in Romans 1:16, where the apostle Paul says that he is: "Not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." The theme is the explanation of the gospel of which he is not ashamed. The main text (the means of it) is that the just shall live by faith.

**The Apostle Paul**

The apostle Paul, as a Jew, would very naturally, before he was a believer, have had certain attitudes concerning the Roman government. This book is being written to the capital city of the whole Roman Empire. When the apostle Paul writes this book, he has certain attitudes that differ from those which Jews would usually hold in his day – attitudes which Paul himself undoubtedly held at the time when he himself was a member (in all likelihood) of the Sanhedrin. Those Jews viewed Rome as an enemy. They did not like the Roman Empire, and their hope was to secure independence from Rome. Now that Paul is a believer; now that he is a Christian; and, now that he is involved in the enterprise of preaching the gospel throughout the Roman Empire, he has come to understand a very important point of doctrine:

**Human Government**

God has provided human governments for the purpose of establishing conditions in the world that enable us to propagate doctrine – to be able to spread the gospel message. Throughout the Word of God, governments are called upon to do certain things. These we may call "the divine laws of establishment." Governments are to establish courts of law. They are to provide enforcement for the laws. They are to provide protection for the citizens. They are to maintain peace in the community. And they are to maintain peace externally between nations. In other words, governments are designed for the purpose of controlling the sin nature, and it has its expression at various levels.

**The Origins of the Government of the United States**

As you know, we are now preparing in this country for the bicentennial celebration of the founding of the United States of America as a free country. I thought that it might be of interest to remind ourselves a little bit of the sort of heritage which is ours relative to governments, for a great deal of the American concept of liberty; the concept of government; and, the concept of a law and order society, we have inherited from the magnificent social system which the Roman Empire had evolved to in the concept of individual personal rights, and the role and the workings of government. Our very buildings, if you visit our capital city of Washington, you will see, reflect the classical concepts of Greek and Roman architecture, and this has been carried out as well in our system of jurisprudence.

**Our Founding Fathers**

So, as we think back upon the men who brought this all together, these were men who had a certain vision. They were a certain type of man. One of the things that I want to make very clear is that these were, by and large, men who knew the Word of God, and men who had some divine viewpoint perspective. Thus, they put together a system of government that is fantastically aligned with the concepts of the Word of God.

**The Second Continental Congress**

Going back to the time when the colonies finally had to make a decision whether to separate from the mother country or not, there were 56 delegates to that Second Continental Congress who were now confronted with a very momentous issue. They had to decide whether they were going to separate or not. They had come together, as they had previously agreed they would, in a Second Continental Congress following the first one. Since the meeting of the First Continental Congress, the incident at Lexington and Concord had taken place. So, by the time the Second Continental Congress met in Philadelphia, the war had already come to the colonies. The Second Continental Congress made one more conciliatory gesture toward King George III. They sent him a statement of a basis upon which they could come together again under the full jurisdiction of the British Empire, in which the colonies would again have a spirit of full loyalty to the king. When King George III read their Declaration of Peace extended to him, his reaction was to pronounce the colonies officially in rebellion. That finished all hope.

**The Declaration of Independence**

So, the result was that the state of Virginia introduced a resolution to the effect that the colonies should separate themselves. On July 2nd, 1776, Congress voted to proclaim the independence of the United States. Already, before this, they had appointed Thomas Jefferson and four other men (a committee of five) to write a statement as to why the colonies were going to make this break with the mother country. By June 28th, 1776, the declaration was ready for discussion. Finally, after Congress voted on July 2nd, 1776, it had been debated; corrections had been made; and, the final form of the Declaration of Independence was settled upon. Then on July 4th, 1776, the document was officially signed, at which point the colonies became independent states separated from the British Empire.

It was the custom in those days for only two people to sign a document like that. One was the president of the Congress, who was John Hancock, and the other was the secretary of the Congress, which was Charles Thompson. The two of them signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4th, 1776. Then Congress ordered a new copy of the declaration to be made (copied), this time on parchment. This time it was signed by all 56 delegates on August 2nd, 1776, and that's the copy that you usually see reproduced, where you see all the signatures with John Hancock's name up there as president, first and largest, and then the other men (the other 56 delegates) according to their states.

Some of them (six of them, as a matter of fact) were off someplace else on August 2nd. But as they drifted back into Philadelphia, they added their names to this document.

They try to be lighthearted about this, because some jokes were cracked on the occasion. For example, Benjamin Franklin said something to the effect of: "Now gentlemen, if we do not hang together, we shall all surely hang separately." This was because this is a very serious thing that they had done. The king had declared them in rebellion, and they put their names to a document that said, "We're through being a part of the British Empire." John Hancock is said to have signed his name in such large letters and said, "Now George III will not have to put on his spectacles to read my signature, and he will be able to double the reward on my head." However, these were probably jokes of men who knew that they had indeed put their lives; their fortunes; and, their sacred honor on the line.

This document was kept secret because they wanted to delay as long as possible public knowledge to be carried, particularly to the king, as to who the delegates were who actually signed this Declaration of Independence. You must remember that many of the American colonists were loyalists to the king, and were not in favor of this separation. So, it was not until a few months later, on January 18, 1777, following Washington's victories at Trenton and Princeton, that this declaration was finally made public.

I'd like to read to you just a brief summary of the kind of men that made up this body who signed this document which put into effect, on the basis of the heritage of Roman law, the concept of a nation based upon free enterprise; based upon capitalism; and, based upon the divine laws of establishment.

I'm quoting from a book entitled Signers of the Declaration: "Liberally endowed as a whole, with courage and sense of purpose, the signers consisted of a distinguished group of individuals. Although heterogeneous in background, education, experience, and accomplishments, at the time of the signing, they were practically all men of means, and represented an elite cross-section of 18th century American leadership. Every one of them had achieved prominence in his colony, but only a few enjoyed a national reputation.

"The signers were those individuals who happened to be delegates to Congress at the time. The signers possessed many basic similarities. Most were American born out of Anglo-Saxon origins. Except for Charles Carroll (a Roman Catholic) and a few deists, every one subscribed to Protestantism – for the most part, basically political non-extremists. Many at first had hesitated at separation, let alone rebellion. A few signed only reluctantly.

"For their dedication to the cause of independence, the signers wished loss of fortune; imprisonment; and, death for treason. Although none died directly at the hands of the British, the wife of one, Mrs Frances Lewis, succumbed as a result of harsh prison treatment. About one-third of the group served as militia officers: most seeing war-time action. Four of these men were taken captive. The homes of nearly one-third of the signers were destroyed or damaged, and the families of a few were scattered when the British pillaged or confiscated their estates. Nearly all of the group emerged poorer for their years of public service and neglect of personal affairs. Some even sold their personal property to help finance the war.

"Certainly, most of the signers had little or nothing to gain materially, and practically all to lose, when they subscribed to the Declaration of Independence. By doing so, they earned a niche of honor in the annals of the United States. Whatever other heights they reached, or whatever else they contributed to history, the act of signing ensured them immortality."

The final paragraph of what they signed at such great personal cost to themselves reads as follows: "We therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in general Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do in the name, and by the authority of the good people of these colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these united colonies are, and of right, ought to be, free and independent states; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown; that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved; and, that is free and independent states, they have full power to levy war; conclude peace; contract alliances; establish commerce; and, to do all other acts and things which independent states may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives; our fortunes; and, our sacred honor."

These were men (fantastically wise and informed men of the 18th century) who understood the errors and the mistakes of governments in the past. They caught the vision of what the Word of God presents as divine laws of establishment. And out of it was born the courage to put their lives; their fortunes; and, their sacred honor on the line for us. It does indeed cause us to ask ourselves: were we are today in the position that these men found themselves – were our lives; our fortunes; and, our sacred honor put under the demands that theirs were put, how would we conduct ourselves in a similar situation?

**Paul, a Servant of Jesus Christ**

Well, the apostle Paul, as he wrote to the center of the whole Roman Empire, had a deep appreciation, as he certainly stresses in this book, for establishment; for governments; for their role in our lives; and, for what they're supposed to do. So, we begin this book which was written by this man to the center of the empire that ruled the world. The first thing he does is identify himself as: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ." The first seven verses here are a single sentence. In the English, it's something around 125 words. In the Greek, it comes out to something like 93 words. This is all one single sentence. It's the longest greeting of any of Paul's letters. This is probably because he's writing to people that he has never met before, and to a church which he did not himself establish; Therefore, it is one with which he needs to establish a relationship of rapport in order to proceed to explain to them the things that he is going to discuss in this letter. Paul did plan, as he indicated in this letter, to visit Rome very soon. We have this in Romans 1:10-13 and in Romans 15:22.

**Paul / Saul**

So, he identifies himself, first of all, as Paul. In the Greek, his name looks like this: "Paulos." The word "Paulos" means "little." This was his Greek name. He also, as you know, had another name. Originally, as a Hebrew, he was called "Saul," and his Hebrew name is "Saul." This meant "demanded." Jews often had two names, especially Jews who were dealing with people in the gentile world. They would have their regular Hebrew name, but they would also have a Greek that they would use. They would also change a person's name when some crisis took place in a person's life. As you remember, for example, Abram's name was changed to Abraham. In the case of Jacob, when he met the angel that night and fought with him all night at the brook, his name was changed to Israel. So, it was the custom upon some crisis, or upon some new dignity, or some new office to which a person would advance, such as in the case of Daniel, that he would be given a change of name.

**Paulus**

Saul's name was changed to Paul, it seems, when he came into the office of an apostle. We have this name first used in Acts 13:9, about the time when he first began his public official ministry under the gift that was given to him of apostleship. He had a Latin name also, and that was simply "Paulus." Since Paul was an apostle to the gentiles, he moved with these various names. Wherever he was, and whatever the group was that he was dealing with, he would use the appropriate name.

Paul himself came from the tribe of Benjamin. He was a freeborn Roman citizen. He was a man of great natural intellect, and he was well-educated. He once persecuted the Christians in behalf of the Jewish rulers, but in time, when he found that he couldn't whip the Christians, he joined them. He had a little help from God on the Damascus Road in making that decision. But he, who was once the murderer and the persecution of Christians, now became their outstanding defender.

**A Servant (a Slave)**

Three facts are described for us in this opening verse in the book of Romans concerning the apostle Paul. The first thing he says is that he is "a servant of Jesus Christ." This is the Greek word "doulos." "Doulos" actually means "slave." There are several words that Paul could have used in the Greek language for "servant," but he used the hardest; the toughest; the most definitive; and, the strongest word of all of them, and that is this word "doulos," which simply means a slave or a bondslave. It is the strongest Greek word for servitude. The apostle Paul identifies himself as the one who writes, and he indicates (by calling himself a slave of Jesus Christ) his dependence and his subjection to the Lord Jesus Christ as his master – his master who brought him out of the slave market of sin with his death upon the cross.

You must remember that, at the time that Paul wrote, there were literally millions of slaves in the Roman Empire. The apostle Paul had been born a free man. Yet, here he is writing, and the first thing he says to identify himself is, "I'm Paul, the one who has elected to be a slave of Jesus Christ forever." He makes it clear that he is not the representative of some human celebrity. He makes it clear that he is the servant (the slave) of someone very special; namely, the person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Paul is able to exercise his volition in order to choose this role of being a slave. He has the wisdom to see the value of this role because he has a spiritual maturity structure erected in his soul. This is the thing that enables him to respond to the Lord Jesus Christ, and to say, "I am His slave." It is Bible doctrine that gave him a love for the Lord, and it is His love for the Lord that enabled him to respond to Christ in the role of subjection.

**Love**

You cannot respond to anybody unless there is love. Here's a person A; and, here's a person B. Person B is under the authority of person A. In order for that person B to take that role of subjection, there will have to be the channel of love. If person B does not have love for person A, neither will person B accept the role of subjection. If this person B happens to be a wife, and this person A happens to be a husband, you have exactly the same condition, and a condition which explains a lot of problems in marriage. You have wives who do not want to be in subjection to their husbands. And the reason they do not want to be in subjection to their husbands is because they have not developed the capacity to love their husbands. Whatever they once had, or whatever they think they have, at the point where they are not able to accept the role of subjection, this is indicative of the fact that they do not love their husbands, at least to that degree.

**Subjection**

What does it mean to be in subjection? Well, if you place yourself as a slave of another, in that kind of subjection, it means that you do not insist on being independent. You do not insist on going contrary to the desires of the one under whose authority you come.

**Feminism**

The feminism idea counters all of this biblical concept. Feminist is a satanic perversion, and it really destroys a woman's fulfillment. That is because feminism operates on the concept that a woman is to come to fulfillment by refusing to be in subjection to male authority of one kind or another that rightly should exist over her. A woman who is in subjection to her husband, if this relationship exists, is a woman who does not want to do what her husband does not approve. She freely chooses to respond to him. A woman's role is that of responder. The husband's role is that of aggressor. That's the divine relationship.

If a woman looks at her husband and says, "I don't like the fact that he is the aggressor, because in his leadership role, he wants to do things that I don't want to do." To that extent, she is not in subjection to him. And the reason she does not want to go along with him is because she lacks an affection for him – an affection which only the Word of God, properly responded to, can give a person. If she wants to do the things that her husband does not approve of, then she is giving a signal to all the world just as clear and loud as can be: "I do not love my husband. And the reason I do not love my husband is because I do not have the capacity from the Word of God to be able to exercise that affection toward him that would cause me to want to become his bondslave," so to speak.

Sarah knew what that meant. That's why the Word of God tells us that Sarah, the wife of Abraham, called Abraham "lord." She called him "lord" because she was capable of taking her place of subjection to him.

The same is true relative to children and their parents. The kids who are willing to do what they're told; the kids who are willing to be in subjection to their parents; and, the older kids who have grown up and are making major decisions in life, are willing to accept the advice and the opinions of their parents because they love their parents. When they lack a genuine affection which, again, only the Word of God can give the capacity to exercise – when they love their parents, then they will be willing to respond to their parents. Love is what makes you respond. Then they will not want to do what their parents object to doing. ... They will not want to oppose their parents. They'll be willing to listen to their parents and to accept that.

Very frequently, a great deal of grief is brought into a person's life because he simply (as he grows older) will not listen to his parents. He simply will not accept the advice and the viewpoints and the role of his parents. Why? Because somehow he has lost that affection. Maybe be once had it, but the time comes when he does not love his parents sufficiently to take the role of a responder toward them.

The same thing is true of a pupil and a teacher. A pupil who has respect and an affection for a teacher is a pupil who readily responds so that teachers, and who will subject himself to the authority of that teacher, and will do what he is told.

The same thing is true between a member of a church and the pastor-teacher. You'll have people in the congregation that will go along, and they'll have a pastor in the church, and they'll have a certain affection. There will be a love, and there will be a respect. And the result will be that they will listen to his instruction, and they will be going positive, and they will respond to it. Someplace along the line, they may begin going negative. Perhaps they begin going negative to some of his instruction. That's usually the way it is. As they begin going negative to what the pastor-teacher is teaching them, they themselves cannot establish that he is in error on that which he is teaching. As they go negative toward him, they begin to cool off in their affection toward him. And as they begin to cool off in their affection toward him, they begin to find more and more that the spirit that they have within them is to buck him; to fight him; and, to resist him, and they are no longer willing to be subject to him. That is, they are no longer subject in the sense of being willing to respond to his instruction.

Whereas there was a time in their life when they couldn't respond enough. They were falling all over themselves to respond to everything that he had to say. They were constantly consulting with him on his opinions and his viewpoints in all the moves that they were making. What's the difference? The difference is the growing lack of affection. They have lost the capacity for love toward their teacher because of some negative response within themselves.

The apostle Paul is saying a very great thing when he says, "I am Paul, and I am a slave of Jesus Christ, because he was indeed just exactly that. He was a slave of Christ. It does naturally lead us to wonder about ourselves whether we could say the same – whether we are capable of loving the person to whom we should be in subjection. You cannot become a slave of Jesus Christ through external gimmicks either. People may think, "Yes, I want to be subject to Jesus Christ, I want to be a slave of Jesus Christ. How will I do that? Well, let's see. This little Christian camp here is going to have an unmarried couples rally. I'll go to that, and I will find myself very dedicated to the Lord. This camp is going to run a rally for people who would like to find somebody to get married to. I will go to that." Perhaps you think that you can sit at the campfire that night, and that that's how you will find subjection. Perhaps you think of making some kind of commitment, or some kind of dedication – to come up and make a testimony?

It always distresses me when somebody comes storming up and says, "I just made a decision." A man did that some time ago, and he said, "I decided to stop smoking." He even stood up in a Lord's Supper meeting, and made a big thing of it. That's dangerous ground. Something had moved him that he wanted to be subject to the Lord. And smoking was something he felt he needed to get rid of. Well, maybe he did. But to think that that was going to draw him into a relationship of being subject to the Lord Jesus Christ was a mistake, as experienced subsequently proved, because he was not only back to that, but he was back to a lot of other things that were a whole lot worse.

Frequently, this is what happens. You may think that if you clean up one demon in yourself, you're going to now have a wonderful walk with the Lord, but you find that that demon has only gone out and gotten four of his buddies to come back with him, and then he moves back in, and your situation is even worse than it was before.

The slave position to Jesus Christ is the highest honor that a Christian can accrue to himself. Is that your position today? Unless you love Him, you will not be in the slave position to Him. Unless you have deeply immersed your mind in Bible doctrine, you will not have the capacity to love Him, and therefore you will not be a slave to Him, and you will try to approach it with gimmicks.

**A Called Apostle**

There's a second thing that Paul tells about himself, and that is that he is "a called apostle." The word "called" is the Greek word "kletos". Kletos indicates an appointment. It simply means an appointment to some kind of position. "Apostle" is the Greek word "apostolos." This is one who has a message to carry. Paul, by divine appointment, held the authority of an apostle.

Your translation may have the words "to be" in italics. They are not in the Greek. It is not as if Paul were called to do something in the future. It is simply "called an apostle." That's the way it should read, because he was appointed an apostle, and he was an apostle at the time when he was writing this book. He was immediately an apostle from the time that he was born-again.

**An Apostle**

There are certain requirements to be an apostle. Only people were qualified to be chosen by God the Holy Spirit to be an apostle who had actually seen Jesus Christ in His resurrection. You have this in Acts 1:22, 1 Corinthians 9:1, and 1 Corinthians 15:8-9. Unless you had seen Jesus Christ after He was raised from the dead, you could not be an apostle. That is why today we can have no such thing as apostolic succession, such as, for example, the Church of England (the Roman Catholic Church) claims – that one apostle has passed on his gifts to the next. Some denominations call him a bishop, but they mean the same thing – apostolic succession, as if one could pass it on to another. An apostle is always a gift which is sovereignly bestowed by God the Holy Spirit. It's a spiritual gift. It is not a human appointment.

It so happened that the gift of apostleship was a temporary gift in the New Testament church. It does not exist today. It was given on the day of Pentecost to the 11 disciples (Judas excluded). It was later given to the apostle Paul. Paul qualified as an apostle who saw Jesus Christ in the Resurrection on the Damascus Road. He was an unusual order of apostleship. This is the highest spiritual gift in the New Testament local churches.

This was a gift that was necessary before the New Testament Scriptures were written, because the apostles were the channels of divine revelation to the believers. And they were absolute authorities. They were the final authority. They were the Supreme Court of New Testament days. This gift was confirmed by various supernatural gifts in turn. In other words, an apostle (to perform his job) would confirm that he was an apostle by certain supernatural gifts, such as: being able to heal people; being able to speak in tongues; and, such as being able to perform miracles. You have this in Acts 5:15, Acts 16:16-18, and Acts 28:8-9.

The basic purpose of this gift was communication of doctrine. This gift is no longer on the scene, but the responsibility of the communicating of doctrine *is* on the scene, and this has been taken up by the pastor-teacher gift today. Sometimes other men are called apostles in the New Testament. But this is in a non-technical sense in the sense of a messenger who is sent upon a certain mission. You have this in John 15:27, Acts 10:39, and Acts 26:16.

**Separated**

There's one other thing the Paul says about himself, and that is: "separated to the gospel." This is "apochorizo." "Apochorizo" in the Greek is the perfect, which means that it happened in the past, and it continues. Galatians 1:15 tells us that the time that it happened was from the time that Paul was born from his mother's womb. It is passive in that Paul did not decide to have the appointment of apostleship. He simply received it. It is a participle. It is a statement of fact.

Paul was set apart to the Lord's work in three distinct stages. Galatians 1:15 tells us that he was set apart (he was separated unto the Lord's work from his mother's womb). Acts 9 tells us that he was separated from eternal death on the Damascus road when he was saved. And Acts 13:1-2 tell us that he was separated at Antioch to his missionary service.

**The Gospel**

What he was separated unto was the gospel. The gospel is the "euaggelion." This means, as you know, "good news" – salvation for guilty sinners. The old English word for "gospel" was the word "godspell," and that means "God's story." The English translation "gospel" simply means "good news." And it is the good news of God. God is the source of this good news. Paul has been separated onto God's gospel. This stresses the origin of the message. There are many gospels today which have not originated with God. But the gospel to which Paul was separated was one that originated with God Himself.

You and I may say the same thing about ourselves as we said about Paul – that we also have this threefold divine treatment, in that we have been purchased by the blood of Christ (the death of Christ), and thus we may declare ourselves to be His slaves; we have been called to eternal life; and, we have been separated to a service. We have been separated to a specific ministry. So, what is true of Paul is also true of us. We have been purchased to declare ourselves slaves of Christ; we have been called with a gift to be exercised; and, we have been separated unto a specific service by the Lord.

This is our introduction into the book of Romans. This is the jumping-off point for the gospel which is going to be explained in such detail in this book. But this gospel message, right off the bat, the minute Paul announces it, you will notice in verse 2 that he does not want to leave any doubt that what he is talking about is not a novelty, particularly for the Jews. Jews, when they heard him talk about the gospel, you may be sure that the first thing the Jews were going to say was, "Where did you get this message? Where did this message come from?"

**This Gospel was Promised Before**

So, Paul, in verse 2 says, "Which (referring to this gospel) He had promised before. This word "promised before" is "prepaggellomai." This simply means "promised before." Salvation was an issue in the Old Testament. In order to live, the book of Romans says, you have to be righteous." That requires salvation. For people in the Old Testament to live forever, they had to be righteous. That required salvation. So the Jews would want to know: "Paul, are you speaking about some kind of a message which is a novelty? Is this something that's brand new?" So, immediately Paul says, "No, I am not an unbeliever. I am not inventing some kind of a modern gospel. I am not bringing something to you which actually God must place under His curse." We do have something which God, at a point in the Old Testament Himself, gave as information concerning the gospel.

**By His Prophets**

How did he give it? Paul says, "He did this by His prophets." The word "by" is the Greek word "dia," and it really means "through." They were the channels (they were the means) – these Old Testament prophets. They were the way that the revelation concerning the gospel of salvation came.

This is found throughout the Old Testament, but I'll just give you one example. We have a verse in Isaiah 53:6. This verse sums up for us this message that Paul is talking about: "All we like sheep have gone astray. We have turned everyone to his own way, and the Lord has laid on Him the iniquity of us all." The apostle Paul is going to actually take eight chapters in the book of Romans to explain what that one verse says – to explain that God is going to take sinners, and someone else is going to bear the penalty in their behalf.

Paul stresses the fact that these prophets are *His* prophets. That is, they are chosen men. They are men chosen specifically by the Lord in the Old Testament to bear the gospel message. They gave the means of salvation very clearly – faith. The concept of salvation was something that unfolded as the Old Testament went along. The early Old Testament saints did not understand all that we understand about Christ dying on the cross, by which God was going to achieve salvation. The content unraveled itself. Even the Lord Jesus Christ, as you remember, used the Old Testament in order to show His mission here on the earth. In Luke 24, when He met the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, and they were so discouraged by the fact of His crucifixion and all that had taken place in Jerusalem, the Lord says in Luke 24:25, "Then He said unto them, 'O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have separate these things, and to enter into His glory?'"

Then it says, "Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." So, what He actually did was took the Scriptures (the *Old* Testament Scriptures) and said, "Here, I'll explain to you from the Old Testament Scriptures which have foretold all the things that have happened in Jerusalem; all the things that happened to the Savior; and, all of these things concerning His death. All they had to do was look back at Isaiah 53:6. And no doubt Jesus touched on that verse with them. And all they had to do was read it. And the Lord said, "You see? What happened in Jerusalem had to happen to the Messiah. He had to take the stripes for the sins of the world. This had already been told us. Now, where had this been told to us?

**The Doctrine of Inspiration**

Well, He identifies this as being the Holy Scriptures. Specifically, He has in mind here, of course, the Old Testament Bible. These are called holy because they are writings which have been set apart by God. It is, in fact, here a reference to the doctrine of inspiration. That's what we're dealing with. These are Holy Scriptures because they have been set apart (as no other religious book in the world has been set apart) to convey to us God's revelation.

So, in the very opening of the book of Romans, the apostle Paul identifies himself. He indicates that he's a slave of Jesus Christ in the Roman Empire where millions of people wish they were not slaves. He has found real freedom through assuming the role of a slave of Jesus Christ. He is called to the gift of apostleship – the absolute supreme authority in the New Testament church. All apostles have now passed off the scene. He is separated to the ministry of proclaiming the gospel – a good news from God, but a good news which is as old as the prophets of the Old Testament, who were the first ones who promised that this good news was going to be fulfilled in time by the work of God Himself.

These were recorded in a book. They were written in Holy Scripture. And when they were written, the doctrine of inspiration teaches us that God the Holy Spirit superintended what these men wrote without overriding the natural way of expressing themselves – their natural vocabulary, in any way affecting their background or their way of thinking. They put down what seemed a natural way for them to express themselves on this subject of the gospel. But the Spirit of God saw to it that they used exactly the right word, and that they presented the truth in very exact revelation.

What they revealed, we are going to look at in greater detail in the sessions which lie before us.

Dr. John E. Danish, 1971
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