

Paul's Letter to the Romans:



THE PINNACLE OF
CHRISTIAN THOUGHT

Beautiful Feet...¹

Romans 10:14-11:12

Now the last time we were together, we continued our study of Romans 9-11. It is a very controversial portion of Scripture. Of course, it's not controversial because it's so difficult to understand. Rather, it's controversial because it discusses the doctrine of election, and more specifically the doctrines of predestination and reprobation. Now I should add that Romans 9-11 is not really a theological treatise on election.² It discusses election but it is not about election. In fact, I think it might be helpful to say that Paul just assumes everyone reading his letter will come to text with the sovereignty of God and the Kingship of Jesus already firmly established in their minds. He assumes his readers accept the doctrine of election.

Or perhaps, I ought to say it a different way. Paul is not arguing for election in Romans 9-11.³ No, he is arguing for something else altogether and in that argument he just happens to use the doctrine of election as one of his weapons. Now because of that I think it is possible to draw two important inferences. First, if you despise the doctrine of election, you will never understand the Apostle Paul properly.⁴ Paul loved the sovereignty of God. He loved the Kingship of Jesus and the fact that ultimately the advancement and success of the kingdom of God is not dependent upon man's belief but is rather dependent upon God's

elective purpose and decree. Now bothers and sisters, even if that makes you wince to hear me say I want to tell you that is good news not bad news.

Of course, there is another inference to be drawn concerning election and predestination here and this is it. If your heart is hardened toward the conversion of sinners...if you are not genuinely moved deep down in your soul concerning the salvation of those you know and love you misunderstand Paul and Paul's doctrine of election. If your Calvinism is of the sort that spawns theological complacency and allows you to just sit back and let the world rush headlong into hell uncontested you, too, misunderstand Paul. You see, Paul rejoiced in the doctrine of election but he also rejoiced in the opportunity to take the gospel to the world. He believed the two things fit hand in glove and that they were not in any way contradictory or hateful to one another.⁵

Of course, that raises the question, **"Well if Paul wasn't shooting his bullets trying to persuade his readers concerning the doctrine of election, what was he trying to get them believe?"**

Here's the answer that I posed for you last week. **Paul wants to show his Gentile readers that God's promises regarding their salvation can be trusted and relied upon even though the Jewish nation, in the main, had not believed and thus had not received the promises of God.**

Now you can see how that would have been a very natural question. You can see where Gentiles reading the Old Testament would have thought and would have asked, **"But Paul, God made so many promises to the Israelites in the Old Testament and now they have refused to accept those promises in Christ. If they don't receive the promise, how can we know for certain we will?"** It's a

great question, don't you think? It actually hits us where we live. That is, it's a pastoral question not just a theological one.

Anyway, Paul answers that question and he answers it by saying,

^{NIV} **Romans 9:6**...It is not as though God's word had failed. For not all who are descended from Israel are Israel.

You see Paul's initial answer concerning the unbelief of Israel is that not all of the Israelites are members of **"true Israel."** Here's how he says it.

^{NIV} **Romans 9:8**...it is not the natural children who are God's children, but it is the children of the promise who are regarded as Abraham's offspring.

Paul proves that point by contrasting the children of promise, that is Isaac and Jacob with the natural children Ishmael and Esau. And his point is pretty simple; **"God's electing purposes never included every single Israelite. God chose Isaac not Ishmael and he chose Jacob not Esau."** And the point is this, throughout the history of Israel there has always been a believing or elected remnant inside and unbelieving Israel; that is, there has always been an Israel within Israel. Now that certainly doesn't mean that those Israelites who failed to believe were excused in their unbelief. No, they were responsible for their unbelief because God had offered them the gospel and the promises and because they rejected them in favor of pursuing their own righteousness, a righteousness gained by doing the works of the law.

Now what we are going to see in the Romans 10:14-21 is Paul's answer to two separate questions. The first question Paul is going to answer is this, **"Are you sure the Jews heard the gospel?"** and then secondly he is going to answer the question, **"Are you sure the Jews understood the gospel?"**

Now if you are entering into the spirit of the letter of Romans here you may even be asking yourself this question. **“O.K. Tom, that’s what you say, but are you sure that is what Paul says?”** If you are asking that question you are tracking me perfectly and yes I am sure that is what he is asking. In fact, I want to show those two questions and then we’ll go back and start in on the text at verse 14.

First then, look down to verse 18. Paul says there:

^{NIV} **Romans 10:18**... But I ask: Did they not hear?

Now the question is a little awkward to the English ear even in a simplified translation like the NIV. The question put colloquially would be something like this, **“Did they really hear it?”** Now his answer to that question, follows right after the question? And what is his answer?

^{NIV} **Romans 10:18**... Of course they did:

Then in verse 19, he asks the second question.

^{NIV} **Romans 10:19**...Again I ask: Did Israel not understand?

Now the question, just like the previous question, is a little awkward to our English ears and is really asking something like, **“Did they really understand it?”** Now you can see in the second half of verse 19 that Paul doesn’t answer this particular question quite as simply as he did in verse 18. In fact, he lengthens the answer by quoting the Old Testament but let me tell you...the parallel nature of the two questions tells us that the answer is going to be the same as the answer to the first question, **“Of course they did.”**

So then those are the two questions Paul is going to answer in this section. **“Did they really hear the gospel?”** and **“Did they really understand the gospel?”** Still before we get to those two questions, let’s go back to verse 14 and see what Paul is doing there.

Let’s gain some context by reading Romans 10:10-13.

^{NIV} **Romans 10:10...** For it is with your heart that you believe and are justified, and it is with your mouth that you confess and are saved. ¹¹ As the Scripture says, "Anyone who trusts in him will never be put to shame." ¹² For there is no difference between Jew and Gentile-- the same Lord is Lord of all and richly blesses all who call on him, ¹³ for, "Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved."

Now what Paul is going to do starting in verse 14 is to expand upon the theme of **“calling upon the name of the Lord”** by introducing a whole long string of questions. His purpose here is to explain the importance of necessity of taking the gospel to the world. I happen this is one of the loveliest parts of book of Romans. In much the same manner as Romans 8, it forms a chain of thoughts in which a word ending one clause is used or repeated at the start of the next clause. Now in one of our previous lessons, I identified that literary device as an example of **“sorites”** (a phrase I picked up from F.F. Bruce) but I think that is wrong. It is, rather, an example of **“anadiplosis”** and I am pretty sure the quality of each of your lives has been impacted negatively because I messed up that identification and I apologize for that.⁶

Anyway, what *anadiplosis* does is repeat the last word of a clause at the beginning of the next clause for dramatic effect. You’ll remember in chapter 8, it sounded like this:

^{NIV} **Romans 8:29**...For those God foreknew he also predestined...And those he predestined, he also called; those he called, he also justified; those he justified, he also glorified.

Well Paul does almost the exact same thing here except that he reverses the order chronologically. You see Romans 8, he follows a logical sequence perhaps even a temporal sequence. But here in Romans 10, he starts at the conclusion and works his way backward. Now what I want to do before I read the verses is spell out for you what the sequence of thoughts are in his list and then I want to turn them around backwards from how he gives them and show the list chronologically. Does that make sense?

If not, perhaps it will once you see it. First off Paul states, "**Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved.**" Then he launches into a series of questions. Here they are.

How shall they call if they have not believed?
How shall they believe if they have not heard?
How shall they hear unless someone preaches to them?
How will someone preach to them unless they are sent?

Of course, if you turn it around and out it in sequential or chronological order it will go like this.

The Lord sends someone.
They preach.
Some hear.
Some believe.
Some call upon the name of the Lord and are saved.

Now that's the structure of the passage. So follow along as I read it.

^{NIV} **Romans 10:14...** How, then, can they call on the one they have not believed in? And how can they believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preaching to them? ¹⁵ And how can they preach unless they are sent? As it is written, "**How beautiful are the feet of those who bring good news!**" ¹⁶ But not all the Israelites accepted the good news. For Isaiah says, "**Lord, who has believed our message?**" ¹⁷ Consequently, faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ.

Now do you understand the overall import of what Paul is saying? He is saying that if everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved, we are under obligation, indeed under compulsion, to take the gospel to the world.⁷ I wonder if I might ask you to do a bit of reflection here, "**Are you actively engaged in any sense in taking the gospel to the world?**" Now I am not asking if you have you visited every single nation, tribe and tongue yourself. I am not even asking you if you have ever attempted any sort of foreign evangelism. But I am asking, "**Are you helping someone, someplace to do that?**"

Do you have any contact with any missionaries of any kind?

Do you pray for any missionaries?

Do you encourage any missionaries?

Do you support any missionaries?

Do you have any sort of vision for the gospel that extends beyond the end of your driveway?

If not, why not?

You see Paul is saying that because the unbelieving world needs to call upon the Lord to be saved, we have an obligation to take them the word of God.⁸ We are not excused from that obligation because we are too old or too poor or too afraid. And there are hundreds of ways in which we can do just what he is talking about here. As a church APC, has been singularly blessed with a whole host of missionaries. We have Bible translators and church planters and theological educators and computer programmers and typesetters and even school teachers

who have prepared themselves to do one thing or another to take the gospel to the world and they take it seriously and some of you don't even know you are worshipping with these "**beautiful footed**" beings and all I can tell you is that you need to wake up and smell the gospel going out into the world. You need to take a missionary out to lunch or go on a short-term mission trip or pick out a specific missionary and pray for them or support or write to them or just go to a Mission Committee meeting and see what our missionaries need. You need to do that...I am telling you as one of your pastors, you need to do that for your own good and for the advancement of the gospel. You need to come to the realization that missionaries are not just a bunch of antisocial wallflowers who happened to be unable to find ministry in the American church somewhere; no, they are anything but that. They are "**beautiful footed**" champions of the gospel.

James Montgomery Boice relates a story in his commentary about one such "**beautiful footed**" champion of the gospel, a young man in West Africa who had contracted elephantiasis. Elephantiasis is a dreadful disease that causes the bones in the lower legs to swell enormously and the skin of the lower leg to turn thick and hard and to eventually split, crack and bleed. It invariably leads to amputation. Boice writes:

The poor *young* man was victim of elephantiasis *but* became a radiant Christian and could *not help but* tell people of the grace of God, which *God* had shown *him in* Jesus Christ. *The young man lived in* an African village and determined that *he was going to tell every person in his* village the good news of salvation. It was extremely difficult for him to walk *because of the* monstrous legs which bore him about, but he *suffered through* the pain and shuffled from hut to hut to tell *everyone there* about the Savior who had come into his life. At the end of several months he was able to tell the missionary that he had visited every hut in the village and that he *was now going to take the gospel message to a village that was about two miles* away.

So, he started out each morning, walked the two miles to that village, going from hut to hut with the gospel, and returning *each evening right* before sundown to his own hut. Finally he managed to visit every hut in *that* neighboring village.

Finally, he spoke to his pastor and to the missionary, who was a medical doctor about a village that lay ten or twelve miles through the jungle, and asked if the gospel were being taken to that village. As a boy, before he had contracted elephantiasis, he had traveled the jungle path to that village, and he remembered that it was a large village *with a lot of people*, and he longed to take them the gospel as well. The doctors told not to go to that village; *they warned him that it just to arduous a journey*. But day after day his burden grew. One day his family came to the missionary and said that the man had disappeared before dawn and *that they were very* concerned about him.

Later, they found the out the full story. *The young man with elephantiasis had dragged* his leathery legs and gigantic feet *twelve miles down* the path that led to the distant village on his heart. The people of the village later explained that *when he had arrived well after noon*, his feet were already swollen, bruised and bleeding. They offered him food, but even before he could eat he began to tell the people about Jesus. Up and down the village he shuffled, even to the very last hut, telling them that the God had sent his only Son to die that their sins might be removed. He told them how the Lord Jesus had been raised from the dead and had come into his heart, bringing joy and peace.

That night after sundown he began the long arduous journey back to his own village. Toward midnight the missionary doctor was awakened by a noise on his front porch and he went to the door and found the poor young man lying there virtually unconscious and bleeding profusely from his terribly swollen leg-stumps. The missionary called his helpers and they lifted the man onto one of the beds in the little hospital where the doctor went to work on him. The doctor said that he had never seen such a pitiful sight as he tended the poor man's enormously misshapen and bleeding feet...feet, which had come back from such an errand of love and mercy. Unashamedly the doctor explained that as he bent over the man's feet to minister to them, to clean and dress them that his own tears mixed with the ointment he was putting on them. The doctor ended the story by saying, "In all my life I do not know when my heart was more drawn out

to another Christian believer. All I could think of was the verse in the Word of God, 'How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings that publish peace.'" ⁹

Now I love that and you know I have experienced a bit of the same affection that doctor felt myself. When I was in Niger I met a young missionary named Byron Harrison. Byron and his wife Annette lived in a row of African houses without any western amenities at all. They did not even have a car. Byron was surveyor for Wycliffe, which meant that he traveled in and out of the bush locating and tracking certain people groups so those studying their languages would know where to find them. Byron loved his job. He only had one problem. He was extremely susceptible man to malaria, which is not a particularly good thing when you live on the largest river in northwest Africa. When I met him, he had already contracted malaria, some forty times. At that time, he was taking six times the Lariam, the drug you take to keep from getting malaria that the doctor had prescribed for me. But it didn't seem to matter; he knew he was going to get malaria. He expected to get Malaria. And you know what? He didn't care and his precious wife didn't care either. They thought what they were doing was worthwhile and valuable and they were willing to die to keep their work going. How can you not love someone who is so aware of their being sent with the gospel?

Of course the problem with Israel was not that no one was sent to them and it was certainly not that no one preached to them. It was not that they did not hear the gospel or even understand the gospel. No, the problem was that they did not believe the gospel.¹⁰ Look at how Paul puts it in Romans 10:18.

^{NIV} **Romans 10:18**...But I ask: Did they not hear? Of course they did: "**Their voice has gone out into all the earth, their words to the ends of the world.**"

Now the verse that is being quoted here in Romans 10:18 is taken from Psalm 19:4. In it's original context the verse is speaking of general revelation and not about special revelation like teaching or preaching. In fact, let's read Psalm 19:1-4.

^{NIV} **Psalm 19:1**...The heavens declare the glory of God; the skies proclaim the work of his hands. ² Day after day they pour forth speech; night after night they display knowledge. ³ There is no speech or language where their voice is not heard. ⁴ Their voice goes out into all the earth, their words to the ends of the world. In the heavens he has pitched a tent for the sun,

You see what Paul is doing here is taking a verse from Psalm 19 which says that the whole creation bears witness of the presence of God and applies it to the preaching of the gospel going out to the Jews and the question is, "**How can Paul do that?**"¹¹ How is it that Paul can apply a passage which speaks of one kind of revelation to another kind of revelation and how can he say that all of the Jews have heard the gospel? I think the answer to that question is that the Jews have had the gospel for a long time. I don't think it means that Jew had heard the word of Christ in His day in its fullest sense but that heard about the gospel all along in hearing the Old Testament. It is the same point he made early on in his epistle when he argued that he was not preaching a new gospel but the same one that the patriarchs and the prophets had revealed. The other possibility is that he is speaking of the Jews who came up every year to Jerusalem from every tongue, tribe and nation. In that sense, Jews from every land had already heard the gospel of Jesus.

In verse 19, Paul continues the thought by asking a second question.

^{NIV} **Romans 10:19**...Again I ask: Did Israel not understand? First, Moses says, **"I will make you envious by those who are not a nation; I will make you angry by a nation that has no understanding."** ²⁰ And Isaiah boldly says, **"I was found by those who did not seek me; I revealed myself to those who did not ask for me."** ²¹ But concerning Israel he says, **"All day long I have held out my hands to a disobedient and obstinate people."**

Now, I pointed out earlier that Paul does not answer the question directly here with a "Yes" or a "No" but he does answer it clearly by answering it using three Old Testament passages, one from Deuteronomy and two from Isaiah.

^{NIV} **Deuteronomy 32:21**...They made me jealous by what is no god and angered me with their worthless idols. I will make them envious by those who are not a people; I will make them angry by a nation that has no understanding.

And Paul's point is that just as God's people made Him jealous by worshipping other Gods, so He intended to make them jealous by calling to Himself a another people, a people He had not known before. And it is the same point in the Isaiah 65 passage quotes. That is, "a people that had not sought Him have found Him and they have done so in spite of the fact that He has held out His hands to the Israelites day after day.

The image is of course anthropomorphic speaking of God as if He were a father or a mother pleading with their child to come to them only to be rebuffed and ignored. And that leads of course, to a third question by Paul, a question summing up his whole argument and line of thinking.

^{NIV} **Romans 11:1**...I ask then: Did God reject his people? By no means! I am an Israelite myself, a descendant of Abraham, from the tribe of Benjamin.

“Does that mean,” Paul asks, “that God rejected His people?”

Paul’s answer is just as brief and terse as his question. **“God forbid” or “May it never be”** is his answer; it is the same dramatic answer he has given to so many of the other questions he has raised against his objectors. **“God has not rejected His people,”** says Paul **“and I know that is so because I am one of His people, a Jew, a descendant of Abraham from the tribe of Benjamin.”**

And then Paul turns back to the issue of election he had raised early in chapter nine. Now I am going to read all the way down to verse 10 but before I do I want you to get Paul’s argument in your mind. This what he is going to say, **“Those that God foreloved He elected and it has always been that way. It was that exact same way in the days of Elijah; even Elijah was unaware of the fact that God had a people out there beside himself. But He did and He does. He has a remnant out which has been chosen by grace and that s true even though the rest have become hardened to the gospel.”**

Now follow along as I read verse 2-10.

^{NIV} **Romans 11:2**...God did not reject his people, whom he foreknew. Don't you know what the Scripture says in the passage about Elijah-- how he appealed to God against Israel: ³ **“Lord, they have killed your prophets and torn down your altars; I am the only one left, and they are trying to kill me”?** ⁴ And what was God's answer to him? **“I have reserved for myself seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal.”** ⁵ So too, at the present time there is a remnant chosen by grace. ⁶ And if by grace, then it is no longer by works; if it were, grace would no longer be grace. ⁷ What then? What Israel sought so earnestly it did not obtain, but the elect did. The others were hardened, ⁸ as it is written: **“God gave them a spirit of stupor, eyes so that they could not see and ears so that they could not**

hear, to this very day." ⁹ And David says: "May their table become a snare and a trap, a stumbling block and a retribution for them. ¹⁰ May their eyes be darkened so they cannot see, and their backs be bent forever."

The finally in verse eleven, Paul asks the obvious question, **"Is there no chance of recovering the people of Israel to the gospel?"**

^{NIV} **Romans 11:11**...Again I ask: Did they stumble so as to fall beyond recovery? Not at all! Rather, because of their transgression, salvation has come to the Gentiles to make Israel envious. ¹² But if their transgression means riches for the world, and their loss means riches for the Gentiles, how much greater riches will their fullness bring!

You see what Paul does here is to look at the unbelief of the Jews from a positive point of view and by that I do not mean a happy point of view. What I mean is that he understands the unbelief of the Jews to have the positive effect that salvation has come to the Gentiles and that that has happened to provoke the Israelites to jealousy and to faith. On the other hand, he argues that if their unbelief has brought faith to the Gentiles how marvelous it will be when their full number comes to faith.

Now we are going to stop right there and finish up Romans 11 next time as we finish up our study of Romans for a while. Brother John will be starting a study of Proverbs the week after that which will run for a quarter and I want you to avail yourself of his hard work and study and attend his class as faithfully as you have this one. But before we conclude I want to take just a minute and speak a word of encouragement to those of you who have loved ones who have not yet come to Christ. The issue for you is faithfulness and endurance. You cannot make your parents, or your brothers and sisters or even your children come to

Christ but you can be faithful in your witness and faithful in your service so that your proclamation of the gospel will be heard and be understood.

Let's Pray

¹ Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988; reprint, 1994), 390, note 61. Technically, Morris is right the term translated "beautiful" is *ὥραλοι* which means "timely" or "seasonable". Morris says it was used of ripe fruit, which was timely and perfect, thus "beautiful". It reminds me of Billy Crystal's line in the Princess Bride, "There is nothing better than 'true love' except perhaps a nice MLT, mutton, lettuce and tomato, where the mutton is nice and lean and the tomatoes are perky, I just love that."

² John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans (NIC)* 2 vols. in one (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968; reprint 1980), vol. 2, xii-xv. Murray's overview of the purpose of Romans 9-11 is very good.

³ C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans: Volume 2, Commentary on Romans 9-16 and Essays* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979; reprint, 1981), 447. "With regard to the special difficulties, which the contents of these chapters present, those features, which have struck very many students of the Epistle to the Romans—not surprisingly—as offensive and repugnant, several things may usefully be said at this point. (i) It is of the utmost importance to take these three chapters together as a whole, and not to come to conclusions about Paul's argument before one has heard it to the end; for chapter 9 will certainly be understood in an altogether unPauline sense, if it is understood in isolation from its sequel in chapters 10 and 11. (ii) We shall misunderstand these chapters, if we fail to recognize that their key word is "mercy". Paul is here concerned to show that the problem of Israel's unbelief, which seems to call in question the very reliability of God Himself, is connected with the nature of God's mercy as really mercy and as mercy not just for one people but for all peoples; to show that Israel's disobedience, together with the divine judgment which it merits and procures, is surrounded on all sides by the divine mercy—and at the same time to bring home to the Christian community in Rome the fact that it is by God's mercy alone that it lives."

⁴ R. Kent Hughes, *Romans: Righteousness from Heaven* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossways Books, 1991), 174. Hughes is very wise here: "A word of caution before we proceed: This is one of the least popular passages in the Scriptures because Paul bases his defense of God's character on the doctrine of *election*, which teaches that before the world was created God chose who would receive salvation. This does not jibe with our natural way of thinking. In fact, this section runs so counter to man's normal thought that I know of one pastor who simply skipped it he preached through Romans. We must avoid such a mistake for the sake of our own souls and of the church."

⁵ C.H. Dodd, *The Epistle to the Romans* in the Moffatt NT Commentary Series (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932; reprinted 1947), 171. Even though Dodd is usually frustrating and sometimes even irritating, he can still occasionally be quite good. I like his point here in Romans

9 even though I do not like his idea that Romans 9-11 is simply an inserted and thus disconnected sermon. "The first two parts, then, of the sermon must be taken as complementary: first, God's plan of salvation is a free determination of His sovereign will conditioned by nothing else than the everlasting mercy which is His nature and property; but, secondly, it works through the free response of men in faith, and those whom it rejects have themselves rejected the opportunity offered to them. The Jewish nation as a whole, though they knew (or might have known) the way of God, chose their own way, and cannot complain if the divine purpose has passed them by and selected the Gentiles as the recipients of his promise."

⁶ J.A. Cuddon, *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (New York: Penguin Books, 1977), 37. "The repetition of the last of one clause at the beginning of the following clause to gain a special effect." See also, E.W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1898; reprinted in 1968 and 1999), 251.

⁷ John Stott, *Romans: God's Good News For the World* (Downer's Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1994), 286. "The essence of Paul's argument is seen if we put his six verbs in the opposite order: Christ sends heralds; heralds preach; people hear; hearers believe; believers call; and those who call are saved. And the relentless logic of Paul's case for evangelism is felt most forcibly when the stages are stated negatively and each is seen to be essential to the next. Thus, unless some people are commissioned for the task, there will be no gospel preachers;"

⁸ F.F. Bruce, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Tyndale Press, 1963), 205. "Hence arises the necessity of proclaiming the gospel worldwide. Men are urged to call on the name of the Lord and be saved; but they will not call on His name unless they have been moved to believe in Him, they cannot believe in Him unless they hear about Him, they cannot hear about Him unless someone brings them the news, and no-one can bring them the news unless he is sent to do so. The preacher is an apostle' in the primary sense of the word; he is a herald or ambassador conveying a message from someone who has authorized him to deliver it. Here Paul magnifies the office of the apostle or evangelist; it is God's good pleasure by their proclamation of His amnesty to bring His mercy home to those who believe the message. Of those who bring this joyful news the prophet spoke centuries before: 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!'"

⁹ James Montgomery Boice, *Romans Volume 3: God and History, Romans 9-11* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1993), 1249-51. Boice quotes a taped sermon from Barnhouse, which is just too good to let go. I have edited the story slightly to make it shorter. See also Morris, 391. He writes, "They (their feet) might be smelly and dirty after a long hot journey, but to those who eagerly awaited good news they were beautiful."

¹⁰ C.K. Barrett, *Romans: The Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957), 204. Barrett writes, "The break in the chain occurs at the link of faith."

¹¹ Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* in the New International Commentary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1996), 666-7.