

Countering False Inferences (vv. 5-8)

VERSE 5 But if our unrighteousness demonstrates [promotes] the righteousness**of God, what shall we say** (εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν, τί ἐροῦμεν;*[conj ei if; 1st class + conj de + d.a.w/noun nom.f.s. adikia unrighteousness + pro.gen.p. ego**“our” + gen.m.s. theos + noun acc.f.s. dikaiosune righteousness + pres.act.ind.3s. sunistemi**demonstrate])?***The God who inflicts wrath is not unrighteous, is He? (I am speaking in human****terms.)** (μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω *(neg me +**adj.nom.m.s. adikos unrighteous + d.a.w/noun nom.m.s. theos + d.a.w/pres.act.part.nom.m.s.**epiphero inflict + d.a.w/noun acc.f.s. orge wrath + prep kata + noun acc.m.s. anthropos +**pres.act.ind.1s. lego])***VERSE 6 May it never be** *(neg. me + aor.dep.opt.3s. ginomai)]!***For otherwise, how will God judge the world** (ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον *[conj.**epi otherwise + interro.adv. pos how? + pres.act.ind.3s. krino + d.a.w/noun nom.m.s. theos +**d.a.w/noun acc.m.s. kosmos])?***VERSE 7 But if through my lie the truth of God abounded to His glory, why am I****also still being judged as a sinner** (εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι*ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἔτι καγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι [part ei if; 1st class +**conj de + d.a.w/noun nom.f.s. aletheia truth + d.a.w/noun gen.m.s. theos + prep en + d.a.w/noun**instr.nt.s. pseusma untruthfulness; lie; lx + adj.nt.s. emos my + aor.act.ind.3s. perisseuo abound**+ prep eis + d.a.w/noun acc.f.s. doxa glory + pro.gen.m.s. autos his + interrog.adv. tis why? +**adv. eti still + adv. kago also + adj.nom.m.s. hamartolos sinner + pres.pass.ind.1s. krino**judge])?*

VERSE 8 And why not say (as we are slanderously reported and as some claim that we say), "Let us do evil that good may come" (καὶ μὴ καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ

καθὼς φασὶν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν ὅτι Ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθὰ [*conj kai + neg me + adv kathos + pres.pass.ind.1s. blasphemeo slander + conj kai + adv kathos + pres.act.ind.3p. phemi say; "claim" + pro.nom.m.p. tis some + noun acc.p. ego we + pres.act.infin. lego say + conj hoti that + aor.act.subj.1p. poieo "do" + d.a.w/adj.acc.nt.p. kakos evil + conj hoti that + aor.act.subj.3s. erchomai come + d.a.w/adj.nom.nt.p. agathos good*])?

Their condemnation is just (ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν ὧν [*pro.gen.m.p. hos "Their" + d.a.w/noun nom.nt.s. krima + adj.nom.nt.s. endikos deserved, just + pres.act.ind.3s. eimi*])).

ANALYSIS: VERSES 5-8

1. Paul continues to rebut false inferences regarding his teaching that human unrighteous (STA activity) serves to highlight God's perfect character.
2. In verse 5 two questions are asked which are designed to be regarded as contemplating an abuse of the doctrine set forth in the preceding verses.
3. An abuse to the effect that if negative volition to the promises does not make null and void God's faithfulness (v. 3), but renders it more conspicuous or, in terms of v. 5, if the unrighteousness of man serves to exhibit more clearly the righteousness of God, then would God be unrighteousness in inflicting wrath upon sinners?
4. It is plausible and inevitable logic to say that God cannot justly inflict punishment upon any sinful action which is instrumental in promotion ("demonstrates") of divine integrity with regards to the truth.
5. Again, how can God manifest His displeasure and inflict wrath upon that which sets off His glory in more conspicuous relief?
6. "Let us to evil that good may come" appears to be the unavoidable moral lesson.
7. There does not seem to be a good reason for thinking that there is any substantial difference between the false inference or abuse contemplated in verse 5 and the two questions of verses 7 and 8.
8. The inference proposed in verse 8 is that if the truth of God, that is to say, His faithfulness in fulfilling His word, has been more abundantly exemplified by man's unbelief and contradiction, and God thereby glorified, then the agent of this unbelief cannot any longer be regarded as a sinner.
9. When Paul identifies himself with the distortion that is given to the truth of God and says "through my lie", this is but a rhetorical way of expressing the thought; he is not reflecting on his former unbelief and the way in which God's grace abounded in his own case.
10. This would be extraneous to the subject at hand; he is not here dealing with "where sin abounds grace did much more abound" (5:20).

11. The subject dealt with in verse 7 is carried on in verse 8 and the question of verse 8 is closely attached to the interrogative of verse 7b, “why am I also being judged as a sinner?”
12. The essence of verse 7 could be paraphrased as: “Instead of being judged as a sinner for the lie that we give to the integrity of God, why not rather let us to evil that good may come?”
13. The corruption implicit throughout, namely, that the integrity of God is made more conspicuous by human unbelief and sin.
14. This slogan sets forth the underlying assumption that Paul deals with from verse 5 and forward.
15. The construction of verse 8 may be somewhat irregular, but the thought is not obscure if we recognize that the two clauses, “as we are slanderously reported and as some claim that we say” are parenthetical to the main thought as per the paraphrase given above (pt. 12).
16. The verb translated “demonstrates” (pres.act.ind. 3s. *sunistemi* prove, demonstrate) in v. 5 is comes across as blasphemous.
17. Paul is not dealing with a hypothetical situation in these four verses.
18. The antinomian perversion has been laid against Paul.
19. His teaching had been distorted as encouraging sinful behavior.
20. It is likely that those in view were his legalistic opponents who sought to undermine his ministry as an apostle by imputing to Paul antinomianism.
21. The concluding statement: “Their condemnation is just” is directed at all who opposed and distorted Paul’s teaching regarding the magnification of God’s glory.
22. This would include those who took Paul’s teaching and turned it into lasciviousness, or who charged Paul with the promotion that leads to antinomianism.
23. What then, is Paul’s response to the distortion with which he is dealing in verse 5-8?
24. We do not have a lengthy argument after the pattern of the one in chapter 6:1.
25. There Paul deals with the abuse applied to the doctrine of grace, where here he is dealing with an assault upon the righteousness of God.
26. The consideration he lays against this distortion is: “May it never be! For otherwise, how will God judge the world?”
27. “Demonstrates” could be translated “promotes.”
28. This at first glance is shocking!
29. The question is: How does human sinning promote God’s righteousness?
30. The short answer: The response of God when He administers wrath is the way +R of God is demonstrated.
31. “What shall we (informed believers) say?” introduces Paul’s response to those who take issue with the first class condition of v. 5a.
32. The second question (“The God who inflicts wrath is not unrighteous is He?”) requires a negative response.
33. The consideration He sets against the distortion is simply: “May it never be! For otherwise how will God judge the world?” (v. 6)
34. It might seem that this consideration begs the question.
35. For of what avail is it to affirm that God will judge the world if the question is: how can God be just in executing judgment if His righteousness is commended by our unrighteousness?
36. Categorical assertion of a thing to be proved is no argument!
37. This, however, is what we discover in this instance.
38. Paul appeals to the fact of universal judgment, and he does not proceed to prove it.
39. He accepts it as an ultimate fact of revelation.

40. These facts are final and argument must be content with categorical affirmation.
41. The answer to objections is dogmatic proclamation.
42. There is one final expression in this passage that needs explanation—"I am speaking in human terms." (v. 5c)
43. He is accommodating himself to the human interrogation and reasoning.
44. In reality the questions and objections are impertinent and out of place.
45. For God's justice is not something that may be called into question.
46. These are questions that arise in the human mind, and are used to highlight the abhorrence that God might be unjust.
47. And so he repeats the formula: "May it never be!" (vv. 4 & 6).
48. It is for the purpose of repudiating the suggestion that he voices the questions.