

and that whatever God actually does cannot be unrighteous. Paul's first argument, therefore, is to show that God actually claims the right which has been called in question.

Origen, many Fathers, and a few modern commentators assert that vv.15-19 contain not Paul's own words, but a continuation of the objection, the whole to be refuted by the indignant disclaimer of v.20. But the structure of the sentence and of the argument refute this exegesis. *μὴ γένοιτο* cannot be a simple parentheses, and must be followed by the remainder of the apostle's answer to the objection. Moreover if this had been the construction the interrogative sentence would not have been introduced by the particle *μή* expecting a negative answer.

*λέγει* without a nominative for *θεὸς λέγει* is a common idiom in quotations. *γὰρ* <sup>follows</sup> ~~precedes~~ the name of Moses, for if a Jew were to name one man who above all others deserved God's mercy, it might be Moses, yet even to Moses, God made the statement which is quoted.

Ἐλεήσω.....οὐκ εἴρω. . The quotation is taken verbatim from the LXX of Ex.33:19. In that passage God condescends to grant the bold request of Moses that he might behold His glory with his bodily eyes, but gives him to understand that it is not because of any merit on his part. The emphasis in the assertion to Moses is on the idea of effective mercy. Paul applies it to assert the equally present idea of selective mercy. When God chooses to be merciful to anyone He has the sovereign power to do so; he has equally the sovereign power to determine within Himself the individual to whom He will be merciful. In the relative clauses the emphasis is on the ὅν for ὃν generally follows the emphatic word. The difference in meaning between the two verbs ἐλεεῖν and οὐκ εἴρω is nearly the same as that between the two substantives λύπη and ὀδύνη