

righteousness of God, if this principle of election be true. Why does God hold men accountable -- what righteousness or justice can there be in His punishment of sin -- if he hardens whom He will? The accountability of man is brought forward, but it is still the righteousness of God which is in question. This is a phase of the original objection, of v.14. ἔτι, still, not temporal but logical--in view of what is presented. βουλήματι is used instead of the more usual θέλημα, probably to imply more definitely the deliberative will of God. ἀνθεστήκεν Perfect with present sense. <sup>cf. Winer, p.274.</sup> Not the process, but the result, is meant. No one can resist God's determination to harden him, therefore ~~how~~ can God righteously hold him accountable.

v.20. ὦ ἄνθρωπε Before dealing with the objection, Paul rebukes the spirit of it. His form of address is strong, and designed to show the folly of a creature in thus presuming to question what has been declared to be true by the infinite wisdom of the Creator. Lange says, "When man goes the length of making to himself a god whom he affects to bind by his own rights, God then puts on His majesty, and appears in all His reality as a free God, before whom man is a mere nothing, like the clay in the hands of the potter." (quoted in Godet, Romans, vol.2, p.165.)

μενούχη This expression seems to belong exclusively to N.T. Greek. It is a strong correction. "Much more certainly still", "nay, rather". Cf. Rom.10:18; Phil.3:8. ἀνταποκρινόμενος used only one other time in the N.T. (Luke 14:6). The Greek writers do not use it, but it is found in the LXX in Judg.5:29, and Job. 16:8; 32:12. Thayer defines it as, "to contradict in reply, to answer by contradicting, reply against". Godet says it "does