this word with KaTnprioqueva of v.22, we are struck with three differences, which can hardly be accidental. Whereas Kathpriogueva is passive and does not show with any definiteness who has prepared the vessels of wrath for destruction, Trontoludoev is active, and definitely ascribes the preparation of the vessels of mercy to God. Thou not udo Ev has the element of previousness in it. In the former case attention was directed to the present condition. Here our attention is directed to the previous activity of God. Moreover here we have the agrist, while there we had the perfect. There we had a completed condition in evidence. Here our attention is directed to a single act which God has performed with reference to these "vessels of mercy". Finally, we should notice that Paul has used a different verb here. he used the general word for prepared or fitted, a word often used of fitting up a ship, here he changes to a compound of Frolpias w

which often indicates, "to constitute qualitatively". These differences should not be overstressed, but the fact is clear that, whatever may be inferred or implied about the preparation of the vessels of wrath, in the case of the vessels of mercy there is asserted a definite previous act of God constituting them as such.

EIS OUSAV Here again is the expression of destination. This phrase corresponds antithetically to EIS ATTURED of \$1.32. And as the meaning of that phrase was eschatological, and had reference to the eternal destiny of the vessels of wrath, so in this case the reference is to the eternal glory, which God hath prepared for His elect.

v.24. Paul now very deftly brings our attention back to the startingpoint of the discussion, while at the same time continuing the