

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

STUDIED THROUGH ITS DEDUCTIVE LOGICAL FORMS: SHOWING
THE LOGICAL OBLIGATION OF SERVICE.

MRS. SALLY NEILL BOACH.

PART I.

(All references marked No., are made to "Elements of Deductive Logic:"—Noah K. Davis.)

As an example of clear, deep, concise thinking, Paul's "Epistle to the Romans" is peerless in literature. It was written by a thinking man for thinking men. Though containing beautiful passages of emotional outburst, it does not appeal primarily to the emotions, but to that faculty in man which seeks out the relation of things and compares judgment with judgment and forms conclusions; that faculty which marks the supremacy of man in the animal world; that faculty which we call thought. The book handles the gravest problems and faces the most stupendous facts with which human nature has to deal. It hides nothing, evades nothing, condones nothing that can possibly affect the issue. Sweeping aside all that would cloud and obscure, it lays direct hold upon fundamental facts, and relates and cor-relates until it has woven in the net-work of masterful logic the profoundly simple truths that control the destiny of man. To the careless or superficial reader the Book of Romans—saving a few isolated passages—cannot be otherwise than uninteresting, incomprehensible, and tedious. It is only to those who, seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit, will persistently dig that its treasures are revealed—only to those who will do the hard work of thinking and will patiently follow through the syllogisms which mark the steps in his argument will Paul's tri-

umphant "Therefore!" abound with fuller meaning for every utterance and echo like an anthem of praise.

The first twelve verses of the first chapter constitute the salutation, wherein Paul, introducing himself by his proudest title—"a servant of Jesus Christ"—and announcing his apostleship, greets the saints in Rome and expresses the anxiety he has had to visit them and share with them the comforts and consolations of the gospel. But remembering that these same citizens of the Imperial City, then at the summit of her power, were accustomed to playing the master and not the penitent, to dictate and not to obey, in the next five verses, he impresses upon them the necessity and sufficiency of the gospel that he is not ashamed to preach even in Rome.

I.

As if remembering that he is addressing men (though now "beloved of God" and "called to be saints") to whom the revealed word, held in such reverence by himself, had been no more than the sacred literature of a conquered nation, by courtesy of the Imperial Government allowed to be on equal footing with the myths and fables of their own and other nations, the Apostle goes utterly outside of the Scriptures to find the major and the minor premises of his first syllogism. (No. 85, 86.) He thus steps unreservedly over upon the ground of those Romans other than the Christians, who may be disposed to question the authority and inspiration that are to him a sufficient foundation. He draws his first premises from observation and experience, and appeals to inspiration only to corroborate that which is patent to the attentive consideration of all. In its condensed logical form this first syllogism is as follows:

Those having the sufficient opportunity to know the one God as He is revealed in nature and not reverencing Him as God are those guilty before God manifest in the Law of Nature. (I:18-32.)

All men, both Jews and Gentiles, are those having the sufficient opportunity to know the one God as He is revealed in nature and not reverencing Him as God. (II, III:1-18.) Therefore:

All men, both Jews and Gentiles, are those guilty before God manifest in the Law of Nature. II:1 (*Guilt.*)

This conclusion is a very important fundamental proposition.

In I:18-32, Paul elaborates his major premise in full, drawing in clear, bold lines the awful picture of human nature following the gravitation of its own depravity. It is a picture of human nature of every age, every clime, every condition, and every individuality, manifestly falling far below its own possibilities and given over "to a reprobate mind". The guilt is not in a failure to accept a particular creed or dogma, of which, perhaps, many have never heard, but in a wilful and continuous turning aside from the claims of the Creator as made by His revelation in nature.

The minor is introduced by the word "for" in the first verse of the second chapter, and is made universal by the indefinite, individual "thou", and is then shown (II:2-29, III:1-18) in specific detail to include both Jews and Gentiles. After the premises have been stated as reported by observation and confirmed by the silent testimony of each man's conscience, Paul appeals to the Scriptures (Ps. XIII:3, 4, V:9, X:7)* as corroborative evidence.

The first verse of the second chapter, with a sweeping "whosoever", faces the conclusion of universal, individual guilt, made the more emphatic, because, by consenting to the uncontroversory premises, men become their own accusers in the very remarkable fact that each sees in the conduct of others—especially as related to himself—simply a repetition and reflection of his own conduct to God, and, sitting in judgment upon his brother, he unconsciously pronounces his own sentence.

*Septuagint: Ps. 13:3-4, 5:10, 9:28.

II.

The second syllogism (III:19, 20) is a sorites (No. 106) condensed to an Epichirema (No. 105). The Sorites is also an Episyllogism, having for its first or major premise the conclusion of the first syllogism. This argument is better understood by remembering that Paul has been talking about God's law in nature, (unwritten), and when he speaks of those who are "under the law" he refers to that. When he speaks of "whatsoever the law saith" he refers to the written or moral law:—and yet written and unwritten are alike "the law", *ὁ νόμος*.

The point is that the written law was addressed to people already proven guilty, and was designed to make their guilt manifest. A very careful study of verses 19 and 20 will evolve the following:

All flesh is guilty before God manifest in the Law of Nature.

Those guilty before God manifest in the Law of Nature are those addressed by the Moral Law.

Those addressed by the Moral Law are thereby given knowledge of existing sin.

Those given knowledge of existing sin are those possessing an imperfect righteousness.

Those possessing an imperfect righteousness are those unable to work out a perfect righteousness:—i. e., fulfill the law.

Those unable to fulfill the law are those unable to be justified by the deeds of the law.

Therefore: All flesh is unable to be justified by the deeds of the law; or by Infinitation, (3) A yielding E., (No. 81.) . . .

No flesh is able to ("shall") be justified by the deeds of the law. (*Helplessness*.)

The Apostle has now established the fact of the universal helplessness of man. There is a point reached beyond which humanity simply cannot go. A guilty man faces a rejected, sovereign God—and there is no escape.

One man or one age or one community of men can not help any other, for all have been proven alike guilty. Condemnation and punishment must inevitably follow guilt, or the sovereign God has failed to maintain His supremacy and the dignity of His law. Obviously, any relief to the situation must now come from the divine side and can only be made known by revelation. Paul claims that he is sent by God to make known to men this revelation which is the divine plan of salvation, designed by the Father, executed by the Son, witnessed by the Holy Spirit, and graciously offered by the Triune God for the consideration and acceptance of men. This plan (21-27) Paul proceeds to unfold. The first step of the plan is to provide a due righteousness, that is, a right doing, (21-23) "witnessed by the law and the prophets"; this is the absolutely perfect righteousness of the God-Man, Jesus Christ. By the simple acceptance of it as alone perfect and His, the plan is that to each one so accepting it shall be accredited through the channel of faith. It is offered as a free gift "unto all that believe", no one having a whit more claim to it than his brother, "for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God"; how often short, or the degree of shortness, it is useless to discuss. But before this righteousness can be accredited for justification, the penalty of the existing sin must be met, else the perfect law of an Infinite God would be outraged and dishonored (24-25). This penalty is death—to the soul, soul death—and is met by the shed "blood" of Jesus, and all that it tokens, which blood provides atonement by the redemption that is in Him. The simple acceptance of it through faith offers this atonement as a "propitiation" to the offended law. The Divine law being pledged to accept, the guilty man has now nothing against him; the provided righteousness is placed to his credit, and God is "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus". The only condition imposed upon man is that he will consider the facts of the case, acknowledge his own guilt and helplessness, take God at His word,

and accept in detail the divinely revealed plan. This is faith. God is proven infinitely merciful as well as infinitely just, and human boasting is forever "excluded" (27.)

III.

Paul is now ready for his third syllogism which is an Enthymeme (Nb. 104) having only the conclusion expressed in verse 28, but which clearly develops into a Sorites, the premises being manifestly embodied in the verses just preceding. Written out, it becomes:

Justification is that granted to man in accordance with God's plan of salvation.

That granted to man in accordance with God's plan of salvation is that based upon the substituted atonement and imputed righteousness of Jesus.

That based upon the substituted atonement and the imputed righteousness of Jesus is that which a man receives by faith without the deeds of the law.

Therefore:—Justification is that which man receives by faith without the deeds of the law; or,

"A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (*Faith.*)

This plan is offered to the Gentile as well as to the Jew, the same God being over all (29, 30), and the law is established, being honored in every detail by Jesus and by the faith that accepts Him as the Substitute.

IV.

But there might be in the mind of the Jews some lingering unwillingness to renounce the claim he had already made as the descendant of Abraham, bearing the seal of circumcision, or in the mind of the Gentile some lingering fear that, after all, the Jew might be on vantage ground. This unwillingness and fear Paul meets in an argument that culminates in the 16th verse of the fourth chapter. Beginning with the chapter, in the first eight verses, Paul makes the distinction between the reward given to a worker, which is a debt, and the gift accorded

by the grace of God—which gift is based on an imputed righteousness. The Jewish claim was based in Abraham, and here Paul, for the first time, goes to the Scriptures for fundamental proof. These assert that Abraham believed God, and it (the believing) “was counted unto him for righteousness”. (Gen. XV:6). Clearly Abraham had no righteousness that merited God’s reward, but his faith laid hold on God’s righteousness (Gen. XV:6) which was thence imputed to him. Paul again appeals to the Scripture, quoting David, (Ps. 32:2, 3)* and establishes the same point. Next he sets forth the fact that this blessing could never have been the reward of circumcision (9, 10) because Abraham received it before he was circumcised, and the circumcision was accorded him as a token of what had been secured and not as a means of securing. So, Abraham, being an earthly father to the circumcised, became also a father to those that believed (to whom also the same righteousnessness should be imputed) being uncircumcised, and, in a double sense, a father to circumcised believers. (11, 12.) Verses 13-15 constitute a very condensed and interesting argument and clearly show the skilled logician. Verse 13 is the compound conclusion (No. 107), one syllogism being held in verse 14, and the other in verse 15. Evidently, Paul has in mind this disjunctive proposition (No. 113).

Either the promise was to
Abraham and his seed
through the law,

or through the imputed
righteousness of faith.

From this he first obtains the following Conjunctive Syllogism (No. 119), which he solves by “Tollens”:

* Septua. Ps. 31: 1, 2.

“If the promise were through the law,—or, “If they which are of the law be heirs,

faith is made void and the promise is of none effect.”
(Verse 14.)

“TOLLENS.” } Faith was not made void
and the promise had effect.
(Ver. 3, 11.)

Therefore:—The promise was not through the law.

(First part of conclusion in verse 13.)

Again, to make his argument doubly sure, Paul goes back to his disjunctive proposition, and, using it as the major premise of a disjunctive syllogism (No. 120), employs “Tollendo Ponens” to deduce his conclusion. To establish his minor (that is to deny his first disjunct member), he uses an Epichirema (verse 15) whose conclusion forms the minor premise to the Episyllogism whose conclusion establishes the “Tollendo”; and whose minor (y) is the conclusion of its prosyllogism, (5) the Enthymeme closing verse 15. This conclusion is emphasized by being expressed conditionally, thus:

“Where no law is, there is no transgression”;

but obviously, it is a simple judgment (No. 116) equivalent to

“Law is that proving transgression.”

This argument will be more easily followed by repeating the disjunctive proposition and tracing each form in full:

DISJUNCTIVE PROPOSITION.

Either the promise was to
Abraham and his seed
through the law,

or through the imputed
righteousness of faith.

EPICHIREMA, VERSE 15.

“. the law worketh.
for where no law is, there
is no transgression.

} Conclusion of Enthymeme.

ENTHYMEME EXPANDED.

That revealing sin is that
proving transgression.

The law is that revealing
sin. iii:20.

(Prosyl.)

Therefore:—Law is that proving
transgression. Ver. 15. (y.)

EPICHIREMA EXPANDED.

That proving transgression is
that working wrath.

Law is that proving transgression. (y.)

Therefore:—Law is that work-
ing wrath. (x.)

That working wrath is not that (Episyl.)
through which the promise comes.

Law is that working wrath. (x.)

Therefore:—The Law is not
that through which the promise
comes. (See first part of conclusion, verse 13) (Tollendo.)

Second part, conclusion, }
ver. 13. } Therefore:—The promise
is through the imputed
righteousness of faith.

(Ponens.)

This affirmative conclusion forms the **first or major** premise of Paul's fourth syllogism, for which next important step he is now ready. This Episyllogism is a Sorites, given in condensed form in verse 16. It expands as follows:

The promise (of heirship to Abraham—verse 13—or of salvation to the believer, (iii:28) is through (or based upon) the imputed righteousness of faith.

That which is based upon the imputed righteousness of faith is not the reward of works. (Verses 4 and 5.)

That which is not the reward of works is the gift of grace.

Therefore:—

The promise of salvation is the gift of grace. (*Grace.*)

And being the gift of grace, it is sure to all exercising the faith, regardless of race or works. Again, Paul cites Abraham as an example, recalling the fact that God's promise was made good to Abraham against all hope because he had received it in faith. He argues (23-25) that God therein proved His ability to make good to believers the promise of salvation based upon the imputed righteousness of Christ (which was testified by His resurrection) as the ground of justification—which righteousness is made available to us by the blood of His atonement.

V.

Chapter V opens with the Enthymeme expressing the conclusion of the fifth syllogism. The major premise is assumed as a self-evident proposition. The minor is the simple and natural outcome from the conclusions of the third and fourth syllogisms. Manifestly, those receiving justification are those who are justified by faith; moreover, justification, fulfilling the promise of salvation, is the gift of God's grace. Then it is not hard to see that those who are justified by faith are those who are accepting and acknowledging the gift of God's grace. The Enthymeme develops as follows:—

Those accepting and acknowledging the gift of God's grace are those having peace with God.

Those who are justified by faith are those who are accepting and acknowledging the gift of God's grace.

Therefore:—Those who are justified by faith are those who are having peace with God. (*Peace.*)

This peace we have through Christ Jesus, through whom (V:2) came the access by faith into this grace; and with the peace we are privileged to "rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Moreover, tribulation, (ἡ θλίψις) the rubbing and wear and tear that one gets in this life, loses the power to harm the soul at peace with God. Its only work can be (3-5) to give those rich, deep lessons that culminate in our fuller hope and expand our capacity to love—or rather, to transmit God's love that abounds in the heart. Then follows the beautiful "*a fortiori*" (No. 108, p. 140) argument of verses 6-10, showing the solid ground upon which is based the hope that "maketh not ashamed", and which is the outgrowth of the peace that we have with God. For, if—wonder of wonders!—when we were debtors to the Law and enemies, Christ made the atonement and saved us from hell, how much the more probable that after we were reconciled, He would put His righteousness to our credit (III:22) and, giving us heaven, finish the salvation which He had begun. Therefore, the peace and the hope are based upon the certainty of a perfect and omnipotent God finishing His own work.

VI.

Not only is this true, but there is yet another reason for joy, for the fulness of grace in Jesus rests upon a fundamental principle which is suggested to Paul by the consideration of the certainty of God finishing His work. This principle, which is termed "The Federal Headship of Christ", forms the substance of the next argument, (verses 11-21), culminating in the conclusion of verse 18,

which is a summing up of conclusions expressed in the correlatives "as" and "so". A word as to the title, "Federal Headship". Webster defines "federal" as "derived from agreement or covenant". The familiar word, "headship" carries with it the idea of descent, that suggests the closely related thought of heredity. The recorded fact that the tempter was allowed to test his powers upon Adam and upon Christ*, and that the results of the assailing were in each case entailed†, proves the permissive agreement granted by God with the Evil One in the contest for the possession of man. Hence the title, "Headship", derived from agreement and entailing characteristics upon descendants. A careful reading of verses 12 and 15 will evolve this syllogism in Barbara: (No. 99.)

The relation recognized by the law as existing between Adam in his fall and his posterity is the relation of headship and descent, with all that headship and descent entail.

The relation determined by grace to exist between the Lord Jesus Christ and those who become His saved through faith is the relation recognized by law as existing between Adam in his fall and his posterity.

Therefore:—The relation determined by grace to exist between the Lord Jesus Christ and those who become His saved through faith is the relation of headship and descent with all that headship and descent entail.

This conclusion refers to the *fact* of the headship recognized to exist in Adam under law and in Christ under grace, and gives rise to the correlatives "as" and "so" in the conclusion in verse 18.

In verse 12 is set forth the nature and effect of Adam's entail, and in verse 15 the nature and effect of the entail of the Christ. The consideration of these suggests two sets of premises resulting in virtually the same conclusion in Celarent (No. 96, Fig. 2):

* Gen. 1, Matt. iv.

† I Cor. xv:21, 22.

(1). That entailing sin and death is not the headship of Jesus Christ.

The headship of Adam is that entailing sin and death.

The headship of Adam is not (in kind) the Headship of Jesus Christ.

(2). That entailing righteousness and life is not the headship of Adam.

The headship of Jesus Christ is that entailing righteousness and life.

The headship of Jesus Christ is not (in kind) the headship of Adam.

These conclusions refer to the *nature* of the headships and give ground, in verse 18, for the contrasts expressed between "offense" and "righteousness", "condemnation" and "justification". In verse 19 the contrast is farther expressed by "disobedience" and "obedience", "sinners" and "righteous", and the fact of the headships by the words "one" and "many". Verse 19 is the amplification of verse 18 where we have the sixth syllogism condensed into a conclusion which we have seen is in its nature not simple, but compound, (No. 107), being traceable to different sets of premises. The great point proven is *Headship*, and the contrast between the headship of grace and the headship of the law. The more manifest the entail from Adam's headship, obviously, the more conspicuous and glorious the entail from the Christ's. Hence, (20, 21) the moral law was promulgated that sin might be exposed and the source of death brought into sharp and vivid contrast with the source of righteousness and life.

VII.

Granted the Headship of Christ, with its entail of righteousness and life, then it is evident that those who by nature are under the headship of Adam must enter into that relation with Jesus as an existence distinct and new. This is granted to those exercising faith, and is the

transition from the old headship, with its entail, to the new with all that it means. At the beginning of Chapter VI, Paul declares this New, or Soul, Life, as the meaning of the ordinance of baptism, and in this and the chapter following he discusses its various phases, showing that the two headships cannot co-exist or share supremacy. The seventh syllogism is a condensed sorites whose conclusion is expressed in the fourth verse of Chapter VI, and whose premises are suggested in verses 1-3, and in the preceding discussion. It develops as follows:

We are those by privilege of grace deriving headship from Christ. Those deriving headship from Christ are those having been baptized into Christ. (Verse 3. Comp. I Cor. XII:13, Gal. III:27.) Those having been baptized into Christ's death are those having died with Him to sin. (Verse 2.)

Those having died with Christ to sin are those having risen with him to righteousness. (III:22.)

Those having risen with Christ to righteousness are those receiving, in token, the symbol of Christ's burial and resurrection. (Acts IX:17, 18. Comp. Col. II:11, 12.)

Those receiving the symbol of Christ's burial and resurrection are those buried with Him by baptism into death, and rising with Him into the likeness of a new life.

(Compare Matt. XXVIII:19, Acts VIII:38, and "*βαπτίζω*."

Therefore:—"We are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, we also should walk in newness of life." (*New Life*.)

The quoted conclusion, though varying in expression from the strictly logical form, contains nothing that is not implied in the premises. Note, in the text, that the baptism of verse 3 is antecedent to that of verse 4.

The remainder of Chapter VI specifies *how* we are to "walk in newness of life". Christ's death was *once* and not to be repeated, and He is forever free from that

to which He died. So also we:—and therefore, being risen to new life, under the Headship of Christ, we are freed from the dominion of sin. (6-14.) But, (15-23), what if some, presuming in the safety of grace, and, knowing that the law, having no more power over those under the Headship of Jesus, cannot hold them to account—what if these voluntarily yield to sin? Paul answers that choosing sin as master proves the old headship with its entail and denies the entail that is under grace. But the Apostle has better hope of those to whom he is writing, and he appeals to their experience to know if they would still choose the headship of law. The strong contrast between law and grace is brought out in the last verse by the words “wages” and “gift”, “death” and “life”. Chapter VII continues the same subject. Here (1-6) Paul illustrates the point by re-marriage after death has severed the first marriage bond: “that being dead wherein we were held” when we brought forth “fruit unto death”, “we are delivered from the law” that we “should be married to another” and “bring forth fruit unto God”. But Paul would have us understand (7-13) that while being free from the dominion of sin is being free from law, yet law and sin are by no means synonymous terms—but law is that making manifest the power of sin, and is, itself, good. Then in that wonderfully realistic piece of word painting (4-24) he shows the conflict that must ever wage between the spiritual ego of the believer, that acknowledges the Headship of the Christ and rejoices in what it entails, and the carnal nature, that is the mortal body, which is still under the dominion of sin. But even in the contemplation of so dark a picture, the Immortal Headship is asserted, and, in verse 25, the soul sings its pean of victory.

VIII.

In the sixth and seventh syllogisms, those relating to headship and newness of life, Paul has been dealing with the source and manifestation of Christian character as

it is developed in those concluded by the fifth syllogism to be at peace with God. The last verse of Chapter VII, bringing him, after scenes of terrible conflict, to a vision of triumph in Christ, leads him again to study the position of the believer with regard to safety, and so carries him back of the fifth syllogism, where he concluded peace with God, to its logical antecedents, the third and fourth syllogisms, from which he affirmed the doctrine of justification accorded by grace through faith. Taking up the argument there, he follows it by another line of thought. Chapter VIII, the glory of the believer, opens with the eighth syllogism in the form of a conclusion to a sorites whose unexpressed premises are distinctly traceable through the previous syllogisms and text as follows:—

No condemnation is that resting upon the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. (III:21.)

That resting upon the righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ is that resting upon those to whom His righteousness is imputed by grace through faith. (III:22, 28; IV:16.)

That resting upon those to whom Christ's righteousness is imputed by grace through faith is that resting upon those who are in Christ Jesus and who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. (V:18, 19.)

Therefore:—No condemnation is that resting upon those who are in Christ Jesus and who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. (*No Condemnation.*)

This is *the* note of triumph for the Christian. It is not only the fact that by the atonement of Christ the law has acquitted him of all past debt and he is at peace with God, (V:1), but the added fact that through the righteousness of Christ he is forever acquitted of all future debt. His obligation is canceled and he has an *inexhaustible* supply to his credit. Paul goes on to explain (2-4) how the perfect righteousness of Christ, made manifest through his subjection in the flesh to the law governing our human natures, obtained the offered reward—life—and, sin, being condemned in the flesh, this

righteousness is "fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit". And so it follows (5-10) that those yet under the headship of the flesh have neither part nor lot in Christ's reward, nor inheritance under His Headship, and are, necessarily, at enmity with God; while those in Christ are dead to the flesh headship now struggling for supremacy. But more: the reward of life, (11), won by His perfect righteousness, was accorded to the body of Christ as well as to the soul, and was delivered in the resurrection. Hence, under the sweeping conclusion of "No Condemnation", it must extend to the bodies of believers, and the resurrection of the body is assured. But the claim of the believer is made manifest in his life (12-14)—whether or not he shows the inheritance coming from the Spirit. But lest his readers (those in Rome and those of all time, "called to be saints") be appalled by this statement, Paul reminds them that they are not left alone to demonstrate their claim, but the Spirit works with them (15-17) asserting their adoption into oneness with Christ:—a unity in suffering as well as in the glory. Yet (18) he would not shrink from the suffering—though he does not underestimate it,—for it is insignificant when compared with the glory. He would have them remember that Christ's inheritance includes all things—even the creature (*ἡ κτίσις*, inanimate nature that can not choose His righteousness) is, along with our bodies, (19-24) to be glorified and transformed because of it. In this hope (the hope of the reward due Christ's righteousness) Paul would have the believer live, and by it he would have him be sustained, being helped, even in his supplications, by the Spirit, who knowing him also knows God's will concerning Christ;—the same Spirit who manages his redemption from purpose to finish as one eternal now, "working all things together for good". (25-30.) Paul has seen the Christian assailed by all the powers of evil without and within, but now (31-34) he sees this same beset Christian championed by the eternal

God:—what cares he then for the number or nature of his foes? He sees the Christian resting upon the Divine Justice that spared not the Only Begotten, and enfolded in the love that glorified the risen Christ. And, finally, he sees him clothed in the perfect and accepted righteousness of an enthroned Intercessor, and so enabled to defy any that condemns. Grandly the Apostle climbs (35-39) and rejoices as he climbs—for his Rock is impregnable—until, having reached this summit, he challenges the universe, present and future, height and depth, angels, principalities, and powers, shouting his eternal song of triumph that is based upon the grace, mercy and truth of the Triune God manifested in Jesus Christ our Lord.

END OF PART I.