§ v.] LANGUAGE, AND STYLE. (<yrropucrion.   
   
   
 expression? And if we besides take into account the peculiarity of the   
 Apostle’s character above pointed out, are we not obliged to confess,   
 that so universal a reflexion, such a calculation, as Rothe’s theory sup-   
 poses, is altogether inconsistent with that character,—that such a pro-   
 cisely measured style would be inexplicable from a spirit like that of   
 the Apostle, except on the assumption of a passive inspiration? and   
 as regards the point itself, I cannot see, that the writings of Paul,   
 examined in detail, justify this prejudice in their favour, even according   
 to the ingenious and minute exegesis of Rothe himself.” (This he   
 instances by examining Rothe’s account of the defective constructions   
 in Rom. v. 12 f.) «\* \* \* \* That the great Apostle was no ordinary   
 thinker,—that he did not, after the manner of enthusiasts, carried away   
 by warmth of feeling, write down what he himself did not understand,   
 is beyond question :—but that all which hitherto has been accounted in   
 him negligence or inaccuracy of expression, proceeded from conscious   
 intention of the writer,—can neither be justly assumed a priori, nor   
 convincingly shewn a posteriori.”   
 4. To these general remarks of Tholuck I may add some notice of the   
 peculiarities of the argumentative style of the Apostle, with which we   
 are so much concerned in this Epistle.   
 (a) It is his constant habit to insulate the one matter which he is   
 considering, and regard it irrespective of any qualifications of which it   
 may admit, or objections to which it lies open,—up to a certain point.   
 Much of the difficulty in ch. v. vi. vii. has arisen from not bearing this   
 in mind. .   
 (0) After thus treating the subject till the main result is gained,   
 he then takes into account the qualifications and objections, but in a   
 manner peculiar to himself; introducing them by putting the over-   
 strained use, or the abuse, of the proposition just proved, in an inter-   
 rogative form, and answering the question just asked. On a superficial   
 view of these passages, they assume a sort of dramatic character, and   
 have led many Commentators to suppose an objector to be present in the   
 mind of the Apostle, to whom such questions are to be ascribed. But   
 a further and deeper acquaintance with St. Paul’s argumentative style   
 removes this impression, and with it, much of the obscurity arising from   
 supposing, or not knowing when to suppose, an interchange of speakers   
 in the argument. We find that it is the Apostle himself speaking   
 throughout, and in his vivid rhetorical manner proposing the fallacies   
 which might be derived from his conclusions as matters of parenthetical   
 enquiry.   
 (c) Perhaps one of the most wonderful phenomena of St. Paul’s   
 arguments, is the manner in which all such parenthetical enquiries are   
 interwoven into the great subject; in which while he pursues and   
 annihilates the off-branching fallacy, at the same time he has been   
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