very plain. It is almost verbatim from the  
Septuagint, the **for** being inserted by the  
Apostle as continuing the testimony, ‘for  
the prophet proceeds.’ The literal rendering  
of the Hebrew is, “The consummation  
(or consumption) decided, overfloweth with  
righteousness: for a decision (or consumption)  
and a decree shall the Lord Jehovah  
of Sabaoth make in the midst of all the  
land.” As it stands in the Septuagint, the  
meaning seems to be, *the Lord will complete  
and soon fulfil His word in righteousness*(viz. his denunciation of consuming  
the Assyrian and liberating the remnant  
of His people): *for the Lord will  
make a rapidly-accomplished word in the  
midst of all the land.* If the above interpretation  
be correct, and the view which I  
have taken of the analogy of prophecy, it  
will follow that this verse is adduced by the  
Apostle as confirming the certainty of the  
salvation of the remnant of Israel, seeing  
that now, as then, He with whom a thousand  
years are as a day, will swiftly accomplish  
His prophetic word in righteousness.

**29.]** Another proof of a *remnant* to  
be saved, from a *preceding* part of the  
same prophecy. The citation is verbatim  
from the Septuagint, who have put “*seed*”  
for that which is in the Hebrew “*a remnant*,”  
i.e. something left.

**30—33.]** *The Apostle takes up again the  
fact of Israel’s failure, and shews how their  
own pursuit of righteousness never attained  
to righteousness, being hindered by their  
self-righteousness and rejection of Christ.*  
These verses do not contain, as Chrysostom  
and others think, the solution of the whole  
difficulty; this solution is simply in the  
creative right of God, as declared ver. 18 ;  
—but they are a comment on ver. 16, that  
it is not of him that willeth, nor of him  
that *runneth*: the same similitude of running  
being here resumed, and it being  
shewn that, so far from man’s running  
having decided the matter, the Jews *who  
pressed forward* to the goal attained not,  
whereas the Gentiles, *who never ran*, have  
attained. If this is lost sight of, the connexion  
of the whole is much impaired, and  
from doctrinal prejudice, a wholly wrong  
turn given to the Apostle’s line of reasoning,—who  
resolves the awful fact of Israel’s  
exclusion not into any causes arising from  
man, but into the supreme will of God,—  
which will is here again distinctly asserted  
in the citation from Isaiah (see below).—  
**What then shall we say?** This question,  
when followed *by a question*, implies of  
course a *rejection* of the thought thus  
suggested—but when, as here, by an *assertion*,  
introduces a further unfolding of the  
argument from what has preceded. **That  
the Gentiles, which pursue not after**(see Phil. iii. 13) **righteousness** (not  
*justification*, which is merely ‘the being  
accounted righteous,’ ‘the way in which  
righteousness is ascribed:’ not this, but  
*righteousness itself*, is the aim and end of  
the race), **attained to** (the whole transaction  
being regarded as a historical fact) **righteousness,  
even** (righteousness—not however  
that arising from their own works, but the  
righteousness, &c.) **the righteousness which  
is of faith.**

**31.]** **But Israel, pursuing after the law of righteousness**  
(what is the *law of righteousness?* It  
may mean either (1) an *ideal law of  
righteousness*, a *justifying law*,—or (2)  
*the law of Moses*, thus described: or (3)  
which I believe to be the true account  
of the words, “*the* **law** *of righteousness*”  
is put regarding the Jews, rather  
than merely “*righteousness*,” because in