*make haste*: i.e. shall not fly in terror,  
shall not be confounded.

**CHAP. X. 1—13**.] *The Jews, though  
zealous for God, are yet ignorant of God's  
righteousness* (1—3) *as revealed to them  
in their own Scriptures* (4—18).

**1.**] **Brethren** (“now, as if the severity of  
the preceding argument were passed over,  
he affectionately addresses them as *brethren*.” Bengel), **the inclination** (or, **desire**)  
**of my heart and my supplication to God  
on their behalf** (Israel, se ch. ix. 32; the  
insertion of “*Israel*” in the text is against  
the authority of all our oldest MSS. and  
versions) (**is**) **for** (**their**) **salvation** (lit.  
‘towards salvation.’ The Apostle’s intention seems to be, to destroy any impression  
which his readers may have received un-  
favourable to his love of his own people,  
from the stern argument of the former  
chapter).

**2.**] **For** (reason why I thus  
sympathize with their efforts, though misdirected) **I bear witness to them that  
they have a zeal for God, but not according to** (in accordance with, founded upon,  
and carried on with) **knowledge** (accurate  
apprehension of the way of righteousness  
as revealed to them).

**3.**] **For** (ex-  
planation of not according to knowledge)  
**not knowing** (i.e.not recognizing; the A.V.,  
*‘being ignorant of*,’ is liable to the objection  
that it may represent to the reader a state  
of *excusable* ignorance, whereas they *had it  
before them*, and *overlooked* it) **the righteousness of God** (not, the *way of justification* appointed by God, as Stuart and  
others; but that only *righteousness* which  
avails before God, which becomes ours in  
justification; see De Wette’s note, quoted  
on ch. i. 17), **and seeking to set up their  
own righteousness** (again, not *justification*, but *righteousness*: that, namely, described ver. 5; not that it was ever theirs,  
but the Apostle speaks subjectively), **they  
were not subjected** (the passive, **were not  
subjected**,—not as in A. V., “*have not  
submitted themselves*,”—expresses the *result*  
*only*; it might be themselves, or it might  
be some other, that should have subjected  
them,—but the historical fact was, that  
they *were not subjected*) **to the righteousness of God** (the “*righteousness of God*”  
being considered as a *rule* or *method*, to  
which it was necessary to conform, but to  
which they were never subjected, as they  
were to the law of Moses).

**4—13.**]  
The “*righteousness of God*” is now explained to be summed up in that Saviour  
who was declared to them in their own  
Scriptures.—**For** (establishing what was  
last said, and at the same time unfolding  
the “*righteousness of God*” in a form  
which rendered them inexcusable for its  
non-recognition) **Christ is the end of the  
law** (i.e. *the object at which the law  
aimed*: compare the similar expression  
1 Tim. i. 5, “*the end of the commandment*.” Various meanings have been given  
to the word **end**. (1) *End*, “finis,” *chronological*: ‘Christ is the termination of  
the law. So Augustine, Luther, and  
others. Bnt this meaning, unless understood in its pregnant sense, that Christ,  
who has succeeded to the law, was also the  
object and aim of the law, says too little.  
In this pregnant sense Tholuck takes the  
word ‘end,’ *the end in time and in aim*.  
It may be so; but I prefer simply to take  
in the idea of Christ being the end, i.e.  
aim of the law, as borne out by the citations following, in which nothing is said  
of the *transitoriness* of the law, but much  
of the notices which it contains of righteousness by faith in Christ. (2) Clement  
of Alexandria, Calvin, and others, take **end**  
for *‘accomplishment*,’ a sense included in