being *precision*, it is much more probable   
that the Apostle should have written  
both clauses in their present formal parallelism,   
and that the second should have  
been early omitted from its seeming superfluity,   
than that it should have been inserted   
from the margin. Besides which,  
the words do not correspond sufficiently  
with those of the first clause to warrant  
the supposition of their having been constructed   
to tally with it. –**But** (directing  
attention to the *consequence* of the admission,   
*the election* **of grace**) **if by grace**  
(the selection has been made), **it is no  
longer** (when we have conceded that, we  
have excluded its being) **of** (arising out:  
of, as its source) **works: for** (in that case)  
grace no longer becometh (literally, i.e.  
becomes no longer—loses its efficacy and  
character as) grace (the freedom and  
spontaneous character, absolutely necessary   
to the idea of grace, are lost, the act  
having been prompted from without):—  
**but if of** (arising out of, as the cause and  
source of the selection) **works, no longer**  
**is it** (the act of selection) **grace: for** (**in  
that case**) **work no longer is work** (the  
essence of work, in our present argument,  
being ‘*that which earns reward,*’ and the  
reward being, as supposed, the election *to  
be of the remnant*,—if so earned, there can  
be no admixture of divine favour in the  
matter; it must be *all earned, or none:*  
*none conferred by free grace, or all*).  
These cautions of the Apostle are decisive  
against all attempts at compromise between  
the two great antagonist hypotheses, of  
salvation by God’s free grace, and salvation   
by man’s meritorious works. The  
two *cannot be combined* without destroying  
the plain meaning of words.—If now the  
Apostle’s object in this verse be to guard  
carefully the doctrine of election by free  
grace from any attempt at an admixture  
of man’s work, *why* is he anxious to do this  
*just at this point?* I conceive, because he  
is immediately about to enter on a course  
of exposition of the divine dealings, in  
which, more than ever before, he *rests all  
upon God’s sovereign purpose*, while at  
the same time he shews that purpose,  
though apparently severe, to be one, *on the  
whole, of grace and love.*

7.] **What  
then** (what therefore must be our conclusion   
from what has been stated? We have  
seen that God hath not cast off his own  
chosen nation, but that even now there is  
a remnant. This being so, what aspect do  
matters present ? This he asks to bring out  
an answer which may set in view the rest  
who were hardened)? **That which Israel  
is in search of** (viz. righteousness, see  
ch. ix. 31; x. 1 ff.), **this it** (as a nation)  
**found not, but the election** (the abstract,  
because Israel has been spoken of in the  
abstract, and to keep out of view for the  
present the mere individual cases of converted   
Jews in the idea of an *elected  
remnant*) **found it;**

**8.**] **but the rest  
were hardened** (not *‘blinded*.’ This meaning,   
frequently given to the word here  
occurring in the original, is now generally  
acknowledged to be a mistake. **Were  
hardened** is passive, and implies *God as  
the agent*), **according as it is written** (if  
we are to regard these passages as merely  
*analogous instances* of the divine dealings,  
we must remember that the *perspective of  
prophecy*, in stating such cases, *embraces  
all analogous ones*, the divine dealings  
being self-consistent,—and *especially that  
great one*, in which the words are most  
prominently fulfilled),—**God gave them a  
spirit of stupor, eyes that they should  
not see, and ears that they should not  
hear; unto this present day.**—These last  
words are not, as in A.V., to be separated  
from the citation, and joined to “*were*