understood that” ...) **I am speaking to  
you (the) Gentiles: inasmuch therefore**  
(this word, which is not in the received  
text. is read by our oldest MSS.) **as I am  
[the] Apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify mine  
office** (by striving for their conversion  
and edification at all times,—by introducing   
a reference to them and their part  
in the divine counsels, even when speaking   
of mine own people)**, if by any means  
I may** (regarding it as a real service done  
on behalf of Israel, thus to honour mine  
office by mentioning the Gentiles, if this  
mention may) **provoke to jealousy mine  
own flesh** (the Jews), **and may save some  
of them.**

**15.**] **For** (a reason for my  
anxiety for the salvation of Israel: not  
merely for the sake of mine own kinsmen,  
but because their recovery will bring about  
the blessed consummation of all believers.  
Verses 13, 14 should not then be in a  
parenthesis, as sometimes printed) **if the rejection   
of them** (not ‘*their loss,*’ as Luther  
and others, by which the antithesis to what  
follows is weakened) **be** (the occasion of)  
**the reconciliation of the world** (of the  
Gentiles, viz. to God), **what** (‘of what,  
kind,’ in its effect) (**will be**) **the receiving  
of them, but** (the occasion of) **life from  
the dead?—Life from the dead** may be  
variously taken. (1) It may be metaphorical,   
as in ch. vi. 13, and may import,  
that so general a conversion of the world  
would take place, as would be like life  
from the dead. So, more or less, many  
Commentators, who explain it of a joy  
like that of the resurrection. But against  
this interpretation lies the objection, that  
*this is already involved* in *the reconciling*  
*of the world,* and thus no new idea would  
be brought out by the words, which stand  
in the most emphatic position. (2) It  
may mean that ‘life from the dead’ *literally*   
should follow on the restoration of  
the Jewish people; i.e. that the Resurrection,   
the great consummation, is bound up  
with it. So Chrysostom, Origen (who  
says, “Then will take place the receiving of,  
Israel, when the dead also shall receive life,  
and the world from corruptible shall be  
made incorruptible, and mortals shall be  
endowed with immortality”), and many  
others. The objection to this view seems  
to be, that the Apostle would hardly have  
used **life from the dead** thus predicatively,  
if he had meant by it a fixed and predetermined   
*event*;—but that, standing  
as it does, it must be *qualitative*, implying   
*some further blessed state* of the  
reconciled world, over and above the mere  
reconciliation. This might well be designated   
*‘life from the dead,’* and in  
it may be *implied* the glories of the first  
resurrection, and deliverance from the  
bondage of corruption, without supposing  
the words **life from the dead** to be equivalent   
to *the resurrection of the dead.*  
—Stuart well compares Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14,  
which was perhaps before the mind of the  
Apostle.

**16–24.**] *Such a restoration of Israel  
was to be expected from a consideration of  
their destination and history. This is set  
forth in similitudes, that of the root and  
branches being followed out at some length,  
—and their own position, as engrafted  
Gentiles, brought to the mind of the  
readers.*—**Moreover** (a further argument  
for their restoration, following on ver. 11)  
**if the firstfruit be holy, so also is the  
lump** (not here the firstfruit of the *field*,  
as some have understood it, nor does **the  
lump** mean the cake made by the priests  
out of the firstfruits which fell to them,  
Deut. xviii. 4;—but the portion of the  
kneaded lump of dough, which was offered