he says, “When He says that Elias shall  
come and restore all things, He speaks of  
Elias himself, and of the conversion of the  
Jews which shall then take place,”—and  
shortly after calls him *the Forerunner of  
the Lord’s second coming*. Similarly Theodoret   
and Gregory of Nyssa; so also  
Augustine, saying, “That in the last times,  
before the judgment, the Jews (by means  
of Elias who shall expound the law to  
them) shall believe in Christ, is a thing  
much asserted in the sayings and hearts of  
the faithful.” Similarly most of the fathers  
and schoolmen. Jerome, however, on Isa. xi.  
11, says, “By no means, as our Judaizers  
say, shall all Israel be saved at the end of  
the world when the fulness of the nations  
shall have come in; but we understand all  
this of the first advent.” Grotius and  
Wetstein believe it to have been fulfilled  
after the destruction of Jerusalem, when,  
as Eusebius relates, thousands of the circumcision   
became believers in Christ. But  
Tholuck has shewn that neither could  
the number of Gentiles received into the  
Church before that time have answered  
to the *fulness of the Gentiles*, nor those  
Jews to *all Israel*, which expression accordingly   
Grotius endeavours to explain  
by a Rabbinical formula, that “all Israel  
have a part in the Messiah;” and this  
saying he supposes the Apostle to have  
used in a spiritual sense, meaning the  
Israel of God, as Gal. vi. 16.—The Reformers   
for the most part, in their zeal to  
impugn the millenarian superstitions then  
current, denied the future general conversion   
of the Jews, and would not reeognize it  
even in this passage:—Luther *did so recognize   
it*, at one time, but towards the end of  
his life spoke most characteristically and  
strongly of what he conceived to be the impossibility   
of such national conversion.—  
Calvin says: “Many understand this of the  
Jewish people, as if Paul said that they  
should be restored to religion as before; but  
I extend the name of Israel to all the people  
of God, in this sense, when the Gentiles  
shall have entered in, the Jews also from  
their defection shall betake themselves to  
the obedience of the faith, and thus will be  
completed the salvation of all the Israel of  
God, which must be compounded of both:  
but so that the Jews shall have the prior  
place as being the firstborn in the family of  
God.” Bengel and Olshausen interpret **all  
Israel** of the *elect believers of Israel:*—  
Beza, Tholuck, and many others, hold that  
the words refer, as I have explained them  
above, to a national restoration of Israel to  
God’s favour.—I have not mixed with the  
consideration of this prophecy the question  
of the restoration of the Jews to *Palestine,*   
as being clearly irrelevant to it: the  
matter here treated being, *their reception   
into the Church of God*):

**as it is written**] This quotation appears  
to have for its object to shew that the  
Redeemer was to come *for the behoof of  
God’s own chosen people.*—For **out of Sion,**  
the Septuagint have ‘*for the sake of Sion,*’  
the A.V. ‘*to Zion.*’ The Apostle frequently   
varies from the Septuagint, and a  
sufficient reason can generally be assigned  
for the variation: here, though this reason  
is not apparent, we cannot doubt that such  
existed, for the Septuagint version would  
surely have suited his purpose even better  
than “*out of,*” had there been no objection  
to it. It may be that the whole citation is  
intended to express the sense of prophecy  
rather than the wording of any particular  
passage, and that the Apostle has, in the  
words “*out of Sion,*” summed up the prophecies   
which declare that the Redeemer  
should *spring out of Israel.* The Hebrew  
and A.V. have, ‘*and unto them that turn  
from transgression in Jacob.*’

**27. when I take away**] from another place in  
Isa. (ref.),—hardly from Jer. xxxi. 34, as  
Stuart thinks;—and also containing a  
general reference to the character of God’s  
new covenant with them, rather than a  
strict reproduction of the original meaning:  
of any particular words of the prophet.  
“How came the Apostle, if he wished  
only to express the general thought, that  
the Messiah was come for Israel, to choose  
just this citation, consisting of two combined   
passages, when the same is expressed.  
more directly in other passages of the  
Old Testament? I believe that the term  
‘*shall come?*’ gave occasion for the quotation:   
if he did not refer this directly