

The Place of Israel in the Scheme of Redemption: As Set Forth in Romans 9-11 Part 1

-
Henry C. Thiessen

We have already seen that the Church at Rome was predominantly Gentile. Paul directly addresses his readers as Gentiles (11:13ff); he includes the Roman Church among the Gentile Churches (1:5–7, 13–15; 15:14–21); and he seeks to establish friendly relations with the Jews in Rome when he reaches the city (Acts 28:17–22). Had there been a very strong Jewish element in the church, he would probably not have thought it possible to make such a contact, for the enmity of the orthodox Jews against their fellows who accepted Christianity would have been a barrier to such a fellowship.

But there was also a Jewish element in the Church. This may be gathered from the large part of the Epistle that is essentially Jewish. Such are the questions about the validity of the law, the nature of redemption, the method of becoming righteous, and the divine choice of Israel. The latter forms the basis of the chapters now before us. Possibly the discussion about the believer's relation to the state, the question of meats, the observing of days, etc., was also especially aimed at the Jewish believers in the Church (chs. 13, 14). It may be, however, that Paul had the Gentiles in mind also in dealing with all these subjects; for as Gentile Christians they read the Jewish Old Testament and generally had the same questions in their minds as the Jewish Christians.

In our approach to chapters 9–11 we should go back to the fact that Paul had represented the Gospel as “to the Jew first” (1:16). At some point in his treatise he must develop this thought. If the Gospel is to the Jew first, then how explain the almost universal rejection of the Gospel by the Jew? Is it not clear that though they once occupied the place of special privilege, they occupy it no more? More than that, seeing that they have rejected their own Messiah, is not their rejection final? But if that is the case, what is to become of the promises made to Israel in the Old Testament? These are the problems that Paul undertakes to solve in these chapters. It should be observed, therefore, that Paul is not writing a defense of himself and his ministry to the Gentiles; the rather is he dealing with these questions in defense of God's ways with Israel.

We may say at once that Paul believes that Israel has been set aside as a nation; that God, Who chose them for a place of special privilege, is justified in setting them aside if He wishes to do so, seeing that Israel was not chosen because of any merit of its own, but because of the elective purpose of God; that Israel itself has caused God to set them aside, seeing that they persist in seeking after righteousness in their own way and that they refuse to accept the righteousness God has provided for them; that individual Israelites may be saved as truly as individual Gentiles, if they accept the Gospel; that the Gentiles have been admitted to all the privileges of the Gospel without acceptance of the law; and that God will yet return to Israel as a nation and fulfill all His covenant promises to them in the Old Testament.

In the study of Paul's argument we may follow a simple outline: The Tragedy of Israel's Rejection (9:1–5); The Justice of Israel's Rejection (9:6–29); The Cause of Israel's Rejection (9:30–10:21); The Extent of Israel's Rejection (11:1–11); The Duration of Israel's Rejection (11:12–32). Paul follows his argument with a matchless Doxology (11:33–36).

I. The Tragedy of Israel's Rejection (9:1-5).

Paul begins a new section at this point. There is no grammatical connection between what precedes and what he now writes. This is due to a lively emotion (Godet), as is seen in the opening verses (1–3). Paul had been accused of hostility toward his own people; he resents the charge and testifies that both his conscience and the Holy Spirit testify that he is deeply concerned about them. Indeed, he has “great sorrow and unceasing pain” in his heart because of them. He could even wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren’s sake, if that were permissible. Robertson argues that the imperfect tense $\eta\upsilon\chi\acute{o}\mu\eta\nu$ is potential. Godet holds that since the wish is expressed in the past tense it could not be, nor was it intended to be, fulfilled. Hodge argues similarly. In order to show, now, how highly he regards his own people, Israel, Paul sets forth their great excellencies.

They were Israelites. This was the new name God gave Jacob, and it expressed the covenant relation in which they had stood in the past. Theirs was the adoption. They had had the place of an adult son in the family of nations. Hodge well says: “As Paul is speaking here of the external or natural Israel, the adoption or sonship which pertained to them, as such, must be external also.... They were the sons of God, i.e., the objects of His peculiar favor, selected from the nations of the earth to be the recipients of peculiar blessings, and to stand in a peculiar relation to God.” Theirs was the glory. Denney takes this to refer to something definite, like the pillar of cloud and fire. Hodge, Godet, Boise, Sanday and Headlam, Robertson, and Moorehead agree with this view. Theirs were also the covenants. This may mean both the several covenants that were made with Israel (Hodge), and the renewal of the original covenants (S. and H.). Theirs was also the giving of the law. That is, they, rather than some other nation, had had it entrusted to them. Theirs was also the service. This undoubtedly refers to the impressive service of the tabernacle and the temple. Theirs were the promises. This refers, no doubt, especially to the promise of the Messiah. Theirs were the fathers. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David—what nation would not be proud of such an ancestry! From them, as concerning the flesh, Christ came. Godet calls attention to the fact that Paul here changes from “whose” to “of whom,” i.e., Christ is *from* Israel, but He does not belong to them exclusively. The Apostle embraces the opportunity at this point to declare that, so far from being *merely* from Israel, Christ is “over all, God blessed for ever.” This was the greatest honor bestowed upon the nation; how could Paul, a fellow Israelite, other than grieve continually that his so highly privileged people were so irresponsible to the Gospel! He is obliged to write of their rejection, but he does so with a broken heart.

II. The Justice of Israel's Rejection (9:6-29).

Let it be kept in mind throughout that Paul believes that Israel has been rejected as a nation. Farther down he states this fact, but here he merely assumes it; it seems too painful a thing for him to put into words. He therefore immediately proceeds to defend the justice of God in their rejection. He does this (1) by showing that God’s choices in the past have been some from among others, without doing any wrong to those not chosen (6–9). From this it follows that He can also set aside those chosen when in His wisdom this becomes necessary. Israel has been rejected; but this in no wise means that His promise has failed, for there is a nominal Israel and also a true Israel. Not all that are of Israel are Israel; nor are all Abraham’s seed just because they are descended from Abraham. In other words, “it is not the children of the flesh that are children

of God; but the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed.” By *children of God* (v. 8), Paul, in this context, undoubtedly means simply in a national and outward sense.

This elective purpose of God is further illustrated in His choice of Jacob rather than Esau (10–13). This is a stronger proof than the foregoing, for both Esau and Jacob had the same father and mother, whereas in the case of Ishmael and Isaac they merely had the same father. Denney says that Paul is not here teaching that God in His sovereignty has predestinated some to eternal salvation and others to eternal perdition, but that “he is engaged in precluding the idea that man can have claims of right against God, and with it the idea that the exclusion of the mass of Israel from the Messiah’s kingdom convicts God of breach of faith toward the children of Abraham.” The choice of Jacob in preference to Esau was not based on works. Godet says, we must distinguish between God’s foreseeing *work* and *faith*, the latter being not merit, “since faith consists precisely in renouncing all merit, in the humble acceptance of the free gift. Faith foreseen is therefore a wholly different thing from works foreseen.... *To accept* and *to merit* are two different things.” Thus God could foresee that Jacob would accept His promises without meriting the blessing (vv. 11, 12). And as for the quotation from Malachi 1:2ff, saying, “Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated” (v. 13), it is clear that Paul here used hyperbole. Luke quotes Jesus as saying: “If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, etc., he cannot be my disciple” (14:26); but Matthew quotes Him as saying on an earlier occasion: “He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me,” etc. (10:37). Paul, no doubt, similarly says, God loved Jacob *more* than Esau. With Godet we hold that although neither Jacob nor Esau had as yet done anything either good or bad, yet God foreknew how each would act with reference to His promises.

We call attention to two quotations on the whole passage. Sanday and Headlam quote Gore thus: “The absolute election of Jacob—the ‘loving’ of Jacob and the ‘hating’ of Esau—has reference simply to the election of one to higher privileges as head of the chosen race, than the other. It has nothing to do with their eternal salvation” (*in loc.*). Ironside likewise says: “There is no question here of predestination to heaven or reprobation to hell; in fact, eternal issues do not really come in throughout this chapter, although, of course, they naturally follow as the result of the use or abuse of God-given privileges.... The passage has to do entirely with privileges here on earth. It was God’s purpose that Jacob should be the father of the nation of Israel, and that through him the promised Seed, our Lord Jesus Christ, should come into the world. He had also predetermined that Esau should be a man of the wilderness—the father of a nation of nomads, as the Edomites have ever been. It is this that is involved in the prenatal decree: ‘The elder shall serve the younger.’”

But the Jew will not readily assent to Paul’s argument thus far. He still is puzzled about the justice of God in thus setting aside Israel. Paul anticipates this persistent objection and undertakes further to prove that God is just in dealing thus with Israel (14–18). He asserts that God is not arbitrary, and proves it by two Old Testament statements. (1) To Moses God had said: “I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion” (Exod 33:19). Paul concludes from this that it “is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy” (vv. 15, 16). Does this mean that God arbitrarily elects to be gracious to some of the unsaved and to condemn those to whom He does not wish to show mercy? Indeed not. An examination of the context from which this statement is quoted reveals the fact that these words were spoken to Moses, when, after he had interceded for Israel’s preservation following the sin with the golden calf, he persisted in asking that God would show

him His glory. In answer to this request God said that He would meet him at least part way, and that He would be gracious to whom He would be gracious, and show mercy to whom He would show mercy (Exod 33:17–19). It was, therefore, to one in God’s favor that God said these significant words. To him that hath, more shall be given. The words indicate God’s justice in giving more to one righteous man than to another, especially if he should ask for more. There is no

question of salvation or of damnation in this statement. The reference to willing and running, consequently, merely means that mere desire and effort are insufficient for the experience of a deeper revelation of God; that God is free to grant or to refuse such a revelation without involving His justice.

The above illustration shows that God may show favor to a good man without becoming unjust. Paul next undertakes to show that God may also show disfavor to an unworthy man without becoming unjust (17, 18). God raised up Pharaoh (ἐξήγειρά σε), i.e., as Sanday and Headlam say, He brought him into the field of history. They show that this Greek word “is used of God in calling up the actors on the stage of history. So of the Chaldeans, Hab 1:16....of the Shepherd for the people, Zech 11:16....of a great nation and kings, Jer 27:41 [LXX].... It expresses just what the context demands, that God had declared that Pharaoh’s position was owing to His sovereign will and pleasure—in order to carry out His divine purpose and plan.” So also Godet. Let it be noted that the question of eternal salvation does not enter into the account. God took a wicked man and brought him into history. It was an occasion of occasions for Pharaoh. If he had obeyed God and had let the people go, he would have become one of the honored sovereigns of the ancient world. Compare Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus in the later history of the people. But God knew that he would not obey Him; and so He brought him into history that He might show His power in him and that God’s name might be published abroad in all the earth. The hardening was at first his own act. Five times it is said that he hardened himself (7:13, 14, 22; 8:15, 32; 9:7), for 4:21 and 7:3 are a prophecy, before the time when it is said that God hardened him (9:12). Even after that hardening there was apparently some remnant of freedom left, for he again is said to have hardened himself (9:34, 35). At length, as if by way of a terrible retribution, God is said five times to have hardened him (10:1, 20, 27; 11:10; 14:8). The idea is the same as that in Romans 1, where God is said to have given man up after he had wilfully quenched the light that he had, and had resisted the first rebukes of God’s mercy. Thus Israel was a wicked and rebellious nation, and God was just in giving them up at this time.

Paul has not set forth the details concerning the hardening of Pharaoh, but merely declared the fact that God hardened him. This may easily lead to the view that if that is the principle of God’s dealings, then there is no human responsibility. Paul next takes up this point and shows that such a supposition is unwarranted (19–24). To the argument that then God cannot find fault and that then no man can withstand His will, Paul replies that it is very much out of place for a piece of clay to criticize the potter for making it into one vessel or another. Does not the owner and workman have a right to do what he wishes with the clay? If he wishes to take a suitable piece of clay and make of it a vessel unto honor and of another a vessel unto dishonor, may he not do it? Notice that, as Godet remarks, it is not a question about the *production* of the clay and consequently not about the *qualities* it possesses, but solely one about the *use* made of it by the potter. Has God no right to choose Israel for a place different from that of Esau? Has He no right to set aside a people of special privilege if it please Him, especially since they are what they are? Has He not a right to show His wrath and make His power known upon the vessels of wrath,

fitted (κατηρτισμένα, meaning *to equip as a vessel that is putting out to sea*, not ἐτοιμάζειν, as in v. 23, which denotes the beginning of this moral development) to destruction?

Israel as a rebellious nation is here in mind; but the symbolism is drawn from God's dealings with Pharaoh (v. 17). Israel as a nation was rebellious and stiffnecked; they were fitted unto destruction both by their own conduct and by God's hardening of them. But that Paul is still speaking about Israel as a nation and not of individual "fitting," is evident from the fact that he immediately turns to say that God had mercy on some from both Israel and the Gentiles (v. 24). In this way God made known His wrath and power upon Israel as a disobedient and rebellious people: by

rejecting them nationally and permitting judgment to come upon them (cf. Matt 22:7); and also made known the riches of His glory upon those who responded to His mercy, both Jews and Gentiles. Godet remarks that in the word προητοίμασεν are contained both the ideas of foreknowledge and foreordination. Paul supports his contention that God had rejected Israel and had admitted the Gentiles by predictions from the Old Testament, saying that He would do this (9:25–29). First he shows that God had planned to call the Gentiles (vv. 25, 26). Though, as Grant remarks, these passages from Hosea (2:23; 1:10) are directly spoken to Israel, yet in principle they apply to the Gentiles also. Then Paul shows that though Israel should increase and become even as the sand of the sea, only a remnant should be saved, and that it is only the Lord's grace that the whole nation is not extinguished. The quotations are from Isaiah 10:22ff; 1:9. Thus it is clear that the rejection of Israel is national and not individual; that it was divinely foreseen and predicted; and that it is perfectly consistent with the justice of God.

Although Paul has thus far argued that God is just in rejecting Israel solely on the ground of His sovereignty, seeing that the rejection does not debar from personal salvation, he next argues that there is a valid reason for this rejection. This reason is found in Israel itself. Therefore Paul next proceeds to this topic.

III. The Cause of Israel's Rejection (9:30-10:21).

Paul first states the more outward and visible cause (9:30–33) and then the more inward and basic cause (ch. 10). Let us look at the two somewhat carefully.

1. Their wrong method of seeking righteousness (9:30–33). Paul's question: "What shall we say then?" (v. 30) harks back to 9:6. "The explanation of the fact not being found by saying, God has annulled His word; what, then, is the solution of the enigma?" Thus, after setting aside the false solution, Paul invites his reader to seek with him the true one; and this solution he expresses in v. 31 " (Godet). That is, Paul here sets forth the positive reason for the rejection of Israel. He begins with an astounding assertion: "The Gentiles, who followed not after righteousness, attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith." "What to all human probability was the most unlikely to occur, has actually taken place" (Hodge). Paul does not mean that the Gentiles did not follow after morality, but merely that they did not follow after righteousness in the religious sense of the word, justification. Note that they did not seek it as such, but they "attained to" (κατέλαβεν, better, *grasped, seized, Word Pictures*) it. Paul continues, If this perplexes you, let me add that they seized it *by faith*. Over against this he remarks: "But Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works." He does not say that they sought for a "righteousness of the law," but, as Godet says, Israel had law for its real object and expected righteousness to flow from it. If Israel had been truly occupied with moral

righteousness, the law would have been a pedagogue to lead them to Christ; but they sought only the letter and not the spirit. The result was that Israel did not even attain to that law, that is, “a certain mode of being, fitted to determine the will. The reference is to the true mode of justification” (Godet). The reason was, they sought it not by faith, but “as it were by works.” “St. Paul wishes to guard himself from asserting definitely that ἐξ ἔργων was a method by which νόμον δικαιοσύνης might be pursued. He therefore represents it as an idea of the Jews, as a way by which they thought they could gain it.... The ὡς gives a subjective idea to the phrase with which it is placed, but the exact force must be determined by the context” (S. and H.). The effect of their wrong method of seeking righteousness ended in their stumbling at the stone of stumbling and rock of offence, i.e., at their Messiah, Who brought to them the true righteousness, that of faith. Paul enforces his assertion with a quotation from Isaiah 28:16, where the people are represented as stumbling

at the stone of stumbling which God will lay in Zion, and by faith in Whom they may be saved.

2. Their ignorance of spiritual truth (ch. 10). “Paul, overwhelmed with the sadness of the subject, pauses for a moment (10:1, 2) to emphasize his grief” (S. and H.). He does not merely exult in the aforementioned excellencies of his people (cf. 9:4, 5), but heartily desires and earnestly prays for their salvation. He then explains their rebellion against God’s righteousness as due to ignorance. They are ignorant of four things: of the fact that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness; of the freeness of salvation; of the universal character of salvation; and of the prophetic revelation. These must next be looked at somewhat in detail.

(1) Of Christ as the end of the law for righteousness (10:1–4). The apostle declares that Israel has a zeal for God, but it is not according to knowledge (κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν). They did not couple with their zeal real discernment of things. Yet they should have had this knowledge, for Abraham, their forefather, had been justified by faith and not by works (Rom 4), and God had spoken of this kind of justification by the prophets (Isa 50:8, 9; Hab 2:4). Seeking their own righteousness, they did not *subject* themselves to the righteousness of God. Τοῦ Θεοῦ is, no doubt, a subjective genitive. Here we have the true way of becoming righteous: it is by submitting one’s self to the righteousness of God. This indicates that true righteousness is imputed, bestowed from without, not earned. Paul supports his claim that righteousness is no longer, if it ever was, possible by the law, by declaring that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness. The word τέλος may mean either *end* or *aim*. The latter idea is expressed in Galatians 3:24, where Paul says the law is a *pedagogue* to bring us to Christ; and that meaning is possible here. But the context seems to require the former meaning: with the death of Christ, the whole regime of law has come to an end. It is, therefore, out of place any longer to seek to be justified by works of the law. Israel was ignorant of this spiritual truth, and for this reason failed to accept it. Consequently, God had to reject the nation.

(2) Of the freeness of salvation (10:5–11). This is another thing of which the Jews were ignorant. Paul uses language from Moses to set forth the two kinds of righteousness. (a) The righteousness of the law (v. 5). Moses declares “that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby.” This is a quotation from Leviticus 18:5: “Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and mine ordinances; which if a man do, he shall live in them.” The point here is not that no man can do what the law prescribes, but that in case he did it, it would be his own righteousness and not God’s, which is next described (Stifler). It would seem to be pure tautology to say that a man that does the righteousness of the law lives in it. (b) The righteousness of faith (6–8a). Paul here quotes from Deuteronomy 30:12–14 some things that are

difficult to understand. “Paul does not say that Moses describes this righteousness; he does not set Moses against Moses. He says the righteousness itself speaks; it is self-descriptive” (Stifler). Godet says: “The Apostle selects certain words out of this passage and uses them to describe the characteristics of the new righteousness by faith as he conceives it.... It is noticeable that St. Paul does not introduce these words on the authority of Scripture (as v. 11), nor on the authority of Moses (as v. 5), but merely as a declaration of righteousness in its own nature.” Hodge says: “There is nothing in the language of the apostle to require us to understand him as quoting Moses in proof of his own doctrine. It is, indeed, more in accordance with the spirit of the passage, to consider him as merely expressing his own ideas in scriptural language, as in v. 19 in this chapter, and frequently elsewhere.” So also Sanday and Headlam, whose work should be consulted for Paul’s use of Old Testament quotations.

In Deuteronomy the words, “Who shall ascend into heaven?” mean, the law is not far off; it is not in heaven, so that you must ask, Who will go up to bring it down? It is very near and not hard to attain (S. and H.). Paul uses

these words to mean: You who desire to reach the heaven of communion, say not, How shall I ascend to it? (as if by your obedience); for it has already been done, and to ask how is to deny that Christ has done it (Godet). To deny that Christ has already provided righteousness is the same as if we tried still to bring him down. Likewise, to ask, Who shall descend into the abyss? is the same as to deny that Christ has already completed redemption. Indeed, as the law was near at hand in Moses’ day, so the word of the Gospel is now nigh the Jew and Gentile, and both need only to accept it with the heart and confess it with the mouth. This word Paul preached, and men needed only to “confess with” the “mouth Jesus as Lord,” and “believe” in the “heart that God raised him from the dead,” and they would be saved. For belief with the heart is unto righteousness, and confession with the mouth is unto salvation. Why then continue to seek righteousness by works of law when it can be had by faith? Paul supports his argument with Isaiah 28:16: “Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame.” But Israel was ignorant of the freeness of salvation and so rejected it. Consequently God had to reject them as a nation.

(3) Of the universal character of salvation (10:12–18). This is the third thing of which Israel was ignorant. Paul here (a) reminds his readers of the world-wide purpose of God. There is no difference between Jew and Greek: “for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him.” Here he gives the reason for the similarity of method for all (S. and H.). Paul further quotes Joel 2:32, exactly as in the LXX: “Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” The name has universal value; therefore it ought to be universally proclaimed. (b) He testifies to the world-wide proclamation of the Gospel (vv. 14–18). Sanday and Headlam explain vv. 14–21 thus: “This section seems to be arranged on the plan of suggesting a series of difficulties, and giving short decisive answers to each: (1) ‘But how can men believe the Gospel unless it has been fully preached?’ (v. 15). *Answer*: ‘It has been preached as Isaiah foretold’ (v. 15). (2) ‘Yet all have not accepted it’ (v. 16). *Answer*: ‘That does not prove that it was not preached. Isaiah foretold also this neglect of the message’ (vv. 16, 17). (3) ‘But perhaps the Jews did not hear’ (v. 18). *Answer*: ‘Impossible. The Gospel has been preached everywhere.’ (4) ‘But perhaps they did not understand’ (v. 19). *Answer*: ‘That again is impossible. The Gentiles, a people without any real knowledge, have understood. The real fact is they were a disobedient, self-willed people’” (*in loc.*). Calvin and Hodge hold that Paul here seeks to justify his preaching to the Gentiles; but Paul puts the argument very differently. The Gospel having been preached universally, the Jew, too, has heard it. The Jew had neglected God’s method of obtaining righteousness; but in order to

convict him of guilt in this neglect, Paul must show that he had had opportunity to know and that his ignorance is culpable. The conditions to calling upon the Lord had been fulfilled, and the Jew wilfully rejects the privilege. Thus God had to reject Israel because they were ignorant of the universal character of the Gospel, and because they were wilfully ignorant of its message.

(4) Of the prophetic revelation (10:19–21). This is another aspect of Israel's ignorance: they did not know the revelation in their own Scriptures that the Gentiles were to come in and that they themselves were to be set aside. Moses had already predicted that God would provoke Israel to jealousy with that which is not a nation, with a nation void of understanding (in Deut 32:21). And Isaiah had waxed very bold in declaring that God was found by them that sought Him not, and made manifest unto them that asked not of Him (in Isa 65:1). But of Israel Isaiah could only say: "All the day long did I (stretch) spread out my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people." Israel should have known from their own Scripture that the Gentiles would come in and that they would be set aside. The reason is found in their disobedience and gainsaying, and not in God's injustice.

The Place of Israel in the Scheme of Redemption: As Set Forth in Romans 9-11 Part 2

-

Henry C. Thiessen

(Concluded from the January-March Number, 1941)

IV. The Extent of Israel's Rejection (11:1-10).

We may quote Godet and Sanday and Headlam for the transition to the present section. Godet says: "The apostle has proved in ch. 9 that when God elected Israel, He did not lose the *right* one day to take the severest course against them, if it should be necessary. Then he has showed in ch. 10 that *in fact* there was a real ground and moral necessity for this measure. He proceeds, finally, to establish in ch. 11 that it was taken with all due regard to the position of this people, and within the limits in which it should subserve the salvation of mankind and that of Israel themselves." Sanday and Headlam say: "St. Paul has now shown (1) (9:6–29) that God was perfectly free, whether as regards promise or His right as creator, to reject Israel; (2) (9:30–10:21) that Israel on their side by neglecting the Divine method of salvation offered them have deserved this rejection. He now comes to the original question from which he started, but which he never expressed, and asks, Has God, as might be thought from the drift of the argument so far, really cast away His people? To this he gives a negative answer, which he proceeds to justify by showing (1) that this rejection is only partial (11:1–10), (2) only temporary (11:11–25), and (3) that in all this Divine action there has been a purpose deeper and wiser than man can altogether understand (11:26–36)." We shall now show that Paul teaches that the rejection of Israel is only partial.

1. We have the evidence of Paul's own case (v. 1). As has just been said, looking back at the argument thus far, Paul realizes that the readers may conclude that God had completely and finally broken with all Israel; therefore the

then (Godet). His answer is an emphatic No. He cites the fact that he himself is an Israelite, that is, he is a member of the covenant people; that he is of the seed of Abraham, i.e., not a proselyte (Denney); that he is of the tribe of Benjamin, “the one tribe which with Judah mainly represented the post-exilic theocratic people” (Denney). Saul, the son of Kish Israel’s first king, was also a Benjamite (1 Sam 9:1, 2). Let no Israelite think that *he* would argue that Israel has been set aside in its totality! Let the Christians know that his conversion is proof of the fact that individual Israelites may yet be saved!

2. We have the evidence from Scripture and present fact (2–6). First Paul makes the positive assertion: “God did not cast off his people which he foreknew.” Surely not the *true* Israel-only the merely nominal Israel. For a time He has rejected them, but God can wait and He will yet show that the rejection was not final, as Paul here shows that the rejection was only partial. So Godet, Alford, Sanday and Headlam. Stifler says: “In the words ‘his’ and the phrase ‘whom he foreknew’ there is a double proof that Israel, though for the present rejected is not cast off.” Paul next introduces a quotation from the passage of the Scriptures which contains the history of Elias (Godet), to show the distinction between the apparent and the real situation, then and now. When Jezebel threatened to kill Elijah, after he had killed the Baal prophets, he fled to Mt. Horeb. There in the still small voice God spoke to him. Elijah spoke in his utter discouragement, saying that they had killed God’s prophets, digged down His altars, and that he alone was left and they seek his life (1 Kgs 19:10, 14). But Elijah was mistaken. The heavenly answer said to him: “I have left for myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal” (1 Kgs 19:18). Thus, Paul exclaims, there is also today “a remnant according to the election of grace” (v. 5). He hastens to add, “But if it is of grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace” (v. 6). This point needed to be emphasized, in the light of Israel’s continued inclination to the view that acceptance is on the

basis of works. This remnant is, no doubt, “the small portion of the Jewish people who in Jesus have recognized the Messiah” (Godet). It is an election “of grace” (subjective genitive, grace is active in the choice). The election is not to physical preservation (as Godet holds), but to salvation. Grace operates in the case of those who accept the Gospel. Acceptance of the Gospel is not works, but the appropriation of a provision made for their salvation. Paul is not contrasting the physical destruction of the bulk of the nation with the physical preservation of a remnant of the nation, but the nominal Israelites with the true Israelites. God has rejected the nominal Israelites, but still accepts the true Israelite, the one who accepts Christ and the Gospel.

3. The explanation as to the disobedient (7–10). What then? in v. 7, means, if Israel is not really rejected, what then? What has happened? (Godet). Hodge says: “The Jews zealously and perseveringly sought after righteousness. They failed, however, as the Apostle says, because they sought it by works.” τούτο is emphatic; they found self-righteousness and ended up in religious exclusiveness, but *righteousness* they did not obtain. But the remnant obtained it, those in Paul’s day and since then who have believed from among Israel. The rest were hardened. Sanday and Headlam say: “They have not failed because they have been hardened, but they have been hardened because they have failed; cf. 1:24ff.” It does not say, however, by whom they have been hardened (Hodge, S. and H.). “This hardening affected the understanding as well as the heart. It was both blindness and obduracy” (Hodge). Paul quotes from Isaiah 29:10 that God sent them this judicial hardening. He also uses David’s language in Psalm 69:22, 23; 35:8; 28:4 with reference to Israel. “Those who in his days were the enemies of the spiritual life of the people are represented in the Apostle’s days by the Jews who have shut their ears to the message” (Sanday

and Headlam). He quotes David thus: “Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompense unto them: let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow thou down their back always.”

Thus Paul has shown that the rejection of Israel is only partial. The nation as a nation has been rejected; not only so, but it has even been hardened. God Himself gives them a spirit of stupor, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this very day. The justice of the rejection and the cause of it had already been set forth. But the individual Israelite may still be saved. In His grace God accepts individual Israelites today as well as individual Gentiles. The Apostle makes it clear, however, that those who are saved during this age are saved by grace and not by works.

V. The Duration of Israel’s Rejection (11:11-32).

Looking back over the condition of the mass of his people, Paul is brought once again to the difficulty of verse 1. He states it once more, this time in a way that mitigates its severity and hints that the fall of Israel is not the last thing concerning them to be taken into account (Denney). The question arises, why is the bulk of the nation set aside? Could God not have continued to carry on as He did in Old Testament times, when there also was a nominal Israel and a true Israel? Paul now proceeds to the discussion of this question.

1. The divine aim in the rejection of Israel (11–15). The Apostle speaks of a two-fold purpose in the rejection of the nation: (1) To facilitate the progress of the Gospel among the Gentiles, and (2) to provoke Israel to emulation by the conversion of the Gentiles. Let us briefly study these purposes.

(1) To facilitate the spread of the Gospel among the Gentiles (11a, b). “Did they stumble that they might fall? God forbid.” What is the force of ἵνα here? Is it purpose or result? Should the question read: “Did they stumble in order that they should fall utterly,” i.e., so as never again to be restored? Or: “Did they stumble with the result that they should utterly fall?” The latter, no doubt. So

Sanday and Headlam. They hold that if it is purpose, then the passage “ascribes stumbling as a deliberate act undertaken with the purpose of falling. We cannot here any more than elsewhere read in a Divine purpose where it is neither implied nor expressed, merely for the sake of defending an arbitrary grammatical rule.”

Trench says: “παράπτωμα is sometimes used when it is intended to designate sins not of the deepest dye and the worst enormity. One may trace this very clearly at Gal 6:1, our Translators no doubt meaning to indicate as much when they rendered it by ‘fault’; and not obscurely, as it seems to me, at Rom 5:15, 17, 18. Παράπτωμα is used in the same way, as an error, a mistake in judgment, a blunder, by Polybius.... But this milder subaudition is very far from belonging always to the word.... There is nothing of it in Eph 2:1.... παράπτωμα is mortal sin, Ezek 18:26; and the παραπεσεῖν of Heb 6:6 is equivalent to the ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν of 10:26.” By their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles.” Says Godet: “It is through the fault of Israel that it has been impossible for the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles to be carried out except by God’s breaking with the chosen people.” Furthermore, the early preachers were so full of the Spirit that they must preach; and since the Jews did not receive their message they turned elsewhere (Acts 11:20; 13:46, 47). In other words, Israel, so far from being a medium for the salvation of the Gentile, had become a hindrance. If God was going to save the Gentile, He had to set aside Israel.

(2) To stir Israel to emulation by the conversion of the Gentiles (11c–15). εἰς τὸ παραζηλώσαι αὐτούς denotes the more remote end for which the conversion of the Gentiles becomes a means (Godet). “If their fall is the riches of the world, and their loss the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness?” Here Paul presents one reason why the Gentiles should be interested in the conversion of Israel: if their fall has meant so much for Gentile salvation, their restoration will mean so much more! The “riches” means the state of grace into which the Gentiles have been introduced by faith in a free salvation (Godet). Their “loss” (Greek, ἥττημα αὐτῶν) does not mean numerical diminution, as Godet, Boise, and Stifler hold, but *worse estate* or *loss*, as Hodge holds. Alford agrees with Hodge against Godet, saying the latter’s interpretation would spoil the argument “*a minori ad majus*.” Hodge declares that numerical diminution is against the meaning of the word.

Paul next tells us that part of his object in working for the conversion of the Gentiles is to stir Israel to emulation of their faith (13–15). “Let it be understood that I am speaking to you Gentiles” (v. 13). This seems to prove that the Roman Church was predominantly Gentile; for in the preceding two and a half chapters the Jews are invariably spoken of in the third person, and in the half chapter now beginning the Gentiles are constantly spoken of in the second person (S. and H.). In other words, Paul is endeavoring to win the Gentiles to an appreciation of the Jews and to induce them to help bring them to Christ. Paul is addressing them because he is an apostle to the Gentiles. He would glorify his ministry, i.e., he would lead as many Gentiles to Christ as possible. But he also has a more remote end in view: “If by any means I may provoke to jealousy them that are my flesh, and may save some of them.” This is one reason why he desired the conversion of the Gentiles. “If the two events, the salvation of both classes, were intimately related, there was no ground of ill feeling on either part” (Hodge). “No doubt he does not deceive himself; he does not reckon on a conversion of Israel *en masse* before the last times; but he would like at least, he adds, to save some of them, as firstfruits of the harvest” (Godet). “For if the casting away of them is the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?” How is this the “reconciling of the world”? “Inasmuch as it brings down that wall of law which kept the Gentiles outside of the divine covenant, and opens wide to them the door of grace by simple faith in the atonement” (Godet).

Denney says: “In 2 Cor 5:19 the world’s reconciliation is the act of God in Christ; but it was an act which for the mass of mankind only took effect when Jewish unbelief diverted the Gospel to the Gentiles. So their restoration will produce a tremendous conversion of the Gentiles. This benefit is to accrue to the Gentiles as Gentiles, and not to Gentile Christians. The words seem to mean that the future conversion of Israel will mean the conversion of the Gentile world. The reference to “life from the dead,” cannot refer to the resurrection of the dead, i.e., the first resurrection, for that is not the point in the argument. Hodge says nowhere else is the phrase ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν used of the literal resurrection, and if Paul had intended a reference to the resurrection, there is no reason why he should not have employed the familiar words, ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν (p. 575). Boise agrees that the reference is to the spiritual life that will come to the Gentiles. But Sanday and Headlam think the meaning is the “‘general resurrection’ as a sign of the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom.” So also Stifler.

2. The admonition to humility and faithfulness on the part of the Gentiles (16–24). In this section Paul turns aside to admonish the Gentiles who have been so enriched by Israel’s fall. They ought to be humble and faithful in view of Israel’s character (v. 16). “If the firstfruit is holy, so is the lump: and if the root is holy, so are the branches” (v. 16). “By the offering of the

firstfruits, the whole was considered to be consecrated; and so the holiness of the Patriarchs consecrated the whole people from whom they came” (S. and H.). So say also Godet, Hodge, Stifler, and Denney. Ironside takes the “root” to refer to Abraham, and the “lump” to “the regenerated remnant in Israel” (p. 139). But Sanday and Headlam say: “That the meaning of the ἀπαρχή is the Patriarchs (and not Christ or the select remnant) is shown by the parallelism with the second half of the verse, and by the explanation of St. Paul’s argument given in v. 28 ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς πατέρας.” The same idea is expressed in the words: “If the root is holy, so are the branches.” The Patriarchs are the roots; the individual Israelites are the branches.

The Gentiles ought further to be humble and faithful because of the blessings they have inherited from Israel (vs. 17, 18). “Salvation is of the Jews” (John 4:22), and the Gentile needs ever to remember his obligation to the Jew. Paul understates the case here by the figure known as *meiosis*, when he says: “Some of the branches were broken off.” He means the majority, but not all. He makes allowance for those who now turn to Christ, as continuing in the true patriarchal line. He next represents an act against nature: A wild olive branch is grafted in among the remaining branches, and is made partaker with them of the root of the fatness of the olive tree. Godet says: “According to the reports of some travelers, the course taken in the East is sometimes that supposed by the figure of the Apostle. A wild young branch is engrafted in an old exhausted olive, and serves to revive it. But there is another more natural answer, viz., that the apostle uses the figure freely and without concern, to modify it in view of the application. What proves this is the fact that in v. 23 he represents the branches broken off as requiring to be engrafted anew. Now this is an impracticable process taken in the strict sense.” We may add that Paul himself tells us that this is an unnatural process (v. 24); indeed, the whole strength of the argument depends upon this fact. The idea is simply that of analogy: As a scion is engrafted into another and has no independent life, but derives all its origin from the root, so the Gentiles are introduced among the people of God, not to confer but to receive good (Hodge). The figure shows the continuation of the people of God, at least from Abraham down through the present Gentile age. In view of the fact that the Gentiles have thus come into the possessions of the Jews, they ought not to boast against the branches; for they do not bear root, but the root bears them.

Then also the Gentiles ought to be humble and faithful because of the judgment that has befallen disobedient Israel (vs. 19–21). The Gentile Christian might easily think that since God has cut off Israel to make room for him, God’s preference of the Gentile is plainly evident. Paul admits the fact, but reminds the Gentiles that Israel was broken off because of their unbelief, and that he was received and kept only by faith. There is not the least cause for highmindedness in this, but rather plenty of occasion for fear. The reason for this is the fact that if God did not spare the natural branches, Israel, He will much less spare the Gentile if he fails to keep the conditions on which he was accepted. The Gentiles will, indeed, be cast off somewhat similarly when Christ returns, when salvation will again go forth directly to the Jews.

Finally, the Gentiles ought to be humble and faithful in the light of God’s dealing with both them and the Jews (vs. 22–24). Paul now points out God’s two ways of dealing with men: Toward them that fell, He dealt in severity; toward the Gentiles, He dealt in kindness (χρηστότης is moral goodness, integrity, in Rom 3:12; elsewhere it means benignity, kindness, Rom 2:4; 2 Cor 6:6; Gal 5:22; Col 3:12; Titus 3:4; Rom 11:22; Eph 2:7. This is the complete list according to Thayer). But the Gentile can only then hope for a continuation of God’s goodness toward him if he himself continues in that goodness. If he does not continue in it, he too will be cut off. Well

does Godet remark in this connection: “It is but too clear to any one who has eyes to see, that our Gentile Christendom has now reached the point here foreseen by St. Paul. In its pride it tramples under foot the very notion of that grace which has made it what it is. It moves on, therefore, to a judgment of rejection like that of Israel, but which shall not have to soften it a promise like that which accompanied the fall of the Jews.” Let it be remembered, that Paul speaks of Gentile Christendom and not of individual members of Christ. But Israel has the promise, that when it comes out of its unbelief, God will graft it back into its own olive tree. This may look like an impossible prospect to man; but God is able to do it, just as He is able to bring back to life the dry bones of Ezekiel’s vision (ch. 37). If God can engraft a branch from a wild olive tree into a good olive tree and make it partake of the fatness and fruit of that good tree, an act wholly contrary to nature, can He not much more graft back the natural branches into their own olive tree? The question is its own answer. Because of God’s dealings with both Jews and Gentiles the Gentile ought to be humble and faithful.

3. The prophecy of Israel’s restoration (vs. 25–29). We have in the preceding paragraph passed by one element in v. 24. Paul does not merely argue that God *can* graft in the natural branches, but he prepares the way to say that He *will* do this. The “how much more” is an argument *a fortiori*. Godet says: “When the hour has come, their restoration will be accomplished still more easily than the incorporation of the Gentiles.” But thus far Paul has merely shown the moral congruity of the event which he is now contemplating; he announces the fact positively and as a matter of revelation (v. 25). We note the separate elements of this enunciation.

(1) The assertion of Paul (vs. 25, 26a). The form of introduction here used always indicates that Paul is trying to make a deep impression in what follows: “For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits, that a hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and so all Israel shall be saved.” He says this in order that his readers may not think the fall of Israel is complete and final. Paul speaks of the facts concerning Israel as a “mystery.” “Among the heathen μυστήριον was always used of a mystery concealed, with St. Paul it is a mystery revealed” (S. and H.). A part of this mystery is the “hardening” that God has permitted to come and even judicially sent to *some* of Israel (vs. 7, 17). Godet says: “*In part* has a *numerical* sense, though Calvin applies it to the *degree* and Hofmann to a restricted time of hardening.” The Reformers generally were opposed to the doctrine of a Millennium. See quotations from Luther in Hodge. Having thus reasserted the idea that the “hardening” is partial, Paul proceeds to say that it is temporary. Calvin tried to make ἄχρι οὗ (*until*)

mean the impossible *in order that*; others have interpreted the words to mean *as long as*, i.e., *while* the Gentiles are entering. Godet, however, argues that the phrase could mean *as long as* only with the present indicative, and that with the aorist subjunctive *until* is the only possible meaning. He also holds that the expression, “the fulness of the Gentiles,” denotes “the totality of the Gentile nations passing successively into the church through the preaching of the Gospel.” This does not mean that all the Gentiles will ultimately be saved; it merely means that the “hardening” of Israel will continue until the number of the Gentiles whom God is calling out for His name (Acts 15:14, see also 15–18), has come in, i.e., into this olive tree of which he has been speaking. Thayer agrees with Godet that the above phrase means *until*.

If this be the correct interpretation, then no one can know how soon God’s favor will be withdrawn from the Gentiles and He will again turn to Israel as His special people. It is one of

His secret decrees. But whenever that time comes, “all Israel shall be saved.” This certainly does not mean that all the Israelites who have ever lived will be saved; for death decides the issues of life. Nor does it merely mean the “remnant according to the election of grace” that is now accepting Christ (v. 5). Nor yet does it mean every individual Israelite that will live when Christ takes the Church to Himself; for the Old Testament prophetic books as well as the Revelation teach that there will be a great sifting of the nation during the Tribulation and that only a remnant of those then living will actually be saved. Godet, Hodge, and Sanday and Headlam hold that it means the nation as a whole. That is true, if we keep to the idea that Paul is here speaking of the rejection of Israel as a nation and therefore also of the restoration of Israel as a nation. But it is possible that he is more particularly thinking of the spiritual salvation of all such as will mourn for Christ when He comes and will repent (Zech 12:10–14; Rev 1:7). Indeed, it appears from various prophecies (e.g., Ezek 20:33–44; Zech 13:7–14:9), that the majority of Israel living when Christ comes to earth will be destroyed by judgments. It is then only the nation that is left after these purging judgments that will be saved.

(2) The predictions of the Old Testament (vs. 26b, 27). “As it is written” in Isaiah 59:20; 27:9, quoted freely from the LXX, though the only important change is the substitution of ἐκ Σιών for ἔνεκεν Σιών in the LXX; the Hebrew reads “to Zion.” In any case, the coming of the Messiah is presupposed. He cannot come *out of* Zion until He has first come *to* Zion. Since the deliverance consists in turning away ungodliness from Jacob, the reference is not to the first coming of Christ, but to the second. At the first coming they rejected Him; when He comes again they will accept Him. Paul next alludes to the new covenant which God will make with them. Stifler says this “seems to be a condensation of Jer 31:31–34.” Boise says, “This use of αὐτή pointing to what directly follows and to the idea contained in a dependent clause, is found elsewhere in N.T. Greek.” The “new covenant” will be made whenever (ὅταν indicates that the time is uncertain) He shall take away their sins. Even Hodge says: “This national conversion is also predicted in Zech 12:10, and in many other passages of the Old Testament.”

(3) The standpoints from which to consider Israel (vs. 28, 29). In these verses Paul sums up the argument of the preceding verses. From the standpoint of the Gospel, they are enemies. Godet says, this means only in a passive sense. In this sense, they are an object of hatred, i.e., of the just wrath of God. Once having determined not to abandon the law and their monopoly founded upon it, they needed to be struck with blindness, so that they might not discern Jesus as their Messiah. Otherwise a Judaized Gospel would have hindered the offer of salvation to the Gentiles. These are true words by this French expositor. From the standpoint of the election, they are beloved for the fathers’ sake. This is not “according to the election of grace” now, but God’s act in choosing Israel in Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Paul justifies his teaching concerning the future restoration

of Israel by saying, “The gifts and the calling of God are not repented of.” The “gifts” probably refers to the moral and intellectual aptitudes with which God endows a man; the Greeks, the Romans, and the Phoenicians, had each their special gifts—so also did Israel. The “calling” refers to God’s choice of the nation in their forefathers. In other words, God is not sorry that He has chosen and endowed Israel as He has. He will yet put those gifts to use and finish His work in and through them.

4. A general view of God’s plan regarding both Israel and the Gentiles (vs. 30–32). Again we notice that there was a strong Gentile element in the Church at Rome. Paul addresses these Gentiles thus: “As ye in time past were disobedient to God, but now have obtained mercy.” The

“time past” carries us back to the contents of chapter 1. They had first had their time of disobedience. But now they had obtained mercy, that is, they had now come into the place of nearness to God. The aorists denote the whole time of disobedience and the entire time during which they received mercy. Godet says: “But at what price? By means of the disobedience of the Jews. We have seen this indeed: God needed to make the temporary sacrifice of His elect people in order to disentangle the gospel from the legal forms in which they wished to keep it imprisoned.” “Even so have these also now been disobedient, that by the mercy shown to you they also may now obtain mercy.” The *vôv* is temporal both times. The aorists again denote this whole time of Israel’s disobedience. The Apostle insists that the fact that they have been rejected as a nation, because they have become disobedient as a nation, yet leaves a responsibility with the Gentiles: they are to seek their salvation. However there is a question about the exact place of the *ἴνα*. See Godet, Hodge, and Sanday and Headlam for a discussion of this question. “For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all.” This shutting up is the giving over of the Gentiles spoken of in Romans 1:24, 26, 28; the hardening of Israel is the judicial blinding of Israel for the present age (11:7, 17, 25). The last part of this statement does not mean universal salvation, as DeWette, Farrar, and many others hold, at the end of the age; but rather that in their respective ages God has mercy nationally upon both Jews and Gentiles—upon the Gentiles now, upon the Jews in the age to come.

THE DOXOLOGY (11:33–36). Paul has concluded his argument, vindicated the Divine justice and mercy, and shown that even the reign of sin leads to a beneficent result. He now, carried away by the contrast between the apparent injustice and the real justice of God, bursts out in a great ascription of praise to Him (S. and H.). He exclaims: “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!” Sanday and Headlam hold that all three genitives, *riches*, *wisdom*, and *knowledge* are coordinate; but Godet, we think more properly, holds that *πλούτου* alone goes with *βάθος*, and then *σοφίας* and *γνώσεως* are expansions of *πλούτου*. “How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out!” His *judgments* are His judicial decrees, seen in those severe dispensations of God in punishing the Gentiles (ch. 1) and the Jews (ch. 11). In other words, though Paul has definitely vindicated God in His dealings with both Israel and the Gentiles, there remains an element of mystery still about these dealings. Much the same idea is repeated in the second element: “His ways past tracing out.” His *ways* are His methods of acting.

In the following verses (vs. 34, 35) he supports his claim that the ways of God are inscrutable by a quotation from Isaiah 40:13. In Isaiah these words are used of the wonders of creation; Paul here uses them of God’s government of the world. Man has neither come to know (ingressive aorist) the mind of the Lord, nor been in a position to give Him advice as to what He should do. Much less has any one ever been able to give to God, so as to merit a gift in return. The Jew is not able to impose upon God any obligation whatsoever. The last part of the quotation is from Job 41:11.

Paul ends the discussion with a statement of his philosophy of the universe (v. 36). “For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things.” Hodge rightly says: “It is God as God, the Godhead, and not the persons of the Trinity in their distinct relations, that is here brought into view.” Godet says: “God’s absolute independence, man’s total dependence in everything which might be a matter of glory to him: such is the thought of this verse, the termination of this vast survey of the plan of God. The first preposition, *ἐκ*, *of*, refers to God as Creator.... The second, *διὰ*, *through*, refers to

the government of mankind... The third, εἰς, *to*, refers to the final goal.” In other words, God is the Creator, Governor, and Goal of the universe. Everything is of Him, is governed by Him, and will ultimately fully redound to His glory. Alford says of verses 33–36 : “The sublimest apostrophe existing even in the pages of inspiration itself.” As a natural outburst of the heart Paul ends by saying: “To him be the glory for ever. Amen.” Every true student of the divine purpose and program will join him in this exclamation of praise.