sentence on sin in former ages in His forbearance, to be placed in question:—to shew,  
that though He did not then fully punish  
for sin, and though He did then set forth  
inadequate means of (subjective) justification,—yet He did both, not because His  
justice was slumbering, nor because the  
nature of His righteousness was altered,—but because *He had provided a way* whereby sin might be forgiven, and He might be  
just. Observe, the facet mentioned *is not  
forgiveness*, or *remission*, as the A. V.  
erroneously renders it, but **passing over**, or  
**overlooking**, which is the work of *forbearance* (see Acts xvii. 30), whereas *forgiveness*  
is the work of *grace*,—see ch. ii. 4:—nor  
do **the former sins** mean, ‘the sins of each  
man which precede his conversion,’ but.  
*those of the whole world before the death  
of Christ*. See the very similar words,  
Heb. ix. 15.

**26.**] This second **shewing forth** is distinguished from that in  
the last verse, as the fuller and ultimate  
object, of which that was a subordinate  
part:—**with a view to the** (or His) **manifestation of His righteousness in this  
present time.** The shewing forth that He  
was righteous throughout His dealings with  
the whole world, by means of setting forth  
an adequate and complete propitiation in  
the death of Christ, was *towards*, formed a  
subsidiary manifestation to, His *great manifestation of His righteousness* (same sense as before,—judicial righteousness, *justice*)  
*under the Gospel*.

**(in order) that he may be** (*shewn to be*:—the whole present  
concern is with the *exhibitions to men* of  
the righteousness of God) **just and** (yet,  
on the other side) **the justifier of him who  
is of** (the) faith in Jesus (him who belongs  
to, stands in, works from, as his standing-point, faith in Jesus: see ch. ii. 8, note, and reff.).

**27–IV. 25.**] JEWISH BOASTING ALTOGETHER REMOVED *by this  
truth*, NOT *however* BY MAKING VOID THE  
LAW, *nor* BY DEGRADING ABRAHAM FROM  
HIS PRE-EMINENCE, *but* BY ESTABLISHING  
THE LAW, *and shewing that Abraham was  
really* JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, *and is the*FATHER OF THE FAITHFUL.

**27.**] **our** (or, **the**) **boasting**, viz. *of the Jews*, of  
which he had spoken before, ch. ti. :—not  
‘*boasting*’ in general, which will not suit  
ver, 29.

**By what manner of law** (is it  
excluded) ? (is it by that) **of works? Nay,  
but by the law** (the rule) **of faith**. The  
contrast is not here between *the law* and  
*the Gospel* as two dispensations, but between the *law of works* and the *law of  
faith*, whether found under the law, or the  
Gospel, or (it' the ease admitted) any where  
else. This is evident by the Apostle proving below that *Abraham was justified*, not by works, so as to have whereof to  
boast, but by faith.

**28.**] The verb implies, not ‘we conclude,’ but **we hold, we  
reckon**: the former is against New Test.  
usage; and has probably caused the change  
in some of our MSS. of **for** into *therefore*,  
by some who imagined that this verse was  
a conclusion from the preceding argument.  
**For we reckon** (as explanatory of the verse  
preceding,—on the other supposition the  
two verses are disjointed, and the conclusion comes in most strangely) t**hat a  
man is justified by faith apart from**(*without*; but more than without—so distinctly without, as to be utterly and  
entirely separate from and independent  
of) **the works of the law** (not *works of law*); and therefore boasting is excluded.

**29.**] In showing how completely