IV. 1. ROMANS. 29   
   
   
 AUTHORIZED VERSION, AUTHORIZED VERSION REVISED.   
 of the Gentiles also: is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes,   
 80 seeing it is one God, of the Gentiles also: 39 seeing that   
 which shall justify the cir- ° God is one, which shall justify the °¢   
 cumcision by faith, and un- circumcision by faith, and the un-   
 circumeision through faith. cireumcision through faith.   
 31 Do we then make void we then make void the law through Do   
 the law through faith? faith ? God forbid: nay, we esta-   
 God forbid : yea, we esta- blish the law.   
 blish the law. IV. 1 What then shall we say   
 IV. } What shall we say   
 then that Abraham our   
 Sather, as pertaining to the   
   
 Jewish boasting is excluded, St. Paul pur- safely say that the Apostle never argues of   
 poses to take\*the ground of their own law, law, abstract, in the sense of @ system of   
 and demonstrate it from that. He will precepts,—its attributes or its eflects,—   
 shew that God is not (the God) of Jews but always of THE Law, conerete,—the   
 alone, but of Gentiles, and that this very law of God given by Moses, when speaking   
 point was involved in the promise made of the Jews, as here: the law of God, in   
 to Abraham, by believing which he was as faras written in their consciences, when   
 justified (ch. iv.), and therefore that it speaking of the Gentiles: and when in-   
 lies in the very root and kernel of the law cluding both, the law of God generally,   
 itself. But, as often elsewhere, he passes His written as well as His unwritten will.   
 off from this idea again and again, re- —Many Commentators have taken this   
 curring to it however continually,—and verse (being misled in some eases by its   
 eventually when he brings forward his place at the end of the as standing   
 proof text (in chap. iv. 17), Abraham's by itself, have gone into the abstract   
 faith, and not this fact, has become the grounds why faith,does not make void the   
 leading subject. 30 seeing that] lite- law (or moral obedience) ; which, however   
 rally, if least (if are to hold to what is true, have no place here: the design being   
 manifest as a result of our former argu- to shew that the law itself contained this   
 ment) God is one, which shall justify the very doctrine, and was founded in the pro-   
 circumcision (literally, Jews, after the mise to Abraham on a covenant embracing   
 analogy of chap. ii. 26) by (out of, as the Jews and Gentiles,—and therefore was not   
 preliminary condition,—the state out of degraded from its dignity by the doctrine,   
 which the justification arises) and but rather established as a part of God’s   
 the uncireumcision (the Gentiles) through dealings,—consistent with, explaining, and   
 (by means of their) faith. Too much explained by, the Gospel. IV. 1—5.]   
 stress must not be laid on the difference of Abraham hinself was justified by faith.   
 the two prepositions (see ver. 22 and —The reading and punctuation of this   
 note). The former expresses the ground verse present some difficulties. Ax to the   
 of justification, taken, by, or out former, I may remark that the verh hath   
 of faith: the latter the means whereby found is omitted by our oldest MS. autho-   
 the man lays hold on justification, his rity, and placed variously by others.   
 faith: the former is the objective ground, Omitting it, the sentenee will stand,   
 the latter the subjective medium. 31.) “What shall we say then concerning   
 But again the Jew may object, if this the Abraham, our father as pertaining to the   
 case, if be the ground, and Faith the flesh?” If the verb be retained, the   
 medium, of justification all, punctuation may be, “ What shall we say   
 or uncircumcised, surely the law is set then? that Abraham, our father, as per-   
 and made void. That this is not so, the taining to the flesh, hath found” (righte-   
 Apostle both here asserts, and is prepared ousness, or some advantage over Gentiles) ?   
 to shew by working out the proposition of This has been adopted by Grotius and   
 ver. 29, that the law itself belonged to a others of some authority. Another mode,   
 covenant whose original recipient was jus- slightly differing, may be, “ What then?   
 tified by faith, and whose main promise shall we say, that,’ &c. But as Tholuck   
 was, the reception and blessing of the Gen- well remarks, both these methods of punc-   
 tiles. the law] i.e. the law of Moses, tuating would presuppose that St. Paul   
 4s every where in the Epistle. We may had appeared to give some reason in the