

Review: Romans 6:1-8:39—SECOND MAJOR CORNERSTONE for our foundational, godly edification as a member of the church, the body of Christ.

- ESTABLISHMENT IN THE DOCTRINE OF OUR SANCTIFICATION BY GRACE THROUGH FAITH—the goal: the complete knowledge of our sanctified standing before God “in Christ” which enables us to “live unto God.”

- The Ultra-simplistic Breakdown of all that is contained in Romans 6, 7, and 8:

(slide #31)

- These 3 chapters teach us our basic understanding and appreciation of our godly sanctification, and you’ve basically got 4 major sections...

1) **Romans 6:1-13** - which teaches us the most basic and fundamental issue when it comes to beginning the doctrine of our sanctification: the doctrine of our being “*dead to sin*” and “*alive unto God*.”

2) **Romans 6:14 - 7:25** - which teaches us that the effectual working of our sanctified position “in Christ” requires that we be “*not under the law, but under grace*.”

3) **Romans 8:1-13** - which teaches us a detailed analysis of what it means to “*walk after the Spirit*” and not “*after the flesh*” as well as the details of what it means to God to be spiritual or carnal and the mechanical means to deal with sin, the flesh and carnality. It gives you a graphic, and almost line by line description of the actual way in which walking after the Spirit works, so that all your thoughts are consistent with that, the way in which you put it into practice is consistent with that, and the appreciation for this being the way in which the fruit of the Spirit is brought forth is understood properly as well.

4) **Romans 8:14-39** - which begins the appreciation of the capstone of our sanctification as it is Biblically understood, and that is that you are going to be able to live unto God as a son. It begins our sonship education in earnest.

- Those are your 4 major doctrinal issues, that when they are all put together in their totality give us the complete and effectual working of our sanctified position “in Christ” so we can actually start to LIVE unto God in the details of our lives.

- Therefore as far as the bulk of the comprehension is concerned of our sanctified position “in Christ” you’ve really got it all at the end of chapter 8 verse 39 once those 4 major components are properly dealt with.

- And they all have their own proper sense & sequence to them.

- The next thing to do is to see the major components that make up this second major section of our sanctification of our not being *under the law, but under grace*.

- The Major Components of Romans 6:14-7:25. (slide #32)

1) Rom. 6:14-15—Here the apostle Paul once again sets before you the next big issue to understand and appreciate in the proper education of your godly sanctification. And that major doctrinal issue is that you are *not under the law, but under grace*. And because of that statement and what it naturally provokes, all of the erroneous thinking about the law gets dealt with by 2 major Objections and 2 major Misunderstandings.

- And this is the next natural thing that has to be dealt with because of what we have just come to understand and appreciate about our sanctified position in Christ, that we are *dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord*.

- And this doctrine will naturally build on all that doctrine.

- But this is not just another building block of information (it is that) but more than that: this being not *under the law, but under grace* is to be the next natural thing because any attempt to get grace abounding in your functional, sanctified life by trying in any way whatsoever to utilize the law in doing it will not only FAIL in ever producing *fruit unto holiness*, but utilizing the law to be the thing you are to now live by will take your sanctified life and put it to DEATH!

- Often times people will think that if we are to be good, holy, and righteous, the immediate thing that comes to mind (especially to the flesh) is that God wrote down His good, holy and righteous standards in the law that He gave to Moses on Mount Sinai.

- And so that must be the way to now live or *walk in newness of life*, right?!?! WRONG!!!!!!

- There is a natural penchant or bend in your natural man to attempt to *walk in newness of life* by walking under that law! And even if you don't think that is so, you need to recognize it, acknowledge it, and understand and appreciate it as being the truth of the matter.

- But you must be told and taught that *walking in newness of life* can NEVER be accomplished by getting under the law.

- Therefore, Rom. 6:14-15—Declaration that we are "*not under the law, but under grace*" and the erroneous objection in connection with that.

2) - Rom. 6:16-23—The erroneous thinking of the 1st Objection of not being under the law, but under grace attacked, exposed, and dismissed as the error that it is. (Two parts: {16-18, and :19-23})

- (slide #33)

- **1st OBJECTION:** The law is my only compelling reason for not sinning and for doing good.

- The first part of the corrective doctrine (6:16-18) set forth the truth that GRACE provided you with just as compelling of a reason to not sin and to do good as the law ever did.

- But because of *the infirmity of your flesh*, the second part of the corrective doctrine (6:19-23) set forth the truth that GRACE is not merely “just as” compelling or equally as compelling as the law, but GRACE is far greater and far more excellent and far more compelling to restrain you from sinning and to motivate you to do good as the law ever was!

- And the powerful ‘punch’ or ‘kicker’ at the end of the corrective doctrine was to introduce the issue of you now being able to produce *fruit unto holiness* (which is the greater compelling reason) - because what you are able to produce by GRACE is *holiness* unto God, i.e., it is that which is complete and total acceptance, delight, joy, and pure pleasure to Him.

- But even more than that, the *everlasting life* and *eternal life* issue brought up in (:22 and 23) gives you the additional concept that the *fruit unto holiness* you are able to produce by grace through faith in your sanctified position “in Christ” is something that your Heavenly Father wants around Him and wants around Him forever! He will never forget it! It will forever adorn His personal presence!!!

- That fruit unto holiness produced by grace will never cease to make your Heavenly Father happy, joyful, pleased, and delighted for ever and ever!

- (back to slide #32)

- Each of those “*know ye not*” is in direct connection with the stated truth of us being *not under the law, but under grace* and the startling reaction that that provoked in the ensuing question of (:15), “*What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace?*”

- These first two major objections God has the apostle Paul deal with constitute the two most natural and most common objections that the issue of not being *under the law, but under grace* generates in the thinking of someone’s mind.

- And then, after those two objections are dealt with, following that there are two ‘root’ type Misunderstandings that are often deeply set in most people’s minds that are really at the core or source of where those first 2 objections came from.

- What Paul is doing is rooting out all of the erroneous thinking that will hinder and prevent a saint’s sanctified position in Christ from ever being able to be put into effect. Especially to prevent putting your now fully developed understanding of being *dead to sin* and *alive unto God* and to *walk in newness of life* from ever being put into effect.

- And really, an objection is usually raised because of some kind of a misunderstanding.

- And so you naturally have these misunderstandings dealt with after the objections are dealt with and expelled.

- Once the objections come out (being provoked out of your thinking), then once those objections are seen having no grounds whatsoever to stand on, then God comes along and says, “Now let’s really get to the root of this matter.”

- “And the whole reason why you had these objections in the first place is because you had some real false ideas and misunderstandings about some very fundamental things in connection with the law in the first place.”

- And that’s what the last two issues from 7:7-12 and 7:13-25 deals with.

- That’s why Paul asks those questions like he does: (7:7 & 7:13). He doesn’t really treat them so much as objections, he treats them as, “Is this really what you’re thinking?”

- And the order in which all these objections and misunderstandings about the law occurs is very important, and each one will, as it is dealt with, as it is exposed as the erroneous thinking that it is, and then dismissed as having any credit at all, each one will then provoke you to ask about the next issue—that is, as each issue effectually does its job, it leaves you with, ‘Oh, well what about _____ this?’

- And that doctrine is in the order it is in because God knows exactly how the human mind works!

- And when we finally get to the end of chapter 7 and verse 25, God expects to have completely (by the effectual working of what He has done) uprooted all the misunderstandings about the law that naturally exists in people's minds when it comes to sanctification.

- And all we're after right now in this basic outline is to see that there is a deliberate, progressive and organized development of ridding the mind of erroneous understanding about the law.

- This, again is the power of Biblical sense & sequence.

4) Rom. 7:7-12—1st Misunderstanding in regard to now being *not under the law, but under grace* and the corrective doctrine regarding it.

5) Rom. 7:13-25—2nd Misunderstanding in regard to now being *not under the law, but under grace* and the corrective doctrine regarding it.

- And then, at the end of verse 25 of chapter 7, you're left with only ONE alternative; there's only one, legitimate, viable alternative for putting our sanctified position in Christ into practice: GRACE.

- And it's not that being "*under grace*" is just an option, it is the ONLY THING LEFT!!! And therefore it is the only thing that will work.

- Romans 7:1-6 (read)

- **The 2nd Objection** to not being *under the law, but under grace* attacked, exposed, and dismissed as the error that it is.

Romans 7:1

I Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

- First of all, if our outline is correct and these first 6 verses of chapter 7 do form a package of corrective doctrine to a 2nd objection to being *not under the law, but under grace*—an objection that is based upon some erroneous thinking about the law as a means of putting our sanctified position in Christ into effect, then the next thing we should do is take an overall look at this package of doctrine and see if it is made up of component parts. (The steps to take to root out this erroneous thinking.)

- And maybe it is, and maybe it isn't, but before dealing with the details of the passage, that's what we need to look for and identify.

- Romans 7:1—The first component part.

- Just as we have seen previous to this throughout the way in which God is presenting the information to us through the apostle Paul, we usually get a statement that declares in a single sentence what the main objective of the whole package of doctrine is going to be all about.

- And because this not only begins a new chapter in the book of Romans, but also because of the use of the opening terminology, “*Know ye not,*” it should cause us to realize that this is exactly what is happening here, too.

- Wherefore, just as we have already become accustomed to back in chapter 6 and verse 16 (as well as other previous passages), my understanding is that here in chapter 7 and verse 1, the apostle Paul gives us another statement in question form that lays out, in general, the issue that is going to be dealt with—as well as kind of encapsulating the entire objective of the corrective doctrine contained in the whole package of verses 1-6.

- Therefore the question of Romans 7:1 is designed to draw our attention upon the next, natural objection that would be raised and now brought to the surface (so to speak) in view of the original corrective doctrine that was presented in Rom. 6:14

14 For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.

..... and in view of the erroneous thinking of the 1st Objection being completely attacked, corrected, and dismissed.

- So contained in Rom. 7:1 is the 2nd Objection based upon the erroneous thinking about the law being the means by which a Christian is supposed to put his sanctified, functional life in effect. (or, to do what :4 said, *even so we also should walk in newness of life.*)

- Romans 7:2-3—The second component part.

- Following the English words of logic, since verse 2 begins with the word “*For*” - which is not so much a ‘for’ of further explanation and amplification, but is a ‘for’ used to introduce the ground or reason for something previously stated—and as such it is commonly used as the first word of the sentence, verse 2 is, therefore, the beginning of something.

- It is the beginning of an illustration that is used as a legal appeal to the ground or reason why the 2nd Objection of erroneous thinking is wrong and truly erroneous.

- That is, it gives the legal basis for what was previously stated in the question of verse 1.

- Again, paying attention to those English words of logic that help us out so much, we see that verse 3 begins, “*So then if*,” - and continues on dealing with the legal illustration upon which will hang the basis upon which the 2nd Objection of erroneous thinking will get dismissed.

- Therefore, my understanding is that verses 2 & 3 go together to form the legal grounds of which the apostle Paul appeals to attack and begin to correct the erroneous thinking of the 2nd Objection.

- Romans 7:4-6—The third component part.

- Verses 4, 5, & 6 all begin with 3 different words of logic, but all three are terms that are used to form the corrective doctrine that emerges from the marriage illustration of (:2-3) and finally make the personal application of the corrective doctrine to effectually work within the inner man of any person who held the erroneous thinking about the law presented in (:1) of this 2nd Objection.

- Verse 4 begins a summary application of the previous information concerning the marriage illustration— “*Wherefore ...*”

- Verse 5 begins with an “*For*” of further explanation and further explanation to that issue.

- Verse 6 begins with a “*But now*” as an applied conclusion of the corrective doctrine that fully dismisses the 2nd Objection as having no legal basis or no legs to stand on (so to speak) at all.

- Now, if that basic component structure to Rom. 7:1-6 is clearly seen, then we can begin dealing with the details of this 2nd Objection.

- Romans 7:1—The 1st Component = Setting forth the 2nd Objection of erroneous thinking about the law being the means of functionally living unto God and producing *fruit unto holiness* in my sanctified position “in Christ.”

- And, just as we had to do with the last package of corrective doctrine that went from chapter 6 verses 16-23—just as it was critically imperative that we had a very, very clear understanding and appreciation (a very finely defined understanding) of what that 1st Objection was—which was critical to properly grip all the corrective doctrine that was brought to bear upon it—so it is here, too.

- Before going any further into the corrective doctrine, we must first and foremost get a firm grip on just what it is that is being objected to about the law, or else the steps to correct it won't have the ‘punch’ they are supposed to have; and the power contained in the application just won't ever make the deep-rooted inroads (so to speak) in your inner man that it is supposed to make.

- And the result will be that there will still be roots left to grow back into more errors!

- Therefore, when we read (:1), what is this 2nd Objection?

Romans 7:1

I Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

- Simply put, this objection has to do with “*how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth.*”

- And if you know exactly what that ‘meaneth’ then there is no problem.

- But if your thinking just hit a brick wall, then maybe we need to do some clear and proper defining of just what is being objected to here about the law.

- The first thing that jumps off the page is this “Know ye not” - therefore, the first thing we should recognize (since we have had this expression several times already) is that this is something that you (or at least someone—the one’s being addressed in the context) should already know.

- And it is something that should already be known.

- Paul is going to begin the corrective doctrine by giving us a concept that is perfectly suited to properly deal with this whole 2nd Objection.

- And by beginning with a “*know ye not*” we are to understand that this is not a new concept. No. Rather it is something that we should already be aware of, and something that we should already have a frame of reference for.

- He may use it in a different way and in a different context, but the basic concept is something that we do know about.

- And, as we have seen several times before, this “*know ye not*” expression is designed to make sure that you understand something so that you can, later on, apply it to yourself.

- And it is done in a way that purposefully and pointedly makes you ACCOUNTABLE to acknowledge the truth of what you are being taught so that the meaning of it, and the significance of it, can, at the right time, and for the right reasons, be personally applied in the details of your life.

- And therefore before anything else is said, you need to acknowledge this first, initial, concept in the corrective doctrine and make sure you see the reality of that before moving on.

- “*Know ye not*” is giving you some information concerning the TRUTH of the matter in connection with yourself!

- And this is one of those times where God is taking you to task, so to speak, to be either accountable to already know this concept or this information before you get here, or else holding you accountable to go and get the proper information you need to clearly understand what is going on here.

- So you need to ask yourself, “Do I fully have a grip on what I am being told that I should already know? And on the basis of that, do I really know for sure what the thing is that is being objected to here about the law?”

- If not, then we need to do a little work on that issue in order to have a clear grasp of the concept Paul is presenting us with here in Romans 7:1-6.

- Before moving on, however, I just want to make one observation that is not exactly on the subject, but that is something germane to our verse.

- We have in (:1) - “*Know ye not, brethren, ...*”

- “*brethren*” = (avdelfo,j = a brother) - used only 1 other time by Paul (1:13).

- This is another one of those terms that usually takes a beating by most modern Bible correctors.

- It is usually laughed at or scoffed at as being an archaic and out of date way of saying ‘brother’ in the plural: ‘brothers’

- And, in fact, the NIV and the NRSV (the modern English translations that boast to be easier to read and more accurate than the KJV) both have the word ‘brothers’ used here in Rom. 7:1.

- But interestingly enough, THE BIBLE (AV) never one time uses the term ‘brothers’ (pl.) - even though the KJ translators had it readily available.

- “brother” = 367x

- “brother’s” = 35x

- “brothers” = 1x

- Therefore, in the excellency of older English (not OE) there must be a difference between ‘brothers’ and “*brethren*” - and there is!

- OED = The standard English plural, down to 1600, was *brethren*. *Brothers*, after its early appearance in Layamon, is not quoted again till the end of the 16th c., when it is used by Shakespeare indiscriminately with *brethren*. In the 17th c. *brothers* became the ordinary form in the literal sense; *brethren* being retained in reference to spiritual, ecclesiastical (church), or professional relationship.

- The critical shade of meaning between brothers and *brethren* is one of

- Whoever these “*brethren*” are, we are supposed to be able to appreciate that they have some kind of special and important relationship to the issue being presented.
- And my understanding and appreciation is that, the obvious relationship is that they are justified members of the church, the body of Christ.
- But what we’re after is the ‘not-so-obvious.’ Therefore there is something more to understand about these “*brethren*” and the way in which they are related—not just to each other—but, in the context, to the issue of this 2nd Objection that is being raised.
- At this point, since we have already been able to recognize that (:1) is designed to present us with the 2nd Objection to our not being *under the law, but under grace*, we need to clearly define just what that objection is.
 - So far, it is something that we (or at least someone) is supposed to already know—because of that first “*Know ye not.*”
 - And the “*brethren*” makes us appreciate that there is a special relationship that is being looked at—or at least there is a connection between this 2nd Objection and these “*brethren*” who are closely related to it.
 - And it would stand to reason then that the Objection is stated in the information contained in the last phrase—“*how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?*”
- But the problem (if it is one) with this last phrase is that Paul doesn’t explain anything about this Objection—he just states it as if you already know what he’s talking about.
 - And, in fact, because of the “*Know ye not*” he really does expect you to already know what he’s talking about.
 - He doesn’t explain the Objection of (:1) in the following verses, he just goes right on to present an illustration that is designed to be the platform on which he will attack this erroneous thinking and then dismiss it by making the proper application in (:4-6).
- So what happens if you don’t clearly understand and appreciate what this 2nd Objection is? How do you go about clearly defining just what this Objection is if you don’t already “*know*” what is being talked about?

- First of all, in order to find out what a component of Biblical and doctrinal information is all about—to clearly identify it and define it—when it is not especially dealt with or explained on in the verse itself: there are a number of ways in which you go about finding that clear definition that will better flesh out this 2nd Objection.

- One thing you can do is to look at the immediate preceding verses & context to see if there is anything there that either you missed, or that stands out as a way in which this issue/concept can be connected with the previous one.

- And in our case, we would have to look at Romans 6:14, where the statement sits that is being objected to in the first place— and on down through the end of the chapter that all dealt with the 1st Objection. (6:14-23)

- But when you do that, it seems that that 1st Objection is really pretty well a self-contained issue. That is, when it ends in 6:23, there doesn't seem to be any 'loose ends' hanging around.

- That 1st Objection that the law is my only compelling reason for not sinning and for doing good, is fully dealt with and it seems to have a wholeness or completeness to it that really sets it aside as a completed thought and completed issue.

- So that kind of rules out going back to the immediate verses and context to find out what this 2nd Objection is all about.

- Note: It also rules out the possibility of Paul simply rehashing or rewording the 1st Objection—No—he's not restating what he's already taught—this is something entirely different from that 1st Objection, even though it naturally arises in your thinking when the 1st Objection gets dismissed, and especially in view of that original statement of (6:14—that we are *not under the law, but under grace.*)

- Another thing you can do is to go to the end of the immediate section that you are dealing with—because sometimes as a body of information gets concluded, the original concept or issue is brought out as all the components of the argument gets summed up and brought to bear on it, and it sheds light on the original concept.

- But when you look down into (:5-6), even though we find some terms and phrases that may be a little puzzling right now, there really isn't anything there that addresses this objection in a way that would cause us to better define what the 2nd Objection is about.

- If anything, the phrase, "*the motions of sins which were by the law*" in (:5) and the issue of us serving in "*newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter*" in (:6) only serves to tell us that there is something more about the law that we should have already understood before we ever got here.

- All these factors would come along and tell me that we don't have a rehashing of what we've already been over, nor is it something that would be a natural, further development of that previous issue.

- Therefore this would lend itself to tell me that this is a completely different objection.

- Then, the 3rd thing you can do, if you can't define the issue from the preceding passages, and you can't find clues in the conclusion that would make this 2nd Objection "click" in your thinking, then you have to think about that there is a 'hole' somewhere in your understanding (here, about the law), before you ever got to this point that would naturally cause this to not be a well-defined and clear objection in your thinking now.

- And again, you should realize that back there in the original statement and objection—in 6:14 when this whole thing began, there's more than just the issue of objecting on the basis of the erroneous thinking that the law is my only reason for restraining sin and doing good.

- But Rom. 7:1 gives us some additional help to this issue.

- Notice that there is something special about this verse.

- What grammatical feature does (:1) have that none of the other vss. have that we've been dealing with since we started the doctrine of our sanctification back in 6:1?

- A: The parenthesis— "*(for I speak to them that know the law,)*"

- This is a great example of how God had thought out and built into His word, features within it that aid you in being able to know where to go to find the information that you're lacking—He doesn't leave you in a lurch!

- Part of the genius of what God has done in putting the Bible together is that He has built into His word the capacity within the various forms of doctrine or the components that make up that “form” of doctrine, where it is likely that these ‘holes’ in your understanding might arise, He has built into it the capacity for you to grab hold of something that is said within that component and it makes it so that you can “*go ye and learn what that meaneth.*”

- So when you look at (:1) - you should ask yourself, “Why is that parenthesis sitting there?”

- “*(for I speak to them that know the law.)*”

- Why does Paul have to say that?

- You should know that by the use of *brethren*, and then that being followed by this parenthesis which gives a further description of just who these *brethren* are that Paul is addressing, that this is a specialized group of individuals—individuals that have a particular relationship to that law!

- Therefore, by what God has the apostle Paul say in that parenthesis, He identifies just exactly where it is that this Objection comes from, and what it’s all about!

- In fact, this parenthesis is a good example of where, with the apostle Paul, or even with someone in God’s program with Israel (like the prophets) - or anywhere in God’s word where what He is saying is for a particular group of people, it tells you that this isn’t for just anybody or just everybody.

- And therefore, it tells you that this particular group that is being addressed—they’ve got a particular problem that specifically needs to be addressed, and some others in the audience do not necessarily have that problem.

- And that’s what you’ve got here. That’s why this parenthesis is here.

- This 2nd Objection is a very particular problem and it is very specifically directed.

- Which means that there is going to be a particular kind of thinking that’s going to generate a particular kind of objection about the law (and what 6:14 said about it) that needs to be addressed.

- Maybe not everyone is going to come up with this objection, but enough of them will so that it's got to be dealt with.

- That may not seem like a very big step, but it really is—because that starts to narrow down the potential options as to what this Objection really is.

- Because it's not an objection that just 'any old' member of the church, the body of Christ (on the basis of what 6:14) says, is going to come up with.

**- YOU HAVE TO “KNOW THE LAW” TO COME UP
WITH THIS OBJECTION! -**

- Now, that brings up the next question: What in the world does “knowing the law” mean?

- Because there's a whole bunch of ways that you can “*know*” something.

anywhere, - And the Greek (ginw,skw) isn't going to get you

because you're not going to get to the bottom of what this 2nd Objection is by a word study in Greek!

- Ginosko can be used in a whole bunch of ways, too!

- Fully appreciating the context will give you far more than what a word's meaning in Greek will ever give you.

- When Paul uses that expression, *them that know the law*—that is not a phrase or an expression that simply refers to knowing that the law exists.

- Because everybody he's writing to knows that the law exists!

- So, obviously, it's not that generic.

- Nor is it simply referring to Israelites, or the Jews. Granted, they know the law better than most—and granted, they are undoubtedly the one's who would come up with this objection more likely than anybody else would.

- But if that's all Paul is after, he simply would have said, (*for I*

- And Paul has done something just like that, previously, back in Romans 2:17.

17 *Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God,*

- So when Paul wants to focus his attention upon the people of Israel for simply being the people of Israel, that's what he does—he calls them exactly what they are.

- But that's not what he's done here.

- Again, granted, Jewish members of the church, the body of Christ that are in Rome when this epistle was first penned and received are the most likely members in the church at Rome that were going to come up with this objection—but Paul doesn't simply call them 'Jews of the body of Christ' - because that's not all Paul is after!

- In fact, that's not really what he's after at all.

- He's after what it is in a Jew, in particular, (though not exclusively, but more likely than not), what it is in one that makes him a 'knower of the law.'

- In other words, he's after what that expression means to him!

- He's after some unique-type thinking that an Israelite would naturally have about the law.

- And there is a unique-type thinking that they would have about it by virtue of, in a sense, what it constituted.

- John 7- (This may not stand out like a sore thumb or a red flag) - but here the Lord is talking to unbelieving Israelites—and you need to look at something He says here in connection with what He's doing regarding the arrival of the climatic stage in Israel's program—and the things that He's doing and saying that are all designed to bring that to bear upon the people of Israel. (accountability factor)

- And in that context the Lord brings up the issue of Moses—and even mentions the law by name - but what we're after is what He says to them about Moses and a particular issue in God's program with Israel, that God had Moses do something special with.

- In the context, the Lord is speaking in the temple at the time of the feast of tabernacles.

- And while teaching (which, by the way they “*marvelled*” at in :15) He brings up the issue of Moses and the law and a very particular way in which they viewed the law and understood some things about that law.

(Go back to) - John 5:1-16—this is the real background that picks up again here in John 7—this is the “*one work*” that Jesus will speak about in the passage we are about to look at which allows Him to deal with the way these Israelites looked at the law.

- Jn. 7:14-24 (read)

- If you remember, this is a passage that we looked at when we were back in Romans 6:14-15 and gaining a clear understanding of what that 1st Objection was all about.

- And we were only interested, at that time, in seeing that they looked upon the law and understood the law to be a very powerful thing—something that had real power behind it—power (they erroneously believed) to restrain sin and power to produce something good.

- But now we’ve got to look a little deeper at just what they thought about as they viewed that law.

- (:22-23) - We’re especially interested in what the Lord says here about Moses and about circumcision.

- (:22) - *Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision;* - then the Lord realizes that if He didn’t say what He did in the parenthesis, (*not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;*), they would immediately try to correct him and say,

“No, Moses didn’t give us circumcision, Abraham did!”

“What’s the matter with you? Can’t you read Genesis 17?”

... and of course the Lord could read Gen. 17- - after all, He wrote it! And He knew that God, through Abraham, gave Israel circumcision. But at the exact same time, it’s a perfectly true statement that ‘Moses did it!’

- And that's why He could say, "*Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision;*"

- And my point in bringing this whole issue up is, what the Lord is after here has something to do with the law—and it has something to do with the law's AUTHORITY.

- Because the truth of the matter is, even though God gave Israel circumcision through Abraham, its full authority did not come into effect until God had Moses give it to them in the law!

- And that's why they would even circumcise a man on the Sabbath day—so that *the law of Moses should not be broken.* (:23)

- And what the Lord's particularly after here is to pick up on something that all these Israelites that '*know the law,*' (Rom. 7:1), KNOW!

- And it's in just this kind of an issue (which is why we're back here), where a particular understanding and appreciation about the law gets brought to the surface, which is directly involved in that expression in the Romans 7:1 parenthesis, "*(for I speak to them that know the law,)*."

- In other words, in just what way did they *know the law*?

- Because **ginw,skw** (*know*) can be used in a whole bunch of ways and in a whole bunch of contexts! (You can't just take a Greek Lexicon and "pigeonhole" it—i.e., confine it to only one, standardized meaning!

- Precisely, how then did they "*know the law*"?

- We've already seen that they understood the law to be an instrument of great power.

- So much so that it was the controlling authority/mechanism to all their actions. (Both what they do and what they don't do.)

- Gen. 17:9-14—notice when God gave circumcision to Israel through Abraham, He gave it to Abraham and to his *seed*—plus when He gave it He calls it a *covenant*—He calls it a *token of the covenant*—so its got some pretty good power and authority to it right back there according to what (:14) says!

- In fact, failure to circumcise even carried the death penalty before it was put into the law under Moses.

- Yet, when God talks about circumcision to the people of Israel in John chapter 7, He doesn't mention Abraham; He doesn't mention anything sitting back there in Genesis 17 at all.

- (come back to John 7:22-23)

- He simply acknowledges that it originally was of the *fathers*, not of Moses. But when it comes to all He wants to say about it, He says it's Moses that I'm focusing my attention on.

- And notice that this issue of how that Israelite would "*know the law*" is not something they erroneously came up with—it didn't come from the VRS—in fact, it was altogether proper for them to think because it was God that caused it to happen.

- Notice that even when the Lord Jesus states the issue, He correctly says, "*that the law of Moses should not be broken*". He properly and correctly calls it "*the law of Moses.*" Even though it was God who had Moses give them circumcision in the law.

- And because of that there's something extra-special about the law.

- If God can take an issue that He has already put in covenant form; that has already got an oath attached to it, and a death threat attached to it in connection with ignoring it—and then vests it in the law—and in so doing makes it so that when an Israelite thinks of circumcision, he more or less thinks first about Moses rather than Abraham, that tells you something of how they "*know the law.*"

- It tells you that when they would hear "*for ye are not under the law, but under grace*" they would react in horror and object to it (i.e., the 2nd Objection of Romans 7:1)

- As (:23) says, if they are willing to circumcise a man on the sabbath day, *that the law of Moses should not be broken*—(something that they should **not** be doing on the sabbath day and they do it anyway) - it tells you that they viewed that law (to use the expression) with 'stars in their eyes.'

- And to say that you're no longer under that law is to pull the rug out from under them, so to speak.

- When an Israelite looked at the law, he didn't just look at it as a legal instrument that carried the controlling authority over their lives—they did see that, but they viewed it as far more than that.
- An Israelite viewed the law (and rightly so) as **GOD'S SUPREME, MOST EXCELLENT EXPRESSION OF AUTHORITY, AND AS SUCH, IT CANNOT BE SUMMARILY DISMISSED OR IGNORED!**
 - (“Summarily” = in a legal sense; it cannot be dismissed or ignored without formality!)
- And yet, that's exactly what Romans 6:14 says! You are to dismiss it. And you are to have nothing to do with it!
 - How in the world can that be so?, when the law is God's most excellent, supreme, legal authority?!?!?
- Therefore this objection is only **partly** erroneous. And that is the reason why only a Jew, or someone who “knows the law” would ever think of this objection. The objection is that God, **legally**, just can't do that!
 - That Jew who “knows the law” is in a position to recognize that God has established that law as His supreme, most excellent expression of His authority—He even vested the covenant of circumcision with Abraham in it! And the moment He did it, He could come along and say, “*Moses gave unto you circumcision.*” (John 7:22)
 - Even God, Himself recognizes the progressive development of His authority as coming to its highest, most powerful, most excellent point of all in that “law of Moses.” (Jn. 7:23)
 - Therefore, as an example of that, even circumcision is in its most excellent form—most powerfully, legally binding expression; when it got put in that law—is even more so than it originally existed back in Genesis 17!
 - And the fact that the law is God's most excellent authority, then it cannot be summarily dismissed or ignored.
 - And that's why they would circumcise a man on the sabbath “*that the law of Moses should not be broken*” - they'd rather break a command in connection with the sabbath day than break the “*law of Moses.*”

- The partial error is that they thought that the feature of the law being God's supreme, most excellent expression of authority, as it existed in their mind **was a permanent thing**—and it wasn't!!!!

- They thought that the supreme, legal authority of the law was a permanent feature to that law that could not ever be set aside.

- They erroneously thought that the law's supreme authority was a permanent legal issue that could never be formally or legally dismissed! — AND THAT IS WRONG!

- All of this is the thinking that is behind the Objection that begins to be dealt with—and which needs to be dealt with in Romans 7:1-6.

- Because once the objection that, "The law is my only means of restraining sin and doing good," is shown to be erroneous and dismissed—especially, the ones that "*know the law*"- whether they are Jews by nature, who would naturally know it to that extent, and would know that it's the ultimate authority that God has established, and that, on the basis of the way in which He established it, it cannot just be dismissed or ignored—because He put it as SUPREME in His dealings with them—so whether you're a Jewish member of the church, the body of Christ that would naturally think that—or whether you just have a keen legal bent in your frame of mind, that when you thought about that statement in 6:14, it would make you to come along and say, "Wait a minute! The law, by nature of it being *the law*, can't just be summarily dismissed, either!"

- You can't just arbitrarily come along and say, "Ok, you're not under the law anymore, I'm going to put you under grace now."

- Even a Gentile person with a legal bent in his thinking would object and say, "God, legally, can't do that."

- So whether you're a Jew who's going to think that because you "*know the law*" or whether you're just a Gentile member of the church, the body of Christ with a keen legal mind whose going to recognize that same thing and come up with that same Objection—the issue is, THAT OBJECTION HAS GOT TO BE DEALT WITH!

- And the first 6 verses of Romans 7 deals with it—and they show that that dominion capacity of the law is NOT necessarily permanent—and that God has not just arbitrarily set it aside; displaced it; & replaced it with grace!

- No. He fully satisfied every legal claim that that law (that He made that supreme expression of authority) to have—He satisfied them all!!!

- And when He replaced it and put us under grace, He did it, not only perfectly legally, but He also did it because it was also perfectly and completely necessary to do it!

- And that's what the first 6 verses of Romans 7 shows, teaches, and proves.

- And that fully dismisses that 2nd Objection!

- And to be honest, unlike the previous objection, and really unlike anything else we've had in the doctrine of our godly sanctification, you really have to think about this one.

- Because this one is not going to just naturally fall into place.

- You've got to have (it's imperative that you have) at least a firm understanding of the legal—the powerfully legal relationship that existed between God and His law and the Jew and God's law and how supremely excellent it was by nature to establish God's ultimate authority in every detail of that Israelite's life!

- The truth of the matter is, most of us here simply do not have an adequate frame of reference for what's being objected to here—and really, you can't pick up a frame of reference for it in one or two hours of Bible class!

- And you can kind of test yourself as to whether or not your frame of reference is sufficient or not by asking yourself (honestly) - "Just how impressed am I with this 2nd Objection?" - does it really impress you as being a 'big deal?'

- If not, or if it only mildly does, then you know for sure that you don't have a sufficient enough frame of reference for really appreciating and understanding what is going on here.

- This issue is so powerful in a Jew's mind (which is one reason why we went back to the John 7 passage in order to get that kind of a frame of reference) - so powerful was it that the law was 'known' as THE LAW OF MOSES—and in that respect it wasn't even known as the Law of God—the point being that when you gather up the whole of how that law was viewed by that Jew, it was as if, once it had been established as the covenant with Israel that it was

.... it was as if it was such a permanent issue to them that even God Himself could not tamper with it (i.e. as to its permanently legally binding nature—not as to God ever being able to alter it in any way, because they knew that He could do that) - but to them, as far as its permanently legally binding nature was concerned (being the covenant it was to them), not even God Himself could ever dismiss it or set it aside!

- But it had to be set aside and dismissed for us in this *dispensation of grace*.

- Not just because of the way in which our sanctified position in Christ is designed to operate—and not just because God did, indeed, have a legal way and a legal right to do it—but also because it was absolutely necessary to do so!

- While it may not be the appropriate time to bring this up—maybe some things should be said here about that ‘necessary’ need to set the law aside in this dispensation of grace.

- And I say that it may not be appropriate because, while many folks who do “*rightly divide the word of truth*” (mid-Acts) often times will quote Romans 6:14 as a dispensational verse.

- We know that, contextually, that is not what Rom. 6:14 is doing: for we know that it is being presented in a context that is dealing with our sanctified position in Christ—but even though the dispensational issue is not in view, as I said before, there is a necessary reason for having the law set aside and dismissed as having any kind of dominion or legal authority or legal force or control over a saint who is a part of the church, the body of Christ in this dispensation of grace.

- And there will be, later on in Romans, a time in which the law will be brought up and where it will be clear that the law cannot be legitimately utilized by us, the members of the church, the body of Christ in another way other than just justification or sanctification.

- And that other legitimate reason for why the law had to be (legally) set aside and dismissed when God changed the programs (from His program with Israel, to His program with the church the body of Christ) - is because the law did not contain sufficient, adequate, or appropriate information for our education as members of the “*new creature*” of the church the body of Christ in connection with the vocation God has for us.

- Simply put—even if God made the provision (and this is only hypothetical, because He didn't) - but even if God made the provision for us in this dispensation of grace to be able to utilize the law like the members of the remnant of Israel are going to be utilizing it in the final installment in His program with Israel, we would NOT be able to be educated by it enough to be able to function in connection with the vocation God has for us in the “heavenly places.”

- Because the law is NOT designed for that!

- Prov. 1 - The basic table of contents of the curriculum for sonship education and sonship edification.

- Yet while the basic structure or skeleton of the table of contents is the same for a Father to properly educate a son in either program—the doctrinal information—or the packages of doctrine that is given for a son's education in Proverbs is not in keeping with God's designed purpose for the particular business or vocation He is in with His son who is the “*one new man*” or the “*new creature*” of the church, the body of Christ, today.

- Prov. 2:1; 3:1; 4:1-4 - Notice the “*law*” and “*commandments*”

- More specifically, in view of God's program with Israel and the vocation unto which they are called—that is, the business in which they will be engaged in with God for their program (to establish His kingdom on this earth) - notice that section in Proverbs where it looks prophetically at that climatic stage in God's program with Israel.

- Prov. 30:11-14

- And while the word “kingdom” is not mentioned in Proverbs, notice that this is a prophetic passage that looks at what that remnant will be experiencing in the climatic stage—and it does have information that is pertinent to the business God has with them in establishing His kingdom on the earth.

- Prov. 30:29-31 (:31)

- Once again, the law doesn't contain the necessary information that is designed for us to be able to function properly in the vocation God has for us in the “*heavenly places*” - the law is just not designed for that!

- That's why we have OUR EPISTLES in the first place!
- That's why we have Romans through Philemon—that's why we have our own curriculum of information that is designed for the vocation we have in doing business with God in the proper business He is engaged in now!
- If you were to take Paul's epistles out of the Bible (and I'm not saying this in view of properly understanding this dispensation of grace and all that) - I'm just saying that if you physically took your Bible that you have in your hand right now, and were to cut Romans through Philemon out of it, and you were to come along and say,

“I know what that portion of God's word says—I know that I live in the dispensation of grace– I know that I'm a member of the “*new creature*” of the church, the body of Christ—but I'm going to be educated for the vocation God has for me as a member of that “*new creature*” on the basis of Genesis through Malachi; Mat., Mk., Lk., & Jn.; and the opening chapters of the book of Acts, along with the books of Hebrews through the Revelation.”
- YOU WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO DO IT!!!
BECAUSE YOU COULD NOT BE EDUCATED!!!
- You could be educated for Israel's program, **but you could NOT be educated for occupying a position of *principality, power, and might, and dominion in the heavenly places!***
- In fact, the truth of the matter is, that near the end of Level 1 of sonship education, you begin to learn some things, and be taught some things that are designed to enable you to understand and appreciate how **angels think!**
- And a member of the nation Israel—until the kingdom gets established—doesn't need to know any of those things... but you do!
- Every member of the church the body of Christ needs to know about how angels think—because that's part of what is going to qualify you to be able to “*judge angels.*” (I Cor. 6:3)
- How can you judge someone that you're not even on a peer-level with???

- But all I'm trying to get across is the fact that **there are 2 main 'reasons'** (to simply put it that way) - for why we're *not under the law* in this dispensation of grace!

- And really, they're not distinct and separate reasons—they're interrelated—but they need to be talked about as 2 separate things.

- 1) One reason that we are *not under the law, but under grace* is because of what Romans 6, 7, and 8 sets forth.

- 2) And the other is because our vocation is different from Israel's.

- And the information contained in the law for Israel trains them, prepares them, educates them, and so forth, for their vocation. (BUT NOT FOR A HEAVENLY VOCATION!)

- And even though there may be some (and in fact there are) some 'inter-dispensational' truths and some 'inter-dispensational' similarities, and 'inter-dispensational' commonness, and so forth; all those 'inter-dispensational' issues are outweighed by the completely different dispensational truths; completely different dispensational issues; completely different dispensational differences; ... enough so, so that you have to keep the 2 programs distinct, which is what 'right division' is all about in the first place!

- So maybe it is appropriate for this little 'caveat' to address the fact that the law is inadequate to ever be utilized by a member of the "*new creature*" for even more reasons than what it will do to your functional, sanctified life.

- Back to Romans 7:1

I Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,)

- By now we should have a pretty good grip on just what is being objected to in this 2nd Objection to us not being *under the law, but under grace*.

- The law, as God's supremely excellent expression of His authority put in a legally binding contract and covenant, CANNOT be summarily set aside, dismissed and ignored!

- This issue MUST be addressed—and it must be properly answered to the full satisfaction of the law, itself!

- And if you don't have as good a grip on this 2nd Objection yet, the remainder of (:1) should provide you enough information to "get it."

I know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?

- "dominion over" (Pres.Act.Ind. kurieu,w = to be lord of, to rule, to have dominion over)

- *Dominion* is the idea of having an influence upon or a power over things and forces.

- But *dominion* also has the idea of having mastership over someone in a legal framework—that is, it carries the idea of having a legal jurisdiction (i.e., the power and right to interpret and apply the law!)

- That is, THE LAW having *dominion over* someone indicates its preeminence in authority in governing so that nothing stands above it.

- Which is exactly how "them that know the law" viewed it!

- And as we have already seen back in (:14), when you are speaking of someone or something having dominion, that powerful and preeminent authority to govern over the affairs of men was given by someone else—and it is God Himself who did it.

- Therefore this Objection is based upon a real truth: the law really does have jurisdictional *dominion over a man as long as he liveth.*

- And this really frames up the 2nd Objection.

- But this statement that frames up the 2nd Objection is not without a qualifying statement—a VERY IMPORTANT qualifier:

.... *as long as he liveth?*

- And notice that this was something that was very well understood and appreciated by "them that know the law" - and it is the very legal and appropriate means by which God can deal with it so as to be able to set it aside to the full satisfaction of the law!

- Those that “*know the law*” recognize this important issue—so important that it was not to be left out of the Objection—for the objection could have ended with the question mark at the end of the word “*man*” - but that would have made the objection intentionally deceitful—but we’re not dealing with deceit; we’re dealing with real hypocritical, erroneous thinking, albeit sincere and forthright (so to speak).

- We’re not dealing with something that is down right deceitful, we’re dealing with honest, natural erroneous thinking about the law.

- And it’s that last phrase: “*as long as he liveth*” that is the basis for all the corrective doctrine that is going to be the element—the legal element designed into the law that allows for all the rooting out of the erroneous thinking contained in this 2nd Objection. (And it’s the ***only legal way*** possible to get out from under that law!)

- That’s why I said that this is only partly erroneous—part of it is based on truth—but partly erroneous is erroneous enough!

- So the God has the apostle Paul follow the same kind of method of presenting the information that he has followed throughout all the fundamental doctrine of our godly sanctification.

- He presents the body of information he is going to talk about in a single statement.

- And this statement (of :1) presents us with the 2nd Objection:
Since the law is God’s supreme, most excellent expression of His authority, it cannot be summarily dismissed or ignored.

- You can’t legally just say, “*ye are not under the law*” and get away with it!

- And this is something that a properly educated saint would “*know*” by the time he got to this point in Romans—furthermore it is something that a Jew or anyone with a legal grasp of the law would naturally object to.
(*them that know the law*)

- And again, if you’re not really all that impressed by this 2nd Objection, then it is obvious that you have missed something in a previous Bible class—and it’s also obvious that the corrective doctrine will not have the ‘punch’ it is designed to have in your inner man!

- So Romans 7:1 forms that First Component part.

- It sets forth the 2nd Objection which is based upon some more erroneous thinking about the law being the means by which a Christian is supposed to put his sanctified life into effect.

- And really, as we have examined this objection; since it is based upon at least a partial truth, there really is a connection that it has to something that has already been brought up in the previous section dealing with that 1st Objection.

- Where? Look back, and think back to how that 1st Objection was attacked, corrected and dismissed: how was it done?

A: In 2 parts. And that second part was the section that dealt specifically with an “*infirmity of your flesh.*”

- And since this doctrine about the law in connection with our godly sanctification has a sense and sequence to it—it goes through a progress—it ‘dovetails’ from one issue to the other, from one concept to the other—always building upon something that has already been said.

- And as we noticed in connection with that “*infirmity of your flesh*” your flesh will always try to scramble around to attempt to ‘save face’ and find some ‘hook’ to cling to—something to latch on to so that it’s argument (and longing desire or *weakness*) will still stand, and it can utilize the law for a performance system for living the life of the Christian!

- And, in a sense, that’s what is still going on here. The *flesh* has one other issue that it can latch on to. It has a legal issue that it thinks it has found that will bring this “notion” or “theory” (as someone said I had) that we are *not under the law, but under grace* down.

- I’m not saying that this is strictly an *infirmity of the flesh* issue, because that’s NOT the way this is said in (:1) - but I do believe that this is something that that *flesh*, as it scrambles around to latch on to something, can and indeed does do.

- The strict truth of the matter is that this objection is something that would be brought up by either a Jew, or someone who is familiar with legal issues like the law.

- So that takes us to Romans 7:2-3

2 *For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.*

3 *So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.*

(Romans 7:2-3)

- Romans 7:2-3—The second component part.

- Following the English words of logic, since verse 2 begins with the word “*For*” - which is not so much a ‘for’ of further explanation and amplification, but is a ‘for’ used to introduce the ground or reason for something previously stated—and as such it is commonly used as the first word of the sentence, verse 2 is, therefore, the beginning of something.

- It is the beginning of an illustration that is used as a legal appeal to the ground or reason why the 2nd Objection of erroneous thinking is wrong and truly erroneous.

- That is, it gives the legal basis for what was previously stated in the question of verse 1.

- Again, paying attention to those English words of logic that help us out so much, we see that verse 3 begins, “*So then if,*” - and continues on dealing with the legal illustration upon which will hang the basis upon which the 2nd Objection of erroneous thinking will get dismissed.

- Therefore, my understanding is that verses 2 & 3 go together to form the legal grounds of which the apostle Paul appeals to attack and begin to correct the erroneous thinking of the 2nd Objection.

- And Paul is NOT teaching on marriage, divorce, or remarriage in Romans 7! Rather, he is utilizing a valid, legal argument (sitting in the law, itself) to correct and root out the erroneous thinking that the law is **permanent**, with no way possible for it to ever be set aside and dismissed, once it has been confirmed.

- In fact, the truth of the matter is, this valid, legal argument or illustration is not just ‘an’ illustration; it’s the **ONLY**, most excellent choice to deal with this erroneous thinking about the law!!!

- So as (:2-3) get underway, what is presented is only understandable with the background of, and against the backdrop of, what we have worked on for these past couple of weeks:

- The 2nd Objection is one that only a Jew who ‘knows the law’ or any person with that same kind of a frame of reference or that same kind of understanding and thinking concerning the law’s supreme authority, and so forth, would have: that it’s not something that can be just summarily dismissed.

- Yet based upon what (6:14) says, they’re going to come along and say, ‘That’s what it sounds like you’re saying!’ ‘It sounds like you are saying that God just up and set the whole law aside—without any legal basis or legal reason for doing so—and just dismissed it and replaced it with this thing you’re calling “*grace*.”’

- And those making this objection are ones who “*know the law*” - not just knowing the law’s various commands and statutes and ordinances, etc., but that they know what it is in connection with how God gave it; and the **prestige** He attached to it, even taking that issue of circumcision from the Abrahamic Covenant and investing it in it: and therefore in so doing, making it so that the legal authority and the supreme authority (and really the ultimate authority) in connection with that circumcision issue was (in their minds) expressed through the law, and not so much through that covenant that God made with Abraham!

- So the objection is a very natural one. And a legitimate one. And really, it’s not a false one, nor is it a foolish one.

- And it is one that really does need to be properly dealt with. (6 very wordy verses are dedicated to it!)

- And not only does the Objection need to be dealt with, but the objection also provides the basis for SAYING SOMETHING ELSE about the law that comes up in the course of Paul’s dealing with the objection that provides the “kicker” (so to speak) for getting your mind ‘settled’ on the fact that we HAD TO BE put “*under grace!*”

- It’s not just a matter of, ‘Well, maybe we didn’t really have to, but God just chose to do it this way.’ NO! In view of what God’s doing with us, it is a “MUST” situation. It’s not a ‘good, better, or best’ choice-type situation—it must have been done this way!

- And the erroneous thinking of this 2nd Objection is not the objection itself, because the objection— or what is appealed to in the objection is legitimate.
 - The erroneous thinking of this 2nd Objection is their ASSUMPTION!
 - It's the **assumption** that is in error.
 - The assumption is that since the law has this 'dominion capacity' to it, that it also contains this permanent capacity as well.
 - And not only was it recognized (properly recognized) that the law had a "dominion" capacity of permanence; it is also coupled with the fact that the *dominion* capacity of the law lasted 'as long as a man liveth.'
 - So the "*dominion*" capacity, plus the 'duration clause' (so to speak) of the law's *dominion over a man* being as long as he liveth, puts the **permanent nature** of the law in contextual perspective.
 - And when dealing with a law or laws that are set in a context of time—that is, within a time limitation—we often hear that referred to as a statute of limitations.
 - A statute of limitations is a statute in a common law legal system that sets forth the maximum period of time, after certain events, that legal proceedings based on those events may be initiated.
 - They assumed that the law of Moses had NO statute of limitations—but it did—the only thing was that the law's statute of limitations didn't run out until the *death* of that individual.
 - So the erroneous thinking is that, due to the permanent nature of the law's *dominion* capacity until the death of that person, i.e., since the law had no statute of limitations, **it is therefore impossible for any person to be physically alive and not under the law!**
 - AND THAT IS WRONG!
 - And, in fact, (especially for *them that know the law*,) there is sitting right in that law itself a perfect way to understand just how it is possible to be physically alive and yet get out from under the dominion capacity of the law.

- (:2-3) - Illustrative Legal Analogy of the Marriage Contract.

(From Num. 30—dealing with laws concerning vows—but it won't profit you anything to go back and look at it, because first, there isn't anything in the verse that would indicate you should, and second the way it is presented in (:2-3) is really as a self-contained issue.)

- Notice that when the individual words are looked at in (:2-3), none of them are hard words or hard to understand:

- 79 words
 - 64 one syllable words
 - 11 two syllable words:
 - “*husband*” 6x
 - “*liveth*” 2x
 - “*married*” 2x
 - “*woman*” 1x
 - 2 three syllable words— “*another*” 2x
 - 2 four syllable words— “*adulteress*” 2x
-

- Note the first phrase of (:2):

2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth;

- The semicolon lets us know that there is a fairly strong pause that is to be taken at the end of this first phrase.

- Therefore there is something that is important—there is an important issue that is to strike a blow in your thinking as this first phrase is read and processed—it's kind of like a ‘light’ should go on in your thinking as this issue of marriage and the time limits of its legal power or legal authority or legal force is stated as a parallel issue to the one about the law. (Note the match of the last 4 words to :1)

- “*For*” = not used as a ‘for’ of further explanation or further amplification—but it is a ‘for’ used to introduce the ground or reason for something previously stated—and as such it is commonly used as the first word of the sentence.

- This is a ‘for’ of reason or grounds (legal grounds).

- Therefore this tells you that (:2) is the beginning of something—the illustrative analogy of marriage. (:2-3)

- At this point a couple of things should strike your thinking:
 - 1 is that this issue of the marriage contract carries all the legal parallels to it that will enable the 2nd Objection to be properly dealt with; for it to be shown to be in error; and to finally dismiss it as having no legal legs to stand on.
 - Marriage as the legal contract it is under the law will be the all-sufficient means to show just how it is possible for someone to remain physically alive, and yet have that law set aside and dismissed so that the person previously under that law is now free from that law.
 - 2nd is deeper than that—it has to do with just why God is having the apostle Paul use marriage in the first place—just what is it He is driving at with this analogy from marriage? What is He after?
 - (And this is the reason for the pause—to not miss this issue)
 - So, in connection with this illustrative analogy that is given in (:2 and 3) - based upon what Paul just said in (:1) - we need to understand and appreciate (apart from the obvious), just what it's after.
 - In other words, why would the issue of marriage be the most excellent issue to bring up in the illustrative analogy?
 - And this is a very critical issue—in fact, it is more important than the obvious issue because without it you can't properly segue (or make a smooth transition) directly from this section of corrective doctrine to the next in (:4)!
 - Just as you had to see the Objection in very clear and precise way, so too you must get a grip on this issue in just as clear and just as precise of a way so that the effectual working of the corrective doctrine will make the proper impact in your 'inner man.'
 - And what we're after is that there really is more to this than just a legal reason for bringing up the marriage issue—the legal reason is easy and obvious to see—but why, exactly, is marriage the single most excellent issue to draw from so that this objection can fully be recognized as erroneous and finally, be forever put out of your mind?
- What is it about marriage that so perfectly fits what is going on here???

- The obvious reason for the marriage issue to be used as an illustrative analogy has to do with it, (just like the law of Moses), being a contractual arrangement or agreement that puts the person who goes under it in a legal obligation to it until their death.

2 For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth;

- You've got to realize that it is the designed, effectual working of this final, concluding matter—and 7:1-6 it is the final concluding matter that makes it so that the Objection based upon the radical statement of 6:14 is seen to have no further legs to stand on!

- And this final issue, now, comes along, and as it deals with the objection of the law being “*the law*” and it just can't be summarily dismissed and all, God purposefully and intentionally brings up this issue of marriage, not just because it has similar or parallel features to it as that of the law contract, but because it also is the most excellent way to set forth the real answer to the objection—the answer that most excellently and most effectually works to do just what the corrective doctrine is and has been designed to do from the very beginning of our education into our godly sanctification:

- and the real answer to the objection is deeper than mere legal wrangling—and that is because all law, and whether it can operate or whether it can't operate is based upon one fundamental issue: **YOUR RELATIONSHIP TO IT!**

- The real reason the marriage issue was chosen in the first place to be utilized by God through the apostle Paul is not just because it perfectly fits the parallel legal issues of the law—but more than that the marriage issue provides for all of the various components and concepts in the realm of your relationship to it that will be able to fully deliver you from that law!

- The reason the marriage issue was chosen in the first place is because it provides for not only the death concept, but also **for the new relationship concept**.

- And it is by taking you doctrinally through how you were related to the law once (*in the flesh*), and how you are now related to the law (*by the body of Christ*) and all that that means, that the objections are fully gone—dismissed for good!

- So along with all the proper legal issues about the law that marriage so aptly parallels—one of the most important reasons for bringing the issue of marriage up as the most excellent way to correct the erroneous thinking about the law is this issue of your relationship to it—because when you are talking about a change of someone’s relationship, nothing more clearly illustrates that change of relationship than marriage!

- When a woman gets married, she is no longer just a woman, she’s a wife (with all the legalities that relationship carries with it)—when a man gets married, he’s no longer just a man, he’s an husband (with all the legalities that relationship carries)—and if one of them dies, then that relationship changes again—to a widow or a widower—and that carries certain legal issues with it because of the relationship change.

- And one of the major legal elements or features that marriage carries—(one that parallels the relationship that someone under the law also carries) - is the exact same time element or ‘duration clause’ that makes it a seeming permanent issue: and that is that a woman who has an husband *is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth.*

- So, therefore, is it right to assume that in the marriage relationship, that that is a permanent relationship that has no legal fiat (or legal authority or legal course of action) for that relationship to ever change, except for the death of one of the persons in that marriage relationship?

- A: No—as the next phrase in (:2) makes evident!

- In other words, is it possible for someone under the law of marriage to be physically alive and yet not under that law of marriage? — Well, yes, in fact, it is!

- So, once we have paused enough at the semicolon at the end of the first phrase of (:2), then the last phrase comes along and states the legal technicality that provides for the first established relationship to be changed, and another relationship gets legally established.

2 *For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth; **but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.***

- There are some legal technicalities provided for in marriage—(just as there are legal technicalities provided for under the law) - that allow for **another relationship to be established**, once death ended the first one!

- And in the analogy of marriage, the woman who agreed to the marriage contract came under the laws of marriage that bound her to him as long as he lives.

- But upon the death of her husband, she (still being physically alive) is “loosed” or set free from the bonds of the legal marriage contract.

- The point is, that in order for someone to be physically alive and yet not under that law of marriage, something has to drastically change in that person’s relationship!

- And the illustrative analogy of marriage with the law brings out the fact that both of them have in common a relationship change that takes place upon the **death** of the one in that former relationship.

- (*... but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.*) Rom. 2b

- Enough said—this really is simple enough.

- But Paul does not just leave it at that. — Verse 3 brings up one other legal issue that needs to be stated in order to present the issue in sufficient enough of a way so as to fully set it up for the proper application to take place in (:4-6).

- In other words, (:2) isn’t sufficient to properly and fully frame up the corrective doctrine because there is still one area where someone could cry “foul” - and it is set forth in the first phrase of (:3) down to the colon.

3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: (Romans 7:3a)

- This additional legal issue of marriage needs to be stated because it will act to prevent a foul (a legal offense) from taking place.

- And the “foul” has to do with trying to have it both ways—what if she tries to be married or united in a relationship with another man while still under the law of marriage to her living husband?

- This is Paul doing in a similar way what the Lord Jesus Christ did back in John 7:22—(*“Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man.”*)

- Paul is presenting the information so that these with this acute legal frame of mind are prevented from objecting still further.

- The question might go something like: “Well, what you are saying is that God did some kind of an ‘end run’ around the issue and put you under this thing called grace, but He had to do it while at the same time keeping you under the law. And that’s a foul—that’s a legal offence!”

- So this possible legal objection is brought to the surface and dealt with as well.

- You can’t have it both ways—in the context of your functional life, you can’t be in the old relationship of being under the law, and at the same time (or better to say it, without any change of relationship to that existing law) be under grace (or in another relationship) too.

- Granted, this is not the time or place to deal with issues of being under grace and trying to live under the law at the same time, because what is being driven at here only has to do with the issue of the relationship and the relationship change that has to take place to get out from under (or “loosed”) from the existing legal relationship.

- Paul will deal with the issue of trying to live under the law while being under grace later on.

- see Gal. 2:16-21 (:21)

(Romans 7:3)

3 So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adultrous:

- Paul is covering every possible objection. And he is doing it in a very general way.

- The simple idea is that God can’t just do an ‘end run’ so to speak and put you under grace (because in the mind of one who knows the law he still may think that something like that has to be the way it could only be done, because in their mind the law just has no way of being dismissed!)

- Therefore the issue of the woman being called an adulteress is not supposed to be an issue that we are to look at categorically, but it is simply, that's what you get legally called when this happens because it's a 'foul' legally speaking—it is a legal offense—and that's what an adulteress is—adulteress is the term used for a woman who has legally offended the law of marriage when she tries to illegally change her marriage relationship.

- Adultery is a sin. And it is a sin because it has violated the relationship laws governing marriage.

- Adultery is the voluntary sexual intercourse of a married person with one of the opposite sex. Adultery in its most fundamental form is a corruption of a relationship; and in marriage, a corruption of the marriage relationship.

- But we're not so much interested in the sinful aspects of adultery—in this analogy we're interested in it being totally discounted as a possible means by which God could put you under grace without dismissing the law.

- No. The only possible means for the statement of Romans 6:14 to be true (... *ye are not under the law, but under grace*) is for DEATH to come along and IT brings about the necessary change in relationship so that one can legally be "loosed" or "free from that law."

- And so because of this possible objection being raised, you have the remainder of (:3)

3 ... but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.

- The point is that the illustrative analogy of marriage make it so that the only possible way to get *free from that law* is by **DEATH!**

- And the analogy sets it as a parallel issue to not *being under the law*—there is only one way (only one legal way) that it can be done: YOU HAVE TO DIE TO THAT FORMER RELATIONSHIP!

- And that's the key to correcting the erroneous 2nd Objection!

- Notice that out of this entire section of Romans 7:1-6 dealing with this 2nd Objection to Rom. 6:14 (*ye are not under the law, but under grace*), this is the only colon in these 6 verses.
 - Therefore there is supposed to be a rather serious pause at this point to ensure that you have been properly impressed or properly benefiting from the effectual working of what has been presented in this first clause of (:3).
- “*So then if,*” - *So then* = tells us that this clause logically follows on the heels of what has just been stated in (:2) - moreover it is not drawing a full conclusion, but it is a natural flowing result of, and is naturally built upon and follows upon the information set forth in (:2).
 - *if* = (3rd Cl.Cd.) sets forth the possibility of a case in which a new relationship is brought into the legal arrangement or legal contract which was not allowed by law.
- 3 *So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress:*
 - This is the thought or clause that we are to stop, pause, and make sure that we have been properly impressed with.
 - And the reason has not to do with the issue of marriage and adultery in the marriage, but it has to do with the possibility of trying to establish another relationship—a new relationship, but doing it while under the existing relationship.
 - The idea is that someone who “knows the law” and sees it as God’s supreme authority that cannot summarily be dismissed—as that permanent relationship that cannot be put away until death—they could argue that Paul’s radical statement in 6:14 is really an attempt to establish a new relationship while still under the old relationship.
 - And this really sets forth all the possible relationships that can exist:
 - 1) Either our relationship with the law is permanent, with no way out from under it until death;
 - 2) Or God would have to establish this new relationship— this thing you call *grace*— even while we are still related to our old, former relationship with the law.

- And these are the only possibilities that can exist in the thinking of someone who “knows the law” and objects to it being summarily set aside.

- But this possibility won’t work—it won’t legally work, just as the remainder of the first clause of (:3) says: “... *she shall be called an adulteress*: ...”

- In other words, if you try to establish a new relationship on top of the former relationship, one that runs counter to that former relationship, then what you have done in the process is break the law—point is, you can’t legally do that! (Which is the grounds for the objection in the first place!)

- Therefore the effectual working of the colon is to allow us to pause and consider all the possibilities—that is, all the ways in which this radical statement that we are *not under the law, but under grace* can be legally looked at so that it forces you to come back to the one and only issue remaining for this radical statement to be legally of force.

- It forces you to go back and look at that ‘duration clause’ in the law—because that is the ONLY thing that is left to even be considered as a means by which the law can be dismissed and set aside: “... *as long as he liveth*” (:1) or “... *so long as he liveth*” (:2)

- So, once we have paused long enough for this to impress us and for us to be properly benefited by its effectual working, the next and final phrase of (:3) appeals right back to the core element that will, indeed, allow for another relationship to be legally established.

3 ... *but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.*

- “*but*” = an adversative conjunction that expresses something set in opposition to the previous statement—that is, in opposition to the wrong, erroneous thinking that a second relationship is established with *grace* and *law* functioning side by side, (which is illegal), what follows then is the truth of the matter.

- “*if her husband be dead, she is free from that law;*” - and the semicolon is another moderate pause to properly benefit from this statement. — And there is something to be impressed with in this clause.

- Notice that when the ‘duration clause’ is stated, there is a slight change of terminology from (:2) to (:3).
- (:2) - “*but if the husband be dead, she is **loosed** from the law of her husband.*”
- (:3) - “*but if her husband be dead, she is **free** from that law;*”
 - We have “*loosed*” (**katarge,w**) *from the law* (:2)
 - And “*free*” (**evleu,qeroj**) *from that law* (:3)
- “*loosed*” and then “*free*”
- These are very closely related terms. But the shade of meaning or the discriminating difference is in keeping with a particular development or progress that is being made in the argument.
- “*Loosed*” comes from the basic idea of something not clinging to you, and in a legal sense, that you are no longer under obligation, i.e., no longer attached to the law; you are released from it. The ties are broken or dissolved. And in its shade of meaning it carries the idea (in a legal context) of being without fault.
- And in order to develop and/or generate in your thinking the proper understanding and appreciation of what it means to not be *under the law without offending the law in the process of doing it*, this is the first and most basic concept to be generated: just like the woman in the marriage contract whose husband dies, she is loosed from the law of her husband.
- That law that bound her to the contract has been dissolved; it no longer ‘clings’ to or is attached to her because her relationship to it has completely changed—and she is now in a different relationship to it.
- Furthermore, being loosed from it indicates that her now severed relationship to the law that she was once fastened to, is itself, a legal standing or state—that is, she is loosed from it without any fault or breaking of it being chargeable to her!
- She is clear from the law that bound her without charge!
- But there is more to it than that, which is why the terminology changes.

- All that does is tell you that, “Ok, your relationship now is one that you are no longer tied to, or fastened to, or attached to the law.”—but someone could say, “Yeah, but that doesn’t give you a legal right to establish a new relationship—all that does is dissolve the former relationship.

- But that is wrong, erroneous thinking.

- And that’s why it needs to be stated again, but now with a little more detail to it than it had before.

- But it really is important (if you’re going to really deal with this in a legal framework so that there will be proper thinking that will fully root out the erroneous thinking and replace the erroneous thinking with correct doctrine), it is important to state it this way, and to make an issue out of being *loosed from the law*, FIRST.

- It may not seem so to you, but it does to ones who ‘*know the law*’!

- And the first step or first issue to be dealt with is becoming *loosed from the law*—and becoming loosed from it legally. And the death of her husband accomplishes that first step—it dissolves the legal bond—it looses her from it!

- In fact, in any relationship with any law, death accomplishes this first step—it looses you from its grip!

- So in the eyes of the law, she is *loosed* from its mastership, but the question now is, can she legally go on and establish another entirely new relationship?

- And that’s what (:3) is designed to answer.

- And to do this it must first of all present the issue of a new relationship getting established—but it does it by looking at it from the viewpoint of what would happen if a new relationship was attempted to get established on top of her existing relationship with the law—and that IS illegal—that IS a legal offense—and it carries with it a moniker that corresponds to it being the legal offense that it is: ADULTERESS.

- But if the same thing that qualified her to be *loosed from the law* is brought into the picture—DEATH—then not only does her former relation to the law change (she is loosed from the law), but it also provides for her to have an entirely new relationship established.

- And the proper way to express that issue is not with the same terminology used before, but it has to get a little more descriptive than that.

- That's why we have:

3 *but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law*;

- “Free” while still a general term, does describe the legal position in a more defined way—and that more defined way is that while someone may be *loosed* from the law, *free* tells you that that law has no strings attached (so to speak) - it is an entire issue, not just in part, but in whole.

- Remember, however, that the terms that are used here to describe the legal position or legal relationship are not verbs, but adjectives.

- “Free” can be used as both. But what we’re interested in is how the term *free* is used as an adjective to describe the legal state of someone under the law where death has changed that relationship.

- And it is here, in the shade of meaning that is carried by the term *free*, that not only is the most excellent way to describe what death legally accomplishes to the relationship one has with the law, but it also will bring to bear many doctrinal issues that we have already covered in the corrective doctrine from 6:16-23.

- Using the term *free* to describe one’s legal relationship indicates the idea of not being subject to the rule or control of someone or something else—and in this case, the law.

- But being *free from that law* indicates something more—an additional feature to the relationship of being *loosed from the law*.

- *Free* implies and connotes independence, sovereignty, autonomy, and so forth when it is used to describe the state or condition of not being subject to external rule or control.

- But the real ‘kicker’ or power in this advanced term—the shade of meaning that is supposed to really jump out a grab hold of you; or that you are supposed to be impressed with and benefiting from is that the term *free* stresses the absence of external **compulsion**, and not the absence of restraint!

- In this state, **the law has no compelling power over you!**

- Therefore, being *not under the law, but under grace* means not only do you have a more compelling reason to do what grace says; and not only do you have a greater compelling reason to not sin; and not only do you have a greater compelling reason to do good; but you have no legal compelling reason to be under the law, and every compelling reason to be under grace!

- Because, just as in the illustrative analogy of marriage, since *death* has brought about a change of relationship to that law, you not only are *loosed* from it, but you are *free* from it as well—**it has no power to compel you to do anything it says!!!**

- Your position “in Christ” has made it so that the law’s compelling power has been completely (and lawfully) dismissed and set aside—and a new relationship (a relationship *under grace*—a relationship that has built into it all of the proper and powerful compelling reasons to do what it says, that the law doesn’t hold a candle to) your position “in Christ” has made it so that a new relationship can now be established!!!

- Therefore in the illustrative analogy of marriage, here in (:2-3), the woman is *loosed* and *free from that law*—because ***death*** has brought about the lawful change in her relationship to it—the law is fully satisfied, she is, indeed, *free from that law*. She’s *free* to establish a new relationship—she’s *free* to be married to another man.

- The ‘long arm of the law’ can’t touch her!

- And based upon that, if she goes into another new relationship, she has not broken the law, nor has she violated any aspect of that law, because in the relationship she now stands, that law doesn’t apply; it has no compelling power over her at all—and therefore that last phrase of (:3) is TRUE.

3 ... *so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.*

- Therefore in the illustrative analogy of marriage, you are in a relationship with the law governing marriage that has only one possible means of ever allowing for a change of that relationship to take place: death.

- And that’s just exactly like the law of Moses. It, too, will not legally allow for any change in one’s relationship to it to take place except upon the means (or grounds) of death.

- The erroneous 2nd Objection says that you can't just summarily dismiss someone from being under the law (even if it is an apostle that says it) as long as they are alive—if it's mastership is until 'death do you part' (and it is), it is assumed to be permanent and Paul's statement in (6:14) is not true!

— WRONG! —

- The beauty of the argument is that you could say to the ones who "know the law," "So what you're saying is that if I were to die, I would no longer be under that law—right? My relationship to the law would be changed, and a new relationship could be legally established—right?"

- And they would have to answer, "Right."

- Ok, then, that is exactly what has happened—and that is exactly how it is that God can legally satisfy the demands of the law, and at the same time allow for a new relationship with *grace* to get established.

- And the next questions would be: "Well, how in the world could that ever take place?"

- And that takes us right back to the cross-work of the Lord Jesus Christ!

- And that is what (:4) is going to do! It's going to apply this legal illustrative analogy in a very real way.

4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

(Romans 7:4)

- This begins the 3rd and final component to this 2nd Objection.

- 1st Component—7:1

Set forth in a single statement the objective or subject of the entire package of doctrine: The 2nd Objection—anyone who 'knows the law' knows that the law is God's supreme, most excellent expression of His authority; and as such it just can't summarily be dismissed, set aside, or ignored.

- 2nd Component—7:2-3

The most excellent illustrative analogy of marriage which sets forth the parallel legal basis for which the law can, indeed, be dismissed and set aside, and an entirely new relationship gets established.

- Death: when death occurs, the former compelling power of the law no longer is of force, and freedom from that law now allows for an entirely new relationship to get established—and it's all done legally.

- 3rd Component—7:4-6

Personal application of the corrective doctrine designed to effectually work within the inner man so as to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the objection is erroneous, and to fully dismiss it as having any validity whatsoever.

- And this is personal application is accomplished in 3 steps:

- 1) (:4) - Application, in summary form, of the previous illustrative analogy of marriage to the reality of who God has made you to be in Christ when He fully identified you with Christ your Redeemer and His redemption, which allows for the law to be dismissed and a new relationship to get established.
- 2) (:5) - Further explanation and amplification of that issue with emphasis upon the truth that the law could never accomplish what it is erroneously thought to accomplish.
- 3) (:6) - The applied conclusion of the corrective doctrine that fully dismisses the 2nd Objection as having no valid basis on which to stand; with special emphasis upon the new relationship being now *not under the law, but under grace.*

- These are the steps that root out **all** the erroneous objections of us not being *under the law, but under grace.*

- These are the steps that God, your Heavenly Father Himself, thinks about when he sees you *under grace* and *not under the law.*

- These are the steps (and the only steps) (and the order of the steps) the Father expects to operate in your inner man to think about it the way He thinks—i.e., to think WITH Him!

- This is the sense & sequence God expects you to follow because it is the very same one He, Himself, follows!
- And there is still some of you that have yet to fully get a grip on the value of the Bible's sense & sequence!
- We haven't said all that can be said on any of the issues that have been presented so far. And we're not supposed to run a 'stem to stern' categorical analysis on any of these issues. That's NOT the way you are supposed to learn any doctrine in the Bible—if it were, God would have written a categorical outline to each doctrine and put it in His word—but He didn't!!!

- Now, if we have a proper grip on what this 2nd Objection is all about; and if we have a proper grip on just exactly what God is after by having the apostle Paul set forth the illustrative analogy of marriage as the most excellent way to begin to dispel the erroneous thinking of the objection, then we can no on to (:4) and make a proper segue or transition into the truth of how we really stand in God's eyes being *under grace* and *not under the law*.

- read (:4-6)

4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

- Notice the **semicolon** at the end of the word *Christ*;—therefore we know that we are going to have to pause for something important that we are supposed to be properly impressed with and benefiting from in this first clause.
- “*Wherefore*” (w[ste]) = “wherefores” are not usually final conclusions. They can be, but more times than not, they are not final conclusions.
 - They're summarizing conclusions—or gathering conclusions in preparation for the next installment.
 - And that's what is going on here.
- Paul is gathering up all that has been set forth in (:1-3) and based upon all that, (:4) is going to begin setting forth the summary conclusion that will apply the doctrine, but as he does it, it will also make the proper preparation for the next things he is going to be able to say about the law in (:5 and :6).

- And not only will it prepare for what is said in (:5-6), but what is said in the whole of (:4-6) is going to make the proper preparation for what will be taken up in the next installment to our corrected understanding and appreciation about the law in the misunderstandings that will arise in (:7), and again in (:13).

- And it really does that—what is said in (:4-6), and especially in (:5-6) really draws to the surface the questions that ‘arise’ in your thinking when you hear what he has to say—(kind of like it ‘lures it to the surface’).

- “Wherefore, my brethren,” - (avdelfo,j = a brother)

- Again, we’ve already had this in (:1), and it is one of those terms of older English that gets laughed at and scoffed at by the bible correctors as just another way of saying ‘brothers.’

- But as we have noted before, “*brethren*” is the most excellent term to us in this context.

- Because *brethren*, as opposed to brothers, is used when the context wants to deal with a specialized relationship, such as a spiritual, ecclesiastical, or professional relationship.

- And that critical shade of meaning of a specialized relationship perfectly fits what the context of this passage is driving at!

- These *brethren* are those not only in the special relationship of being fellow members of the church, the body of Christ—but they are also those with a keen sense of the law—either Jews who “*know the law*” or anyone else with a keen legal mind that would object to what Paul said in (:6:14).

4 Wherefore, my brethren, **ye also are become dead to the law** by the body of Christ;

- The first step of application is that “*ye also are become dead to the law*” - that issue of **death**—of the ‘duration clause’ of the law (so to speak) - the one that was so well illustrated by the marriage law

- ... that's what all this has been driving at—it's death that looses you from the law; and it's death that frees you to go on and get another relationship established—and that is the critical issue—that is what has already happened to you!

- Notice every word in the clause is important!
- “ye” = 2pp Nom. = every believer—all of you! (Used once before in (:1), but used 2x here in (:4)).

(see John 3:7—*Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.*)

- This is the position that each and every believer or saint is in—this is your status—this is your identity!
- “ye” is personal—the personal application.
- “also” = Adjunctive use of **kai**, = also = in the very same way, in the very same degree—that is, to the same legal degree that death causes the laws of marriage to have no more compelling force over you and allows for another relationship to get established, in that same way and to that very same legal degree ye also are become dead to the law.
- “are” = right now—not ‘were’ - not ‘have’ - No. “ye also are”
 - The stress is being laid on your present position “in Christ”; your present identity—and “are” tells you that it is strictly a grace process—it is something that was included in your being justified by grace through faith alone in Christ alone!

4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law....

- “become” = English prefix “be” = about + come = to come about. For example in the expression, “It has come about that you are dead to the law.”
- Again, it expresses your current position in Christ; but that your position has been brought about by some other means than your own works—grace did it! Some other force worked upon you to bring about this position you now have in Christ!
- The whole clause is dripping with grace!

- And it is right here that our pause (the semicolon) is designed to have its greatest effect—it's effectual working in our inner man—to impress us and for us to be benefited by

4 *Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become **dead to the law by the body of Christ**;*

- 2 phrases: *dead to the law
by the body of Christ;*

- “*dead to the law*” - that is the reality of our relationship to that law!
- We are dead to it.

- And if that phrase sounds familiar, it is! And we should be able to go back and put our finger exactly on the spot where that was first told to us!

- Rom. 6:1-2 (:2) - Right at the beginning of the doctrine of our godly sanctification.

- And now you should be able to see just how and why we had to learn that issue first! {Sense & Sequence!}
(And I don't know of any systematic or categorical approach to teaching the doctrine of sanctification that does that!!!)

- And if you remember back when we went over that doctrine and that verse we took a long time looking at that little word “*to*.”

- And we said that the *to* is **a to of relationship**. And it is a real death that has severed and killed that relationship to the law that we used to have.

- That relationship no longer has life to it—we now have a life relationship to something else. All legal ties to that law have ended because death changed that relationship completely!

- It is CRITICAL to understand and appreciate that when death takes place, the former relationship to that law no longer has any power to compel you to do what it says—the law can't compel a dead man!

... *ye also are become **dead to the law***

- And just as being *dead to sin*, we need to acknowledge this, too!

- We need to acknowledge our being *dead to the law* to be the reality of the case—and on the authority of it's truth enforce it!

(regardless of how you “feel” about it !!!!!)

- This is another example of the wonderful work of God's grace on our behalf—how He thought of everything—His marvelous thoughtfulness!

- And just how was it done? What is the mechanical means by which God accomplished this relationship-altering death?

4 by the body of Christ; ...

- “*the body of Christ*” is the mechanical means by which we have been put to death—a death that severs all legal ties to the law.

- Now, someone might come along and think that this phrase is speaking of us being members of the church, the body of Christ, and because we are now part of His body we are no longer under the law.

- But as far as what a saint has learned from Romans 1:1 up until this point, it is clear that that is NOT what this is talking about! Because doctrinally speaking, you don't know anything about the *new creature* of the church the body of Christ that you are a part of.

- No—this is talking about the very body of Christ as pertaining to His work on the cross—and especially His work as it pertains to our sanctification!

- This being *dead to the law by the body of Christ* is a further development in the issue of you being baptized into His death, burial, and resurrection!

- And that's the first thing you learned in the sound doctrine of your sanctification.

- Now you're being told that the very way in which that provision was made for you *not* to be *under the law*, but *under grace* was that the very death, burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ provided for that as well!

- So when you got baptized (identified) with His death, burial and resurrection, you became legally identified with death even to the point that the law's dominion ends!

- Therefore God has not summarily dismissed or canceled the law or anything along those lines—He has legally satisfied its demands and has legally delivered you from it!

- And He did that so that He could legally put you “*under grace*” instead.

- Note that even the Lord Himself underwent a change to that law by His death, burial and resurrection.

- His relationship to the law changed to the degree of what He was doing with He was functioning as the Redeemer.

- That’s why later on (even though it is not for the exact same reason—but not a reason that is far removed from this reason) that’s why when you’re over in Gal. 4:4-5, Paul says that Christ was “*made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law ...*”

- He was *made of a woman, made under the law*—and therefore when He died, He died therefore to it, Himself.

- And therefore anybody identified with Him gets that applied to them, too, - they get that exact same thing.

- So you really have to pause at that first semicolon and allow the impact of this corrective doctrine to really ‘sink in’ (so to speak) - because all the things we looked at in (:1) of the 2nd Objection; and all the illustrative analogy in (:2-3) - all that “set up” - if it you have properly handled it, it should make this transition into the application an easy one. (And things just fall into place).

*4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; **that ye should be married to another**, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*

- The final clause of (:4) has 3 steps to it.

- 1) *that ye should be married to another,*
- 2) *even to him who is raised from the dead,*
- 3) *that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*

- Each being separated by a comma.

- This first phrase of the final clause of (:4) - (along with such passages as II Cor. 11:2; and even trying to insert it some way [which is a joke] into the Eph. 5 passage on marriage) has been the cause of much speculation or assumption that we, the members of the church, the body of Christ, are, indeed the “Bride of Christ.”

- (Along with some real dishonest handling of passages out of Rev. 21.)

- By the way, there is no verse in the Bible that has the phrase, “bride of Christ.” And we are NOT the ‘bride of Christ!’

- But trying to use this (or any of the verses I just mentioned—or any verses in the epistles of the apostle Paul) as proof that we (the new creature of the church the body of Christ) are the ‘bride of Christ’ is only done by someone who blatantly ignores the context of the passage!

- And when it is stated here, “*that ye should be married (gi,nomai = to be; to come into existence; to become) to another,*” the context has set forth an illustrative analogy of the legal issues in the marriage contract.

- And (:4) is simply picking up the APPLICATION of that illustrative analogy.

- And since the illustrative analogy provided for (as the end of :3 says) *so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man—* since the analogy provided for ANOTHER RELATIONSHIP to be established, once death ended the first one; so also is it with us!

- And that’s all Paul is coming along and saying. That’s how you end up being able to be put *under grace*.

- God didn’t make us *dead to the law* _____ (blank) _____.

- No—He made us *dead to the law*, and made it so that we are *not under the law*, and put us *under grace*.

- His intention was to establish and provide for us to be (legally) in another relationship with Him!

- Therefore the word “*married*” while it is used in the sense of the illustration of marriage, it’s primary purpose is to set forth this new relationship we now have as a perfectly acceptable, legal arrangement or union!

- The issue of someone bringing up the ‘bride of Christ’ here is just another example of ‘Christian stupidity’ - of Christians failing to THINK and failing to let God tell them what to think and what to do!

- Any 6th grader who reads this passage and just leaves it in its context will know exactly what to do with it—any scholar with 10 years of academic Greek will be totally lost as to what to do with it!

- So this first phrase of the final clause of (:4) “... *that ye should be married to another,*” begins with the word “*that*” and introduces the purpose clause; the very purpose for which we are *become dead to the law by the body of Christ*.

- The purpose: to be established in another new relationship, and that new relationship is that we are fully united and fully identified with the Redeemer and His redemption which legally puts us *under grace*.

- That’s the first step of the final clause of (:4).

4 ... *that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*

- The second step: *even to him who is raised from the dead,*

- Carefully emphasizing our relationship to the RISEN Lord Jesus Christ.

- And this is designed to do exactly what it did back in (6:4-10).

- **Death and the law have a lot in common!!!!**

- Again, this emphasizes all that we are “in Christ” - it does harken back to us being baptized into the death, burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ—and it demands that you understand and appreciate the extent and the degree to which you are identified with Him.

- And you can verify the reality of your identity in Christ in such passages as Romans 6:4 and 6:8-9.

3 *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?*

4 *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*

(Romans 6:3-4)

5 *For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection:*

(Romans 6:5)

8 *Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him:*

9 *Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.*

- (really, the first 10 verses of Romans 6)

- It is critical that you understand and appreciate (and remember) what your baptism into Jesus Christ is intended to do: it's intended to make the same thing true of the one who gets baptized as is true of the one he is baptized into.

- Your identification with Christ (as a beneficiary of His redemption) makes it so you can look at what happened to Him and say, "That exact same thing happened to me!"

- And therefore all of the ramifications (or consequences, or what develops out of your baptism into Christ's death, burial, and resurrection) are the very things that were declared to you back in chapter 6 in connection with you being *dead to sin* and *alive unto God*; and these ramifications are still being declared to you in chapter 7 in connection with you being *dead to the law*!

- That's why you've got His Righteousness, (you don't have something that is similar to it, you've got His actual +R in justification); and that's why you've got His eternal life (you don't have something that is similar to it, you've got His actual eternal life); and now the same thing is true in connection with sanctification. He came out of dealing with **sin** and **death** and **THE LAW** in His own death, burial and resurrection, with a sanctification in God's eyes and in God's sight and before God—and you don't have one that's similar to that or close to that or one that only resembles that—No—you have got that exact same thing: a sanctification—exactly **like** His!

- But since this is set in a context that is not exactly talking about what we were talking about in chapter 6—in connection with our being *dead to sin* and *alive unto God*) - and since there has been a further development in the doctrine of our sanctification—that being that we are *dead to the law*) - and since it was necessary to bring into the argument the issue of the illustrative analogy of marriage, there is something more to this than the mere issue of Paul just pointing you back to some previous information (even though that is what is being done—there is more to it than that).

- And in that sense, we must keep the whole last clause of (7:4) intact—because it is working off of what has been said in the first 3 verses of chapter 7.

- So while there are three steps (so to speak—marked off by the commas), all three are talking about and are being drawn from the preceding illustrative analogy of marriage that will correct the erroneous thinking that the law (because it is the law) could never be legally dismissed or set aside.

- And so with that as our backdrop we have this final clause of (:4) with these 3 steps to it:

- *that ye should be married to another,*
- *even to him who is raised from the dead,*
- *that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*

- The first step tells us that because of the cross-work of the Lord Jesus Christ as our Redeemer, it provided a legal basis upon which a new relationship or a new “marriage” or a new union could be and was established.

- But this second step picks up on something important in the illustrative analogy of marriage—in the marriage illustration the woman never dies herself—and yet her relationship to the law (the law governing marriage) was put to death by someone else (in this case, her husband).

- And that’s what is important about bringing up the issue of us being *married to another*, **even to him who is raised from the dead.**

- We get to remain alive, but we have applied to us the status of death to the law!

- There’s more than one persons involved here: there are 2!

- His death (and our identification with it) makes it possible for the compelling power of the law to be broken, set aside and dismissed.

- But His resurrection from the dead (and our identification with it) make it possible for us to still be alive—to have functional life that is in no way the same as it was before—to have a functional life that is not under that law—and to have a functional life that, instead of producing what the law would produce in us; instead functions to do something entirely different—a functional life that can produce something God is pleased with, in fact that He is ‘ecstatic’ about!

- And that makes the proper transition into the last step of this final clause of Romans 7:4.

- *that we should bring forth fruit unto God.*

- Note: “*should*” - which is in keeping with the fact that, as we have seen before with the issue of being *dead to sin*, and also that as Romans 6:6 said, “*Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.*” - just as we noted there that our identity with Christ means that we no longer have a “*body of sin*” - since our “*body of sin*” has been destroyed, the production of your physical, functional life is not immediately claimed by death—and the only way in which your functional life can be put to death is (not by death’s immediate claim like it used to do) but by you, yourself putting it to death because of stupidly and foolishly yielding yourself back to it! (By something like law-keeping or works of your own flesh.)

- We may, indeed, functionally die (Romans 8:6—“*For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.*”), but it is not because the power of death caused it—death does not have the legal power to impose itself on you that way any more!

- Therefore bringing forth *fruit unto God* is what we *should* be doing; not necessarily what we will do—and sadly, it is not what most Christians ever do!!!

- And bringing forth *fruit unto God* is the objective of the sanctified, functional life you have “in Christ.” (To produce *fruit unto holiness*—6:22!!!)

- Again, we don't have spelled out to us what that "*fruit*" is, because at this point we don't need to know specifics—that will all occur at the right time and the right place in your sonship edification.

- All we're after here is the broad concept.

- However, we do have some general, basic things that have been told to us from those first 13 verses of chapter 6—and that is that we can:

- 1) *Reckon* ourselves to be *dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*
- 2) *Let not sin reign in our mortal bodies.*
- 3) Disobey the lustful appeals sin makes to us.
- 4) Refuse to yield our members as *instruments of unrighteousness.*
- 5) Yield ourselves unto God.
- 6) Yield our members as *instruments of righteousness.*

- There's at least 6 things we can do by grace through faith that will result in *fruit unto holiness!*

- And if you carefully look at those things you will realize that they really are grace produced—each one of them is produced by being given a body of information to operate on in which you are to respond by faith to that information!

- Basically, it's faithfully operating consistent with who God has, BY GRACE, made you to be "in Christ!"

- So Romans 7:4,

4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

..... takes the illustrative analogy of marriage that has within it all the necessary components that allow for the erroneous thinking, (that since the law is what it is, what Paul said in 6:14 cannot be true—God cannot just summarily dismiss it),—to be attacked and corrected—and then 7:4 comes along and makes the very personal application of that correct doctrine so that the objection is seen to be in error, and then finally dismissed as having no validity to it whatsoever.

- You can't carelessly or impulsively just dismiss the law. What Paul says in Romans 6:14 is wrong.

- Why?

- Because the law is in force as long as you are alive.

- Well, so are marriage laws. But if, for instance, the husband dies, the wife is loosed from the law of marriage, right?

- Well, yes, but even if that is true, it doesn't necessarily mean that she can remarry—that she can have another marriage relationship established.

- No, that's wrong. Go back and look at the laws governing marriage. If she tries to establish another marriage relationship while her former husband is alive, she has broken the law and she is called what she is in the eyes of the law: an adulteress.

- But the death of her husband totally frees her from that law, right?

- Death makes it so she is loosed from the law and free from that law, right? Death makes it so the law has no compelling power over her at all, right?

- Ok, right, you're right.

- And therefore she can have a new relationship established just as if that law that formerly bound her didn't even exist, right?

- Right.

- Well, then, that exact same thing happened to you when you believed the gospel of Christ and were saved from the debt & penalty of your sins. God the Holy Spirit baptized you into Christ your Redeemer.

- And you are completely in every way identified with His death, burial and resurrection—you, therefore have died to the law as you now stand “in Christ.”

- You now have a new relationship established by being united with Christ through baptism (identification).

- And not only that, because Christ, your Redeemer, was raised from the dead, and because you are identified with His resurrection, it means that you not only have died to the compelling power of that law, but you are also still alive to be put in a new relationship of being under grace. (being “in Christ” is being under grace!)

- And all that makes it so that we can bring forth fruit unto God—we can, by grace through faith, produce fruit unto holiness—not stained or contaminated with our own fleshly works of the law.

- The simple truth is, the cross of Christ and my being *baptized into Jesus Christ* makes your Objection completely fall apart!

- So, (:4) sets forth the corrective doctrine. And it does end with a period. But does that end Paul’s whole response to the 2nd Objection?

- No. — The objector is probably at this point thinking hard (scrambling around to find something else to latch on to) and before he can take a breath to say anything else, Paul goes on with (:5 and :6).

- Q: If the corrective doctrine is pretty much set forth in (:4), why does Paul have to go on and say what he does in verses 5 & 6?

- A: Because the **full impact** of the corrective doctrine at the end of (:4) has not yet been made!

- Even though the issue seems all wrapped up in the concept of us bringing forth *fruit unto God* because we are no longer *under the law, but under grace*; the full impact of that needs what is going to be dealt with here in (:5-6) for the total effectual working of that reality to be the marvelous, full-blown glorious thing it ought to be so that you would NEVER think of putting yourself under that law!

- And what is FURTHER needed is for that objector to understand that the law provided NO CAPACITY to ever bring forth fruit unto God!

- And verses 5 and 6 set forth the reality of that!

- And verse 5 is going to tell you that the law has no capacity to do what it is erroneously assumed that it can do—in fact, the law’s only capacity is to bring forth fruit unto DEATH!

- And therefore verse 6 will (more or less) go on to say that you HAD to be delivered from that thing, or you would have no way in the world to put your new, sanctified position “in Christ” into practice.

- Because the law wouldn't allow you to do it—it would fight against you—it would oppose you!

- And that's why (:6) completes the Objections.

- On the basis of the effectual working of Romans 6:15-7:6, no one can honestly sustain the objection that the beginning of 6:15 states, any longer!

- You have to be purposely and deliberately dishonest in refusing to believe what 6:15-7:6 says if you're going to continue to object!

- A person might come along and say, “I have to admit, you're right—but I don't understand everything here, though. I might have some problems with this—does this mean this, and does this mean that?” and that's what 7:7-25 is going to deal with.

- 7:7-25 is going to deal with HONEST misunderstandings and misassumptions.

- But the end of 7:6, you cannot honestly sustain the objection of 6:15 any longer!

- Therefore if that doctrine has effectually worked within you, you have to realize that the ONLY way your position in Christ could ever be put into practice is to NOT be under that law, but to be under grace!

- And that's why (:5 & 6) have to be there. And that's why the end of (:4) pointedly bring that issue up again—the issue of bringing forth fruit unto God.

- It doesn't bring it up because it hasn't been stated before—it brings it up so that the final 'nail in the coffin' can be driven in and the law can be dismissed as the means whereby that could ever be done.

- So with that kind of an introduction to these last 2 verses of this package of doctrine in Romans 7:1-6, let's look at some of the details in those 2 verses.

Romans 7:5-6

5 *For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.*

6 *But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.*

- Let's take up that first phrase of (:5) -

5 *For when we were in the flesh,*

- "For" is a 'for' of further explanation and further amplification.

- Paul, as we just noted, has something further to say by way of explanation and amplification to the issue of us bringing forth fruit unto God and that it could never be done under the law.

- And Paul is now going to explain how that the law does not provide us with the capacity to bring forth fruit unto God.

- "when we were in the **flesh**"

- "flesh" (σα,ρξ) = while this term has been used before in the book of Romans, it has never been used in quite this same way.

- This is the first time it has been used in connection with us being "*in the flesh*." (In fact, the closest thing to it is back in 6:19 when Paul talked about *the infirmity of your flesh*, but even there it is not what he is talking about here.)

- The common way most folks think about this expression "*in the flesh*" is that it is either referring to your former position 'in Adam,' or your position under the law.

- But it's worded the way in which it is worded because what it says is not simply the equivalent of being 'in Adam' or the equivalent of being under the law.

- Otherwise that's what it would have said.

- Rather, Paul says, "*For when we were in the flesh*" — and that's what you're IN when you're *under the law*.

- Now, that might sound like I just denied what I just said, but that's not the case.
- If you listen carefully, the idea is that being *in the flesh*—that's what you are left to (so to speak) when you are under the law.
- Under the law, you are left to your flesh's capacity to do what the law says, and to bring forth fruit under it—and your design and your purpose is to try to bring forth fruit unto God under it.
(Which is exactly what most Christians are trying to do this very minute!)
- But the point is, that you are left to your flesh's capacity to bring forth fruit that God's Justice will accept.
 - Which means that it's got to be God's own fruit!
- And one of the purposes of the law was to show and demonstrate that the flesh has no capacity to bring forth ANYTHING that equals what God can do!!!
- And that's what (:5) teaches. It teaches that *when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law*
 - Notice it's "*motions (Pl) of sins (Pl)*"
 - This position of being "*in the flesh*" and attempting to put whatever capacity the flesh has into effect by going under that law—it didn't just have a 'minor glitch' to it (so to speak) - it didn't just have a single flaw—it didn't just fail in one area, or even two or three—No—the capacity of your flesh is utterly incapable of success in ANY area of that law!
 - The capacity of your flesh to operate under that law fails repeatedly—it fails multiple times—it doesn't just put "a" sin in motion—the production of your flesh under that law set the *motions of sins* into effect!
- "*motions*" (pa,qhma = that which one suffers; an enduring, an undergoing) - AV 16x—*suffering* 11; *affliction* 3, *affection* 1, *motion* 1
- *Motion*, in the most general terms (and it is a general term) indicates the process of moving. It is an abstract term of action—of active operation due to some force acting upon the object.

- “*Motions*” = a moving, - in English we often put an ‘e’ in front of it to get the word “emotion” (e = out + motion = a moving—hence a moving out).

- It has to do with movement that is caused or directed by another force acting upon something.

- All other modern English translations have “passions” - but the context is driving at what the end product (the “fruit”) or the outward expression is of your *flesh*.

- And it is conceivable to have a ‘passion’ without any outward sign of it.

- *Motions* causes you to think of something visibly brought forth. And that’s what “*fruit*” is—it’s the outward product—it’s what the members of the tree produce!

- *Motions of sins* generates in our minds just what the context is driving at: when our *flesh* interacted with *the law* it resulted in the *motions of sins*—the affect of law upon & in conjunction with our *flesh* was to put sin in motion.

- And it did in ‘in spades’ - the plurals emphasize the extent or degree to which sin was set in motion—not just one way or in one or two areas—but the law put the whole range of sins into motion!!!

- (The very law that you would argue is the thing that is going to produce +R/Holiness?!?!?)

- Ex., We may talk about the earth (or other heavenly bodies) ‘moving’ - but that doesn’t mean the same thing as talking about the *motion* of the planets—or the *motion* of the earth. Because when we talk about the earth being set in motion, it has at least 4 different movements to it. (And the force that affects all those motions is gravity.)

- Again, this is the ONLY time in the entire Bible where the term “*motions*” or ‘motion’ occurs.

- Therefore, this is unique terminology– or, we might say, overly expressive terminology (and I don’t mean that in a bad sense or critical sense).

- And often times when that unique or overly expressive terminology is encountered, it's designed (if not solely, then primarily) designed for the purpose of 'grabbing your attention' and underscoring the concept—making it so you can't miss it!
- And when you think about what is going on in these final two verses (:5-6) in connection with the Objection regarding the law, being the law that it is, you can't summarily dismiss it, and so forth; that's what He's doing.
- God is, through the apostle Paul, bringing that whole issue to its conclusion. And He's making it, therefore, so that all of the outstanding objections that have been dealt with since (6:15) began to deal with the objections of our not being *under the law, but under grace*—and brings it here to the point where no objections will remain.
- The only thing that's going to be dealt with after (:6) is the root behind those objections: the common misunderstandings concerning the law's purpose. (And that gets dealt with from 7:7-25).
- Therefore, (:5-6) are going to make a very strong, dogmatic statement that produces a strong, dogmatic realization!
- And the fundamental realization is that, this position "in Christ" that we've been given CANNOT be put into practice under that law.
 - Which is why (:6) goes on to say—*But now we are delivered from the law,*—we had to be *delivered* from it to be able to get this position "in Christ" to be put into practice!
 - And, therefore, we've got to have something ELSE operating in our "*spirit*" - we need "*newness of spirit*" and not "*the oldness of the letter*" operating in it!
 - But before that "*newness of spirit*" without the "*oldness of the letter*" operating in it can be fully described in Ch. 8:1-13, those two 'tap-roots' behind the objections in the first place have got to be uprooted and thrown out—which is again what 7:7-25 does.

- So when you think about what is going on in (:5-6), that terminology there is especially designed to make it coincide with, and give all the necessary support for that conclusion that our position in Christ will not function under that law!

- (And that's the whole reason why we're not under the law, but under grace.)

- And so we're confronted with this, shall we say, exceptional expression: "*the motions of sins*" - an expression that is overturned by all the modern Bible correctors and modern English versions to read something like 'sinful passions' - which is an expression that is NOT in keeping with what the context of Romans 7:5 is driving at!

- 'Sinful passions' totally obscures what the context of Romans 7:5 is supposed to be generating in your thinking about being under the law and the erroneous thinking about that law!

- The Bible corrector will, of course, appeal to his final authority: Greek lexicons and Greek grammars that are written by unbelievers and/or men of doctrinal heresy; and finally to his own personal opinions and preferences.

- (The only consistent point of agreement among them is that the reading of the KJ is WRONG and must be corrected!)

- But the truth of the matter is "*motions of sins*" is in perfect keeping with the context, and more than that, it carries a shade of meaning that 'passions' simply fails to carry.

- Remember that the context is dealing with erroneous thinking and erroneous objections about the law—plus keep in mind that the first phrase of (:5) sets the stage for the proper working of the context:

"For when we were in the flesh,"

- And there is something very particular (even though it is a very basic and fundamental concept) - there is a very particular issue or concept about the law that is supposed to be generated in your thinking by this phrase.

- That phrase: "*the motions of sins, which were by the law,*" is designed to kind of 'hit you between the eyes' with the truth of something that the whole objection was based upon, being the exact opposite of what you were thinking—i.e., you thought that it was so, when in fact, that was NOT so.

- The whole objection was based upon the law being a means of squelching or restraining sin, and promoting righteousness and holiness.

- But the context of (:5) plus the excellency of the expression “*the motions of sins*” tells you in basic, easy-to-understand language that what that law actually did in truth was to PUT SIN IN MOTION!

- And the basic, fundamental issue in the term “*motions*” (an issue obscured by such a term as ‘passions’) is the issue of; the shade of meaning of: the law gave sin *motions*—that law gave sin the ability to MOVE AROUND!

- It (the law) didn’t shackle it (sin) - it didn’t chain it to a tree—it gave it the right to MOVE AROUND within you (your flesh) and do what it wanted to!!!

- And that’s the shade of meaning “*motions*” has that “passions” doesn’t have! That idea of being free—**freedom of movement** or “*motions*” - and that’s what the context is driving at—for you to have just that kind of ‘smack in the head’ impact made in your thinking!

- That law didn’t come along and put RIGHTEOUSNESS in motion! It put SIN in motion! It didn’t put HOLINESS in motion—it put *sins* in motion!

Romans 7:5

5 For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.

- Notice that phrase: *which were by the law*

- “*by*” (**dia,**) is a *by* of means—i.e., the law is the mechanical means that put sin in motion! (Again, just the opposite of most thinking that the law is the mechanical means to squelch sin, to prevent sin from taking place, to retard or restrain sin.)

- “*did work in our members*”

- “*work*” (**evnerge,w** = to be operative (operational); to be at work; to put forth power)

- “*members*” (**me,loj** = a member or limb of the human body.)

- We had this term used before, back in (6:13).

- The *mortal body* is the general expression, but while we have our *mortal body*, we also have this sanctified, functional life position “in Christ” of being *dead to sin* and *alive unto God*—and now we are also told that we are *dead to the law* (7:4).

- Furthermore, we are to bring forth *fruit unto holiness* (6:22) in our mortal bodies—and the term *members* is the issue of having that to be EXPRESSED in our body.

- Our *mortal body* is composed of *members* by which we can do all sorts of things. Our feet and legs can take us some place; our arms and hands can be occupied with crafting something or participating in something, or cooperating with something, etc.

- And the *members* concept is the issue of implementing or putting into practice something. It’s the issue of you responding in a particular way—(whatever the context is).

- But here in (7:5) it’s not the idea of bringing forth *fruit unto holiness under grace*; but bringing forth **fruit unto death under the law!!!**

5 *For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. (Romans 7:5)*

- That law didn’t come along and put RIGHTEOUSNESS in motion!
It put SIN in motion!

- And those “*motions of sins*” *did work in our members* (and what does it bring forth?) *fruit unto death*.

- Fruit that God’s Justice comes along and says, “I’ll have nothing to do with that—that’s to be totally separated from Me!”

- So the phrase “*when we were in the flesh*” is designed to make the impact on your thinking (and generate in your thinking) the concept that being under the law is an agreement with, or an attempt to have our flesh do the work—it’s saying that we agree to the terms of the contract that within our own *flesh* we will (in conjunction with this law) produce fruit that God’s Justice will accept.

- Which is the same as saying that our *flesh* under that law will produce the exact equivalent to what God, Himself, can do!

- But instead of actually doing that, every time the law engages with our **flesh** it puts in motion SINS and not righteousness (or holiness)!!!
- This is another (shocking) function of the law that we had to be told about!

5 *For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.*

6 *But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.*

- Notice how (:6) has a ‘ring’ to it kind of like 3:21—

21 But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;

- And what was that? The Gospel of Christ. (Justification)

- And this is kind of like a ‘gospel’ - or God’s spelled-out-message for our sanctification!

- Before we look at the remaining details of (:6), let’s look for a moment at the way in which some of the terms that are being used here are to be understood and appreciated.

- We are told in (:5) that putting ourselves under the law can only bring *forth fruit unto **death***—and then that terminology is brought up again in (:6) when it says, “*But now we are delivered from the law, that being **dead** wherein we were held; ...*”

- (:5) death (qa,natoj) - physical/bodily death

- (:6) dead (avpoqnh|,skw) - the natural death of a man

- And the usual way in which we used to deal with such things was to take time to analyze just what kind of death is being spoken of: is it physical death? or spiritual death? or some other category of death?

- But in this case you have to pay attention to the way in which the information is being presented to you—and it is critical that you keep yourself within the context of what is being said to you.

- And this is no place to critically analyze or categorize death at all!!

- And if you do pay attention to both the context and the way things are being presented to you in the book of Romans, you already know that you are going from milk to meat.
- You are going from very basic to very specific.
- And we really aren't dealing with any kind of critique or any kind of a categorical analysis of *death* at this point in Romans.
- In other words, just what are we to make out of the uses of *death*, *dead*, or even *life* and *living*, for that matter? (Rom. 8:6, 10, 12-13)
- And for right now, all we're after is the basic concept of what *death* is—and *death*, in its most basic definition is A SEPARATION.

- *Death* is a judgmental separation.

- And in this context here, it's dealing with the fact that God's Justice comes along and says, "Put that away from me! I'll have nothing to do with that! I have no acceptance with that!"

- There's something about both the term *life* and *death* that an awful lot of people don't really appreciate.

- And that's because they have no frame of reference (or very little frame of reference) for how God has used these terms all throughout His program with Israel before you ever come to us in this dispensation of grace.

- God has used those terms (*life* and *death*) in numerous ways and in numerous contexts throughout His program with Israel, before this dispensation of grace began.

- And there's a realization (or an expectation) - or maybe I should say a real expectation that we would realize that, and understand and appreciate that those are terms that can be used to mean something other than (or in a context other than) either physical death or physical life; or spiritual death or spiritual life—which are the two most common contexts in which we are able to think about *life* and *death*.

- But, if you have been paying attention, you know that God has used them in other ways.

- And especially, when you're talking about *death*, God can come along, (and has come along), and talked about and utilized the issue of *death* to refer to things that have no physical life to them; or even things that have no spiritual life to them—but to use these terms in the most fundamental way in which life and death can be used.

- And that is to refer to something that has life as something that is compatible with and acceptable to God.

- And something that has death to it as something that has no compatibility with Him and that He has no acceptance with—and therefore He shoved that away from Him! He doesn't want anything that is death or dead near Him!

- He's not going to allow it to be near Him and to be with Him!

- And when you get here to the doctrine of our sanctification, you need to realize that in the first 5 chapters of Romans, in dealing with the issue of the “gospel of Christ” and our justification unto eternal life, etc., those issues of physical life/physical death & spiritual life/spiritual death and even eternal life/eternal death **have** been dealt with.

- And because of that, you need to have the realization that when this doctrine of sanctification comes along—and even though it's going to talk about (and rightly so and necessarily so) the issue of Christ's physical death, burial and resurrection—and us being baptized into His literal death, burial and resurrection—when it then talks about the *life* and *death* issues that come out of that, it's going to talk about them in the context of sanctification.

- And so because sanctification is a different issue than justification and salvation—the real possibility exists, therefore, that you're going to have another kind of *life* and *death* brought up.

- And not only would you think of that as a reasonable possibility and a reasonable likelihood, but any familiarity you have with Israel's program would also let you know that that's not simply likely: that's a MUST!

- Because sanctification under Israel's program was spoken about with *life* and *death* in connection with it—and the *life* and *death* wasn't physical life or physical death, or spiritual life or spiritual death in the sense of eternal life or eternal death.

- But it was FUNCTIONAL LIFE and FUNCTIONAL DEATH.

- And therefore having what is brought forth, either as having acceptance with God or non-acceptance with Him.

- And either being rewarded or not rewarded on the basis of that, and so forth—other things that pertain to the context of **sanctification.**

- And so when the doctrine of our sanctified position in Christ has been taught, and then the application of it is made to the details of our lives right now—the issue becomes one of functional life by living in accordance with and consistent with that position in Christ; or functional death by not living in accordance with and consistent with it.

- And the first issue of ‘accord’ or ‘discord’ comes up based upon what Paul said in Romans 6 and verse 14.

- That *sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace*—and therefore that indicates that there is only ONE WAY in which this position in Christ we’ve just been given (and that we have recognized the reality of) - there’s only one way in which it can be acceptably put into practice: and that is to live under grace and not under the law.

- And from there you start getting confronted with the fact (as the objections are dealt with and the necessity of seeing that being *under grace* is the only way it’s going to work)—you start getting confronted with the fact that if you put yourself underneath that law, you’re going to bring forth fruit that is death in God’s eyes—or *fruit unto death.*

- And therefore it’s fruit that God is NOT going to accept—He’s going to say, “Separate that away from Me! I don’t want that around Me!

- In fact, there’s going to be an appointed time when He is going to rid Himself of any such fruit that’s brought forth.

- For us, it’s at the Judgment Seat of Christ—for Israel, it’s at their judgment (as James says) in preparation for entrance into that kingdom.

- But the issue is, that because it is *fruit unto death*, God not only declares it to be such, and declares that His Justice will have nothing to do with it—but when it actually comes to the time for rewards in connection with sanctification, He will physically destroy it and dismiss it and get rid of it from His presence so it's not even around.

- The point is, that's what the *death* and *life* issue is unto sanctification.

- It's really not an issue of trying to equate it to physical life or physical death or spiritual life/spiritual death type issues—no—even though there is commonness in all categories of *life* and *death*, but the major issue in our sanctification is FUNCTIONAL life and FUNCTIONAL death—because that IS the kind of *life* and *death* you are concerned with in the application of sanctification.

- And the more someone is aware of the use of *life* and *death* in that way, the more they appreciate that—especially in this middle section of the doctrine of our sanctification when you're actually dealing with the issue of putting it into practice—and the fact that there's only ONE WAY of putting it into practice so that the *fruit* that's brought forth, the end of it is “*everlasting life*” - it, itself lives forever—and God doesn't destroy it and get rid of it!

- And that's the capstone to Ch. 6—that's how it ends with the fact that *under grace*, we've got the greatest and most compelling reason there could ever be for not sinning but doing that which is righteous and good in God's sight—because we have the capacity to bring forth *fruit unto holiness*—and that *fruit unto holiness* is fruit unto life everlasting—it's going to live forever; God wants it around forever.

- He's so delighted with it and it so glorifies Him, and it is so fully compatible with every aspect of His character and nature that He wants it around—and therefore He gives it *everlasting life* as well!!!

- That's the most powerful motivator there is!

- So therefore all of the terminology in verse 5; and even in verse 6; is not designed to have you run through some sort of mental, categorical marathon-type obstacle course of detailed analysis of all these terms—no—it is deigned to simply generate in your thinking (by very powerful words or ‘generators’ so to speak) that everything that is most commonly thought about when it comes to the law is in reality the exact opposite of that erroneous thinking!

- And in (:5) we have two expressions of that oppositeness of thinking about the law.

- In connection with the law:

- 1) “*the motions of sins*” - the law was the mechanical means in our flesh by which sin was put in motion—free to move about unshackled.
- 2) “*fruit unto death*” - the law worked in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.

- Both phrases are graphically descriptive expressions of what being ALIVE TO SIN is all about—because when you’re alive to sin, sin is what is in motion in you—and it’s not unto one particular sin, it’s unto numerous, multiple, multitudes of them.

- And the result of all that being alive to sin under that law is, in the final analysis is the production or bringing forth of *fruit unto death*— it produces something God wants destroyed and put away from His presence!

- And what all that terminology in (:5) leaves you with is an understanding for, and the complete necessity for God having to do exactly what (:6) opens up with—God is going to have to DELIVER you from that law!

- And not just because putting you *under grace* was one of several alternatives—no—putting you under grace was the ONLY alternative!

- And the final ‘kicker’ to drive the final nail in the coffin of the law’s uselessness to us is the fact that when you’re *under the law* and you’re functioning under its dictates, you have going on in you the exact OPPOSITE of your position “in Christ!”

- You have that law putting sin in motion and giving it life and being the ‘life-blood’ of it (which is the exact opposite of you being *dead to sin*) - and you have it (that law) working in your *members to bring forth fruit unto death*, when your *members* have been made *instruments of righteousness!*

- So in a sense, the impact of the effectual working of (:5-6) is: ‘Can’t you get it through your thick skull that you can not be underneath that law and put your position in Christ into practice?’

- ‘Can’t you see that it does the exact opposite of what the first 10 verses of chapter 6 says God made you to be “in Christ?”

- And the issue is, that’s exactly what you’re supposed to see—and when you see that, your only conclusion is: 6:14 has to be the way it is—I have no other objections—there can be no other objections.

- There can still be some misunderstandings and some puzzlement and perplexities, and that’s what 7:7-25 deals with—but there can be no other objections. Romans 6:14 stands—it HAS to be that way!

- So we have (:6)

6 But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.

- And we have a semicolon so that we pause and have the full realization of the first clause:

“But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; ...”

- That’s what God HAD to do, it was absolutely necessary; and that’s what your being baptized into Jesus Christ did do! *It delivered you from the law!*

- “*But now*” is the gospel-like good news of God’s spelled-out message to you of your sanctification.

- “*we are*” is the present and current position we have in Christ.

- “*delivered*” tells you that you have a true and real salvation in connection with sanctification: in justification you had to be saved from the debt & penalty of your sins—and in sanctification you had to be saved from the power of sin’s operations in your members!

- And there is an important shade of meaning to the term *deliver* that ‘discharged’ (ASV, RSV, NRSV) or ‘released’ (NIV, NASV) or other words used by modern English translation or Bible correctors simply doesn’t carry.

- *Deliver* is simply **not** in the synonym family of those words!

- The synonym family of words that properly surround the term *delivered* are words like *rescued* and *saved*!
- “*Delivered*” (**katarge,w** = to cause a person or thing to have no further power or force or influence; to render inoperative)
- But the context (being gospel-like or salvation-like) demands a more aggressive and forceful term be used to generate in your thinking that a complete separation from the law had to take place—we had to be severed from it; literally, *saved* from it: we had to be *delivered* from it!
 - But the context is driving at more than just being separated from the law’s effects—there is something very personal being driven at. (I’ll get back to this later)
- In dealing with the excellency of the KJV’s use of the English word “*delivered*” there are a couple of things at work to make this the most excellent choice of words for this context.
 - One is the use of a word with a very powerful plosive phonetic: (d) or even (p) words have it. And it’s in these areas of phonetic excellence and prosody excellence (i.e., the structure of particular meter within a verse) that make the term *delivered* the most outstanding word in your thinking in the whole first clause of (:6) - I say that with one small caveat: there is another (d) word that stands out as well: “*dead*.”
 - And to the credit of the ASV, RSV, and NRSV they do have a plosive (d)-word ‘discharged’ - but ‘discharged’ fails miserably to enforce in your thinking what this very personal issue is that is being driven at by the context of 7:1-6!
 - The NIV and NASV are just pathetically weak on all counts in dealing with this term! (‘released’)
 - The other reason for *delivered* being the most excellent term to be used in this context has to do with a shade of meaning it carries that both ‘discharged’ and ‘released’ simply do not carry.

- Definition-wise the term *deliver* means to set free, to liberate, to release (NIV NASV), rescue, to save.

- But when you go look at the etymology or origins of what makes up the word *deliver*, its Latin and French roots signifies, to run to a person's assistance in the moment of difficulty; **to save and make safe!** (A salvation!)

- Now, to get back to that very personal issue that is being driven at by the context of someone who is justified unto eternal life by grace through faith; and more than that, one who is sanctified unto functional life by grace through faith, and is being told in very powerful language that they are *not under the law, but under grace*—in fact that law and being under that law is viewed (for anyone in their sanctified position “in Christ” in this dispensation of grace—in God’s program with the members of the church, the body of Christ) - that is, being sanctified unto functional life, but attempting to live that sanctified life under that law is viewed as a PERSONAL PERIL to that individual Christian!

- And, fortunately, when we are told that we had to be *delivered from the law*—one of the shades of meaning that *delivered* has that any of the other words like ‘discharged’ or ‘released’ does not carry, is that when you are talking about having to be *delivered* from something, it is telling you that you are in PERSONAL, IMMINENT DANGER!!!

- The shade of meaning of *delivered* is the idea of taking you out of danger (harm's way) and keeping you safe from danger. (That’s why this is in all reality a ‘salvation’ message!)

- In fact, it is perfectly permissible to use even more forceful language in connection with being *delivered*: for it connotes being saved from danger and EVIL! (Because, just as Paul tells Timothy [I Tim. 4:1] that living under that law doctrine is “*giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils;*”)

- Both the plosive (d) and the element of personal danger is designed to drive home the full force of the impact in your thinking about the law and its roll in your functional, sanctified life!!!
(*But now we are delivered from the law, ...*)

- Now for the second phrase of the first clause:

6 *But now we are delivered from the law, **that being dead wherein we were held**;*

- Without going back over ground we've already covered, this phrase draws you back to the legal basis upon which we are *delivered from the law* and upon which Paul's statement in 6:14 stands (... *for ye are not under the law, but under grace*) and upon which the whole 2nd Objection (that because the law is the law, you just can't summarily dismiss it and set it aside) is exposed as erroneous, attacked, corrected, and dismissed as having any valid substance to it at all.

- Simply put, *that being dead wherein we were held* cites the legal basis upon which being *delivered from the law* could be done.

- "*that*" is not a purpose clause *that*, but it is a *that* which is used to express the cause, ground or reason of what was previously stated.

- Therefore, in keeping with the context of "*them that know the law*" - God has the apostle Paul make this drastic and very harsh statement about us having to be *delivered from the law*, but for those legal minds out there, remember that this is all done lawfully!

- "*being dead*" - is the lawful manner in which it is done. Because of our position "in Christ" being baptized by the Holy Spirit *into Jesus Christ* (6:3-4), we have been baptized (fully identified) into His actual death, His actual burial, and His actual resurrection.

- Therefore this further issue that needs to be stated about us having to be *delivered from the law* also has as its legal basis for being done (just as (:4) said): we also are *become dead to the law by the body of Christ*.

- The deadness or death being spoken about here is our death-identity with the Lord Jesus Christ who, Himself died a real death and died to that law as well.

- And that death-identity we have "in Christ" allows for us to be *delivered from the law* (as well as all the other things in keeping with the marriage illustration/analogy).

- And notice the choice of terminology in (:6) just underscores the real and present danger that the law and it's whole law system is to the functional life of the believer who is now *under grace*!

*6 But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead **wherein we were held**;*

- “held” (kate,cw = to hold down, to hold away from, to detain)

- “held” is being used in a legal context—a very serious and dangerous legal context.

- It is as if you are being held on charges to then be taken away and executed—which is just what would happen if you were to try to live under that law; if you were to grab hold of the law and try to put your sanctified life into effect by means of that law!

- Again, this expression “held” in the phrase *wherein we were held* is designed to generate in your thinking the very real danger—the dangerous position you are in if you are trying to functionally live unto God under that law!

- It's not funny or ‘fun’, it's not something to play around with, it's not to be taken as having some latitude or ‘wiggle’ room to be utilized—NO! - you are in a dangerous, perilous position under Israel's law system!!!

- A dangerous system that you had to be delivered or saved from!!!

- So we have the first clause of (:6)...

6 But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; (and now we have a second clause—which is a purpose clause) that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.

- “that” introduces the purpose clause—the very purpose for which we have been saved or *delivered from the law*.

- And the truth of the matter is, that even though we are introduced to some new terminology that talks about what our current, sanctified position in Christ is all about (in general), at the same time it calls upon you to bring many things already encountered from Ch.6 into play.

- “(in order) *that we should serve in newness of spirit, ...*”

- Note “*should*” - which we had back in (:4) (“*that we should bring forth fruit unto God*”) - while you are being told the ONLY way in which your sanctified life in Christ will function properly, it in no way means that is what most Christians will actually do.

- For you can (and most do) put themselves under that law system which dishonors God and honors the Adversary; and is a disgraceful thing for any believer to do!

- Putting yourself under Israel’s law system in this dispensation of grace is foolish and nothing but Christian stupidity!

- “*serve*” (**douleu,w**) - which we were introduced to back in 6:16, and which is ‘corrected’ from “*servant*” to ‘slave’ which completely destroys the doctrinal impact in the context! (In fact the NRSV still tries to have it ‘that we are slaves’)!)

- Again, the shade of meaning of *servant* (that slave does not have) is the idea of having a compelling reason to do what someone says—and **grace** is infinitely more compelling and infinitely more powerful to compel you to do what it says (more than the law could ever be) — to restrain you from sinning and to motivate you to do good!

- “*in newness of spirit*” - (a very general expression)

- (**kaino,thj pneu/ma**) - a new state of life.

- Remember that we have already encountered “*newness of life*” back in Romans 6:4—but now we have *newness of spirit* (small case ‘s’) - meaning your human spirit.

- Most of the Bible correctors and modern English translations completely confuse the context and the issue by capitalizing the ‘s’ in spirit!

- This is, again, because the only point of agreement with the modern Bible correctors is that the KJV is always wrong. And they totally misunderstand the accuracy and excellency

- “*newness of spirit*” is a general expression that is talking about something going on in your human spirit.
- That expression is describing (in general terms) that a new system of thinking and operation in your human spirit is what you are now going to have to operate on!
- That means having a new system of operation and thinking in your human spirit instead of having the letter of the law operating there!
- Instead of having that performance system in your mind, and thinking that God is going to bless you if you do good and curse you if you do evil!
 - And, by the way having FEAR as your motivation!
And having that operating in your mind.
(Ex. 19:16-19; 20:18-20)
- And instead of having all that in your mind, and being mindful of that, and responding in the details of your life on the basis of that kind of thinking, God tells you that you are *dead to the law by the body of Christ*—He’s *delivered* you from that law!
- And that issue of the *newness of spirit* is the issue of **GRACE THINKING!**
- It’s the issue of thinking of who you are “in Christ” by the riches of God’s grace unto you—and being motivated by that! And responding in the details of your life, and living consistent with all that GRACE has made you to be!
- The issue now is that being *delivered from the law* and now serving (having a greater compelling reason) to *serve in newness of spirit* is the establishment of this new relationship with this new system of being under grace—on the basis of that then, is that the way (the ONLY way) I’m ever going to serve God properly and to His honor and glory in connection with my position in Christ, and to do that I’ve got to have NEW INFORMATION operating in my human *spirit*, and not the old information of the letter of the law!

- And by doing that, that will have, therefore, your *members* that are to be those *instruments of righteousness* actually bringing forth the righteous *fruit unto holiness* that lasts forever!

- And so we have (:6) saying,

6 But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.

- “*oldness of the letter*”

- “*oldness*” is to be understood as it was when we were back in (:6) talking about our “*old man*” - that is that it is *old* in the sense that this thing called the *newness of spirit* is totally and completely **different** than anything contained in that letter of the law.

- It is a general expression indicating something that is no longer useful to us in any way or in any sense—it’s old!

- And calling the letter of the law “*old-ness*” (having the quality and characteristic of being old) - is saying that your sanctified position in Christ, and what you are going to have to operate on is completely different in quality and completely different in characteristic than anything contained in that law!

- There is, however, something more detailed we can know about the use of the word “*letter*” to describe the law, but my understanding and appreciation of what is going on here doesn’t really demand that we know that at all. (In fact, I have already covered that issue—although it has been quite some time ago.)

- Since this is to “*them that know the law*” this term “*letter*” is terminology that would be immediately understood by any thinking Jew with an honest heart.

- And there is some detailed and technical issues involved with the “*letter*” terminology—and the Lord Jesus Christ takes the apostate, vain, religious system in Israel to task for their lack of such things that He calls the “*weightier matters*” of the law back in Matthew 23:23.

- The term “*letter*” is really an expression referring to the methodology of the law—the way in which it went about doing its job.
- And that’s the big, major contrast that is being made here in (:6).
- The two systems (*under the law—under grace*) operate differently; their methodology is different (completely different) - and the way in which the spirit (small ‘s’) of the member of the church, the body of Christ (the sanctified saint we’re dealing with here—you and I) the way in which we think in connection with sanctification, and the way in which we utilize the information that God gives us for putting our position in Christ into practice in the details of our lives is different from both what is contained in the law, and from how the law addressed our spirit!
- And that’s like the final hammer blow of that final nail in the coffin—because since you have to operate on *newness of spirit* and not in the *oldness of the letter*, then you can’t be *under the law* and have your position in Christ function.
- Because the law will not address your *spirit* as it needs to be addressed, nor give it what it needs to have operating in it so your position in Christ can function.
- And that becomes even more evident as the rest of the doctrine of our sanctification is given to us—including the information about our vocational purpose in this dispensation of God’s grace.
- Because the law doesn’t contain any real information that helps us out very much at all, if any, when it comes to being prepared to function as a member of the *new creature* of the church the body of Christ.
 - Which is why we needed to have a whole new sonship curriculum written for us—the sonship curriculum for the members of the remnant of Israel wouldn’t do us any good. (All that comes up later—but it is part and parcel of the *newness* concept under grace.)
- But the point here is that this expression, “*the oldness of the letter*” is an expression that is designed to be a very powerful and graphic phrase that puts the law in an awful, horrible position in your thinking—in fact just the complete opposite of what is most commonly think about when most folks think about God’s law!

- And these kind of almost disparaging, belittling, derogatory (and to anyone embracing that law system they are actually **insulting**) expressions are just heaped up, one on top of the other throughout verses 5 and 6.

- The law operates in connection with our flesh.
- The law was the mechanical means by which sins were put in motion.
- The law produced fruit unto death.
- The law was so dangerous to our sanctified, functional life position in Christ that we had to be delivered from it.
- The law held us in a position of imminent peril and personal danger.
- The law compelled us to serve God by fear.
- The law is the opposite of how we should be serving God.
- The law fails to contain the proper information we need to operate on in this dispensation of grace.
- The law is old and useless to put our sanctified position in Christ into effect.
- The law will put your sanctified, functional life in Christ to death.
 - (That's 10 harmful and detrimental things about the law that comes out of just verses 5 and 6!!!)

- Well, if we can honestly say that we see 6:14 standing as being the truth of the matter—and if we can see these two objections being fully dealt with and perfectly legally dismissed with no other possible objections being raised, then we should be ready for the remainder of chapter 7 that goes on to deal with tow major and common misunderstandings that lie at the root of these objections in the first place.

- ROMANS 7:7-12

- THE 1ST MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT THE LAW and its corrective doctrine that replaces the misunderstanding with proper understanding about it.

- We should be well aware of the fact that we are still in the **SECOND MAJOR CORNERSTONE** of our foundational, godly edification:

- Establishment in the doctrine of our Sanctification by grace through faith—with the goal of a complete and comprehensive knowledge of our sanctified standing before God “in Christ” which enables us to “live unto God.”

- And we should also know that all that information is contained in Romans chapters 6, 7, and 8.

- And within the four-fold breakdown of those 3 chapters we are currently in the 2nd major component of that body of information—which runs from Romans 6:14 through Romans 7:25.

- All of which teaches us that the effectual working of our sanctified position “in Christ” requires that we be “*not under the law, but under grace.*”

- And now in Romans 7:7-13 we are no longer dealing with any objections to being under grace and not under the law—but we now shift to dealing with the underlying misassumptions and misconceptions about the law which are at the very root of the objections in the first place.

- So in these 6 verses we are going to be dealing with the 1st of 2 Misunderstandings in regard to now being *not under the law, but under grace* and the corrective doctrine regarding it.

- Now, as we have said before, the remainder of chapter 7 is now going to deal with the deepest roots of all that lie at the very core of all these objections and erroneous thinking about the law—about how it is that we are going to put our sanctified life “in Christ” into effect.

- And just the way in which God has arranged His word—in the very sense and sequence that He put it in the book form that you hold in your hand—there should be something very fundamental and very real about all this when it pertains to your functional life.

- And this is something very elementary, but very profound to really hit you square between the eyes (so to speak) - for it is something that (even though it is so elementary) it is missed by almost every Bible teacher—and that is that **God, Himself has written the method and/or the system of proper edification for His saints!**

- And this is shocking to most Christians—and in fact, even if it can be pointed out to most Christians (i.e., if they have enough honesty of heart to give it a hearing), it will in large part be ignored and cast behind them as having no reality/importance to them at all.

- Being just as (if not more) guilty as apostate Israel in Psalm 50:16-17—*16 But unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth? 17 Seeing thou hatest instruction, and castest my words behind thee.*

- For if nothing else—if you only give Romans 6-8 a fair and honest reading, it becomes absolutely clear that there is a method or system or curriculum that is laying here in these verses.

- And that curriculum has order to it. It has sense to it. It has a particular sequence to it that God, Himself ordered, arranged, and put together with all His omnipotent and omniscient power and understanding of how He, Himself created your human spirit and human soul (your entire “inner man”) and even your human body - and how to properly appeal to it, and to properly have things generated in that inner man so that by the power of His words and by the order of His words and by the effectual working of His words there will be proper growth and edification in that inner man of yours that He, Himself created.

- And by this point in our study of Romans this should be a reality in your thinking—not just some kind of theory or general idea or hypothesis—but an identifiable reality!

- But the truth of the matter is that that is NOT the way most folks ever look at the Bible. And because they never give the Bible the proper place of final authority in their lives, they only see it as a collection of God’s writings that have been randomly put together, or at least put together by mere men without any consideration as to it having a continuous line of educational curriculum.

- And it is also a glaringly apparent truth that almost all (if not all) of the Bible teachers and those who write about the Bible either fail entirely to see the truth of God's own written curriculum for our education and edification—or else they totally ignore it and opt instead for their own humanly designed curriculum based upon very little of what God said, and based instead on the wisdom of men and what men say.

- And this is the case from the desks of the highest Bible critics in the theological seminaries down to the pulpits and Sunday school classrooms and home Bible studies.

- And the proof of this can be seen in any Christian bookstore. Because the vast majority of Christian books are all geared in some way to how a Christian is supposed to live their life.

- They deal with prayer, the ways of the heart, the purpose of life, facing fear, temptation, sin, lust, the 'journey' of life, the battle for the mind, how to be a man, how to be a woman, how to love, how to have a prosperous marriage, cures for life, how to have a heart like God's, issues of Christian conduct and behavior, problems of faith and faithlessness, believing in yourself, spiritual leadership, how to be "like Christ" (and 8 essentials to get you there), knowing God's will for your life, exploring the cravings of the human spirit, Christian courage, Christian discipline, Christian discipleship, Christian's walk, and all done in 4 easy steps or 8 steps or 7 steps or 12 steps, etc., etc., etc.

- In other words those who fail to recognize God's book as having an already written, fully developed, and fully detailed curriculum for our education and edification, identify only those things they think are problems, then make up their own way of dealing with them, sprinkle them with a verse here and a verse there out of something they call a bible, and then pawn it off on a Christian public that is just asking to be duped of their money and bewitch of their functional, sanctified life—a vicious cycle of a never-ending assembly line of printed garbage given to a willing Christian public who is easily parted with their money.

- And you would think that if they just looked at the books on their shelf, they would realize that that last book didn't work—because I had to buy another—and that didn't work because I had to buy another...

- Shouldn't it have occurred to someone by now that—let's see, the first Bible was printed by Gutenberg back in 1455, so that makes 551 years—in 551 years of printing books, hasn't it occurred to anyone that all those books that men write that attempt to make up the steps or the devices or the methods or the systems to cause a believer to properly and consistently live unto God just doesn't work????

- How much more time do we need? How many more hot, #1 best-sellers do we need? How many more books are folks going to buy that, either wittingly or unwittingly make themselves out to be the “KEY” to Christian living, only to set it aside (and after all the emotion wears off) wait for the next “KEY” to come along and dupe them again—and again, and again

- The truth of the matter is that most of the Christian world is blinded by the stars in their eyes—the hottest Christian celebrities that become “The Untouchables” in their eyes.

- Isn't it sad when you can get more of a 'rise' out of a Christian by saying that what their favorite Christian author wrote is erroneous and wrong???

- In fact, many of the modern Christian celebrities make their living off of saying what God said is erroneous, spurious, and wrong!!!!

- But the truth of the majority of Christianity today is that however things are going to get done will be the way men and women who fail to regard God's word as the final authority in their lives think it should be done—in other words they just make it up.

- Worship service—they just make it up by personal choice.
- Ministry—they just make it up by personal choice.
- Edification—they just make it up by personal choice.

- And worst of all—God's word—the Bible—they just make it up by personal choice.

- So how do you think living and functioning in the sanctified position you have been given in Christ is supposed to work? (Truth is, if this is all you've got—it can't possibly work!!!)

Illustration:

- Johannes Kepler, known as the father of modern astronomy, helped science advance beyond centuries of error. He refused to ignore the apparent contradictions between observation and theory. Aristotle had argued that the sun and planets orbited around the earth, which he believed stood motionless. He had also determined, wrongly, that orbits formed perfect circles. Aristotle reasoned these circular orbits not based primarily on observation but he intuited it (meaning he made it up based on his own personal preferences).

Simply, he thought it should be so and therefore declared the orbits circular. For many centuries careful plotting of the inner planets yielded problems for Aristotle's theory on orbits. Observation and theory seemed at odds.

Most scientists contented themselves assuming their observations wrong and Aristotle's teaching right. Most Bible students do this, too. Christians read passages in the Bible that seem to flat out contradict their learning. What is the typical response? Inattention. Christians choose to ignore what they read in order to retain what they have always been told.

On a Sunday morning in 1996, two Christians were attending church together. One of them (a real Bible student with Biblical theology instead of systematic theology) mentioned to the other that Christians would one day judge the world. His friend strongly disagreed: "No, God will be the judge, not us." He repeated it as though quoting a familiar refrain.

The true Bible believer pointed out several passage of scripture to his friend in order to convince him that this was so. Among other passages he brought him to I Corinthians 6:2-3 which says, "*Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more the things that pertain to this life?*"

Obviously the Bible believer's friend didn't know this. Because he disagreed. "No, that's not right," he said. The Bible believer was flabbergasted.

After the service this Bible believer's friend who strongly disagreed with him about judging the world opened his Study Bible and read the footnote on I Corinthians 6:2, which stated that "The saints will judge the world ... and we will also judge angels."

- "Well, what do you know?" said the Bible believer's friend.

“You’re right. We will be judging the world,” he admitted, **pointing to the footnote at the bottom of the page.**

The Bible believer whispered back, “Why do you believe the footnote, but not the text?”

He never got an answer.

Kepler believed his eyes and not the incorrect notes in his science books, not the erroneous ideas others had taught him. He found an *eight-minute* discrepancy in the arc between the actual orbit of Mars and predictions based on Aristotle’s theoretical model. He could have merrily ignored that apparent discrepancy, chalked it up to difficulty in astronomical measurements, and went on to obscurity as a non-achiever.

However Kepler would not ignore the apparent inconsistency. Imagine his wife calling, “Johann, would you forget those eight minutes and come to bed!”

Rather, he pursued it relentlessly until that particular difficulty yielded its hidden truth. Planets did not move in circular orbits as Aristotle deemed. Planets travel in elliptical orbits around to foci. Thus the Christian astronomer Kepler discovered the first of his three laws governing the motion of the planets and thereby fathered modern astronomy.

- The bottom line is that only honesty of heart and honest of text will open the door to properly dealing with all of the many issues that go to make up the entire Christian way of life—especially the functional, sanctified life of the believer.

- And critical to that is to put away footnotes and marginal references and the stable of stars writing books to sell to gullible Christians—and simply realize what God has done when He put this book together.

- Because if we end up with just another method—just another systematic approach—or just another theory—or just another curriculum based on the wisdom of men and their own personal preferences, then we are just as bad and doing just as much damage to the human spirit as all the other writings of all the other religions in the world! All we’re doing is contributing to the delinquency of Christianity!

- So these two major misunderstandings about the law—one addressed in 7:7-12 and the other addressed in 7:13-25— are at the very deepest root of why those 2 Objections we just looked at occurred in the first place.

- But those objections needed to be dealt with first because those objections had a life of their own (so to speak) that were based upon these misunderstandings and misassumptions.

- And, just like the objections, these misunderstandings about the law are set in a particular order—and they follow a particular progression.

- This first one really comes out of what was said to put to death the 1st and 2nd Objections—i.e., what is said in 7:5-6 makes it so that this first misunderstanding has to be dealt with—and once that is done there will be another second misunderstanding that will come out of what is said in these verses of 7:7-12, and all of (:13-25) will deal with that final misunderstanding about the law.

- And so because of that, this first misunderstanding of (:7-12) is so essential—because you really can't appropriately deal with what the second misunderstanding is until this first one has been cleared up because by clearing up the first one, you expose the second one!

- And that's why it's dealt with in the order in which it is.

- So the first thing we need to do is to take a look at verses 7-12 and identify the various steps or components to it that properly takes you through the misunderstanding, the corrective doctrine and the dismissing of the erroneous thinking, replacing it with the proper understanding.

- (And this IS a great example of not just attacking erroneous doctrine, but attacking it, proving it is in error, but then replacing that erroneous thinking with correct, sound Bible doctrine!)

- And as we have noted before, and just as we did with the 2 erroneous Objections to us not being under the law, but under grace—it is the first step or first component to the argument or presentation that is so crucial because it is the one that sets the tone for everything that follows—and everything that does follow will be based on having a very clear understanding of what that first step is all about.

- And there are some of those *words of logic* that help us get the breakdown of the passage, but all they do is give us some general helps or guidelines—they don't help identify what each component is.

- 1st Component: Stating the 1st Misunderstanding About the Law.

- As it has been with the way in which God has the apostle Paul present the information about our godly sanctification—especially in connection with the erroneous thinking about the law, and that we're not under it, but *under grace*—in each package of doctrine we have been given, Paul states in his opening statement what the big issue of that body of information is going to be about.

- Paul makes an opening statement that distills the entire body of information down to its main objective—an objective that can be presented and clearly grasped in a single statement.

- And since we have kind of become accustomed to that being the case—it comes as no surprise to find that that is exactly how he is going to go about dealing with these remaining misunderstandings about the law.

- In fact, you should almost anticipate that.

- And when you look at first verse of this package of doctrine (:7) that's exactly what we find.

Romans 7:7

7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

- And when you look at that verse, what do you see?
- You see 2 questions followed by a sentence that has 2 clauses to it; but you have a short, two-word statement in the middle ("*God forbid.*").

- And we have confronted this same kind of thing back in the opening verses to the doctrine of our sanctification in 6:1-2. (But here, it's a bit more compact than that.)

- And just by the nature of having these opening 2 questions in rapid succession followed by the "*God forbid.*" really makes us look at those 3 small statements as presenting the core or objective of the body of doctrine being presented. (and they do)

- But the objective stated in a single statement is the middle one:

7 What shall we say then? **Is the law sin?** God forbid.

Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

- So, my understanding is, that the first component of this body of doctrine is really those first 3 small statements of (:7).

- Or you could say **(:7a)** is the STATING OF THE FIRST MISUNDERSTANDING in a clear, simple statement.

- So when you look at (:7a) it's made up of 2 small questions and a "God forbid."

- "What shall we say then?" = this opening questions is designed as a prompting question—a leading question—it is prompting a consideration of something.

- "Is the law sin?" = this (even though it is another question) actually answers the prompt, itself, by asking the question that exposes the misunderstanding—in fact, in just these 4 words you have stated what the misunderstanding is all about.

- Now when you take those two questions together, then what you have is a kind of 1-2 combination punch that brings the whole misunderstanding to the surface—and, in fact, that is exactly what needs to be done—and that is the **first thing** that needs to be done.

- And that's what the first part of (:7) does: "What shall we say then? Is the law sin?" = that brings the misunderstanding and erroneous thinking that naturally comes out of what Paul said about the law in (:5 and 6) to the surface.

- And then, included in (:7a) is this now familiar rebuke or reproof to that kind of thinking: "God forbid." And this is a reproof and the exposure of the fact that that IS a misunderstanding!

- But then, right after the *God forbid* comes along and tells you not to ever think that—that that's wrong thinking—the very next word comes along and tells you that the corrective doctrine is getting underway: "Nay," - and the first component of that corrective doctrine is what the rest of (:7) says—because it's one whole sentence.

- So we have (:7b) = The 1st Component of the Corrective Doctrine.

*7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid.
Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not
 known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*

- Then (:8) begins with the word “*But*” - and that tells me that we’re getting another component—and this component has two sentences that make it up—and that’s why they are gathered together in one verse.

- So (:8) is the 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine.

- Then (:9) begins with the word “*For*” - which is going to give you a further step in the development of the corrective doctrine—and that further step that you now need is for that corrective doctrine to be VERIFIED or proven in your thinking.

- But it doesn’t end in (:9) - because (:10) begins with “*And*” which is telling you that what is being stated in (:10) is supposed to go along with what is said in (:9) - so verses 9 and 10 go together.

- (By definition, “*and*” means ‘together with’ or ‘along with’ or ‘in addition to.’)

- So, verses 9 & 10 go together to Verify the Reality of the Corrective Doctrine.

- Then (:11) begins with another “*For*” - which indicates that there is one more, or a 3rd Component of Corrective Doctrine which comes out of, or is built on the first 2 components plus the verification verses of (:9 & 10).

- And then (:12) begins with a “*Wherefore*” and that’s going to be a summary conclusion—the fact that it does not say “*Therefore*” tells you that this whole issue of dealing with the misunderstandings (while completed thus far) isn’t over yet! But this particular misunderstand or misassumption is going to be ‘put to bed’ in connection with what (:12) says.

- So (:12) is the Summary Statement which is Designed to Replace the Misunderstanding.

- And that's just what it does—based upon the corrective doctrine, plus the proofs or verification of that corrective doctrine, you then have given to your understanding and appreciation the truth of the whole matter being considered; or the replacing of erroneous thinking with proper, godly thinking about that law.

- But that's not the end of the erroneous thinking—that's not the end of the misunderstandings—and there is going to be something else to come along; and that's why another question is stated in (:13) that is designed to expose the other aspect of the misunderstanding about the law that can now (now that this first thing is cleared out of the way) it can now be dealt with.

- So, my understanding is, that's the basic structure of Rom. 7:7-12.

- But that's only the structure. That's not really coming along and putting a value statement on each component or identifying what each component is really designed to do.

- Because you really can't even do that until you clearly (and I mean clearly) understand and appreciate what the Misunderstanding is in the first place.

- And in order for all that corrective doctrine to properly work—to effectually work within your inner man—it is essential to have a clear and firm grasp of what the misunderstanding is all about.

- So the next thing we need to do is to go back to (:7a) and find out what in the world does it mean when Paul says, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin?"

- "What shall we say then?" - Notice in this 5-word question that the last word is "then" - this tells you that what is going to be dealt with comes out of or follows what has just previously been said.

- Something that was stated just previous to this made it, or intentionally put your mind in the position, so that the very next, natural thing that you would think is that the law is sin! (And 7:5-6 did that very thing!)

- In (:5 & 6) we had several harsh, almost insulting or offensive things said about the law—said about something (that law) that most Christians think is something to be embraced; something to be picked up and utilized; something that is the very mechanical means by which your sanctified life “in Christ” should be put into practice!

- To be under the law you have to be “*in the flesh*.”
- The law is the mechanical means that put sin in motion.
- The law worked in our members, NOT to bring forth fruit of righteousness unto holiness, but to bring forth *fruit unto death*.
- So dangerous was that law to your sanctified life that you had to be “*delivered*” from it.
- Under that law you were “*held*” or imprisoned on charges awaiting execution.
- The “*oldness of the letter*” of that law cannot be operating in your *spirit*, you have to have something new operating there—*newness* of thinking in your human *spirit*—grace thinking, instead of *old letter* law-type thinking.

- And it's kind of like (actually it's exactly like) that a person who has just gone through this 'root canal' and had all their objections put to death (so that there is no life in them at all) - then because of the things Paul said about the law in (:5 & 6) - Paul then leads off (:7) with this leading question, "*What shall we say **then**?*" - then what Paul does is, by the next question, "*Is the law sin?*" - he actually puts the very words you are thinking right in your mouth.

- And, to stay with the 'root canal' illustration—after the roots of the tooth have been extracted, it lays bare the nerve—and as soon as that nerve is touched—IT HURTS—and it makes it so that you VOICE it!

- And that Misunderstanding is really: Thinking that the law is designed to do something that it's NOT designed to do, and not understanding exactly what it is that the law IS designed to do when it comes to sin.

- Therefore in light of all that Paul said about the law (being designed to put sin in motion, et. al.), the natural thinking that someone who holds the misassumptions about the law— the natural thing they are going to come along and say is: “You’re saying that something is terribly wrong with the law!” “You’re saying that it is SIN, ITSELF—because SIN is the fundament issue of something that is terribly wrong in man when it comes to God!”

- So, Paul, what you’re saying is that the law has that exact same thing—there’s something terribly wrong with it!

- But that statement, that questioning, that conclusion only comes because the misassumption and the misunderstanding about the law PROMPTS someone to say that!

- And that’s what Paul now takes advantage of—he brings that to the surface in (:7) - and then he says, *“God forbid!”*

- Don’t think that there’s something wrong with the law—no—there’s something wrong with your thinking about the law!

- And that’s what we need to correct! - (And that’s what he goes on and does.)

- Therefore the idea is that once a person really comes to understand and appreciate that the law didn’t squelch sin—didn’t restrain it—didn’t even reduce it one bit—in fact it did the very opposite—it put sin in motion—it gave sin life—once that is understood, then if there isn’t further corrective doctrine about that law, a person will naturally think, “Well, it the law sin?” (because that’s what you’re thinking, isn’t it? that’s exactly what you’re thinking at the end of verse 6 isn’t it?)

- You see, when you are thinking wrongly about the law in the first place (that it is designed to retard or restrain sin), and once it has been proven that the law not only **didn’t** do that, but it did quite the opposite—it gave sin life—then without the corrective doctrine about the law, you will naturally slip into another erroneous misunderstanding: that the law is, itself sin—because you would naturally assume that the law is equated with what is wrong in man in the eyes of God in the first place: SIN!

-
- And notice that this erroneous misunderstanding is so well brought out by the last word in the question: “*Is the law sin?*”
 - He doesn’t say, “Is the law sinful?” - sin-ful = full of sin—no—the misunderstanding isn’t “Is the law full of sin or sinful?”—this person is actually thinking that it is, itself, SIN.
 - And Paul is using the word “*sin*” in the sense of what sin is definition-wise—sin (definition-wise) in man is the issue of something being horribly wrong between man and God.
 - That’s why man does horrible things in God’s sight: iniquity, wickedness, evil, unrighteousness—things that are contrary to God’s own character and essence.
 - Because the fundamental thing is: there’s something horribly wrong between man and God. And that’s how something can be called ‘sin’ when that issue of how you stand in God’s sight is what you’re trying to express.
 - And so, because of the wrong thinking about the law in the first place—and on top of that, all that has just been said about the law in the corrective doctrine of (:5-6) - all that leaves that person with is kind of like throwing their hands up and saying, “It’s like what you’re saying then is that the law is sin, itself!”
 - And that’s because of a real huge vacuum that is left in their thinking by what (:5-6) did! The person who has held to the erroneous Objections simply does not have anything else in their thinking to operate on **except jumping to another erroneous line of thought!**
 - And because of that it takes further, correct and proper instruction to root that out and fill it in with sound doctrine concerning that law and it’s proper function—the way it was designed by God to function in the first place!
 - Now, granted, you may not have ever dealt with someone who has this problem, but when you’re dealing with someone who’s really ‘got the disease,’ they will almost fly into a rage when they hear things like what Paul says in verses 5 & 6. And they will come along accuse you of vilifying the law—and accuse you of blaspheming it! (Usually calling the law “God’s Word” and confusing the two).

- Therefore this 1st Misunderstanding about the law stems from the still erroneous thinking about the law in the first place.

- “*Is the law sin?*” - That is, if what you say about the law is true; i.e., that it put sin in motion, and worked in our members to bring forth fruit unto death, and we had to be delivered from it and so forth—then all I can conclude by that is that the law is sin, itself.

- And by saying that, a person is actually saying that there must be something horribly wrong with that law—because I know that that’s not what it is supposed to do!

- You see, the core of the misunderstanding stems from the erroneous thinking (thinking that is fighting for any last chance to still have life to it)- the erroneous thinking that the law is supposed to be the thing we are to use to put our Christian life into practice.

- Isn’t a “practicing Christian” a keeper of God’s laws????

- *Depart from me, ye evildoers: for I will keep the commandments of my God. (Psalm 119:115)*

(Let’s run some verses)

- Matt. 19:17

- John 14:15; 15:10

- I John 2:3; 3:22; 5:2-3

- Rev. 12:17; 14:12

Paul’s letters have NOTHING like this in them!!!

- Because saying that there has to be something wrong with the law says, at the exact same time, “That’s not what that law was supposed to do! That law was supposed to squelch and restrain sin from taking place!”

- When someone concludes that ‘the law is sin’ based upon the things the apostle Paul said in (:5-6) it is because they still have not understood the roll or function of the law in the first place.

- This may sound like the corrective doctrine of the 1st Objection didn’t do its work—but that’s not the case.

- Because that 1st Objection had to do with the law being the greatest compelling power to restrain sin and promote righteousness and goodness and holiness—but as we saw, grace is far greater to do both those jobs!