

- And someone (especially someone with this deep-rooted disease of erroneous thinking about the law) - someone could get that idea dismissed and still retain the mistaken notion that the law was initially designed to be a help to me—to be the mechanical means to put my Christian life into practice.

- And that 2nd Objection only dealt with the legal aspects of summarily dismissing the law and setting it aside—which was corrected by the further understanding and appreciation of our being baptized into Jesus Christ and having the full benefits that comes out of that new identity we have “in Christ.”

- But this deep-set and deeply-rooted thinking that the law is to be my guide, my crutch, my support, my aid: what I am supposed to grab hold of and pick up and utilize to put my Christian life into practice ..... ALL OF THAT STILL REMAINS in the thinking process!

- The question, “*Is the law sin?*” is an admission that you still think the law is supposed to stop sin and produce good—because you think that there is something wrong with it—something terribly wrong with it—you still don’t get it!

- This is the quintessential use of the old adage:

**“It’s like throwing gas on a fire!”** (or alcohol)

- Your front porch is on fire and so you go over to a bucket that has cold, clear liquid in it—that you just assume is water—and when you throw it on the fire, it blows up into a roaring, out-of-control blaze!

- And as you watch your house burn down, you stand there scratching your head, looking into the bucket and say, “Hey, that wasn’t supposed to do that! Hey, this water is fire—don’t drink any water or else you’ll blow up!”

- No, stupid—it was alcohol, not water—and alcohol isn’t supposed to put out a fire, alcohol is designed to ignite a fire!!!

- Therefore saying that the ‘law is sin’ is tantamount to saying that something must be wrong with the law, because it’s not supposed to do those things that were said about it in (:5 and 6)!

- So we have stated for us in the first two questions what this 1st Misunderstanding is all about:

7 *What shall we say then?* (A question designed to lead and prompt your thinking based upon what was just said about the law in verses 5 and 6) *Is the law sin?* (Does this mean that there is something horribly wrong with the law?) ***God forbid.***

- “*God forbid.*” (mh, ge,noito) = a powerful expression that means,

“*God forbid you to ever think that!*” = it is an expression of being repulsed at the thought that someone might ever arrive at such an erroneous conclusion!

- As we have often noted when we first encountered this phrase back in Romans 3:4, it has taken quite a beating over the years of scholars and other second-rate translators trying to correct it and update it and make a “better” translation out of it.

- (Ex.—Certainly not! or May it never be! or By no means! or some even translated it ‘Hell no!’)

- However, when you really consider the fact that what is being appealed to is someone’s volitional response to going down a path of heresy and contrary, erroneous thinking; and when you consider the fact that this phrase is indicative of something so repulsive, so inconsistent with truth, and in such extreme opposition to sound Bible doctrine—there is just no more excellent; or clearer; or more forceful; or more in keeping with the context translation than that which the King James translators expressed in our phrase, “*God Forbid.*”

- It forcefully tells you that this thinking is WRONG and God, Himself, forbids you to think one more thought along those lines!

- Therefore we have the fullness of the 1st Misunderstanding stated:  
7 *What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid.*

- And, without sounding redundant or repetitive, I want to make sure that we have a very clear and comprehensive understanding and appreciation for what it is, EXACTLY, that is being misunderstood.

- Based upon the sense & sequence of the entire body of information we are given about not being *under the law, but under grace*:

- The 1st Objection someone would raise is the issue of the law's greatness of power to compel a person to either not sin or to do good.

- And the corrective doctrine to that both presented and proved that the law is **not** the greatest compelling power there is—for grace was proven to first of all be it's equal—and then further proven to be far greater to restrain sin and motivate to do good than the law could ever be! (Rom. 6:16-23)

- But in all the proofs given in chapter 6 about the 1st Objection, it did not address (or maybe I should say, it didn't FULLY address) the underlying 'root' of erroneous thinking about the law—that fundamental misunderstanding that would cause someone to rise up and challenge us being *under grace* and not *under that law* simply because of how the law and its powerful influence was erroneously viewed in the first place.

- Then the 2nd most common Objection was raised which was the issue of the law, being the law, it could not easily, rashly, or summarily be dismissed by some kind of 'blanket' statement, even if it was said by the apostle Paul.

- And the first 6 verses of chapter 7 addressed that erroneous objection—it fully proved that there is, indeed, one way in which God could, and, indeed, did provide for all the legal ties and legal relationships you could have with that law to be broken and set aside—and for an entirely new relationship to get established—a relationship with *grace* made possible by the redemptive work of the Lord Jesus Christ and our being fully identified with that work by us being baptized into Him!

- But none of the information contained in Romans 6:15-7:6 focused upon or pinpointed the underlying erroneous thinking about the law that someone would hold on to that would cause them to make these kinds of objections in the first place.

- And verses 7-12 is what that is all about.

- What is it that gave 'life' to these objections? What gave life to them was a misunderstanding about the law, fundamentally, in connection with sin!!!

- And therefore, that basic issue of the thinking that the law was a squelcher of sin and a promoter of righteousness—that can even be dug down a little bit further (so to speak) - and the reason why someone would think that is because they think that God designed the law to take away the life of sin and to make it functionally dead—and to give someone the ability to live unto God.

- And that's the fundamental error and wrongness and misassumption and mistaken thinking that's usually resident in someone's mind. (That's what is at the bottom of it all.)

- And so someone who has that thinking would naturally come along, therefore, and they would have to conclude that, on the basis of what the apostle Paul has been saying, he must be saying that there is something wrong with the law.

- That would be the only reason why God would want us to therefore *not be under the law, but under grace* (or some other system).

- And the reason why he thinks that is because he thinks **that God has designed the law to make sin functionally dead and to make someone functionally alive.**

- And that's NOT what God has designed the law to do—the truth of the matter is, if the law could do that, there would be NO NEED for your position "in Christ."

- So that's the issue that has to be 'uprooted' (so to speak), and that's got to be gotten rid of, because that's the only way, when you get to the end of chapter 7, that you will come along and recognize that the only way you can live unto God is on the basis of your position "in Christ" that you've been given, and to be **under grace** in connection with it! (And to have the law completely removed from the equation!)

- So we go back once again to that fist part of Romans 7:7-

7 *What shall we say then?* - and what is going on is that Paul is now going to bring up that concluding thought that someone has to conclude has to be the case with the law if they've possessed the previous objections and if those previous objections have been based upon a misunderstanding concerning the law's design and purpose regarding sin.

- And so Paul brings up the issue of “*Is the law sin?*” - because that’s really what we’d have to be saying; and that’s really what you’re thinking if God had had to make it so that we serve Him by “*newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.*”

- And now, bringing all that to the surface, Paul can come along now and say, “That’s your fundamental problem, buddy!” “Your fundamental problem is that you don’t understand the design & purpose of the law properly!” “And you need to get that straightened out!”

- And so, we get that “*God forbid*” - that tells you all that kind of thinking is wrong—God forbid you to think that—your understanding about the law is all wrong!

- And beginning with the first word after that *God forbid*, Paul says in effect, “Here is the proper understanding you’re supposed to have!”

- And essentially, that’s what you’ve got from the rest of (:7) all the way down through (:25).

---

- Therefore by this point we should have covered, in enough detail, the issues that lay at the heart of the matter of what this 1st Misunderstanding about the law is all about.

- The corrective doctrine of the first 2 objections really have not addressed this issue as the big issue in someone’s thinking.

- And now it is all brought to the surface:

- “*Is the law sin?*”

- Implication: There must be something horribly wrong with the law.

- Fundamental Misunderstanding: The law is supposed to make sin functionally dead and a Christian functionally alive.

- **GOD FORBID!**

- So, naturally, we move from a clear and comprehensive understanding of what the Misunderstanding is, to the 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine that begins the process of correcting the erroneous thinking about the law and replacing it with proper understanding—the better thing that replaces the erroneous thinking about being *under the law* is proper understanding about being *under grace*.

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.*

- Romans 7:7b—1st Component of Corrective Doctrine.

- All this erroneous misunderstanding about the law can be boiled down into three main areas.

- And (:7b) deals with the first area or first issue; and (:8), which is the 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine deals with the second main area or second issue, and one more final thing has to be said in (:11) to complete the Corrective Doctrine—and these three issues will be able to fully correct all this mistaken and misunderstood thinking about the law.

- So the 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine is found in (7b):

7 ..... *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.*

- The first thing to notice about this sentence is that it has 2 clauses to it—divided by a colon—which is the most powerful pause there is in the English language short of a period.

- So the clauses can almost stand on their own as a complete thought, but the Author still intends for the 2nd clause to go with the first clause and complete the thought.

- And as we have noted before (and by now should almost be second nature to us) - this colon is calling on us to stop and pause long enough to see something very important—in other words, this is an identifiable “step” in the process of the godly rooting out of the erroneous thinking about that law.

- And so there is something we need to pause and see—and to make sure that we have been properly impressed with and properly benefiting from the effectual working of each clause.

- So let's look more closely at that first clause of (:7b):

*“Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: ...”*

- This is the PROPER response to the question, “*Is the law sin?*” (The one w/ the erroneous thinking would answer: “Yes!”)

- “*Nay*” (Conjunction **avlla**, = a multipurpose conjunction that is most often used as an adversative and translated “*but*” - however it can be used in a variety of contexts which would call for it to be utilized many different ways.)

- For instance, *yea*; *yet*; *nevertheless*; *howbeit*; *nay*; *therefore*; *save*; etc.

- In this context, it demands the use of the negative reply, “*nay*.”

- And as most who encounter this word (and it’s opposite, “*yea*”) it is often brushed aside by Bible correctors as an old and archaic way of saying “*no*” - but, as always, the KJ translators had “*no*” readily available to them (Jn. 21:5), but saw both something in the discriminating difference between “*no*” and “*nay*” that would make *nay* the more excellent choice, as well as something in the context that governed or warranted the use of “*nay*” over “*no*.”

- This is not the first time Paul has used this term—we first encountered it back in Romans 3:27— “*Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? **Nay**: but by the law of faith.*”

- So, what is the discriminating difference between *nay* and *no*?

- Primarily, the difference between *yes* and *yea*, as well as *no* and *nay*, has to do with the EMOTION behind it.

- Yes and no are merely simple terms of affirmation and negation. And by themselves they don’t have to convey the emotion of either the person who is affirming something or negating it.

- We do have punctuation marks that we can use to help out with that, if we wanted to use it that way—for we could use an exclamation mark after either term to indicate the highly charged emotion of the person making the statement.

- But *nay* and *yea* are words, that by nature, take either the affirmation or the negation and indicate or call special attention to the emotion of the person who is saying it.

- And they, therefore, convey emotion by themselves— that the negation is a strong one and its got feeling behind it, or the affirmation is a strong one that has got some powerful feeling behind it.

- And our English punctuation can even come along and augment the emotion of that by using an exclamation mark at the end of a “*Nay!*” or a “*Yea!*”
- But by their very nature, *yea* and *nay* convey the fact that there is strong feeling (almost, shall we say, strong PERSONAL feeling) behind it.
  - In other words, it is a way of putting something down in writing, that, if you were actually hearing the person saying it, you would realize that they are, by the *Nay*, coming very close to denouncing something—and by the *Yea* they are coming close to pronouncing something, or announcing it.
- And, contextually, that’s what you have going on here. Because if you look at what is surrounding it, it is following a “*God forbid*,” which, is itself a very highly emotionally charged expression—and then you have following the *Nay* the little personal pronoun “*I*”.
  - And this *Nay* is used to bring our thinking to something that is going on here that is now turning to the PERSONAL issue of the apostle Paul, himself.
  - And so it ‘seasons’ or ‘flavors’ the context of Paul now beginning to inject his own personal and emotional experience into the picture of all this corrective doctrine.
- And so that “*God forbid*” (which has emotion in itself) that would make *Nay* the more excellent choice over *No*—but the issue is that even if the “*God forbid*” wasn’t there, when Paul says, “*Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: ...*” that’s a strong denunciation of the thinking that, “Well, the law must be sin if what you just said is true!”
- And so by that excellent English *Nay*, there, the translators are recognizing that there is emotion to what Paul is saying in print! And they’re conveying that, and appropriately and rightly so!
- And that is, by design, to set you back on your heels (so to speak). And to realize, “Wow, I’m not only wrong—but I must be seriously wrong!” And that’s what it is—because Paul is dealing with the root of that Christian’s problem (sanctification-wise).



- In fact, most of the times that affirmations and negations are made in God's word they are *Yeas* and *Nays*.  
(In fact a verse like Zech. 4:13 and that one we mentioned in John 21:5 are probably about the only times you find "No" being used in our English Bible—there may be more, but they are very few.)

- So *Nay* tells us that we have a highly emotionally charged context; a very serious issue is being dealt with; a strong denunciation is being proclaimed; and also we have this injection of Paul's own personal experience in regard to the issue of being *not under the law, but under grace* and the law being sin, itself.

- So we really get a great deal of information—or at least of how our thinking is to be set in relation to the information we are about to get, by the use of *Nay*.

- (Far from being old, archaic, and just another way of saying "no" - i.e., implying that it is of little or no value to us!)

**7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. *Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law:* .....**

- So the first step in the 1st Component of the Corrective Doctrine is "*I had not known sin, but by the law:*"

- And with the personal pronoun "*I*" Paul now steps into the picture, himself.

- And this is important because when it comes to the verses that verify the reality of this corrective doctrine (:9-10), Paul is the example of how that doctrine corrected his own, personal misunderstanding about the law in his own functional, sanctified life.

- But now we need to get a grip on just what this first step of corrective doctrine is, and what it is designed to do—because it is the first, necessary, and PROPER step to take to fully root out all this erroneous misunderstanding of how most Christians commonly think about the law.

- "... ***I had not known sin, but by the law:* ..."**

- We need to understand and appreciate—just exactly, what is that saying to us about the law that is contrary to the way we commonly think about it???

- But before we do that, note that as Paul begins the 1st Component of the corrective doctrine, he, for the first time in Romans, injects himself personally into the corrective doctrine.

- “*Nay, **I** had not known sin, but by the law: ....”*

- As this part of the corrective doctrine gets underway, the whole thing comes forth from the apostle Paul’s own personal experience.

- And this is by design. Paul is setting forth the corrective doctrine by personally relating it from his own personal experience.

- And while we will look at this issue in a little more detail, (especially when we get down to verses 9 and 10 where Paul will verify the 2 components of corrective doctrine stated in verses 7b and 8), I want to say something about it now because it really does come into play right here: but also because I want you thinking about just what God does with Paul as our apostle.

- As we have gone through the book of Romans, and as we have come to understand and appreciate God’s word rightly divided, we have noted from time to time some things about the apostle Paul and his unique apostleship—as our apostle—as the apostle to the Gentiles in this dispensation of Gentile grace.

- In fact, as we have noted in Romans 1:1 and 1:13 that Paul’s apostleship was unique from that of the other apostles—especially unique from that of the 12 apostles in God’s program with Israel.

- (Slide #17—“Apostles” Show)

- And not only is Paul’s apostleship unique, and not only is he uniquely our apostle—but it is for this very reason—that he *is* a unique apostle to us Gentiles that from time to time God did some things with Paul that were special and highly significant.

- It’s not the time to go into great detail on this matter here, but a few things should be brought to our thinking that will give us a better appreciation for the things God did with Paul, and therefore give us an understanding and appreciation for why he injects himself into our passage in Romans 7—and based on that you should get a real grip on the proper point of view your thinking needs to be in, in order to understand why he says what he says, and the way he says what he says in verses 8 and 9.

———— PAY ATTENTION TO PAUL! —————

- WWJD??? - This, or DWJD (do what Jesus did), is commonly used as a slogan by many Christians who fail miserably to rightly divide God's word. Because what they mean by this is that we must live or put our Christian life into practice by doing what Jesus did in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. (*What about in the Revelation?*)
- (I suppose no one ever thought about doing what Jesus WILL do out in the day of the Lord's wrath!)
- And the meaning of all this is quite clear—turn the other cheek, don't judge others, don't be violent, don't be insensitive, love everybody, don't run down some other person's religion, be passive, peace-loving, **and above all never, ever be offensive in word or deed!** (*Tolerance!*)  
 (... never marry, never have children, never plan for your retirement, never have a bank account, never have air conditioning, never own a car ????)
- In fact, the truth of the matter is that most Christians either believe themselves, or else have been taught to believe that we, today, are supposed to be followers of Jesus in His earthly ministry along with the 12 apostles and their earthly ministries—Peter being the main character or main apostle to follow.
- Now while it may be a noble thought to 'follow in the footsteps of Jesus,' it is NOT a Scriptural truth—it is not according to "*sound doctrine.*"
- The truth of the matter is, the Lord's life would be impossible to copy because it was a perfect life, a life lived apart from sin as I Peter 2:22 says, "*Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.*"
- In fact, the apostle Paul actually writes about the WWJD slogan!
- II Cor. 5:14-16 (:16)! - Notice that we are not to even to know the apostle Paul "*after the flesh*" - that is we are not to follow him as a man—but that does not mean that we do not have him set forth as our pattern, or example or ensample; but it is not Paul the man we are to follow, but Paul the apostle—that is, God did something special with Paul by means of his office as an apostle that set forth for us the example or pattern by which we as the members of the church the body of Christ should follow after.

- Therefore my understanding is that when you properly handle and rightly divide the word of truth, while it is absolutely proper and true that we are supposed to be “Christ-like” - which is to say, we are supposed to live consistent with who God has made us to be “in Christ,” it is NOT the earthly life of Jesus that we are to follow, but the pattern or example of the special and distinctive apostleship of Paul.

- Don't misunderstand, we are told ( ex., I Thess. 1:6) that we are to be “*followers of the Lord*” - but that is strictly in regard to what the Lord is doing in this dispensation of grace in which we live. It is not in connection with the Lord's earthly ministry as in the gospel accounts or in the opening chapters of the book of Acts.

- Now if this sounds strange to you—or even somewhat sacrilegious—you need to understand and appreciate that I am simply doing what God was having the apostle Paul do all the time.

- God would continually have the apostle Paul “*magnify*” his office in connection with his special and distinctive apostleship.

**-(SEE “APOSTLES” SLIDE SHOW—see Rom. 1:1)**

- The truth of the matter is, most Christians (even theologians and Bible teachers) often times don't really know for sure just what to do with the apostle Paul—because since they do not rightly divide the word of truth, Paul kind of sticks out like a sore thumb.

- And, unfortunately, most Bible teachers just stick Paul in with the 12—make him to be the 13th apostle, or else they make him to be a replacement for Judas.

- Rom. 11:13 - Note that when you ‘*magnify*’ something you enlarge it for the purpose of drawing attention to it, because for some reason or another it is vital to see it, and it is vital to make sure that you don't miss it, or do not underestimate it. Otherwise you are going to fail to understand something that is necessary for you to understand, with the result that it is going to cause problems for you.

- When you want or need something to stand out in a very clear way so that it become a “big issue” to someone because it needs to be a ‘big issue’ to him, then you “*magnify*” it so that he cannot miss it and so that he ‘sees’ what he needs to ‘see in connection with it.

- This that God had Paul do, and that Paul speaks of doing here in Romans 11:13, is the very thing that I am doing as well. I am magnifying the “office” of the apostle Paul as “the apostle of the Gentiles” that God has made him to be, and I am doing it in view of its profound significance in connection with the great dispensational change that God has brought in.
- Understand that I am emphasizing Paul’s apostleship—I am not promoting, or exalting, or unduly emphasizing *the man Paul*, rather I am promoting, exalting, and properly emphasizing the issue of his special and distinctive apostleship.
- Paul is not a self-appointed, or self-styled apostle. That is, he did not decide to ‘jump on the band wagon,’ so to speak, when he saw what the 12 apostles were doing, and simply declare himself to be an apostle—which, if he had done so really would make him to be nothing more than an impostor and a fraud.
- But Paul is a genuine apostle, with genuine apostolic authority, power, ordination, commissioning, and the like. Therefore he genuinely speaks for God, and likewise God genuinely speaks through him, and God genuinely administers His program through him.
- And the truth of the matter is that the one we are repeatedly exhorted to be “followers” of is none other than the apostle Paul, himself.
- I Cor. 4:8-17 (:16-17) - (mimhth,j)
- I Cor. 11:1
- I Thess. 1:1-7 (:6)
- come back to Phil. 3:17
- Not only are we to be *followers* of the apostle Paul, but we are also to understand and appreciate him as our “*ensample*.” (And we are to become “*ensamples*,” too—see II Thess. 3:9)
- The word “*example*” is used 8x, all in the NT by 5 Greek words:
  - paradeigmati,zw = to set forth as an example (bad sense).
  - u`po,deigma = what you get as a result of copying a figure.
  - tu,poj = the mark of a stroke or blow; an impression.
  - u`pogrammo,j = a writing copy or example set before one.

- Our English word *example*, definition-wise, commonly indicates a pattern that is designed to be copied; that which is proposed to be imitated—or in the case of persons a pattern of life that is to be emulated (or strived to equaled).

- And among all its synonymous terms, *example* is the most general of them all.

- *Example* indicates a pattern or form which is used as a sample which is to be, and ought to be followed or avoided.

- And of all the synonymous terms, example is only to be followed generally. ('wiggly' room)

- But the excellency of our English language has the capacity to use a term that takes all of the meaning of *example* and give it a further and more specific shade of meaning. And that word is ENSAMPLE.

- *Ensample* carries all of the meaning of *example*—that is, it is a pattern or form which is used as a sample which ought to be followed or avoided—but *ensample* is a species of an example.

- *Ensample* is found to be utilized only when the context is driving at something highly & deeply serious and by which you are to be especially impressed. It goes far beyond the general or the ordinary to something outstanding or extraordinary.

- Therefore *ensample* means a sample, pattern, model, precedent, or example that is and ought to be followed—but the further shade of meaning that it contains (which *example* does not contain) - and which makes *ensample* the most excellent term to describe what the apostle Paul is to us—is that an *ensample* is a pattern that is to be followed, but if it is not followed, it is done so at your own personal peril!

- And in this way it connects with that term that Paul used in connection with his office—the word “*magnify*” - because if you fail to follow an *ensample*, you do so at the risk of great personal peril—it is vital that you follow it—or else you will be in a mess, you will have terrible problems as a result of not following it!

- (“en” = “in” - to put something into or on what is being denoted) (ex = out)

- Wherefore we have such passages as:

*- Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample.  
(Philippians 3:12)*

*- Not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us.  
(II Thessalonians 3:9)*

- Therefore when we come back to our passage in Romans 7:7b and see the apostle Paul now injecting himself, personally, into the corrective doctrine, we really should take great care to take note of something very vital and very important—something the we should not miss—something that is vital (vital = necessary to the continuation of life!)

- Now there is more to this that has a real bearing on the corrective doctrine contained in Romans 7:7-12, but we will return to this issue of Paul and his distinctive and unique apostleship when we get to the two verse that verify the corrective doctrine in (:9 & 10).

- But what we have covered about Paul and his special and distinctive apostleship so far should give you a good grasp of the very personal nature of what he is setting forth here in the 1st Component of corrective doctrine for this misunderstanding that the law is sin—i.e., that there is something horribly wrong with the law because the erroneous thinking about it is that the law is supposed to make sin functionally dead, and a Christian functionally alive.

- And I think that it would be essential for us to begin to think about Paul and his specialized apostleship in just this way even at this point of (:7) as he begins to personally put himself into the picture of godly sanctification in connection with the law and utilizing it in the Christian way of life.

*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 as we were saying before this caveat into Paul's apostleship—we need to understand and appreciate just exactly what is that saying to us about the law that is contrary to the way we commonly think about it???

- Well, as we have already noted before, (:7) is actually broken down into 2 parts:

1) “*What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid.*” - and this first part (or verse 7a) precisely sets forth the major subject that is going to get dealt with in all of the information that is contained in this package of doctrine—all of verse 7 down through verse 12.

- And that major subject is the erroneous thinking and misunderstanding that **THE LAW IS SIN**.

- And as we have already come to understand and appreciate, this 1st of 2 common Misunderstandings about the law, is that the law is supposed to make sin functionally dead, and the law is supposed to make me, as a Christian, functionally alive.

- And because all of the doctrine of our godly sanctification, (after it gets underway with the 2 major issues you are supposed to clearly understand and appreciate coming out of chapter 6—that we are *dead to sin* and *alive unto God*), it confronts you with a huge block of instruction about the law of Moses and how it will ruin your sanctified life in the eyes of God—and therefore because of how God has the apostle Paul present this doctrinal information about the law and all its harmful and adverse effects to our functional, sanctified Christian life, (especially in verses 5 and 6), someone (anyone) who has this erroneous misunderstanding about the law (which would include almost the entire Christian population alive today) they would be thinking the very thing that the apostle Paul prompts and leads them to say in verse 7a—“*Is the law sin?*” - that is, “If what you are saying is true, then there must be something horribly wrong with the law—because I know that it’s not supposed to do that!”

- **BUT IT IS SUPPOSED TO DO THAT!**

- THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH THE LAW—WHAT IS WRONG IS THE WAY YOU THINK ABOUT THE LAW IN THE FIRST PLACE!!

- Now, in the rest of verse 7 (or :7b) we have the 1st Component of corrective doctrine—“*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.*”



2) “*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.*” - this is the fundamental corrective doctrine that will attack, root out, and finally dismiss this erroneous misunderstanding about the law—it will take a few more components and some verification along the way, but this is the fundamental issue to deal with in order to produce the destruction of the erroneous thinking.

- And what Paul says here in (:7b) is designed to be the first thing that someone who misunderstands the law’s purpose in connection with sin needs to think of and needs to realize so that they now begin to properly understand that there really isn’t anything wrong with the law at all.

- (That the law is **not** sin, itself—in the sense that it’s missing the mark and can’t do what God designed for it to do—No—the real problem is your understanding is missing the mark; it’s not realizing or stating what God designed the law for and what it’s designed to do!)

- Now this 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine of (:7b) has 2 clauses to it.

- (Notice the colon after the word *law*—that is a very strong pause—it is almost as if that first clause could stand as a sentence or statement or complete thought on its own—but the Author intended for the rest of the verse to be attached on to this first thought in order for the full impact of the thought to be made.)

- So there is something important and something that we are designed to be impressed with and for an impact to be made in our inner man by this first clause—and we need to pause long enough so that that impact is fully made.

- 1st Clause of Corrective Doctrine:

*“Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: ...”*

- We have already noted that the “*Nay*” first of all comes along and declares (very powerfully declares) that the idea that the law is sin (or that something is wrong with it) is NOT the problem—the problem (the very serious problem) is that there is something wrong with YOU and your thinking about it.

- And then the rest of the 1st Clause states what it is that you are supposed to understand and appreciate as that 1st step to correct your erroneous thinking.

- Now let's take a close look at this first clause and make sure that we understand just exactly what Paul is saying to attack and straighten out all this erroneous misunderstanding.

- "*I had not known sin, but by the law:*"

- The colon tells you that you really shouldn't proceed on unless you have fully gripped exactly what is being said here—and my understanding is that most folks (and most Bible commentators and Bible teachers) never really get what Paul is driving at in this first clause.

- And I'm intentionally making a big deal out of this because if we don't get a good grip on what this first clause is saying—especially what it is doing to set a particular context or contextual framework in our minds—then we won't get an appreciation for why we have 3 different words coming up (2 in verse 7 and 1 in verse 8) that describe the law in connection with sin in Paul's own personal life.

- Because we have coming up these 3 words:

- "lust" (evpiqumi,a)
- "covet" (evpiqume,w)
- "concupiscence" (evpiqumi,a)

- And to ever hope to understand and appreciate why those 3 different English words are used to translate what is essentially the exact same Greek word—you have to have a firm, good grasp on the context in which they are used.

- Because there really isn't any reason to use 3 different words unless something in the context has come along and demanded it!

- And the context in which they are used is set in this 1st clause: "*I had not known sin, but by the law:*"

- So we really need to perceive something more fully by this expression than what first meets the eye or what is the most obvious thing it says.

- And to gain this fuller perception, let's make sure that we keep this connected with what we know that this 1st Misunderstand is all about (which

- Because you've got to understand that everything Paul is saying, he is saying primarily to dismiss that Misunderstanding.
- Everything Paul wants to say is said in order to get rid of that, "*Is the law sin?*" issue—granted, he dismisses it when he says, "*God forbid*" but the issue is not simply to dismiss it on the basis of that, but to dismiss it with a full explanation as to WHY it ought to be dismissed.
- And the corrective doctrine that begins with that "*Nay*" provides the information to make it so that there's not a shadow of a doubt by the time you get to the end of (:12) that the law is **not** sin.
- So just by the way in which the information is constructed, you know therefore that the reason for those 3 different English words has some bearing upon providing the full dismissal of the idea that the law is sin.
  - It contributes to that somehow—it adds some weight in some way—and it is significant therefore that those 3 different concepts (very synonymous, but there is some shades of meaning between them) are stated as they are because they add something to the doctrine by their discriminating meanings to verify the fact that the law is not sin.
- Therefore we know that this is not just some kind of an exercise in English etymology, but it has real meaningful and contextual and doctrinal significance.
- So in view of the issue involved in the Misunderstanding—when Paul comes along and after he denies it by saying "*God forbid*" and then begins the corrective doctrine by saying "*Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law:*"—when he says, "***I had not known sin***" what does that mean?
  - And we need to be careful with this phrase—in fact we need to really analyze it to determine just exactly what he is driving at.
  - The first thing (and the most obvious thing) to recognize is that the word "*known*" (**ginw,skw**) is usually taken to mean that Paul became **'aware'** of sin by the law—but that really isn't good enough because the common way that is thought of is that Paul became aware of sin in general by that law—as if Paul never knew what sin meant before he was confronted with the law of Moses. (But that obviously isn't the case at all!)

- Neither is this issue of 'knowing sin' the issue of Paul trying to pick it up and utilize it in putting his sanctified life into practice, because he really doesn't deal with it that way until he gets to verse 9 and 10. (Don't get the cart before the horse.)

- This is actually something much more basic than that.

- My understanding is that when Paul says, "*Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law*" - he's got a meaning to that that is not so much just the definition of sin ( *a`marti,a* = 'missing the mark' so to speak) - but it's more than that.

- It's kind of like the issue of the fact that he **LEARNED** some things about sin— he learned or came to know sin intimately (that's not the best way to say it, but it will do for now) - in other words he came to know some things about sin more than just casually knowing what it meant, definition-wise.

- And it's because of what he's saying there, and what it means for him to 'know sin,' that when he describes the reality of that by the example he makes of not knowing "*lust*" - he uses the word that our KJ translators translated "*lust*" - and then when he cites the particular commandment from the law that brought that knowledge of *lust* along, the commandment didn't use the term "*lust*" itself, it used another word that because of what it was **gave** that knowledge of *lust*, and then because of what the law was designed to do, it was able to take that fundamental concept of *lust* and show it in all its ugliness!

- (That's why, in :8, the expression is "*all manner of concupiscence*" - and it's the word *concupiscence* that takes the *lust* concept and puts it in a **BAD** sense or in an UGLY sense—in a SINFUL sense!)

- See, the word lust itself doesn't necessarily have to mean sin—(Galatians 5:17—*For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh...*—the Spirit lusts against the flesh—is the Holy Spirit sinning??? No. Because you can lust in a GOOD sense.)

- But Paul is talking about *lust* here in a bad sense—and he's utilizing the term lust ONLY in its bad sense—only in its expressions of desires for things against the will of God.

- And in connection with that Paul takes the particular command that focused upon sinful desires— “*Thou shalt not covet.*” (10th Comm.)
- And then that particular command that focused upon sinful desires was, once an individual tried to utilize it and obey it—because the law was not sin, itself, but was designed to ‘make sin known’ and was designed to ‘bring it home’ on the person that was trying to keep it—it was able to, as Paul says in (:8), it “wrought in me all manner of concupiscence” - it therefore came along and worked in me ALL of the ugly desires that my being is capable of against the will of God!
- That’s the kind of ‘knowing sin’ that Paul is talking about. He’s not just talking about ‘knowing sin’ definition-wise.
  - Paul knew what the word *sin* meant. And if he didn’t he could have gone to anybody and asked them, “What does the word sin mean?” and they could have told him.
- But when he says, “*Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law*” that is the issue of him knowing sin PERSONALLY (so to speak).
  - And knowing that it’s in him!
  - And knowing that it’s a bad thing!
  - And it’s an ugly, horrible thing that’s in me!
    - It’s like the surgeon’s scalpel—you often hear of someone ‘going under the knife’ - and in some cases you hear of someone saying that the cancer or disease just spread and killed the person because they opened them up—and if you took the illustration to the same conclusion of erroneous misunderstanding as you have here—the conclusion would be that the knife or scalpel was cancer—No.—it just opened up what was there all along.
- And because the issue of ‘knowing sin’ is the issue of knowing it more than just definition-wise, but knowing it as God was bringing the issue home through that law, so that it would be seen to be the horrible thing that it was, and the fact that the individual under it was that very thing: “*under sin*” - and sin was in control (so to speak) - that’s the issue Paul is after when he’s correcting the misunderstanding that “*Is the law sin?*”
- No—it’s not sin, itself, but it’s job is one of bringing the issue of sin in all its ugliness home to anybody who is underneath it!

- And that is totally the opposite of this erroneous thinking about the law— that the law is supposed to make sin functionally dead in me!

- This first step of corrective doctrine is setting the stage or setting the proper context your thinking is supposed to be in:

*“I had not known sin, but by the law: ...”*

- You think that the law is sin because it doesn't do what you think it should do—you think it should put sin to death and make me alive unto God—but that is NOT what the law was designed to do.

- And you have assumed or jumped to the conclusion that there is something horribly wrong with the law because you have been shown that the law didn't put righteousness in motion— it put sin in motion—the law didn't bring forth fruit unto functional life; it brought forth fruit unto death—you had to be delivered from that law because of how it endangered your functional life— and the law didn't free you, it held you in death, therefore you had to be put *under grace*.

- And without any correct doctrine in your inner man, you are forced (as it were) to conclude that the law is sin; that there is something wrong with the law—but that's not true.

- The truth of the matter is, there is something wrong with you—there is something wrong with they way you think—with the way you think about that law in connection with sin.

- And the first step to clear up all this erroneous thinking is to realize that the law (far from being sin) actually made the sin that was already in me “*known*” - that is it brought the realization of sin in me to my own personal awareness!

- And in Paul's personal life, he could come along and say, “That law made the issue of lust (for example) *known* to me - and it did that by the commandment that said, ‘*Thou shalt not covet*’ - which was a particular kind of wrong, sinful, contrary to the will of God desire. And therefore when I took that commandment and tried to operate upon it, sin took occasion by that commandment, and it *wrought in me all manner of concupiscence*—every kind of ugly, wrong, sinful desire that was resident in me became *known* to me, and manifest to be in me by that one commandment!”

- And in that context Paul can say therefore, “I knew sin” on the basis of that!
- Therefore the kind of “knowing sin” Paul is talking about is not just a knowing that sin exists—**but it is knowing it for its functional life!!!**
- The expression, “*I had not known sin*” is a personal awareness of **the functional life of sin**—of the life-process and life-mechanics of sin’s function in his own inner man.
- And there’s your first step of corrective doctrine—the law is not sin, itself—the law is the means by which I became personally aware of the depths and the degrees and layers of the horrible, ugly, sin that resided in me.
  - **The first step of corrective doctrine to the erroneous thinking and misunderstanding that the law is sin: is that the law gave sin functional life in me! The law didn’t make me functionally alive unto God, it made sin functionally alive in me!**
  - And I became fully aware of sin’s life in me by that law!!!
  - That’s the context of what Paul is driving at when he says, “*I had not known sin, but by the law: ...*”  
And that’s the proper context to understand and appreciate what Paul means when he uses the word “known” - “I had not known sin, ...”
  - And this is wildly different—exactly opposite of what most Christians think the law of Moses was designed to do!
  - And actually, even though what Paul is giving us is an abbreviated survey of the course of education as to how the law properly operated, the details of all that he says here is sitting back in the law itself.
  - Paul doesn’t go into very much detail here, but just gives us one example of how it functioned in his own personal life.
  - And he puts it together, more or less, in a statement-type form here for the purpose of dismissing that misunderstanding.
- But in order to describe sin—and to describe it beyond the definition of it, and to be able to describe it personally; and to be able to describe it’s functional life personally, those 3 concepts (*lust, covet, & concupiscence*) are needed in connection with the 1 example he makes out of it.

- You need the *lust, covet, and concupiscence* issue to deal with all the facets that make up sin's functional life.

- But for now when Paul gives this first step of corrective doctrine to the erroneous thinking that the law is sin, he says, "*Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: ...*"

- And therefore if that's the case, then the law's purpose with respect to sin is NOT one of making sin functionally dead—rather it's one of making me AWARE of it!

- And hopefully we have made enough of a pause with this first clause so that you have come to really get a firm grip on just exactly in what way or in what context this clause is being put in so that you get the real benefit by the effectual working of this first step of corrective doctrine.

- And now we move on to the second step in the 1st Component of corrective doctrine to "*Is the law sin?*" (Which is the second clause of verse 7b)

7 .... *for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*

- Now we are moving from the general "*known*" (ginw,skw) in the first clause to a more specific "*known*" in the second clause.

the - "*for I had not known (oi;da) lust (evpiqumi,a), except law had said, Thou shalt not covet (evpiqume,w).*"

- And it's more specific or more 'perfect' because it comes from the personal experience of the apostle Paul, himself!

- The "*for*" is a *for* of further amplification—and so after the colon, to further amplify on what Paul has just said, and to prove the reality of it he cites one, single example of how the law (far from putting sin out of his mind or making sin functionally dead in him) the law actually did the exact opposite—and here is one case of that thing happening personally to me! Paul says.

- "*for I had not known lust*" - the 3 terms (*lust, covet, and concupiscence*) all come from essentially the same Greek word: **evpiqumi,a** = from "epi" (an intensifier) + "thumos" = to breathe violently; to be in a heat; and came to mean a concentrated, intense



- And as we have noted before, lust can be either used in a good context with a good meaning, or it can be used in a bad context with a bad sense connected with it.

- And here in the context in which Paul is using it, when he says, “*for I had not known lust,*” he means it in the sense that he had not known that *lust* was a sin! (i.e., that it was wrong and opposed to God) - *except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.*

- And here we have this one example of the proper function of the law as it pertained personally to the life of the apostle Paul.

- We have the 10th Commandment stated in its abbreviated form—(from Exodus 20:17)

*17 Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's.*  
(Exodus 20:17)

- So when the law comes along and says, “*Thou shalt not covet,*” the proper thinking is, “Oh, coveting must be a sin! That's why God says, 'Don't do it!'”

- In fact, let's take that word *covet* and look at what God says about it.

- While *lust* can, and indeed is, taken in both a good and a bad sense; the word *covet* is never taken in a good sense.

- And a properly educated member of the nation of Israel who is under that law would know this—because it was graphically impressed on his thinking from what is setting back in their Scriptures—let's note just one example:

- Psalm 10:3

- So what you've got is: *lust* is an intense longing desire (good or bad) but when the light of the law is shined upon it—or to put it another way, when you put yourself under the law, the 10th commandment comes along and identifies that *lust* as wrong, bad, or sin.

- It makes you aware of sin—it doesn't do a thing to suppress it!

- And that's because the meaning of *covet* has to do with an inordinate, longing desire for what belongs to another.
- And, just as all of the law—but especially the 10 Commandments are supposed to do—they function as a kind of “well-head” or comprehensive commandment to a lot of other sins that lie underneath it.
  - This is what the Lord Jesus Christ dealt with in the Sermon on the Mount—(Matt. 5-7) - as well as in Matt. 23:23 with the “*weightier matters of the law*.”
- So the law makes me aware (or makes known to me) that coveting is a sinful abhorrence in the eyes of God.
- But more than that, it digs down to this other issue that is now made known to me—that my intense desire is a *lust* that is also wrong, and bad, and sin in the eyes of God. (I just can't win!)
- And what Paul is doing is coming along and making you think about what the law is saying in some of its commandments, (for example), it comes along and tells you that your thinking that it is designed to repress and prohibit sin—or make sin functionally dead and make you functionally alive— can't be true at all!
- Because by the very way in which it says what it does, and the very way in which it talks about sin, is really one of bringing it to your attention! It's really an issue of identifying your sin and making you keenly aware of it.
- And so the first thing that (:7) is doing is that it is beginning to chip away at that erroneous understanding— and it's beginning to get your thought pattern going in the right direction.
- So there we have it—the 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine:
  - “*Is the law sin?*” - is there something wrong with the law?
  - Isn't it supposed to make sin functionally dead, and me functionally alive unto God?
  - No. Quite the opposite—because by the law I came to know all about the functional life of sin.
  - For example, by the 10th Commandment, Thou shalt not covet, I became fully aware that my lust was sin.
  - The law's not sin—I am: and it shows me to be that very thing!

- But that's not the end of it—there's more. (IT GETS WORSE!)
- And that is what the 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine is for.

*(Romans 7:8)*

*8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.*

- If some folks ever even get a 'gist' understanding of the law and grace, it usually is a very shallow one.
- And if it is shallow, then I guarantee you that some time and some place you will find yourself going *under the law* in some form or another.
- Because the truth of the matter is, even though what (:7) does seems to be very thorough and seems to do a good job (and it does) in getting your thinking going in the right direction—the truth is, to fully deal with this horrible danger to your Christian life, it takes more than that.
- And the reason for that is—that you still haven't seen the depths to which being *under the law* ruins and puts to death your functional life unto God—because the law does something more than merely exposing sin in you, or making you keenly aware of sin in your members.
- And all of the failures to live *under grace* by Christians today can be traced to a failure to properly understand and appreciate Romans 6 and 7!  
(w/o which you don't have a prayer of u/a ch.8!)
- So we need to have this 2nd Component to the corrective doctrine.
- And by stating what Paul says in (:8), not only is the law designed to bring sin to the awareness of the one who is under it; and to make him aware of what sin is and so forth—but the law actually gives sin, itself, the opportunity to manifest itself to its full degree in the person's life!
- And therefore, because of that, it actually gives sin functional life rather than making it functionally dead!
  - And that's why the last thing he says in (:8) is "*For without the law sin was dead.*"

- If you were to take that sentence and put it on a board, all except for the last word—and then asked most Christians with this erroneous thinking to fill in the last word, they would certainly put: "ALIVE."

- And those are the 2 things (those first 2 Components of Corrective Doctrine) that the person whose misunderstanding about the law is such that he thinks that it was designed to prohibit sin and make it functionally dead—those are the 2 things that he needs to ‘wrap his mind around’ (so to speak) and realize that’s the truth of the matter in connection with the law with respect to sin.

- It makes you AWARE of what sin is—it identifies it for you—so you are aware of the fact that it’s an issue in your life—and then it comes along and GIVES sin functional life in your members!

- So that it takes *occasion by the commandment*, and it makes it ‘work’ in you *all manner of concupiscence*.

- And what does that mean? That means that without the law, sin is dead—and with the law, sin is functionally alive!

- And that is the proper understanding and appreciation that needs to be had in connection with the law’s purpose and design with respect to sin.

- So now let’s begin to look at some of the details in (:8) - in this 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine to, “*Is the law sin?*”

8 *But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, ....*

- “*But*” (Conj. **de**,) - occurring at the beginning of this sentence, it is used as a disjunctive conjunction which serves to connect and continue the information stated in the previous sentence while still expressing opposition to the main subject at hand, viz., “*Is the law sin?*”

- So the first 2-clause sentence of (:7b) produced the first component of corrective doctrine: Far from making sin functionally dead in my members and putting it away from me; the law made me fully aware of what sin is and that sin is a major issue in my life.

- But that’s not good enough to fully and properly correct the erroneous thinking in this 1st Misunderstanding about the law—it now needs to be taken another step beyond the 1st Component of corrective doctrine to this 2nd Component: Far from making sin functionally dead in my life, the law actually GIVES sin functional life in my members!

- Therefore this “*but*” serves not only to present something that is adverse or in opposition to “*Is the law sin?*” - but the word “*but*” can also be used to set forth an inevitable accompanying circumstance or result.

- And this is in keeping with the fact that, beginning in (:7) we started a series of events taking place in connection with the law and how it operated in regard to sin—in making sin functionally alive—the Commandment said, “Thou shalt not covet” - then that made it so I became aware of the sin of lust—but there was more to it than that, and this 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine is now going to take you to the inevitable (impossible-to-avoid) result!

- So this “*but*” is doing 3 things:

- 1) It is connecting and continuing the information in (:7b);
- 2) It is opposing the erroneous thinking that the law is sin; and
- 3) It is taking us to the unavoidable result of what will happen if you put yourself *under the law*, instead of *under grace*!  
(The full unavoidable result will be stated in (:11)!)

- Therefore this is another component step in the process of rooting out fully the erroneous thinking about the law in connection with sin.

*8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, .....*

- Notice that we have a word-for-word repetition— “*sin, taking occasion by the commandment*” - here and in (:11). Therefore we need to get a good grip on this phrase because of how it properly takes our thinking through the process of the functional life of sin when you are *under the law*.

- Both of these phrases are designed to bring to your attention (which is in keeping of how we are to “know” sin by the law) - the phrase brings to your attention and exposes some of the mechanical features of how the law works upon someone who puts himself under it.

*8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, .....*

*11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, .....*

- “*occasion*” (*avformh*, = a military term meaning a place from which

a movement or attack is made; a beach-head; a base of

- The KJ translators always translated the term “*occasion*.”
- The modern translations use the word ‘opportunity,’ however, as we will see, ‘opportunity’ and “*occasion*” do not mean the same thing, and to use ‘opportunity’ here (as always) would weaken what Paul is driving at! It doesn’t make the verse better—it makes it worse—it doesn’t help the translation— it damages it!
- One discriminating difference between “*occasion*” and ‘opportunity’ is that it is quite conceivable to have an opportunity, but not to take the *occasion*, even though the opportunity presents itself.
- In other words, just having an opportunity doesn’t necessarily mean that some action will be taken—because even though one may have an opportunity, one may not necessarily do anything about it.
- *Occasion* isn’t like that—because *occasion* indicates that some action actually does take place.
  - For example, one of the properties of water is that it will seek its lowest level. So if you pour water into a container, you are giving it an opportunity to demonstrate this property.
  - But once the opportunity is actually given, water will, indeed, take the *occasion* to actually fulfill this property, once it has been poured into the container, it will (no doubt about it), it will seek its lowest level.
- And in this way, *occasion* indicates the action actually is taken with whatever result is indicated.
- And in this discriminating sense and difference, ‘opportunity’ just says that it MIGHT take place, whereas *occasion* tells you it will take place, and it, indeed has taken place!
- And while all this might sound like I’m splitting hairs, hairs need to be split here—because there is a process being presented here—one we might call a ‘sure-fire’ process.

- And on top of that, we are having presented to us the functional life process of sin under the law—a process that is demonstrating the actual functional activity of sin within you when you are under it—so therefore it is critical that we are accurate and very clear on the actual function of it so that it drives home the depths and levels to which sin, in all reality, actually functions under the law.

- Simply put, *occasion* is in perfect keeping with the context, and ‘opportunity’ isn’t!

- Now while all that is true, definition-wise, there are some problems with what I just said—because you can punch some holes in it if you really think about it.

- And that’s because ‘opportunity’ and *occasion* are very close and very similar in their meaning.

- And to ‘split-hairs’ even a little finer, there is something else about the differences in these two words that needs to be understood so that you will see the excellency of using *occasion* here in (:8) and on down in (:11).

- My understanding is that when you use the word *occasion*, and couple it with a verb that indicates that someone is going to take advantage of it—like the verb “*taking*” (*lambda,nw*) in “*taking occasion*” - that doesn’t necessarily demand that this was a forced issue (so to speak) or a ‘had-to-be-this’ type way issue.

- For example, I could (and just did) go to do a wedding. And someone could come along and say, “This is a very special occasion.” But I didn’t really have to be there. In fact, I could have turned it down. There was nothing compelling me to do it. Therefore there is a use of the word *occasion* that doesn’t necessarily have that issue of being forced to do something associated with it.

- And the reason I want to have you thinking about it this way is because my understanding is that there is a discriminating difference between *occasion* and the way most modern translations use the word ‘opportunity’ — and that is because in our English language *occasion* and opportunity are two words that can be used to describe the exact same thing—but where the two words differ is in the PERSPECTIVE!

- It's not so much in definition—because really, if you take *occasion* and take opportunity, you are doing the exact same thing.
- But the issue is the perspective that's in view.
- Or, in other words, there are times when it is more appropriate, (depending on what you're talking about), to say that it 'took opportunity' rather than it took occasion.
- And in some other situation it's going to be more appropriate to say the thing "took *occasion*" rather than it 'took opportunity.'
- And the thing that makes the difference is the position that the individual or the object is in that determines whether it takes occasion or it takes opportunity.

8 *But **sin, taking occasion by the commandment**, .....*

- The position sin is in is that it needed something to **prompt** it! It needed something to motivate it—it needed something (like Paul said earlier) to put it in motion.
- And when you are on the **receiving end** of such a need, you take the occasion when it is given to you.
- But when you are the thing that supplies what's needed, you supply the opportunity.
- So what's going on here is that 'opportunity' is involved here, but it's involved by default—it's the LAW that supplies the opportunity! And it's **SIN that takes occasion in connection with it!!!**
  - The *law* supplies the opportunity—that *commandment* "Thou shalt not covet" is what supplies the opportunity for *sin* to be put into *motion*.
  - And as soon as the opportunity is supplied—**sin took the occasion!**
- And that's the difference in those words—and the problem is, when it comes to the newer translations, is that they're using the word that really belongs to the "law" and they're applying it to the word "sin."
  - (Sin's on the receiving end of the opportunity, and therefore it takes the occasion that's given to it, and makes use of it!)



- And again, you can come along and say that's a hair-splitting technicality, but it's really NOT—it's the difference between those two words—it's the difference between being **accurate** and not being accurate with language—with words!
- And that's why those words are what they are here in (:8) and down in (:11).
  - Because they emphasize the fact that THE LAW IS GIVING SIN an opportunity! It gives it an opportunity to have full-blown functional life!
  - And sin's not a dummy: as soon as it's given an opportunity to have full-blown functional life, it takes advantage of it—it takes the occasion—it's a 'special occasion' to it—and it takes full advantage of it—it makes full use of that opportunity the law gave it!
  - And, by default, what this, of course, is coming along and making you understand and appreciate is that when you and I (as Christians) stupidly and foolishly put ourselves underneath that law, we give sin the occasion—and make it a special *occasion* for sin in our members to have functional life when God, by our position in Christ, has come along and given us the doctrine of our position in Christ and taught us that we're functionally dead to it! (We're *dead to sin!*)
  - Simple reminder: You've got to be given the opportunity first, before you can take occasion.
    - And therefore, when you are taking *occasion*, or whatever is taking *occasion*, it's being **given** the opportunity by something else.
    - That's why it says, "*sin, taking occasion by the commandment*" - the commandment is giving it (sin) the opportunity, and it (sin), therefore takes the *occasion*.
    - And that just underscores, all the more, that the law's design and purpose is to GIVE sin the opportunity to have full-blown functional life.
- And therefore that's why we have the rest of the sentence saying what it says: *8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, **wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.***

- “*wrought*” (katerga,zomai = to perform, accomplish, achieve; to work out; to bring about)

- *Wrought* is the older English past tense of the word ‘work.’  
(And it is NOT an archaic word!)

- The most common way in which the newer translations handle this word is to use the term “produced” - but the problem with this is (just as in most cases where the newer translations differ from the Authorized KJ) is that ‘produced’ is a much more vague term, whereas *wrought* has a more specific shade of meaning that is driving home to your inner man the specific mechanics of what happens when you put yourself *under the law*.

- In other words, *wrought* is after something more specific and more precise than merely a bringing something forth!

- “Produced” (past tense of ‘produce’) is a general term meaning to bring forward or to bring forth; to bring into existence—and while it can be used in a specific context, the word itself really doesn’t carry much shade of meaning outside of simple production or a simple bringing forth.

Wrought

- And my understanding is that when you are saying that something was *wrought*, it doesn't just mean that something was produced—it means more than that— it is driving at something that should grab your attention.
- *Wrought*, as I said earlier, is the older English past tense of work.
  - And when you talk about something being produced, you just mean that it came to be or it came forth.
  - But when you speak of something having been *wrought*, you have something a little more specific in mind—something (shall we say) more graphic to describe.
  - For when you have *wrought* something you have formed it, you have fashioned it, you have worked it into something.
    - For example, even to this day you still hear the expression, “wrought-iron” or something that is “hand-wrought” - and that has a special meaning to you—especially, for instance, if you are buying something of a higher quality—for that is the sense it is used— “hand-wrought” is more expensive because it has been molded or sculpted or crafted by the hand of the master artist—whether his work is in bronze or iron or clay or whatever.
- **Machine/factory product vs. Hand-wrought\$\$\$**
- And it's this sense of something that has been through a process of specialized, full-attention-to-detail, 'hands-on' fashioning, forming, and EFFORT that sin can now take, under the prompting of the law, to give sin the *occasion* to really put its sinister artistry on full-blown display.
- And that's what this 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine is dealing with.
 

*8 But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. ....*

  - The erroneous thinking that the law makes sin functionally dead is totally wrong—in fact you need to be confronted with just how deep sin can now function in your members under that law—and it doesn't just make you aware of sin—it actually makes it so sin can WORK in you with full-blown effort and attention to detail! It puts sin to work!

- It's not that sin is just there by means of the law—but that it's there in your members AND it's at work— it's active—it doesn't stop until it has been fully FORMED in you down to it's deepest level. (It EVOLVES!! evolution!)

- The law **gave** sin the opportunity to get to work—sin then took *occasion by the commandment*—and it **wrought** (it fashioned and formed) itself until it was fully functional to its fullest degree!!!

8 *But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.*

- “*all manner*” (pa/lj) - sin didn't just work one way or two ways or three or four ways—it worked *all manner*, referring to every species, kind, or sort—it worked every sort of sin it could!

- It worked all sorts of sin (*lust* in this case) possible!

- Paul says, “Sin took occasion by the 10th commandment (Thou shalt not covet) and wrought in me every sort of vile, disgusting, disgraceful, rotten, ugly category of lust it could work—all the way down to it's worst form of sinful *lust*: **CONCUPISCENCE!**”

- “*concupiscence*” (evpiqumi,a = lust) - from the Latin [cupio], “to desire” - the very name for “Cupid,” the Roman god of love.

- Far from being the sweet cherub seen at Valentine's day, Cupid was a raunchy, obscene and vulgar god. The Roman cult of Cupid believed that he ruled as the son of Night and the son of Hell, and that he mated with Chaos to produce both men and gods. He is often depicted as carrying two sets of arrows: one set gold-headed, which inspire love; and the other lead-headed, which inspire hatred.

- *Concupiscence* came to indicate extreme inordinate sexual appetite—and could be applied not only to sexual lust, but extreme, vehement, carnal desire for worldly things.

- The “con” prefix indicates ‘wholly’ and depicts someone wholly engaged by their will/volition in the desires and pleasures of sinful lust—the pure pursuit of pleasuring the senses—what we refer to today as hedonism.

- While we may speculate as to the exact details of Paul's particular brand of *concupiscence*, the point here is that we have 3 different English words that are translated from essentially the same Greek word:

- "I had not known *lust*" - evpiqumi,a
- "Thou shalt not *covet*" - evpiqume,w
- "all manner of *concupiscence*" - evpiqumi,a

- And the reason for the 3 different English words is to clearly demonstrate to the one who has this misunderstanding that the law is supposed to make sin functionally dead in my life—far from that it does the exact opposite—the law GIVES sin functional life in your members.

- And to graphically get that across, we have the help of our English language.

- And by the use of these words, we are to understand and appreciate the extent and depth that the law can go to put sin in motion and give it functional life in us.

- The law came along and told us "Thou shalt not covet." And that made *lust* in its bad and sinful sense known to me.

- But because of the way the law works in connection with sin, it didn't just give me a dictionary, word-study type definition of *lust*, it gave me an understanding of how sinful *lust* fully & mechanically functioned.

- And now *sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence*—and regardless of what the exact nature of *concupiscence* it was, this word tells us of the functional life of sin down to its ugliest, most horrible form of all!

- And with just that much corrective doctrine from (:7b—1st Component) and what we have so far in (:8—2nd Component); you should have an understanding and appreciation for just how seriously wrong the thinking is to try to utilize God's law—even God's law system— to put your Christian life into practice.

- It is pure Christian stupidity to use that law as the means or guide for living the Christian way of life!!!

- Therefore the first sentence of (:8) - *But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.*—gives you the corrective doctrine that says, not just one manner but ALL of them—every sort of concupiscence—and that’s the sin of lust’s full-blown functional life!

- And that’s what this 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine is all about—the law didn’t just make me aware of sin—more than that, it actually GAVE sin the one thing it needed: *occasion*, or **functional life**.

- What sin can do under that law is kind of like the old expression, “You give him an inch, and he’ll take a mile!”

- Well, you give sin an opportunity to take an inch, and it will take *occasion* to take the whole mile! (“***all manner***”)

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.*

8 *But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. **For without the law sin was dead.***

- As the capstone for the 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine, this final sentence in (:8) needs to be stated, and needs to be fully recognized for the reality that it is—for it gathers up all of the understanding so far and kind of puts it in a nut-shell.

- That’s why it starts off with the word “*For*” - it is a for of further explanation and further amplification on the corrective doctrine.

— *For without the law sin was dead.*—

- And as we noted before, if you have the misunderstanding about the law that is being dealt with here—if you really think that the law makes sin functionally dead and makes me functionally alive unto God—then you would finish the statement with the word ALIVE!

- (Which is exactly the way most Christian folks think!)

- But this final statement of (:8) is designed to not only do that, but it also has another purpose—it does something to the way you think in connection with not only what Paul has said in the first 2 components of corr. doc., but it also sets your thinking properly for what is going to be said in (:9 and 10).

- Now, while nothing is difficult here, or complicated at all—it is, however, very easy to get off track.

- And right here in this last sentence of (:8) is a place where, when some folks read it, they encounter a snag in their thinking.

— *For without the law sin was dead.* —

- And I want to pause for a minute (or two) and make sure that none of you have this snag in your thinking—and I also think this is the appropriate time to now consider some things about the specific context of this passage (as Paul puts himself in the first person—as he will do in verse 9 and following), and see something that will give you the “**Key**” to be able to properly handle some of the terminology and phrases sitting in (:9-10).

- 9 *For I was alive without the law **once**: but when the commandment came, **sin revived**, and I died.*  
 10 *And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*

- And if you are not careful to keep all that Paul is saying in the proper context, these passages are a real puzzle to most folks.

- And so some folks might read the final statement of (:8) - *For without the law sin was dead.*—and think, “Wait a minute. Before the law was ever given, sin was still going on. So, what in the world is Paul doing coming along and saying that before the law sin was *dead*? Wasn’t sin in existence from Adam to Moses? Wasn’t there an awful lot of sinning going on during Noah’s day? Wasn’t sin very much alive before the law? And weren’t people made aware of their sin before the law was ever brought in? Didn’t they covet, lust, murder, commit adultery? After all didn’t Cain know that the murder of his brother Abel sinful and wrong???”

- “Before the law a person could lust, or murder, or steal, etc., and it was just as wrong. Sin didn’t originate with the law—sin was going on a long time before that—and men were aware that they were sinful or sinning. And before the law men knew that there were things that were not godly, not God-honoring, unrighteous, and wicked in the sight of God—didn’t they???”

- Well, of course they did—so is Paul just saying (in a rather awkward way) that “sin was less active?” (Bible Knowledge Commentary)

- And, in fact, some Bible commentators make this mistake and pass this off as Paul just saying that after the law was brought in, people became MORE aware or more fully aware of sin than before the law.

- But this is the mistake of ASSUMPTION—assuming something about the text that it does not say—and presuming the text says something that it doesn't—even reading something into the text that is not even there!

- Sadly, this is an all-too-common mistake. And there is even a theological term for it (tradesman's term) - it's called EISEGESIS, which is a reading of one's own ideas into a given text. (And it's done all the time!)

- And the core of the problem in the statement: *For without the law sin was dead.* is a problem with the word "without."

- The truth of the matter is, Paul does NOT say, "For **BEFORE** the law sin was dead" - he says, "*For without the law sin was dead.*"

- You only assume he means "before the law"!!!

- In fact, the modern translations lend themselves quite nicely to someone making this error by saying, "For **APART** from the law, sin is dead (or sin lies dead)." ASV, NIV, NASV, RSV, NRSV

- But the wording of the AKJV makes it so that you won't make this mistake. It is clear, precise, and flawless.

- First of all, what Paul says at the end of (:8) doesn't contradict anything that I just said about sin and it being known about, and it being very much alive before the law was brought in.

- Because Paul doesn't say, "For without the law, sin didn't exist." Or, "For without the law, no one knew what sin was."

- And the truth of the matter is, the issue of sin being *dead* without the law is NOT the issue of sin having no existence, or sin not being an issue, or no one being aware that there was such a thing as sin, or anything along those lines.

- And Paul is certainly not saying, "For **BEFORE** the law, sin didn't exist." Or, "APART from the law, sin didn't exist."



- “without” (CWri,j = a preposition of separation, meaning without; in the absence of; beside; by itself)

- It is **never** used in the AV (**the Bible**) for ‘before’ or ‘apart.’

8 .... *For without the law sin was dead.*

- The ‘death’ that Paul is talking about here—or by default, the ‘life’ that would be the opposite of it, **IS THE FUNCTIONAL LIFE or FUNCTIONAL DEATH of sin that we’re talking about in this CONTEXT: within the context of SANCTIFICATION!**

- Does that make it ‘click’ in your mind?

- When Paul says, “*For without the law sin was dead.*” - if you’re going to extrapolate or read back into the historical time before the law came in, and became an issue, and was given by God at Mt. Sinai—that’s NOT the context in which Paul is saying it.

- And you know not to do that because Paul is now dealing with the law (and it being the means to make sin alive or dead), and the way he is dealing with it is NOT one of dealing with it in its historical sense, but a PERSONAL sense!

- And you see that happening from the very first verse of this package of corrective doctrine:

(:7) - “... Nay, **I** had not known sin .... for **I** had not known ....”

(:8) - “*But sin, taking occasion by the commandment wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.*”

- Paul is dealing with sin in his personal life. He’s dealing with it in a personal sense—he’s not dealing with it in an historical sense.

- And the issue is:

“*For without the law (the law in me) sin was (functionally) dead.*”

- The issue is not one of putting it back in any kind of historical perspective, it’s the issue of dealing with it in the context of sanctification.

- And this is the place where all of Paul’s own personal life experience with the law in connection with his own personal sanctification, (after he was justified unto eternal life), gets underway to be set forth as our example and as our ensample in the context of godly sanctification!

- And Paul's personal experience with respect to the law and him utilizing it to put his own personal sanctified life into effect gets underway here and runs like a locomotive all the way down to the end of chapter 7.

- And (:9) confirms what we're saying:

*9 For I was alive without the law once*—well, Paul wasn't alive back in Moses' day!!! That's not what he's talking about!

- He's not talking about a historical time when the law came in—he's talking about what has happened in his own personal life.

- And he's talking about the law's function in a person's life in view of the fact of God having brought the law in.

- It's not a contrast between before (from Adam to Moses) and then now (from Moses on).

- It's the issue of you using the law in your own personal life.

- And what Paul is going to say in verses 9 and 10—when he says, "*For I was alive without the law once.*" he's talking about when he, as a justified unto eternal life believer in the Lord Jesus Christ (as a Christian) was functionally alive unto God—and when he says at the end of (:9), "*... and I died.*" he's talking about what happened when, as a justified member of the body of Christ (as a Christian) he put himself under the law, he died—he functionally died!

- Everything Paul is talking about here is AFTER he was justified. He's not talking about what happened before he was justified!

- Verses 9, 10, and 11 are all talking about Paul as a justified man trying to utilize the law to put his Christian life into practice!!!

- **In fact, God had him do that very thing!**

- And He did it for the very purpose of making this **certification!**

- As the apostle of the Gentiles, God sets him up as an example and as an ensample that you cannot utilize the law to put your position in Christ into practice!

- It will not work!

- And you can't go back into the book of Acts and find it.
- You're just flat-out told that right here!
- And by the context, the "alive" here has to be functional life—it can't be 'spiritual' life in the sense of justification because he says he 'dies' - and if that's the case, then he no longer has spiritual life (or eternal life) or justification. So it can't be that!
- And it's certainly not 'physical life' and 'physical death'!
- And this is why it's so important to get into your thinking that Paul, as the unique and brand new apostle of the Gentiles really is our *example* and our *ensample* that we are to "follow!"
- We discussed before the fact that Paul is our apostle—and we are to follow him as he follows Christ.
- Rom. 11:13—*For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office:*
  - We are NOT to be followers of or disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ in His earthly ministry!
  - That is not to say that we are not to be followers of the Lord— for we are:
    - And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost:*
    - So that ye were ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia.*
    - (1 Thess. 1:6-7)*
  - But the way we are to be following the Lord today is to be following Him with some intelligence! That is to be following Him as He is to us—NOT as our Kingdom King—NOT as our "Great High Priest" - but as the "Head" of the church the body of Christ according to what His business is in this present dispensation of grace in which we live!
- I Tim. 6:15— "Potentate" - the highest "prince" or Principality (Paul's description of Christ as Head of the body!)
- We follow Paul- pay attention to Paul—and watch what God does with Paul!

- And not paying attention to Paul is a big mistake!
- One of the main reasons why God has Paul ‘magnify’ his office is because of how strongly the truth of God’s great dispensational change, ( and especially Paul’s special and distinctive apostleship in accordance with it), is going to be opposed by the Satanic policy of evil against the truth of what God is doing today.
- It is going to be vehemently opposed, and denounced, and denied, and even blasphemed, as the policy of evil works tirelessly to get it so that Christians do not understand what God has done.
- And the result is that instead of Christians understanding, appreciating, and walking consistent with the new dispensation that God has brought in, they will be ignorant of it and will endeavor to live their Christian lives either under God’s Law program with Israel, or by a mixture of things from Israel’s program and from God’s program today.
- The Adversary’s goal is to get it so that Christians are BIBLE STUDENTS, but more than that that they are HIS KIND OF BIBLE STUDENTS who do not ‘rightly divide the word of truth,’ and thereby end up living by the things in the Bible that pertain to God’s program with Israel, rather than the things that truly pertain to this present dispensation of grace.
- Because of this God has Paul conclude the book of Romans in a way that warns you about this very thing!
- Romans 16:17-20
- Paul warns about those who will come as Bible teachers—preaching and teaching God’s word—but speaking and teaching contrary doctrines!
- They will either be direct ministers of the Satanic policy of evil, or else they will be ones who are foolishly deceived by it and cooperating with it.
- But the issue is that they will be speaking contrary doctrines to what God, through Paul, teaches us—especially here in Romans—and this includes the issue of them speaking contrary doctrines regarding Paul’s unique apostleship!
- And this is why Paul’s office as the apostle to us Gentiles in this dispensation of grace has to be MAGNIFIED! Making this great dispensational change an obvious (can’t-be-missed) thing!

- And because Paul is our *ensample*, and because God is now engaged in an entirely different program with us, the members of the “*one new man*,” the “*new creature*” of the church, the body of Christ, it became necessary from time to time for God to do things with and to the apostle Paul that were unique and distinct—that is, He would do certain things with Paul that were to provide for us some kind of an example that we could follow with assurance and confidence—things that are especially directed to us, the “new creature” that would fit in and deal with God’s program for us in this dispensation of grace in which we live.

- Therefore God wants us to actually look carefully at Paul’s unique and distinct apostleship—and to focus our attention on it—and learn some things in connection with it that serve us particularly in this dispensation of grace.

- For example—see Acts 14—(Paul’s 1st Journey)

- Acts 14:8-20

- God puts Paul to death and takes his where all believers go in this dispensation of grace: to heaven.

- Then God can have Paul write the necessary doctrine we need to operate on in connection with our death—and do so with the added confidence of one (Paul) who has actually experienced it and then lived to write about it in the body of doctrinal information we need to operate on in our own Christian lives.

- I Cor. 15:5-19

- II Cor. 12:1-4

- The members of the remnant of Israel had their own doctrine and their own testimony of death and dying in connection with God’s program with them.

- And they had examples that gave them assurance of the doctrine they were to operate on.

- Jesus, Himself

- Lazarus (John 11)

- The other Lazarus (Luke 16:19-31—read)

(How different this is from Paul’s account!)

- I only bring this up to illustrate that it really isn't a foreign concept to think that God would do some specialized things with the apostle Paul that were particular in dealing with the doctrine and the putting into practice what our position "in Christ" is all about in this dispensation of grace in which we live.

- Therefore Paul being utilized by God in Romans 7 as our ensample to follow is really in keeping with how God Himself has been setting forth the apostle Paul and making his office to be magnified to us so that we won't miss important details of how we are to put our sanctified life that we have "in Christ" into practice as well.

- And here in Romans 7:8, and following on through the end of the chapter, that is exactly what Paul is doing—he is utilizing himself as the distinct and unique apostle the he is to us, the members of the church, the body of Christ, so that we won't ever be so stupid and foolish as to put ourselves under Israel's Law program/system in an attempt to live unto God.

- And this context is going to follow throughout all that Paul is going to say from now on through verse 25!

- So the 1st Misunderstanding is: *"Is the law sin?"*

- Something must be horribly wrong with the law, because the law is supposed to make sin functionally dead in my members, and make me functionally alive unto God—right? WRONG!

- 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine: *"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." (:7b)*

- Far from putting sin out of my mind and out of my life, the law made me fully aware of sin's functional life-mechanics in my members!

- 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine: *"But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law, sin was dead." (:8)*

- Far from putting sin to death in my members, the law actually comes along and GIVES sin the opportunity (and sin, being no dummy takes the occasion) to have its full-blown functional life in my members!

- The law GIVES sin functional life—it doesn't put sin to death at all!!!

- And now verses 9 and 10 are going to come along and Verify the Reality of the Corrective Doctrine set forth in verses 7 and 8.

*Romans 7:9-10*

*9 For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.*

*10 And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*

- And now, based upon the context—and keeping our bearings by the context that is set for us with that last sentence of (:8), we know that Paul is talking about himself AS A BELIEVER (a Christian) - and that he tried to put his own personal sanctified life into practice by putting himself under the law.

- And therefore based on that, we should know how to take all the terminology and all the expressions and phrases in these 2 verses.

- They should just naturally fall into place in your thinking!

- (:9) - “*For I was alive*” - speaking of Paul’s own functional life—his own sanctified, functional life unto God.

- (:9) - “... *without the law once:*” - speaking of Paul’s functional, sanctified life *under grace*.

- The “*once*” indicates not just ‘one time’ but indicates that there were several occurrences in which Paul, after putting himself *under the law*, and realizing what it did to his functional life, ‘once again’ put himself back *under grace* where he was “*alive*” functionally unto God.

- In other words, “*once*” he was *under grace*, he was “*alive*” unto God—functionally alive under grace.

- And the colon at the end of the first clause of (:9) tells you to pause long enough so that you fully have a grip on the importance of what you are being told—and you are not to move on until that happens!

- (:9) - “... *but when the commandment came,*” - speaking of when Paul intentionally put himself *under the law*—and specifically when he put himself under the 10th commandment: “*Thou shalt not covet.*”

- The *commandment* came to his attention, it *came* to be put into operation, and Paul then *knew sin*, or became fully aware of its functional life mechanics in his members, working on to its full-blown functional, sinful life-limit in him.
- (:9) - "... *sin revived*," (**avnaza,w** = to live again, to recover life)
  - This expression is again being used because of what Paul said at the end of (:8).
  - *Without the law sin was dead*. So when he was not utilizing that law, sin was functionally dead and he was functionally alive—(just like he said at the beginning of (:9)).
  - Then Paul went and picked up that commandment and tried to utilize it, and sin comes back to life—comes back to functional life—it revives—and he functionally dies.
- And that's the very thing the last 3 words of (:9) says:
- (:9) - "... *and I died*." - Paul functionally died *under the law*.
- And this is the first part of the verification of the corrective doctrine from Paul's own personal experience as our ensample of, as the justified unto eternal life, saved, Christian he was attempting to put his sanctified life he had in Christ into effect by putting himself under the law.
- And (:10) is the second part of the verification of the corrective doctrine.
- (:10) - "*And the commandment*," - speaking of the law, and specifically by the example he has set forth, the 10th Commandment, "*Thou shalt not covet*."
- (:10) - "... *which was ordained to life*,"
  - Notice that the two words, "*was ordained*" is in italics. That is, it is not in the Greek text. It is supplied by the translators.
  - And just as with all other modern versions, they also had to supply a word or words to make sense out of the ellipsis that occurs in (:10).
  - But, as always, the modern versions will go to any length NOT to acknowledge the accuracy of the AV.



- So they will use anything—any other words rather than the ones used by the AV translators.
- And in doing so, they, as they always do, weaken the passage and make it harder to understand and obscure the truth and power of what God actually intended to be understood and appreciated. (But more on that later.)
- The expression, *the commandment, which was ordained to life*, and specifically the term *ordained* all has to be kept within the context of the frame of mind that Paul is relating.
- And just as we said, God is allowing him to go through this for the purpose of being able to testify and to verify from personal experience the reality of the corrective doctrine and the correct thinking about the law and its purpose and design.
- And when God allowed him to do that, obviously Paul still retained at that time the common thinking about the law that he's addressing and dealing with here that people commonly have, that the law was designed to give sin functional death and give him functional life.
- And so Paul perceived that thing, and thought about that thing as something that God had "*ordained*" to life—he thought that God had set that thing down, and given it, and said, "Here's the means to functional life!"
- And that what Paul THOUGHT it was!  
(But his thinking was wrong!)
- That's NOT what he *found*—
- (:10) "... *I found to be unto death.*"
- Because when you find something, you either find what you're looking for, **or you discover something you were not aware of!**
- And that's the issue— "*I found to be unto death*" - that is, I discovered something that I wasn't aware of—I was thinking this law was ordained to life, and now I find that this thing is really *ordained unto death!*
- This thing has been set down by God and given for the purpose of making me functionally dead and showing sin to be functionally alive!

- Therefore it was Paul's own erroneous thinking and misunderstanding about the law that would make him think that it was "*ordained to life*"!

- Otherwise he never would have done what he said in (:9)!

- If he thought that thing was ordained and designed to make sin alive and make him functionally dead, he never would have picked that commandment up and utilized it in the first place!

- You've got to keep the context in mind — you've got to keep in mind that what Paul says in (:9) **dictates** what he says in (:10).

- And although it is not repeated in (:10) before the words "*unto death*" - it is to be understood that "*ordained*" is, in reality what is to be understood—you are to understand and appreciate that the correct way to think about the law is that:

*"I found (the law) to be (not ordained to life, but ordained unto death."*

- And "*ordained*" is the more accurate, powerful term that correctly and flawlessly conveys and expresses the issue here!

- As I said before, most of the modern translations refuse to use the word *ordained*, simply because the AV uses it.

- And so they supposedly "correct" it or "make it easier to understand" by using some other term.

- Some leave it out altogether—others use "intended" or "to result" or "promised" or some other word/s.

- But *ordained* is the correct, accurate, flawless term and here's why:

- First of all, bear in mind that the term is not only going to be used in the erroneous thinking about the law, but it is also going to be used (by implication) to refer to the correct thinking about the law—it wasn't ever *ordained to life*, but it was; it truly was, by God, *ordained unto death*.

- 
- Also, there is something about the shade of meaning of *ordained* that carries more weight and conveys more meaning (meaning that is very important) - more precision—than any other term that could be used in our English language.
  - When you examine all the various synonyms that fall into the category of *ordained*, you find that of all of them, *ordained* is the most precise, developed, and the most severe.
  - For example, in the *ordained* synonym family you have:  
*To appoint, order, prescribe, ordain.*  
(From the general to the very specific) - (Milk to Meat).
  - *Appoint* is the most general of the terms. And *appoint* is either the act of an equal or superior.
  - *Order* is the act of arranging, and it is the act of one invested with a partial authority—such as a customer *orders* a book from the bookstore.
  - *Prescribe* is from the Latin compound *pre* (before), and *scribo* (to write), and is the act of one who is superior by virtue of his knowledge—such as a physician who *prescribes* to his patient.
  - But *ordain* (which is a variation of the word *order*) is an act emanating from the highest authority—such as a king who *ordains* something—but even the king's *order* must be conformable to what is *ordained* by God, Himself.
  - And that's the precision of the word *ordained*—it is to be understood as coming from the highest authority possible: from God, Himself!
  - And that's why it perfectly and flawlessly fits the context of Romans 7:10—the erroneous thinking is that God, Himself demands, requires, indeed, has *ordained* the law to be unto functional life—but that is in error—not in that God did not *ordain* the law, for He did—it came from the highest authority possible: God, Himself.
  - But the correct thinking is that the law, *ordained* from the highest authority possible, God Himself, was *ordained* (with all the full weight of that term) not to life, but unto death!

- When Paul says what he does here in (:10) he doesn't intend to blunt the force, the power, or the authority for which that law was given—it really was *ordained*—and *ordained* by God Himself.

- But with all that weight, power, force, and authority of a God-*ordained* commandment or law—it's just that it has to be properly understood and appreciated that it wasn't *ordained to life*; it was authorized and *ordained unto functional death*.

- And that's the correct, godly viewpoint and thinking about the law of Moses in regard to sin, and in the context of godly sanctification for us as members of the church, the body of Christ!

- Verification of the Reality of the Corrective Doctrine:

*Romans 7:9-10*

*9 For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.*

*10 And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*

- 3rd Component of the Corrective Doctrine: Romans 7:11

*Romans 7:11*

*11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.*

- With the “*For*” of (:11), God has the apostle Paul present the further ‘kicker’ to the corrective doctrine—that is, the final component of the corrective doctrine that now needs to be stated and fully realized.

- It is the final component because it build upon all that has been previously stated—but in order to drive home the issue and make the full impact on our inner man that it is supposed to, this additional component has to be stated—it has to be honestly faced and fully realized that putting your sanctified position you now have “in Christ” into effect by means of putting yourself under the law not only makes sin functionally alive in your members and makes you functionally dead unto God—but more than that, it needs to be expressed in a way that makes an impression on you of just how horrible, and just how dangerous of a thing it is to your functional life.

- And the terminology of (:11) is designed to make you aware of just how LETHAL, extremely harmful, and how fatal it really is!!!

11 *For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, ...*

- “*sin, taking occasion by the commandment,*” is the exact phrase used back up in (:8).

- And just as it was used there to indicate that sin in your members was just waiting for something to come along an prompt it—to **GIVE** it something that it needed so that it could be put into full-blown motion—and the law supplied that opportunity—and sin took the occasion to go into action.

- Simple reminder: **You’ve got to be given the opportunity first, before you can take occasion!**

- When something (sin, for instance) is taking *occasion*, it is being **given** the opportunity by something else (the law, for instance).

- And the commandment (law) gives sin the opportunity, and sin therefore takes the occasion to go into action.

- It’s as if sin sits there ready to tear you apart and you just come along and give it the gun, and the bullets by putting yourself under the law. (not the best way to say it)

- But now in this final component of the corrective doctrine, instead of just making it so that it effectually works in your inner man that the law’s design & purpose is to give sin the opportunity to have full-blown functional life—now we are going to take that same corrective thinking we got from (:8) and focus now on its final results!

- And the final results (the real kicker) is a horrible, frightening reality—you are in a very serious and dangerous position of being slain—and even more terrible is that your functional life will be slain by deception!

- This is designed to be graphic, ugly, and with this issue of being deceived: it is a **CRUEL**, monstrous thing!

11 *For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, **deceived me**, ...*

- *Deceive* (*de-* prefix = down, [in a bad sense] + L. *capio* = to take); hence, to take down; to ensnare; to take unawares by craft or guile; to purposely mislead.

- The idea behind *deceive* is to ensnare someone by trickery or to get the better of by intentionally misleading into error and wrong doing.

- Simply put, *deception* is the intentional act of making you think one thing is so, when in reality it isn't so.

- (*Deception* is the 'home field' or natural environment of politics and the politician.)

- The major issue in *deception* is FALSEHOOD—and it signifies especially the producing of a FALSE CONVICTION—that is, falsely convinced that the true, biblical, and godly life of the Christian is to be lived and put into practice *under the law*.

- And here is why *deception* is brought into the picture in this last component of corrective doctrine:

- A believer in Christ, putting his/her Christian life into practice by utilizing the law of Moses is so *deceptive* because it actually uses the Bible (the very word of God) itself to do it.

- You can be, and in fact, you probably must be, a serious student of the Bible to do this.

- But, again, if you're not careful, you will fall right into the snare and trap that any saint will, and most often, does easily fall into if they don't take care to honestly study and rightly handle and rightly divide God's word.

- And you can't just be left to how you feel about it. In fact, if left to your feelings, a Christian will put himself under that law every time—you have to be properly taught and you have to be told how God expects you to put your Christian life in Christ into practice—and outside of proper edification in regard to sanctification, you would **never** function properly *under grace!* (*you have to 'reckon' it to be so*)

- Why? Because sin will *take occasion by that commandment* and *deceive* you every time!

- Therefore being *deceived* is being **under a false impression**—for that is what every deception is designed to do—to make a false impression on someone.

- And every Christian who lives *under the law* is *deceived*—he is under the false impression that he is being godly—that he is doing the will of God—that God is pleased with him—and where sanctification is concerned, that he is putting sin to death in his linion

ion

- Ad, t31(2sher tinsidious nod )atuwhell howing sth your me h28(bert,sth ion)] TJ0 -1.1523 Tdis r

- So we have: “*For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, (didn’t just make me functionally dead, but it) **deceived me**, (produced a false impression and made a false conviction or belief in my thinking) and by it slew me.*”

- And now we have the final, forceful nail driven into the erroneous thinking of the 1st Misunderstanding about the law in connection with sin:

“... **and by it** (the commandment; the law) **slew me.**”

- And here is another example of where the modern versions just can’t stand the AV—because most of them change the word “*slew*” to some other term—and again, water down the force of the meaning!

- “*slew*” (avpoktei,nw = to kill in any way whatever; to destroy; to perish, etc.)

- “*slew*” is the past tense of *slay*.

- *Slay* is an extremely graphic word in the English. And because English is our natural language, we almost instinctively know that there is a difference between *killed* (which, while harsh, is a somewhat softer term), or something like ‘*put to death*’ (NIV) (which is an even softer expression).

- And I say this because we know that we wouldn’t talk about running over a squirrel in our car and say, “When I was coming home today, I *slew* a squirrel.”

- (We’d probably say, “I killed a squirrel.”)

- In fact, in an even more extreme case, we wouldn’t say, for instance, “Yesterday at the prison they took the serial killer and *slew* him.”

- (We’d probably say, “They executed the serial killer.” or “They put that murderer to death.”)

- Notice that we almost, by nature, reserve the word *slay* or *slew* for a special context of death—and it is usually the most severe type of death—for it describes something on a horrific scale—a scale beyond death or dying in general.



- And it is very important that here, at the end of the final component of corrective doctrine, we retain the force of the term so that it will make the deep impression it is intended to make!

- In the family of synonyms, *kill* is the most general, and *slay* is one of the most specific and graphic.

- And, what God is after here in this final component of corrective doctrine is something specific when it comes to dealing with the specific function of the law in connection with sin.

- *Kill* or ‘*put to death*’ is just a general way of signifying a taking away of life.

- But *slay* comes to us from the military—it’s basic meaning is to kill or take away life in the most aggressively violent form possible: **to kill in battle.**

- We talk of a soldier being *slain* in battle.

- And in this sense of it being a word having great violence attached to it, we talk about a battle like Custer’s Little Big Horn (7th Cavalry), where there was a literal blood bath, as being a *slaughter*. (Which is a close kin to *slay*.)

- And so *slay* takes on a hideously, shocking, overwhelmingly violent type of death.

- And we naturally and rightly reserve *slay* or *slew* for just such type of cases of killing or death.

- And because of that it often finds its way into the vocabulary of law enforcement to describe the most violent types of murder cases.

- Jeffery Dahmer, for instance didn’t just *kill* his victims, he *slew* them—he took them apart and dismembered them.

- And without getting too graphic, when you talk about someone being *slain*, you’re talking about a death that affected their whole body—not just a clean shot through the heart or something like that—but a violent and usually, more often than not, a gruesome death.

- And my understanding is that when the apostle Paul tells us about his own personal case of putting himself *under the law* and not *under grace*, God wants him to express it with just this kind of serious and graphic type of terminology: “*For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.*”

- *Sin* took what that law gave it and unsheathed that sword and cut me to pieces—it affected my whole being! (There wasn't a single part of my life that was acceptable in the eyes of God while I was under that law!)

- And far from being the holy, pious, sanctified life that was compatible with and acceptable to God, it *deceived me* into believing that I was safe and sound in the will and acceptable purpose of God—when all the while it was fattening me up for the slaughter—and slaughter me it did!

- I was deceived into believing that the law put sin to death in my members and made me alive unto God.

- But while I merrily went *under the law*, convinced it was the way to put my sanctified life in Christ into effect—my functional life wound up being cut down in battle—it turned on me and *slew me!*

- And it wasn't the law's fault—that would be like saying that it was the fault of the gun or the fault of the sword—no, it was the fault of that which wielded it: sin in me!  
(“... *sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.*”)

- And it is just that kind of a graphic, forceful impression you are supposed to have in your inner man when you ever think about putting yourself under the law—it's the most dangerous, harmful, cruel, and lethal thing there is to your functional life in Christ!

- And you are NOT supposed to ever forget it!

- And every Christian who is under that law system has had their functional life in Christ *slain*—and they are ungodly, unholy, deceived, and unacceptable in the eyes of God—even if they are reading their Bible and doing what it says to do! (And you should now appreciate what it means to not be under the law, but under grace more than you ever have before!)

- Therefore the purpose of the 3rd Component of Corrective Doctrine is designed to take what was said in the first 2 components, and along with the verified reality of that, drive home the awful serious results of attempting to put your functional life in Christ into effect by means of the law—and to say it in such a graphic way (and a very real way) so that it sticks in your thinking and stays stuck there for good!

- And then to make sure that the whole issue is properly resolved, we must have put to us in summary form the fact that it is NOT the law that does this to us, it is sin in our members that does this to us.

- “*Is the law sin?*” “*God forbid.*” There is nothing wrong with the law at all—there is just something horribly wrong with your thinking about the law in connection with sin in your members.

- The law is only doing what it is supposed to do when sin is given the opportunity by it to go into full-blown functional life.

- So the conclusion or summary to this can now be stated in (:12).

#### *Romans 7:12*

- A Summary Statement that is Designed to Replace the Misunderstanding with Proper Understanding:

*12 Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.*

- “*Wherefore*” - not a “therefore” - *wherefore* is commonly used as a conclusion, but unlike therefore, it is usually used where a summary type conclusion is being made.

- And that’s what we’ve got here. We have gone through a body of information that has a structure to it—that has built-in steps and sense & sequence to it—and now it needs to be put into a summary conclusion—BUT, there is still more to say on the general, overall matter.

- So we don’t get a “therefore” here, but a “*wherefore*.” This is going to be the summary conclusion to all that has been said from verse 7 down through verse 11.

- And the conclusion is, and the proper thinking about the law is, that far from being “*sin*” “*the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good.*”

- It is given by God—and it is His righteous standards—and there is nothing of sin about that at all! (It is impossible for it to be sin!)

- “Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, ...”

- “*holy*” = since there has not been any real doctrinal development to the term *holy*, it is to be understood in the basic way in which the context has been dealing with it all along.

- That is, the law is totally compatible with and totally acceptable to the essence and character of God—and why not? God, Himself, gave it, and He, being perfect, it, too, is perfect.

- It is something He accepts and something He is pleased with.

- And the real point of saying that the *law* is holy is to enforce in your thinking that it is the very opposite of anything that is wrong, or evil, or wicked, or sin itself!

- What *holy* is doing here in this context is making you understand and appreciate that the law is, in and of itself, the farthest thing there could ever be from being “*sin!*” (And that’s the point!) (And you should see that by now!)

- But notice that Paul does not just come along and say, “Wherefore the law is *holy*.” or “Wherefore the law is *holy*, and just, and good.”

- No. He uses 2 terms for it—he says:

“Wherefore the LAW is *holy*, and the COMMANDMENT *holy*, ...”

- He says both the LAW and the COMMANDMENT are *holy*.

- Why does he use these TWO terms? There has to be a good reason. (And there is!)

- Remember the way in which the apostle Paul began the argument: In (:7) he said, “*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.*”

- He brings up the general, overall issue of the law; and he goes on to specifically cite one of its commandments—the 10th commandment.

- And he’s going to end up the argument the way in which he started it.

- So if the whole thing Paul has been dealing with here is based upon a Misunderstanding about the law—and when he dealt with it to provide the corrective doctrine for that Misunderstanding—he’s talked about **the law in whole**; and he’s talked about **the law in part** (the commandment—the 10th one, specifically) - so then when he concludes it, it’s only logical that he comes along and puts both the law in whole, and the law in part into its proper light.
- And that’s exactly what he’s doing here.
- And as God has had the apostle Paul deal with this issue of the misunderstanding about the law—he has given us to understand that if you try to put your functional life you have in Christ into effect under that law—**the law in part or the law in whole**—sin will take the occasion to take that law and slay you with it—if you are under the law in part or under the law in whole, the result will be the same: sin will become functionally alive in your members; and you will become functionally dead unto God.
- But it’s not that the law is sin—it’s the sin in you that’s the problem.
- So there’s nothing wrong with the law in whole; and there’s nothing wrong with the law in part!
- The law is *holy*—and any of its component parts (such as the commandment) is *holy, and just, and good*.
- And so the rhetorical (doesn’t need to be stated) bottom line to the whole thing is, “Buddy, it’s your thinking that is at fault here—not the law!”
- 12 *Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.*
- The final thing to notice (final curiosity) is that Paul doesn’t just end with the statement that both the law in whole (*the law*) and the law in part (*the commandment*) is *holy*—period—no—he adds at the end the words *and just, and good*.
- *holy* ( a[gi]o)j)
- *just* ( di,kaio)j)
- *good* ( avgaqo,j)

- Why does Paul add the words *just* and *good* to *holy* in describing the law and putting the law in part and the law in whole in its proper light?

- First of all you should know by now that there is no randomness in the word of God—all these words are there for a reason—and all the words are in the order they are in for a reason.

- So we should be thinking at the outset that this NEEDS to be stated just this way in order to make the full impact on our thinking that the law—far from being sin itself—is anything but that! In fact, it's the very opposite of that!

- And Paul is NOT just using a lot of flowery terminology for mere terminology's sake.

- And the other thing you need to bear in mind is that when someone thinks that the law is sin—there are other issues that go along those lines in the person's mind who thinks that kind of thing.

- And the law being sin is the extreme issue—but along with that (by default) that person has to also conclude that along with the law being unholy (or sin), they must also think that the law is unjust to make sin functionally alive and make me functionally dead unto God, as well as thinking that the law is bad and not *good*.

- All this is the “baggage” that goes along with the erroneous thinking that the law is sin—all these other concepts are in that person's thinking as well—by default, so to speak.

- So since we are dealing with a conclusion, you would expect this kind of thing going on—this kind of thing needing to be brought out and stated clearly.

- We're dealing with a conclusion that has straightened out a misunderstanding—and therefore in the conclusion like this you are going to drive home, by the terminology that you use, the exact opposite of what has been misperceived!

- And in light of that, all this excess terminology is needful and necessary based on the way the erroneous thinking has been understood and dealt with when it was corrected and straightened out. It's the proper way the whole argument logically and biblically follows out.

- As I follow an argument, and I know that this argument started with a misunderstanding, and I know that the misunderstanding has GOT to be dismissed—otherwise the end result of dealing with all these objections and misunderstandings is NOT going to be able to stand—I expect, therefore, that when the corrective information concludes the argument, I’m going to get a PUNCH that’s going to make sure that there’s NO VESTIGE of the misunderstanding remaining.

- And so I would expect that when I come to (:12) here, and it begins with “*Wherefore the law is ...*” - I expect, first of all, a word to be used that is going to come along that is in perfect accordance with the “*God forbid (the law is not sin)*” issue.

- So I get: “*the law is holy*”

- And if, for example, I was sitting there listening to Paul reading to me what he was writing, and at the end of the word “*is*” and he stopped and said, “What do you think I said next?” - I think the first word to pop into my mind, I would have said to Paul, “You probably said “*holy*,” didn’t you?”

- And then he went on and said, “*and the commandment is holy...*” - and if Paul came along and said, “Do you think I might have said anything beyond that?” - (I don’t know if I would have said that you would have to), but the fact that you simply repeated that the *commandment is holy*, you’ve also said some things about the commandment in a little more detail in your proofs in the previous verses—so, maybe I would expect you, Paul, to add a few more things to the *commandment* concept.”

**- So that therefore, in whole and in part, no one can look at that law and say that there is something wrong with it!**

- Because these are all expressions that root out ALL that erroneous thinking that the law is wrong—and these additional words at the end of (:12) FULLY dismiss that erroneous thinking and misunderstanding that the law is sin!

*Romans 7:12*

*12 Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good.*

- Therefore, this 1st Misunderstanding is fully and completely rooted out and dismissed and proven to be the erroneous thing that it is—and it is replaced with the correct thinking that you should have about the law in part and in whole.

**- ROMANS 7:13-25**

**- THE 2ND & FINAL MISUNDERSTANDING ABOUT THE LAW** and the corrective doctrine that replaces the misunderstanding with the proper, Biblical understanding about it.

---

- Again, 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 instead of using ‘class notes’ or some 3-ring binder of categorical doctrines listed in alphabetical order—we should be able to pick up our Bible and take it in hand and use it as a categorical notebook— and we should know that all of the categorical information and sound doctrine of our fundamental education into godly Sanctification for us as members of the church, the body of Christ in this present dispensation of grace in which we live is found in 3 chapters of Romans: chapters 6, 7, and 8.

- And within the 4-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 down through Romans 7:25.

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

- And now in Romans 7:13-25, after having dealt with and dismissed the objections commonly made when someone is told that that are *not under the law*—and after dealing with and dismissing the 1st, most common misunderstanding about the law in connection with sin—we now come to the final major component of corrective doctrine concerning the law and it being the means by which we are to put our sanctified life we have “in Christ” into practice.

- And this final component is another, or **2nd Major Misunderstanding** about the law in regard to us not being *under the law, but under grace*—(and all the corrective doctrine regarding that misunderstanding.)

- And this is the deepest-rooted erroneous thinking of them all!



- In Romans 7:13-25 (13 verses) we continue on with the erroneous thinking about the law, but now we are confronted with a 2nd misunderstanding, misassumption, or misconception about the law which caused the objections to be raised in chapter 6:15-23 (the 1st Objection), and chapter 7:1-6 (the 2nd Objection), in the first place.

- And this is the final one that needs to be confronted and dealt with so that the 'black board' (so to speak) gets fully erased and can then begin to get filled in as chapter 8 gets underway with what it means to be *under grace* and put your sanctified life "in Christ" into practice *under grace*.

- In other words, when this final misunderstanding gets rooted out, corrected, dismissed, and replaced with corrected doctrine, **then (and only then)** are you properly prepared to begin your education into your sanctified life *under grace*!

- And just as each of the objections in 6:15-23, and 7:1-6 needed to be dealt with separately because they each had a life of their own (so to speak), and since they were based upon these 2 major misunderstandings about the law; so, too, do each of these misunderstandings have to be dealt with separately, because they each have a life of their own.

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

- The 1st Misunderstanding came out of what was said to put to death the 1st and 2nd Objections, and once that 1st misunderstanding was dismissed and corrected, something that was said there will **expose** this final root misunderstanding and bring it to light or bring it to the surface so that it can now be confronted and corrected.

- And because of how God arranged the order in His Book, it is essential that you first of all get one dealt with and then the other, and then the other, etc., because you really can't appropriately deal with what this 2nd Misunderstanding is until the first one is cleared up: **because by clearing up the 1st one, you expose the 2nd one!**

- That's why the ORDER is so important—and that's why it is so important to pay attention to the order in which God presents the information to you in His word—they're in that order for a very important and particular reason!

- And that particular reason has to do with God knowing how He created your human spirit and your human soul (your “inner man”); and how His word is designed to effectually work in your inner man to bring about the correct, godly thinking—which will in turn bring about correct, godly living—and finally, correct or godly laboring with your Heavenly Father in all that He is doing in this dispensation of grace in which we live.

- And because it is God’s word which effectually works in you, no other words will work; no other order of words or doctrine will work; and not even God’s words in a different order will work! **That** is the power and importance of paying attention to the Bible’s own sense & sequence!

*1 Thessalonians 2:13*

*13 For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.*

- “Effectually” = not only successful in accomplishing a designated task or purpose (effective); but it is also **final** and **conclusive; it cannot be improved upon;** and **it is NOT to be substituted for!**

---

- So the first thing (as always) that we need to do is to take a look at Romans 7:13-25 and identify the various components that make up this 13-verse body of information that properly takes you through the misunderstanding, the corrective doctrine, and the dismissing of the erroneous thinking and replacing that with the proper, godly understanding about being *not under that law, but under grace*.

- And as you have come to expect, that 1st component is the most crucial because it is the one that sets the tone for everything else that follows—and everything that does follow will be based on having a very clear understanding of what this particular misunderstanding is all about.

- As you go through this final section dealing with the law and its deadly effect on our functional, sanctified life in Christ, the first thing that should strike you is that it is a fairly lengthy passage.

- It's made up of 13 verses.

And we haven't had that many verses to a section of doctrine in the study of our godly sanctification since the first 13 verses of chapter 6.

- The 1st Objection was 8 verses.
- The 2nd Objection was 6 verses.
- The 1st Misunderstanding was 6 verses.

- But don't let the length of the passage cause you to think that it is complicated and confusing—because it's not.

- In fact, there is a reason for this passage being as long as it is.

- But that doesn't mean that things are far more complex or complicated or anything along those lines.

- Because you can be verbose and still be dealing with something that's relatively easy—and yet there is a necessary reason for being verbose (i.e., using an excessive number of words—wordy).

- And that's the way it is in this passage of Romans.

- By the way, speaking of being verbose and wordy, notice again that you have a striking number of times Paul will use personal pronouns throughout the remainder of Romans 7.

- “*myself*” = 1
- “*my*” = 4
- “*me*” = 9
- “*I*” = 27 — a total of 41x!

- And because of what we covered already in vs. 7-12, you should already know that Paul is being used by God as our *ensample* to follow throughout the rest of this chapter!

- Now let's begin to look at the entire 13 verse passage and see, by the use of those English 'words of logic' and by the English punctuation and see what the simple outline or packets of doctrine or components are that make up this final misunderstanding about being *not under the law, but under grace*.

- First of all, by paying attention to the terminology that helps us to know where all the stops and starts are, and remembering how the other major bodies of information have been written, what I would expect to find is what I actually do find.

- For in each previous section of doctrine (each of the 2 objections, and the 1st misunderstanding), Paul gives us the overall objective of what each section is about in his first or opening statement.

- And as excellency in writing does, when you begin an argument, or when you begin your essay, you should be able to, in a single and simple, concise statement set forth what the subject matter or what the objective of the body of information is going to be about.

- And my understanding is that is exactly what is going on at the beginning of (:13) - and it is made even easier for us by that, now familiar, very forceful statement: “*God forbid.*”

- Therefore my understanding is that the structure of (:13) is very similar to the structure of (:7), which was the opening statement of the previous misunderstanding.

- And there we had in (:7) a “Part A” and a “Part B.”

- So when God has the apostle Paul say, at the beginning of (:13): “*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*”

- And that is followed by that: “*God forbid.*”

- We can then come along and say that the first component to this body of information is verse 13a.

- (:13a) “*Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid.*”

- And therefore that 1st component of this final section of ch. 7 is:

**1) THE SECOND MISUNDERSTANDING STATED.**

“*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*”

- And, as always, we are going to have to spend some time in this stated misunderstanding about being *not under the law, but under grace, in order to get a very clear, precise, and full understanding & appreciation of what it is really all about.*

- 
- And the reason for that is just like it was before—you have to get a firm grip on what the misunderstanding is, or else you won't fully benefit from the corrective doctrine.
  - And if you only get about half of the understanding you are supposed to get from the misunderstanding, you will only get about half of the benefit from the corrective doctrine.
  - Also, once the misunderstanding is clear in your mind—then you should easily be able to follow the steps and components involved in all the doctrine that follows it.
    - In fact, there is another feature built in to (:13) that, if you miss it, or goof it up, you will never be able to understand & appreciate why Paul says the things he does in the following verses.
    - And if you miss this important feature of (:13), you will make the same stupid mistakes most theologians make with this passage—they assume that this is THE central passage in all of Paul's writings (if not the entire Bible) for dealing with the old, sinful nature and the war it has with the new, regenerated nature.
    - And if you think that's what is going on in (:15-20) then not only have you screwed up this entire passage, but you clearly have never properly understood (:13)!
      - And you're left to make up some kind of gimmick type device to deal with all these personal pronouns: Like— "*15 For that which I (Paul, the new man) do I (Saul, the old man) allow not: for what I (Paul) would, that do I (Saul) not; but what I (Paul) hate, that do I (Saul).* (& other such variations of this)
      - And that's all this kind of thing is: a theological gimmick that misleads and obscures everything this passage is saying and never gives you a proper understanding of what this is all about!!!
  - (:13) is the KEY to the entire passage—and it will be the controlling verse for everything else that will be said all the way down to the end of the chapter!

- But we'll get to the KEY in (:13) a little later on. For now all we're after is getting the general, simple outline of the passage.
- So (:13a) is the 1st Component—setting forth in statement form just what the misunderstanding is all about that is going to be our focus of attention from now until the end of the chapter.
- But then that leaves us with the rest of (:13) - or (:13b).
  - (:13a) - *“Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid.”*
  - (:13b) - *“But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.”*
- And as this is a single sentence (made up of 2 clauses, but a single sentence, nonetheless), and as such, it is my understanding that it becomes the next, or 2nd Component to this body of information.
  - Now, you could come along and say that (:14) opens up with the word “*For*” - which may indicate that it is a further explanation or further amplification to what (:13b) says.
  - But also notice that (:15) begins with a “*For*” as well. (2 *fors* back to back)
  - And my understanding is that when you examine these two uses of the word *For*, the one that is used in (:14) **is not** a *for* of further explanation or further amplification, but it is used for something else.
- Therefore, my understanding is that (:14) is a stand-alone verse. And as such becomes the 3rd Component to the doctrine.
- 14 *For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.*
- This verse really doesn't attach on to verse 13.
- But getting back to (:13b) - it is actually within all that is said and presented in the 2 clauses of the rest of (:13) that set forth the corrective doctrine that is designed to straighten out the misunderstanding of (:13a).

- 
- (:13b) sets forth in its 2 clauses all of the corrective doctrine that you need to get that misunderstanding about the law that is stated in the first part of the verse (“*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*”).
  - And one of the things you need to start getting into your thinking right now at the outset (so to speak) and bear in mind all throughout the rest of the verses in this chapter—is that everything that will be said and set forth and proven and explained and so forth—all of that will all connect with (:13b) - all of that will match up with what is said in (:13b) - all of it will be an extension of the corrective doctrine stated in (:13b)!
  - The key is to be able to perceive just exactly how (:13b) attaches to all the verses that follow it!
  - And because of the way this body of information gets presented in the most excellent way possible—the way in which it will effectually accomplish what it is designed to do in your inner man—you need to be able to look at it and understand how it is put together so that you can easily follow its component parts.
  - And therefore you get the Misunderstanding Stated—and immediately following that, you get all the necessary corrective doctrine to deal with that misunderstanding.
  - But the thing is, that corrective doctrine, while true, and while able to stand on its own—but because of the nature of the problem with this misunderstanding about the law and your flesh in connection with it—in order for it to make the deep and full impact in your inner man it is supposed to make, it takes more than just a stating of the corrective doctrine—it takes PROOF of the reality of that corrective doctrine.
  - And not just any old proof—a legal proof based upon the effectual working of that corrective doctrine within the inner man of the very apostle of the Gentiles—our apostle—the apostle Paul, utilized by God as our *ensample* to follow as to how to properly put our functional sanctified life we have in Christ into effect in this dispensation of grace.
  - And to properly get this done in the most effectual way—there is a necessary and logical, step-by-step way in which it all gets generated in your thinking!

- Therefore the 2nd Component to 7:13-25 is (:13b).

**2) 7:13b—The Corrective Doctrine.**

*“... But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.”*

- Now when you get a concise, (almost condensed), statement of corrective information or corrective doctrine, (such as you have in vs. 13b), it sometimes becomes necessary to set forth proofs of that which you just stated—especially if what you just stated runs completely counter to the misunderstanding and counter to any frame of reference the reader may have, in order to properly grip the corrective doctrine.

- (It just sounds so wrong to someone who misunderstands that law’s true purpose and intended design!)

- And the proofs contained in this section don’t just contain the necessary proof, they also contain a living, walking, talking 1st-hand witness to testify of its reality! (hence the 40+ personal pronouns!)

- Also, when you get a presentation of corrective doctrine like this, it is also sometimes necessary to, even before you get to the proofs, to make some kind of a clarifying statement or a needful statement or necessary statement that sets the stage for all of the proofs that are to follow.

- And the reason for utilizing a necessary, stage-setting statement is to present something that is familiar to the reader—or something that the reader **does** have a frame of reference for which will help to make the proper connections from the corrective doctrine to the proofs that will be set forth.

- And that is exactly what we have in (:14)!

- 14 *For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.*

- Therefore the 3rd Component to Rom. 7:13-25 is (:14).

**3) The Necessary Statement Setting the Stage for the Proofs**  
that follow.

- (:14) is making a necessary statement based upon what the corrective doctrine of (:13b) has said, in order to prove the reality of what that corrective doctrine has declared.



- 
- Before the proofs can actually be given, (which is what takes place from vs. 15 and down through vs. 23), a setting-type statement needs to be made.
  - And (:14) makes that statement and sets that stage in order to put the proofs in their proper setting.
  - And then beginning in (:15), the proofs that verify the reality of, and the validity of, and the veracity of the corrective doctrine that (:13) has set forth are all laid out.
  - So that, when you get to the end of (:23), the issue is to realize that what the corrective doctrine of (:13) has said that has corrected the misunderstanding that is being dealt with has been sufficiently proven.
  - And if you are going to therefore try to put your position in Christ into effect by going underneath that law, you have to admit that you are an absolutely “wretched man” because you’re in a body of functional death, and you are stuck that way—helpless and hopeless! (i.e., helpless & hopeless on your own!)
  - And the only way out of that condition—the only possible way out is that God’s got an alternative!
    - And at that point, a light is supposed to go on in your head, and you’re supposed to say, “Oh, yeah, isn’t that what God said in Romans 6:14?” (*... for ye are not under the law, but under grace.*)
    - And then you can say, “Ah, *I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord*. So then, here’s the situation—*with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.*”
    - So lets get something else in that mind instead of that law! Just like (6:5) said—I need “*newness of spirit!*”
    - Let’s get something else operating in that mind so that this position in Christ that we now have will work!
    - And that’s what Romans 8:1-13 go on to provide you with!

- And I simply say all that to just underscore why I see what I see—especially why I see (:14) the way I do.
  - And my understanding is that (:14) is a statement that needs to be said in order to set the stage for the proofs that follow it.
  - The information in it sets the stage for the proofs that need to be given in order to validate the reality of the corrective doctrine in (:13).
- And those proofs begin in (:15) - and they run all the way down through (:23).
- And then (:24-25), based upon the proofs effectually working within you, and verifying the corrective doctrine, and making you “*God forbid*,” I’m not going to think that any longer—puts you in the position of realizing that this is exactly what you really are as a justified, sanctified member of the new creature of the church, the body of Christ trying to live your sanctified life underneath that law.
  - And that brings you back to the only alternative that there is—and that only alternative is: **under grace!**
- Ok. So far on our outline we have 3 Components.
  - And the next component is the proof (or proofs) that have to be set forth to prove the reality of the corrective doctrine.
  - But before we reveal the next Component—let’s go back to something I said earlier.
  - Let’s look again at the corrective doctrine sitting in (:13b).
  - And remember that I said that there is something there that is the KEY to the entire passage—a key that will control everything that will be said following it?
  - Let’s look a little more closely at the construction of (:13b).  
“... *But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*”
  - Just looking at it grammatically, what do you see?

- What punctuation kind of stands out in the sentence?
- See that semicolon?
- What does that tell you?
- It should tell you that the sentence of corrective doctrine is divided up into 2 separate clauses.

1) *“But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; ...”*

2) *“... that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.”*

- And my understanding is that it is divided up that way for a reason: a very good reason.
- And the reason is that since there are two clauses or two parts to the corrective doctrine—then it would be reasonable to expect to find that there are 2 proofs that will be given—one to verify the reality of the 1st part of the corrective doctrine; and a 2nd proof that will verify the reality of the 2nd part of the corrective doctrine.
- So when you look at (:15-23), do you see anywhere that a logical place is found where it could be divided up so that you have 2 proofs that coincide with the 2 parts of corrective doctrine?
- And my understanding is that you do.
- Well, as I see it, if you follow our English words of logic, when you read down through vs. 15 and ff, we have:

- (:15) starts off with a “*For*”

- And we know that (:16) goes with (:15) because it starts off with “*If then*” - *then* being a word of logic that tells you that what is said in this sentence follows logically out of what was said in the previous statement.

- And then (:17) begins “*Now then*” which also seems to follow, but in a more conclusion-type way, what was said in (:16).

- And then (:18), even though it starts off with a “*For*”, it reads as if it is actually beginning another kind of argument.

- That is, if you read vs. 18 and follow on in vs. 19, it is as if you are, while still setting forth a proof that goes to the overall subject, it is setting that proof forth from a slightly different perspective.

- And therefore what is contained in (:18) and following would seem to me to be the beginning of another or a second proof.

- So, my understanding is that we have one proof that runs from vs. 15 down through vs. 17.

- And a second proof that runs from vs. 18 down through vs. 23. (vs. 24 & 25 being the conclusion to the whole matter).

- Therefore the 4th Component to 7:13-25 is (:15, 16, and 17).

**4) 7:15-17—The 1st Proof.**

*“15 For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.*

*16 If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.*

*17 Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.”*

- And then the 5th Component to 7:13-25 is (:18-23).

**5) 7:18-23—The 2nd Proof.**

*“18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.*

*19 For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.*

*20 Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.*

*21 I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.*

*22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:*

*23 But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.”*

- And finally we have the concluding application of the corrective doctrine that fully replaces the erroneous thinking and misunderstanding and dismisses **for good** the idea of ever living out your sanctified, functional life in Christ *under the law*.
- And that 6th Component to 7:13-25 is (:24 & 25)  
**6) 7:24-25—The Final Conclusion of Proper Understanding.**  
*“24 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?  
 25 I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.”*
- And that is the 6-Component Outline to Romans 7:13-25.

---

- Now, if my understanding is correct—and if, as I said, (:14) is what I call a ‘stage-setting’ verse—then that means that the most critical thing to understand and appreciate, first and foremost, ... is (:13)!
  - Because you’re not going to know **why** you need a set-up type statement, and what that set-up must be, until you know in detail what (:13) has said.
  - And you can’t properly determine whether the proof is just one big proof, or if it’s 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or more until you know what (:13) says—because (:13) GOVERNS EVERYTHING!
  - The original Misunderstanding; the “*God forbid*” about it; and the fundamental, corrective doctrine that puts the fundamental, correct understanding in the mind—that’s ALL got to be clearly understood before vss. 14 and ff can make the full sense that they’re supposed to make—and to get out of it all that’s built into it!
  - Because, if the corrective doctrine, for example, only involves 1 component—then it stands to reason that you’re probably only going to have 1 proof (you’ve only got to prove 1 thing.)
  - If the corrective doctrine has 2 components—then you’re going to need 2 proofs—and if it has 3 components, then you’re going to have to have 3 proofs because you’ve got 3 things to prove; and so on, and so on.
  - This is why it’s critical to pay attention to the opening verse (:13)!

- So, just logically speaking, and dealing with the structure & makeup of any logical presentation or argument that is denying one form of thinking, correcting it, and putting another form of thinking into effect—the structure to that **is governed** by what the misunderstanding is, and what the proper understanding is.

- And therefore (:13) has got to be clearly understood and thoroughly understood before you can soundly describe the structure of what follows: to prove it, to certify it, and do all that needs to be done.

- So let's look at (:13) and make sure that we really do understand just what it is saying and what it sets forth.

*Romans 7:13*

*13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*

- (37 words—the longest verse in the entire section!)

- And since we already have a grip on the overall, general structure to the verse—we know that the first statement (the opening question) is stating exactly what the misunderstanding is all about.

- So for now, let's just limit ourselves to that one issue and deal with it until we all come to a very firm, clear, and comprehensive understanding of what this final misunderstanding is.

- “Was then that which is good made death unto me?”

- Bear in mind what we said as we were looking at the overall structure and sense and sequence that is designed into all these objections and misunderstandings—i.e., all the way back to chapter 6:15 up to this point.

- Remember that all of these sections or packages of doctrine that deals with us putting our functional life into effect “not under the law, but under grace” - we said that each objection and each misunderstanding have a job to do—and each one is set in order so that each one that comes up in that order naturally follows out of or out from the one preceding it.

- So when we approach this final package of doctrine, we need to ask ourselves: Why would there be another misunderstanding to deal with???

- When Paul asks the question, “*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*” - Paul is anticipating that someone would come along and ask that very question.

- And Paul is not going to say what he does here and on down through (:25) just to rehash or restate or re-prove anything that he has already dealt with.

- In other words, “*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*” is not just another way of saying, “*For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.*” (:11) - or “*For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death.*” (:9-10).

- This is not further proof or corrective doctrine for an already noted and already dealt with misunderstanding—no—this is an entirely different misunderstanding altogether!

- Paul’s question in (:13) is not a slightly different way of saying, “*Was it the law that made me functionally dead?*” and then Paul saying “*God forbid—that’s not what the law was designed to do.*”

- If that’s what you get out of this—then it puts this issue at loggerheads (or at odds) with what (:9-10) says, because (:9-10) says that’s exactly what the law **was** designed to do—and that God did give it to do that!

- We’re not dealing here with an issue of whether or not the law is at fault in connection with putting your functional life to death or not—or trying to lay blame somewhere—or trying to describe where the law is at fault at all.

- This misunderstanding is one that has not been dealt with up to this point—in fact, only by saying the things that are said in connection with the previous misunderstanding does this core or root misunderstanding GET ITSELF EXPOSED! (for the first time)

- And at the risk of over-repetition, because it comes out of the previous misunderstanding and the corrective doctrine that dismissed it—(:7-12) - in order to begin to see the light on this, it would be beneficial to just give the scope paraphrase of (:7-12) once more.

- What Paul has just done in (:7) and down through (:12) has shown that the law does its job perfectly. The law has NO faults to it whatsoever!

- (That is, as long as you understand what the law's job was!)

- If you think that the law's job was to restrain sin and promote righteousness, well, then maybe there really is something wrong with it! Because it doesn't do that!

- But what Paul comes along and says is:

‘That’s not the issue. The law’s job is NOT to restrain sin and promote righteousness!

The law’s job is to put sin in motion—it’s job is to give sin functional life, and to show me to be functionally dead!

And it does that perfectly!

And I, Paul, can testify to that personally as your apostle. I used to think just like you thought—that it would squelch sin and promote righteousness.

So I was functionally alive unto God once—then I picked up that law, and I started utilizing it, sin revived, and I died.

And that commandment that I thought was ordained to life, I found it to be ordained unto death—I was the one that was wrong, not the law!

So there’s nothing wrong with the law at all—there was something wrong with my thinking.

The law does it’s job perfectly as the holy thing that it is in whole—and in all its parts with the commandments being holy, and just, and good—it does its job perfectly of giving sin functional life, and showing me to be functionally dead.’

(Paraphrase of 7:7-12)

- Now when that’s understood and appreciated—that leaves only ONE possible misunderstanding left—which is what Paul anticipates and brings up at the beginning of (:13).

- And we’ve got to make sure that we’re not still thinking that we are now going to still be dealing with something about whether or not something is right or wrong with the law—that doesn’t fit—because Paul has just come along and shown and said that God HAS designed the law to give sin life, and to make me functionally dead!

- (He *ordained* it to do that very thing—and I was stupid to think otherwise!)



- So the question, “*13 Was then that which is good made death unto me?*” means something else!
- And what this question/misunderstanding is all about will be answered when you understand and appreciate WHY ONE MORE QUESTION OR MISUNDERSTANDING OR OBJECTION WOULD COME UP!
- And my understanding is that at this point in the doctrine, there is only one other potential objection, (based upon a misunderstanding), that could arise!
- If the law has been perfectly vindicated for doing its job just like it’s supposed to do—and I was wrong in thinking the law to be what I thought it to be—and wrong about thinking what its job was as I thought it to be—ok, I’ve got all that straightened out—and as I think about that, and think about how wrong I’ve been, and all this kind of business—all of a sudden, only one other potential misunderstanding exists!
  - And it’s kind of like—if everything you’ve been saying, Paul, is now effectually working within me—it’s kind of like it has been backing me into a corner all along—and I’ve got only one other thing that could possibly be true that is my final little spark of life to my original objection of *not being under the law, but under grace!*
- So let’s look again at (:13) and look carefully at just exactly what that question says:
  - *13 Was then that which is good made death unto me?*
  - Notice that it does NOT say,
    - “Was then that which is good what made me (functionally) dead?”
    - Because, the truth of the matter is, that’s the very thing that **made** me functionally dead! (or showed me to be functionally dead).
  - And if you’re not careful, even though you read the words on the page, you’ll end up thinking that’s what it’s saying—or something like the law, itself is death—because it doesn’t say that either—it doesn’t say, “Was then that which is good death?”
- Now, in order to get this properly functioning in our minds, let’s do a little exercise that will hopefully cause this to ‘click.’

- Take the wording of the question out of this particular context.
- And the reason why I want you to do that is so that you just think about what those words, as they're posed as the question that they are, are *implying*.
- Just think of it now without thinking about what the *good* thing is, or whatever.
- If someone comes along and says, "*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*" — regardless of what that *good* thing is, and regardless of what that being *dead* means—or anything along those lines ....
  - If something is **MADE** death unto you—then what does that mean, by nature, about you???
  - Doesn't it mean **that I was ok 'till that thing showed up?**
- In other words, if I came along and *made* you dead, were you dead before I got there??? — NO! You were alive, weren't you? Right!
- Alright. The issue here is, "*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*" — is what you're saying, Paul, is, 'That I'm functionally alive, all well and good, on my own; and only when the law comes is it that I'm functionally dead?'
- NO! "God forbid!" — **You're functionally dead by nature!**
- And the law not only GAVE sin functional life to show you that under it, sin has life, and you're dead; but it also, in turn, shows you that **you're functionally dead by nature**—and not just when that law is around!
- And what makes you functionally dead by nature **is sin in your members!**
  - Which is why, when the corrective doctrine begins it says, "*But sin, that it might appear sin (it's what makes you functionally dead), working death in you by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*"

- See, the only possible objection that's left, after verses 7-12 does it's job, is that, 'Ok, you said that the law does it's job perfectly, and it's job is to give sin functional life, and to make me functionally dead—but maybe, Paul, that means that, by nature I'm not functionally dead—and it's only when the law comes around that I become functionally dead.

- "*Was then that which is good made death unto me?"*

- "*made*" (Aor.Mid.Opt. **gi,nomai** = to become; to be made something—in the Mid. Opt., it's as if it is the last, gasping, wishful, hopeful, conceivable possibility)

- And Paul says, 'No, don't think that either.'

- The truth of the matter is, you ARE dead by nature—and the law also shows that!

- And that's why he has to do the setting in (:14) - because there's a particular setting that a person needs to be 'set in' (so to speak) in order for the law to be able to show that.

- And when a person is put in that position, the law does its job of showing that you're functionally dead, by nature!

**\*\*\* THAT YOUR FLESH IS A FUNCTIONALLY DEAD THING BY NATURE IN GOD'S SIGHT! \*\*\***

- And it is absolutely critical and essential that you perfectly understand and appreciate the reality of this in order to put your sanctified, functional life you have "in Christ" into practice under grace!!!

- And that's why the proofs that follow are as detailed as they are.

- And you really have to take some time with this opening statement—this opening question that states the root-element to all the objections and all the misunderstandings to being *not under the law, but under grace.*

- And you have to fully grasp it and clearly see it for what it is saying—there can't be any fogginess or any uncertainty about it—you have to see that it is stated the way it is to give you a clear understanding of this final misunderstanding!

- And, even though you don't really think of it, as you go through the whole argument, this being the last thing Paul is going to deal with, that, once it's done with, dismisses everything—there are no more possible objections that someone could have—there are no more misunderstandings that a person could be thinking that would make it so that *not being under the law, but under grace* could be something either refused or balked at, or rejected or be objectionable to, or whatever.

- And the reason why it is important to note the order of this one being the LAST one—is that as you deal with the two Misunderstandings or misassumptions from 7:7 down through 7:25, as we have so often noted that Paul is rooting down more and more until this last issue is rooted up and exposed—when he is now dealing with the LAST ISSUE itself, Paul is now getting to the very last vestige of the problem—and that problem has to do with **how you think about yourself!**

- And when you think about it, that 'root-of-the-problem' has really been a failure to honestly realize that, on our own, by nature, in and of ourselves—we're no good—we're functionally dead by nature!

- And that's really the concept that is the fuel and the life for ANY objection, in any manner or form, that would be against the idea of *not being under the law*, and not having it therefore as something to utilize and operate upon.

- It's just like when God was attempting to educate Israel into His Jehovah-ness and grace before they ever came to Mt. Sinai.

- If His education into His J-ness/grace had been received properly by them; and they thought through everything He went over with them in connection with His J-ness/grace, and therefore THOUGHT ABOUT THEMSELVES in connection with that education—the conclusion they would have HAD to have come to is that:

— (A particular, attitude was developed in them over the 400 years in Egypt!)

- 1) We are deserving of all these plagues, too.
- 2) Because we are sinners by nature!  
(Just like any old Egyptian/Gentile!)

- There's nothing good in us by nature at all!

- There's nothing good in us, even to the point of considering it to be 'salvageable' or anything along those lines!!!

- And if that's what they understood and appreciated, when they came therefore to Mt. Sinai and that law covenant was presented to them—if they would have understood that all properly, their response would have been, "What in the world do we want this thing for???"

- "This thing isn't going to help us out at all—because You've already proven to us that, on the basis of what we are by nature and what we do on our own energy—there's no way in the world we can do this on our own energy—because functional life is NOT something we possess by nature!"

- And I only go back over these things, because I want to underscore the fact that, since that's really the most fundamental problem of all, when it comes to the erroneous thinking, and the misassumptions, and mistaken ideas that form the basis for the objection that has been dealt with already in ch. 6, you expect, therefore, that this final misunderstanding is going to, more or less, come along and put the finger on ourselves for what we really are and what we are really like by nature.

- And that's exactly what that question in (:13) is saying:  
*13 Was then* (if you have followed correctly what has been said, this is then the last and only remaining issue that naturally follows) *that which is good* (the law itself) ***made death unto me?***

- The anticipated final, last-straw, last gasping type thinking (Custer's last stand) that someone could come along with that is desperately trying to hold on to that law in some manner or form is the fact that, 'Well, what you are saying, Paul, is that it is when that law comes around, I then become functionally dead—and I'm just fine and dandy on my own, but only when the law shows up do I die functionally!'

- NO! - Wrong! - *God forbid!* - The point is that you ARE functionally dead by nature!

- And we're finally getting to the 'bottom-line' issue now.

- And that's why it's so graphically described from (:13) down through (:25). It's not that the concept is difficult to grasp, or anything like that—it's that the whole **life** of these misunderstandings and misassumptions and objections and erroneous thinking really comes from this failure to honestly see and perceive that what we are by nature is NOTHING GOOD!

- And the law's most penetrating job of all is to expose that very thing!
- And that's what the rest of (:13) goes on to say—and that's what all of (:14-25) go on to graphically prove beyond any shadow of a doubt!
- And really, from 6:15 down to this point, you have really been given (in a negative-type teaching style) an education into not just the obvious issues about *not being under the law, but under grace*—but at the same exact time you've been given an education into just how the mind of a man works.
  - It's kind of like 2 armies have squared off, and one of them has been successfully advancing on the other until that army has now been backed into a corner and is in the last throws of the battle—and its been firing away all the time, but now its used up all its supply and ammunition, and now it's not even an army any more, it's just one lonely soldier who has fired and fired and is now down to his last round—and the final round is what's coming out now in (:13)!
  - And after he fires it, he's going to have to throw down his weapon and throw up his arms and say, "I just give up—I surrender! I can't put my position in Christ into practice by anything but *under grace!*"
- Now—before I go on—before going any further—is there anyone here that doesn't have a clear, firm, 'high-definition' understanding and appreciation for what this 2nd Misunderstanding is about?
  - Because the truth of the matter is, if you don't you are going to get lost—you're not going to be able to take the most important step you've taken so far in being educated into your sanctified position "in Christ" — and that's to begin your education into what it means to be *under grace* that comes up in ch. 8:1-13.
    - You do NOT have functional life on your own, (by nature), and it is the law, and being *under the law*, that makes you fully aware of that issue!
    - In the final analysis, the law was intentionally designed by God to put that on display—to display the fact that you are naturally unholy and naturally unable to produce functional life on your own!
- Therefore you can't ever be *under the law*, you must be *under grace!*

- So we should now understand what the 2nd Misunderstanding that is stated in (:13a) is all about.

*Romans 7:13*

*13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? **God forbid.***

- “*God forbid.*” (mh. ge,noito\)

- (Other trans., = By no means; May it never be so; Hell no)

- This is the most forceful expression there is for putting down or putting a halt to any more thinking along the lines that has been put forth.

- Far from being mistranslated or poorly translated or anything along those lines, this expression is designed to be the most excellent way to cause a person who is thinking down the wrong path to bring that to a halt and not think one more thought along those lines.

- It says, in effect, “God forbid you to ever think that or any other thing like that!” “You are not only wrong in your thinking, but you are seriously wrong in thinking that way!”

- So this “*God forbid*” tells you that this kind of thinking is the most abject, most contemptible, most miserable kind of doctrinally poverty-ridden and absurd thinking there is in connection with this subject! (Void of all doctrinal soundness—or sound doctrine!)

- Therefore the Misunderstanding is firmly put down and exposed as being completely wrong.

- Now we can go on to the corrective doctrine and begin gaining an appreciation for the truth of the matter in this issue of us being totally unable to produce functional life on our own because by nature we are functionally dead, and the law (and getting underneath that law) only makes you fully aware of that fact.

- So now we can go on to the balance of (:13) — or (:13b)

*13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? **God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.***

- Now what Paul is going to do is, he's going to respond to this misunderstanding in really the exact same way he responded to what (:7-12) dealt with.

- After the Misunderstanding is stated; and the "*God forbid*" is declared to indicate that it IS a misunderstanding, it's erroneous and it needs to be corrected; then Paul gives a summary-type correction so that the basic concepts of corrective understanding can then be grasped and understood and appreciated properly.

- And then once that is done, just as he did in dealing with the 1st Misunderstanding, he then went on to verify the reality of the correct understanding and prove the truth of it—and then set forth the conclusion that needs to be drawn from it—that exact same pattern is followed again—in fact, you'd expect that.

- Therefore the balance of (:13) is going to set forth an encapsulation of the correct understanding that needs to be had with respect to the law's job.

- It's not what makes you functionally dead—in essence, it's job is to show you that you're functionally dead by nature!

- And the proofs that follow from (:14 through 23) are going to provide the validation and verification concerning the reality of what this balance of (:13) declares is the law's real job.

- And then, since this is the FINAL misunderstanding to be dealt with, (:24-25) in a sense, capture everything, and declares the miserable, wretched man situation that member of the church, the body of Christ is in by trying to put his position in Christ into practice by the law.

- And then, in view of all this corrective doctrine that has come along and made it so that that doesn't have to be the situation, vs. 25 deals with it as such: declares the GLORY of our ability to put our position in Christ into practice by what 6:14 says, (*not under the law, but under grace*), and then the issue is to go on and do that very thing which is what the opening verses of chapter 8 do.

- And that's the basic structure of this whole passage.



- So what we've got to do now is to get that encapsulated, corrective understanding **plain and clear in our thinking**, because it's going to GOVERN how these proofs and verifications that demonstrate the reality of what it says — it's going to govern the sense and sequence of how that information is going to be presented, and how much of it needs to be given, and how many components its supposed to have and so forth.

13 *Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid.*

**But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.**

- And as we noted before, we have two major components to the corrective doctrine due to the function of the semicolon.

- The semicolon separates this sentence into 2 clauses.

- And the first clause is the first component of corrective doctrine. (*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;*)

- And the second clause is the second component of corrective doctrine. (*... that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*)

- This is further proven by the use of the word “*that*” in both clauses:

- “*But sin, that ....*”
- “*that sin by the ....*”

- “*that*” (  $i[\eta a]$  ) = introduces a purpose clause.

- Therefore we have a double purpose clause. (2 components).

- And the natural thing to expect is that if there are 2 components to the corrective doctrine, and the pattern Paul is following is that once he sets forth the encapsulated corrective doctrine, he goes on and proves the reality of it—you would expect, therefore, that what's going to follow in (:14) on down is that there is going to be 2 major sections to it—the first one validating and proving the first component of corrective doctrine, and the second part of it validating and proving the second component of corrective doctrine.

- And my understanding is that is exactly what we've got.

- (Skipping :14 for the moment) we have:

- :15-17 will prove the 1st Component of the corrective doctrine in verse 13.

- :18-23 will prove the 2nd Component of it.

- And I think that when we really get a grip on just what each of these 2 components of corrective doctrine is saying, you will be able to see **why** the break should take place between vs. 17 and 18.

- Even I struggled with this for a while.  
(I had at one time: vs. 15-17  
vs. 18-20  
vs. 21-23  
vs. 24-25)

- And have you seen a phrase that gets repeated?

- Notice (:17)

*“Now then **it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.**”*

- Notice (:20)

*“Now if I do that I would not, **it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.**”*

- And the reason why that gets repeated twice is because it's valid in proving **BOTH POINTS!**

- In fact, that is a kind of ‘tip-off’ that what is going on from vs. 15 down through vs. 23 **must be two lines of attack:** because of a similar conclusion being drawn in 2 separate places.

- And the only reason for doing that, (with the exception of being redundant—and God's never redundant), is that it needs to be said twice because 2 separate lines of attack or proof are being given.

- So along with the 2 component clauses of (:13) and all this other evidence, it just makes sense that he's going to prove it in 2 parts.

- And he's going to prove the 1st part 1st, and the 2nd part 2nd.
- Now the next thing I think we should do is to look at both of these 2 components of corrective doctrine, and gain an understanding and appreciation for exactly what they are saying and correcting.
  - In other words, we need to look at them in some detail and get a grasp of them so that we can make a summary type statement about what each of them says.
  - And when you can get that fundamental summary-type statement stated correctly, it should (and it will) help you to see WHY the proofs are broken up at the place they are—it will put the proofs in order because it will connect each verse with each component of corrective doctrine.
- First things first—let's take the first one first.

“But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;”

(Let's look at some important grammatical features to this first part)

- Well, since the erroneous thinking is that the law was *made death unto me*—that is, that I was functionally alive unto God all well and good on my own (by nature), and only when that law came around did I become functionally dead; and since that has been put down as being wrong and totally in error by the *God forbid*; it would be only natural that we begin the corrective doctrine with something to indicate to the reader that the sound doctrine concerning the law and my functional life is completely opposite to that erroneous thinking.

- And that's exactly what you have in the very first word:

“*But*” (Adversative Conj. *avlla*, = indicating that this information is adverse to or opposite of the preceding statement.)

- “*But sin,*” - (*a`marti,a*) - sin—that's the issue, not the law—it's not that you were functionally alive until you went under the law; it's sin in your members—it's what you are by nature (sin) that's the problem—you're sinful and functionally dead by nature!

- And it's the law's job to put that on display!

**But sin**—that’s what you are by nature—and somewhere and some place and some time you are going to have to get it through your head that what you are in Christ is NOT what you are by nature! You’re NOT naturally that!

13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid.

But sin, **that it might appear sin**, .....

- “*that*” = as we noted before is the first of 2 purposes clauses = “in order that”.
- In other words, what is now going to be set forth is the true and real purpose of the law—or the law’s real job.
- “*that it might appear sin*,”
  - Note: the “*might*” is not a *might* of maybe it will or maybe it won’t—but it is a *might of intent and purpose*—such as, “I did this so that this other thing might happen.”
- “*appear*” (fai,nw = to bring forth into the light, to become evident, to come into view, to appear)
  - Note that all the modern versions (as usual) differ from the AV—they use words like ‘might be shown’ or ‘might be recognized’ - and because of that miss a shade of meaning that the context demands and that *appear* carries.
  - *Shown* is a form of seeing something and it has to do with something being seen or displayed; and *recognize* has to do with coming to know something that has been perceived before. *Appear* is not like that.
  - Both *shown* and *recognize* can be used in dealing with issues that are, granted, ‘brought to light,’ but both of these terms can have some degree of vagueness to them, and this context demands that there be NO degree of vagueness at all!
  - And it is conceivable that you could see something or be *shown* something, and even to *recognize* something, but only *see* and *recognize* it vaguely.

- But we don't use the word *appear* like that. And the discriminating difference between *appear* and these other words tells you why.

- *Appear*, along with all its other synonyms, all have in common the idea of something coming to light or coming into view.

- But the discriminating difference or shade of meaning that causes you to use them in different contexts has to do with the degree of clarity or degree of vagueness expressed in the context.

- For example, take a word like *shown* or *seen*—or even *seem*—these terms may be used when the actual reality, or fullness of what really is isn't clearly understood.

- For instance, we may look at the movement of the sun and say, "The sun *seems* to move from east to west." And to our perspective here on earth, that is a valid description of how we recognize the sun's movement. (And from that perspective there's nothing wrong in stating it that way.)

- But further research and discovery into our solar system, and when the perspective changes from earth to space, reveals a further reality: the sun isn't moving around the earth, the earth is actually rotating making the sun *seem* to move from east to west.

- And the critical discriminating difference between all these words is **CONCLUSIVE PROOF!**

- And while I grant you that *appear* has been widened over the years to lose some of its 'narrowness' of definition from how it was used in 1611; nevertheless *appear* is used contrary to something that only carries inconclusive proof. (At least, it used to.)

- Also, *appear* is a term that indicates a deep impact that is made on us—that makes an impression on us, personally.

- Therefore, we would say that the stars *appear* in the night sky, but we wouldn't say that they *seem* there, or are *shown* to be there.

- And all these terms have application to moral issues as well.

- As late as the mid to late 19th Century words like *seem*, *shown*, *seen*, and so forth were said of things that had dubious, uncertain, and inconclusive proof. And they were used in contexts that carried some kind of contingency to them—contexts that were in need of further, more conclusive proof to yet be set forth (future).

- But *appear* was reserved for contexts that demanded actual, positive, and conclusive proof—and the reality of the issue being an already proven fact (past).

- For example a thing may *seem* strange only because of the little we can see or know of it. But a thing *appears* clear only when we have a clear conception of it.

- Moreover we could say that it *seems* as if all efforts to salvage and rehabilitate mankind from his sinful condition is futile—but it *appears* from the long history of man's vices and sins that are so clearly prevalent, that man's sinful condition is unsalvageable—(that is, when looking at the clear and conclusive proof of it).

- Now, with all that in mind, let's go back to our passage in Romans 7:13  
 “*But sin, that it might **appear** sin, .....*”

- The thrust of this first part of corrective doctrine is saying that it is the conclusive, proven reality of what we are by nature: sin, that it might appear sin—i.e., that it might be the clear, proven, unmistakable reality of what we are by nature that makes us functionally dead in God's eyes—and the law (that *holy, just, and good* law) is only the means by which that reality is put on display!

- (And that's just what the rest of the 1st part of the corrective doctrine goes on to say.)

“*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;*”

- The *death* that sin works in me is, in this context of sanctification, my functional death unto God—I'm functionally dead by nature!

- And it's mechanically accomplished—or made the conclusively proven fact by means of (“by”) “*that which is good*” which is that law in whole or in part (“*the commandment*”) [Rom. 7:12].

- So when we look at just that first clause of (:13b) - the 1st Component of the corrective doctrine, we need to be clear as to just exactly what it is that it is stating and setting forth as correcting that erroneous thinking that I was functionally alive, all well and good on my own, but only when that law came around was it *made death unto me* and I only functionally died underneath it.

- In other words we need to be able to make some kind of clear, summary statement as to what the 1st Component of corrective doctrine is designed to do.

- *“But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; ....”*

- And you need to understand that each of these statements of corrective doctrine is an encapsulation of the corrective doctrine—they can’t just be taken at face value (so to speak), they each have to have further proof given to substantiate what is stated in an encapsulated form.

- This first component of corrective doctrine is saying that the only thing that the law is doing is bringing to full light; and making a conclusively proven, incontestable statement that the law is merely bringing out what’s already naturally resident in me that makes me functionally dead to begin with — which is *sin* in me!

- In other words, it’s not the law that makes me functionally dead, but its job is to make it (to make the deep impression in my thinking) so that it is unquestionably apparent that it is SIN that is working this functional death in me.

- And the law is that “*good*” thing that is bringing that to the forefront—that makes it apparent—that makes it appear—making it so that the eyes of my understanding clearly see it!

- And that’s the first thing that needs to be understood and appreciated so that this ‘final-analysis’ job of the law can be properly understood.

- The first thing it is going to do is to make it clear as can be that it is SIN, itself, in our members, that makes us functionally dead by nature!

- SUMMARY STATEMENT of ROMANS 7:13b (1st Component of C/D):

**Sin in my members is what makes me functionally dead—and the law brings that to my full attention.**

- And that takes us to the 2nd Component of corrective doctrine that occurs right after the semicolon —

“... *that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*”

- And the “*that*” is once again the second ( *i[na]* ) purpose clause—the “*might*” is again a *might* of intent and purpose.

(:13b) - “... (in order) *that sin by* (by means of) *the commandment* (the law in part—in keeping with exactly how the apostle Paul experienced it in his own life back up in [:9]) *might become exceeding sinful.*”

- So there’s one other aspect to this final, ultimate job of the law.

- It not only shows that it is *sin* that makes us functionally dead and that we’re functionally dead by nature because of it being in our members; but it also does what that last purpose clause in (:13) says.

- And this has to be stated—it has to be dealt with—because it isn’t good enough (due to our own natural ability and our own scrambling around to try to keep life in our argument that we can somehow contribute to our own sanctified, functional life unto God) - it isn’t good enough, nor does it fully correct or fully root up all the erroneous thinking we have about ourselves in light of the law, to just state and deal with that 1st Component of corrective doctrine.

- And it’s in this further aspect of the law’s job that will finally and completely root out and dismiss every last vestige of you ever giving even one more thought about ever touching that law to put your position in Christ into practice!

- Once this ‘kicker’ is brought out into the light and dealt with properly, that law will become ‘poison’ to you—and if the doctrine effectually works in your inner man as it properly should, you’ll avoid that law and any form of legalism as you would a rattlesnake!

- So, again, we have: “... *that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*” - so what’s that further aspect of the law’s job?

- And really, it’s all contained in those last two words:  
“*that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*”



- And you might approach it by asking yourself, “What happens when sin becomes ‘exceeding sinful’?”
- And to kind of zero in even further—it really comes down to an understanding of that word “*exceeding*”.
- “*exceeding*” ( u`perbolh, = from the prefix (huper) = above and beyond— + (bole) = to throw—hence, a throwing beyond or above—a superior achievement, in whatever way the context dictates.)
- Here again, nearly all the other modern English translations go out of their way to translate this any other way other than the AV. (The ASV being a lone exception.)
- Demonstrating once again either their very shallow appreciation for paying attention to the context of a passage; or simply their utter failure to know what’s going on at all—all of the modern translations do have one thing in common—they all obscure the meaning of this passage, they all make it worse and harder to understand!
  - The RSV & NRSV both have ‘beyond measure’ - which is in keeping with the diction-type or dictionary type definition of the Greek word—but comes short of making the proper impact that is supposed to be made in your thinking by the more excellent English word the KJ translators chose.
  - The NIV & NASV both have ‘utterly’ which is a synonym of ‘completely’ or ‘entirely’ and so forth—which not only fails to properly handle [hyperbole], but “utterly” (pun intended) obscures the context of the passage and makes it impossible for the reader to be able to even faintly know what’s going on here—not to mention the fact that since they have made it **impossible** to adequately understand and appreciate what the 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine is saying (impossible to get a proper summary statement about it), it makes it just as impossible for the proof of this corrective doctrine (contained in vs.18-23) to do its job!
  - Wow—in one screwed up word, the NIV and NASV have just destroyed 6 whole verses in its wake!!!
  - How’s that for “better” and “easier to understand!”

- Interestingly, [hyperbole] is used only 8 times in the NT. And it is never translated the same way twice! Each of the 8 times it is translated differently, because it is used in 8 different contexts! (None of which is translated as ‘utterly!’)

- Let’s get back to looking at the excellency of the English word “*exceeding*” as it relates to the 2nd Component of C/D.

- First of all, as I have point out several times already—make sure you don’t do with this word what is so easy to do when you read the expression “... *become exceeding sinful*” — don’t think of it as if it’s saying, ‘become exceedingly sinful’ — it doesn’t say that!

- (There’s no ‘ly’ at the end of *exceeding*!)

- We hardly ever use the word *exceeding* today in an adverbial sense without putting that ‘ly’ on the end of it—but it doesn’t have it here.

- And there’s a slight difference in meaning between something that’s ‘exceedingly sinful’ and something that’s “*exceeding sinful*.”

- Something that is ‘exceedingly’ sinful is sinful in a **comparative sense**.

- It’s like if you were talking about 2 guys in prison.

- One is there for life because he’s a serial murderer.

- And one is there for a year because he got caught stealing a car and it’s his first offense.

- And if you look at them both, and talk about them both, you could come along and say, “One of them is exceedingly sinful [the serial murderer] compared to the other guy who only stole a car.”

- But you normally and most commonly would not say that the serial murderer is *exceeding* sinful over the other guy.

- And even though you could say he’s exceeding sinful, if you do say that, what you’ve done is to move from comparing the two of them together to stating something else about just the one guy.

- The English 'ly' ending comes along and automatically throws the context into one of a comparison!

- **AND THIS IS NOT A COMPARISON OF ANYTHING!!!**

- And, by the way, that's how I know for sure that the NIV and NASV (and any other translation that has a word ending with an 'ly') exposes the fact that they don't know how to handle the very English language they speak and write — and that they are not fit or qualified to translate at all!! ( 'utter-ly' )???

- So we're not dealing with a comparison of two things here at all.

- And you need to make sure you're not thinking along those lines at all, either, or you will get totally off track as to what is being said here, and what is going to be proven in (:18-23)!

- And to help us with this, you've got to keep in mind what that original misunderstanding is dealing with—the original misunderstanding is that I'm **not** functionally dead by nature, but it's the **law** that is making me functionally dead.

- So along with that kind of thinking is the fact that, If I'm not functionally dead by nature, then I've got functional **life** by nature.

- And by thinking that, you would think that, "I've got a natural **capacity**, therefore, to live unto God."

- Granted, this is something that a person who possesses this misunderstanding—this is something they are not, shall we say, wittingly or keenly aware of—or something that is not consciously going on in their thinking.

- But it needs to be brought to the surface and exposed because latent in, or resident in that misunderstanding is the idea that, If it's the law that made me dead (if that which is good made death unto me), then I do have functional life on my own, and that, by default means that I also think that I've got a capacity or ability or power on my own to deal with sin and live unto God—and this is coming along and saying that it's only when that law comes around that I no longer have the capacity to live unto God — NO — “God forbid!”

- It's not the law that made you functionally dead, you are functionally dead by nature—and it's the law's first job, in connection with that, to make that *appear* (“*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good*”) — but then there's one other thing that has to be done in connection with that in order to put the final ‘nail in the coffin’ (so to speak) to show that you are functionally dead by nature.

- And that's the root issue of the fact that you've got NO capacity to do anything about sin's power in you!!!!

- When ‘push comes to shove’ (so to speak), and you try to control it (to control sin in your members) by that law, the law comes along and shows that **SIN EXCEEDS YOU!**

- And you end up being full of sin (*sinful*).

- See, that's the issue when something is *exceeding* something else—and in this case it's *exceeding sinful*.

- But anytime that word *exceed* (or the verbal noun *exceeding*) is used, you're not talking about a comparative—you're talking about the fact that whatever you are saying *exceeds*, it ‘out-does’ something else—it ‘out-does’ anything that is trying to resist it, overcome it, defeat it, or whatever—it *exceeds* it!

- And that IS the issue here.

- The law's job is to come along and make you aware that when you try to utilize it to control sin and put this functional life into practice that you think you have, that law is going to make it so that sin can take advantage of its commandments and it (sin) can exceed your ability to suppress it; and can exceed your power and your strength and your capacity and your efforts!

- And instead of, therefore, getting rid of sin, and squelching it or restraining it and so forth, it (sin) becomes “*sinful*” — or in other words, **YOU become full of it!**

- And this is that other (and final) thing that the law does to you!