

- And when you think of it, this is really an extension of—this aspect of the law is really an extension out of the aspects of the law that was just pointed out when it came to the 1st Misunderstanding.

- The 1st Misunderstanding needed to recognize that there is nothing wrong with the law, the law was just doing its job—what was wrong was your thinking that the law was going to make sin dead—no it wasn't—without the law, sin's dead—with the law, sin is functionally alive—and now the issue is that the law not only gave sin functional life: it gave sin the POWER to demonstrate that it (sin) was more powerful than anything you've got in and of yourself!

- It exceeds any power you've got on your own! It exceeds any capacity or ability you've got by nature!

- And that's the final matter when it comes to dealing with the fact that the law shows that we are functionally dead by nature.

- Because if you've got no capacity to over come sin; if you've got no capacity to impose your will on it and beat it into submission, and do what you want done instead of what it wants done, then you've got NO functional life on your own.

- You're bankrupt as far as functional life is concerned.

- And that's the final job (in the job description of the law) — it is to make THAT an apparent thing!

- And that's what the final proof (when you get down and deal with it) in (:18-23) - that's what the verification that Paul sets forth there— that's what it all describes.

- That's why he talks about, "*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.*" (:23) — Well, if you're brought into captivity, you've been taken a prisoner of war, you're out of the battle, and you've lost! You've been defeated by a greater power!

- But the issue is, from (:18) down through (:22), before Paul makes that statement in (:23) - he's described how he's fought and fought and fought, and the SIN exceeded all his fighting—and it was the LAW that was making that appear clearly to him!

- And when you really see this—and fully understand and appreciate this final issue (this final ‘kicker’) of corrective doctrine about putting your position in Christ into practice under the law—when that has made the proper impact upon your inner man it is supposed to—you end up, just as you did when confronting the prospect of justifying yourself unto eternal life by the law—you end up, just as you did in Romans 3:19, with a ‘stopped mouth!’ (When it comes to sanctifying yourself [or making yourself functionally alive unto God] by picking up the Law of Moses to do it!

- So, with all this understanding, we should be able to now come along and put a Summary Statement to this 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine.

- SUMMARY STATEMENT of ROMANS 7:13b (2nd Component of C/D):

- You’ve got NO capacity (no life, no ability, no power) to do anything about sin’s power within you!

- The law demonstrates (in HD) that sin EXCEEDS you!
(You’re full of sin!)

- When I try to use the law to control sin, sin always EXCEEDS it!

(i.e., sin always exceeds your efforts to control it—even by using the law to control it—in fact, the law just points out just how powerless you are to control sin in your life! And therefore something else is going to have to do that job—Grace!)

- And Romans 7:18-23 is going to PROVE that!

- Now, since this is the final thing (and the most deeply-rooted thing) that needs to be brought to the surface—needs to be honestly faced—needs to be confronted, attacked, corrected and dismissed as having any legs to stand on (so to speak), it is important that you face the fact that the law was NEVER supposed to do what most people think it was supposed to do.

- And it’s divinely intended purpose is NOT what most people who call themselves Christians ever think it was supposed to do.

- Let’s just look at that one issue of the law’s purpose and design—even as it existed in God’s program with Israel—because even with them, it was never given to restrain sin and promote good.

- (And for some of you this will be repetition, but for some it won’t).

- While I know much of this is going to be ‘old hat’ to some of you—I want to do this to draw your attention to something we haven’t made an issue out of yet, and it may help your understanding about the law as God understands it.

- In connection with God putting Israel under the dominion of sin by them foolishly agreeing to go under the law contract, God was, all along, trying to instill in them something that needs to be understood and appreciated by every believer, regardless of any dispensational issue: and that is (just as this final component to our being educated properly about the law in regard to our sanctified position in Christ) - it is that if we are going to be utilized by God at all—we must do it on the basis of His Jehovah-ness and Grace!

- Psa. 124:1-8 (:8)

- Ex. 1:1-8 (:8) — (cp. Isa. 52:1-4 [:4] - an Assyrian!)

- Ex. 6:1-3

- Ex. 3:11-14—(note in :11 how Moses struggled with this issue as well)

- Review:

- Psa. 124:8—*Our help is in the name of the LORD, who made heaven and earth.*

- Ex. 1:8—*Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. (The Satanically imported Assyrian!)*

- Ex. 6:3—*And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty (El Shadday), but by my name JEHOVAH was I not known to them.*

- Our point in going back here is to make sure that you understand and appreciate some things in regard to just what the Jehovah-ness of God is all about.

- (Especially that you know what I am talking about when I use that expression.)

- You need to understand that this “calling upon the name of the LORD” is far more than what most Christians think it is—due to not being properly educated in Israel’s program: Calling upon the name of the LORD = calling upon God’s JEHOVAH-NESS!!!

- And what we are after, in this little ‘side-bar’ to our study of Romans 7:13

(and the issue of what the 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine sets forth—i.e., that you are functionally dead by nature, and every time you try to control sin in your members by the law or by even a single commandment of that law, that very law is going to come along and give sin the power to always exceed your capacity to bring it under control—in other words, it’s the law’s job to give sin the power to demonstrate that it (sin) is more powerful than anything you’ve got in and of yourself to control or stop it—when I try to use the law to control sin, sin always exceeds my ability or capacity to do anything with it!) ——

—and this little ‘side bar’ is to help you realize that when it comes to your sanctified life—your functional life unto God—and when it comes to the issue of controlling sin in your members—you cannot do it by nature—you’re going to have to have God come along and provide that means and that power by His J-ness and Grace and then give it to you by grace through faith!

- Therefore the issue of God putting His J-ness & grace into effect to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves is NOT just a Justification unto eternal life issue—nor is it just an issue for the members of the remnant of Israel— or for the members of the nation of Israel under God’s program with them— nor is it just an issue for those of Abraham’s day, or Noah’s day, or even Adam’s day —— God operating with men on the basis of His J-ness and grace is something that is fundamental to all men at all times — God is your all in all!!!

- And what we’re really after is the issue that God not only has to put His J-ness & grace into effect to Justify us unto eternal life; but He must also put His J-ness & grace into effect in order to sanctify us unto functional life:

- God’s J-ness & grace must be put into effect for us in order to make us SPIRITUALLY FIT!

- So we have to look back here in the book of Exodus to when God gave Moses His name—and when God began giving all of His compound Jehovah names to teach the nation Israel about His Jehovahness and grace.

- God's Jehovah Name:
- Exo. 3:14—(Moses' commission)
 - The verbal expression or title that God gives Himself has two (2) major principles involved in them:

- "**I AM THAT I AM**" - (long form)

1) **TIMELESSNESS** (Eternal) - (Psa. 90:1-2)

- This denotes several aspect of God's J-ness, among which is the issue of His:

- a) Immutability (never changes), and His
- b) Certainty of Council—demonstrated in His delivering them from Pharaoh/Egypt.

- See also
 - Heb. 13:8
 - II Peter 3:8
 - Rev. 1:4

- "**I AM** _____" - (short form)

2) **UNLIMITED CAPACITY/ABILITY**

- Demonstrated in Exo. 15-18—Israel's education into God's capacity.

- THE SEVEN COMPOUND NAMES OF JEHOVAH:

1) JEHOVAH-JIREH—(Genesis 22:7-14) (:14) - God sees (or God sees to it); God will provide; God will provide **Himself** for a sacrifice.

- The Redeemer.

- (Passover) - 'I am your provider.'

2) JEHOVAH-ROPHEKA—(Exodus 15:22-26)

- This is Israel's elementary education as to the issues of God's J-ness and grace—(note :25—God "*proved*" them—i.e., educated them in their own weakness and in His own strength and grace.

- (:26) "*commandments*" - but there are not commandments yet!

- This was said in advance of the Law contract coming down in order to give the children of Israel some advanced information that provides them with the capacity to learn some things about that contract when it does come down and when it is presented to them!

- Jehovah-Ropheka = God that healeth thee.
- This foreshadows a predicament that Israel will get themselves in that they cannot get themselves out of, where they begin to experience disease and sickness brought upon them because of the curses of the law contract—and they will have to cast themselves upon God’s capacity to do this very thing —— heal them!

3) JEHOVAH-NISSI—(Exodus 17:8-15)

- Note that Israel, before they get to Mt. Sinai, end up dealing with opposition from a Gentile army: Amalek and his army.

- (:14-15) - (:14) - the issue of “writing these things in a book for a memorial” - that is, Israel is in grade school and being educated to the basics regarding God, Himself, and them in connection to what they are going to have to have if they are ever going to be what God’s plan and purpose calls for them to be.

- “NISSI” = the “nissi” concept is actually the Hebrew word for “banner” - a “banner” in a MILITARY sense; i.e., a VICTORIOUS MILITARY STANDARD—the issue then becomes one of God being Israel’s Victorious Conqueror; or a Victorious Conquering Hero!

4) JEHOVAH-SHALOM—(Judges 6:24)

= God is our Peace—Peace Giver—and “peace” here in the context is also in a military sense—peace from oppression/oppressors—and it views the LORD as their Deliverer.

- This is an oppression of Gentiles (Midianites) that is brought on by their own rebellion and sinfulness!

- This pictures Israel as having peace in their land so that they can function as God planned and purposed for them, all because God Himself comes as their “Peacemaker” and provides that for them!

- (Note that the altar and the name Jehovah-shalom indicate that they will NEVER be able to provide peace for themselves.)

5) JEHOVAH-RAAH—(Psalm 23:1) = God, my Shepherd.

- Note that Psa. 23 sits in a triad of Psalms:

- Ps. 22—Jehovah-Jireh (Passover & Deliverance)
#1

- Ps. 23—Jehovah-Raah (Regathering issue out of the Lord's Day of Wrath) along with numbers
#2,3,4,5

- Ps. 24—Jehovah-Zidkenu & Shammah
#6,7 (Kingdom is set up and now the LORD is THERE, i.e., He is dwelling there in Jerusalem) [Tabernacles]

- The issue of God having to gather the nation and Shepherd them nationally.

- They not only were going to go astray individually, but also nationally as sheep, they are going to go astray and they are going to end up being taken out of their land and scattered—so they are going to need a Shepherd to re-gather them and bring them back!

- This is far different from that “*idol shepherd*” in Zech. 11:17!

6) JEHOVAH-ZIDKENU—(Jeremiah 23:5-6; 33:16) = The Lord Is Our Righteousness.

= The LORD is our Righteous King!

- At issue here is that Jeremiah has indicted the nation Israel as that 5th Course of Punishment gets itself underway—and he indicts them for individually lacking Righteousness, but also nationally and administratively lacking righteousness—and the only way they are ever going to get Individual, National, and Administrative righteousness, and to be what God had planned and purposed for them to be, is for God to come and righteously reign in their midst!

7) JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH—(Ezekiel 48:35) = The LORD is there.

- In the last 8 chapters of Ezekiel, Ezekiel is taken by the Spirit into the end of the Day of the Lord when the Kingdom is established in the land.

- The Lord's temple is there and the fulfillment of the Abrahamic Covenant has arrived for Israel—that very thing that Abraham looked for—God building a city that has foundations, whose builder and maker is God.

- Ezekiel actually sees that thing fulfilled—he sees the Abrahamic Covenant fulfilled and Israel on this earth reigning and ruling as the head of the nations—with God dwelling in their midst—and that city of Jerusalem's name will be called JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH!

- (Which, by the way, is what the 24th Psa. describes).

- The issue of Jehovah-Shammah is the issue of God becoming the Blessor of Israel.

————— That's the 7 Jehovah-compound names.

- Note that all 7 aspects of God's Jehovahhness must be put into effect in order for Israel to get the kingdom!

(see Isa. 12:1-6)!

- Therefore, all 7 Jehovah compound names were incorporated into Israel's calendar—that is, into their feast calendar.

- Lev. 23

1) Passover (J-Jireh) #1—The Lord will provide Himself a Redeemer.

2) Unleavened Bread (J-Ropheka) #2—The Lord that healeth thee.

3) Firstfruits (J-Shalom) #4—The Lord our Peace.

4) Pentecost (J-Raah) #5—The Lord our Shepherd.

5) Trumpets (J-Nissi) #3—The Lord our Conquering Hero.

6) Day of Atonement (J-Zidkenu) #6—The Lord our righteous King

7) Tabernacles (J-Shammah) #7—Our always there Blessor.

- Now I have said all that to get an appreciation for just what is meant by the “name of the LORD” - it’s God putting His Jehovah-ness and grace into effect to be everything we need for Him to be in order to get us out of the awful predicament we are in BY NATURE!

- By nature, we do NOT have natural righteousness or natural holiness—we do not have natural eternal life or natural functional life— we’re not justified by nature or sanctified by nature—get it?

- Now let’s see something else in connection with God’s Jehovah-ness and grace that was also brought out to the members of the nation Israel as God was attempting to educate them into all that His Jehovah name meant—and we’ll see something important to our study in Romans 7:13—something about that law, that Old Covenant contract.

- First of all I want to go back and look at a passage that records the response of the people of Israel when they first get told that God had visited them and had given to them His name: “I AM THAT I AM” and “I AM _____” (i.e., I am eternal, everlasting—I knew all about your going into the horror of great darkness of Egyptian slavery—I haven’t ever forgotten you. And I have the unlimited capacity and power and strength to get you completely out of your horrible predicament.)

- Exo. 4:29-31—They seem to fully believe the signs and the information that Moses has given them. Sounds great, doesn’t it?

- Let’s see if it was really based upon the effectual working of God’s word in them, or if it was just something else.

- Exo. 6:1-9 (:9)

- Notice that this is God beginning to educate them into His J-ness & grace—into His name—and the fact that He was going to have to do everything for them—to be their all-in-all.

- When Moses told them that God was going to come and deliver them, they worship Him—they have a Praise & Worship service!

- But when Moses articulates for them on behalf of God, God’s J-ness (notice there are 7 issues of God’s J-ness in all those “I wills”), and He outlines for them in advance His J-ness and how graciously He will put it into practice for them—and He educates them in it, and what do they do? REJECT IT! (NO! to education!)

- Before God ever brings them out of Egypt, they needed to learn about God's J-ness and be introduced to it—and the very first time God has Moses talk about it and outline the 7 issues (by the way, why 7? because they all correspond to those 7 compound names!), and Israel rejects it—they harken not to it—they determine not to recognize it and not to be educated into God's J-ness.
- And their rebellion begins when their listening stops—and it is especially interesting that it all begins with an education into God being their all-in-all!
- And that tells you something important about what a man is by nature!
 - For example, you can talk to a person all day long about God, and unless they are blatant haters of God, they will listen and tolerate a lot of those things about who God is; they won't be offended. (He's love, peace, holy, good, etc.)
 - But the minute you strip them down to being naturally unable to contribute any thing to either making themselves right in God's eyes for eternal life—or making themselves right and holy in God's eyes for functional life—then they become offended!
- Truth of the matter is, God as “**I AM _____**” is what unjustified men hate, and it is what any justified person who tries to put their sanctified life into practice under that law, also hates!
- Now God responds to their rejection with further education—with graciousness and patience to educate them into their need for His J-ness.
 - (Which is what goes on with them experiencing all those plagues in Exodus from here on through chapter 14—crossing the Red Sea).
- And more than that, God also takes them through another 5 courses or trials of further education in Exodus chapters 15-18.
- Which brings us to Mt. Sinai and the giving of the law—God's final recourse with them to get them to be educated into this issue of His J-ness and grace and their natural unrighteousness and natural unholiness—and Him being their all-in-all.

- And you need to realize that the Law—The Old Covenant is an absolute REJECTION of God's J-ness—it is men saying that they will produce their own righteousness and their own holiness—they will produce their own justification and their own sanctification—and their own kingdom and their own blessings in that kingdom as well.

- In fact, the rest of Israel's history—until the New Covenant can be implemented for them—is nothing but TIME WASTED and Israel learning the HARD WAY “We're not righteous, we're not holy, we can't usher in our own kingdom, we can't usher in our own peace, we can't get our own victory, we can't re-gather ourselves, we can't rule ourselves, we can't bless ourselves, etc., etc.

- The law's purpose is **NOT** to be a document or code of national or personal freedom!! It is not a guideline for Israel (or any other nation or any other person) to live by! It's not just a civic/personal code of conduct for Israel (or anyone else) to operate their nation by!

- It contains that in it, but that's NOT what it is for!
- (And it is NOT the 'Magna Carta' of human freedom!)

- It is a CONTRACT for Israel to justify and to sanctify themselves, making themselves to be spiritually FIT to be used by God!

- Deut. 6:24-25—(Eternal Life)

- Lev. 18:1-5—(Functional Life)

- Lev. 11:44—(Sanctification)

- Now my point in all this is to underscore the fact that when most people think about the law (and going under it), most often it is only thought about as being a way to justify themselves—and when most Christians think about the law, if they have some modicum of Biblical understanding, they will say that they can't be under the law because they recognize the Cross of Christ and their being unable to save themselves—to justify themselves by works.

- But most Christians never think (because they are never taught) that the law was also designed to be a way of self-sanctification—and because of their blindness to that—or their shallow understanding of the law in the first place, while they bristle at salvation by works—they don't see anything much wrong with sanctification by works—and they easily slide themselves under the law in some shape or form—usually unwitting of the fact that they are just as helpless to produce functional life as they were to produce eternal life!

- But in the initial education God gave Israel, He did something very special, and had them do something very special that would forever testify to them of this truth—if you're going to have eternal life, I've got to give it to you by my J-ness & grace—and if you're ever going to have functional life, I've to give that to you by my J-ness & grace, too!

- Let's come back to that initial education and look at the end of it.
(The Plagues—gain confidence)

- The 10th Plague—Death of all firstborn—produces the Passover.

- Exo. 11:4-7

- Exo. 12:1—Passover begins Israel's calendar year.

- (:2-11)

- (:14-15, 16-22) - Feast of Unleavened Bread.

- 2 calendar events, back to back!

- Through all the plagues, the people of Israel were to gain confidence in God—they were to see that He IS the living and true God—He IS everything to them.

- And this last plague was to teach them the first component of Jehovah that they need to appreciate: That He needs to be their Redeemer.

- They're taught that they are no different than those Egyptians—they are worthy of death by nature!

- The blood of the Substitute is necessary for them to be justified—AND to be sanctified!

- And that's why the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread were to be observed together—that's what they signified—both the need for a Substitute Redeemer to justify them AND to sanctify them—to make them spiritually fit to be utilized!

- Because if you are in a position to be unworthy of death: you're JUSTIFIED—and if you can feast with God with no leaven: you're SANCTIFIED!

- And when you look into a Jewish home there in Egypt on the night of the Passover, that's exactly what you see—you see the blood on the side posts and upper door post—AND you see people inside the door eating or feasting on unleavened bread—a picture of God's Jehovah-ness and grace providing perfect justification and perfect sanctification.

- But did they get it???

- Exo. 15:21

compared to

- Exo. 15:23-24ff

- NO!!! So they go through the 5 trials of further education, they fail each one of them—and then they come to Mt. Sinai where they will get the long and hard education under sin's dominion (the law) what they could have gotten the short and easy way under God's Jehovah-ness and grace!

- Again, the law is a contract that provides for a man to demonstrate he is just as righteous and just as holy as God is, by perfectly keeping that law!

- And as we leave this to go back to Romans 7:13, just look at two other passages that underscore the law as being not just a way to justify yourself, but with a special emphasis on it being also a way to sanctify yourself.

- Deut. 28:9

- Lev. 20:7-8

- Back to 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.

- At this point you should be able to take this verse and pick it apart—you should be able to recognize what each statement is saying and what each component part is designed to do. And you should know why it is presented the way it is—why the word order is the way it is—and why such words as *appear* and *exceeding* are the most excellent English expressions to fully generate in your thinking what God wants generated there.

Romans 7:13—Breakdown:

- *Was then that which is good (the law) made death unto me?*

- 2nd & Final Misunderstanding—the deepest root of them all:
That I am functionally alive unto God by nature, and only when
the law comes around—or I go underneath it—only then do I
become functionally dead unto God.

- *God forbid.*

- That's wrong—seriously wrong and erroneous thinking—God
forbid you to ever think another thought along those lines.
The misunderstanding is put down as the wrong thinking that it is.

- *But sin (that which is in my members by nature), that it might appear sin,
working death (functional death) in me by (by the mechanical means of) that
which is good (that law);*

- 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine: It's not the law, but sin in
my members that makes me functionally dead—and it's the law's
job to bring that to my full attention—to make it *appear*.

- *that sin (sin in my members) by the commandment (even one single
commandment) might become exceeding sinful.*

- 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine: Corrects the life-blood to
all erroneous thinking about the law—of all misunderstandings
about the law—of all objections to not being under the law:
When I try to use the law to control sin in my members, it is the
law's job to give sin such strength and power that it (sin) will always
exceed my strength and power to control it.

- **Conclusion: I AM FUNCTIONALLY DEAD BY NATURE!**

- Now if all that is crystal clear, we can move on to the next necessary step
as God, Himself, has designed for all this corrective doctrine to effectually
work in your inner man—and to work in such a way so that you will never
ever forget it—and in light of all the various ways in which you will be
tempted naturally, and tempted by the Adversary to go back under the law
and reject grace—you will now and forever more operate upon these well-
learned, effectually working doctrines.

Romans 7:14

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

- First off, when we go back and consult our general outline of Romans 7:13-25, as we pointed out there, this verse is used as a **Necessary Stage-Setting Statement** for the Proofs that are to follow.

- 3rd Component to Romans 7:13-25—(:14)

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

- When you get a concise, (almost condensed), statement of corrective doctrine—or any kind of condensed, concise statement of information, such as you have in (: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 any frame of reference that the reader may have—in order to properly get a grip on the corrective doctrine (or information).

- And the reason has to do with what the misunderstanding is, and the lack of a frame of reference that someone might have to both properly understand & appreciate the full impact of what was said in the corrective doctrine, and what is going to be set forth in the proofs that follow.

- Therefore when you get a presentation of corrective doctrine like this, it is sometimes necessary to, (even before you get to the proofs), to make some kind of a clarifying statement or a needful statement or a 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's exactly what we have in (:14).

- (:14) is making a necessary statement based upon what the corrective doctrine of (:13b) has said, in order to make the information contained in the proofs (which prove the reality of the C/D) clearly understood & appreciated, and effectually work in your inner man.

- When we look at (:14) at first glance, (so to speak), to me, there are a few striking things about it right at the out-set:

1) “*For we know*” - what God is having the apostle Paul set forth here in (:14) is something we are supposed to already “*know*” - and what we are supposed to already *know* is that *the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin*—the law is *spiritual* and I am *carnal*.

2) Those words *spiritual* (pneumatikos) and *carnal* (sarkikos).

3) That concept of being “*sold under sin*.”

- These are the concepts and issues (especially the issue of the law being *spiritual* and us being *carnal*) that will set the stage in our thinking, and give us a proper frame of reference for allowing the proofs to make the proper connections between what they verify back to the corrective doctrine sitting in (:13b).

- So while (:13) controls everything else in chapter 7, and while everything said in those proofs connects in some way to (:13), while all that is true—every connection that gets made will run directly through one or the other of these two concepts being set forth in (:14):

- 1) *the law is spiritual*
- 2) *I am carnal*

- And since we are just looking at (:14) in a very general way—to just get a grip on what it is designed to do—it should have already dawned on you that probably the most important thing in the verse is to really understand and appreciate what those two expressions “*spiritual*” and “*carnal*” mean—but mean in this particular context.

- And as I have said repeatedly, while nothing in Romans 7 is all that difficult or confusing or complicated, it is complex—and it is easy to get off on the wrong track and get lost.

- And this verse is a great example of that.

- Because if you are not paying attention—or if you think that you will get to the ‘real truth’ or ‘deeper truth’ or a ‘golden nugget’ by dealing with this verse exegetically, or in a Greek word study type manner—then you will make mistakes—and by making a mistake with *spiritual* and *carnal* here, you will make the terrible mistake of thinking Paul is contrasting his new nature with his old nature!

- i.e., Paul's *spiritual* man vs. his *carnal* man.

- And Paul the apostle is the *spiritual* man;
and Saul of Tarsus is the *carnal* man.

- And then you really goof up by trying to 'clarify'
all the "I's" in the proofs by substituting 'I, Paul' for
when he's talking about his spiritual man, and
'I, Saul' for when he's talking about his carnal man.

- Just like Dr. Scofield did in his footnotes; and like
Dr. Chafer did in his Systematic Theology, and many
other Bible writers and teachers like them. (Along
with almost every study Bible being produced!)

- And that kind of thinking comes from the same kind of mistakes all
the Greek Bible studies and Greek word studies and exegetical kind
of Bible teaching makes all the time—the mistake of failing to really
appreciate and understand the **context** of the passage and allow that
to guide the way the words are being used. (Instead of the other way
around).

- In fact, you know that can't be what is going on here, even looking
at it at face value (so to speak) - because Paul the spiritual man isn't
in view here at all—where does this verse say anything about Paul
the spiritual man? or Paul's new nature???

- What is it that is said to be *spiritual*??? A: THE LAW!
(not Paul!)

- The truth of the matter is, this is a prime place where most of the
teaching of this verse (if there is any) and the verses that follow are
usually taught in error because of seeing these two words, and simply
superimposing on them meanings that come, not from the Bible, but
from the theological baggage most Bible handlers have when they see
words like *spiritual* and *carnal*.

- Like: Ok, doctrine of spirituality vs. doctrine of carnality...

- But upon further examination, (if—you are honest with the text),
that kind of an approach to this passage become untenable!
(i.e., the old "Saul vs. Paul" way it is commonly taught.)

- In connection with that exegetical-type and categorical-type systematic theological-type teaching background— generally based upon this kind of an approach and a Greek/Hebrew analytical approach, some bad doctrine has developed in connection with both concepts in connection with spirituality and with carnality.

- And when I say that, I don't mean to put a kind of good spin on carnality.

- But what I am saying is that the bad doctrine has made it so that passages in which the terminology *spiritual* and *carnal* is used often gets meanings imposed upon it that the CONTEXT in which those words are being used won't support!

- Or the bad doctrine has come along and has imposed meanings upon the term that is so restrictive, that other legitimate meanings that those two words can have, NEVER GET CONSIDERED!

- And that causes huge problems in contexts in which, for example, those two terms are NOT being used in the typical way in which most people think of *spiritual* and *carnal* or *spirituality* and *carnality*.

- And this is, again, a prime example of that!

- Because if you bring to the table the typical understanding of what it means to be *spiritual* and the typical understanding of what it means to be *carnal*, here in (:14), **YOU WILL NEVER GET IT!**

- And you will come along, (as most commentators do), on Romans chapter 7, and their comments on vs.14 are the least amount of comments they say on anything!

- Because they haven't got a clue of what it's talking about there, and they try to get away from it as quick as they can!

- But before we get to a proper understanding of *spiritual* and *carnal* as it is used here in (:14), let's make sure we understand the terminology that leads up to those 2 words—i.e., let's begin looking at it from the beginning of the verse—first things first.

- One other thing to mention before that is to direct your attention to the fact that even though this is a short verse (only 15 words), do you see that it is made up of 2 clauses? (Notice the colon after the word "*spiritual*")

- 1st Clause = 8 words "*For we know that the law is spiritual: ...*"

- 2nd Clause = 7 words "*but I am carnal, sold under sin.*"

-
- So we need to look at this verse as two clauses and make sure that we pause long enough at each one in order to get the proper benefit from it and recognize the importance of it so that it makes the proper impact upon our inner man it is supposed to make.
 - Let's note a couple of details in this first clause.
 - 14 *For we know that the law is spiritual:*
 - Notice that (:14) starts off with the word "*For*" - which is one of those English 'words of logic.'
 - But oddly enough, look at how the very next verse (or next sentence) starts off—(:15 "*For that which I do I allow not:*") - it, too, starts off with the word "*For*" - so we have 2 "*Fors*" back-to-back.
 - Depending upon which English Grammar you are looking at, the word *for* can have a large variety of usages.
 - Some more modern grammars try to whittle it down to a manageable few—but there are some that have upwards to 20 ways in which the word *for* can be used.
 - It all depends on how discriminating the grammarian wants to be.
 - But even though 20 sounds like a lot—you do have to recognize that, even though some of them are very similar; and you could categorize them into fewer usages; you still have to recognize that they are valid and legitimate—even though some of them have fallen into disuse or have been picked up by another preposition—or picked up by the use of the word *for* in combination with another word.
 - And the truth of the matter is that we have a tendency today to, even when we do think more critically, and think more analytically in connection with words, and with recognition of precision of words, and things like that—even we still have a tendency to take that powerful preposition *for*, there, and limit it to 3, 4, or 5 possible uses.
- And granted, 90% of the time 3, 4, or 5 uses are all that you're going to encounter. But the truth of the matter is, there are times when the English word *for* can be used in other ways than those most common ways.

- And you encounter that often enough, especially in our epistles, because of the nature of what God's doing with us through the curriculum for our sonship education.
- By the nature of what God is doing with us, there's almost the expectation that, what we've called 'the words of logic' that govern the logical flow and progression and construction and composition and conveying of information—that we're not only going to encounter those words, probably more frequently than in any other similar sized body of information—but we're likely to encounter some of the rarer or more infrequent uses of some of those 'words of logic' because of the kind of effectual working that is taking place by the information we're being given.
- And that means, therefore, that when you're dealing with the word *for* (since that's the one we're dealing with now) — and especially when you encounter it as we encounter it here in Romans 7:14 and 15 with a double *for*, — (in fact, when you get over to Ch. 8, you'll encounter a triple *for*, like in [:13, 14, and 15 as well as :18, 19, and 20] — that means, therefore that just by the nature of what you're seeing there, you know that you really have got to pay close attention!
- And you've got to have at your disposal, probably more than just the typical, most common potential uses of the word.
 - (Not that some of them won't be the most common ways *for* is used—but it is likely that at least one or two of them may step out of the realm of the normal and may grab a hold of one of those meanings that is not all that common.)
- And it is my understanding that we do encounter one of those rarer or more infrequent uses of the word *for* here, especially in (:14) of chapter 7.
- And I word it that way because when the word *for* is used at the beginning of a presentation, it does commonly have a meaning to it that is not your 'for of explanation' or your 'for of reason' or your 'for of amplification' or your 'for of cause' — (that's 4 of the more common uses of the word for right there.)
- But in the case of the "*For*" that begins (:14) - none of those common meanings fit!

-
- And this is partly due to this sentence standing out as this stage-setting, necessary statement which will act as a conduit (so to speak) for the information sitting in the 2 proofs to pass through here and make a connection with something sitting in the corrective doctrine of (:13b).
 - And this tells you something—that is, since our “*For*” of (:14) doesn’t fit any of the more common uses of the word *for*, it tells you that there is a possibility, therefore, that it must have another meaning to it.
 - And there is a use of the word *for* that **commences a presentation.**
 - And when the word *for* is used for the opening or the commencement of either a presentation or a declaration, it’s not synonymous with that word “because” — and it’s not the idea of “for this reason” — or “for this cause.”
 - Example: Take for instance a person who is going to give a speech and it’s going to be along the lines of a presentation—such as in a business meeting where a vice-president (for example) has gathered all the salesmen around to have this meeting, and he gets his notes and his powerpoint presentation all ready and everything, and then he gets up to begin the meeting, and as he begins talking to make this presentation he starts off with words like, “For in that are gathered here to unveil our new product line” or he might also say, “For now, gentlemen, we present our new product” or something along those lines.
 - But notice that his first 3 words were “For in that...” or “For now gentlemen...” — in other words the very first word that came out of his mouth was the word *for*.
 - Well, he hasn’t said anything yet, so obviously the word *for* isn’t being used to explain anything—nor is it being used to amplify upon anything—he hasn’t said anything yet, so it’s not being used to give a reason or the cause for anything—no—he used it to **begin** his presentation.
 - When *for* is used as the commencement or the opening of some presentation or some argument or some declaration, it has the meaning of “with respect to the issue at hand” or “with regards to our topic.”

- And that's the way (:14) starts off—the topic, the presentation, the issue at hand, has been stated in (:13).

- But a setting has got to be declared before that topic can be properly addressed.

- So when Paul says, “*For we know that the law is spiritual: ...*” the issue is, ‘With respect to this issue we’re going to deal with, we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.’

- And then your next “*For*” that follows in (:15) begins to explain it, and amplify upon it. *Forexpot naltoknow tthe law iFo34.36 Tm(For) Tj/F15 1 Tf1*

- Now let's address the major issues in (:14) that will allow the proofs to be "set" properly in our thinking—and so that what those proofs say will line up with one of the two words we are given here in (:14) that will take that proof and connect it with the corrective doctrine of (:13).

- The major reason (:14) is given to us is in order to **set the stage** of our mind properly in order to handle the proofs which validate the corrective doctrine.

- And within (:14), the specific information that sets that stage is what each of the 2 clauses state:

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

- And even more specifically, the core of it all comes down to an understanding and appreciation for the 2 major words that are at the core of each of the 2 clauses:

- 1) *... the law is **spiritual***
- 2) *... I am **carnal***

- So it is absolutely critical and essential that we get a full grip on exactly what those two terms, (*spiritual* and *carnal*), mean—and what they mean within this particular context, and only within this particular context!

- "*spiritual*" (pneumatiko,j = from [pneuma], breath or air; spiritual)

- Used 26x—always translated *spiritual*.

- "*carnal*" (sa,rkiko,j = from [sarx], flesh, pertaining to the flesh; fleshly; carnal)

- Used 11x—translated *carnal* 9x & *fleshly* 2x.

- I only point this out to let you know that you can do a Greek word study until you're blue in the face, and you won't get one single thing (no breakthrough, no 'golden nugget', no deeper meaning) - in fact you won't even get one step closer to understanding and appreciating what these 2 words mean in this passage at all!

- This is a prime example of where the Greek is pointless and useless to properly understanding your Bible!

- So what comes to our 'rescue' (so to speak)? where do we need to turn to in order to get a clear understanding of this verse???

- A: THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE—and the precise, flawless use of it in the inerrant, infallible Authorized Version of the King James Bible!

- This is a prime example of how the English is superior to the Greek!

- I want to, once again, address the major problem that occurs quite often when these 2 words are thought of by most Bible teachers—especially Bible teachers who approach Bible study as I once did, from the basis of exegesis

(which is the idea—the mistaken idea, that you can't really know what the Bible says until you know what it says in the Greek [NT] or Hebrew [OT] — the assumption being that all English translations are wrong at worst or weak at best; and the worst of all is the AV, therefore the Bible teacher will exegete word by word and come up with what he calls a 'corrected translation') —— (funny)

and the other problem occurs from teaching the Bible categorically

(which is basically going through a verse and picking out certain words that conger up a particular category of doctrine [like our words *spiritual* and *carnal*] — and then taking up a stem-to-stern, point-by-point detailed analysis of everything the Bible teacher can come up with to completely cover the entire doctrine as one big category — and again, the idea—the mistaken idea is that by doing this, and by you having a complete set of notes on each category of doctrine, that you will become spiritually mature by collecting a maximum amount of doctrines in this manner),

therefore, Christian maturity is supposed to occur by this kind of a systematic arrangement of various categories of doctrine—or what I commonly refer to as the systematic theology approach.

- But this approach to Bible study fails to—and the truth of the matter is, it makes it impossible to ever reach a level of Christian maturity (as the Bible itself defines maturity) in the believer.

- The reasons are many, but the most important reason of all is that this approach is completely thought up by, devised by, and designed by men!

-
- God, Himself, never wrote the Bible (even in the so-called “original language”) that way—and He never exhorts or commands those in the office of Bishop or Pastor-teacher to teach His word that way.
 - God, writing His words in the order He put them—and seeing to it that each word, verse, chapter, and book of the Bible was put together in the order He intended for it to be—God, Himself, saw to it that a believer’s growth and maturity—or *godly edification*—would occur when they would follow the sense and sequence He (with infinite wisdom—and He who created your inner man in the first place) Himself purposed and designed into His word.
 - And God also saw to it that His words were preserved, even in translation, so that that AV of the Bible you hold in your hand IS the inerrant, infallible, living words of the living God, without error.
 - So therefore, exegesis is a futile exercise—any “corrected translation” is not correct, it’s incorrect—“corrected translations” are not better or more accurate, they are worse and error-ridden.
 - And learning Bible doctrine categorically doesn’t produce *godly edification*, it produces compartmentalized thinking, it reduces Bible study to an academic exercise, and it produces major road-blocks in a person’s thinking when it comes to simply reading the Bible because when you read a verse like Romans 7:14, and when you see the words *spiritual* and *carnal*, you immediately jump to some kind of a category of doctrine about spirituality or carnality.
 - And if that’s what happens here, you will never know what is really going on in this verse, or in the remainder of chapter 7 or in those first 13 verses of chapter 8! (That’s a total of 24 verses that gets completely screwed up by this kind of man-made approach to Bible study!)
 - Now I say all that so that when we get back here to our words *spiritual* and *carnal* in Romans 7:14, if that is what you’re thinking when you see those 2 words, you need to jettison all that and approach them Biblically, according to what God expects you to have come to understand up to this point in the book of Romans AND NO MORE!
 - Therefore, when we approach the words *spiritual* and *carnal* here in (:14), God expects you to know what they mean solely within the context of Romans 7—and in light of what you have been taught from Romans 6:1 up to this point of your godly sanctification.
 - (Your Greek will never handle these words properly, and your categories of doctrine will never handle these words properly!)

- So just what does God expect us to understand and appreciate when He has the apostle Paul say,

“... *the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, ...*”???

- Just how are we to understand those 2 words: *spiritual* and *carnal*?

- Well, let's approach these words in a way just to underscore the fact of how you've GOT to be thinking in connection with them.

- If you take our Biblical education so far, from the point of Romans 1:1 up until this point, have you ever encountered the words *spiritual* or *carnal* before?

- No, not really.

- Outside of the word *spiritual* being used by Paul in Romans 1:11 (*For I long to see you, that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift, to the end that ye may be established;*) - but it was used there in an entirely different context than this.

- But as far as the word *carnal* is concerned, this is not only the very first time the word *carnal* is used in Romans—it is the very first time the word is used in the entire NT!

- So by all intents and purposes, this is the first time we have been confronted with these 2 words in our epistles—and in all reality it is the first time we have been given these 2 words at all in the doctrine of our sanctified position in Christ. (Rom. 6:1 ff)

- And in light of that, this pretty well means that what is commonly brought to bear on these 2 words is based upon information that you have garnered OUTSIDE of Romans (later books in the Bible), and usually on things that you have thought about, or been taught about *spirituality* and *carnality*, POST Romans 7:14!

- And when you do that, you are headed down a road of trouble!

- Now I do realize that as soon as you get into Ch. 8 you've got the issue of *spiritually* and *carnally*, *Spirit* and *carnal*, etc., that becomes a real big issue, there.

-
- But there's some information you learn through the course of Romans 7:14 and ff, and through the opening verses of Rom. Ch. 8, that makes it so that when you get to the expression *carnally minded* and *spiritually minded* in (:6), and the *carnal mind* in (:7), that you're going to now deal with those concepts a little differently than you did deal with them the 1st time you encountered them in (:14) of chapter 7.

 - And the reason I'm saying it to you that way is because if you, therefore, are going to take the meaning you have in your mind for *spiritual* and *carnal* from Ch. 8—or from I Cor. 2 & 3—or from II Cor. 10—or from some other later place with at completely different context, (and with a whole bunch more edification under your belt when you get to them), and you try to bring that all back and put it into the context of the very 1st time you encounter those words; you bring far more to the table (so to speak), and put far more meaning into those words than God has designed them to have in this 1st context in which He utilizes them.

 - And that causes problems!

 - Therefore the way to approach what Paul is doing utilizing these words in this context—and knowing that this *is* a stage-setting verse that will be brought to bear on those 2 proofs sitting just underneath this verse—what we've got to make sure that we do at this point is to NOT bring too much to the table with respect to the words *spiritual* and *carnal*!

 - In fact, we need to bring (in a sense) the minimum understanding.

 - Now, as we noted, this is the real 1st encounter we have in our epistles to this terminology—but with that said, it should be also noted that God has used expressions like this in His program with Israel.

 - Therefore there is information regarding something being *spiritual*, and what that might mean; and something (even a person like Paul) being *carnal*, and what that might mean from God's previous use of those words in His program with Israel.

 - And going back and getting that would probably be a wise thing to do in order to give us a foundation and that 'minimum' amount of information to bring to the table—especially since we are dealing with the issue of the law, and that IS in God's program w/ Israel.

(or honest)

- So when you think about it, even a logical approach to this terminology, and a Biblical approach tells you that when Paul says, “*For we know that the law is spiritual: ...*” - the ‘knowing’ that he’s talking about there is most likely something that is very fundamental about that law, and he’s really saying, “That’s a given—we *know* this about the law because of something God has already made evident about that law.”

- And when he says, “... *but I am carnal, sold under sin*” - it’s also likely that there’s some information that already has been made evident about what it means when a person is declared to be *carnal*.

- And since there are these very fundamental concepts about what it means for something to be spoken of as being *spiritual* and someone to be spoken of as being *carnal*—it is in those most basic, fundamental concepts that are, in all likelihood, the real key to understanding how they are to be taken in this verse.

- And to go back to what I was saying earlier—the most common systematic, exegetical, categorical approach to “Bible study” that gathers all kinds of information from all over the Bible, ends up coming up with definitions and descriptions about particular matters that have, either far too much information to them that violates the context in which the words are utilized—or they end up excluding real basic and fundamental meaning, never considering that words could ever carry those basic, fundamental meanings.

- And because that happens so frequently, when we come to a verse like Rom. 7:14 where terminology is encountered for the 1st time, you end up making a verse of Scripture say something it was never designed to say. (like the law is connected to the Holy Spirit!)

- And I said all that just to give you an insight into what position your thinking should be in, in order to approach these words and deal with them in an honest, Biblical way.

- So... what is the most basic and fundamental concept for something being *spiritual* — and what’s the most basic and fundamental concept for someone being called *carnal*??

- And as we get an appreciation of this, keep in mind that the verse says, “*For we know that the **law** is spiritual ...*” - he’s not talking about a person here—he’s talking about an entity—a written codex; a thing being *spiritual*.

- That right there comes along and tells you that you've got to get rid of about every other definition or meaning you could attach to the word *spiritual*! Because the bulk of the meanings that get attached to the word *spiritual* apply to people!

- So all those meanings attached to people as being *spiritual* are thrown right out the window!

- In fact, it's not too often you encounter a thing being called *spiritual*.

- But even today, though infrequent, you will still, from time to time, hear someone talk about a thing, and when they do, they describe it as being "*spiritual*"- and they do it in a way that employs this most fundamental meaning that this word *spiritual* carries.

- And we could go to a good dictionary and look up the meaning of *spiritual*, but if you did, you'd see that there are a whole bunch of them—between 16 to 20+

- But what is the most basic, root concept of the term?

- What does the word *spiritual* mean (when describing a thing) that is its **radical, root concept**?

- Often you will hear young people still use the word *spiritual* in this radical-root way—often when they see something like a movie, or a work of art—or hear a song, they'll say, "Man, that was *spiritual*!"

- Or I've heard the word used, for instance, at Arlington Cemetery at the changing of the guard at the tombs of the unknown soldiers. And you'll hear someone walk away from that and say, "That was *spiritual*." (or Yankee Stadium or the Hall of Fame)

- Or a person could go to a city like Chicago, for instance, and look at the skyscrapers—or go to a building like the National Archives and talk about it as being "*spiritual*."

- And there's no religious connotation to it whatsoever.

- Kind of like young people using the term, righteous. And when they do that, they're not looking at it as religious, or through God's eyes, or even in a moral sense—no—they are using it in a radical-root sense.

- And while righteous has a basic meaning of right-ness, they are using it in its most radical-root concept—and the radical-root concept of righteous when used of a thing being right to them is used in the sense that it was “agreeable” to them—that’s what they’re expressing.

- And, by the way, that is what it is in its radical-root concept to God, Himself—when He calls something righteous, that what it is to Him—it is agreeable to every aspect of His essence and character—no part of His essence is offended and it has the status of complete agreeability to Him.

- *Spiritual* is much this same kind of thing. It can be used of a thing. It can be used with no heavenly connotation to it at all. It can be used without talking about something sacred, or ghostly, or supernatural, or ethereal, or airy, or intangible, or celestial, etc.

- In fact, *spiritual* can even be used where there’s not even the issue of lifting it out of the ordinary!

- We’re after something even more fundamental than that. (In fact, what we’re after could be said without God, the Bible, or the Holy Spirit being in view at all!)

- And this same kind of fundamental, radical-root concept can be applied with Paul says, “... *but I am carnal...*”

- So with all that as a back-drop, when a thing is described as being *spiritual*, what are you saying about it? - and you may want to look at it as if you say that something is *spiritual* to you, what has it done to you? What is the basic, fundamental, radical-root concept of a thing described as *spiritual*???

- By the way, any time you’re after a radical-root, every application of the word **shares** that radical-root—it’s the lowest common denominator (so to speak). The radical-root will apply in every context—it will be there in some degree.

- We do get helped out a little by something that has already been said to us here in Romans 7—which is also why Paul says in (:14), “*For we know*” — look at 7:6—what is the root of the word *spiritual*? A: *spirit*

- And we said there that when Paul says we should serve in “*newness of spirit*” that we are going to have to have something new, something other than that law, operating in our our what?..... our mind!

1) - The most radical-root meaning of the word *spiritual* is that it affects your mind!

- Something that ‘s *spiritual* operates in your spirit.
- Something that’s *spiritual* affects your spirit—it affects your mind.

- When some kid comes out of a movie and says, “Man, that was *spiritual!*” What he means by that is, “That got into my head! - - That made me think!”

- Anything that is *spiritual*, in some manner or form, affects your mind—it gets into your head—it works in your mind—it does something to your spirit.

- When Paul says, “*For we know that the law is spiritual ...*” the issue of that law is the issue of it being something that gets in your head and affects your mind—that’s the first, major component of what he is saying.

- The law is designed to operate in your spirit—it’s designed to affect the way in which you think—it’s designed to work with your mind.

- Now that’s not all he’s saying—but that’s where that most fundamental concept begins—that’s the component it begins with—it begins with the fact that you’re dealing with something that’s going to operate in your mind, in your human spirit.

- Now it doesn’t say what it’s going to do –but before it can say what it’s going to do, it has to tell you THAT’S were it’s going to do it!

- But there are a couple other components to add to this in order to give us a full understanding & appreciation of the radical-root concept of what it means for something to be called “*spiritual.*”

- The law is designed to operate within the spirit (in the mind), and it’s designed to DO SOMETHING there! And Paul is simply stating that here: and he’s bringing it to the argument because he knows that it is essential to the argument—but he’s simply bringing a simple reality about the law into view in order to set the stage for what he is about to go on and do.

- He's going to go on to prove the reality of what he said back in verse 13.

- And in order to prove the reality of what he said back in (:13), we need to first of all think about the law in its most fundamental way it can be thought of—and that is, first of all, it's designed to operate in the human spirit and DO something there.

- And then, as it operates in the spirit, being *spiritual*, and doing the basic thing it's designed to do—and then once you understand and are thinking about that and limiting yourself to thinking about the law to this most basic reality concerning what it is and what it can do—then Paul comes along and finishes setting the rest of the stage by the balance of what he says there in (:14) - which is to contrast himself as being *carnal* to that law being *spiritual* — and then with that stage being set, he now goes on and gives the proofs of the 2 points of corrective doctrine that he stated back in verse 13.

- Paul's not making some startling revelation (so to speak) about the law here.

- He's simply stating the most fundamental thing that could be said about it, in connection with it being information that is designed to be either heard or read or both—and since it's information, since it's heard or read, it enters the human spirit—and it's there that it is supposed to do its job! It doesn't do much of anything on the pages of the book it's written in.

- But this is the essential concept that needs to be thought of in connection with the law, in order to understand that it's going to do the very job Paul described back in (:13).

- It's designed, just as he said in (:13), “*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.*”

- The law, therefore is designed to make something appear to you—so that the eyes of your understanding can see it and can acknowledge it.

- Well, in order to do that, its got to be able to get into your mind!

- It's as if Paul is coming along and saying, "Put everything else out of your mind about the law that you could ever think of, and let's just deal with this one thing about it! And that will be sufficient!"

- "Because there's this one thing about it that you need to limit your thinking on **it**, right now, in order to appreciate the reality of what I just said back in (:13)."

- So the law is *spiritual*.

- That means, first of all, it's designed to get into your head; and it's designed to do something there.

- And since, therefore, it's *spiritual*, and it's deigned to get into your head, it's going to therefore do the REST of what anything that is *spiritual* does, most fundamentally of all.

- And there's 2 other basic, essential components to the radical-root concept of something that is *spiritual*—so there's 3 all total.

1) Affects your mind—it gets into your head and operates there!

- But then the 2nd thing is, that once it gets into your head and operates there, (and here is where that concept of when describing something that is *spiritual*, it can be said to "move" you) - anything that is *spiritual* has the power to MOTIVATE you!

2) Motivates you—(motivational power)

- And then the 3rd thing is: anything that is *spiritual*, once it's in your head, and begins to motivate you and move you: the 3rd thing it wants to do is CHANGE you!

3) Change you—(the law desires to change you!)

- And those 3 things form the radical-roots to the word *spiritual*.

- Anything that's *spiritual* gets into your head, motivates you, and works to change you!

- That's why you so often hear someone say, "That was spiritual, that was a life-changing experience!"

- So when Paul comes along and says, "*For we know that the law is spiritual ...*" — that's the fundamental thing he's after:

- We know that the law was designed to get into our heads; motivate us; and change us.

- And that's what he says, "*we know*" - and that's what needs to be acknowledged about the law.

- And that's the thing that makes people think that the law, therefore, should be able to change you; or should be able to cause you to be different than you were before; or replace or exchange your former position with a new position; or to put it simply, the issue of the law being spiritual (i.e., affects the mind and motivates to change you) is what makes most people think that the law can give you functional life!

- Because if it's designed to get into your head; and it's designed to motivate you; and since it's the law we're talking about now, we can define that motivation as motivate you to do good and not sin, and the changing, therefore, would be to change your life, therefore, so that you are morally good, and holy, and pious, and all this business.

- Because the law IS *spiritual*: that's the thing that makes people naturally think that, 'If I'm only under that law, then I'm going to have functional life!'

- But just like Paul said back in (:13), the law was designed to make it so that "*sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.* — yes, the law is spiritual, and it operates in the spirit; and it moves and motivates; and the desire is to CHANGE on the basis of it ... but there is a big "**BUT**" following that colon in (:14) ... "but I am carnal, sold under sin."

- And now you come to the reason **why**, —even though the law is spiritual, it CAN NOT do what you THINK it can do!!!

- And why, instead of doing what you think it can do, it does the very thing (:13) said it was designed to do—it makes sin appear as itself, *working* (functional) *death* in you *by that which is good* (that law)—and makes it so that *sin by the commandment* becomes *exceeding sinful*.

- Now—we have that colon at the end of the word *spiritual*—so we need to be honest with ourselves and see if all that we’ve said and looked at about the law being *spiritual* is clear in your thinking and that you have a level of confidence about just what it is saying and more importantly why it’s saying it!

- The “why” has to do with the fundamental thing that the law drives at because it is *spiritual*, and the fundamental thing that we are supposed to be having done to us by the proper function of our godly sanctification that we have “in Christ.”

- For the fundamental thing our godly sanctification does for us and to us — is to CHANGE us!

- To make it so that we, in our living, practical, moment-by-moment functional life unto God, — so that we are not what we used to be; so that we don’t think like we used to think; so that we don’t live like we used to live!

- And you must understand and appreciate that the law, being the *spiritual* thing that it is, is the only viable alternative you have to bring about change in your life that would result in a holy, fruit-producing life that God would accept.

- And so you have a competing alternative to grace! For the law, being *spiritual*, is the only viable, genuine competitor to grace!

- **B-U-T!!!** There is this huge “fly in the ointment” so to speak, that is going to make it so that the law can’t be used as a viable, genuine competitor, **by YOU!**

- And the way this connects with the original misunderstanding in (:13) is that the person who thinks erroneously about the law, **MUST**, by default (so to speak), they must think that, since they know that the law is *spiritual*, that’s ok, because since I am functionally alive by nature, I can go ahead and utilize that law all fine and dandy!

- **“GOD FORBID!”**

- So we have so far in (:14):

*14 For we know that the law is spiritual (it gets into your head; and it motivates you to change—**it changes you**):*

- Now let's go ahead and pick up that last clause that contains the other key term in the stage-setting information that we need to have as a frame of reference in order for the information sitting in the proofs to make the connections they are supposed to make to the corrective doctrine in (:13).

- The 2nd Clause says:

14 but I am carnal, sold under sin.

- "*but I am carnal*"

- "*but*" is used as an adversative conjunction to indicate something adverse or opposed to or harmful to the argument that is being set forth.

- "*but*" is used to introduce the 'fly in the ointment' or the **fatal flaw** to the argument — and that's exactly what this is.

- The entire argument against us not being *under grace*, but *under the law*—or at least under a mixture of law and grace, is fatally wounded, it is put to death with these final 6 words: "*I am carnal, sold under sin.*"

- In fact, if this final clause is true, then (to work backwards) the 2nd Misunderstanding, the 1st Misunderstanding, the 2nd Objection, and the very 1st Objection all 'die on the vine' (so to speak) - they all fall apart—none of them have any life left to them at all!

- The argument that we do have some kind of natural, functional life of our own; that we can utilize the law to restrain sin and make us functionally alive unto God; that the law can't be summarily dismissed or ignored; and that the law is my only compelling reason to not sin and to do good — the entire argument comes down to this— the entire argument is centered on this, and it will stand or fall on this one, single point of sound doctrine:

"I am carnal, sold under sin."

- Now let's look at that other major term:

- "*I am carnal*" - (sarkiko,j) - 11x, "*carnal*" 9x; "*fleshly*" 2x

- Our English word *carnal* is a separate word by itself, because it, by nature, carries with it the radical-root concept more than the word "*flesh*" does.

- And the reason for that is because the English word *flesh* has a wider scope to it than *carnal*—that is, there is more than one kind of *flesh*.

- There's the actual, physical *flesh*, for example that a human body contains— "flesh and bone" for example.

- And there's the *flesh* of an animal that someone might eat.

- So *flesh* doesn't have the exact same radical-root concept behind it.

- And *flesh* isn't commonly used in contrast to *spiritual*, or something that is immaterial.

- And we have the advantage in English of having the word *carnal*. And the word *carnal* has a radical-root concept that is opposed to something that is *spiritual*, and it is something that the word *carnal* always carries with it.

- *Carnal* carries the particular radical-root concept that's needed here, and that Paul is dealing with here in (:14).

- Caveat: Let me just say that I don't mean to imply that any time the word *flesh* is used in the Scriptures that it's not being used, or can't be used in a sense that is in contrast to either something that's immaterial or *spiritual*.

- Because we can, and we do use the word *flesh* like that.

- All I'm simply saying is that we also have the English word *carnal*—and one of the reasons why the KJ Translators used the word *carnal* at times instead of the word *flesh* is because of the times when that *flesh* concept has to stress the most radical-root concept that there is to *flesh* in God's eyes.

- And that's really what you've got to think of here.

- And that's why you can't standardize the word [sarkikos] to mean either *carnal*, always, or *fleshly*, always—(or some other made-up nomenclature used by the unqualified translators who are always “correcting” God's word.)

- Most people who deal with words like this, usually go to the dictionary and look up the word *carnal*, and they see the most common diction-type definition of the word to mean something pertaining to the flesh or body; something dealing with the body as the seat of passions or appetites; something sensual; even something sexual; something not *spiritual*.

- But this is the same kind of problem you run into when you were first dealing with something that is *spiritual*—all these diction-type definitions deal with aspects of what *carnal* means—but they don't get down to this radical-root concept.

- By the way, if you allow the Bible to define the word, it **does** deal with it in its radical-root concept, and it **does** give you an understanding of what that concept is before you go on to attach these other meanings to it.

- Because the truth of the matter is, all these other meanings are actually built on this one, single, radical-root concept.

- (By the way, [again], we have encountered the word *flesh* several times in the book of Romans; [as near as in 7:5] - and Paul will switch back to it in (:18)!)

- Again, you've got to keep in mind that the word *carnal* particularly conveys or focuses the attention upon the most fundamental thing God sees or thinks about when He thinks about “*flesh*” — when He comes along and declares man to be “*flesh*.”

- And while *flesh* can be used in some contexts in a good sense, the word *carnal* is never used in a good sense—it's always used in a bad sense.

- And the other thing to help you out is to remember that you are being told here that you already “*know*” what this is— just as (:14) starts off, “*For we know ...*” — you've encountered this already.

- (And it's not a word depicting something like our *old man*, or who we are, by nature, *in Adam*—because that's too broad)

- When Paul first confronted you with the word *flesh* (limited to within the doctrine of our sanctification) — what was the concept he attached to it???

- Go back to 6:19—what does he say there about it?

19 I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh:

- The most fundamental, radical-root concept in God's eyes, in connection with *flesh* is that it is intrinsically WEAK!

- By “intrinsically” I mean that its essential nature is that it is weak—it's inherently weak—it's weak, by nature!

- No matter where it's found; no matter what condition it may be in—this one thing is always true of it—it is weak!

- And that's what the word *carnal* ALWAYS focuses upon!

- Anything that is *carnal* is intrinsically weak!

- So you've got this law that is *spiritual*—it gets in your head, motivates you, and wants to change you—but you're intrinsically weak, and can't do what it says—you're *carnal*!

- And you can actually go and check this out another way.

- Rom. 8:3—This is exactly what Paul is going to tell you later on.

- Those are the 2 fundamental concepts involved in (:14) in the words *spiritual* and *carnal*.

- Other contexts in which the words *spiritual* and *carnal* are going to be used can add some things to those words because the context in which they occur will provide information, and have issues that demand further things be added—but those radical-root concepts will always be there, nonetheless. But this is a context in which nothing is being added—all you're dealing with is the most fundamental issue of all, in the word *spiritual* and the word *carnal*.

- Now at this point we need to back off (so to speak) of the details of these 2 words, *spiritual* and *carnal*—

—(that is, IF, IF, IF, you are fully understanding and appreciating that, first of all, the **context** demands that you deal with them in their most fundamental, radical-root concept; and secondly you fully understand and appreciate what the radical-root concept is of each of them) —

— then we need to now look at them in their most fundamental form, and see the reason **why** they are given to you—that is, that you see the need for them to be in your thinking that way so that the proofs connect properly to the corrective doctrine.

- That is, you need to really appreciate why this verse had to be stated—you need to see why Paul had to say this—why he couldn't just launch into (:15) without stating (:14) first!

(NOTE TO SELF: GO THROUGH THIS S-L-O-W-L-Y!!!)

- And that is because, if you're not going to be thinking about the law in this most fundamental sense of all (that *the law is spiritual*—that it is to be operating in your mind, motivating you with a desire to change) - and if you're not going to be recognizing that the law is going to appeal to you to supply the energy to accomplish what it wants done—and by nature, you being *carnal*, are inherently weak—then you're not going to, therefore, be able to appreciate the proofs he is going to set forth, beginning in (:15), that come along and show that, just as he said back in (:13), the law is designed by God to make sin appear to be the very thing that gives you functional death; and to make it (to make sin) to be recognized as being something that you don't have the power to overcome and master!

- Let's say that again ...

- “*For we know that the law is spiritual:*” — it operates in your mind, motivating you with a desire to change you; to change you from a person who is functionally dead to a person who is functionally alive unto God; to change you from a person who, while justified unto eternal life, but with sin still in your members, to a justified person who can control their sin, who can restrain their sin, and who can produce fruit unto holiness that your Heavenly Father will accept and wants around Him forever—(which is what was told to you back in chapter 6: and :22-23).

- Remember that what we're after here is the ability to functionally live unto God—to produce—to produce *fruit unto holiness*—to be changed from a person under the dominion of sin to one whose sin is now brought under control—one whose sin can now be restrained in his members—the ability to put your sanctified life that you now have “in Christ” into effect!

- And if that doesn't ‘click’ in your thinking—then, (even though it isn't the best way to describe it at all), maybe we need to say it here: what we're after is the ability, or power, or capacity to be ‘in fellowship.’

- (To live consistent with who God has made you to be, “in Christ.”)

- And because *the law is spiritual*, it desires to do that job—it desires to bring about that change in you.

- And the way that law is going to attempt to accomplish that, (in fact, the **ONLY** way the law can accomplish that—because it was designed to accomplish its task in this one and only way) — the way the law is going to attempt to bring about the desired change in you: is by appealing to YOU and only YOU to supply the power, the capacity, or the energy to accomplish what it wants done!

- That's not just one way out of many ways the law can accomplish its task—God, Himself designed the law so that the **ONLY** way it can accomplish its task is to appeal to you, personally, to supply the energy for it to do its job!

- And that's why we went back to Exodus and spent all that time orienting ourselves and giving ourselves a frame of reference as to just how it was that the law was to accomplish its task in those members of Israel at Mt. Sinai.

- Remember that the law contract at Mt. Sinai **was a rejection of God's J-ness & grace** and the acceptance of a contract to make themselves spiritually fit!

- That's why we went over all those Jehovah compound names!

- The Old Covenant is an absolute rejection of God's J-ness & grace—it is men saying that they will supply the energy, in and of themselves, and **they** will pick up that law and produce their own righteousness and their own holiness—**they** will produce their own justification and their own sanctification; and their own kingdom, and their own blessings in that kingdom!

- The law is a contract for a man to justify and sanctify himself, making **himself** FIT to be used by God!

- And (since we skipped it before), I want to now underscore the fact that the law, (in keeping with our context of sanctification), was not just a way to justify yourself, but it was also a way to sanctify yourself!

- Exo. 28:31-38 (:36)
- Lev. 20:7-8

- So, once again, since the law is *spiritual*, it desires to bring about a change in you—and the change it's after is to make you fit to be used by God—to make you sanctified.

- But the only way the law can accomplish that is to appeal to YOU to supply the energy to accomplish what it wants done—for without that energy, the law is just words on a page!

- And if you're agreeing to it—if you ascent to it—if you go underneath it—you are BY DEFAULT admitting that YOU, INDEED DO have the capacity or energy to do what it wants to do—and that is what is going on when you *sanctify yourself!*

- Agreeing to go underneath the law is agreeing that you really do have; you have by nature, functional life—you have life, capacity, power, energy to accomplish what it wants to do!

- So you've got this law desiring to change you; and you've got it appealing to your flesh to supply the energy to do what it wants to get accomplished; but you've got one huge problem—a fatal problem—a problem that puts you in a predicament—you've got a **weak link** in this chain...

- "... *but I am carnal*" - you, far from having natural capacity, natural energy, natural life-force to supply that law a way to get what it wants done—you are inherently weak—you're carnal!

- And that fleshly, carnal, weakness spells your doom under that law—because that law demands perfection; perfect obedience, not in part, but in whole AND in part!

- Therefore in God's eyes, if you agree to go underneath that law, either in whole, or just in part, you are, (by default), rejecting God's J-ness & grace; you are saying that you are NOT inherently weak or *carnal*; and you are saying that you will be changed to be able to control your sin by that law which is *spiritual*; you are admitting that you can sanctify yourself!

- By this point, you should be seeing something of the very real danger it is to go under that law contract or system.

- Paul wasn't kidding [or being colorful] when he said that the law put sin in motion; that it worked in *our members to bring forth fruit unto death*; that we had to be *delivered from the law*; that it *held us in functional death!* (7:5-6)

- And he wasn't kidding when he said that we need to *serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter*—we need to have something new operating in our spirit—we need God's J-ness and grace operating there!

- And because you are *carnal*—inherently weak to supply the energy needed for the law to operate—you should clearly understand & appreciate that you can't mix or blend law and grace—and you can't be under that law system even if you imagine it to be minor, benign, or seemingly harmless!

- For example, tithing.

- Mal. 3:7-12

- For example, double/triple-compound discipline.
- Mat. 7:1-2
- also note 7:7-8— “*Ask, seek, and knock*”

- These are all issues of not properly handling the word of God; they are all issues of not “*rightly dividing the word of truth.*”

- For example, did you know that not “*rightly dividing the word of truth*” has, in some measure, led to it actually affecting the national foreign policy of the United States of America???
- Luke 6:35-38 (S on the MT. = disassociate from the VRS)

- And being “*not under the law, but under grace*” **is** a sanctification issue, and it is a “right division” issue [dispensational issue].

- So we have: “*For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, ...*”

- And it’s like God comes along and clears everything off that can be cleared off of the table, that can be thought about the **law**; and everything that can be thought about **you**—and He leaves just these 2 issues.

- And Paul says, “Now, ... let’s look at that law’s function in this *spiritual* way, and with me being inherently weak by nature, and I’ll show you that it does the very thing I just said in (:13) that I said it does.

- And after all the proofs are run through and you finally get to the end of (:25), he says, “That’s the reason why God had to make it so you’re *not under the law, but under grace!*”

- Otherwise your position “in Christ” would NEVER function!

- But notice the verse isn’t quite finished yet!

- There’s a ‘stinger’ or ‘kicker’ to this—the 2nd clause is in 2 parts:

- Romans 7:14*
- 14 *For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.*
- (part 1) (part 2)

- "... *sold under sin*."

- "***sold***" (pipra, skw = to sell)

- "*sold*" is the past tense of *sell*—and that's the point, as you stand (or sit) right at this very moment, that's what you are: you are already fully *sold* (Perf. Pass. Participle) *under sin*.

- In the English, *sold* has the idea of being handed over or delivered up to another.

- The means may or may not be important—for example given over or handed over or delivered up to another for money, or merchandise (barter), or some other commodity.

- And in this context the means is not what is being focused upon—this context is simply stating a known, past, fact: you and I are *sold under sin*.

- It's kind of like the auctioneer's "SOLD" at the end of an auction: going once, going twice, SOLD!

- And the idea is that you are then and there another's possession; you have just been handed over to another.

- Some even think of it as being handed over or sold into slavery or bondage, etc., but that's too broad.

- Since, contextually, we are after the radical-roots of these expressions, *sold*, too, has a basic, fundamental concept that perfectly fits the context of this passage.

- And that basic, fundamental concept of *sold* is that anything that is said to be *sold* is presently under the DOMINION of another—and that's exactly what you were told; what you already "know" - *Romans 6:14* "For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace."

- Being *sold under sin* is being under sin's dominion when you are under that law. Under the law, you are under the complete dominion of sin, being the carnal, intrinsically weak man you are by nature!

- “*under*” (Prep. *u`po*, = under the authority of) even makes this a stronger statement—because you’re not just *sold*—you’re *sold under* the authority of another; *under* the dominion of another—so that you ‘cannot do what you would do’ — (just to kind of set up your thinking for those proofs)!

- Someone who is *sold* under another’s dominion cannot do what he wants to do—and every time he wants or tries to do what he wants—because he is *sold under* this other dominion—he is bent to the will of his lord or master.

- He is controlled, under the domain of and by his master.

- And under the law, that master is *sin!* (*a`marti,a*)

- “... *but I am carnal, **sold under sin.***”

- That’s the end result of taking the *spiritual* law, teaming it up with this issue of being intrinsically weak or *carnal*, and instead of mastering sin and becoming functionally alive, you get *sold under* it, and you end up being functionally dead!

- And going back to something I said before—this 2nd part of the 2nd clause; these last 3 words: “*sold under sin*” - that is a ‘stinger’ or ‘kicker’ to what is being presented to your thinking in this necessary statement of (:14).

- In fact, Paul couldn’t say, “*For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal* (period).”

- Because if that’s all he said he could have given the impression that you could come along and say, “Well, yeah, I’m *carnal*—I’m weak, even intrinsically weak by nature, BUT but I can be rehabilitated, or with the right amount of nurturing, I can be salvaged—something can be redeemed—surely something in me can be cleaned up and made usable underneath that law—we can reform it—it may be bad, but it’s a good fix’er upper!” “Isn’t there some spare part usable?”

- Can’t science, the government, or religion enlighten me? can’t they **enliven** me? give me enough life or energy to take that law and do what it says? —NO!—

- See, without those last 3 words you have that the possibility for that kind of ‘wiggly room’ - but with them, it shuts the mouth!

- Now, with a proper understanding and appreciation of what this final misunderstanding is all about:

13 Was then that which is good made death unto me?
Is the problem with being under the law the problem of me having at least some measure of functional life on my own, by nature—and then whenever I pick up that law and try to function underneath it, that law puts to death what natural, functional life I do have?

God forbid. Wrong—seriously wrong—and God forbid you to think one more thought along those lines! You are totally and completely functionally dead by nature!

... and then with a proper grip on the corrective doctrine that is designed to attack the idea that you have any functional life on your own (by nature): you should see that it is going to take 2 Components to that corrective doctrine to root out all that erroneous thinking:

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

First and foremost you have to honestly be confronted with the fact that it's not the law that makes me functionally dead, but it's sin in my members that makes me functionally dead, and it's the law's job to make sin in my members appear to me to be the very thing that proves that I am functionally dead by nature. In other words, I am functionally dead by nature—and that is because of sin in my members—and the law brings to my full attention that I **do** have sin in my members which proves to me that I am, indeed, functionally dead by nature. I have 0.00% functional life!

... and then

that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

Secondly, (and at the core of any and all objections, erroneous thinking, misunderstandings, misconceptions, or whatever, that I should put my sanctified position in Christ into effect by going underneath the law), the last thing you have to honestly own up to is the fact that every time I try to control sin in my members, sin always exceeds my ability to control it—and that's because it's the law's job to give sin greater power, ability, energy, and capacity than I have to restrain it (sin) in my life!

- But before we go on to prove those two things, we first need to clear our thinking of everything we could possibly think about the law, except for one thing:

14 For we know that the law is spiritual:

It is the designed purpose and intent of the law to get into my head, and motive me to be changed into a person who is acceptable to God's righteous standard; to be changed into a person who is holy in God's eyes.

... and we also have to clear out thinking of everything we could possibly think about ourselves, except for one thing, and one thing only:

but I am carnal, sold under sin.

By nature, I am inherently weak to ever provide the necessary energy that the law demands (that the law has to have, and that the law appeals to me to provide) in order to utilize it (that law) as the means by which sin is controlled in my life and fruit unto holiness can be produced!

- And now with those 2 things in our thinking—and with those 2 things as a backdrop or the stage upon which all this information will be set: we can then go on to prove each of those 2 Components of corrective doctrine.

- And we're going to prove the 1st one first:

- We're now going to prove that *sin, that it might appear sin, working* (functional) *death in me by that (law) which is good;*

- We're going to prove that in light of the law desiring to operate in your head (your spirit) to change you into an acceptable person in God's eyes— able to produce fruit unto holiness—and in light of the fact that you can't provide the necessary energy to do it on your own (by nature) because you are inherently weak to do it (you are carnal) - we now set forth the actual proof that it's not the law that puts your natural functional life to death; you are already functionally dead by nature, and the law's job is to make that fact appear to you, crystal clear, without a shadow of a doubt.

- And verses 15, 16, and 17 are the living, actual proof. It's not a theory, or an assumption, or speculation—because we have a witness who will testify in graphic detail as to the truth of the matter— and it is none other than the apostle Paul, himself! (An expert witness— the greatest authority on the law)

- Again, the proofs prove that you have no functional life by nature; they prove that you are functionally dead by nature!

- 1st Proof: (Proving: “*But sin, that it might appear sin, working (functional) death in me by that (law) which is good;*”)

Romans 7:15-17

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.

- Before we get started going down through the proofs, we need to say something about all these personal pronouns, and how they are to be understood and appreciated. (You’ll be shocked at how simple this is!)

- As we have noted before, there are over 40 personal pronouns in this entire section of (:13-23). (personal pro. = *I, me, my, myself*)

- And (:15-17) here, account for the highest concentration of “I’s” in the entire section.

- In this 1st Proof we have: 10 “I’s” — (6 in :15 alone!)
1 “me”

- In the 2nd Proof we have: 13 “I’s”
5 “me’s”
4 “my’s”

- Most of those who have written on this passage of Romans usually have a very shallow understanding of what is going on here. And I say that because it is evident in that they usually either outright state, or at least imply that this is a difficult passage—made difficult because of all the uses of these “I’s.”

- But, as is most often the case with Bible scholars and Bible commentators, when they see difficulty, you are probably safe to assume just the opposite is the case—it’s really quite an easy passage to handle—but only if you’ve got (:13 and 14) down pat!

- Most of those who have written about this passage—and most of the footnotes in most of the “study Bibles” see this passage as setting forth a struggle or war or fight or strife between man’s 2 natures: the old Adamic nature, and the new nature acquired when he trusted the Lord Jesus Christ as his all-sufficient Savior. (see Schofield note, for example)

- I don't deny that a man's nature is in view here, but it is not at all done in either in that way, or in that context!

- What a man is (what Paul is) by nature is in play here, but that's not strictly what these "I's" are doing—they are not contrasting the 2 natures of man—and they are not to be taken as if some of them were "I, the new man" and "I, the old man."

- The conventional, shallow wisdom of the Bible scholars and Bible commentators would supposedly make this "easier to understand" by having you take the "I's" that talk about Paul in his old nature and substitute Paul's name before he was saved (though, strictly speaking, that's not true either) as "Saul of Tarsus" — and then for all the "I's" that speak of Paul's new nature after he was justified as "Paul the apostle."

- So (:15-17) would read something like this:

- "For that which I [Saul] do I [Paul] allow not: for what I [Paul] would, that do I [Saul] not; but what I [Paul] hate, that do I [Saul]. If then I [Saul] do that which I [Paul] would not, I consent unto the law [or will of God for me](???) that it is good. Now then it is no more I [Paul] that do it, but sin [Saul] that dwelleth in me."

-or:

- "For that which I [old nature] do I [new nature] allow not: for what I [new nature] hate, that do I [old nature]. If then I [old nature] do that which I [new nature] would not, I consent unto the law [or, will of God for me](???) that it is good. Now then it is no more I [new nature] that do it, but sin [old nature] that dwelleth in me."

- But while all this sounds good (?) or easier (?) or at least more scholarly, it really isn't at all what is going on here—and it fails to stay with the context!

- It fails to 1) Recognize that, contextually, what is being dealt with is a Christian attempting to put their sanctified position in Christ into effect UNDER THE LAW!

- and 2) Recognize that everything being said is controlled by what is sitting in (:13 and 14);

- and 3) Recognize that any honest reading of the passage never addresses the new nature at all !!!!

- Any honest dealing with this passage—one that keeps verses 13 and 14 in mind as the verses that control everything else that gets said—as you deal with this passage in light of that, my understanding is that the new nature of Paul, or man’s new nature as a Christian isn’t to be found directly anywhere in this entire passage!!!

- My understanding is that Paul is NOT talking about the “new nature” anywhere here at all!

- You really don’t get to that—or to put it Biblically, “*walking after the Spirit,*” until verse 1 of chapter 8.

(slowly) - And in the mean time, chapter 7, from verse 13 down through verse 25 (the end of the chapter) is strictly dealing with what (:14) set the stage for—and that’s to deal with proving the 2 components of corrective doctrine sitting in (:13b) — it’s dealing with what the *law* is trying to do because it is *spiritual*—therefore it’s trying to change you into a functionally alive, sin-restraining, fruit-unto-holiness-producing person “in Christ” - and the total inability of your flesh, being intrinsically weak or *carnal*, to ever be able to respond properly to that *law*!

- I don’t see the new nature being presented and discussed here, as much as it is really focusing upon what I am by nature—and that mixture of what I am by nature (*carnal*) with the law (being the *spiritual* thing that it is) always results in failure to put my sanctified position in Christ into effect, no matter how pure my motives, or how pure my intentions may be to function under that law.

- I always wind up functionally dead under the law!

- Truth of the matter is, if people would just let (:13), which is the beginning of this whole thing, **continue to HOLD SWAY** in their thinking as they go down through everything Paul says, they would never end up with the Saul/Paul concept, flesh/spirit concept, new nature/old nature concept, or any other ?? concept that they come up with!

- **Because (:13) won’t let you come up with anything like that.**

- (:13) tells you that the issue we’re going to deal with here is this misconception people have about the law’s ability—they think the law has the ability to give functional life—and it doesn’t have that ability!

- It's job, in connection with the concept of functional life, is 2-fold; and (just as we've already gone over in :13), it's to make it so that *sin might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good*; and secondly, *that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful*.

- Well, if that's the issue, why would the idea of a 'new nature' come in anyway???

- And if that's the issue, why would the idea of trying to contrast the old Adamic nature with the new nature ever come up???

- All those things are, granted, not so much totally foreign to the concept, but they are NOT 'in tune' with the concept (so to speak.)

- The idea here is the issue of the law and the issue of functional life, and dealing with the misconception that the law can provide functional life.

- And now we're at the point where Paul is now going to prove the reality of what he said in (:13).

- So that really makes it so that when you come to all these "I's" and personal pronouns that keep on coming up in all of these proofs, it makes it so that you don't have to come along and think,
 "Well, does one "I" mean one thing and the other
 "I" mean something else???"

- No. You come up with the issue that here's the apostle Paul, as the apostle Paul he is—as the justified, sanctified man that he is, trying to do the very thing that the misconception of (:13) would have a saint in this dispensation of grace doing if he continues to operate on that misconception!

- He's going to take that law and say, "This thing ought to give me functional life! Let me try to put my position in Christ into practice underneath this thing!"

- And what he'll end up with is the absolute frustration, and failure, and wretched man realization that Paul expresses in great detail here as he expresses the reality of the 2 things he said in (:13) being what the law is going to have happen to you if you're stupid enough to put yourself under it!!!

- Sin is going to *appear sin*, as the thing *that works death* (functional death) *in you*—and it's going to be *exceeding sinful* and you're not going to be able to do a thing about it!
- And that's what Paul now does in these 2 proofs (:15-17) & (:18-23).
- And the "I's" are not contrasting anything!
- And that makes the whole thing (all the personal pronouns in these proofs) - that makes it a very easy thing to handle and a very easy thing to understand and appreciate—simply staying with the context makes your Bible easy to understand!
- So let's look at the proper Biblical understanding of these "I's" - the better, easier to understand AV:
 - Since these "I's" aren't contrasting anything—**all of them are talking about the exact same thing!** (there's a breakthrough for you)
 - That is, there is **only one sense** to understand all the "I's" in the entire passage:
 - "**I**" = justified, sanctified Paul the apostle, *carnal*, inherently weak by nature, attempting to utilize the *spiritual* life-changing law to put my sanctified position in Christ into practice!
 - (Where all these Bible teachers and writers get off base; where they get all this Saul/Paul, new nature/old nature business is because they see *spiritual* and *carnal*, and they don't pay attention to the context, and they assume onto the text the words spiritual-ity and carnal-ity—they put an '-ity' on the end of these words in their thinking [because they think compartmentally] and wind up jumping to an erroneous [and disastrous] conclusion!)
 - Every **I** in these proofs is Paul the apostle, as he foolishly picks up that law and attempts to use it to functionally live unto God. (Showing every time that (:13) does exactly what it says it does.)
 - The "I's" are the experiential demonstration of the complete failure for functional life to be produced by the law!

- And it takes the “I’s” by the expressions Paul utilizes here to make that be the OBVIOUS thing that it needs to be, so that you end up at the end of (:25) saying, “Thank God I’m not under the law, but under grace!”
- And since the apostle Paul is our *example* and our *ensample* to follow—therefore what he expresses as true of himself, is just as true for you and for me in this present dispensation of grace.
 - That “I” therefore is the same for you as it is for Paul. And that means that each of those “I’s” can be taken as if it were speaking of you, personally.
 - Therefore you can put yourself in the picture—the “I” is you—if you attempt to do what Paul did—to put your sanctified position in Christ into practice by going under the law to do it.
 - You become the “I” — you are the justified, sanctified Christian, *carnal* and inherently weak by nature, attempting to utilize the *spiritual* life-changing law (demanding that you supply it the energy to do its job) and you try to utilize that law to put your sanctified position in Christ into practice.
- I say all this—and go over all these details—just to say that, just as it is with any presentation of information—if the premise will be allowed to hold sway throughout the entire argument, no one will get off track!
 - The whole reason why people, in any argument, or in any presentation of information end up getting off track, is because they will not let the premise that started the whole thing govern their thinking throughout it!
 - And Bible teachers are the worst offenders in connection with that!
 - They treat this as if, when you get to (:15) a brand new subject has opened up—and it hasn’t!
 - Granted, this is some kind of a “strife” (to quote Dr. Schofield) “under the law” - but it is not a strife of 2 natures!
 - Your ‘new nature’ isn’t being dealt with at all!

-
- The issue is just as Paul said it was back in (:14):
'*I'm carnal, sold under sin.*' - the issue is that the law comes along and calls upon your flesh to put it into practice, (to effectually make it work), and that's where the inability comes from.
 - And the law doesn't work with the 'new nature' at all—in fact the law doesn't even recognize the 'new nature!'
 - The law only recognizes the FLESH and its ABILITY!
 - And it calls upon it to put what the law says into practice and produce this functional life that you think you can produce, and the end result is that you end up being *sold under sin!*
 - Since the law calls upon your flesh—and that flesh is intrinsically weak in connection with sin—then you end up being *sold under sin*, not overpowering it and functionally living unto God!
 - And in connection with that, those 2 things that (:13) says, comes to pass—sin appears sin and **it** is what works functional death in you; and sin by that commandment in that law becomes exceeding sinful!
 - Remember once again—just as we said earlier—this is the last 'nail in the coffin' in connection with all the misunderstandings, misconceptions, objections, misassumptions, and erroneous thinking regarding the law.
 - And this is the one that, when you deal with the full-blown manifestation that Paul makes out of it by the 2 proofs he gives in connection with the law making it so that sin appears sin, working death in you, and it becomes exceeding sinful by that commandment: when you go through all the details of it, you're confronted with the HORROR—the horrible realization of your BIG MISTAKE and all your erroneous ideas and everything, in connection with that law, and the end result of the whole thing is a knee-buckling, knee-dropping, crushing blow where you end up on your knees (so to speak) thanking God with all that is in you that you're NOT underneath that thing!
 - (which is exactly what Paul does in :25)
 - Being *under grace* is the ONLY deliverance from this body of death—because there's no deliverance from it by the law!

- That law just comes along and confirms that's exactly what you're in: **A BODY OF DEATH!**

- (and you've got to honestly face that fact!)

- So, just to re-cap: Verses 13 & 14 will tell you exactly how you are to handle all these "I's" in both of the proofs—the 'new nature' isn't being discussed at all here—(though I know perfectly well that someone could come along and say, "Well doesn't Paul have a 'new nature' in this situation?") ... well, of course he does—but that's not the point and that's not the issue — and someone could say that what Paul is doing is trying to put his 'new nature' in Christ into practice, and that's perfectly true—but the "I's" and all the personal pronouns are NOT the issue of him contrasting his 'new nature' with something—it's the issue of him expressing the absolute failing struggle he has, to put who he is "in Christ" into practice successfully underneath that law—and the law is not designed to do it—**the law is not designed to give functional life to a carnal man**—the law, therefore, will not allow him to have functional life by using it, and that's what he demonstrates (in spades) in his own personal experience, as an expert witness in this case!

- Now, if we're clear on the issue of how to understand and appreciate all the "I's" and all these personal pronouns, we can begin to look at the proofs—and we'll look at the first one:

- Romans 7:15-17—1st Proof—proving: "*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;*"

- And at this point the apostle Paul takes the witness stand, (as it were), as both an expert witness and a material witness to provide the actual experience and personal evidence that what has been stated in the corrective doctrine is true.

- There are several different types of witnesses:

- "Expert Witness" = a witness who by virtue of education, profession, publication or experience, is believed to have special knowledge of his subject beyond that of the average person, sufficient that others may officially (and legally) rely upon his opinion.

- Paul is this kind of a witness by virtue of his expertise with the law (a highly educated Jewish Pharisee); and as a Christian apostle & Bible writer of 13 books.

- “Material Witness” = a witness whose testimony is both relevant to the matter at issue and required in order to resolve the matter.

- Paul is this kind of a witness by virtue of being our unique, distinct apostle for us, the members of the church, the body of Christ, in this dispensation of Gentile grace—as our ensample to follow.

- In other words, this isn’t just some guy off the street— just some average Christian—this is a ‘heavyweight’ witness—the chief-est witness of anyone who could be called!

- These proofs, therefore, contain solid evidence which will be indisputable, undeniable, and leave no shadow of a doubt as to the valid, absolute truth of the corrective doctrine in (:13).

- 1st Proof—proving that the law’s job is to make sin in my members *appear sin, working functional death in me*. (I’m functionally dead by nature!)

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.

- Notice that there are 3 verses to this proof—and my understanding is that it has 3 parts to it:

- (:15) = The material/expert witness testimony.
(Paul’s own personal experience under the law).
- (:16) = The result or determined outcome.
- (:17) = The conclusive indisputable proof.

- And the expert testimony of Paul’s own personal experience under that law has 3 parts to it:

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

- Keep in mind that what Paul is beginning to do in (:15) is to provide the experiential proof of what he's just said back in (:13) with respect to the first purpose of the law when it comes to the issue of functional life and functional death—*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;*

- He's going to prove that the issue in connection with functional life isn't something that he has intrinsic, by nature, resident in him; but rather, he's got functional death as something that is intrinsically resident in him by nature—because sin, really, is in control in his members.

- And the law is designed to prove that very thing.

- So Paul takes this law that he knows is *spiritual*, and with that erroneous thinking, he looks at that law and says, “This thing is *spiritual*, therefore it's going to work in my mind, and it's got motivating power, and it's designed to change me—it's got all these wonderful righteous commands and everything to it.”—so he picks that thing up and endeavors to operate upon what it all says and so forth—and then he makes the first statement of (:15)::

- 15 *For that which I do I allow not:*

- And the simple truth of this statement is that, “I end up doing things that I don't want to do!”

- I end up doing things that I don't want to permit to take place in my members and by my members.

- “*For*” - as we noted when we were talking about the double ‘for s’ of (:14 & 15) - this *for* is a *for* of further explanation and further amplification.

- “*For that which I do*” = what actually ends up happening in my own life—what I end up doing under that law. (**breaking it**)

- “*I allow not*” = “*allow*” (**ginw,skw** = to come to know; to perceive; to understand; and 10 other misc. ways it is used.)

- All of the other English translations say either, “I know not” or “I do not understand” - as if Paul didn't really know what he was doing! HA!

- As one commentator said, Paul “was like a little boy whose honest answer to why he did something wrong is, ‘I don’t know.’ A person’s actions are at the dictate of someone or something besides himself that he really does not understand and cannot explain.” BKC—pg.467

- It’s just like the scholars and commentators to attack Paul; to run him into the ground and denigrate him; to make him seem confused and ignorant—but the truth of the matter is, **they**, most likely, are confused and ignorant themselves—especially in what to do with Paul!

- But instead of bowing to the Greek words and Greek dictionaries and Greek lexicons and Greek rules of grammar (all of which are full of errors, biased toward some theological agenda, and unreliable) — what should be recognized (if you’re honest about it) is to realize that the word [ginosko] must have a meaning to it that, in this particular context, can mean “allow”!

- “allow” = coming from the Greek [ginosko], “to know” - you can see how it fits with the word *allow*—the word know can have a meaning where it implies the word allow—for example, one parent might come home and find their son finishing off the last cookie (the one you were saving for yourself) - and the Dad comes up to the Mom and, while holding the empty cookie box while little Johnny is still chomping on the last bite of cookie, the Dad says to the Mom, “Did you know about this?” — and the meaning is, “Did you *allow* this to happen? or “Did you permit this?”

- Granted, it is a rare or uncommon use of the word know, but nevertheless it is a bona fide use of the term!

- But in our context *allow* isn’t just a bona fide use of the word know, it is the most excellent way it could be translated IF you allow (no pun intended) if you allow the context of (:13 & 14) to hold sway in your thinking!

- The context actually demands the use of “allow”!

- And the reason *allow* is the most excellent word to be used here is because of something very important in both the context and in the shade of meaning that *allow* carries to make the proper impact in your thinking that should be made in regard to all that is going on in both the premise and in the proof!

- In the English, *allow* originally had a meaning of “to praise” - it then came to mean commend, sanction, or accept, to permit, as well as many other uses and definitions.
- But *allow* also falls into a category of terms that has a great bearing on our passage—for example, one of the derivatives of *allow* is our word *allowance*—and *allowance* is an **ac-knowledge-ment** or admission of something (i.e, a “knowing” [ginosko] of something); and more than that, when you’re talking about allowances you’re often times (at the root concept of it) talking about some kind of a CHANGE—for when you “leave room for allowances” you’re leaving room for change to take place.
- Therefore, (in keeping with the context of the passage), when Paul says, “For that which I do (breaking that law and sinning) I allow not (instead of that law bringing about a change in my life to be functionally alive unto God and produce fruit unto holiness—going under that law didn’t change me at all, because what did wind up happening is my sin didn’t get controlled, it just kept coming to the surface and appearing to me more clearly than ever before!): ...”
 - In other words, when Paul put himself under the law, with sin in control (so to speak) in his members—[and you’ve got to realize that sin is in control in your members, in your flesh] — Paul says, “I end up doing things that I don’t want to do, and that I don’t want to permit to take place in my members and by my members.”
 - But, of course, this is exactly what the law is designed to do, according to what Paul said about it back in (:13b) - to make sin *appear*, working *death* in him by that law (*that which is good.*) — and this is the experiential proof of it.
- Again, the proof here is the issue in connection with functional life, and that isn’t something that Paul has in him, intrinsically, by nature, resident within him.
- But rather, he’s got functional death as something that is intrinsically within him by nature.
- Because in your members—in your flesh, [just to put it this way for now] — really, sin is in control there, in that realm.

- (And the law is designed to prove that, once again).

- Then we get the next clause—which is the other side of the coin, so to speak.

- And Paul (as an expert, material witness) is giving both sides of the coin—one side is the first clause where he says, “What I don’t want to happen, does happen” — and then we have this next phrase “*for what I would, that do I not;*” where he says, “And what I desire to happen, never does happen!”

- By presenting it this way Paul fully expands on this first clause to give it the fullest understanding and appreciation.

15 *For that which I do* (I pick up that law which is spiritual and operate under it which only results in me producing sin) *I allow not* (I end up doing things that I don’t want to take place): *for what I would, that do I not;*

- “*would*” = the issue of desire or intention—a **hopeful prospect**.

- What Paul *would* do is that his desire or intention is to keep that law which is *spiritual* (change-promising) and produce my own functional life by controlling sin in my members and producing fruit unto holiness.

- But is that what actually happened??? NO.

- “*that do I not;*” - I don’t carry out my desire to produce functional life at all—I just end up sinning again! (my hopes are dashed!)

- And once again, sin has appeared sin working death in him!

- And then Paul caps it off with a statement that indicates the horrible and futile effects of being under the law and producing his own functional life by means of it—a graphic description of how miserable it is trying to live under that law which is *spiritual* appealing to me who is *carnal*.

“.... *but what I hate, that do I.*”

- That law comes along and declares what is a righteous thing and what is an unrighteous thing to do—and I hate that unrighteous thing, but that very unrighteous thing that I hate, that’s what I end up doing!

- And that, (in a nutshell), in (:15) is the experiential proof of the reality of what Paul has just said back in (:13) — functional death is what he possesses by nature — and there is something working in him that’s producing that functional death — but it’s not the law — it’s something else, entirely!

- And back in (:13) he said it was **sin** — and when you follow the rest of his experiential proof, and you get down to the end of (:17) and he concludes, that’s exactly what it is — sin in me!

- Now after he sets forth the experiential proof he gives the result or declared outcome:

16 If then (this is the logical conclusion or logical outcome of it) I do that which I would not (i.e., if I end up doing that which I don’t want to do or desire to do), I consent unto the law that it is good.

- “consent” = to agree together with—to assent or agree with the way the law which is spiritual works in a man which is carnal.

- The law’s NOT the problem at all—and if the law’s not the problem, the reason, then, for the functional death is NOT the law: it can’t be: it’s not possible for it to be the law that’s the cause for the functional death — **and that leaves ONLY one other thing**....

- The Conclusive Proof:

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

(And that’s exactly what I said back in vs. 13!)

- And this statement isn’t somehow saying that you’re not really responsible — that it’s really not my fault — it’s all sin’s fault, so I’m not to blame — or anything along those lines. (devil made me do it)

- In fact, if you get that, you evidently don’t have any capacity to either read or comprehend what you read.

- You’re failing to see how language can be used to talk about how you, yourself, are made up.

- Truth is, you’re suppose to see yourself as this person who has this other power still **resident** within your members—(that’s why he says that *sin “dwelleth” in me*) — sin is still just as powerful as it ever was (remember that sin wasn’t put to death, you were!)

- Now as we have gone through all of this 1st Proof that verifies the reality of the 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine (*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;*), we have been consistent with the context to leave all these “I’s” exactly the same.

- “I” = Paul the Christian apostle (justified unto eternal life), yet *carnal* (inherently weak), using the law to put his sanctified life in Christ into practice — with every pure, and good intention.

- “sin” = a greater power in its own right, residing in Paul’s members, that responded in kind to the law’s desire to produce change: it (sin) showed up instead of holiness, and instead of functional life, it worked functional death!

- You go under the law, and sin goes to work!

- 2nd Proof: (Proving: “... *that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*”)

- Things to keep in mind:

- Final Misunderstanding: “*Was then that which is good made death unto me?*” - I have some amount of functional life by nature, and only when that law comes around do I die functionally, right? *God forbid!* You are totally functionally dead by nature!

- The 2nd Component of Corrective Doctrine: “*that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.*”

- Every time I try to use the law to control sin in my life, sin always exceeds my power to control it—and it is the law’s job to give sin that power, (that greater power than I have to control it).

- The Stage-Setting Context: “*For we know that the law is spiritual* (gets into your head and motivates you to change), *but I am carnal* (inherently weak), *sold under sin.*”

- The “I’s”: Paul the justified, saved, Christian apostle—utilizing the law which is *spiritual* (it desires to change him by using Paul’s flesh, by using Paul’s own natural power, energy, or capacity), yet the “I” is Paul who is a man who is *carnal* or inherently weak by nature, and he’s utilizing that law to put his sanctified position in Christ into effect. (In truth, he’s trying to sanctify himself!)

- With all that in mind (which keeps you on track, contextually), Paul will now provide the expert/material testimony from his own personal life that will prove that every time he tried to use the law to control sin in his life, the law actually gave sin in his members greater power than he had by nature to control sin in his life.

- This proof consists of 6 verses—(:18-23).

- It's the most lengthy of the proofs—and that's because, since this component of corrective doctrine lies at the very root of all the erroneous thinking about the law—

(i.e., that you've got some measure of functional life in you; that you've got some measure of capacity or ability by nature to actually go under the law, and do it!) —

... this proof needs greater detail and greater scope to it because it is the one that the flesh (so to speak) will do its darnedest to hold on to!

- This proof is longer because this issue isn't exactly the same as the first one—it's going to take a little bit more to prove that the law makes it so that *sin by the commandment becomes exceeding sinful*. (And it takes vs. 18-23 to do that—especially vs. 21-23).

- (Therefore this proof has to be PAINFULLY OBVIOUS in order to root up all that horribly wrong thinking about living under the law!)

- (:18, 19, & 20) - are again, Paul's own personal testimony as the expert & material witness—as our ***ensample*** to follow.

- (:21, 22, & 23) - are the results of Paul's personal experience underneath that law and the full verification of the reality that the *God forbid* of (:13) and all it's corrective thinking really is the **truth**, beyond any shadow of a doubt.

- By him picking up and using that *commandment*, that *commandment operating in a carnal man gave* sin in his members greater capacity than he had to stop it—*sin by the commandment* became ***exceeding sinful!***

- These 3 vs. are the most important of all to this proof—because it's the precise terminology used in (:21-23) that IS the terminology that confirms the fact that sin has become ***exceeding sinful***.

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.

- First, let's just take up these 3 verses. And as we read through them you should be able to detect a couple of things right off the bat (so to speak).

- Does any of this have a 'familiar ring' to it? (especially vs. 19 & 20)

- It should. Because it does have some similarity to what Paul just said in his first proof up in (:15-17).

- But as you read it carefully, you should also notice that there is some new terminology brought up in this proof— "to will is present with me" - "how to perform" - and then later on in vs. 21-23 we have a whole bunch of new terminology.

- Well, that 'familiar ring' is there because you've got to remember that (:13) controls this whole passage—and we're only dealing with one (1) thing—it may take 2 components of corrective doctrine to fully root it out, but we're only talking about one thing: the erroneous thinking that you have some measure of functional life by nature.

- And (though I know you know this) you've got to let what Paul has said back in (:13) be the governor (so to speak) of all the vocabulary he's going to use when it comes to proving just how wrong that is.

- And that's why your vocabulary changes a bit here, and some further concepts get brought in, in connection with him describing his desire and his efforts and his intentions, and things along those lines.

- Because Paul is done proving the first of the 2 component parts to the corrective doctrine sitting in (:13), and now this 2nd issue of *sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful* now gets addressed.

(Go over this s-l-o-w-l-y!)

- And when it comes to proving the fact that that is exactly what takes place *under the law*, in a sense it's like Paul **re-visits** the thing he just said in (:15-17), but he does it by 'upping the ante' (so to speak) in connection with issue of **his desire; the strength of his will in connection with endeavoring to achieve it; and the degree of effort** and everything that he puts behind it; and the bottom-line issue is: **that no matter how hard he tries, he fails!**

- And he fails because the law is designed to show that **something else exceeds his own strength**—— and that “something else” is **sin!**

- In other words—sin's got a **stronger will**; its got **more powerful effort**; and it will win out in the end!

- And since that's what the 2nd issue in connection with the law showing that functional death is what we possess by nature and the reason for it being sin; since that's what the law is designed to do, as Paul sets forth the experiential proof of that, he uses the terminology that FITS that proof.

- And therefore he uses the terminology that describes the **strength of his will; the power of his efforts; and the degree of his determination**, and so forth — yet it all comes up short — because something else has got a **stronger will, more powerful effort, and a greater determination** than he has!

- And if you keep all that in mind, then **these subtle shifts he makes in the vocabulary, and the structuring of the phrases** that make up the sentences that constitute the proof — the reason why they're there is because of the nature of this proof — this proof is proving **that sin is more powerful than your own power** (than your own best efforts)!

- Because the truth of the matter is, if you have a categorical-type Bible study background, this is a prime place where you can easily get off track.

- Because this passage is full of terminology that conjures up all kinds of categories of doctrine: terms like “*will*”; “*the law of God*”; “*law in my members*”; “*law of my mind*”; “*the law of sin*”

-
- And if you're not careful, you'll be going off into all kinds of categories of the "will" - like categories of human volition; my will, God's will (chopping up God's will into a half-dozen different kinds of God's will) and so forth—and all that starts invading your thinking.
 - But none of that is what is in play here (so to speak). You've got to put all that out of your mind.
 - What is in play here, and what you are to be thinking when you confront this terminology is strictly what the context is driving at.
 - And in keeping with both the fundamental misunderstanding about the law, and the doctrine that is supposed to correct it — this terminology here is used to express Paul's strength of his will; the power of his efforts; and the degree of his determination.
 - It's a demonstration of your own, natural strength of will; power of effort; and degree of determination VS. the strength, power, and determination of sin when you put yourself *under the law*.
 - And the strength, power, and determination of sin by that law will always exceed your strength, power, and determination to restrain it under that law. (And that's exactly what vs.13 said in the first place).
 - So as we approach (:18-20), it would not be altogether uncommon or unusual to find that there is some familiar expressions or that part of it is similar sounding to what we just covered in the 1st Proof of (:15-17).
 - Because (:13) does link them together, therefore they are not divorced from one another—they don't each happen in a vacuum, so to speak. (They're not greatly diverse).
 - Now let's look at (:18) - but before we do, let's realize that since none of this does happen in a vacuum, and since this is all connected as a single argument, let's just remind ourselves what has just been proven:
 - We have proved the 1st Component of Corrective Doctrine to be true— "*But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good;*" - we've proven that in (:15-17) - we proved that sin in my members is what makes me functionally dead, and it is the law's job to bring that to my full attention.

- But that's not quite good enough to fully root out the erroneous thinking—it's going to have to be 'ratcheted up a notch' - it's going to have to be intensified to another degree in order to fully dismiss for good that kind of erroneous thinking.

- But that 1st Proof **did** leave us with some corrective thinking—and part of that correct thinking we now have is something in connection with how we see ourselves.

- In other words, Paul can only say what he does in (:18) in light of what has been said in the previous proof—and that proof (if it has been properly understood and appreciated) has generated the very thing Paul says about himself in the opening statement of this 2nd Proof.

18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing:

- (By the way, that's the proper understanding of the issue of "self-esteem"!)

- "For I know" = (oi;da) "For I know full well" or "I perfectly know"

- This is going to work as a kind of stage-setting statement in its own right.

- In fact, the truth of the matter is that this first clause is absolutely critical and essential to the entire proof—and if you don't see **why** this can be stated based upon the previous information, then you've failed to have the 1st Proof proven in your thinking—and you'll fail to fully grasp what this final proof is all about—you'll fail to fully benefit from its corrective doctrine!

- What Paul is about to say can now be said to be true in light of fully grasping what was covered in the 1st Proof, as well as all that has been dealt with since Romans 6:1.

- "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,)"

- Paul has fully grasped the 1st Proof and the corrective doc.,

-
- But even in the face of all the correction to a person's thinking about being *under the law*—because of the way what you are by nature is, a person could still harbor one more “peep” to their argument—one more tiny spark of life might remain in their thinking—and this is going to extinguish that last remaining spark—this will shut the mouth with not one ‘peep’ left to be said about it.
 - “*For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,)*
 - “*flesh*” (σα,ρξ) = either flesh or carnal.
 - It is a very context sensitive term—and while it is used only 1 of 2 ways in the Bible, its meaning is always determined by the context in which it is used.
 - *Flesh* can be used, for instance, in speaking of your actual, literal *flesh*, i.e., the material substance of your physical body; or it can be used to speak of your descendants (Rom. 1:3); or it can be used to speak of the life of mankind in general (Rom. 3:20); and so forth.
 - And one of the most common ways in which *flesh* is utilized in the Bible is to refer to your natural, human nature consisting of all the sensual appetites and inclinations (or trends) that are in opposition to and antagonistic to the things of the Spirit—the depraved nature of man. The natural, sinful trends you have by virtue of being born “in Adam.”
 - Therefore there is no real way to standardize the term and make it fit into only one meaning—again, the context will tell you how to understand it.
 - Just as we have been taught throughout the doctrine of our godly sanctification—all the way back from Romans 6:1—while we can talk about our *flesh* as our fallen, natural, Adamic nature or sinful nature, that is really too broad for what is being driven at here.
 - Granted, that is the general idea, but it is too general—because the context has something more specific in mind about your *flesh*.
 - And we learned what that specific issue was when we had our minds set properly by the stage-setting verse (:14) — and that is that we are carnal (sarkikos) — we are inherently **weak** by nature—and it is our weak *flesh* that the law appeals to for its working power!

18 *For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing:*

- “*dwelleth*” (oivke,w = to be at home; to reside or be resident; to dwell— AV = dwell 9; 9x)

- “*no good thing*” (ouvk avgaqo,j)

- The “*good thing*” would be any kind of, or any amount of natural righteousness or natural holiness or natural functional life—some kind of natural functional life that can produce ‘goodness’ or *fruit unto holiness* that God can accept and that can be pleasing in God’s sight.

- This is the honest understanding and appreciation that has been gained by the effectual working of all of the objections, misconceptions, misunderstandings, and erroneous thinking being attacked, dealt with and corrected/dismissed—and especially the understanding and appreciation of the effectual working of the 1st Component of corrective doctrine which we just encountered, and its corresponding Proof contained in (:15-17) that verified the reality of that 1st Component of corrective doctrine.

- “*For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing:*” — that’s conceded, that’s the acknowledged reality of what I really am by nature.

- But the point is, that (since it is our apostle as our ensample to follow), the point is that you understand and appreciate that in your flesh *dwelleth no good thing*—that is, there is **nothing** in you, by nature, that that law can appeal to because sin dwells in your members—you’re *carnal, inherently weak by nature*.

- But now (with that as a base of understanding), that issue now has to get **INTENSIFIED!**

- Because you might scramble around and say, “Well, ok, I’m inherently weak by nature—but really that isn’t all that bad, is it? After all, if something is ‘weak,’ doesn’t that *imply* that it could be made strong? — Couldn’t my natural weakness be rehabilitated? — Can’t I get better? — With the right kind of exercise or therapy or education or with the right environment (sign a pledge card, join the church, come forward and dedicateetc., etc., etc.)????”

- Maybe the problem is a problem **of the degree of my determination**, or the degree of my effort, or the strength of my willpower???

- Personally, I like the word “grit” - because it has the idea of an indomitable spirit.

- And that’s what this final proof is going to be all about— it’s about my “will” - my grit, my determined effort, my willpower — and that’s why it’s the final issue to deal with, because it is the basest of all issues when it comes to dealing with living *under the law*.

- And if you can demonstrate that you are not only inherently weak by nature, but that weakness can’t be overcome by sheer grit, determination, effort, or willpower, even if it has gone through some kind of restoring, reforming, rehabilitating process — if you take away a man’s capacity and ability to do a thing that’s one thing—(but even in that condition he may still be able to rise up and win [such as the South in the first part of the Civil War]); but if you also take away his willpower — then, and only then (in a fight such as this—or in a war such as this), then you’ve got him beat—you’ve completely defeated him—or as they say in the military it is a decisive defeat (i.e., beyond doubt).

- He’s now your captive—he’s completely under your dominion, your control and command—and if he still fights on, it’s so ridiculous that he’s looked on as being (not just stupid), he’s insane!

- He fits the definition of insanity—often attributed to Albert Einstein or Ben Franklin, or whoever: “Insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.”

- And that’s why this issue is the issue of *sin by the commandment becoming exceeding sinful* — that commandment is going to give sin greater strength of will; power of efforts; and degree of determination than your natural strength of will; power of efforts; and degree of determination—and it will do it every time, without exception!

- And by the time you’re finished with this, if you still desire to live *under the law* rather than *under grace*, you’re not just mistaken, you’re nuts!

- And with that colon at the end of the clause—“*For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: ...*” — you need to pause there long enough so that the full impact and full benefit is made on your inner man as to the truth of that statement— a truth based upon all that has been previously said.

- In your *flesh* dwells *no good thing*—nothing *good* resides in your flesh—for the truth of the matter is that sin still resides in your flesh (in your members) — there is no natural goodness, natural capacity, natural strength, natural righteousness or natural holiness that is acceptable in God’s eyes—there is only weakness and sin and functional death in your flesh by nature. (*I am carnal, sold under sin*)

- The “*good thing*” issue is the issue of anything residing in you by nature that the law can appeal to, can join up with, can connect with, in order to put that law into practice in such a way that it will restrain sin, produce fruit unto holiness, and give you functional life in God’s eyes.

- And this 2nd Proof begins with an acknowledgement of what the 1st Proof proved—that *sin might appear sin, working death in me by that law*—and that’s now admitted to be the truth of the matter.

- But that has to now get intensified because it still hasn’t completely dealt with the issue of **why** someone would ever think that they had some degree of natural, functional life—and the final issue has to do with their willpower, their strength of effort, or their degree of determination—and that’s what gets presented in the final clause of (:18).

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.

- “*for to will is present with me;*”

- “*to will*” (Pres. Act. Infin. **qe,lw** = to will or desire; to have in mind; to intend.)

- Again, if you have a systematic, categorical approach to Bible study, it is a prime example of how easily you can get off track — because the tendency is to stop and think about all the categories of the “will” - doctrine of volition; God’s will in half a dozen different categories and so forth.

- But if you pay close attention to what Paul says, he doesn't deal with the "will" that way—in fact if that's what he had in mind, he would have said, "for MY will is present with me" — but that's not what he said—he said, "for TO will is present with me" - and by saying it that way, the issue is not the categorical issue of my volition, it is the issue of the **degree of my will**— i.e., my will-power—the strength of my will, or the power of my efforts, or the degree of my determination!

- This is NOT dealing with volition, per se, the word "to" tells you that—what is in view here is the effort or degree of will—that's why it's "*for to will*" and not "for my will"!

- This is also why all the "would's" are used in (:19, 20, 21)!

- And that's the BIG ISSUE now — that's the final issue because that lies at the core of any person's thinking who rejects God's J-ness and grace, and opts instead to produce their own sanctification by the performance system of the law!

- And that's also in perfect accordance with what is getting proved here — *that sin, by the commandment might become exceeding sinful* — that no matter how hard I try, sin by that commandment always exceeds my strength of will, power of efforts, and degree of determination to stop sin and do good.

- "*for to will is present with me;*" — in other words, Paul is saying, "I have all this desire, determination, willpower, and powerful effort to pick up that commandment and do it—I'm not just casual in my effort, but I'm enthusiastic, I'm deadly serious; I'm dedicated to put every last ounce of my effort and force of my willpower behind my intentions to produce functional life under that commandment!"

- And just as he's got all that determination and strength of his efforts and willpower all cranked up — the horror of his carnal, weak flesh comes crashing down upon him:

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.***

- "*but how to perform*" — "*perform*" is another one of those words all the modern English translations like to change. Yet again proving that they are scarcely paying any attention to the Greek, and paying no attention at all to the context!

- “*perform*” (Pres. Mid. Infin. *katerga,zomai* = to accomplish, achieve, work out, to perform)
- Of all the ways this could be translated, *perform* is the most excellent of all due to the nature of the context being the law and your **degree of determination** to operate underneath it!
- In other words, the whole idea is a performance system (the law) vs. a grace system!
- The context is specifically dealing with the issue of one’s own strength of will, power of efforts, and degree of determination; and in keeping with that, *perform* is the most excellent term to use, and here’s why:
 - In the English, *perform* means to **form thoroughly**, to accomplish entirely, to achieve completely; to carry through to completion, to finish, to perfect.
 - What is *performed* is carried through to its end; and we also use *perform* when we are talking about a particular **means** to bring about the end result—and that means here is the law. You *perform* according to a specific rule or law.
 - But even more in keeping with our context, what is *performed* is done so by very specific efforts! [skills or talents] —— (And that’s the shade of meaning this context demands—the intensity of the efforts made by you under the law!)
- so we have: “.... *for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.*”
 - “*that which is good*” = the keeping of the law; the production of functional life under that law.
 - “*I find not*” = *find* is also carefully chosen to keep with our context because it generates in our thinking that there has been some kind of diligent searching going on—a redoubling of our efforts—for you would only say “*I find not*” if you have put forth real effort, intense searching—therefore all the terminology in this verse just spotlights all the more the intensity and degree of efforts that has gone into this.

- Each word in (:18) has been carefully chosen and crafted so that it will properly generate in your thinking the issue of willpower, strength of efforts, and degree of determination—a serious undertaking has gone on here to attempt to produce sanctification and functional life by that commandment!

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.

- “*For the good that I would I do not.*”

- This, again, is a clause that needs to be paused at to gain the proper degree of benefit and importance.

- “*For* (further explanation of vs.18) *the good* (the functional life and fruit unto holiness) *that I would* (that I desire so intensely to do) *I do not* (I don’t do):

- (That functional life and it’s fruit unto holiness that I so desire to do, I don’t do!)

- “*... but the evil which I would not, that I do.*”

- Notice that in the 1st Proof Paul said something similar to this—but notice the subtle change in terminology:

(:15)— “*...for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.*”

- We have a change in the terminology: from *hate* to *evil*.

- This also goes along with how intensified this last issue is.

- My understanding is that this subtle shift in terminology takes place because it is the terminology that fits what he’s proving. And since what he’s proving is *that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful*, Paul is proving this intensification of sin by the commandment.

- And so, in connection with that, Paul’s own performance in his use of the law became more intense, and sin not only matched his intensity, but exceeded it, and demonstrated its greater power, greater strength, and so forth, than he had.

- And so, because of that, Paul doesn't say, "but the sin which I would not, that I do." or "but the thing I hate doing is what I wind up doing" — even though all that is perfectly true, it isn't good enough to fully generate in your thinking all this **heightened degree** to which this fight has been **escalated!** **THIS IS WAR!**

- This kind of terminology indicates that a further intensified response took place on Paul's part as he endeavored to utilize that law—and a further response took place on sin's part as it responded to his further use of that law.

- And what ended up happening was that, just as God designed the law to show: sin became *exceeding sinful*, and you were shown to have no power whatsoever against it!

- And you were shown, therefore, that you could do nothing about your functional deadness!!!

- And it was the law's job to do that, and it did it.
(And that's what he goes on to say in the next verse).

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

- "Now if" (1st Class condition—if, and it's true)

- "I do that I would not" (or I do the very thing I so intently desire not to do—instead of producing functional life and fruit unto holiness by the law [by the commandment], I wind up producing even greater sin, badness, and wickedness than ever before—I wind up, in this intensified struggle, producing not just sin, but EVIL [*evil* is the graphic term used to indicate the very antithesis of 'good' in every sense! Evil encompasses all badness and wickedness.])

- "it is no more I that do it," (I, Paul the justified believer trying to sanctify myself by the law—I, Paul, with every sincere, ardent, vehement desire to produce functional life by the commandment, with every good intention.)

- "but sin that dwelleth in me." (this other power of sin resident in my members beat me—it doesn't just *appear* to my full attention, but now in this intensified effort on my part, it intensified its power and strength by that commandment, and it exceeded me—no matter how hard I tried, it always won—I never came close to functional life!)

- While it is fully appropriate to state “*it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me*” in the 1st Proof (:17), and in this 2nd Proof, it needs to be understood that it is not supporting quite the same argument.

- It has to be stated in both proofs because even though they are not supporting quite the same argument, they are correcting the same erroneous thinking—both proofs are correcting the thinking that I’m functionally alive, but it’s that darned law that comes along and puts my functional life to death — wrong — *God forbid* —for in both cases (in the case of the law doing its job to make sin *appear sin working death in me*; and in the case of sin *by the commandment becoming exceeding sinful*), in both cases the law is NOT the problem, the law is NOT to blame—the problem is sin in my members, and I am that *carnal*, inherently weak person, and when I go under that law, it just does what it is supposed to do in any *carnal* man—and in the 1st place, it makes sin *appear*, working functional death in me; and in the 2nd place, it makes sin in my members become exceeding sinful!

- So in accordance with the 2nd Component of corr/doc, and in accordance with the proof (or verified reality of it), Paul ‘upped the ante,’ (so to speak), in his own use of the law and in his own expressiveness against sin in his members, and that’s what the terminology in (:18-20) in particular demonstrates and relates.

- And on the flip-side it demonstrates and relates that sin by that commandment matched Paul’s intensification, **and fully exceeded it.**

- And then he concludes it in (:21-23).

- Conclusion of the Proof:

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

- “*I find them a law*” - Now, before you go off track trying to categorize all these laws that are going to get mentioned, as if a categorical understanding is what is needed for this to be understood properly, that won’t work, because invariably it will, somewhere along the line, stray from the context—which is the problem with much of categorical Bible teaching—even homiletical-type Bible teaching—it always goes astray of the context or injects something extra in the context.

- (And you know it goes astray of the context if you start bouncing all over the Bible with a verse here and a verse there just to give your categorical outline some bulk!)

- Homiletics is nothing more than making the Bible fit your outline (usually a rhyming outline), not allowing the Bible to effectually work in your inner man, even if it ruins your rhyming outline!

- 21 *I find then a law*

- When Paul uses this expression, he's using it to conclude what has been happening in his own personal experience when he put himself under God's law (or the Law of Moses).

- He's using the term law in its basic sense of a rule imposed by authority—not so much as “divine law” - but more in the sense of a scientific law—that is, a law because it has a specific situation that can bring certain ingredients together and it can be duplicated over and over again, it can be tested, and every time it is tested, it produced the exact same results.

- And once an experiment can be duplicated exactly every time and tested over and over again—and if the outcome never varies, then you can call it a “law” - much like Boyle's law or Kepler's laws or Charles's law, etc.

- In other words, we can reproduce this 100 times, and you're going to get the same result 100 times—without exception to the rule.

- Well, now, it's no longer a 'rule' it can safely be considered a law.

- This is the *law* of the law—this is the law of being under the law, and not under grace. **This is Paul's law.** or Grace's law.

- And, just by sheer logic, Paul couldn't make this statement in (:13) in the stating of the corrective doctrine—because in order to state a law, it must be based upon a great deal of research, testing, and above all, PROOF! (a great deal has to go into something to get called “a law”)!

- And that's also why you have Paul saying that he 'found' this law.

- He says, “*I find then a law*” — and when a law is “found” it’s been found to be such only after a proof has been substantiated!

- And that’s exactly what Paul’s done here.

- And, again, you were told, back in (:13) that there are 2 things to be proved, and therefore when those 2 things are proved, then a *law* can be stated about “the law.”

- So the “*law*” that Paul is referring to here in (:21) is the particular phenomena that always occurs when the certain conditions of a justified believer (*carnal* and inherently weak) tries to sanctify himself under the law of Moses—when a justified Christian takes the *commandment* and tries to produce righteousness or goodness with it: and this *law* states *that sin by the commandment becomes exceeding sinful* — or to put it as Paul states it in (:21):

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

- “*when I would do good*” - that is, when I bring the full intensity of the strength of my will, and the power of my efforts, and the degree of my desire to bear upon the keeping of the commandment so that I can produce righteousness and functional life, then

- “*evil is present with me.*” - and again, *evil* is the descriptive term to indicate that, while it is sin, it is sin in its full-blown form or in its ‘exceeding-ness’—it indicates that while Paul has intensified his efforts, so has *sin by the commandment*—it now has a heightened degree of fight to it—it has now escalated its power in direct proportion to my own heightened efforts to produce good by it!

- All Paul has to say is this one term: “*evil*” or one phrase: “*evil is present with me*” — because he’s already proven that that evil is bigger, badder, greater in strength of will, more powerful in its efforts, and has greater degree of determination that he has.

- So now all he has to say is: *evil is present with me.*

- And then in (:22-23) he’s going to further expand that statement to embrace all of the necessary issues that went in to his finding of this *law*.

- And he’s going to give us a perfect summary description of exactly how that law operates just to expel any shadow of a doubt about *sin by the commandment becoming exceeding sinful*—sin always exceeds his willpower.

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

- “For” (further amplification of this *law* of (:21) — that, *when I do good, evil is present with me.*)
- to - “I delight” (Pres.Mid.Ind. **sunh,domai** = to rejoice together with; take pleasure in; to enjoy; to delight in; — it has the idea of rejoicing or delighting together with one’s self or inwardly)
 - This is the one and only time in the NT where this term occurs (in both Greek and English) — so that, in itself, should make you take special notice of it!
 - Most often, the common way in which *delight* is understood, and the most common way it is used is to express great pleasure in something— as an intensified form of joy or happiness. (But that is NOT the context in which it is used here—at least, not exactly).
 - For sure, the issue of an intensification or a heightened degree of effort, will, and determination is the big issue here, and I recognize that to be perfectly true;
 - But delight doesn’t just indicate an intense joy or pleasure.
 - And the context indicates that intense joy or pleasure is not all it’s after in the use of this new terminology.
 - My understanding is that what we’re after here is something found in the shade of meaning that *delight* carries with it—and a meaning that, (even though it is still used this way today), it is a meaning that is less commonly used today because *delight*, like so many English words, gets narrowed down to nearly one meaning—and other meanings never get considered.
- English: *delight* has a basic, root concept that not only embraces the issue of a high degree of intensity, but at its root meaning also brings along another very important issue to this particular context.
- And since this whole passage deals with terminology at its basic, most fundamental, radical-root concept, *delight* is no exception.

-
- What I'm specifically after might be easier to grasp with another English word that is very similar to *delight*—in fact it is a derivative of the word *delight*— example: if you go to a party—in fact, a very fancy party—and there are all kinds of specialized foods and appetizers and hors d'oeuvres and so forth, these specialty foods are often called a derivative of the word *delight*: they're called delicacies—which, again, is something (especially food) that is highly pleasing to your taste—but what I'm after is this: if you walked into that party, (outside of your sense of smell), how do you know where all the delicacies are? ? ?
 - A: Where all the people are gathered!
 - And that's what I'm after—that's the basic, fundamental issue in a delicacy or in anything that is described as you *delighting* in it: and that issue is that when something *delights* you, it first of all, and most fundamentally of all, **it is appealing to you—it attracts you**—it aroused your interest.
 - I realize this is easier to see in the word *delight* in its noun form; but it is still the fundamental concept even in its verbal form.
 - For when you *delight* in something, you first and foremost are highly attracted to it—and *delight* comes from the Latin *delecto*, meaning to attract, allure, charm, please, delight.
 - The fundamental concept in *delight* is that **it allures you**—it signifies **something that allures your mind!**
 - Therefore when Paul says, “*For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:*” all of this powerfully graphic terminology is designed to bring all the elements of the **hopeful promise of being under the law**—but not just any old law—“*the law of God*” — that's the Mosaic Law, it brings all that together.
 - “*the law of God*” of (:22) is the law God gave to Moses at Mt. Sinai.
 - And Paul says that he *delights* in it *after the inward man*—well, of course he does—and so should you!
 - After all, that law is holy, just, and good. And it is the very standard of God's own Righteousness—and if ever justification and sanctification could be produced by a man, the perfect keeping of that law would produce it.

- “*delight*” describes all of the powerful attractiveness of the law to make its appeal to your mind—(which is why you have to have :14 down pat to begin with [*the law is spiritual*—it works in your mind])

- *Delighting in the law of God after the inward man* is just recognizing that that’s exactly how the law is supposed to operate—it’s designed to get into your head!

- And you have all this hopeful prospect of producing sanctified, functional life on your own.

- And that hopeful prospect of functionally living unto God and brining forth fruit unto holiness is supposed to *delight* you—it’s supposed to bring you great pleasure and joy and enjoyment and everything like that.

- And more than that, you’re not just approaching it casually, but seriously—with every last ounce of your willpower, with the greatest effort you can bring forth, and with the highest possible degree of determination.

- And “*the law of God*” does that to your “*inward man*” — that’s why I have told you so often that you (your *inward man*) will go after the law system like metal after a magnet!

- (:22) describes Paul as that justified believer in Christ who is trying to sanctify himself by that law—and it holds out to him — or rather it makes its appeal to his mind (his inward man) to pick it up and operate under it.

- And since you are a justified person, but still in a body of corruption with sin in its members—since you are *carnal*, by nature—every person has a natural desire, a natural attraction or allurement to *the law of God*. (you WANT to change!)

- But with all its hopeful prospects, you have to be taught that you can never produce anything under that law that you so delight in, but sin, failure, and functional death! (you have to RECKON it to be so!)

- (:22) just substantiates the proven fact and the reality that even in this final component of corrective doctrine and the proven reality of it—there is nothing wrong with the law at all—that *commandment* is *holy, just and good*—the problem is not the law, the problem is you!

- Now, once you have come this far in the corrective doctrine, and through this conclusion to the matter—and once (:22) is properly understood and appreciated (“*For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:*”)—and after you have paused at the colon so that it makes the proper impact it is supposed to make on your thinking—at this point you can now come along and condense all that into a more compact (we’ll say) phrase that will encompass all the doctrinal information we have covered so far—it sets the stage (so to speak) for specific elements and concepts of the information we’ve covered so far to get condensed into a new phrase that will be utilized by Paul in the next verse.

- It can now be called “*the law of my mind.*”

- But you’ve got to remember that even though new terminology gets introduced here—this is a conclusion of the entire misunderstanding about the law in connection with sin, as well as a conclusion of the corrective doctrine & how it’s designed to straighten out all that erroneous thinking — so even though you get new terminology, you do not get any new concepts or new issues or new doctrine here!

- (There’s no new category of doctrine here!)

- This is simple—and it is nothing new—it’s just that you now have done what any good conclusion does—especially one that is concluding a large body of information and a body of information that had extensive proofs to it.

- And once you have proven the coming together of specific elements and conditions that produce the exact same outcome every time they are brought together—then you can safely determine that they are “*laws*” — so it’s only natural to call them what they are because that, too, has an impact to make on your thinking. (These are unchanging laws and you can’t do one thing to change them!)

- And what you’ve got is simply 3 ‘laws’ being mentioned—and they’re mentions or concluded as ‘laws’ because that’s exactly what the proofs proved.

- So you’ve got:

- 1) “*the law of God*”
- 2) the “*law of sin in my members*”
- 3) “*the law of my mind*”

- The truth of the matter is, “Paul’s Law” is actually the operation of 3 laws with a single, indisputable outcome:

- (:22) gives you the 1st one—and the main one, the ‘brass ring’ (so to speak), because it is the one that, if it is fully complied with, will produce the thing that Paul is after—it will produce functional life.

- 1st Law: “*the law of God*” = the Law of Moses, the Mosaic Law.

- Now (:23) comes in—and remember this is simply a summary conclusion of the corrective doctrine we have already covered (along with its proof).

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.

- Don’t get off track because it seems difficult or confusing—it’s not!

- Just take it piece by piece, and in light of the doctrine we’ve already covered, it should all fall neatly into place.

- “***But I see another*** (e[teroj = another of a different kind [a;lloj = another of the same kind]) ***law in my members,***”

= Simply put, this first phrase of (:23) is Paul simply describing the “law” he mentioned in (:21—*when I would do good, evil is present with me*).

- And this *law in my members* is just the shorter version of it—the longer version will get stated at the end of the verse.

- The “*law in my members*” and “*the law of sin which is in my members*” **is the exact same thing!**

- So there’s 1) *The Law of God*—which holds out the hopeful prospect of self-produced functional life.
(The goal: The prize!)

- But Paul says, that “*I see another law in my members*” - and before he gives the descriptive expression of it at the end of the verse, he is going to tell us what that “*law in my members*” is doing.

- “*warring against the law of my mind*,”

- “*warring against*” (Pres.Mid.Part. *avntistrateu, omai* = to make a military expedition, to take the battlefield; to make war against) - NT 1x only.

- This is the kind of needful, graphic terminology that can now be stated at the end of the proofs—and when you’re talking about warfare, someone’s going to lose and lose big—either someone’s going to die, or someone’s going to get captured and therefore come under the dominion of the other!

- “*the law of my mind*,” = Paul’s description of his *inward man* of (:22).

- The *law of my mind* is what I mind to do with that law (*commandment*).

- It’s Paul (or me or you) as a justified believer trying to sanctify myself—I see that law as spiritual—it wants to get into my *mind* and motive me to change—and I *delight* in that law in my *mind*—I’m attracted to it, I’m allured by it, and the hopeful prospect of keeping it is the prospect of me producing functional life on my own.

- The *law of my mind* is all of that along with my own willpower, my own strength of efforts, and my highest degree of determination to keep its commandments perfectly—that’s *the law of my mind*.

- It is what I mind to do underneath that law!

- But along with this sincere, pure, determined effort to get under this *spiritual law of God* that I so *delight* in—along with that *law of my mind* is this other *law*—and this other *law* is *in my members*—and this *law in my members* is engaged in a full-blown war with *the law of my mind*.

- And since it is a law *which is in my members*—that means that it is a law that is in my **flesh**—and my flesh is *carnal*, **inherently weak!**

- And when a war is like this—when the odds are stacked against you in this way—what do you think the outcome will be? And it will be the same outcome every time you go into battle — you will lose every time out—no matter how hard you try, you’ll lose every time!

- And what I've come to find out is that not only am I engaged in a war between *the law of my mind* and *the law in my members*, but that "law of God" that I so want to keep and that I so *delight* in, that very "law of God" **is working with the side** that is fighting against me!!!

- It's giving *the law in my members* greater war power than I have to fight against it!

- This is horrible—this is about as bad as it can get!

- And notice that in this war—the enemy's strategy isn't to kill the *law of my mind*—because it needs it—if it killed it, it would destroy itself in the process because this whole war is being waged in you—so all it needs to do is to bring the *law of your mind* under its control, under its **dominion**—and that's exactly what takes place—that's all that is necessary for the final outcome to be your ongoing functional death.

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 bringing me into captivity*" (aivcmalwti,zw = to lead away captive; to bring under subjection and dominion)

- When you're brought *into captivity* in a time of war, you've become a Prisoner Of War: POW!

- But while that POW concept is a powerful one, and one that is in keeping with this context—that's not what Paul says—he says that you are brought into *captivity*—and that's what you have to see—you have gotten beat in this war, and as a captive of the war, you have been brought under the power, the subjection, and the dominion of another!

- In this condition, someone or something other than God and God's laws are in dominion over you—are lord over you—are master of you!

- And horror of horrors, you're hit right between the eyes (so to speak) with your captor: "the law of sin which is in my members."

- **Sin** in my members: the very thing I was trying so hard to avoid!

- And Paul waits until right at this point to amplify the terminology of the “*law in my members*” to include the 2 words that are designed to be of such a devastating nature that it just crushes you into the ground!
- It’s not merely the “*law in my members*” (my flesh) - but it’s:
- “... and bringing me into captivity to the law **of sin** which is in my members.”
- And this does several things all at once:
 - It tells you that there is nothing wrong with the law at all: it is holy, just, and good.
 - It tells you that the problem is you—it is what you are by nature—and by nature you are functionally dead unto God!
 - And it takes you right back to Romans 6:14 and tells you that what was said there is indisputably true: under the law sin is in dominion over you—and you are not under the law, you are under grace!
- The “*law of sin which is in my members*” is the never changing rule of what you are by nature—you are carnal, sold under sin—and that “*law of God*” appeals to your *members* (to your flesh) to supply the energy and power for it to go into operation—and what does it find? It finds weakness and sin. And that law is designed to give sin in your members more power, greater strength, and longer lasting determination than anything you could ever muster!
- The “*law of sin which is in my members*” is the hard-core, fully proven, almost scientifically proven fact that that *law of sin in my members*, when it gets underneath *the law of God*—that sin *in my members* is going to **exceed** anything that’s over there in *the law of my mind*—sin by the commandment is going to *exceed* my mind to try to produce any kind of righteousness at all!
- It’s all just a vicious cycle that is going to continually put me to functional death — AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, I CANNOT DO ONE SINGLE THING ABOUT IT, MYSELF!!!
- And the bottom line is this: *SIN BY THE COMMANDMENT* has become *EXCEEDING SINFUL*—all the components of corrective doctrine have been stated and proven—the erroneous thinking is dismissed: **CASE CLOSED!!!**

- And by the time you get to the end of (:23), you're a finished, beaten, defeated, captive!
- And if the effectual working of this passage does its job, you should be able to say exactly what the apostle Paul says in the next verse.
- But this case is presented in such a way, proven in such a way, and concluded in such a way that by the time you get to the end of it, if there is anybody who is left standing at the end of it, they don't have a single breath in their body to utter another word—words are ended—the argument is over—and every mouth is shut who could ever say that we are to put our sanctified life in Christ into practice underneath the law!
 - This case has literally sucked the life out of that position!
 - Because it is a position, not of life—but of DEATH!
- And that's exactly what Romans 6:14-7:23 is designed to do.
- Therefore, if you stand in that position of trying to put your sanctified life into practice under the law—you end up just where Paul ended up in (:24).
- Now we have the Final Conclusion or Final Statement of the Proper Understanding of being *not under the law, but under grace*:

24 *O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?*

- This is a powerful, highly emotionally charged, forceful statement, ... it's a cry, almost a wail—the reality of it all has come home—all the hopeful prospect has come crashing down on Paul—the horror of trying to live under the law in this dispensation of grace is now real to him—and he expresses it.
- “*O wretched man that I am!*” - the issue of being *wretched* is the issue of being in a state of misery, - it is one of the most intensified terms for unhappiness—but more than that, it is a term that expresses that you are cast away in that condition, you are abandoned—*wretched* is the most extreme degree of misery—and it is reserved for a context in which you are talking about, NOT merely external circumstances that has made you that way—but *wretched* is reserved for a context that spotlights what you are by nature!

- And again, this isn't a man that is *wretched* because his new nature has been fighting his old nature, and his old nature won out—NO—this is a man who is justified unto eternal life and is attempting to put his life in Christ into practice by living under the law—God's law!

- The wretched man is the Christian living under God's law!

- He a wreck!

- And then, just as it has to be done in justification—just as there you had to come to the point where you knew you couldn't justify yourself, so you looked to Another—you looked to a “who” - to God, Himself to put His J-ness and grace into effect and give you by grace what you could not do for yourself; and that's what Paul does in the rest of the verse.

24 *O wretched man that I am! **who** shall deliver me from the body of this death?*

- And you have to be delivered from it—and you should know by now that that kind of a deliverance only comes from a Redeemer and His redemption!

- Notice that under that law, your body, far from being a body of life—of functional life, bearing fruit unto holiness, and functionally living unto God—under that law, your body is **a body of functional death!**

- And the law only confirms that that's what you're in: **a body of death!**

- So, “*who*” shall deliver you from the body of this death?

- i.e., Who is going to take us from functional death under the law, to functional life under grace?

25 *I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

- And that is supposed to take you right back to Christ, your Redeemer and the redemption He provided—and the identity you now have with Him as your Redeemer—it takes you right back to those first 13 verses of Romans chapter 6!

- And this is real thankfulness—thankfulness for having functional life—thankfulness for being delivered from the law and put under grace!

- And it was all accomplished *through Jesus Christ our Lord!*

- Then we have that final statement of the chapter—in 2 clauses:

25 ... So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

- And this should be simple by now—you should know that this is not saying that, “See there! The Bible says you are supposed to be serving under the law of God, and you’re supposed to do it with your mind, and you’re suppose to just ‘deny the flesh’ and live under the law! Blah, Blah, Blah....”

- But the context won’t let you do that!

- Paul says this as a final concluding matter to the whole argument. This is the **punch** that is suppose to hit and stick in your thinking from now on—it is the encapsulation of Romans 6:14-7:25!

- Paul says, “*with the mind I myself* (that should tell you everything right there—this is way of self-sanctification) *serve the law of God*;

- And that puts the final nail in the coffin of all this thing about being *under the law*—but it takes 2 more blows to hammer in this final nail:

1st Blow— “*with the mind I myself serve the law of God*,”

- The law is designed to operate in my mind, motivate me, and change me—and I serve it there in my mind—with all my willpower, all my strength of efforts, and highest degree of determination I can muster.

- And that’s how it is supposed to work.

- But it fails to work—it’s just a huge train-wreck—why? because there is something wrong with the law? NO.

2nd (Final) Blow— “*but with the flesh the law of sin*.”

- While the law does get into my head, it appeals to my flesh for its power and strength—but I am *carnal, sold under sin*—and the *law of sin by that commandment exceeds* me, and I end up just as functionally dead under the law as I am by nature—I didn’t change at all!

- The argument is over—the case is closed—we’ve put it in the coffin, we’ve nailed it shut—and now we can just put it in the ground and put the dirt over it and walk away from it—living under the law is now and forevermore a dead issue—it has no life to it at all.

- Now let’s get under grace.

- Now let’s get something new operating in our spirit.

- Let’s get our sanctified life in Christ put into operation.

- And above all, let’s stop talking about living under the law!
