there is but one law of God, partly written in men’s consciences, more plainly  
manifested in the law of Moses, and fully  
revealed in Jesus Christ.

**15.**] **shew,  
i.e. by their conduct shew forth**,—give  
an example of.

**the work of the law** is nearly equivalent to *the things of the  
law above*: but it is singular, as applying  
to each of the particular cases supposed  
in the words of the hypothesis above. If  
it had here been *the works of the law*, it  
might have been understood to mean *the  
whole works of the law*, which the inde-  
finite nature of the hypothesis prevents  
above.

**written in their hearts**] Alluding to the tables of stone on which the  
‘law was written: see a similar figure, 2 Cor. iii. 3.

**their conscience bearing witness thereto**] This is a *new* argument, not a mere continuation of ‘the  
“*shewing the work of the law”* above.  
Besides their giving this example by actions consonant with the law, their *own conscience*, reflecting on the thing done,  
*bears witness to it as good*.

**bearing witness thereto**, i.e. **confirming by its  
testimony**, and signifying the agreement  
of the witness with the deed: perhaps  
also referring to the reflective process, in  
which a man confers, so to speak, with  
himself.

**and their thoughts** (*judgments or reflections*, the self-judging voices  
of the conscience, which being corrupted  
by sinful desires are often *divided*) **among  
one another** (i.e. thought against thought  
in inner strife) **accusing or perhaps excusing** (these two participles are *absolute*,  
describing the office of these judgments,—and nothing need be supplied, as ‘*them*,’ or ‘*their deeds*’). Notice the similarity  
of this strife of conscience, and its testimony, as here described, to the higher and  
more detailed form of the same conflict in  
the Christian man, ch. vii. 16.

**16.**] *To what has this verse reference*? Hardly  
to that just preceding, which surely speaks  
of a process going on *in this life* (so however Chrysostom takes it. See also a fine  
passage in Bourdaloue’s Sermons, vol. i.  
Serm. ii. p. 27, ed. Paris, 1854): nor, as  
commonly assumed, to the verb “*shall be  
judged*” (ver. 12), which only terminates  
one in a series of clauses connected by  
“*for*:”—but to *the great affirmation of  
the passage*, *concluding with ver*. 10. ‘To  
this it is bound, it appears to me, by the  
**words the secrets of men**, answering to  
“*every soul of man*,” ver.9. This affirmation is the last sentence which has been in the dogmatic form:—after it we have a  
series of quasi-parenthetic clauses, carrying on the reasoning by for, vv. 11, 12, 13, 14, After it, the reasons, necessitated by  
the startling assertion, are one after another given, and, that having been done, *the time is specified when the great retribution shall take place*.

**by Jesus Christ**] viz. as *the Judge*—see John v. 22:—belongs to the verb shall judge. See  
also Acts xvii. 31.

**according to** (not  
belonging to the verb “*shall judge*,” as  
the *rule of judgment*, but to the whole  
declaration, ‘as taught in,’ ‘as forming  
part of’) **the Gospel entrusted to me to  
teach.**

**17—24.**] *The pride of the Jews in their  
law and their God contrasted with their  
disobedience to God and the law*.

**17. But if**] The Greek for this, and for  
“*behold*,” differ only by one letter. All  
our older MSS. have but if: and the  
other has been substituted for it in the  
later ones, possibly by mistake, possibly  
because the sentence with “*if*” seems at  
first sight not to be complete. But this  
incompleteness is more apparent than real.  
It is only produced by the resumption of  
the thread ot the sentence with “therefore,” ver. 21. Omit (in the sense) only that word, and all proceeds regularly—