*being dead*,” is without a shadow of authority ; the reading on which it is founded  
having been a conjectural alteration of the  
sacred text by Beza, aud not contained in  
any ancient copy whatever. It arose from  
an entire misunderstanding of the text;  
for it is not the law which is dead, but we  
who are dead to it, see ver. 4); **so that we  
serve** (not ‘*that we should serve*,’ as A. V.  
The present tense describes the actual state:—understand ‘*God*’ after serve) **in the  
newness of the spirit** (i. e. of the Holy  
Spirit of God, who originates and penetrates the Christian life :—the *first mention* of the Spirit, so much spoken of in  
ch. viii.), **and not in the oldness of the  
letter** (the law only a collection of  
precepts and prohibitions, but the Gospel  
a service of freedom, ruled by the Spirit,  
whose presence is liberty), **Newness** and  
**oldness** are not, as in ch. vi. 4, ‘*newness  
of life*,” *attributes* of the genitives which  
follow them, but *states in which* those  
genitives are the *ruling elements*.

**7—25.**] *An explanation of the part  
which the law has in bringing out sin, by  
example of the Apostle’s own case*.—In  
this most important and difficult passage,  
it is of the first consequence to have a clear  
view of the *form* of illustration which the  
Apostle adopts, and of the *reason why he  
adopts it*. The former has been amply  
treated of by almost all Commentators : the  
latter too generally has escaped their enquiry. But it furnishes, if satisfactorily  
treated, a key to the other. I ask then  
first, *why* St. Paul *suddenly changes here  
to the first person*? And the answer is,  
because he is about to draw a conclusion  
negativing the question, “ *Is the law sin*?”  
upon purely *subjective* grounds, proceeding  
on that which *passes within*, when the  
work of the law is carried on in the heart.  
And he is about to depict this work of the  
Jaw by an example which shall set it forth  
in vivid colours, in detail, in its connexion  
with sin in a man. What example then so  
apposite, as *his own*? Introspective as his  
character was, and purified as his inner  
vision was by the Holy Spirit of God, what  
example would so forcibly bring out the  
inward struggles of the man which prove the holiness of the law, while they shew  
its inseparable connexion with the production of sin?—If this be the reason why  
the first person is here assumed (and I can  
find no other which does not introduce  
into St. Paul’s style an arbitrariness and  
caprice which it least of all styles exhibits), then we must *dismiss from our minds  
all exposition which explains the passage  
of any other*, in the first instance, *than of  
Paul himself*: himself indeed, as an *exemplar*, wherein others may see themselves:  
but not himself *in the person* of others, be  
they the *Jews*, nationally or individually,  
or *all mankind*, or *individual men*. This  
being done, there arises now a question  
equally important,—Of *what self* is it that  
he speaks throughout this passage? Is it  
*always the same*? If so, is it always the  
*carnal, unregenerate* self? or always the  
*spiritual regenerate*? Clearly *not the  
latter always*; for to that self the historical account of vv. 7–13 will not apply,  
and still less the assertion, in the *present*, of ver.14. Clearly *not the former always*:  
for to that the assertion of ver. 22 will not  
apply, nor that of ver. 25. Is it alway:  
the *complex self*, made up of the prevailing  
spiritual-regenerate, with the remains of  
the carnal-unregenerate? *Not always  
this* : although this seems nearer to satisfying the conditions: for in the description  
ver. 9, “ *I was alive without the law once*,”  
and in “*I am carnal, &c*.” ver. 14, there  
is no complexity, but the “*I*” is *clearly  
the carnal man*. Therefore not always  
the same. If not always the same, *where  
is the distinction*? If we look carefully,  
the Apostle himself will guide us to it.  
Having carried on the “*I*” unqualified and  
unexplained till ver. 18, he there has occasion to say, “*there dwelleth not in me any  
good*.” But he is conscious that, as he had  
written to the Corinthians (1 Cor. iii. 16),  
“*the Spirit of God dwelleth in you*;” he  
therefore finds it necessary to correct himself by an explanation, *what* “*I*” *he meant*,  
and adds to “in me,” **that is, in my flesh**.  
So that “*I*” there is equivalent to “*my  
flesh*,” i.e. ‘myself in my state of *life* to  
the law and sin, and acting according to  
the motions of sin.’ Again, when the