detailed) **this law** (presently to be defined as  
*the law of sin in my members*), **that** (consisting in this, that) **when I desire** (literally, *to me desiring*) **to do good, evil is  
present with** (see above, ver. 18) **me.**

**22, 23.]** {22} **Explanation of the conflict  
above alleged to exist.** **For I delight in  
the law of God after the inward man** (the  
inward man is equivalent to *the mind*,  
ver. 25; compare St. Peter’s *“hidden  
man of the heart,”* 1 Pet. iii. 4. But not  
*merely* the *mental and reasoning part of  
man:*—for that surely *does not* delight in  
the law of God :—it is *absolutely necessary*to presuppose the *influence of the Holy  
Spirit,* and to place the man in *a state of  
grace, before this assertion can be true.*And it is surprising to find Commentators  
denying the gradual introduction of the  
*spiritual man* in the description of this  
conflict. TRUE, THE SPIRIT is not yet introduced, because purposely kept back until  
treated of as the great Deliverer from this  
state of death; the man is as yet described  
as compounded of the outer and inner man,  
of the flesh and the mind, and the operations of the two are detailed as *if unassisted,*  
—even the term *spirit*, for the human spirit,  
being as yet avoided, —but all this is done,  
because *the object is to set the conflict and  
misery, as existing even in the spiritual  
man, in the strongest light*, so that the  
question in ver. 24 may lead the way to  
the *real uses* and *blessed results* of this  
conflict in ch. viii.): {23}**but I see** (equivalent  
to *‘find:’* —as if he were a spectator of  
that which is going on within) **a different  
law** (differing in kind and aim, not *“another”* merely) **in my members** (i.e. in  
my *flesh*, as in ver. 18) **warring against**(in continual dissension and conflict with)  
**the law of my mind** (the consent, viz.  
**to the law of God**, which my mind yields; not *the law of God*,—any more than the  
different law in my members is *the law of  
sin*,—but *both* meaning the standard or  
rule set up, which inclination follow:—  
the one in the mind, *in harmony with the  
law of God*,—the other in the members  
or flesh, *subservient*, and causing subservience, *to the principle or law of sin*),  
**and bringing me** (the whole complex self  
—the ‘me’ of personality and action)  
**into captivity to the law of sin** (the sinful  
principle, of resistance to God’s law: *sin*,  
as awakened and set energizing, ver. 9,  
by that law) **which is in my members.**—  
Commentators have much disputed whether  
this *different law*, and the *law of sin*, both  
being in *my members*, are *different*, or *the  
same*. It appears to me (see above) that  
the identity cannot be maintained without  
introducing great confusion into the sentence.

**24.]** *The division of the man against himself,—his inward conflict, and miserable  
state of captivity to sin in the flesh, while  
with the mind he loves and serves the law  
of God. From this wretched condition,  
which is a very death in life, who shall  
deliver him?* The expression **body** cannot,  
well be figurative, meaning, *“the totality  
of sins,”* or *“the deadly mass of sin,”* but  
must, on account of the part which the  
*flesh* and the *members* have hitherto borne,  
be *literal*.

**The body of this death** will  
mean, ‘the body whose subjection to the  
law of sin brings about this state of misery,’  
compare *“the body of sin,”* ch. vi. 6.  
From this body, as the instrument whereby  
he is led captive to the law of sin and  
death, he cries out for deliverance: i.e.  
to be *set free*, as ch. viii. 2, *from the law  
of sin and death*.—The cry is uttered, as  
De Wette well observes, in *full consciousness* of the *deliverance which Christ has*