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 law sin? God forbid. AUTHORIZED VERSION.   
 ten.sit.a, Jess, 1 I had not known sin, except,   
 Neverthe-| Is the law sin? God for-   
 bid. Nay, Thad not known   
   
 approval of the law of God isaffirmed (not flict division against one’s self would   
 the mere designing to do His will, 15, infallibly about utter ruin, and might.   
 16, 19, 20, which I will treat by and by), well lead to despair (ver. 24), but for the   
 it is not barely “JZ,” but, to avoid con- rescue which God’s grace has provided by   
 fusion, in ver. 22 the Apostle adds after Jesus Christ our Lord. And this rescue   
 the inward man, and in ver. 25 subjoins has been such, that I, the “I myself” of   
 myself; in both cases shewing that (see ver. 25, the real self, nobler aud better   
 notes below) he speaks of the complex man, part of the man, serve, with the mind (see   
 himself made up of an inward, and an there), the law of God: whereas it is ouly   
 outward man, ot the mind and the flesh. with the flesh, according to which (vii   
 Are we then justified in assuming, that up I do not walk, but overcome and mortify   
 to ver. 22 the carnal-unregenerate self is it, that I serve (am still to) the law   
 spoken of, but after that the complex self? of sin. Then this subjection of the flesh   
 Such a supposition would not be consistent the law of sin, to the bondage of corrup-   
 with the assertion of the desire from ver. tion, is fully set in its natwre,—con-   
 15 onwards: no such will existing in the sequences to the carnal,—and uses to the   
 carnal unvegenerate man. I believe the spiritual,—in eh. vi Any thing like a   
 true account will be nearly as follows :— summary of the exposition of this passage   
 from ver. 7—13 incl. is historical, the would be quite beyond my limits. It may   
 « T” there is the historical self, the suflice here to that most of the ancients   
 working of conviction of sin, and shewing supposed “I” throughout the passage to   
 the work of the law; in other words, the represent mankind, or the Jews generally,   
 carnal self in the transition state, under and the whole to be taken chronologically,   
 the first motions towards God generated to ver. 9, as before the law, after 9 as   
 by the law, which the law could never have under the law. This was once Augustine’s   
 perfected. Then at ver. 14, St. Paul, ac- view, but he afterwards changed it, and   
 cording to a habit very common to him, adopted in the main that advocated above.   
 Keeps hold of the carnal self, and still 7.) See note, ch. vi. 1. Is the   
 having it in view, transfers himself his law (not ‘ conscience,’ in our case, the   
 present position,—altering the past tense revealed law of God, which awoke the con-   
 into the present, still however meaning science to action) sin \—not ‘the cause of   
 by “I” (in ver. 14), “my flesh.’ But, siz,’ which in one sense the Apostle would   
 having passed into the present tense, he not have denied,—but sin, abstract for   
 immediately mingles with this mere actiou concrete, sinful, or, as Bengel expresses   
 of the law upon the natural conscience, the it, the sinful cause of sin. ‘The question   
 motions of the will towards God which are itself refers back to ver. 5, where the   
 in conflict with the motions toward sin in Apostle had spoken of “ thestirrings of   
 the members. And hence arises an appa- which were through the law.” It is asked,   
 rent verbal confusion, because the “ J,” for not by an objector, but by the Apostle   
 example, in yer. 17, of whom it is said, himself, in anticipation of an objection.   
 is no longer I that perform it,” being the Nevertheless] i.e. but what I mean   
 entire personality, the complex self, is of is. —I say not that, but....   
 far wider extent than the “J,” of whom it I had not known] The literal rendering of   
 issaid, “in me, that is, my flesh, the original sentence is, I was living in a   
 not any good.” But the latter “JZ,” in state of ignorance of sin, were it   
 this part of the chapter, is shewn to be Then what is the sin here spoken of? Is   
 (verses 17, 20) no longer properly “J,” it sin in act, or sin in principle,—the   
 but “sin that dwelleth in me,’—and so it principle of sin? Not sin in act, so that   
 passes altogether out of sight after ver. Lhad not known sin should mean, ‘I had   
 20, and its place is taken by the actual not entered into contact with sin,’ i.e.   
 then existing complex self of Paul com- ‘had not sinned ? for then the law would   
 pounded of the regencrate spiritual man, have truly and actually been the cause of   
 sympathizing with God’s law, serving God’s sin: nor, sin in act, so that the meaning   
 law, in conflict with the still remaining were, ‘I had not known the nature of «   
 though decadent carnal man, whiose essence sinful act? for this would not agree with   
 it is serve the law of sin, to bring eap- the subordination of the one particular sin   
 tive to the law of sin. This state of con- specitied below : the coveting itself being