here, require the second person,—and  
would hardly suit a personification such as  
we find in this clause.—The second part of  
the verse refers back to ch. v. 20, 21, where  
the law is stated to be the multiplier of  
transgression,—and accords with 1 Cor.  
xv. 56, “*the strength of sin is the law.*”  
The stress is on the *not having* **dominion**:  
as if it had been said, ‘Your efforts to  
live a life of freedom from the tyranny  
of sin shall not be frustrated by its after  
all tyrannizing over you and asserting its  
dominion: for ye are not under that law  
which is the strength of sin, but under  
that grace (here in the widest sense, justifying and sanctifying,—grace in all its attributes and workings) in which is no condemnation, ch. viii, 1.—It will be seen  
from the above, that I interpret “*having dominion*” rather of the *eventual* triumph of sin by obtaining domination over us, than of its reducing us under its subjection as servants in this life. This is necessary, both to fit this verse into the context,  
and to snit the question which arises in  
the next. The discussions as to whether  
**the law** in this place is the moral or ceremonial law, and as to whether we are bound  
by the former, are irrelevant here: the assertion being merely that of the general *matter  
of fact*, about which there can be no question, that we (Christians) are not under *the  
law*, placed in a covenant of legal obedience,  
but under grace,—placed in a covenant of  
justification by faith and under the promise  
of the indwelling Spirit—subjects of a *higher  
law*—even the *law of the Spirit of life in  
Jesus Christ*, ch. viii. 2. Whether we are  
*bound* by the law, and how far, depends on  
how far the law itself spoke the immutable  
moral truth of God’s government of the  
world, or was adapted to temporary observances and symbolic rites now abolished,—the whole of which subject is not under  
consideration here. I make these remarks  
to justify myself for not entering into those  
long and irrelevant discussions with which

many of our commentaries are interrupted,  
and the sense of the Apostle’s argument  
confounded.

**15–23.**] *The being under grace* (free  
from the condemnation of sin) *and not  
under the law, is no encouragement to  
sin*: *for* (vv. 16–19) *we have renounced  
the service of sin, and have become the  
servants of righteousness*: *and* (vv. 20–23) *the consequences of the service of sin  
are terrible and fatal, whereas those of  
the service of righteousness are blesse  
and glorious.*

**15.**] **are we to sin?** i. e. **may we sin?**Notice, that he is speaking of *committing  
acts of sin*; not of a habit of living in  
sin, although that would be involved by  
such acts. This question is not, any more  
than that of ver. 1, put into the month of  
an objector, but is part of the Apostle’s  
own discourse, arising out of what has  
preceded, and answered by him in the  
following verses.

**16.**] ‘You are the  
servants either of God or of sin,—there is  
no third course.’ The former part of the  
verse reminds them merely of an universal  
truth,—that the yielding ourselves servants for obedience to any one, implies  
the *serving*, being (in reality) the servants  
of such person. Then this is implied in  
the form of a dilemma, implying that there  
is no third service. ‘Now this must be  
true of you *with regard either to sin or to  
God*.’ K**now ye not that to whomsoever  
ye yield yourselves servants to obey** (i.e.  
with a view to obedience), **his servants ye  
are whom ye obey**, (and in this case) **whether it be** (servants) **of sin unto death** (‘with death as the result,’—not physical  
death merely, nor eternal death merely,  
but DEATH [by sin] in its most general  
sense, as the contrast to [life by] RIGHTEOUSNESS,—the state of misery induced by sin, in all its awful aspects and consequences:—and so throughout this passage and ch. vii.), **or of obedience** (viz.  
obedience to Him who alone ought to be