is in fact the sentence immediately preceding. The steps of the proof are these :  
*The law binds a man only so long as he  
lives* (ver. 1): for example,—a married  
woman is only bound to her husband so  
long as he lives (vv. 2, 3):—so also the  
Christian *being dead* with Christ and alive  
to Him *is freed from the law* (ver. 4).

**brethren**] Not addressed particularly to *Jewish* Christians: see below : but  
generally to the Roman Church.

**I am speaking** (writing) **to men acquainted with  
the law**; i.e. the persons to whom I address  
this epistle are such as know the law: not,  
as the A. V. unfortunately, ‘I speak to *them  
that know* the law,’ as if he were now addressing a different class of persons. Nor  
does the knowledge of the law, here affirmed  
of the Romans, prove that the majority of  
them were Jewish Christians: they may  
have been Gentile proselytes.

**that the** (Mosaic : for of that, and not of any other  
law, is the whole argument) **law hath  
power over a man for so long time as he**(the man, see verses 4 and 6: not ‘‘it,”  
i.e. *the law*, as some would render it,  
which would introduce the irrelevant question of the *abrogation of the law*, whereas  
the whole matter in argument is the *relation of the Christian* to the law) **liveth ?**

**2.**] **For** (not merely an example, but  
the example is itself the proof) **the woman  
which hath an husband** (literally, the  
woman under a husband, in subjection to  
a husband) **is bound by the law to her  
husband while he liveth** (literally, **to her  
living husband**): **but if her husband die,  
she is loosed from** (literally, annulled  
from) **the law of** (‘regarding,’ compare  
“*the law of the leper*,” Levit. xiv. 2) **the  
husband.**

**3.**] **Therefore** (‘*from the  
same consideration it follows that*’), **while  
her husband lives, she shall be called an  
adulteress, if she be joined to** (i.e. **attach  
herself to, become the wife of**) **another  
man: but if her husband die, she is free  
from the law** (of her husband), **so that  
she is not an adulteress, though she  
be joined to another man**.—So far all is  
clear. But when we come to the application of the example, *this* must carefully  
be borne in mind, as tending to clear up  
all the confusion which has here been  
found by Commentators :—that the Apostle is insisting on the fact, that DEATH  
DISSOLVES LEGAL OBLIGATION : but he is  
not drawing an exact parallel between the  
persons in his example, and the persons in  
his application. The comparison might  
be thus made in terms common to both:  
(1) *Death has dissolved the legal obligation between man and wife: therefore  
the wife is at liberty to be married to  
another*:—(2) *Death has dissolved the  
legal obligation between the law and us:  
therefore we are at liberty to be married  
to another*. So far the comparison is  
strict. Further, it will not hold: for in  
the *example*, the *liberated person* is the  
*survivor*,—in the *thing treated*, the *liberated person* is the *dead person*. And so  
far from this being an oversight or an  
inaccuracy, it is no more than that to  
which, more or less, all comparisons are  
liable; and no more can be required of  
them than that they should fit, in the