**the slave who was called in the Lord** (not  
as A.V., ‘ *He who is called in the Lord being  
a slave.’*

***in the Lord:*** as the *element  
which* what is about to be stated takes  
place) **is the Lord's freed man.** The Lord’s  
freed man is not here in the ordinary Roman  
sense ‘the Lord’s manumitted slave:’ for  
the *former master was sin or the devil*, see  
on ch. vi. 20;—but *only, a freed man belonging to Christ,* viz. freed by Christ from  
the service of another. This the reader  
would understand as a matter of course: **in  
like manner he that was called, being free**  
(not the freeman being called), **is the slave  
of Christ.** Christ’s service is perfect *freedom,* and the Christian’s freedom is the  
*service of Christ*. But here the Apostle  
takes, in each case, *one member* of this  
double antithesis from the *outer world*, *one  
from the spiritual*. The (actual) slave is  
(spiritually) free: the (actually) free is a  
(spiritual) slave. So that the two are so  
mingled, in the Lord, that the slave need  
not trouble himself about his slavery, nor  
seek for this world’s freedom, seeing he has  
a more glorious freedom in Christ, and  
seeing also that his brethren who seem to  
be free in this world are in fact Christ’s  
servants, as *he* is a servant. It will be  
plain that the reason given in this verse  
is quite inconsistent with the prevalent  
modern rendering of ver. 21.

**23.]***Following out of the idea*, **the slave of  
Christ**, *by reminding them of the* PRICE  
PAID *whereby Christ* PURCHASED *them for  
His* (eh. vi. 20): *and precept thereupon*,  
BECOME NOT SLAVES OF MEN: i.e. ‘do  
not allow your relations to human society,  
whether of freedom or slavery, to bring you  
into bondage so as to cause you anxiety to  
change the one or increase the other.’  
Chrysostom and others think the precept  
directed against *eye-service,* and general  
regard to men’s opinion. But it is better  
to restrict it (however it may legitimately  
*be applied* generally) to the case in hand.  
Others understand it as addressed to the  
*free*, and meaning that *they* are not to *sell*  
*themselves into slavery*: but this is evidently  
wrong: as may be seen by the  
change to the *second person plural* as  
*addressing all his readers* : besides that a  
new example would have been marked as in  
vv. 18,21. See Stanley’s note.

**24.]**  
*The rule is again repeated,* but with the  
addition **with God**, reminding them of the  
relations of Christ’s freed man and Christ’s  
slave, and of the price paid just mentioned :  
of that relation to God in which they stood  
by means of their Christian calling.

**25—38.]** *Advice* (with some digressions  
connected with the subject) concerning the  
MARRIAGE OF VIRGINS.

**25.**] **virgins**  
is not to be understood *unmarried persons  
of both sexes*, a meaning which, though  
apparently found in Rev. xiv. 4 (see note  
there), is perfectly unnecessary here, and  
appears to have been introduced from a  
mistaken view of vv, 26—28. The emphasis is on **commandment**—**command of  
the Lord have I none,** i.e., *no expressed  
precept;* so that, as before, there is no  
marked comparison between “*the Lord,*”  
and “*I*.”

**to be faithful**, ie., as a  
steward and dispenser of the hidden things  
of God, and, among them, of such directions  
as you cannot make for yourselves,  
but require one so entrusted to impart to  
you. This sense, which has occurred in  
the estimate given of himself in this very