the general term leave here, of *both parties*, the husband and wife, not “*put  
away*” (as Matt. v. 31, &c.), which would  
apply only to the husband. In the A. V. this  
identity of terms is unfortunately neglected.  
The same word, **leave**, or **part from**, would  
well have expressed both cases.—*By the  
Greek as well as Roman customs, the wife  
had the power of effecting a divorce.*  
At Athens,—when the divorce originated  
with the wife, she was said to *leave* the  
house of her husband: when with the husband  
to *be sent away*. At Rome, the only  
exception to the wife’s liberty of effecting a  
divorce appears to have been in the case of  
a freedwoman who had married her patronus. Olshausen thinks that St. Paul puts  
both alternatives, because he regards the  
*Christian party as the superior one* in the  
marriage. But, as Meyer remarks, this would  
be inconsistent with the fundamental law of.  
marriage, Gen 16, and with the Apostle’s  
own view of it, ch. xi. 3, xv. 34; Eph.  
v.22; 1 Tim, ii. 11, 12.

**14.]** *Ground  
of the above precept*.

**is sanctified** ]  
The meaning will best be apprehended by  
remembering (1) that *holiness*, under the  
Gospel, answers to dedication to God under  
the law; (2) that the sanctified under the  
Gospel are the *body of Christian men*, dedicated  
to God, and thus become His in a  
peculiar manner: (3) that this being so,  
things belonging to, relatives inseparably  
connected with, *the people of God*, are said  
to be *hallowed by their holiness* : not holy  
in themselves, but sanctified, i. e. included  
in the holiness of the faithful relative.  
Chrysostom well shews the distinction  
between this case and that in ch. vi. 15,  
that being an *impious* connexion,—in and  
under the condition of the *very state,* in  
which the other party is *impure* : whereas  
this is a connexion according to a pure  
and holy ordinance, by virtue of which,  
although the physical unity in both cases  
is the same, the *purity overbears the impurity*.

**in the wife... in the brother]**  
*in*, i.e. his or her *sanctity is situated*  
in, rests in, *the other*.

else; literally,  
**since in that case** (i. e. as understood, the  
*other* alternative,—the *non-hallowing*).

**are]** not *would be*, nor *were*, as A. V., but  
*present* : because the supposed case is assumed  
and the ind. pres. used of what *has*  
*place* on its assumption.

**holy**] as  
above: **holy to the Lord**. On this *fact*,  
*Christian children being holy*, the argument  
is built. This being so,—they being  
hallowed, because the children of Christians,—it follows *that that union out of*  
*which* they sprung, must as such have the  
same hallowed character; i. e. that the  
*insanctity* of the one parent is in it *overborne* by the *sanctity* of the other. The  
*fact* of the children of Christians, God’s  
spiritual people, *being holy*, is tacitly assumed  
as a matter of course, from the precedent of God’s ancient covenant people—  
With regard to the bearing of *this verse*on the subject of Infant Baptism,—it seems  
to me to have *none*, further than this:  
that it establishes the so far, between Christian and Jewish children, as to  
shew, that if the initiatory rite of the old  
covenant was administered to the one,—  
that of the new covenant, in so far as it  
was regarded as corresponding to circumcision  
would probably as a matter of course  
be administered to the other. Those who  
deny any such inference, forget, as it seems  
to me, that it is not *personal* holiness  
which is here predicated of the children,  
any more than of the unbelieving husband  
or wife, but *holiness of dedication*, by  
strict dependence *on one dedicated*. Notwithstanding this *holiness*, the Christian  
child is individually born in sin and a child  
of wrath; and individually needs the washing of regeneration and the renewing of  
the Holy Ghost, just as much as the Jewish  
child needed the typical purifying of circumcision  
and the sacrificial atonements  
of the law. So that in this *holiness* of the  
Christian child, there is nothing inconsistent