with the idea, nor with the practice, of  
Infant Baptism.

**15.]** *But if the wish  
for separation proceed from the side of  
the* UNBELIEVER (emphatic), *let him* (or  
her) *be separated*.

**is not put under  
bondage]** i. e. the same necessity does not  
exist when a believer is joined to an *unbeliever*  
as when *believers* are joined. In  
this latter case, to abide in the union is  
imperative; in the other, if the unbeliever  
wishes to dissolve the union, it may be  
dissolved.

**in peace]** Not the same  
as “*to peace*” (A. V.), but signifying the  
moral element *in which* we are called to  
be: see ver. 22 below.—The meaning is,  
“let the unbeliever depart, rather than by  
attempting to retain the union, endanger  
that peace of household and peace of spirit,  
which is part of the calling of a Christian.’  
— Observe, (1) that there is no contradiction  
in this license of breaking off such a  
marriage, to the command of our Lord in  
Matt. v. 32,—because the Apostle expressly asserts, ver. 12, that *our Lord’s  
words do not apply* to such marriages as  
are here contemplated. They were spoken  
to those *within the covenant*, and as such  
apply immediately to the wedlock of *Christians* (ver. 10), but *not to mixed marriages.* (2) That the question of re-marrying  
after such a separation, is here *left  
open*: on this, see note on Matt. v. 32.  
(3) That not a word here said can be so  
strained as to imply any license to *contract*  
marriages with unbelievers. Only those  
*already contracted* are dealt with: the  
*being unequally yoked with unbelievers*is expressly forbidden, 2 Cor. vi. 14, and by  
implication below, ver. 39.

**16.]** This  
verse is generally understood as a ground  
for remaining united, as ver. 13, in hope  
that conversion of the unbelieving party  
may follow. thus ver. 15 is regarded  
altogether parenthetical. But (1) this interpretation is harsh as regards the context,  
for ver. 15 is evidently *not parenthetical*,—  
and (2) (see my Greek Test.) it is hardly  
grammatically admissible. The fact is, that  
the verse is not a ground for remaining  
united, in hope, &c.,—but a ground for consummating  
a separation, and not marring  
the Christian’s peace for so uncertain a prospect  
as that of converting the unbelieving  
party. The question thus preserves its  
strict sense, **How knowest thou** (about  
the question) **whether ....?** and the  
verse coheres with the words immediately  
preceding, “*God hath called us in peace.*”  
The meaning then of the verse will be  
as follows: (Let the unbeliever depart :  
hazard not for an uncertainty the peace in  
which you ought to be living as Christians :)  
**for what assurance hast thou, O wife,  
whether thou shalt be the means of thy  
husband’s conversion? Or what assurance hast thou, O husband, whether thou  
shalt be the means of thy wife’s conversion**“This interpretation is the only  
one compatible with the obvious sense of  
ver. 15, and of the expression how knowest:  
thou whether thou shalt save; and is  
also in exact harmony with the general  
tenor of the Apostle’s argument, which is  
not to urge a union, but to tolerate a separation  
Stanley; the rest of whose note is  
deeply interesting as to the historical influence of the verse as commonly misunderstood.

**17.] Only** takes an exception,  
by way of caution, to the foregoing motive  
for not remaining together (ver. 16). The  
Christian partner might carry that motive  
*too far*, and be tempted by it to *break* the  
connexion *on his own part*; a course already prohibited (verses 12—14). Therefore the Apostle adds, **Only** (only be careful  
not to make this a ground for *yourselves*  
causing the separation) **as to each the  
Lord distributed [his lot], as God has**