**selves**] Each man within himself, in his  
own judgment.

**14. nature itself**]  
i.e. the mere fact of *one sex* being by  
nature unveiled, i.e. having short hair,—  
the other, *veiled*, i.e. having long hair.  
This plainly declares that *man* was intended   
to be *uncovered*, —*woman, covered.*  
When therefore we deal with the proprieties   
of the *artificial* state, of *clothing  
the body*, we must be *regulated by nature’s  
suggestion*: that which she has indicated  
to be left uncovered, we must so leave:  
that which she has covered, when we  
clothe the body, we must cover likewise.  
This is the argument. The word **nature**  
does not mean *sense of natural propriety*,  
but NATURE,—*the law of creation*.

**have long hair**] “To have long or beautiful   
hair is a sign of effeminacy. Paris in  
Homer is reproached as having long hair,”  
Eustathius.—The Apostle (see above) makes  
no allusion to the *customs of nations* in the  
matter, nor is even the mention of them  
relevant; he is speaking of the dictates of  
nature herself.

**15.**] See on ver. 14:  
compare Milton, Par. Lost, iv. 304 ff.

**a covering**, properly a *wrapper*, or enveloping   
garment. “In this passage,”  
says Stanley, “the Apostle would refer to the  
‘peplum,’ which the Grecian women used  
ordinarily as a shawl, but on public occasions   
as a hood also, especially at funerals  
and marriages.”

**16.**] cuts off the  
subject, already abundantly decided, with a  
settlement of any possible difference by  
appeal to universal apostolic and ecclesiastical   
custom. **But if any man seemeth  
to be contentious**,—i.e. ‘if any arises who  
appears to dispute the matter, who seems  
not satisfied with the *reasons* I have given,  
but is still disputations.’ Before what follows,   
we must supply “*let him know, that.*”

**we** (emphatic)—the Apostles and their  
immediate company,—including the women  
who assembled in prayer and supplication  
with them at their various stations, see  
Acts xvi. 13.

**no such custom**] The  
best modern Commentators agree with  
Chrysostom in understanding this, “*no  
such custom as that of being contentious.*”  
But surely it would be very unlikely, that  
*after so long a treatment of a particular  
subject*, the Apostle should wind up all by  
merely a censure of a fault *common* to their  
behaviour on *this and all the other* matters  
of dispute. Such a rendering seems to me  
almost to *stultify the conclusion*:—“If  
any will dispute about it still, remember  
that it is neither our practice, nor that of  
the Churches, *to dispute.*” It would seem  
to me, but for the weighty names on the  
other side, hardly to admit of a question,  
that the **custom** referred to alludes to *the  
practice of women praying uncovered.* So  
Theodoret and many others. He thus cuts  
off all further disputation on the matter, by  
*appealing to universal Christian usage:*  
aud to make the appeal more solemn, adds  
the words **of God** to “*the Churches,*”—the  
assemblies which are held in honour of and  
for prayer to God, and are *His own Churches*.  
Observe “*the Churches,*” not “*the Church.*”  
The *plurality of independent testimonies  
to the absence of the custom*, is that on  
which the stress is laid. This appeal, ‘TO  
THE CHURCHES,’ was much heard again at  
the Reformation: but has been since too  
much forgotten.

**17–34.**] CORRECTION OF ABUSES REGARDING   
THE LOVE-FEASTS (AGAPÆ)  
AND THE PARTAKING OF THE SUPPER  
OF THE LORD.

**17.**] refers back to  
what has been said since ver. 2, and forms  
a transition to what is yet to be said.