‘*reductio ad absurdum,*’ which has heen  
made in the *concrete* twice in ver. 17, is  
now made in the *abstract*: **if the whole  
were one member, where would be the  
body** (which by its very idea “*has many  
members,*” see xx. 12, 14)**?**

**20.**] brings  
out the fact *in contrast to ver.* 19, as  
ver. 18 in contrast to ver. 17.

**21–26.**] *And the spiritual gifts are  
also necessary to one another.* This is  
spoken of in reproof of the *highly endowed,*   
who imagined they could do without  
those less gifted than themselves, as the  
preceding to those of small endowment,  
who were discontented with their gifts.

**22, 23.**] Nay, the relation between  
the members is so entirely different from  
this, that the *very disparagement*, conventionally,   
of any member, is the *reason  
why more care should be taken of it*. I  
understand by “*those members of the  
body which seem to be more feeble,*” those  
members which in each man’s case appear  
to be inheritors of disease, or to have  
*incurred weakness*. By *this very fact,*  
their n*ecessity to him* is brought out much  
more than that of the others.

**23.**]  
So also in the case of the parts **which we  
think to be less honourable**—on which  
*usage has set the stamp of dishonour.*Perhaps he alludes (as distinguished from  
“***uncomely parts***” below) to those limbs  
which we conceal from sight in accordance  
with custom, but in the exposure of which  
there would be no absolute indecency. So  
Chrysostom, “He says well *which seem,*  
and *which we think* (but I should draw  
a distinction between the two, in accordance  
with the above explanation of *the weaker  
parts*, and render the one **which seem to  
be** [of themselves], and the other, **which we  
think** [conventionally], on which see Acts  
xvi. 20, note), shewing that this verdict is  
given, not by the nature of things, but by  
public opinion.”

**we bestow more  
abundant honour**] viz. *by clothing:* honouring   
them more than the face, the noblest  
part, which we do not clothe.

**our uncomely parts**] Here there is *no* qualification,   
such as *which seem*, or *which we think*,  
—and no ambiguity. Chrysostom says,  
“These parts enjoy more honour: for even  
the miserably poor, if compelled to go with  
the rest of their body naked, will not  
endure to shew these parts unclothed.”

**24.**] The *comely* parts are in some  
measure *neglected*, not needing to be  
covered or adorned: **but God** (at the  
creation) **tempered the body together**  
(compounded it of members on a principle  
of mutual compensation),—**to the deficient  
part giving more abundant honour.**

**25.**] **that there be no disunion** (see ver. 21)  
**in the body, but that the members may**