with the usage of St. Paul and with  
ver. 83: also as more simple. The sense  
remains substantially the same, and answers much better to the comment furnished by the succeeding clauses:—husbands ought to love their own wives as  
they love their own bodies [i.e., themselves: for their wives are in fact part of  
their own bodies, ver. 31]: this being illustrated by and referred to the great mystery  
of Christ and His church, in which the same  
love, and the same incorporation, has place)  
**ought the husbands also** (as well as Christ  
in the archetypal example just given) **to  
love their own** (emphatic: see above on  
ver. 22) **wives as** (with the same affection  
as) **their own bodies. He that loveth his  
own** (see above) **wife loveth himself** (is  
but complying with that universal law of  
nature by which we all love ourselves. The  
best words to supply before the following  
“*for*” will be, “And this we all do”).

**29.] For** (see above) **no man ever hated his  
own flesh** (meaning, *himself*, but put in this  
form to prepare for “*one flesh*” in the  
Scripture proof below)**; but nourisheth it  
up and cherisheth it, as also** (doth) **Christ**(nourish and cherish) **the church:**

**30.] for** (again a link is omitted; ‘the  
church, which stands in the relation of  
marriage to Him: for, &c.’) **members we  
are of His Body** [,—**(being) of His flesh,  
and of His bones**](see Gen. ii. 23. As the  
woman owed her natural being to the man,  
her source and head, so we owe our entire  
spiritual being to Christ, our source and  
head: and as the woman was one flesh  
with the man in this natural relation, so we  
in our entire spiritual relation, body, soul,  
and Spirit, are one with Christ, God manifested in our humanity,—parts and members of His glorified Body).

**31.] For  
this cause** (the allusion, or rather free citation, is still carried on: compare Gen. ii.  
24:—i.e. because we are members of Him  
in the sense just insisted on. This whole  
verse is said [see on ver. 32 below] not of  
human marriages, but of Christ and the  
church. HE is the **man** in the Apostle’s  
view here, the Church is the **woman**. I  
would regard the saying as applied to that,  
past, present, and future, which constitutes  
Christ’s Union to His Bride the Church:  
His leaving the Father’s bosom, which is  
*past*—His gradual preparation of the union,  
which is *present*: His full consummation  
of it, which is *future*. This seems to me  
to be necessary, because we are as truly  
now **one flesh** with Him, as we shall be,  
when heaven and earth shall ring with the  
joy of the nuptials;—and hence the exclusive future sense is inapplicable. In this  
allegorical sense most of the ancients, and  
the best of the moderns, interpret: and  
Eadie would have done well to study more  
deeply the spirit of the context before he  
characterized it as ‘strange romance,’ ‘wild  
and visionary,’ and said, ‘there is no hint  
that the Apostle intends to allegorize.’  
That allegory, on the contrary, is the *key  
to the whole*) **shall a man leave father and  
mother, and shall be closely joined to his  
wife, and they two shall become** (see Matt.  
xix. 5, note) **one flesh** (“not only, as they  
were before, in respect of their origin, but  
in respect of their new conjunction.” Bengel).

**32.] This mystery is great**(viz. the matter mystically alluded to in  
the Apostle’s application of the text just  
quoted: the mystery of the spiritual union