

# Glory for Men; Glory for Women (1 Cor. 11:2–16)

*By Jacob Gerber*

In 1 Corinthians 11:2, Paul transitions to a new subject that he will address through chapter 14: orderly public worship. As we have observed, Paul often uses the phrase “now concerning...” to introduce new subjects (1 Cor. 7:1, 25; 8:1). While Paul will introduce the subject of spiritual gifts in public worship with the phrase “now concerning...” (1 Cor. 12:1), he does not do so here in 1 Corinthians 11:2. This may possibly indicate that the Corinthians had not directly asked Paul’s opinion, but that Paul is instead addressing an issue he observes on his own.<sup>1</sup> Paul begins by commending the Corinthians for maintaining the “traditions” that he delivered to them (1 Cor. 11:2). In this, Paul acknowledges that the situation isn’t entirely bad, even though he does recognize a situation he needs to address.

This passage is notoriously difficult and controversial, so we should begin our study of this passage by making a few preliminary observations to frame our study. First, the *details* of Paul’s advice to the Corinthians may have been clear to the Corinthians, but they are no longer clear to us. The phrase that the ESV translates in v. 4 as “with head covered” might be literally translated “having down from the head.”<sup>2</sup> Translated this way, the difficulties become obvious. What would it mean to “have down from the head”? Many have understood this to mean some kind of veil or cloth head covering; however, the word “veil” does not appear in the text. Others have understood this to refer to an arrangement of the hair, whether “let down” or bound up on top of the head.<sup>3</sup> Some have insisted that, for a woman to appear in public (especially public worship) without some kind of head covering would have suggested that she was flouting her husband’s authority or making herself sexually available to other men, while others point to a variety of contradictory cultural meanings between Romans, Greeks, and Jews for wearing/not wearing a head covering.<sup>4</sup> Thus, we should be hesitant to draw any absolute practical conclusions about the original instructions from Paul to the Corinthians. Even more, we should be extremely cautious about drawing a straight line from those cultural practices to any such practices in our own culture, today.

Second, while the *details* of Paul’s advice is murky, we should also recognize that Paul’s *theological* understanding and rationale is quite clear. As elsewhere, Paul argues that husbands are the heads of their wives (v. 3; cf. Eph. 5:22–24), but he also teaches that husbands should look upon their wives as their “glory” (v. 7; cf. Prov. 12:4; Eph. 5:25–33). Paul insists on different roles for men and women in

---

<sup>1</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 429.

<sup>2</sup> Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 517.

<sup>3</sup> Barnett, *1 Corinthians: Holiness and Hope of a Rescued People*, 196. This particular suggestion for interpreting v. 4–5, though, has the difficulty of seeming to clash with Paul’s later statements in v. 14–15 about a woman’s long hair as her “glory.” (Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 548.)

<sup>4</sup> For a good summary, see Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 557–65.

the church (v. 4–5), while also insisting that neither men nor women are independent of the other, since all things come from God (v. 11–12; cf. Gal. 3:28). So, as we interpret this passage today, we should be slow to draw hard conclusions about specific rules for today about what men and women should wear, or about how they should style their hair.

Nevertheless, this passage forces each of us to consider *why* we are wearing what we are wearing, and *why* we are styling our hair in a particular way. Are we doing all things to the glory of God (1 Cor. 10:31)? Are we seeking to live as is “proper” to testify to these theological truths within the context our own cultural context (1 Cor. 11:13)?<sup>5</sup> As Charles Hodge writes, “Dress is in a great degree conventional. A costume which is proper in one country, would be indecorous in another. The principle insisted upon in this paragraph is, that women should conform in matters of dress to all those usages which the public sentiment of the community in which they live demands.”<sup>6</sup> So, while the underlying theological principles remain the same, the cultural symbols which *reflect* those theological principles may change. Ultimately, the effect of not having enough information to know what exactly Paul is instructing the *Corinthians* to do in their own dress and hairstyles, forces us to reflect more clearly on what *we* are doing in our own dress and hairstyles. That is, this passage does not so much tell us *what* to do as to help us reflect critically on *why* we are doing what we are doing.

## Headship: The Rule of Christ in the Church (1 Cor. 11:3–6)

In 1 Corinthians 11:3, Paul introduces the first major theological truth that we should reveal in the way we dress: *headship*. The idea of *headship* has to do with *authority*, as the parallel passage in Ephesians 5:22–24 makes clear: “[22] Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. [23] For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. [24] Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands.”<sup>7</sup> Some have sought to avoid these implications by arguing that *head* (*kephalē*) means “source,” rather than “authority.” While this meaning may make some sense, especially in light of v. 8, there is so little evidence from any ancient Greek sources that “head” was ever used this way that “no Greek lexicon offers this as an option.”<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, as one egalitarian author admits, “in view of the whole shape of the argument, the patriarchal implications of v. 3 are undeniable. Even if Paul is thinking here primarily of man as the source of woman rather than authority over woman, this still serves as the warrant for a claim about his ontological preeminence over her, as vv. 7–9 show.”<sup>9</sup>

So, in 1 Corinthians 11:3, Paul reminds the Corinthians that Christ has authority over every man, and that the husband has authority over his wife. In the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ,

---

<sup>5</sup> “For as a man’s dress or gesture has in some cases the effect of disfiguring, and in others of adorning him, so all actions are set off to advantage by decorum, and are vitiated by the want of it. Much, therefore, depends upon decorum (τὸ πρεπον,) and that not merely for securing for our actions gracefulness and beauty, but also to accustom our minds to propriety.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 350. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)

<sup>6</sup> Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 204–05.

<sup>7</sup> Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 225.

<sup>8</sup> Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

<sup>9</sup> Hays, *First Corinthians*, 184.

women and men are on the same footing (Gal. 3:28), but in regard to ordinary life in the home and in the church, distinctions of authority remain between men and women.<sup>10</sup> We should note that Paul first points out that “the head of every man is Christ.” In this, Paul is insisting that men are *not* independent. Yes, wives are under their husbands’ authority, but men are under the headship of Christ.<sup>11</sup> Men may not act however they please, as though they were accountable to no one but themselves. Unless men recognize that they are accountable to Christ himself for how they lead and sanctify their wives, they will ever use their authority wrongly. God has not entrusted men with headship of their homes so that men may boss their families around according to their own whims. On the contrary, headship of the home requires men to love their wives as Christ loved the church, by giving themselves up self-sacrificially to purify, nourish, and cherish their wives (Eph. 5:25–33). Christ’s self-sacrificial love at the cross provides an everlasting pattern that men ought to imitate to exercise the authority God has granted them (cf. 1 Cor. 11:1).

For men, though, passivity and self-indulgence has been a besetting sin ever since Adam abdicated his responsibility in the garden of Eden. Rather than fulfilling his mandate to “keep” (i.e., “guard”) the garden holy (Gen. 2:15), Adam passively allowed his wife to conduct negotiations with the serpent, and then he listened to his wife’s voice to take and eat the forbidden fruit (Gen. 3:6, 17). To this day, indwelling sin draws men generally to follow in the footsteps of Adam. For women, on the other hand, indwelling sin draws them to follow in the footsteps of Eve by seeking to fill the void of their husbands’ abdicated leadership. After the original sin, God declared that women would no longer experience the life-giving joy of being the helper of their husbands, but would experience the headship of their husbands as a curse: “Your desire shall be contrary to your husband, but he shall rule over you” (Gen. 3:16). From that point, all the way up to Paul’s day, and even into our own, we need to be reminded that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of a wife is her husband.

What, though, does Paul mean when he writes, “the head of Christ is God” (1 Cor. 11:3)? Isn’t the Son the Second Person of the Trinity, fully God himself? Yes, but Paul is not writing about God the Son, considered according to his divine nature. According to that divine nature, the Son existed in the “form of God,” having “equality with God” (Phil. 2:6). Yet, the Son “emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant” as the Christ, the God-Man (Phil. 2:7). During his earthly ministry (what theologians call his “estate of humiliation”), Christ humbled himself by becoming obedient to the will of the Father, even to the point of death on a cross (Phil. 2:8).<sup>12</sup> As John Calvin writes on this

---

<sup>10</sup> “When he says that there is no difference between the man and the woman, he is treating of Christ’s spiritual kingdom, in which individual distinctions are not regarded, or made any account of....In the meantime, however, he does not disturb civil order or honorary distinctions, which cannot be dispensed with in ordinary life. Here, on the other hand, he reasons respecting outward propriety and decorum — which is a part of ecclesiastical polity. Hence, as regards spiritual connection in the sight of God, and inwardly in the conscience, Christ is the head of the man and of the woman without any distinction, because, as to that, there is no regard paid to male or female; but as regards external arrangement and political decorum, the man follows Christ and the woman the man, so that they are not upon the same footing, but, on the contrary, this inequality exists.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 354. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)

<sup>11</sup> Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 433.

<sup>12</sup> For “estate of humiliation,” see *Westminster Larger Catechism*, questions #46–50.

verse, “Inasmuch as he has in our flesh made himself subject to the Father, for, apart from this, being of one essence with the Father, he is his equal. Let us, therefore, bear it in mind, that this is spoken of Christ as mediator. He is, I say, inferior to the Father, inasmuch as he assumed our nature, that he might be the first-born among many brethren.”<sup>13</sup>

After stating this theological principle, Paul moves on to the addressing his specific concern: the roles of men and women in public worship. When Paul speaks of praying and prophesying in v. 4, he is talking about the work of leading public worship in the church.<sup>14</sup> Whether leading the church in public prayer (cf. 1 Tim. 2:1–8), or leading the church in prophesy by building them up in the word of God (cf. 1 Cor. 14:5), Paul insists that *how* we do such things matters. The way we dress may either underscore or undercut what we are doing. Particularly, Paul teaches that if a man prays or prophesies publicly while “having down from the head” (ESV: “with his head covered”), his dress dishonors his head. Again, we don’t know the specific details of what this head covering might be. The covering itself is not important however, but only the theological implications of such a covering.<sup>15</sup> Christ has appointed this man as his lieutenant, to speak his words, and to lead the congregation in prayer to him.<sup>16</sup> For this man to cover his *head*, then, would symbolize dishonor toward his *head*—that is, toward Christ. This might be the equivalent, perhaps, of the *faux pas* of wearing a baseball cap to a formal dinner.<sup>17</sup> Not only would this be rude (cf. 1 Cor. 13:5), it draws attention to the man wearing the baseball cap, “when all eyes should be elsewhere, not least on the glory of God.”<sup>18</sup>

On the other hand, if a woman were to pray or to prophesy with her head *uncovered*, Paul adds that she would dishonor *her* head—that is, her husband (1 Cor. 11:5). Paul is not saying that a woman may pray or prophesy in public worship if her head *were* covered, for he later says that “the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says” (1 Cor. 14:34). Rather, his point in 1 Corinthians 11:5 is to contrast the headship of the man with the submission of the woman. It would be similar for a parent to say, “When you disobey me, it is so disrespectful to lie about what you have done!” By saying this, the parent is not authorizing disobedience, so long as the child is honest about it. Rather, the parent is focusing on the disrespectfulness of the lying, without commenting on the disobedience itself. In the same way, Paul is focusing here on proper and improper use of a head covering, and he will pick up

---

<sup>13</sup> Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 353. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>

<sup>14</sup> Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 207–08.

<sup>15</sup> “All of this shows us that Paul is not laying down an absolute rule that is to be observed by Christians of all times in regard to covering the head or leaving it uncovered during worship. Not the custom as a custom is vital but the *significance* of a custom....Hence Paul explains it to the Corinthians at length and bids them to abide by their custom. For to abrogate it and to fly in the face of it means, in their case, not only to violate that significance but at the same time to disavow that significance.” (Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 435.)

<sup>16</sup> Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 355. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>

<sup>17</sup> Hays, *First Corinthians*, 184.

<sup>18</sup> Thiselton, *First Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical & Pastoral Commentary*, 173.

the question of who may lead the congregation in prayer and prophesy in 1 Corinthians 14.<sup>19</sup> So, Christ calls *men* to pray and prophesy. *Men* must minister Christ's prophetic word to Christ's people, and *men* must speak to Christ in prayer on behalf of all Christ's people. For men to pray or to prophesy publicly with a covered head would be to dishonor the authority of their head—that is, of *Christ* himself (1 Cor. 11:4).

But, for a woman to pray or to prophesy publicly, much less with an uncovered head, would be to dishonor her own head, her husband (1 Cor. 11:5a). She would be bypassing her husband's authority not only in her actions, but also in her dress. This is the theological principle, but then Paul shifts back to appealing to the cultural symbol of that theological principle when he urges any woman who would lead in public worship with uncovered head to shave off all her hair (1 Cor. 11:5b–6). Again, there are many suggestions about the precise cultural meaning of a woman's cutting her hair short, but it is better to focus on the theological significance Paul is pointing us toward.<sup>20</sup> Instead of asking *which* hairstyles we may or may not have, we should instead ask *why* we want this or that hairstyle. Does it bear witness to the honorable position God has given to us by creating us male and female? Or, does our hairstyle function as a cultural symbol that advocates *rejecting* God's good purposes in creation? If so, then our hairstyle is a disgrace.

## Glory: The Revelation of Christ in the Church (1 Cor. 11:7–16)

In v. 7, Paul introduces the second set of theological concepts: *image* and *glory*. Here, Paul gives an additional reason that a man should not cover his head, namely that the man is the image and glory of God. The woman, on the other hand, should have a symbol of authority on her head (v. 10), because the woman is the glory of man. An *image* is a reflection of someone or something else. Here, Paul is saying that the man is a reflection of the glory of God, while the woman is a reflection of the glory of man. As above with the concepts of *headship*, it is important that we distinguish different aspects of *image*. Just as the woman relates to Christ as the head of the church directly along with the man (Eph. 5:23), so the Bible tells us that the man and woman *together* constitute the image of God

---

<sup>19</sup> “It would not, therefore, be allowable for them to prophesy even with a covering upon their head, and hence it follows that it is to no purpose that he argues here as to a covering. It may be replied, that the Apostle, by here condemning the one, does not commend the other. For when he reproves them for prophesying with their head uncovered, he at the same time does not give them permission to prophesy in some other way, but rather delays his condemnation of that vice to another passage, namely in 1 Corinthians 14.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 356. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)

<sup>20</sup> The strongest explanation may arise from the humiliation of shaving the head of a foreign slave before and Israelite could marry her in Deuteronomy 21:10–14: “[10] “When you go out to war against your enemies, and the LORD your God gives them into your hand and you take them captive, [11] and you see among the captives a beautiful woman, and you desire to take her to be your wife, [12] and you bring her home to your house, *she shall shave her head* and pare her nails. [13] And she shall take off the clothes in which she was captured and shall remain in your house and lament her father and her mother a full month. After that you may go in to her and be her husband, and she shall be your wife. [14] But if you no longer delight in her, you shall let her go where she wants. But you shall not sell her for money, nor shall you treat her as a slave, since *you have humiliated her.*” (cf. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 209.)

in relation to knowledge, righteousness, and holiness (Gen. 1:27).<sup>21</sup>

Here, though, Paul is not talking about the man and woman as the image of God *in general*, but the man as the image and glory of God in one area *particularly*: the dominion and rule of Christ in his church.<sup>22</sup> There are three reasons for the special function of the man as the image and glory of God. First, as Paul reminds us, the man was created first, and the woman from the man (v. 8). Second, the woman was created *for* man, not man for woman (v. 9). Third, God gave his original mandate to Adam alone, before Eve was created (Gen. 2:15–17). Therefore, Adam was responsible for working and keeping the garden in a way that Eve was not. Furthermore, God gave Adam alone the warning not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, so that Adam was responsible for the original sin in a way that Eve was not. Even though Eve was the one deceived (2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14), “sin came into the world through *one man*...” (Rom. 5:12), and “in *Adam* all die” (1 Cor. 15:22). In the order of creation, God has appointed man to bear the responsibilities, rewards, and consequences of exercising *God’s* dominion and authority in the world. *Man* is the image and glory of God.

Women, then, are the *glory of man* (1 Cor. 11:7b). Relatedly, we read in the Proverbs that “An excellent wife is the crown of her husband, but she who brings shame is like rottenness in his bones” (Prov. 12:4). However high a man may rise in exercising dominion in this world, he gains no higher *crowning glory* than he finds in an excellent wife. This is not a demeaning role for the woman, but “it is a great honor that God has appointed her to the man as the partner of his life, and a helper to him, and has made her subject to him as the body is to the head.”<sup>23</sup> As Charles Hodge explains, “She is the glory of the man. She receives and reveals what there is of majesty in him. She always assumes his station; becomes a queen if he is a king, and manifests to others the wealth and honour which may belong to her husband.”<sup>24</sup> As such, everything she does (including her dress) must reflect the authority of her head (v. 10)—that is, her husband. This word “authority” is a *metonymy*, where a part stands for the whole. By the *symbol* of authority she wears, she bears witness not only to her husband’s authority over her in the created order, but to the glory of Christ’s authority over his whole kingdom. Even the angels have some interest in this, although Paul does not explain more (v. 10).

---

<sup>21</sup> “God created man male and female, after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness, with dominion over the creatures.” (*Westminster Shorter Catechism*, #10)

<sup>22</sup> “The same question may now be proposed respecting the image, as formerly respecting the *head*. For both sexes were created in the image of God, and Paul exhorts women no less than men to be formed anew, according to that image. The *image*, however, of which he is now speaking, relates to the order of marriage, and hence it belongs to the present life, and is not connected with conscience. The simple solution is this — that he does not treat here of innocence and holiness, which are equally becoming in men and women, but of the distinction, which God has conferred upon the man, so as to have superiority over the woman. In this superior order of dignity the glory of God is seen, as it shines forth in every kind of superiority.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 357. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)

<sup>23</sup> Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 357. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>

<sup>24</sup> Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 210.

In v. 11, Paul reminds his readers that men and women are not independent of one another. The woman may have come *from* the man, having been created *for* the man, but now all men are born of women—and, furthermore, all things (men and women alike) come from God (v. 12). Next, Paul once again appeals to the cultural symbols of these theological principles. He asks them to evaluate whether it is *proper* for a woman to pray with an uncovered head (v. 13).<sup>25</sup> Then, he asks rhetorically whether nature itself teaches that long hair is a disgrace for a man, but the glory of a woman, as her covering (v. 14–15). Last, Paul insists that he will not enter into a fruitless debate with a contentious person, for the churches of God do not have a practice of quarreling (v. 16).<sup>26</sup> Again, the point is not that we should draw hard conclusions about the *specific* clothing and hairstyles we should have. Rather, we should live in a way that conforms with the order God appointed for our lives at our creation.

## Glory for Men; Glory for Women

God created men to exercise his dominion and authority in the world. Having Christ as their head, men should lead the spiritual lives of their homes and lead the public worship of the church. As men do this, they *image* God and reflect the *glory* of God through ministering the dominion of Christ himself through word and prayer. The besetting sin of men, then, is to shrink from this high calling back into passivity. Rather than actively rising to deal with challenges, men are so often tempted to abdicate their leadership, slinking to the sidelines of their homes and their churches as they wait for women to fill the void of their leadership. Like Adam, they are content to wait in passivity until Eve passes out the fruit. May it never be for us! It is glory for men to *rule*, exercising the dominion of their head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

This does not mean, however, that men may abuse their power in any respect. On the contrary, just as the Father delighted to glorify his the Lord Jesus Christ, and just as Christ willingly gave himself up for his Church, so husbands must look upon their wives as their *crowning glory*. Men must live not to lift *themselves* up at the expense of their wives, but to lay down their lives in order to lift

---

<sup>25</sup> “The point of the question turns on πρέπον, whether it is ‘proper’ for a woman to pray or to worship with her head uncovered. The verb πρέπω means ‘to shine forth,’ ‘to be distinguished’; hence the adjective == excellent, worthy, fitting, or ‘proper.’ We thus see that the obligation mentioned in v. 7 and v. 10 is one of propriety. This is general propriety since the next question turns on the teaching of nature; yet as far as the Christian is concerned, who does everything to the glory of God (10:31), even general propriety carries a Christian influence with it. Paul is quite certain what the answer will be, v. 2. When the Corinthians consider the custom they have they will certainly not call it improper.” (Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 448.)

<sup>26</sup> “To be contentious, i.e. disposed to dispute for the sake of disputation. With such persons all argument is useless. Authority is the only end of controversy with such disturbers of the peace. The authority here adduced is that of the apostles and of the churches. The former was decisive, because the apostles were invested with authority not only to teach the gospel, but also to organize the church, and to decide every thing relating to Christian ordinances and worship. The authority of the churches, although not coercive, was yet great. No man is justified, except on clearly scriptural grounds, and from the necessity of obeying God rather than man, to depart from the established usages of the church in matters of public concern.” (Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 214.)

up *their wives* as their crown and glory. Thus, just as Jesus willingly submitted to the will of his Father during his earthly ministry, and just as the church must submit to Christ in all things, so wives ought to submit to their husbands as their *heads*. But, while passivity is the besetting sin of men, usurping the authority of the husband is the corresponding besetting sin of women. Nevertheless, it is glory for women to *reveal* the honor of their husbands in their conduct, speech, and even in their dress and hairstyles.

## Confessional Citations

*The Westminster Standards (the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Westminster Larger Catechism, and the Westminster Shorter Catechism) cite our passage as a prooftext in the following places. In longer sections where our passage is particularly a prooftext of one phrase, that phrase is set in bold.*

**1. Some aspects of worship, church government, and day-to-day living are ordered by the light of nature, Christian wisdom, and the general teaching of Scripture. Even though these might not give us specific commands, we must always observe them as best we can:**

WCF 1.6. The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word: **and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed** [1 Cor. 11:13–14].