

Fortunatus, and Achaicus (xvi. 17), or in some other way. The question raised is that of the relation between men and women, especially in public worship. Related themes are treated in chapters vi and vii.

- 3 I am glad, then, that you think so kindly of me, **but** I should prefer to see behaviour in the church ordered in accordance with Christian principle. **I wish you to know that Christ is the head of every man** (subject and predicate could be reversed in this clause, but in the two following clauses *head*, being anarthrous, is predicate, and these carry the present clause with them), **the man** (or possibly *the husband*) **is the head of the woman** (or possibly *the wife*), **and God is the head of Christ**. In this verse (which is to be contrasted with 4, 7, 10 below) the word *head* (κεφαλή) is evidently used in a transferred sense. In the Old Testament *head* (*rosh*, sometimes but by no means always translated into Greek as κεφαλή) may refer to the ruler of a community (e.g. Judges x. 18); this use, however, though it was adopted in Greek-speaking Judaism, was not a native meaning of the Greek word (for details see H. Schlier, in *T.W.N.T.* iii. 674 f.). In Greek usage the word, when metaphorical, may apply to the outstanding and determining part of a whole, but also to origin (e.g., in the plural, to the source of a river, as in Herodotus iv. 91). In this sense it is used theologically, as in an Orphic fragment (21a): Zeus is the head, Zeus the middle, and from Zeus all things are completed (*Zeὺς κεφαλή, Zeὺς μέσσα, Διὸς δ' ἐκ πάντα τελεῖται*; that some MSS. have ἀρχή instead of κεφαλή adds to its significance; see also S. Bedale in *J.T.S.* v (new series), 211-15). That this is the sense of the word here is strongly suggested by verses 8 f. Paul does not say that man is the lord (κύριος) of the woman; he says that he is the origin of her being. In this he is directly dependent on Gen. ii. 18-23, where it is stated (a) that woman was created in order to provide a helper suited to him, and (b) by the removal of a rib from Adam's body. It is true that Paul might have reached a different conclusion if he had started from Gen. i. 27, where from the beginning creation seems to have been of male and female alike (perhaps—as some ancient Jewish interpreters thought—of an androgynous being). Paul is indeed partly influenced by this verse when in verse 7, after writing that man is the image and

glory of God, he says that woman is the glory of man—not his image, for she too shares the image of God, and is not (as some commentators have thought) more remote from God than is man.

So far we have concentrated on one clause. *Man is the head of woman* in the sense that he is the origin, and thus the explanation of her being. That *God is the head of Christ* can be understood in a similar way. The Father is *fons divinitatis*; the Son is what he is in relation to the Father. There can be no doubt that Paul taught a form (we may call it an innocent form) of subordinationism; see further iii. 23; xv. 28, with the notes. The Son would no longer be the kind of Son we know him to be if he ceased to be obedient to and dependent on the Father.

It is harder to explain the clause that states that *Christ is the head of every man*—of every man, not simply of the Christian; for it is scarcely legitimate (with Robertson-Plummer) to take *every* to mean simply 'whether married or unmarried'. The reference is probably to Christ as the agent of creation (cf. viii. 6: *through him*); possibly however the thought goes further: as the existence of Christ is given in the existence of God, and as the existence of woman is given in the existence of man, so the existence of man is given in the existence of Christ, who is the ground of humanity (cf. Col. i. 16, In him all things were created). Thus a chain of originating and subordinating relationships is set up: God, Christ, man, woman. From this proposition practical consequences are deduced.

Every man who prays (that is, in public and aloud, as any Christian might do in the assembly) **or prophesies** (for the gift of prophecy see xii. 10, et al.) **with a veil** (throughout this paragraph *veil*—always a paraphrase, since the Greek word κάλυμμα does not occur—is to be understood as a head-covering concealing the hair and upper part of the body, not as a covering for the face—so Schlatter, who shows that the reference is to the practice of the devout and modest Jewess; see *Ketuboth* vii. 6: What transgresses Jewish custom? If she goes out with her head uncovered . . .) **hanging down from his head** (κατὰ κεφαλῆς; so Robertson, pp. 606 f., M. iii. 268; it is worth while to retain this somewhat pedantic rendering because, as we have seen, κεφαλή is sometimes used metaphorically; Héring takes κατὰ to mean