

CONTENTS.—(1) How requisite it is that women cover their heads in the public assemblies for the worship of God,¹ vv. 2–16. (2) Regarding the abuses of the Agapae, and the right way of celebrating them, vv. 17–34.

Ver. 1 belongs still to the preceding section.—Become *imitators* of me. *Become* so, Paul writes, for there was as yet a sad lack of practical evidence of this imitation; see also x. 32 (comp. Kühner, *ad Xen. Anab.* i. 7. 4). — *καγώ*] as I also have become an imitator, namely, of Christ. Comp. on Matt. xv. 3. Christ as the highest pattern of the spirit described in x. 33. Comp. Phil. ii. 4 ff.; Rom. xv. 3; Eph. v. 2; Matt. xx. 28.

Ver. 2. Conciliatory preamble to the sharp correction which follows. — *δέ*] is simply the *autem* leading on to a new subject; hence we are not to seek any set purpose in the similarity of sound between *μιμηταί* and *μυμησθε*. — *πάντα*] because you are in all respects mindful of me. Rückert's explanation: "you think on everything that comes from me" (xvi. 14), is needlessly far-fetched, seeing that *μυμημαί* with the accusative, very frequent in Greek writers, does not occur in the N. T., and the absolute *πάντα* is common enough (ix. 25, x. 32). — *καὶ καθὼς κ.τ.λ.*] and because you hold fast the traditions in the way in which I delivered them to you. This is the practical result of what was stated in the foregoing clause. *Παράδοσεις* might refer to doctrine as well as to usages and discipline (comp. Gal. i. 14; Col. ii. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6; Plato, *Legg.* vii. p. 803 A; Polyb. xi. 8. 2); but the tenor of the following context shows that Paul means here directions of the latter sort, which he had given to the Corinthians orally (and also perhaps in his lost letter, v. 2). He had, at the foundation of the church and afterwards, made various external regulations, and rejoices that, on the whole, they had not set these aside, but were holding them fast in accordance with his directions (*κατέχετε*, comp. xv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21; Heb. iii. 6, x. 23). As to the connection of *παρέδωκα . . . παραδόσεις*, see Winer, p. 210 [E. T. 281].

Ver. 3. "After this general acknowledgment, however, I have still to bid you lay to heart the following particular point." And now, first of all, the principle of the succeeding admonition. Respecting *θέλω . . . εἰδέναι*, comp. on x. 1; Col. ii. 1. — *παντὸς ἀνδρ.*] note the prominent position of the word, as also the article before *κεφ.*: of every man the Head. That what is meant, however, is every Christian man, is self-evident from this first clause; consequently, Paul is not thinking of the general order of creation (Hofmann), according to which Christ is the head of all things (Col. i. 16 f., ii. 10), but of the organization of Christian fellowship, as it is based upon the work of redemption. Comp. Eph. v. 21 ff. — *κεφαλῆ*, from which we are not (with Hofmann) to dissociate the conception of an organized whole (this would suit in none of the passages where the word occurs, Col. ii. 10 included) designates in all the three cases here the proximate, immediate Head, which is to be specially noted in the second instance, for Christ

¹ Much fruitless trouble has been taken to connect even the non-veiling of the women with the state of parties at Corinth. Now it has been the *Pauline party* (Neau-

der), now the *Christ-party* (Olshausen), and now the *followers of Apollos* (Räbiger), who have been represented as the opponents of veiling.

as head of the church (Col. i. 18 ; Eph. i. 22, iv. 15) is also head of the woman (comp. Eph. v. 22 f.). The relation indicated by κεφ. is that of organic subordination, even in the last clause : *He to whom Christ is subordinate is God* (comp. iii. 23, xv. 28, viii. 6 ; Col. i. 15 ; Rom. ix. 5 ; and see Kahnis, *Dogm.* III. p. 208 ff.), where the dogmatic explanation resorted to, that Christ in His *human* nature only is meant (Theodoret, Estius, Calovius, *al.*), is un-Pauline. Neither, again, is His *voluntary* subjection referred to (Billroth), but—which is exactly what the argument demands, and what the two first clauses give us—the *objective* and, notwithstanding His essential equality with God (Phil. ii. 6), *necessary* subordination of the Son to the Father in the divine economy of redemption.¹ Much polemic discussion as to the misuse of this passage by the Arians and others may be found in Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact. — Gal. iii. 28, indeed, shows that the distinction of the sexes is done away in Christ (in the spiritual sphere of the Christian life) ; but this *ideal* equality of *sex* as little does away with the empirical subordination in marriage as with differences of rank in other earthly relations, *e.g.* of masters and servants. — κεφ. δὲ Χ. ὁ Θεός] The gradation of rank rises up to the *supreme Head over all*, who is the Head of the *man* also, mediately, through Christ. This makes it all the more obvious that, on the one hand, the man who prays or speaks as a prophet before God in the assembly ought not to have his head covered, see ver. 7 ; but that, on the other hand, the relation of the women under discussion is all the more widely to be distinguished from that of the men.

Ver. 4. First inference from the aforesaid gradation of rank.—This inference is a *plea of privilege for the men*, which was but to prepare the way for the censure next to be passed upon the women. Had Paul meant to *correct* the men because they had prayed or preached as prophets at Corinth with their heads covered (Chrysostom and many of the older commentators ; see against this view, Bengel, and especially Storr, *Opusc.* II. p. 288), he would have gone into the matter more in detail, as he does in what follows respecting the women. — προσευχ.] of praying aloud in the public assemblies. For that Paul is giving instructions for the sphere of *church*-life, not for *family worship* (Hofmann), is quite clear from the προφητεῖαν added here and in ver. 5, which does not suit the idea of the private devotions of a husband and wife, like the σχολάζειν τῇ προσευχῇ in vii. 5, but always means the *public* use for general edification of the χάρισμα referred to, namely, that of apocalyptic utterance (Acts ii. 17 f., xix. 6, xxi. 9 ; 1 Cor. xiii. and xiv. ; Matt. vii. 22). Moreover, vv. 5 f. and 10 *presuppose publicity* ; as indeed *a priori* we might assume that Paul would not have prescribed so earnestly a specific costume for the head with a view only to the family edification of a man and his wife. It was precisely in the necessity of avoiding

¹ Melancthon puts it well : "Deus est caput Christi, non de essentiali dicitur, sed de ministerio. Filius mediator accipit ministerium a consilio divinitatis, sicut saepe inquit : Pater misit me. Mihi hic mentio non

arcanæ essentialis, sed ministerii."—Even the exalted and reigning Christ is engaged in this *ministerium*, and finally delivers up the kingdom to the Father. See xv. 28.