and if this is to be so, the Apostle proceeds,  
why not go further, and cut off her hair,  
which of itself is a token of this subjection?   
But if this be acknowledged to be  
shameful (it was a punishment of adulteresses),   
let the further decency of the  
additional covering be conceded likewise.

**6.**] The argument see above.  
**let her** ALSO, besides being unveiled, &c.

**7–9.**] *A second reason for the same,—  
from the dependence of the man on God  
only, but of the woman on the man.*

**7.**] **For** refers back to and gives a reason  
for the words “*let her be covered,*” the  
difference between the sexes being assumed,  
—that one *should be* and the other should  
*not* be veiled.

**the image...of God,**  
Gen. i. 26. This the *man* is, having been  
created first,—*directly*, and in a special  
manner: the woman indirectly, only *through  
the man*.

**and** (the representative of  
the) **glory of God:** on account of his superiority   
and *godlike* attributes among other  
created beings. This is obviously *the point*  
here brought out, as in Ps. viii. 6; not that  
he is *set to shew forth God’s glory*, because  
God *glories in him*. *Man* is *God’s glory:*  
He has put in him His Majesty, and he  
represents God on earth: *woman is man’s  
glory:* taken (ver. 8) from the *man*, shining  
not with light direct from God, but with  
light derived from *man*. This of course is true  
only as regards her place in creation, and her  
providential subordination, not in respect of  
the dependence of every woman’s individual  
soul directly on God, *and not on man*, for  
supplies of grace and preparations for glory.  
The Apostle omits in this case *the image*,  
because anthropologically the woman is not  
the *image* of the man, on account of the  
difference of the sexes: and also perhaps  
because thus he would seem to deny to the  
woman the being created in the *divine*  
image, which she is as well as the man,  
Gen. i. 26, 27. The former reason appears  
the more probable.

**8.**] **For** gives the  
reason of the former assertion, “*the woman  
is the glory of the man,*”—viz. that **the  
man is not** (emphasis on “IS,”—‘takes not  
his being,’ in the fact of his original creation.   
The *propagation* of the species is  
not here in view) **out of the woman, but  
the woman out of the man** (compare Gen.  
ii. 28, “*She shall be called woman, because  
she was taken out of man*”).

**9.**] **For  
neither** (parallel with ver. 8—*another*  
reason: not *subordinate* to it) **was the man  
created** (emphasis on “CREATED” as before  
on is) **on account of the woman, &c.** —In this  
verse, besides the *manner* of, creation, **out  
of** *the man*, the occasion of creation, **for the  
sake of** *the man*, is insisted on; see Gen. ii.  
18 ff.

**10.**] **For this cause**, *on account  
of what has just been said*, by which