the subordination of the woman has been  
proved:—refers to vv. 7–9.

**the woman ought to have power on her head**  
(i.e. the *sign of power* or *subjection:*  
shewn by the context to mean *a veil*). So  
Diodorus Siculus speaks of an image of a  
queen, having three kingdoms on its head,  
to signify that she was daughter and wife  
aud mother of a king; where ‘kingdoms’  
evidently mean *crowns*, the *tokens of kingdom*.   
And as there from the context it is  
plain that they indicated *participation* in  
the glory of the kingdoms, so here it is as  
evident from the context that the token of  
**power** indicates being *under* power: and  
such token is the covering. In this meaning   
all the principal Commentators agree,  
both ancient and modern. See some of  
the differing views discussed in my Greck  
Test.

**because of the angels**] i.e.  
because in the Christian assemblies the  
holy angels of God are present, and delighting   
in the due order and subordination  
of the ranks of God’s servants,—and by  
a violation of that order we should be  
giving offence to them. So Chrysostom,—  
“Knowest thou not that thou standest  
with angels? with them thou singest, with  
them thou praisest: and wilt thou stand  
laughing?” And in another place he  
says, “To shew that the whole air is full of  
angels, only hear what the Apostle says,  
when he is rebuking the women and ordering   
them to wear a veil on their heads.”  
Some, with a modification of this rendering,   
take **the angels** to mean the *guardian  
angels*, appointed, one to take charge of  
each Christian. So Theophylact and Theodoret.   
But though such angels *certainly do*  
*minister* to the heirs of salvation, see Matt.  
xviii. 10 and note,—there does not appear  
to be any immediate allusion to them *here*.  
Others again understand ‘*bad angels,*’ who  
might *themselves* be lustfully excited (so  
Tertullian),—or might *tempt men so to  
be*,—or might *injure the unveiled themselves.*   
**But the angels**, *absolute*, never  
means any thing in the N.T. except *the  
holy angels of God*. See some other explanations   
in my Greek Test. But still  
a question remains, WHY *should the  
Apostle have here named the angels, and  
adduced them as furnishing a reason for  
women being veiled in the Christian assemblies?*   
I believe the account given above  
to be the true one, and the *reason* of adducing   
it to be that the Apostle *has before  
his mind the order of the universal church*,  
and prefers when speaking of the assemblies   
of Christians to adduce those beings  
who, as not entering into the gradation  
which he has here described, are conceived  
as *spectators* of the whole, delighted with  
the decency and order of the servants of  
God. Stanley thinks the most natural explanation   
of the reference to be, that the  
Apostle was led to it by a train of association   
familiar to his readers, but lost to us:  
and compares the intimations of a similar  
familiarity on their part with the subjects of  
which he was treating in 2 Thess. ii. 5–7.

**11.**] *Yet is neither sex insulated and independent   
of the other in the Christian life.*  
**In the Lord**, i.e., in the Christian state; a  
well-known phrase. See e.g. Rom. xvi.  
2, 8, 11, 12 (twice), &c.

**12.**] *And in  
this, the Christian life accords with the  
original ordinance of God.* **For** (proof of  
ver. 11) **as the woman is** (was taken,  
Gen. ii. 21 f.) **out of the man, so the man**  
(is born, in the propagation of the human  
race) **by means of the woman; but all  
things** (both man and woman and all  
things else: a general maxim, see 2 Cor. v.  
18) **are of** (as their source,—thus uniting  
in one great head both sexes and all creation)   
**God.**—They are dependent on one  
another, but *both* on HIM: the Christian  
life, therefore, which unites them in Christ,  
is agreeable to God’s ordinance.

**13.**] *Appeal to their own sense of propriety:*   
cf. ch. x. 15.

**in your own**