

# **Dr. Gary Meadors, 1 Corinthians, Lecture 25, 1 Corinthians 11:2-34. Paul's Response to Questions of Public Worship. 1 Corinthians 11:2-15, Part 1 Male and Female in Public Worship**

© 2024 Gary Meadors and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 25, 1 Corinthians 11:2-34, Paul's Response to the Questions of Public Worship, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, Male and Female in Public Worship before God, Part 1.

Well, welcome back to our lectures on 1 Corinthians.

Today, we're going to be in 1 Corinthians chapter 11. We'll kick this chapter off and have two or three sessions within it. In many ways, 1 Corinthians 11 may be the most challenging chapter in the book of 1 Corinthians for interpretation.

Some of that relates to some ambiguity of phrases and terms as to what they meant in Paul's time and space. Some of it is due to the large interest in this chapter from major organizations in the gender debate, particularly in the USA. They have perhaps created as many problems sometimes in interpretation as they have solved, but they certainly have brought to the table a lot of issues that relate to the teaching of Paul on male and female and particularly man and woman, husband and wife.

So, we're going to start this chapter. You should have a note package, note package number 12, in your possession, which is the start of 1 Corinthians chapter 11. This is actually our 25th lecture in 1 Corinthians.

It's getting about what I thought it would be. I figured we would have about 30 sessions to get through this book. But as I continue to work on it with you, I just stand amazed at how much information there is on 1 Corinthians.

Not only do I have major commentaries that I've mentioned, I have stacks and stacks of journal articles. I can't even read everything that I have in the space that I have to do it. But that's the way of the Bible.

If it weren't that way, we'd have less than a divine book, wouldn't we? It's the quest to know, which is part of fulfilling the fact that we are created in God's image, and he's given us this task to know him through his word. So, 1 Corinthians 11 will take us to another aspect of that. As I've been doing, I'm highlighting issues in the notes and giving you some answers.

Sometimes, I raise more questions than I answer. That's typical. In fact, it's a sign, I think, of good teaching because if you are a good student, your greatest trait is curiosity.

You have the curiosity to know and to search until you find some answers. 1 Corinthians 11 will give you everything you want in that regard because it will challenge you to read widely and repeatedly in terms of getting your arms around some of the issues. Let's see if we can get it started and get you off in the right direction.

All right, page 134, note pack 12. You'll notice that Roman numeral number 4 has to do with Paul's response to that written communique all the way back in chapter 7 and verse 1 when we talked about the things whereof you have written. In number A, Paul's response to issues of sex and marriage is in chapter 7, and Paul's response to the question of food sacrificed to idols is in chapters 8 through 11.

Now C, Paul's response to the questions of public worship in chapter 11. Now, chapter 11 covers two things. It covers males and females in public worship, and then it covers the church in relation to gatherings around the Lord's Supper in the last half of this chapter.

It has been pointed out that there is no *peri de* to kick off this chapter, and consequently, some have raised the question as to whether they asked the question, that is the Corinthians, or whether Paul has brought this in because he knows that it's an issue and therefore is going to treat it. At this point, it's sort of irrelevant. We do have it, and we'll deal with it.

The sequence for treating this text is a bit difficult because we've got lots of things involved. We've got some deep issues involved in historical and cultural backgrounds. We've got issues involved with the use of terms, and then we have just the context itself, which ought to be where we start, and we'll try to do that.

Now, all the issues need to be considered at almost the same time. It's a massive thing to control. Given the complexity of 1 Corinthians 11, 2 to 16, just these early verses, in the current evangelical debate over gender, we will deal with this section in three movements.

In our first movement, we'll try to do a basic reading of the text, where we will raise some issues and give some answers to them. Then, after that, we will look at the historical cultural reconstruction that has been brought in to help us with those details, but I think it's good to look at the details. Then, I will look at how some have imaged it from their historical cultural presentations.

Then thirdly, I'll give you some information about the gender issue and the gender debate. This is particularly American, USA-focused, but it would be good for you to have this information to think through. We won't talk a lot about that, but I have given you some important documents that you can pursue if you don't already have them or can't surface them on your own.

So, let's start with a basic reading of the text in its context. This section, 11, 2 to 34, is about public worship. We see in the first part some issues with male and female, and we see in the second part probably a nice introduction to where they were meeting.

They were in patron's homes, and we'll see that in terms of the question of the Lord's Supper and the early congregation. First of all, male and female in worship before God, 11:2 to 16. As we've mentioned, the overall context is public worship.

There has been some writing. There are so many who have gone about trying to deal with some of the difficulties of this chapter that they have also created certain lenses through which to read the chapter, and some have created lenses that this is private, not public, and so forth and so on. But the majority opinion still remains that we're talking about public worship, the church when it's gathered together, however many that might be.

The structure of the section is not all that difficult, but I'm sharing a few contributions with you. These are more for you to think about on your own as you meditate upon these texts, but nonetheless, let me highlight some of these. At this stage in our research, we're looking for a basic layout of the facts and the flow of the text.

At this point, the highly disputed terms will be held off until we get to those aspects. First of all, Fee, who is a Pentecostal scholar of no small repute and is also an egalitarian, will use those terms because they do relate a lot to the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 11. There are hierarchialists, complementarians, and egalitarians.

I would probably use the terms hierarchial and egalitarians and leave complementarian in the middle, which I'll explain later when we come to those terms more specifically. Hierarchialists have a view of men over women. Egalitarians have more of an equalizing view that men and women are equal, but they have various created roles to fulfill.

Now, in Fee's structural setup, he has a three-part division. 11:3 to 16, I want you to understand. 11:7 to 12, the explanation of man and woman and the problem of public worship in relation to how they relate to God and how they relate to each other.

Then 11:13 to 16, a call for discernment on Paul's teaching. That's pretty much of a Western layout by paragraphs. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if these don't somewhat match, and I see that they do.

The paragraphs that are in the New International Version. Working by paragraphs, and Fee, by the way, is a bit of a proponent of that in his book on Exegetical Guide to the New Testament. He emphasizes paragraphs heavily, and they are a very important part of finding structure.

Then there's Fitzmeyer. Fitzmeyer is interesting because, as a Roman Catholic, you know that he's going to come at this very traditionally in terms of the role of men and women, and probably hierarchical in some ways, if not totally. He doesn't always expose his hand on those issues because Fitzmeyer, I call him the Joe Friday of commentaries.

That was a TV series many, many, many decades ago, actually, of police who went out and investigated and interviewed people, and Joe Friday was the guy who wanted the facts. He didn't want people's opinions: the facts and only the facts.

Well, Fitzmeyer is very much that way. He's a historical critical scholar, and he also tends to look for those items rather than trying to theologize or be overly hermeneutical. So Fitzmeyer's perspective is broken out into smaller pieces.

11:3, the programmatic statement that is Paul's basic theological principle, and we could read that text to see what he's talking about here. I don't know why he didn't include verse 2. I praise you, I'm going to read verse 2, I praise you for remembering me and everything, and for holding to the traditions just as I passed them on to you. Verse 3, but I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.

Verse 3 gathers together the question of head and the three components, the two which are particularly controversial in this text, being man and woman. Then 11:4 to 6, Paul's thesis sets forth the difference between the heads of men and women in public prayer and worship in a rhetorical sort of way. 11.7 to 9, his explanatory argument asserts the relationship between women and men.

Now, we will look over this in detail, but this is just seeing the structure. 11.10, which is an extremely important verse, the concluding statement to 3 through 9, the woman's obligation to have authority on or over her head. The word on or over is very controversial; it relates to a preposition, and we'll see that when we get to it.

That verse also has the phrase because of the angels. 11:11 and 12, Paul's qualifying counter-argument in the Lord, corresponding to 7, excuse me, verses 7 to 9, and reflects a little bit of a possible chiasm. And 11.16, admonition based on church

discipline, the concluding verse of the passage, which is just as troublesome in some ways as the rest of it.

Fitzmeyer's further summary of the view of the meaning of this text flirts with his interpretive construct. His paradigm is stated in five arguments, five reasons, he says, why a woman should not pray or prophesy. He says cultic assembly; we'll use that term cultic; it just means religious, if you please, with an uncovered head.

First of all, biblically, the order of creation found in the Genesis story reveals that woman has been created for man to be his companion and helper. Hence, as the glory of man, she should cover her head. Now, that will come up very much as we get into it.

The woman's head represents man, and in worship, the covering of that head is designed to reduce man in the worship context. Whereas the man's head is Christ, and his head is uncovered to promote Christ. It's all a big part of the imagery here.

Theologically, the ordered headship of God, Christ, man, and woman calls for the veiling. There's a pecking order that's involved, a created pecking order, according to Fitzmeyer. Sociologically, a convention based on nature itself considers a woman's uncovered head in such a situation as shameful and a disgrace.

Now, that'll come back to ask, well, why does she cover it in the first place? Why could it be a shame or a disgrace? As a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, the churches of God have no such custom as uncovered heads of women at prayer in a calling assembly. Verse 16 that's a troublesome passage, and we'll look at that later.

There are two takes on that, as you can imagine, at the end of the passage. And then verse 10 is because of the angels and what their role might be in all this. We'll pick that up as we flow through the text.

Garland, he's a Southern Baptist, but he's in the progressive part of the Southern Baptist group. In that sense, he's an egalitarian. Most Southern Baptists would be hierarchical in some sense, but he is egalitarian, teaches at, he was at Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville, got moved out of there, and has been at Baylor College in Waco for a long time.

Garland's section summaries are always profitable to read, and I've mentioned that to you before. Garland is careful to note that Paul is not attempting to establish a gender hierarchy in this text, but is merely ordering women in public worship within their cultural sensitivities. I think that's very important, and while he may or may not be consistent with this observation as he deals with the text, the fact is that we've got to come to this text clean, and that is extremely difficult to do in the current

cultural setting of America and perhaps other parts of the world in terms of what is the role of women in ministry.

America has had some strong traditions of this hierarchical view, which wants women under the authority of men, absolutely, and that's been at odds for decades now with a couple of groups that I'll point out to you later as to just what is the role of women in relation to ministry, and if you bring that debate to 1 Corinthians 11 too early, you bring lenses that force the text into your categories before you've looked at the text in a purer manner, in their perhaps original manner that Paul was dealing with, and you bring your own theology to bear on them too early. You have to be careful with that very, very much. Direct teaching comes before creative constructs, and at least he's noted that he is not attempting to establish a gender hierarchy here.

Now, that would be a strong hierarchical position, that he is, but the complementarian on the progressive side of complementarian and the egalitarians point out very much that this isn't a text that should be used to browbeat women into submission to men, but it's a text that should be looked at from the standpoint of the role of men and women in public worship and their authority or right to participate. Garland, this time, it's not Talbot, Talbert, but it's Garland who gives us a chiasm on the structure of our text of 2 to 16, and you can see it here. I'm not going to read it all to you, but you'll notice that the crucial verse, verse 10, does come in the middle.

The central assertion is that, for this reason, a woman ought to have authority over her head. I find that quite interesting, to be frank, and I think it also supports the strong possibility of a chiastic structure because the logic of the text ends up falling in verse 10 a great deal. All right, page 136.

These three major interpreters, Fee, Fitzmeyer, and Garland, illustrate the flow of this text. The flow is pretty straightforward. It's the devil's in the details, not in the big piece of it, even though the details help us to get to the big piece, and when we've seen that, it helps us to get to the details.

It's a both and. Let's look at the text now in its own flow. In 11.2, verse 2 starts us out, as I read just a little while ago.

I praise you, Paul says. Notice we don't have a *peri de*. We don't have Paul using a slogan here to introduce the subject.

This is why some raise the question if the Corinthians wrote to him about this, or if he's bringing it in because he had knowledge that they needed it. That's neither here nor there, but nonetheless, it's a valid observation. I praise you for remembering me in everything and for holding to the traditions just as I pass them on to you.

Now, let's look at that. That's a very interesting beginning verse for this section. The term translated traditions and tradition is not a bad word in the Bible, and here it is.

It's used as a technical term in both Judaism and in the New Testament. In Judaism, it was used for the oral transmission of religious instruction. The *paradosis* is the Greek term.

The traditions were the oral transmission of religious instruction and the Jewish traditions, both Old Testament and then what we call Second Temple Judaism, which begins in the third century BC, around that time, maybe a little earlier with the deportations to Babylon, destruction of the temple, and things of that nature. But the Jewish people created a very large cache of literature we call Second Temple Judaism. The Septuagint was a piece of that, but you've got Ecclesiasticus.

You've got the wisdom of Ben Sirach. You've got the Psalms of Solomon. You have two huge volumes of Jewish literature that are not canonical and cover the intertestamental period.

The Maccabees. In the RSV Bible, they've always included a portion of the Apocrypha, which includes 1st and 2nd Maccabees, but there are actually four Maccabees, 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th. Three and four are included, so there's only a piece of this Second Temple Jewish literature that's included in the RSV, not because it's canonical, but because it's important historically.

It's the land bridge, if you please, the literary bridge between the Old Testament and the time of Jesus and the apostles. This is something that's very neglected. What is it that influenced Jesus as a learner of Jewishness as he grew as a child? What was it that influenced Paul? Who was Gamaliel? Why was he studying in Jerusalem with Gamaliel at a very early age? Well, that was Second Temple Judaism.

They studied not only the Old Testament scriptures but also their own writings, which were pretty prolific during that period. They even show up in the New Testament. There are a number of places where we get quotes in the New Testament that come out of Second Temple Judaism literature rather than the Bible, and yet they're incorporated in an authoritative manner into the New Testament.

They only get their real authority when they get into the New Testament, so to speak. Otherwise, it's all a matter of historical writing, not something that has the imprimatur of inspiration on it. But when they come into the New Testament, then we take them to be accurate by God's providence.

All right. Now, the excellence of maintaining true traditions, this *paradosis*. Notice these traditions, *paradosis*, that's a noun, did not originate with Paul, but he handed them down.

There's a verb, the noun paradists, the verb is pareidolia, and these words are used in Acts and in the New Testament as the authoritative transmission of authoritative information, and it becomes basically a code word for that kind of thing. Paul's going to use it a little later, as I mentioned in this paragraph, in 1 Corinthians 15, in just that way. He didn't originate this material, but he handed them down.

He was in the flow of tradition. Paul was not counter-tradition. He was a counter-human tradition.

But what was true and accurate was that Paul picked up on, forwarded, and enhanced it in a number of ways. This term, in its various forms, is used in reference to tradition which is viewed as authoritative. Whatever the tradition history might be, the term paradoseis, that is traditions, is used of men.

It's used for the Colossian heresy, which was a tradition of the wrong kind. It's used of Judaism. They had their traditions, and they also used true Christian traditions.

I've given you text on each of those. The verb use in Luke 1-2 is quite important. The prologue to Luke 1 is one of the most important prologues in the Gospels, because it gives us an insight into how Gospels were written in the first century.

Luke claims that he is giving paradoseis. He's giving authoritative transmission of information. It's another important text along this line.

This term probably refers to the established oral teaching, which was part of the early Christian pool of instruction. And as I've said repeatedly now, this term normally implies an authoritative tradition, such as in 1 Corinthians 15-3, where Paul appeals to it in his instruction about the resurrection. So, Paul is not a lone ranger.

He got marginalized from time to time, and just his dedication seemed to marginalize him from some people. But the fact is that Paul is a teacher of true tradition, both Jewish and Christian, as well as one who develops it in a fuller way as he unpacks the meaning of that tradition to the churches in his epistles. Paul presents created sex distinctions as canonical and non-negotiable.

That's the prescriptive nature of paradoseis, of tradition. I'll use the words prescriptive and descriptive. Sometimes, the Bible teaches us what we call a normative fashion.

It's something that is always true. That prescribes truth, prescribes to us what we should believe. Sometimes, the Bible is descriptive.



It describes to us how the church operated. That's not prescribed to us. We don't have to do it exactly the same way they did it.

For example, I used to hear lots of sermons on Acts 20:20 vision, going from house to house, and that was the basis for a house-to-house visitation program for a church. That's not the way to use the book of Acts. There is nothing wrong with house-to-house visitation, but that's not the way you use the Book of Acts.

The book of Acts is describing to us how the early church did it. We can pick up a lot of ideas from there, but it's not prescribing to us exactly how we have to do it. We do not have to observe communion every time we meet as Christians.

They tended to do that in the first century. We don't necessarily have to frame the church service around that. Some groups have, the Plymouth Brethren, and I enjoyed it.

I operated in my earliest Christian days within some Plymouth Brethren assemblies, and the Presbyterian church I go to now observes it every week. But like anything, some of these things can become too pro forma, and in some denominations, it can be misunderstood by people who don't understand the gospel as clearly that it's doing something for them. We have to be very careful about how we handle that particular tradition.

Acts is describing, and so is Paul describing, or is he prescribing as he speaks? In relation to these created distinctions of the roles of male and female, and how God describes them in Genesis and then in the biblical narrative, we should probably view that as normative prescriptive material. This is the way it is. There are some challenges in unpacking it.

Some people take logical leaps, or illogical leaps as you prefer, from one small piece of information and explode it into a system. And be careful about that. But the fact is, is that these are prescribed teachings.

They're part of the traditions that we should observe. They're not just descriptive. I think, however, that maybe the nature of the cover, and we'll talk about this a little bit.

Women were to be covered, but how do you cover? Those are two different things. The nature of the cover is a created distinction, and what that image is, the glory of the woman, the glory of man, and the issue of the nature of the cover. There's an array of interpretations as to what that means.

That's not as crucial as forensic teaching. That's more of the functional, pragmatic end, and that's a little more descriptive. This term, this tradition issue, in its various

forms, is used in reference to tradition, which is viewed as authoritative, whatever the tradition history might be.

I've already read that to you—next paragraph. Paul presents created sex distinctions as canonical and non-negotiable.

He views, however, the issues of cover as customary. Now, this becomes controversial, and that's not a simple thing to answer in verse 16, and we'll come back to it. That could well be descriptive, depending on how you understand it in the context.

He notes that the larger issue relates to the shameful actions of some women who were testing or challenging the historic distinctions between men and women, that is, the *paradoseis*, the traditions. Paul is willing to offer theological justification for maintaining a custom because of the importance of the deeper issues. So custom is tied to tradition, and if the custom is designed to reflect the tradition, then that becomes something that is a quasi-tradition, if you please.

Maybe not fixed forever, but certainly fixed within their context, and we'll talk about that more a little bit later, particularly in verse 10. Now, as we move along here, the passage, verse 2, that is, is not intended to lower the status of women. In fact, this would be the overall passage.

Chapter 11 exalts women in many ways. Verse 5 says, But every woman who prays or prophesies, now that authorizes her, who prays or prophesies. This is public place.

So right here, almost off the cuff, as if you should already know this, Paul authorizes her. Women who pray or prophesy with their heads uncovered dishonor their heads. Now, we've got to figure out that cover and the issue of dishonor.

It is the same as having her been shaved, but she's authorized. He's not putting women down. He's actually entitled them in ways; in many situations in Jewish history, they were not entitled before.

Verse 11, So don't get too big for your britches, gentlemen. Verse 12, But everything comes from God, and that's a very, very important phrase at the end of this paragraph of 7 through 12, because everything comes from God. That is the central focus in this whole passage.

The question is not how men and women relate to each other as much as it is how do men and women relate to God in public worship. That's the crucial point in this text. And that is the terminal statement there in verse 12. Let's look on.

So, it's not intended to lower the status of women. The text at least promotes the right and freedom of women to participate in public worship as long as they do so in keeping with the created distinctions that Paul brings. Now, when you say created distinctions, egalitarians sometimes want to soften that because many times, the created distinctions are understood as women under men.

Rather than alongside men, their whole view is of equality, egalitarian equality, whereas hierarchists like created distinctions because they jump on the bandwagon that this is about men over women. Those are some theological distinctions that are brought into this text more than they are out of the text. The text is not treated as much as has been brought into it by some of these special controversies over males and females.

Paul does not aim to silence Christian women but rather to guarantee that in their self-expression, they did not deny an integral part of themselves, says Talbot. That is, men rightly related to God, women right related to God, not to the man, but to God, are able to worship openly and freely. And they do not deny who they are according to Genesis in the process.

Man is the glory of God, woman is the glory of man. And that's going to have a lot to do with why a woman is covered in a man. It's not about man to woman, woman to man.

It's about each of them to God. Keep that perspective in mind. In this regard, one must ask, what was the original point that Paul intended to score here? And I think it is to protect God's glory in creation.

We're not protecting male glory, nor are we protecting female glory. We're protecting God's glory. In that, distinctions are created.

These are not ontological distinctions per se but functional distinctions that Paul believes should be maintained from Genesis and the metanarrative of Scripture. But it's not a harsh putdown on the female. We have to say that because that's what has often happened.

Frankly, it's happened more over the last 60 or 70 years. Frankly, in the 1800s, women carried the missionary movement. Even the Southern Baptists have all these women who take up offerings for those who were famous missionaries.

Consequently, it's something that has been pushed more in recent decades for reasons that historians can inform us. Now, secondly, the symbolism of the worshiper's head before God in 3 to 16, page 137. After 11:2, bringing to us this issue of the paradoseis, the traditions, we enter an arena of vying for interpretation over certain terms and the relationship of those terms.

And I've buried myself over the years in some of this material, and sometimes I walk away, and I feel my head is spinning, and I just dumped everything out that I put in it. And it is no small challenge to get into this literature. But I think the biggest problem we make is we get into all the creative constructs too early.

We get into the special agenda hermeneutic stuff too early. We need to try to keep the text clean to see what it says in terms of Paul in the first century and then come to it later. I think if we would do that more carefully, there would probably be less verbiage about 1 Corinthians 11 than there is in the gender debate.

Several important details of this passage have been and are greatly debated, and a final compelling resolution of the evangelical gender debate is not in hand. It's not in hand class because when someone has a construct they're defending, it'd never be in hand because they're going to morph to defend their construct. So, whether you're egalitarian or hierarchical in your basic orientation, you will support that view.

That's agenda hermeneutics, and everybody practices it more or less. The best we can do is to be aware of our practice and try to be honest with the scriptures and their basic direct teaching before we get too deeply imbibed into our own final conclusions when we go back to the text. As Fee summarized it, Fee is an egalitarian, but listen to this summary.

As a good scholar, he's trying to keep it under control. Quote, along with these larger contextual questions, this passage is full of notorious exegetical difficulties, including one, the logic of the argument as a whole, which in turn is related to two, our uncertainty about the meaning of some absolutely crucial terms, and there's a number of those, and our uncertainty about prevailing customs, both in the culture in general and in the churches in particular, including the whole complex question of early Christian worship. Paul's response assumes that there is an understanding between them and him at several key points, and these matters are therefore not addressed.

Like any epistle, it's a one-way telephone conversation. They would have given us some footnotes. Thus, the two crucial contextual questions, what was going on and why was it going on, are especially difficult to reconstruct.

But I want to come back to that theme again, that we can also make it difficult to reconstruct because we have come to certain conclusions, and we want to see those conclusions, and we want terms to fit our preconceived conclusions. It is a cycle, it is a circle, text, terms, phrases, what I think they mean, what others think they mean, back to the text. It's a big circle of looking at this information and trying to be as honest and open as we can be with the total biblical construct.

I have read some, I think, who do that very well and some who use the text for their own purposes, and I won't name names. And that's true at scholarly levels, not just at popular levels. Furthermore, in verse 11:3, the biblical teaching of headship is stated, and then it's going to be unpacked.

First of all, it's stated. Does the plain reading of 11-3 indicate that head is prescriptive or a descriptive item? It says in 11:3, but I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God. Well, that's a paradox there.

That's still, in many ways, connected to number two. So, I think we're going to have to come down the side that that is a prescriptive statement. It's not just a descriptive statement.

Paul is, but these are still metaphors. It's still a metaphor for the relationship between God and humanity, between male and female, female and male, in biblical narrative. How is the head, the kephale, how is the head in 11:3 to be understood? And we'll get to that here.

Is it authority or hierarchical? That is the subordination of women to men. And some would bend this text, I think, to the fact, to be a proof text that women ought to kowtow to men. But here again, even as Garland, who's an egalitarian, said, that's not what the text is about.

But the more hierarchical one is, the more one wants this text to be that way. Because it gives you a male dominance in ministry, which is seen and wanted to be held. Is it authoritative or hierarchical? Or is it source or origin? Woman proceeds from man.

And it also says Christ proceeds from God. Now, it gets really tricky that way. The source and origin would be easy to see.

But the big discussion is, what does that mean for Christ? To see it for man and woman, we know that woman was created out of man. We know that God created man. But the question is, how does Christ proceed from the Father? And can you use the analogy of male and female? Do you have to? Might be another question.

But nonetheless, in the setup, that becomes a controversial issue. This debate overhead has poured over into the debate over what we call subordination, in reference to the Trinity. For example, in what sense would Christ be sourced or subordinate to the Father, if you take the source view? And like I say, there's no small amount of literature on this.

Both journal articles and books have been written about this question, both before we got into the gender question and the subordination issues with the Trinity. But then it comes over and we get into this controversy about women, and the hierarchicals particularly picked it up because it served their purposes, and accused the egalitarians of heresy, subordinating Christ, and having a wrong, a heretical subordination view in relation to the Trinity. Well, I'm not going to work all that out here, but you need to be alerted that that's a huge controversy, and you can spend a lot of time, we could spend a course probably, talking about Trinity, subordinationism in relation to the Trinity, and then come over and ask if there's illegitimacy in relation to people using it in relation to gender.

But that will have to be something that tickles your curiosity. The term translated as head is used 10 times in 11:3 to 10. Now, we've mentioned before that repetition is something that should get our attention.

The word wisdom is used 21 times in verses, in chapters 1 to 4. So, chapters 1 to 4 have got to have something to do with wisdom, and it's used all over the place. Man's wisdom, God's wisdom, good wisdom, bad wisdom. Well, in these few verses, we have 10 occurrences of head, and they're pretty much translated that way, kephale, they're not hidden in the translation.

Repetition should always perk up our interpretive senses. Now, I've given you a chart here, where I've put out the text in the left-hand column and then the text in the middle. I use the NRSV.

I would like to have had an array of text, but you can only have so many columns on a page. And I'll give you some of this in another way later, but here it would have been nice to have. But the fact is, is that the translations all use the word head.

So, we don't have any big difference in using the word head. The big difference is what people say head means. All right, the third piece of this chart is, it's very important to ask yourself the question, is head used literally, head, or is it used metaphorically, that my head represents God in public worship.

Man is the glory of God. Okay, so you got literal, and you've got metaphor. In 11:3, I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man.

Well, he's not sitting on my shoulders. That's a metaphorical use. And the husband is the head of his wife.

He's not sitting on her shoulders. That's a metaphorical use. And God is the head of Christ.

Again, it's a metaphor. Metaphors are notorious because metaphors are not self-explanatory. They have to be explained.

And that's what's going on in this text, as well as in studies on Trinity. You have to explain the metaphors. And when you have something like that, you are going to have an array of opinions.

The church had good and bad, and we've got the same thing that goes on 11:4: any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head that literally disgraces his head. Whoa, is that literal, or is that talking about disgracing Christ? Because he no longer shows the glory of God. I think it's probably a metaphor.

I put question marks there so you can look at it closer. 11:5 has three references. But any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled, well, that's literal, disgraces her head, like with the previous verse, on man.

This is probably a metaphor, but I put question marks. It probably doesn't need to be question marks, but I put them anyway, just to be nice. It is one and the same thing as having her head shaved.

Well, you don't shave a metaphor. You shave a literal head, so that's literal. Okay, going further, verse 7, for a man ought not to have the head veiled, his head veiled. That's literal, since he's the image and reflection of God.

Woman is the reflection of man. 11:10, for this reason, a woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. I think that's literal this time, not a metaphor in this particular point.

All right, so we can see that we've got this word, we've got it repeatedly used, and this becomes a big term that's debated as to its meaning. People debate the term, do word studies, make it come to a conclusion, and then they force that on everything else. Sorry.

The meaning of kephale and the word study approach have been interesting. I've watched this in professional societies over the decades that I participated there. Some have said that kephale is used to mean ruler or authority, and they've surfaced thousands of texts where head is used for a ruler, or head is used for someone who's the head of the organization, the head of the corporation, the head of the river.

Now, that wouldn't work so well, would it? Even though that's used that way, but that comes under source. So, what do we have here? We have some individuals. You will find the people who take head to mean ruler or authority to, by and large, be in the hierarchical camp.

They will usually call themselves complementarians, and I'm going to comment about that in a little while. I'll call them hierarchalists, and it's not because I'm a big strong egalitarian. I'm trying to go with the text, and I probably float more in the complementarian domain, but I will move on the continuum of that complementary domain.

According to the text, I'm not a slave to the system, and I try not to be intentionally. First of all, under rulers or authority, this view has been published in exhaustive word studies. Wayne Grudem is famous for carrying lexicons to professional medians to prove his point that claims the use of the head as the source does not exist.

Grudem has done these studies and published them. People have published against him. The Trinity Journal from Trinity Theological Seminary has a number of studies back-to-back of pro and con over this.

Some of them are cited in my bibliography, others that you can surface. If you want to study this domain, my friends, you're looking at 2,000 to 5,000 pages of reading to get into the gender debate. It's a whole lot easier to get into the Bible first, but you get over to the gender debate, and it's going to go crazy because they're using the same text and claiming different things for different reasons.

Grudem has thrown out challenges to surface usages of kephele as source, and we'll see in the next section that that challenge has been met by some. The second view, of ruler or authority, results in a view of women as subordinate to men. Male leadership is the norm in the home and church.

So, with ruler authority comes the analogy of subordination, and that can be applied harshly to kindly. That's a continuum of hierarchicalism, moving into some parts of complementarian. And so that's to be unpacked in the systems a great deal more.

I'm not after the systems here, but I am including them as a heads-up. Secondly, this term is used to mean and is translated in the idea of source or origin. Now this has a lot of heavy hitters in its train.

The ruler or authority has some heavy hitters, but most of those are pretty much in the train of conservative evangelicalism. There would be some perhaps outside that train. I think Fitzmeyer, he's a Roman Catholic, not an evangelical.

So, it's not an easy thing to delineate to who's of this. But here's, I've just given you some samples. All right, source or origin point.

First, while this view is slow to do the word studies, they have arisen. Some have arisen to the challenges of others. Some have looked at the others and said, I'm not going to grace that with a challenge.



And so, you've got this yin-yang between these two movements. But an interesting person named Charlie Martin, who is also a Roman Catholic, arose to answer Grudem's massive word studies. You know, if you find 2,500 passages that prove your point and somebody finds one that's clear that doesn't, that's an interesting David and Goliath, isn't it? While this view is slow to do the word studies, that is the egalitarian view, they have done it.

Troy Martin has taken up Grudem's challenge and shown that, indeed, head is used in Greek literature to mean source. Now there's a number who have done some studies and shown that source and origin can be a part of the idea of kephale in Greek literature. I think that's probably a passe point to some extent.

There's a whole lot more that may have it as ruler authority, but it's just the nature of literature. But if you've got the source of a river, the head of a river, we use that as a metaphor in our own culture, don't we? The head of the river is the source of the river. It's not the ruler of the river.

It's not the authority of the river. So, it's kind of ludicrous to think that we wouldn't have this side to this particular term because it's a common metaphor in many ways. First of all, I've given you the places, some of the places, just two or three of them that Martin surfaced, and others have surfaced as well that show you that source or origin is a legitimate translation.

The heart is the source, the first point. The arche, that's another word for source or beginning of blood. The head is the source.

There's head. kephale is the source of phlegm. And that's a literal head, but it's still a source.

Notice how you have to resupply the concept of source in each of these translations. The head is the source of phlegm. The spleen is the source of water.

And he goes on and on in his list. Aristotle has a text. Why does the face sweat the most? I believe this should have been in quotes.

I forgot my initial quotes there, my beginning quotes. Why does the face sweat the most? Is it because sweat passes most easily through parts that are rare and moist? Some of these early writers had some funny ways of describing things. You do sweat under your arms, don't you? The head seems to be the source of moisture as it is due to the considerable moisture that the hair grows.

The head seems to be the source of moisture. The kephale once again has source or origin. Martin goes further and reasonably demonstrates that the heart, rather than the head, is the center of intelligence, reason, thinking, and decision making.

The Bible has been pretty clear on that, but most Christians miss it. As a man thinks in his what? Not in his brain, but in his heart. As Jesus said, out of the heart proceeds the issues of life.

They were using the organ because, in the ancient world, they thought that reasons centered here. Emotions centered in the splunkna, bows of compassion. In our culture, we know that thinking centers here, and we give the heart to the emotions.

So, we butcher the bible every time it uses the word heart. If a person believes on the Lord Jesus Christ with all their heart, no. Think about it.

Heart is a synonym for mind and the rational process most of the time in scripture because it was the ancient world. Martin's article gives you a nice little entry into that, as well as this quote here. He goes on to say, that specifying kephele as authority over as Grudem does is simply incompatible with Paul's anthropology.

And I'm not going to give you the whole section there, but you can go see the article by Troy Martin. Troy Martin's also been involved in publishing a multi-volume medical Greek medical dictionary of the ancient world. And I'm sure there'll be a nice entry on heart in that medical dictionary.

I have not seen that publication. It's been going on for decades. I think that it's out, but I've been out of the stream in my retirement, and that would be out of my price range as well.

And I don't have a library close by to run and check, so unfortunately, I don't have that. But even though I've only given you a little here, it's enough. That kephale can mean source and origin, even though it means ruler and authority many, many times, along with RK.

They become almost synonyms in that regard. And so, you can't, you don't jump on bandwagons because of numbers. You jump on bandwagons because of context.

That's the final arbiter of every word. It's the context in which it is used. And I don't count. You can count all you want, but counting is not the final authority.

Now, I've given you a reference here to Martin's article, which is probably in the SBL papers of 2007. Also, the resulting view of egalitarianism argues that women are equal to men in most domains of the home and church. So, hierarchialist, women are subordinate to men in the home and church.

Egalitarians, women are equal to men in the home and church. That doesn't mean that hierarchialists don't see men and women talking to each other to work out problems in the home or in the church. It doesn't necessarily mean that they're barred from teaching, either.

Some radicals would do that, but not all. On the egalitarian side, it doesn't mean that they don't see some legitimately created distinctions between male and female, genetically, DNA-wise, and so forth, and so on, and even in some functionality domains. But it does mean that there's more of an equality.

They will often use the passage in Galatians that there's neither slave nor free, male nor female. You have to be a little careful with that text so that you don't overuse it as proof text to say more than what you can prove from other texts. So, while accumulating proof by words can be fun and helpful, it does not always resolve the question of meaning.

Word studies in and of themselves do not resolve meaning. I do a lot of work in the question of spirituality, and the adjective for spiritual isn't used all that much in the New Testament. Jesus never used the term, and the term was never used of Jesus.

But if I were going to write a book on what it means to be spiritual, I don't think I want to marginalize Jesus. And the term wasn't used in the Psalms. I don't think I want to marginalize the Psalms.

And so, consequently, we have to be careful that we don't overwork words to the exclusion of a contextual meaning issue. All meaning resides in context. Words get their meaning from context, and that is absolutely crucial in hermeneutics.

Moving on to page 139, the first main bullet point is there. The metaphorical usages of head constitute the crucial items of interpretation. We saw that head is probably more literal than metaphor, but the metaphorical ones are the ones that are the focus, obviously.

The meaning of head in its metaphorical translation has been highly disputed. We just saw some of that. The dispute primarily revolves around the gender debate.

Hierarchalism and some complementarians promote a translation of authority, while egalitarians argue for source. At times, one needs to step back and wonder if a modern agenda, the gender debate, has overridden a plain reading of the text for the purpose of agenda hermeneutics. The plain reading of a text in its context, and how it relates to the metanarrative context of the bible, must always be our first task.

Hierarchalist. A little repetitive here, but I'm summarizing. Hierarchalist.

Now, I use this term rather than complementarianism, and I have a little asterisk that goes down to the bottom of page 139 and says note. Notice my note here. For some time, there has been a controversy over who owns the term complementarian in the gender debate.

Many think that a certain group of hierarchalists hijacked the term. You'd have to live through some of these debates, see them played out in the professional arena and in the published arena, to almost stand back and chuckle a little bit over some of this. It's not funny.

It's gotten rather vicious on occasion. However, a group of hierarchalists hijacked the term for themselves and gave it their meaning, which is not the historically preferred meaning in the history of the genre debate. This is not hard to research.

Scott McKnight rang the changes on the hijacking of the word complementarian by hierarchalists. They took it over. Why? It's a softer term.

They didn't like being accused of being hierarchical with all that that brings to the discussion. Take the word complementarian. They just took it, gave it their definition, which created problems in how the term had been used within the literature.

Well, that's the facts. You can figure out the application of it. Back up to the bullet point.

I use the term rather than complementarian since it's more of a middle-road term and always needs validation. That is complementarian. When someone says they're a complementarian, that's only the beginning of the discussion.

If someone says they're a hierarchalist, pretty much understand who they are. Someone says they're egalitarian, you pretty much understand who they are. They say there's a complementarian.

Well, that's going to take a couple of books to figure that one out. And that's just about the way it's gotten in the gender debate. So, you have to ask questions.

So, moving on. Hierarchalists see this text as dependent upon a gender structure relationship established in the Genesis cultural mandate. The priority and order of 1 Corinthians 11 reflect the authority of creative distinctions for the purposes of gender distinctions.

Now, a lot of this will take us back to Genesis. If we got into the creative constructs of the gender debate, we'd have to go back there. I'm not going to go back there, but I'll give you a little insight here.

Is a woman's submission to a man from a hierarchical standpoint a created submission, that is, before the fall, or is it a post-fall submission? This is an interesting little conversation. Was this issue of tension between males and females a created thing or a result of the fall thing? And you'll see if you get into the literature on hierarchical and egalitarian, those two positions being fought in the book of Genesis. Where does the role of male-female begin? In creation or post-fall? Now, post-fall messed everything up, and it could have messed this up too, but that's something for you to keep your eye open to as you get into the literature in these areas if you choose to do so.

Egalitarians and some complementarians. And I think what you have is hierarchical, egalitarian. Complementarian has that whole middle, and some lean this way, some lean that way, and then you got the ones in the middle.

I probably find myself very much in the middle. I see some truth on both ends of that continuum, and I would rather try to work with the text first and the other issues second as much as possible. All right, moving on.

Egalitarians view Paul's concern as not hierarchical, that is, who has authority over whom, and that's a legitimate observation, but relational, that is, the unique relations that are predicated. I think that's predicated rather than predicted if you have that in your notes that way. I'll try to get that fixed.

On one being the source of the other's existence. This does, however, raise the problem of Christ sourced in God. Fee addresses this subordinationism on page 505 of his work.

That would have been his first edition, I believe. You can compare it to the second edition, where he probably expanded it since more had gone on since the first edition of his commentary. You will find in the gender debate literature items on subordination controversy.

If you go to the websites, I'll give those to you later, of either of these camps, you will find more than you want to talk about that subject. They'll talk about the theology of subordination in the Trinity, how it is used as a metaphor in the gender debate, and for some, whether it is a valid analogy, do you have to force that analogy between God and Christ, or is it just a more of a surface analogy like men, women, women, men. In fact, the Christians for biblical manhood and womanhood, who are on the hierarchical side of the fence, have gone so far as to claim that the Christians for biblical equality are heretics because of their views on 1 Corinthians 11 and some of the issues we're talking about here.

Now, you need to go into literature and see that. There's been a little more heat than light on occasion, but there is a lot written and plenty of good material. There's good stuff on both sides of the fence.

You have to read widely and carefully because there are a lot of agenda hermeneutics going on, and you have to use the same text to teach a point. You have to be extremely careful, but you can deal with that by reading broadly. That's the key to success.

At the bottom of the page, 2b, the teaching of headship is discussed in verses 4 through 15. The spiritual symbolism of the head is the metaphorical symbolism in relation to males and females. This is the issues of uncovered and covered.

1d, the application of the symbolism in the Corinthian assembly in verses 4 through 6. Verse 4, let's look at verse 4. Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head. So here we're talking about the man. You'll come back and talk about the woman in verse 5. How do men dishonor their head if it's covered in the assembly? Have you ever thought about this? This has always struck me as odd.

If you read the Old Testament, the high priest had a pretty fancy headdress he was required to wear in the Holy of Holies, didn't he? He had to cover his head. He could be killed if he didn't have his head covered. Orthodox Jewish men wore a yarmulke.

It's a skull cap, which shows their respect for Yahweh. Well, so there's an interesting question about why man would be uncovered with some of those traditions. Paul doesn't bother to address some of that.

I can't imagine it didn't come to his mind, but maybe it didn't come to his mind because he wasn't barking up that tree exactly. I'd recommend Richard Oster's article here. Richard Oster is a professional archaeologist, a worksmith of archaeology with New Testament text, and also of classical sources with the New Testament text.

He has a great article. You need to resurface. This isn't that hard on the internet anymore.

If you've been to a college or seminary and you think you're having trouble just getting it off the general web, contact the librarian at your school. Most of these schools on campus have access to databases way beyond what the internet has, and way better than often you may find on the internet unless you find those primary journals on the internet. You'll find them a lot of times.

They'll give you the first page and then tell you you've got to pay something to get the rest of it. Well, if you go to your library and talk to your librarian, you may have

access to more than you know. You may be able, from your online site, to go to your library, put in a code, and be able to search massive, massive aspects of the journals and bring up these articles.

I have a terabyte computer, and I have gigabyte after gigabyte after gigabyte of journal articles that I've copied into my computer from those library sites for my use in teaching. Well, you can do the same thing. Get creative.

Get ambitious about this and find that stuff. So, I've always wondered about that, but Richard Oster's article is a reasonable way to address the issue. Corinth, again, was a Roman colony.

When Roman men worshipped, especially the elite and the leaders and the Caesars. In Corinth, when Roman men worshipped, they would pull their toga up over their heads in homage to the deity. Now, because of our context here, I can't flash pictures up for you.

If I was more sophisticated, perhaps I could do that. All you've got to do is Google Roman Caesars and look at them, and you'll see a bunch of them. Augustus, for example, has the toga up on his head.

The toga up on the head is related to Roman religion. They didn't always wear it up there. The women would, but not the men.

The men had it down, but when they were in a religious context, they wore it up as a statement of homage to the deities. Roman men worshipped with their heads covered, especially the elite and the Caesars. This devotional gesture quote was known as *capite volato*.

If I get my Latin correct there, probably not. Was used by both permanent Roman clergy and by officiating laymen, which could relate to anything from a Caesar before he was considered a deity or something like that in the Roman cult. But they would bring that up over their heads.

The Druids did the same thing. You remember that from English history. That goes back to Rome.

That provides the matrix for the devotional apparel mentioned in 1 Corinthians 11. And Oster very clearly walks through this issue of Roman men covering their heads in worship settings to show homage to gods. So, for a Christian man to be covered would be syncretism.

It would be showing homage, and it would seem that they're doing what the work. That's one aspect. The other aspect would be that in the created distinctions that Paul's been talking about, man's head is the glory of God.

And you don't cover that in worship, in the symbolism. So, you've got two things going on here. The possibility of Roman religious influence and the reality of a different metaphor and a different meta narrative in relation to men in worship.

Unfortunately, there is little attention paid to men in this chapter because everybody's after the women. David Gill, the article in your bibliography expands on this problem and the question of the male issue and veiling. 11:4 is not that hard to answer.

By analogy, we should find an easier route in 11:5 and following in contradistinction to the male on two counts. That is not being syncretistic with Roman religion and following the imagery of man being, Christ being the head of man, and therefore related to God and being open and out. Women, on the other hand, in Roman culture were veiled because of marriage and humility, but they were also veiled in the church because their head was the symbol of man, the glory of man, and man's glory ought not to be prominent in worship.

So, therefore, the veil. Okay, we'll talk more about that imagery, but just get it into your minds at this particular point. Now, that brings us up to 11:5, and it also has us for about one hour in our lecture.

So, I'm going to stop here on page 140, and we're going to start the next lecture in 1 Corinthians 11, verse 5 on page 140. Read your notes, do as much research as you can, educate yourself, and I think that if you get into that discipline, you'll learn to enjoy it. Thank you.

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 25, 1 Corinthians 11:2-34, Paul's Response to the Questions of Public Worship, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, Male and Female in Public Worship before God, Part 1.