

Dr. Gary Meadors, 1 Corinthians, Lecture 26, 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 2

© 2024 Gary Meadors and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 26, 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 2.

Well, we're continuing with 1 Corinthians chapter 11. We're on page 140 of notepad number 12, and we're going to begin looking at chapter 11, verse 5 in the middle of the page. When we stopped, we talked about 11.4, the issue of a man dishonoring his head by being covered, and that that cover most likely relates to Roman religion.

And that for him to do that, to pull the toga up over his head would be syncretism. He shouldn't do it. And furthermore, he shouldn't do it because man is the glory of Christ.

In the imagery that Paul uses, he should not be covered. So, I got a couple of ways to look at that. In 11:5, how do women dishonor their head if uncovered in the assembly? 11:5 states that every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head.

It is the same as having her head shaved. All right. Now, the terminology for cover varies, and we'll talk about that a little more.

It's perhaps different than one might expect. If you're thinking of a veil, it certainly has nothing to do with the face, as in Islamic cultures, but it would be some sort of veil. And you can see these freely.

If you just go Google Roman women of the first century, you'll see they use the toga very much like a man would use it, except they use it for a different purpose. A man used it when he was officiating, in some sense, or worshiping. She used it to show that she was married and had herself covered in public in that regard.

But it was a very modest type of covering that was part of the clothing itself. And you can view those kinds of iconography records very easily online. In fact, the Greek word for veil, and that's the head, not the face, the Greek word for veil isn't even used in 1 Corinthians 11 at all.

It's nowhere to be found. So, if it was some simple hat sort of situation, then it seems like that word would have been used, but it isn't used. And that's part of the complication of this text in terms of its language.

In 11:4, it has something having down the head. In 11:5 and 13, it talks about with uncovered head. It's not 11.7, it must be 11.7. A ceremony for veiling is talked about in terms of Plutarch.

He has a document called Advice to New Brides. In that document talks about a Roman woman being veiled, covered, her head covered, as in this marriage ceremony to indicate that now she is a married woman. He uses some of the same terminology in his source that we have here in 1 Corinthians, using compound terms rather than just the typical noun that might be used.

Some views will make a lot about the coming down because that's a kind of dominant compound that's being used in this chapter. And we'll talk about that when we come to the variety of views on this. At the same time, these terms are used for veiling, which was the social indicator by which the marital status of a woman was made clear to everyone.

Oster refers to Plutarch, quote, which discusses the Roman custom of wearing head coverings in liturgical settings. And the women were involved in that just like the men were. Once again, New Testament scholarship often neglects Roman sources and primary sources in the reconstruction of these texts.

Plutarch's advice to the bride and groom talks about veiling the bride as a symbolism of being married, using the same word that's used here, the kata kalupetai, where it's coming down. So, a head covering is a solid part of signaling a married woman in Roman culture. So that was not unusual.

Paul isn't, and I don't think Paul's focusing so much on that as he is relating to the imagery of male, female, and God in this text. Yet, in the typical Roman culture, when they would have gathered in a public meeting, women would have had their veil up for the purpose of just being Roman wives. So that would have been normal.

We'll talk a little later about Winter's proposal about new Roman women who might just not have done that for the sake of in-your-face in relation to their flexing muscles in their new setting and the new power that they were finding in the Roman Empire. Talk about that in a minute. Oster continues his critique of poor historical work on 11:4 and a variety of terms in the phrases.

Quote, he says, an example of kata with the genitive case undermines the foundation of Murphy O'Connor's contention. When describing individuals wearing head

coverings, Plutarch uses the Greek phrase *kata kephales*, which is the word down the head, in a way similar to the conventional understanding of 1 Corinthians 11.4 and demonstrates that having down the head can refer to something resting on the head. So, it's a matter of just the variation of language and that you can say things differently.

In New Testament studies, when we have these kinds of phrases, we need to go back and study the Greek sources that are contemporaneous and, before that, closely before our target text so we can see what the Norman kind of nomenclature was. So, this is not unusual nomenclature. It was used this way without just using the word for a hat.

The Greek phrase does not have to denote hair flowing down the back of the neck or the head. Greek literature contemporary with the New Testament demonstrates that the phrase *kata kephales*, this according to the head, down the head, can merely mean on the head. So variation in language, no secrets, because it was language that was used in other places to mean the same thing, have something on the head.

The bottom line seems to be that Paul is criticizing a woman who is breaking protocol for whatever reason. Why did this subject even come up? It could have come up for two reasons. If a male, elite male out of Roman Corinth came into a Christian assembly with his head covered, that would have been syncretism with Roman religion.

If a woman came in with head covered, that probably would have been normal. But if they came in uncovered, that would have stimulated conversation. And that's a possibility in a historical reconstruction of the new Roman women that we'll mention with Winter a little later on.

There was some breaking of protocol in some way that Paul needed to address in the community. I'm impressed with the explanations that tied the text to its own time and place. Oster and Gill, a major article we haven't even talked about, and Winter provide a context to see that public worship was being invaded by some Roman cultural norms, even new ones, and was not good for the Christian assembly.

So, historically and culturally, we'll look at some issues that could build a case. But you don't necessarily have to have that to get the same point. That the woman's head is the glory of man, and Paul argues it should be covered because man shouldn't be the focus of the assembly, but God should be the focus for both the male and the female.

So, we've kind of got a normative pattern of men and women before God, and we've also got a cultural issue that may have stimulated some of the controversy. Oster has

provided a compelling argument to explain the men. In fact, that's what his article was about in 1 Corinthians 11.

And the men are neglected by virtually all commentaries, along with the common neglect of historical, cultural features of a Roman colony, according to Oster. If we explain the cover in relation to men as culturally driven, then should not the same pattern be used to explain the issue of women that they should have been culturally driven to be covered not to be uncovered, as married women in public gatherings? Here are some illustrations proposed concerning the nature of the cover for women.

This list illustrates a basis for validation of what the cover is. A lot of writing and commentaries focus on, well, what is the cover? They seem to get more enamored with that than they do with what the cover symbolizes, which seems to be more of what Paul's after. Or he could have made the cover clearer for us.

He didn't address that. He covers the fact of it for another reason. But people got really interested in what the cover was.

Here's a list of interpretations. For example, Bruce Waltke, a fine Old Testament scholar, actually argues that it was a veil or hat type and should be true today. He sees it as a normative thing to continue on.

There are the Mennonites; women will wear a hat, and so will the Amish. In some of the reformed groups, women are expected to wear a head covering. In the Russian church, women wear head coverings in worship settings.

They take this very literally. So, there is that particular view. And there's some bibliography at the end of my notes on that.

The cover, which was a veil or hat type item, was used for cultural reasons but no longer binding. In other words, it's a descriptive text, not a prescriptive text, which is Wilson's argument in Bibsac. A third view is the cover is a woman's long hair.

A lot of people jump on this because it's convenient. A woman's long hairs are covered, but that's probably a very unlikely view. But William Martin has an article on that.

Fourth, the cover is related to how hair is fixed on the head. And this is a particularly popular view, or it was popular because it answered a lot of questions about women. And so they said that the hairdo was the issue.

And I've given you a number of names there. In the Thompson article, I think Cynthia Thompson gives a lot of pictures and shows the hairdos, and that was viewed as a cover. That's been very popular.

I think that the toga, that men wore a toga, but the clothing that women wore was also easily done that way. And hairdos are controversial, too, because of prostitutes as well as the cover. A prostitute would not cover herself.

She would expose herself. And so, we've got several cultural things going on at the same time. Fifth, the cover is related to certain cultural aspects of Roman religion, which apply to both men and women.

Both Oster and Gill call for that. The men would not pull it up, not supposed to. The women would pull up their clothing over their head.

Plenty of Roman pictures to see exactly what that looked like. Then the sixth thing is a little newer, and it is by Bruce Winter. The cover, especially its absence, in other words, not having the cultural expectation of a woman, a married woman being covered, relates to the new Roman women problem and is therefore culturally bound.

One of Winter's books is *Roman Wives, Roman Widows, the Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*. He also worked through what was going on culturally within Rome. Women were flexing their muscles in Rome, in lots of ways.

For example, there were actually women wrestling in the games, which was never heard of before, but they were flexing their muscles to use an analogy to be part of those games. There were lots of issues in Roman law about women and property and so forth. Men had rights, women didn't, but women were pushing those rights.

So, there was a bit of a feminist movement in the Roman world at the same time that Paul was addressing this. But it probably would be premature just to pull all that over into this passage. We may not need it because Paul was unpacking biblical imagery, but that could have been part of the cultural stimulus for the problem that Paul was addressing.

And trying to address it, rather than addressing the problem of new Roman women, he addresses, well, why would you or why wouldn't you be covered? It seems much more mild. If you look at it, I've always been impressed with chapters 11:2 to 16; it's not nearly as bombastic as the controversies that preceded it. And even in the latter half of 1 Corinthians 11, where we've got the problems of the Lord's Supper, where Paul gets really testy.

It just seems so different that he's handling this with more kid's gloves, if you please, in 11:2 to 16. So, it makes you wonder why it came up and just how much of a problem was it. But there is information that can be brought to bear, and I think Winter has some key insights that ought to be taken into consideration. These

women might have been new Roman women, and they were not veiling themselves in public, which was a problem, too, with the issue of prostitutes and married women.

We use the word prostitutes not in the Western sense but in a first-century sense, which was just maybe a little bit different because of the access that was there. And they may have gone to the house churches because the public assembly of Christians wasn't out in the open, per se. It was in courtyards, as we see in the latter part of this chapter. It was in houses.

Were these Christian women feeling their oaths and wanting to do something different as they felt their newfound freedoms within the Roman culture and brought them into the church culture? Was that creating problems? Was it sort of like the weak and the strong? The weak would veil themselves, and the strong wouldn't. Well, it doesn't frame it that way, but we could ask that question. Was that an issue within the culture that was creating problems? This brief survey of the issues that this text raises should sober any interpreter.

There have been hundreds, thousands of pages written over the issues we've raised here in the last few minutes in the previous lecture and in this one. It should also indicate that dogmatism is not in keeping with the interpretation, 1 Corinthians 11:2 to 16. We need to look at the options, we need to look at the field, and we need to have some humility, even though we may say, I think this is the way it is.

It is also a lesson in hermeneutics as to how each view, using the same text, presents evidence for how they explain each of the problematic words and phrases in a way different than perhaps their colleagues who have a different view. So, once again, that may be more of a window than we like to admit that all of us come to the text with an agenda, and sometimes we tend to see what we came for. We need to be very careful about that, look at the text first, and then come to the array of interpretations secondarily, but not exclude them because the array of interpretations tickles out, meaning that we may have missed otherwise.

Let's go on, though, 7 to 10, another crucial piece in the flow of this text. It's actually the next piece of the paragraph. We read some of this.

A man ought not, verse 7, to cover his head since it's the image and glory of God. Get that now. And by the way, look at the end of verse 12, which is the end of this paragraph.

Also, man is born of woman, but everything comes from God. See, the thing that gets missed so much is that this passage is not about us; it's about God and how we relate to God in public worship. But woman is the glory of man, for man did not come from woman, but woman from man.

That's talking about Genesis, of course. Verse 9, neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. Genesis, it is for this reason that a woman ought to have authority over her own head because of the angels.

Now that's the big linchpin verse. Nevertheless, in the Lord, woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. In other words, there's an interrelationship here.

There's an equality between them. For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman, but everything comes from God. So the imagery, if we just let the text speak, is how man and women, men and women, are imaged before God in public worship.

Let's think a little more about that in 7 to 10. First of all, the meaning of glory. In verse 7, it says, back up here, a man ought not to cover his head since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man.

This word glory is extremely important, not that it's some code word or secret word, but it's showing us what the imagery is about. Man images Christ and God, whereas the woman images man in the identification of male and female before God. Glory relates to men's and women's relationship to God's creation pattern of being created in Genesis 1:27.

For this reason, which goes back into 7 through 9, verse 10, the key verse, for this reason, on account of this connection back, not forward, the glory of men and women is to live in light of being created in God's image. Now, this is a theme that we've mentioned, but we need to bring it back in full force here that created in the image of God and along the lines of the Genesis narrative, God created man, man named the animals, and the naming of the animals, he knew that he was incomplete. Woman was created from man; it's a story of the rib, and to be an answer to man is the way that the Hebrews put it: not to answer to him but to complete him.

There is the male and the female; the two make up the totality of human creation, complementary to each other, equal in many ways, different in some ways, and then we have to work all of that out as we go along. But the fact is, is that what this text is about? And that's the first thing that it's about. The creation narrative in 1 Corinthians focuses on man, God, woman, man.

As Morna Hooker put it, who has some fine work on Corinthians, man is the glory of God. Therefore, his head must be bare. He's the glory of God. That's the imagery, the symbolism. Woman is the glory of man.

She was created from him as answering to the need for the completion of male-female. Therefore, her head must be covered because a man shouldn't get the glory in the congregation or the worship setting that's going on. And I think there's a legitimate thing we may not get into too much between the 1st century and today, but in the 1st century, this imagery was so very important, both culturally and now religiously. The woman is the glory of man. Therefore, her head must be covered.

And we don't need to say that it's covered, so she shows her subjection to men. That's not what the text is about. It's not saying that.

She's covered so that she shows her submission to God. Rather than flaunting man from her uncovered head, she is covered, and by that, she is validated fully for prayer and prophecy in the congregation. That's the point.

She's empowered. For this reason, *dia touta*. You may not have Greek, but I have a little more in here because we need it in this chapter 11 flow.

But *dia touta*, there in the line, means for this reason. It's an inferential prepositional setup. The woman, the *gune*, ought, and there's language of obligation by the way, ought to have authority upon her head.

Then I quote, for this reason, a woman has authority on her head. That's a literal translation. You'll see that in a moment that it's not followed very much.

Most people are going to add something, and we'll see this. Does the translation on, which is the preposition *epi*, mean location on the head or control over the head? See, there's an interpretive issue, and gender-driven hermeneutics comes in and jumps quickly on one or the other depending on which direction they want to go. Consider an array of translations for interpretation.

The King James, the woman to have power on her head. Her is supplied in that regard, by the way. It'd be supplied every time.

It's understood because of other parts of the body. It's just understood it belongs to her. The ESV notices that the ESV is not a formal literal interpretation, a translation, and has a symbol of authority on her head.

That's a functional, dynamic translation. They've added the word *symbol*. That's not in the Greek.

The NASB does the same thing. They have a symbol of authority on her head. They put it like the old King Jimmy.

They put it in italics to indicate it's not in the Greek. Then the NIV, the woman ought to have a sign of authority. So, we got symbols and signs being imported here to try to explain what's going on.

NIV is a dynamic or functional translation. That's how they work on her head. The TNIV, I put that in.

You may not remember the TNIV, which was never published in the U.S. It was published in England, and they never got over here for a number of reasons. But here's the way they brought it to have authority over her own head. Well, they added another word, own head, because of the angels.

That is the result of an agenda to interpret this as the woman gaining control over her head. And then the NLT covering on her head as a sign of authority because the angels are watching. Well, if we bring agenda-driven hermeneutics to this immediately, we start asking questions like source authority, source and authority, rule authority, source origin, and that kind of thing.

Well, maybe what we ought to be asking is what authority or power is. In fact, exousia is even translated rights in the earlier part of 1 Corinthians, where you have the elite men who have the authority; they have the right to do something. That's often not raised too much in this latter part. The woman ought to have the right upon her head.

So, it seems that this text is more interested in the woman conforming to a certain procedure for the sake of her participating in public worship, having the right to do so, the privilege to do so, and even the authority to do so. It's not a text that is trying to explicate her relationship with the man. That's the way it's often read to turn it into a gender text.

It's a text about worship and a woman's role in relation to that worship. We bring in too much baggage too quickly and start putting it on all these terms and bringing in these other items. You don't have to say that it is a symbol or a sign of authority, but why do they add those words if they're not moving to something like the TNIV and the NLT where we see a clear interpretation of she's doing it so she can gain her authority when all the time she has the right rightly related to God by the cover within the congregation.

So, to get control of ourselves, and when you have thousands of pages that have been published on this text in the gender debate, it's very hard to get control and ask more basic questions. There is an article that I've already mentioned by Morna Hooker, who does that, and I think that she does a fine job of trying to get under control and eliminate all of the impositions and just ask what is going on in this text.

Now, the traditional view is to add a symbol or sign to explain the image that the woman is under authority, namely the man's.

She has a symbol of authority, a symbol that she belongs to the man and is supposed to follow the man's dictates. Well, that's another discussion. That's not the discussion that Paul's in here.

Paul's in a discussion of being right related to God in worship, and the reason for that is glory, doxa. She's the glory of man. It's not the question of who rules over whom.

But this imports the modern gender debate into this text and skews the imagery of Genesis. Paul is not trying to marginalize the female nor glorify the male. Each has glory in their appointed relationship to God.

Man does not cover his head in worship because he is the glory of God. The woman covers her head because she is the glory of man within the larger biblical narrative, even back to Genesis. Each has power in this creation imagery.

Now, you need to highlight the top of page 143 there because that's the key point in all this. We get too much poured into the text before we get out of the text its basic meaning. Morna Hooker made this comment, quote, in the same way the obligation which lies upon the woman is based on the fact that she is the glory of the man.

In her case, therefore, her uncovered head will reflect his, that is, the man's glory, both because she is his glory and because he is her metaphorical head. It is for this reason that the judgment in her case is different. Her head must be covered not because she is in the presence of man but because she's in the presence of God.

There's the catch. This is about God, not men. But she's in the presence of God and his angels, and in their presence, the glory of man must be hidden.

It's not the focus. God is the focus. If she were to pray or prophesy with an uncovered head, she would not be glorifying God but reflecting the glory of man.

And in God's presence, this must inevitably turn to shame. It's like she shaves her head. It's a shame.

Honor and shame in the culture. She doesn't honor God. She shames God by letting man be the glory.

And if she went in with a shaved head and did that, it would even be worse. It's a nasty metaphor, isn't it? Now, this is what it took me a long time. I read and read and read and read and felt like I was twisted up like a pretzel.

With all the literature, everyone uses the same text and says different things, all that's important. And all of it would come to the table if we were going to do a lecture on what is egalitarianism, what is hierarchicalism. We're not doing a lecture on those.

We're doing a lecture on 1 Corinthians 11. And Hooker has disciplined herself as a fine scholar to keep that focus in view. You need to read that paragraph over a couple of times.

Hooker notes that in the Second Temple Jewish literature tradition, the angels worshiped Adam at the creation. Now, Second Temple Jewish literature was written primarily between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Some of it was a little later.

And it's a huge cache of literature that the early Christians in the Jewish vein inherited. We even have some of it quoted in the New Testament books as proof text for things like the death of Isaiah. Jude uses a number of things from Second Temple Jewish literature.

Janice and Jambres as the names of the magicians in Egypt. That's not in the Bible. That's in Second Temple Jewish literature.

When it goes in the Bible, it gets God's imprimatur. It's approved. Outside of the Bible, it's uninspired literature.

So, perhaps in 1 Corinthians, Paul thinks there is a danger that the angels might be misled into worshiping man if his glory is displayed by the woman being unveiled. That the temptation to the on account of the angels does not offend them. This is about God.

Man's head is a metaphorical imagery of God. Woman's head is a metaphorical image of man. You cover the woman's head so that the angels, on account of the angels, are not embarrassed to see man in terms of the woman and, therefore, miss God.

That's too simplistic a way to put it. But that's the kind of dynamics that I think we need to be thinking about in this text rather than looking for some way to prove another gender view. So, how is cover an authority? Again, Hooker's analysis cuts through the modern gender debate and allows Paul to speak.

She says, quote, once again the answer may lie in Paul's use of the word *doxa*. That's the word glory in 11:7. Since the words glory and worship are to some extent synonymous, to be the glory of God is in itself to worship him. Excuse me, I got off the line there.

Since the words glory and worship are to some extent synonymous, to be the glory of God is in itself to worship him. Glory and worship are in the same category. According to Paul, however, it is a man and not a woman who is the glory of God and who will, therefore, naturally play the active role in worship.

If a woman also, in contrast to Jewish custom, takes part in prayer and prophecy, in other words, she now has the right to do that, this is because a new power has been given to her. Yet now women, too, speak to God in prayer and declare his word in prophecy. To do this, she needs authority and power from God.

The head covering, which symbolizes the effacement of man's glory in the presence of God, also serves as the sign of the authority or right which is given to the woman. With the glory of man hidden by her being covered, she too may reflect the glory of God in a worship setting. Don't draw attention to man. Draw attention to God.

Now, this is all metaphor; it's all symbolism, so it takes a while to get your arms around that. All metaphors have to be interpreted, and they are not self-interpreted. And so, in these metaphors of the man not covered, the woman covered, it's not about the pecking order of the sexes; it's about how they stand before God in worship.

And when you stand before God in worship, you deface, and you subdue a man who is the product of creation, and you uptick the role of God, which is man, the crown of the creation in the imagery of Genesis. That's what Paul is after here. Now, that was being violated somehow.

I emphasize the end of the quote here in bold letters, for from far from being a symbol of the woman's subjection to man, that is the veil. Therefore, her head covering is what Paul calls authority. It gives her authority. In prayer and prophesying, she, like the man, is under the authority of God.

So that's the symbolism you see. It's not trying to unpack all the sexes. Garland said this, Fee said this, but when they go into their explanations, they default almost to talking about hierarchicalism, complementarianism, and egalitarianism.

Marta Hooker cuts through this stuff in her article, which by the way, well, I think I won't say that because I'm not sure I've got the connection right, but she's written a number of things on 1 Corinthians, including a major book on it. All right, so Thistleton also comes in and supports Hooker's analysis on this text and in no small way in his volume, pages 835 to 841. So I've repeated it enough, but it takes repetition.

It took me a long time to start to see this rather than trying to figure out all the views about gender. Let's start with the text. The text is about males and females worshipping God, and that's what matters. How you image yourself to God in relation to the biblical narrative is what matters. A lot of the other issues are on the back burner for other things, other times, not here right now.

Now, people will come back to this text, that's going to be forever, but we need to be extremely careful how we come back to it. Be sure we've got the text first. Winter, and several others have done this, but Winter makes an interesting observation.

He said there's a variant on the term authority in this text in a number of manuscripts. The Vulgate, the Coptic, and a variety of early church fathers, those are all part of secondary sources, some in Greek, some in Coptic. Also, Ptolemy, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Bede.

They substitute the word veil, the actual word for veil hat, for the word exousia, the authority, and they make a variant reading on that. Now, their variant readings should not usurp the reading of exousia in Corinthians because the best manuscripts, most of the manuscripts, have that, but it does show a history of interpretation, a history of interpretation that there was something on the woman's head which in that setting showed, veiled the glory of man so that the glory of God could dominate in the worship setting. All right, what about on account of the angels? Here again, there have been numerous proposals on this.

Some have talked about evil angels who want to mess things up, such as the created order. But most, and I'm just going to go with it, see this as a variation on the angels as part of the observers and, in a sense, the policemen of creation. There's some text in Job; there's some text in the New Testament that talks about the presence of angels in relation to creation as God's monitors.

And so, this is best understood via the angels as caretakers of the created pattern and also in the domain of worship. The glory of man must be hidden, and the woman must wear a covering on her head because of the angels, meaning that the angels are not offended because they know who is supposed to be glorified in worship, and that is God. There's even some imagery in the book of Revelation where the angels fold their wings over their heads in an honorific aspect of God, so that God alone is in the forefront and not the angels.

So, the angels are just sort of part of the narrative complex that is not going to be offended by the woman's actions. The relationship between males and females was created in 11:11 and 12. Nevertheless, in the Lord, verse 11, woman is not independent of man, nor is the man independent of woman.

If you've been married, you understand that. For as a woman came from man, so also the man is born of woman. But everything comes from God.

This is just a statement of the mutuality of men and women. It can't be just run off as an egalitarian doctrinal statement, but it certainly is a statement that men and women are equal before God in worship. And that equality is borne out in the first century style of worship by the men being uncovered and by the woman being covered.

We might ask, is 11:15, I'm getting ahead of myself here. Oh, all right. Page 144.

11:15. 13 to 15. Verse 13. Judge for yourselves: is it proper for women to pray to God with their heads uncovered? I see your answer to that now should be, no, it wouldn't be proper because her head symbolizes man, and that interferes with real worship, so she should be covered.

Your answer to this verse should not be, well, if she's uncovered, she's not being obedient to her husband. That's bringing in extraneous information to this text. It's not about that.

It's about her to God. Does not the very nature of things teach you that if a man has long hair, it's a disgrace to him? And there's a very cultural piece to that. The Nazarites grew long hair in terms of a vow.

We know that some Old Testament had long hair. Absalom got his hair caught in a tree. But let me suggest to you, get rid of your medieval pictures of Jesus with long hair.

He would have had scrubby hair like any good Jew of the time. They typically did not have long hair. For as woman came from man, so the man also is born of the woman, but everything comes from God.

I'm sorry, let me go down to verse 15. But that if a woman has long hair, it is her glory for long hair is given to her for a covering. That's what we'll talk about in a moment.

If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice: verse 15, an argument from analogy or identity. Paul was arguing by analogy that since woman have by nature been given long hair as a covering, not in lieu of a covering, that in itself points to their need to be covered when praying and prophesying.

See, if it was an argument from identity, it would say that the hair is the cover. A lot of people jump on that as a view. The hair is the cover because it's convenient.

In modern America, in most congregations, women do not wear hats. And so they justify that by saying, well, her hair is her cover. Well, if you saw a lot of modern women, there's not much there to be a cover.

Some of them are shorter than men, and some shave their heads, and all kinds of things go on. Don't use the passage in that regard. It's an analogical statement that by nature, men typically don't have long hair.

Women typically have long hair, and men aren't covered. Women are covered. Nature tells us that by an analogical argument, women should have the cover.

That's all it's saying. Nothing more, nothing less. Then we come to what, for me, is a pretty troubling verse on the surface.

And while there are some real challenges in getting things under your belt in all of 1 Corinthians 11, this one's no small part of that challenge. In 11.16, if you read the King James, the American Standard, or the New Revised Standard Version, it says, we have no such custom. Let me read it from the, read the verse from this particular version, the NRSV.

1 Corinthians 11, verse 16. I have to push my glasses up so I can see. But if anyone is disposed to be contentious, this is the sort of concluding statement about what Paul's been saying.

We have no such custom, nor do the churches of God. No such custom. Listen to the 2011 NIV, verse 15.

16. If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God. No such practice, no other practice.

That'll split your head right down the middle. I can remember, as a naive reader, reading no such custom, saying, boy, he went through an awful lot of gyrations, just to say, at the end of the day, it doesn't make any difference. And then I read, no other custom, which would imply, that's the way you got to do it, because the churches do it that way.

It's what some have called canon law. It's the traditional expectation. Well, on the surface, on page 144 in the middle, this variation of translation begs for a difference in meaning.

The term translated custom is clear, but the modifier, such or other, is the focus. Your Greek lexicon uses the term such custom. You won't find the option of others in that setting, but that must not end the day.

Custom is a conscious practice of collectivity. And we have parodicis at the beginning, meaning a tradition, an authoritative tradition. We have the word custom at the end.

Why did he use parodicis back here? I see something going on here. We'll get to that. Two views about what custom references.

Is it the practice Paul was criticizing? That there's no such practice. In other words, a woman takes her hat off in public worship. No such practice.

Don't do it. Or is it in support of the traditions? There's no other practice. I got that kind of reversed there.

No such practice means you don't have to worry about it. No other practice means that's the way you got to do it, no other way. Those are two choices, two images.

Judge, who's an author of an article, seems to argue that Paul's delineation of worship may contain some conventions that were cultural that served the tradition, which is the forensic side, that was established. In other words, the nature of the cover and what the kind of color, hats, hairdos, and so forth and so on. There could be some conventions there.

One could argue that we don't have to do it in modern culture because it doesn't come out the same as it did in an ancient polytheistic culture. If you were in Russia, you'd wear a hat, ladies, because that's what they do. That's what all their churches do.

They've even had some issues with this as the modern world, so to speak, moves into their territory. I have a brother-in-law who's been a missionary in Russia. So, Judge seems to argue that there's a delineation of conventions against traditions as a possibility for this text to refer to the conventions but not to the traditions.

Paul's too smart to contradict himself at the end of the passage. The Joe Friday of commentaries, which is Fitzmeyer, says this. His translation of this text is, if anyone is inclined to be argumentative about this, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.

And then Fitzmeyer says, Paul was aware that his complicated arguments about this problem may not be convincing to everyone. So, in effect, he appeals to Christian church discipline or custom, what's now come to be called canon law, and Schuster, Schuster, Fiorenza rightly calls it an authoritative appeal. Fitzmeyer's Roman Catholic connections shine through here.

He kind of describes it from that analogy of text and tradition, which would be the reverse of the word tradition. But the analogy may be insightful. After all, Paul was an apostle, and his conventions should be taken seriously.

So, you can see how verse 16 throws us right at the very end into a bit of a washing machine here. Other commentaries point out that Paul's seeming concession is to the issue of the contentious nature of the historic Corinthian context. He says we have no other custom, which basically says to any of the Corinthians who want to exercise rights, who want to make an issue out of it, that they can't do that because it's not permissible.

The other churches follow this line, and you need to follow this line. That would be the no other. So, it is interpretive, and no other would be more interpretive than no such custom.

But no other is winning the day in terms of most renditions and explanations. While Paul would not compromise on the creation motif, he may have been open to allowing a variety of how that motif is upheld in worship; that would be the conventions. Namely, the seeming argument over the use of the cover cannot trump the reality of the metanarrative and the fact that all other churches are in line with this teaching.

That alone should cause them to take stock and rethink their own practices. So, there are some oddities here, and that last one in verse 16 is not easy to solve or to address, but at the same time, there are at least some scenarios that you can take. In interpretation, we don't always come up with the view, but we come up with some options we think through until we have further light to perhaps push us in one direction or the other.

On the next page, 145, perhaps the most important is to contrast the tradition delivered in 11:2 with the custom noted in 11:16. How do you account for what seems to be a stark change of language, the parodicist language? The tone of the argument in 11:2-16 is markedly different than 17-34, which is about the Lord's Supper. He's gentle in 11:2-16 by and large, firm but gentle, but when he gets to 11:17-34, and he's dealing with heresy, so to speak, man, he gets right on it. 11:2-16 flows from praise to discussion to propriety.

11:17-34 contains no praise but unequivocally commands certain actions. So there's a difference in the feel between the paragraph we've just looked at in 2-16 and what we're going to look at in 17 and the following. So there's some reason Paul was walking lightly, but still presenting the creation motif, how they should relate to it, and yet there were some variables evidently in there of custom, but the communities of the first century church had adopted them and they should continue, and it could

be something as simple as a married woman being veiled in a house church, rather than being like she might have been in her own house, and that is unveiled.

Maybe they were offending Romans by violating Roman custom. So, there are a lot of ways to think about this, and we just need to stop and do that. I have a brain teaser, which I'm not going to answer, but it's a brain teaser.

If Paul were writing this section today, how would he frame it? If you think about that, how would he frame it? What would be prescriptive? What would be descriptive? What would be the created pattern? What would be custom? That'd be a good little thing for discussion. If Paul were writing this section today, how would he frame it? Well, as far as marching through the text, that's it. I want to talk a little bit about historical, cultural reconstruction as a background to the text.

Rather than giving you this section first and then letting it overshadow the text, I wanted to walk through the text first and then do this. We did it a little bit differently in 1 to 4, 5, and 6 because it was appropriate to do it there because it was so strong. Here, it's a bit less, but it's still a serious consideration.

It basically relates to Winter's reconstruction, not just winter, but others as well. He's written on it, made it convenient to us in articles and in his book on New Roman Wives. He says, bullet number one, when men wore veils, exclamation.

The articles by Oster, Gill, and others demonstrate that veiling was a practice for both men and women in Roman society. Winter reflects on how this pattern is reflected by Roman emperors who led cultic activity, and was also true for the social elite in Corinth, who fulfilled their cultic function. These Roman officials pulled their toga head covering up over their head when officiating a religious ceremony, and perhaps civic or legal events as well.

Winter reasons that if the high status practiced this in the Christian assembly, say they got up front the reed, and they pulled it up, or when prophesying, then perhaps the lower status followed suit, and thus pagan syncretism and social status conflict might arise. That's a legitimate reed from what we know about Roman Corinth. Secondly, the Greek term *gune*, which is the word, there's one word in the enunciation for woman, *gune*, and wife, *gune*.

Context is the only way to know the difference. That's true for man and husband, *aner*, man, *aner*, husband. Context makes the difference.

It can be translated as either woman or wife. It is contextually dependent. The context of 1 Corinthians 11 requires that it be translated wife.

The mention of a veil and the headship analogy requires it. Plutarch's advice to the bride and groom indicates that a woman began to practice veiling with marriage. So, this text is addressing husbands and wives in public worship, not men and women generically.

Some have come up with a view that these were household codes rather than public worship, and that throws a whole different slant on the text. The new Roman wives scenario from winter. There is adequate evidence to posit that women of high status fed up with a sexual double standard for males, the banquet scene that we've talked about, men owning properties, women not, and general patriarchalism, and their legal wives decided to create new patterns of social and sexual behavior.

In Roman annals, this scared the far out of the Caesars because this was anti-cultural in Rome by Roman women of status. So, it's a very interesting thing to track. The bedroom speech given to newlyweds by Plutarch demands that the wife accept the male's casual sexual encounters; we talked about that before, in social settings such as Roman banquets finally became intolerable for the wives, and a revolt occurred.

The reality of the new woman and their behavior evidently prompted Caesar Augustus to put forth new legislation with severe penalties to save Rome's male-oriented view of family values. The legislation seems to have failed. There is a fascinating insight into some of the inside Roman culture that was going on during this period.

You can see that in the publication that I've given you there. The first bullet on 146. While married women veiled themselves in public, they probably did not do so in the privacy of their own homes.

The Corinthian church met in private homes. Were some not veiling when they met? Was that what was going on? The unveiled wife is an affront, as Paul clearly indicates in 11, 5, and 6. Paul equated not wearing a veil with the social stigma of publicly exposed and punished adulteresses reduced to the status of a prostitute. Very serious.

Were they getting lax in a house church, which they wouldn't have in a public setting? Perhaps Paul was trying to distinguish Christian wives from the new Roman women. Were some of the Christian wives getting on board with new Roman women? Therefore, a typical social convention was maintained to avoid guilt by association. Maybe it was a concession to the Roman culture so that the church didn't create more problems than it already had.

The veil was not created for a religious or created pattern purpose. It was an issue in the culture that could undermine the ethics of the church. In 11:7, and 10, Paul used a prominent and strong Greek verb that signified ethical obligation.

I mentioned the word ought to you before. Both husbands and wives were to demonstrate the high status of marriage by means of certain social conventions. Men were not to be veiled, which thereby reflected syncretism with Roman authorities and cultic practices.

For the wife, the most obvious sign of marriage was the wearing of the veil. Therefore, she was obliged to have the authority or sign of marriage on the head. Paul was not saying here that the husband, as head, exercises authority over his wife.

Otherwise, he would have used the verb *exusiaiō*, simply that the woman is obliged to wear on her head what signified to all and sundry that she was married. So, it's not about the gender demand. It's more about a social structure in that sense, and it would have been more about a divine structure as we've read it in the text.

Paul's reference to nature in 11:14 reflects the mindset of his time. The philosophers of his time appealed to nature as a teacher of culture. For a man to wear long hair indicated a denial of their masculinity and tagged them as homosexuals.

All first-century cultures possess means by which the polarity of the sexes was defined by various conventions. Hair length was one such feature in Roman Corinth as 11, 14, and 15 accurately noted. Men's short hair is another convention.

What is left in our culture to signal symbolize marriage? We don't have as many conventions that are fixed as they did, do we? And I'd like to also say get rid of the medieval pictures of Jesus where he has long hair. First century Roman men had scuffy hair usually with a beard, and what you see as the pictures of Jesus are nothing more than medieval Leonardo da Vinci reconstructions. Get rid of them.

The last bullet on 146. The regular public gatherings of the early church for public and cultic practices were a different pattern from the religious practices of pagan religions. Except for special days to honor Rome, religion was practiced privately in the first century by many Romans.

If you remember *Gladiator* in the movie, they had the little hand gods they carried with them, and they kept them in their pockets and did things like that. The Christians were an odd lot to their pagan neighbors. They met publicly, corporately, on a weekly basis.

They gathered and sang together. They used the political term for their gathering, an *ecclesia*, which was an odd thing for religion. They had no iconic representation of their god present, no idols.

They called them atheists because of that. I could have added that they ate and drank the blood of Jesus here. They were cannibals.

They were accused of cannibalism. The gathered church was first called Christians by the Romans, as Acts 11:26 reflects. The Jews would not have used such a term.

It also has a Latin prefix or suffix, which means the Romans used it, which was used in political jargon. This label is a perception of outsiders about believers in Christ. How groups in antiquity perceive themselves and how they are perceived by outsiders is a fascinating study.

E.P. Saunders has a good book called *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*. I'd highly recommend you read it. All right, so there's some of the cultural, historical goings-on that Winter, Gill, Thistleton, and many of the others bring out these things.

But it's only those who understand Roman culture, study Roman culture, and read primary sources in Roman culture and Greek culture that bring that to bear in New Testament studies. Many times, it gets neglected because we look at phrases, we look at an internal description, and we often miss, particularly in epistolary literature, the meaning of these things because we don't have the background. Now, information on further research on gender issues in 1 Corinthians chapter 11.

I'm not doing a lecture on egalitarianism, complementarianism, and hierarchicalism. That's messy, but I've given you some things here to help you. On the American scene, there are two organizations, the Council for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, and the Christians for Biblical Equality.

I believe those are still the websites. I'm sure they are, but you can google them to find out if they've changed their address for any reason. You can go to those websites, and you can find more material that will cover you up. Books have been written, articles have been written, and journals have been circulated for the views of each of these individuals.

I would just remind you to be careful with the word complementarian. A lot of people like to use it but understand what they're saying before you allow them to use that term rather than hierarchy. Christians for Biblical Equality have the same thing.

There is a ton of literature. Before my Bible went to Texas, to a library there, I had over 5,000 volumes and couldn't bring it all to Florida. I just reconstructed a few things for teaching online.

I had an entire bay, a whole bay of books on the gender debate. I don't have those anymore, and if I did, I still wouldn't be doing a lecture on this, okay? But I've given

you some stuff so you can go and look at this yourself. So, go to the primary sources and the people who hold the views.

Don't go to secondary sources. Don't try to understand Council for Biblical Womanhood from somebody who's writing for Christians for Biblical Equality. Don't try to understand Christians for Biblical Equality by somebody writing for the Council of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.

Go to the horse's mouth. Now, I've also given you two things just for your convenience. One of them is the kind of the doctrinal statement of Christians for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.

Now, this is a lengthy document. It starts on page 148. I believe it is.

Let me double-check my pagination here. I had to change something. Yeah, page 148 should be in your notes, but it's called the Danvers Statement because they met up in the northeast in a city called Danvers, and that statement was put out in 1988.

I actually was at the initiation meeting in New England at an annual Evangelical Theological Society meeting when Christians for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood was founded and put into operation. It was an informational meeting of the people who had formed it. I actually asked Christians if Biblical Manhood and Womanhood were being formed to study the text and bring things to light or whether it was being formed to press an agenda.

My question wasn't answered. History has shown us that you can say both end if you want, and that would be true, but there's also a heavy agenda that's been pushed here. All right, so that is a lengthy, lengthy statement.

It runs all the way from 148 for almost 20 pages or about 19 pages all the way up, and it's detailed, so you can start that. Do not let details say that one view is better than another because the Christians for Biblical Equality statement is rather brief. They have longer statements that they've put in other places, but I've only given what was on the website as their statement of faith. you can read it and get the gist of it from there, but you'll need to go into their literature to get a fuller-orbed presentation of their views.

I've given you a select bibliography at the end of these notes. I have highlighted that this is very select. I've got much more than what's here, but there's no use pounding people with bibliography.

This is just a better, more important material. I've highlighted a few things to sort of indicate that you should start with them. For example, James Beck and Craig Blomberg wrote a book on two views on women in ministry.

These viewbooks are extremely helpful because they put out the data for you to see, and you see these people respond to each other. When people use the same verses to say different things, that's very helpful, so I highly recommend that sort of book. Wayne Grudem, who is a strong hierarchicalist, paid here.

Evangelical feminism and biblical truth, an analysis of more than 100 disputed questions. So, you'll get Wayne Grudem's opinion about these issues in a book. David Gill, just above that, the importance of Roman portraiture, which has to do with hairdos, for head coverings in 1 Corinthians.

That's a good article. I'm passing over things not because they're not good, but just because I've highlighted a few things. Richard Oster, here's the article I mentioned to you When Men Wore Veils, I like the title.

That's extremely important for you to read. Ronald Pierce, *Discovering Biblical Equality, Complementarity Without Hierarchy*. That's an edited book; it has a ton of articles in it that you should look at.

As does the next highlighted book by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. John Piper is also a hierarchicalist, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, A Response to Evangelical Feminism*. That, a ton of articles, and both of those books are edited.

Those are premier books that you can look at for each side. They're promoting their ideas and their presentation of their views. Cynthia Thompson, there's an important book on hairstyles or an important article on hairstyles.

Bruce Waltke, there's the article on regular hats applying today. Bruce Winter, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows*, and just lots of other stuff. So, there's 1 Corinthians 11, as much of a synthesis as I can give you to try to get you into this text.

I've tried to give you fuller notes so that that could help you as well. What a fascinating text. What a challenge.

Do not think that you can simply deal with this. You need to do your homework. You need to collect some literature, build yourself a little library on it, and get to work so that you can develop your own understanding of these texts.

But whatever you do, get the key ideas, the key motifs, and the text itself in its flow first. Then, launch out into all the special agenda hermeneutical articles and books, which are a myriad of items. So best wishes as you begin that journey.

You'll find it to be quite interesting and quite entertaining at times, as to how brilliant people who can handle the Bible in all of its aspects can have different views

from the same Bible and even argue vociferously with each other about those. God bless you as you enter that array. And I'll see you for the last half of 1 Corinthians 11 in our next lecture.

Please look up the notes. That'll be notepad number 13. And we'll talk about those items there.

Blessings on you.

This is Dr. Gary Meadors in his teaching on the book of 1 Corinthians. This is lecture 26, 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 2.