

Littleton Bible Chapel Position Paper

Covering and Uncovering of the Head during Prayer and Ministry of the Word

1 Corinthians 11:2-16

It has been the practice of LBC for the past forty-five years to ask women to cover their heads when they pray and teach publicly, and for men to uncover their heads when they pray and teach in a public setting.

This practice is not an empty tradition of our church but a direct injunction of the Scriptures. We have prepared the following paper on 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, for you to consider the accuracy and the truthfulness of our practice.

It is our desire to encourage believers to take this passage seriously and to consistently practice the teaching therein. This has been a long neglected passage, and today is completely unacceptable in our feminist environment. We understand the offense of this teaching. But since we take the passage at face value and not as cultural, we have no choice but to practice its teaching.

Our desire as elders is to make people aware of what the Bible teaches about this distinctive Christian practice and to encourage both men and women to practice this teaching.

If however, people disagree with our interpretation, we do not force this practice on anyone. We respect the liberty of the conscience of all our fellow believers.

1 Corinthians 11:2-16

Headship and Subordination Symbolized by Covering and Uncovering of the Head

The letter of 1 Corinthians deals with many practical local church issues and problems, ones that affect all churches in all ages. Certainly no one can ever accuse the letter of 1 Corinthians of being boring or too theoretical. Every chapter pulsates with real-life situations in the new planted church in the worldly city of Corinth. So it is not surprising that three times in the letter Paul addresses male-female relationship issues (7:1-40; 11:2-16; 14:34-37), topics that still spark white hot debate today, as it did in Paul's time.

Of these three passages, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is extraordinarily rich in Christology, Christian anthropology, angelology, Old Testament interpretation, gender insights, interpretive challenges, and examples of skillful pastoral persuasion, correction, and rebuke.

We are convinced, however, that the true significance and application of this passage still awaits discovery. There is much confusion and doubt surrounding this text of Holy Scripture. The passage mystifies most people. The majority of our esteemed commentators approach this passage with erroneous assumptions that are nearly impossible to challenge. They deny its central point of application for today. Some commentators seem to see only numerous, complex interpretive puzzles. Hopefully this paper will help illuminate the truths of the text and inspire others to keep searching.

Some of the details of this passage are admittedly difficult to interpret with confidence, but the main point is clear. Even highly debatable verses like verse 10, regardless of one's interpretation, do not distract from the chief point: *Christian men are not to cover their heads when actively engaged in praying or prophesying and Christian women are to cover their heads when praying or prophesying.* That's it. Everything else in the passage is meant to support this practice.

Read the passage and ask the Spirit of God to illuminate your mind (*Note: All Scripture references are taken from the New American Standard Bible, The Lockman Foundation, 1995*).

11:2 Now I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you.

11:3 But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.

11:4 Every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.

11:5 But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head, for she is one and the same as the woman whose head is shaved.

11:6 For if a woman does not cover her head, let her also have her hair cut off; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her cover her head.

11:7 For a man ought not to have his head covered, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man.

11:8 For man does not originate from woman, but woman from man;

11:9 for indeed man was not created for the woman's sake, but woman for the man's sake.

11:10 Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

11:11 However, in the Lord, neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman.

11:12 For as the woman originates from the man, so also the man has his birth through the woman; and all things originate from God.

11:13 Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?

11:14 Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him,

11:15 but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her? For her hair is given to her for a covering.

11:16 But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other practice, nor have the churches of God.

Introduction: Praise for Obeying Apostolic Tradition, 11:2.

In chapters 7 to 11:1 Paul answers questions raised by a letter from the church in Corinth. The believers sought his judgment concerning marriage and sex (1 Cor. 7) and eating meat consecrated to an idol and participation at pagan feasts (1 Cor. 8:1-11:1). Chapter 11 verse 2 begins a new section of the letter. Surprisingly it starts with an introductory word of praise: "Now I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you."

It is possible that in verse 2 Paul is responding to a statement made by the Corinthians themselves in their letter. One commentator imagines their letter to say: "we remember you in everything and maintain the traditions even as you have delivered them to us."¹ If that is the case, they had assured Paul that although they had not seen him for nearly three and a half years, they gladly remembered him in every respect and held firmly to the traditions he had taught them when present with them. Even if their self-congratulation is a bit overly optimistic, Paul sincerely commends them for their good intentions (cf. 1 Cor. 1:4-8). And, most likely, there were traditions they kept faithfully but are not mentioned in this letter, and even those traditions they had distorted they at least had followed in form, such as the Lord's Supper and appropriate head apparel.

Although the Corinthians erred in numerous ways, at heart they sought to follow Paul's instructions and example. They desired to be loyal to him, albeit imperfectly, like most of us today. The letter of 1 Corinthians itself demonstrates that they sought his counsel and commendation.

So Paul commends them for keeping the "traditions." The word "traditions" is very important in understanding this passage and particularly its application for us today. The term is rich in theological significance. The Greek word for *tradition* is *paradosis*, which literally is "the things

handed on.” The word “points us to the fact that the Christian message is essentially derivative.”ⁱⁱ The traditions originated with Jesus Christ, not Paul. It is Paul’s job to pass the traditions on to others. The plural is used here (*paradoseis*) and means the individual oral/written teachings of Paul the apostle. These “traditions” comprised the true, original, foundational teachings of the apostle to the Gentiles, the divinely revealed truths of Christianity. These traditions are binding Christian truths. Paul exhorts the newly converted Thessalonian Christians to “stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught, whether by word of mouth or by letter from us” (2 Thess. 2:15). “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you keep away from every brother who leads an unruly life and not according to the tradition which you received from us” (2 Thess. 3:6).

These traditions are not man-made traditions in the bad sense, like the traditions of the Pharisees, which thus can be dispensed with when convenient, but divinely communicated doctrines that must be obeyed. Today these traditions are recorded in the New Testament for us to follow.

Note that Paul also uses the related verb “delivered” (*paradidomi*). The verb “delivered” can be used of handing down, passing on, transmitting of tradition: “hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you.” A regular part of Paul’s ministry in establishing churches was transmitting the authoritative traditions he had received from Christ to his converts. Paul views himself as Christ’s messenger, one who “delivered” the truths of Christ to others. Paul viewed himself as a teacher of Jesus Christ. For the most part the Corinthians tried to adhere to these authoritative traditions.

Two specific traditions are addressed in chapter 11. Both of these traditions deal with distinctly Christian symbols. The first tradition is the uncovered/covered head (1 Cor. 11:2-16), and the second is the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:17-34). The first tradition required some further reinforcement and clarification. A few disagreeable persons may have raised objections (v. 16). It was not, it appears, a severe problem. Most held fast to this tradition. But the second tradition was sorely abused. For this abuse Paul says he cannot praise them (v. 17). His instruction on the Lord’s Supper is couched in stern rebuke and correction.

11:17 But in giving this instruction, I do not praise you, because you come together not for the better but for the worse.

11:18 For, in the first place, when you come together as a church, I hear that divisions exist among you; and in part I believe it.

11:20 Therefore when you meet together, it is not to eat the Lord’s Supper,

11:21 for in your eating each one takes his own supper first; and one is hungry and another is drunk.

The tradition of the Lord’s Supper is familiar to all Christians, but the head covering/uncovering is not. The compelling way in which Paul argues for this practice forces us to take this practice seriously. The essence of the tradition is presented in verses 4 and 5:

- Every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.

- But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head....
- Paul presents weighty theological and biblical arguments to establish his point on covering and uncovering the head.
- The reality of headship-subordination relationships in God’s plan
- The issue of disgrace
- The original Creation account of the sexes
- The angels watching
- The lesson from nature
- The universal practice of the churches and Paul

b. The Headship-Subordination Relationships in God’s Plan, vv. 3-6.

Some dissention existed among the Corinthians over the tradition of covering and uncovering the head. So Paul wants them to understand the correct theological and biblical reasons for covering and uncovering the head, and thus to confirm the good practice of those who held firmly to the tradition.

(1) *The principle of headship, v. 3.* Paul launches into his topic with lofty theological fervor: “But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ” (v. 3). Immediately Paul demonstrates that uncovering/covering the head at the appropriate time is a Christian practice. It is founded on the headship/subordination relationship between the man and the woman designed by God.

The opening clause, “I want you to understand,” reveals the earnestness Paul felt that they grasp the principle of headship. Paul wants believers to understand this doctrine of headship and its appropriate symbols for the sexes. The Corinthians had an incomplete or misconstrued understanding of the doctrine. So they needed clarification.

Since the tradition needing clarification is uncovering/covering the head (*kephale*) of the respective sexes, Paul uses the word “head” as it explains the relationships that exist between Christ and man, man and woman, and God and Christ to support the injunction on head covering. Three times in verse 3 he uses the word “head” (*kephale*), in the figurative (metaphorical) sense. It is the key word of the verse. It prepares us for verses 4 and 5, uncovering/covering the physical head.

Note the structure of verse 3. There are three pairs of statements: Christ/man, man/woman, and God/Christ. There is a headship-subordination relationship that exists between Christ and man, between man and woman, and between God and Christ. These relationships cannot be altered to suit secular society’s egalitarian philosophy. The headship relationship between man and woman must not be erased.

(a) *Christ/Man.* Paul first wants his readers to understand that “Christ is the head of every man.” Every man (male) has a head, a leader, an authority figure to whom he must submit. That head is Christ. Because Christ is “the head of the church” (Eph. 5:23) and “head over all things” (Eph. 1:22), Paul can say Christ is the head over “every man.” Paul knew his truth of Christ as man’s

head better than any man alive. In verse 1 he writes, “Be imitators of me, just as I also am of Christ.” Paul was a man under authority. No man is self-ruling; no husband, elder, Bible teacher is without a head. God doesn’t exempt the man from being under authority. Christian women as well as Christian men need to know this important truth: Every man has a head to whom he should submit and obey.

How does Christ’s headship over the man work? Christ leads the man through His Word, the prompting of the Holy Spirit, and the community of saints and the local elders. A Christian man is to be characterized by a humble, submissive attitude towards the Word of God.

There is an important lesson here for men. Since Christ is a head, He is the perfect example of headship. Christ never abuses those under His leadership. He is not a self-centered, controlling tyrant. He seeks at the expense of Himself the well-being and growth of those he leads. The Christian man is to learn from Christ’s headship what Christian headship is. Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for her (Eph. 5:25). So too the man must love his wife sacrificially or any other people he leads. The man in his God-appointed headship role should reflect the leadership role of his head, Christ. “Therefore they are not free to define and to exercise their headship in any way they choose, but only according to the pattern of Christ’s own headship and in according with Christ’s teaching about male headship given through the inspired apostles (Eph. 5:23-33; 1 Peter 3:7).”ⁱⁱⁱ

By “head” (Greek, *kephale*) is meant “leader,” “authority over,” “director.” Some commentators say “head” means “source.” Of course this is true as verse 8 highlights, but it is not the point here. More is involved in this section than just source. It must include authority. The subject under discussion is social relationships and order between the sexes, and public ministry.

(b) Man/Woman. Second, he wants his readers to understand that “the man is the head of a woman.” This is not only the center pair of the three but the main point to our overall context. There is a headship/subordination relationship between men and women. Some in Corinth may have taken their newly found liberty and position in Christ to unbiblical conclusions. So Paul says, “man is the head,” not woman. Indeed, she is the only one not called a head. God has ordered the male-female social relationship this way.

Feminists believe that women’s submission is the result of the Fall (Gen. 3:16) and that one of the results of Christ’s work of redemption on the Cross is to abolish the curse of subordination-headship relationship between the man and woman. This viewpoint, however, is rendered false by the present verse. As the crucified, risen, and exalted Christ and head of the new creation, He is head of the man and God is the head of Christ and the man is the head of the woman. The local church of Jesus Christ is to model this headship relationship between man and woman by certain gender-appropriate actions (1 Cor. 11:5; 14:34, 35).

Although the term submission (Greek, *hypotasso*) doesn’t appear here it is implied in the headship relations. Man submits to Christ, woman submits to man, and Christ submits to God.

It is debated whether Paul means “husbands and wives” or “men and women” generally. If verse 3 were the only verse of the passage, “husbands and wives” would be the correct rendering, as in

Ephesians 5. But the entire context requires the more general meaning of male and female, “man and woman.” He speaks of “every man” and “every woman.” The major directive concerns men and women praying and prophesying, not family relationships. It is not just husbands who are the image and glory of God, but men generally. It is not exclusively the husband who “has his birth through the woman” but men. In this way 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is like 1 Timothy 2:8-15 where man and woman generally are the correct renderings.

The passage would still have application to the husband and wife relationship. If a woman did not have a husband the headship principle would apply to her father or the local church elders.

The woman is in no way inferior to the man because she subordinates herself to him any more than Christ is inferior to God the Father because He subordinates Himself to the Father. So the headship-subordination relationship of the man and woman is evidenced not only in the original creation order of Genesis but in the greater order, the nature of the Godhead. Man’s headship authority is rooted in God’s own nature.

The woman’s head covering is related to this headship order; man is her head. She is under man’s authority. Thus she covers her head.

(c) *God/Christ*. Third, he wants his readers, men and women, to understand that “God is the head of Christ.” By stating that “God is the head of Christ,” Paul emphasizes a relationship of authority and subordination between God and Christ. Christ subordinates Himself to God the Father. Thus Christ both exercises the role of head and subordinate. He is an example for both sexes.

What makes this statement even more instructive is that Christ is God, the Son. He is fully and eternally equal with God the Father in essence, power, glory, and worth, yet distinct in role and mission. Yet in His mission and role as redeemer, sent by God, He is functionally subordinate to God.^{iv} Willingly He *obeys* and *submits* to God the Father’s authority and will (1 Cor. 15:28; see also 3:23). The submission and obedience of Christ to God cost Him His life. As the Scripture says, “who, although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, and being made in the likeness of men. Being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross” (Phil. 2:6-8).

With remarkable precision, S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., former professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, summarizes this truth: “The ultimate and telling proof that equality and submission may coexist in glorious harmony is found in the mediatorial mission of the Son of God, ‘God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God’ (Nicaea), who completed it in the true liberation of submission to His Father (cf. John 8:21-47; 1 Corinthians 15: 24-28; cf. 11:3).”^v

What a tremendous encouragement this truth is. If Christ our Lord is subordinate and willingly suffered in obedience to the will of His head, so can every Christian man and woman gladly subordinate themselves to their head, even when it is disagreeable and hard. Brother and sister, think on the profound words by David Gooding, “From this we gather at once what an important

thing headship is in the realm of redemption: under God everyone, whether man, woman or Christ himself, has a head.”^{vi}

(2) *Displaying male headship by uncovering the head, v. 4.* After setting down the fundamental principle that “the man is the head of a woman,” Paul states the specific tradition that symbolizes the headship/subordination relationship between the sexes when praying and prophesying:

Every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.

But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head....

The uncovering of the man’s head (v. 4) and the covering of the woman’s head (v. 5) are both connected to the headship-subordination principle of verse 3. Men can pray and prophesy, and women can pray and prophesy, but in order *to distinguish them in these activities*, the head of the man is to be uncovered and the woman covered. They are to display “Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman.” Thus Paul raises the issues of covering and uncovering above the cultural standards of the day. He uses the most profound possible arguments to prove the need for the appropriate covering or uncovering the head.

Verses 4 and 5 are part of what Paul wants “you to understand.” This is a distinctly Christian principle, and it applies *to both men and women*, not only women.

This is distinct Christian teaching, not Roman, Greco-Roman, or Jewish. Here is why:

(i) The uncovering and covering of the head is considered part of the *paradosis*, “traditions,” Paul had originally “delivered” to them (v. 2). This is an important point to grasp. Paul considers the head covering issue *paradosis*, binding on believers to obey. Thus this tradition must be maintained; it is not optional.

Most commentators believe that only the principles of headship, or sexual differentiation, or not offending society’s cultural norms are the universal, binding principles of the passage. They dismiss the teaching on head covering as a culturally specific issue not binding upon us today. These expositors however are missing the main teaching of the passage. The headship principle is provided to prove that the covering is *paradosis*.

Knowing that the Corinthian believers were independent, individualistic, freedom-minded people, it is likely that many of them didn’t appreciate such specific rules on covering and uncovering the head. So Paul must remind them that it is apostolic tradition, not personal preference.

(ii) The issue defended in this passage is a distinct Christian tradition, not Roman or Jewish tradition. “No Greco-Roman custom,” states Clark, “corresponds to what Paul enjoins. There is no evidence for the view that he was urging the Christians at Corinth to conform to the norms of society around them for missionary reasons.”^{vii}

Corinth at the time of Paul's evangelistic mission was Roman Corinth. Greek Corinth was destroyed in 146 B. C. Julius Caesar ordered Corinth to be rebuilt as a Roman colony in 44 B. C. So the predominant cultural influence of the city was Roman. "Institutions, legal procedures, social customs, architecture, public images and to some extent language owed more to Rome than to the Greek world."^{viii} "The testimonies of the inscriptions are clear regarding the existence of a significant Roman cultural presence in first century Corinth."^{ix} "Although the population and culture of this colony were surely heterogeneous, Corinth was nevertheless 'in a way, a copy' of Rome.... One should not forget in this connection that Roman priests were State officials and that Roman religion was inextricably interwoven into the fabric of Roman civic life and institutions, at home and abroad."^x

According to Roman custom, both men and women routinely covered their heads when actively sacrificing or during devotional prayer. Richard E. Oster in a well-documented scholarly article entitled, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11:4," provides the historical data to show that Roman men wore head coverings not only when offering sacrifices, but when praying or worshipping. Indeed, he goes on to say, "individual Romans covered and uncovered their heads for a variety of reasons."^{xi} Oster also challenges the commentators who claim that Paul's instruction regarding men to uncover their head is hypothetical, and only added for the sake of argument. "These conclusions," writes Oster, "do not acknowledge the relevant Greek and Latin texts, as well as the archaeological data that depict ancient mores and sacred laws concerning men's devotional head apparel."^{xii} Men covering their heads during prayer was a reality in Roman Corinth.

So if Paul is concerned to have the Corinthians follow the prevailing Roman custom of men covering their heads for the sake of the gospel, he should tell the men to cover their heads when praying. Paul tells Christian men to uncover their heads, however. *He forbids the men from following Roman practice.* Some Roman men could have found Paul's teaching on uncovering the head offensive or strange. The point is, it is Christian custom to tell a man to uncover his head when praying and prophesying. This is apostolic Christian teaching, not Roman.

It is also claimed by some commentators that Jewish men covered their heads (the *tallith*) in worship, but this is unproven. It is not legitimate to read later Jewish traditions back onto first-century, Diaspora Judaism. It appears rather that Jewish men in Paul's day prayed bareheaded.^{xiii}

Furthermore, Roman Corinth was built on Greek soil, so there were Greek citizens and considerable Greek influences. Corinth was only 45 miles from Athens. Greek men did not cover their heads when they prayed or worshipped.^{xiv} Greeks were less concerned than Romans with head covering practices.

There is nothing in this passage like we have in chapter 8 about offending weaker believers by eating food offered to idols. Head covering is not a matter of liberty or local custom. Paul states a distinct Christian practice that he expects all the believers to follow even if they are accustomed to different practices. He also rigorously defends its practice with theological and biblical reasons.

Ben Witherington captures Paul's intent when he writes:

Paul is not interested in baptizing the status quo or normal Roman practice. He is setting up new customs for a new community, and these customs are deeply grounded in his theological understanding of creation, redemption, their interrelation, and how they should be manifested in worship.^{xv}

(iii) It is extremely important to see that Paul is not asking Christian women to cover their heads or wear a veil whenever they are in public, and he is not asking men to uncover their heads in general worship. Paul has specific actions in mind for uncovering/covering the heads of the respective sexes. He wants Christian women to cover their heads when they are actively engaged in praying or prophesying (wherever that may be) and men to uncover their heads when they do the same.

It is an unquestioned, deeply-rooted assumption that the head covering is a local, cultural issue. This assumption is not even challenged by most interpreters. They do not even seek to prove that head covering is a cultural issue. They know it to be the case, largely because it is not part of their experience or tradition. They simply wave a magic wand over the passage and declare the tradition to be cultural and not applicable for today. They trivialize the teaching of this passage. Those who assume that this tradition is cultural and not required for today are required, however, to demonstrate that it is cultural and inapplicable for today. It is not obvious from the text that covering/uncovering is a temporary cultural issue. Paul argues adamantly for its practice.

Accepting the instruction of verse 4 to be a Christian practice, there are several questions we now need to address.

(a) *When should a man uncover his head?* In his commentary on 1 Corinthians, Simon Kistemaker says that Paul, “does not want a man to cover his head at a public worship service.”^{xvi} The text of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, however, says no such thing.

In verses 4 and 5 Paul uses two, present tense, temporal participles, “while praying or prophesying.” These two participles inform us of the activities contemplated--praying and prophesying. It is during *these activities* that a man is to uncover his head. So they tell us *when* a man “ought” uncover his head (v. 7). The point at issue is this, praying and prophesying with a covered head. That is what is shameful for a man.

Paul is not saying that a man should take his hat off when he enters the congregational gathering. Paul intentionally adds no modifying word or phrase like “in church,” “at home,” or “in public,” or “in the presence of ladies.” He doesn’t specify a place. Thus we should not add our own limiting ideas, like “in church.” The *Good News Bible* is wrong when it adds the phrase, “in public worship: “So a man who prays or proclaims God’s message in public worship with his head covered disgraces Christ.” By adding the words “in public worship” the scope of the instruction on uncovering the head is wrongfully limited. He means that a Christian man is to uncover his head whenever and wherever he prays or prophesies, in public worship or in a home Bible study or prayer session.

Of course, a man will pray and prophesy in the meeting of the church, and when he does perform these activities in the church he is to uncover his head. The point is, *whenever and wherever* a man prays or prophesies--in church or outside of church, at home, or in public--he should uncover his head.

We should also note that the one praying is to uncover his head, not those who are listening.

(b) *Does prophesying represent other forms of utterance gifts?* Another question is, is the term “prophesying” meant to serve as a representative term for other utterance gifts such as tongues-speaking, teaching, or preaching? Should a man uncover his head when he teaches or preaches the gospel? Or should we limit the uncovering precept only to prophetic activity? That is unlikely, and here is why. As a master of the economy of words, Paul contrasts two general categories by the Greek particle “or,” the vertical speaking to God in prayer and the horizontal speaking to people the Word of the Lord. Prophecy is inspired speech, the Word of the Lord. In the letter of 1 Corinthians and the Corinthian church prophesying plays a prominent role. It would be stylistically clumsy to list all the different forms of speaking the Word of the Lord after prayer. It is simple and to the point to say, “praying or prophesying.” So when either speaking to God in prayer or speaking to people the Word of the Lord, a man should uncover his head. We conclude that prophesying represents all forms of activities that speak the Word of the Lord.

We should note that prophecy is not just “foretelling” the future as the English term might suggest. It is both foretelling and telling forth the Lord’s message and instructions “for edification and exhortation and consolation (1 Cor. 14:3).

(c) *What about silent prayer, private prayer, or family activities?* Another question to answer is whether praying includes silent, private praying, and family prayer, as well as public, corporate praying in the presence of others. Prophesying is unquestionably not silent, private, or personal. Prophesying is a spiritual gift for the benefit of others and exercised before others publicly. We know of no such thing as silent, personal prophesying. Prophesying is audible and for the sake of others (1 Cor. 14:3). Since praying is linked and contrasted with prophesying, it too most likely is a public, formal, corporate activity.

Furthermore, verse 13 tells us that the head covering is an issue of “propriety,” which is a public matter. Moreover, the shame of being inappropriately uncovered or covered appears to be observable, something people can see and react to. In a letter addressing problems among the believers Paul makes it clear whether he is referring to private action, like praying silently and privately to God (14:28).

Finally, if silent prayer of the mind is included, then an argument could be made for men to always be uncovered and women to be constantly covered. First Thessalonians 5:17 says “pray without ceasing.” A Christian is commanded to be in a constant spirit of prayer. Of Paul himself, Leon Morris writes, “Prayer was as natural to Paul as breathing.”^{xvii} We can talk to the Lord all day long as we perform our normal life’s activities. Thus it can be argued that a woman should always have her head covered and a man should never have his head covered. To do otherwise would send the message that they are not in the spirit of prayer. This line of reasoning seems foreign to the point and creates a hornet’s nest of questions.

It is best then to understand both praying or prophesying as audible activities in the presence of others. Regarding prayer and prophesying activities within one's family or household, some believe the head covering commands are inclusive of this private context, while some do not. We consider both interpretations acceptable and a matter of personal conscience.

In simple, succinct style Paul writes in verse 4: A Christian man is not to cover his head when he prays or prophesies. This is to be true of "every" Christian man who prays and prophesies, not just the Christian men of Corinth. The principle of uncovering the head is as universal a principle as Christ is the head of every man and man is the head of the woman.

Although the vast majority of Christian people view covering and uncovering the head as an irrelevant tradition, Paul doesn't. He gives considerable space to defend this doctrine; fifteen verses. He argues adamantly for the practice. He is quite serious about the whole matter. In his socio-rhetorical commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ben Witherington comments that, "All we can say from the point of view of rhetorical analysis is that it is obvious that Paul regards this as a very important matter"^{xviii}

(3) *Female subordination displayed by covering the head, vv. 5, 6.* In parallel style Paul states the woman's side of the equation in verse 5: "But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head."

The majority of the argument addresses the woman's part. Most likely the woman's head covering was the point of question. So the main issue Paul is arguing for with profound, Spirit-led reasoning is why a woman "ought" to cover her head when engaged in praying or prophesying.

Unlike the man who must uncover his head "while praying or prophesying," the Christian woman is to cover her head "while praying or prophesying." This, too, is a distinctly Christian tradition.

In Paul's Corinth, whether Greek or Roman, it was not required that a woman appear in public veiled, unless for some special rite or occasion. "Public marble portraits of women at Corinth, presumably members of wealthy and prestigious families are most frequently shown bare-headed. This would suggest that it was socially acceptable in a Roman colony for women to be seen bareheaded in public."^{xix} "Because most of the women's portraits presented here portray women with uncovered heads, one may infer that bareheadedness in itself was not a sign of a socially disapproved lifestyle....for Hellenistic and Roman women a veil was a possible choice but not a requirement."^{xx}

In the East, women covered their heads in public. This included Jewish women. Some think Paul is imposing Jewish customs on the church at Corinth, but this is untrue. Paul is not telling women to cover their heads in all public occasions.

Several questions, concerning the woman's head covering, need detailed attention. The questions of when (time) and where (place) a woman should cover her head or pray are not argued for here. These issues the Corinthians must have understood. It was not a problem. As to when a

woman ought to cover her head, Paul states that as a matter of course, “while praying or prophesying.” With this brief information we must be satisfied.

(a) *Does Paul teach that a woman is to cover her head in the church meeting?* It is widely assumed that verse 5 teaches that women are to cover their heads during congregational gatherings. Again, Kistemaker writes, “Correspondingly, he does not want a woman to come to the worship services without a head covering.”^{xxi} Another commentator remarks, “Evidently at Corinth women were coming to church with their heads improperly covered, thus causing disorder and disrespect in the service.”^{xxii} Paul, however, simply doesn’t say, “while in the worship services.”

Here is an example of a common interpretive error, reading into the words of the text our own preconceived words and ideas. It is a problem we all struggle with. We don’t look carefully at the words themselves. We don’t allow the words to speak to us. Indeed we can’t let them speak because we assume they say otherwise. They contradict our mental conception of the passage. We read into them too much or too little.

What the words of the text actually say is, that “while praying and prophesying” (v. 5) a woman is to cover her head. In abbreviated form verse 13 repeats the same idea, “is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?” It is during these specific, limited activities, that correspond to the man’s, that she is to be covered. It is misleading to expand the application of women’s head covering beyond these specific activities. If we do, we have stepped outside of the words of Scripture.

Now if a woman prays or prophesies in a church meeting then, of course, she is to cover her head while speaking.

However, in chapter 14 Paul restricts women from speaking in the congregational meetings. So in Paul’s mind women do not pray or prophesy in the congregational meetings; they are silent (1 Cor. 14:34, 35). So for women this instruction on covering will be applied outside the formal church setting, where and when it is appropriate for her to pray and prophesy.

The only justification that can be found in this text for a woman covering her head during a church meeting is that she is silently praying to God during the meeting. But it is highly questionable that Paul is referring to silent prayer. And even if he is, this still would not justify wearing a cover while listening to a 45 minute sermon.

Paul is not asking women to both be covered and silent in the gathered meeting of the church. In the church meeting she is to be silent as a sign of her submission (1 Cor. 14:34, 35). Outside the church gathering she can pray and prophesy, but then she is to be covered.

A final note. In churches where women cover their heads while sitting silently in a church meeting, often don’t practice covering their heads when praying and ministering outside the church meeting—during the very activities Scripture explicitly commands them to cover their heads.

(b) *What kind of covering?* As to the nature of the covering the passage provides no special instructions. Paul uses general terms. *The New Revised Standard Version* uses “veil” throughout this passage. But veil may communicate to some the idea of covering the whole head including the face (Gen. 38:15; 2 Cor. 3:13-16; the Greek word *kalymma*, “veil,” “covering,” is not used in 1 Cor. 11; it is in 2 Cor. 3:13-16).^{xxiii} In light of the word *peribolaion* in verse 15 more likely a Roman woman pulled her cloak (himation) over her head. Paul uses three different terms for the covering, all of them general terms.

- Verse 4: *kata kephales echon*: literally, “having down the head.”^{xxiv}
- Verses 5, 13: *akatakalyptos*: the verbal adjective, “uncovered.”
- Verses 6, 7: *katakalypto*: the middle verb, “to cover oneself.”
- Verse 15: *peribolaion*: “cloth covering,” “cloak,” “wrapping.”

In contemporary society a woman may wear a hat to church or in public as part of her outfit to accentuate her beauty. It is a fashion statement, like wearing jewelry. The Queen of England most often wears a hat in public. When women are invited to meet the Queen they are expected to wear a hat.

A Fashion magazine ran this headline, “If you want attention, wear a hat.” An expert in image design gave this advise to women about wearing a hat: “More than any other accessory, hats have clout. They draw attention. They indicate wealth and power. And they are a show of strength.”^{xxv} Hats are a matter of style and cultural convention. There is nothing wrong with wearing a hat for style, or wearing a hat to church, but this is not the point of 1 Corinthians 11.

Our passage says a woman is to cover her head *when* she prays and prophesies. It is during these spiritual activities she is to be covered. Covering the head is a religious act, not fashion display. The covering is a Christian symbol that she is under authority. So whatever a woman uses to cover her head *when she prays* it should correspond to the meaning of the act. Women who do cover their heads in church meetings today use a mantilla or prayer cap.

(c) *Is the covering or uncovering for the sake of unbelievers or believers?* Some commentators assume that Paul’s instruction on covering and uncovering the head is for the sake of the unbelieving community. “One of Paul’s rationales for his commands in this passage is to avoid hindering the spread of the gospel by sending misleading cultural signals.”^{xxvi} Nothing, however, in this passage even hints at such a rationale.

Verse 16 states explicitly that this is a practice among all the churches and leaders. The Christian meaning of the symbol of covering and uncovering is distinctly Christian. David Gooding is absolutely correct when he says,

Ancient Greek men, likewise, normally prayed to their gods bareheaded, but obviously not for the same reasons as Christian men prayed with their heads uncovered. Indeed, an unconverted Greek would never have guessed the significance of the Christian practice, if

the Christians had not told him. The meaning of the symbol as the Christians used it was altogether and exclusively Christian.^{xxvii}

Along this same line expositors say that we can't practice this tradition today because unbelievers wouldn't understand it. Well, it is not for them. This is a Christian practice. If our own evangelical, Bible-believing brothers and sisters don't understand the meaning of the covering they can be taught, if they are willing. They have to be taught the significance of the Lord's Supper and baptism.

Evangelical Christians are too frightened of what the world thinks of them. Any one living in a sizable city sees Jewish men and Muslim women covering their heads all the time. They are not frightened of what people say. They follow their beliefs and people respect them for it.

(d) *Does the passage teach that women pray and prophesy in the church meeting?* Most commentators use this text as the prime example that women prayed and prophesied in the first century churches. Indeed it would be the only example. The problem, however, is that 1 Corinthians 14:34-36 explicitly forbids women from speaking in church meetings.

**Women praying and prophesying
in the church.**

1 Cor. 11:5

**Woman are to be silent
in the church**

1 Cor. 14:34, 35

There appears to be conflict in teaching between 1 Corinthians 14 and 1 Corinthians 11. For we who believe that all Scripture is God breathed-out and profitable for teaching and correction (1 Tim. 3:16), there can be no contradiction. Paul was an utterly brilliant man, a true scholar. He would not contradict himself on such an obvious, simple matter within the space of three chapters. Furthermore, the divine author of the letter of 1 Corinthians, the Holy Spirit, makes no mistakes. We are the ones who have the problem, not Paul. Consider the following points to resolve this problem.

(i) It is inaccurate to say that 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 refers specifically to a church worship service. It is also inaccurate to assert that the passage refers exclusively to non-church settings. 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is about covering and uncovering the head while praying and prophesying. Paul is arguing for why a woman "ought" to cover her head and why a man "ought" not to cover his head while praying or prophesying. 1 Corinthians 11 simply does not designate a specific setting or place. It doesn't say "in the church." Therefore, in the most general sense whenever and wherever a man prays or prophesies--whether in a formal congregation gathering or in non-church settings he is to uncover his head. In the case of the man, 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 has applications to a church meeting. If he prays or prophesies in a church meeting he must uncover his head.

However, with the woman, she is expressly forbidden to speak in the congregational gatherings, according to 1 Corinthians 14. In the case of the woman, 1 Corinthians 11 doesn't have application to a church setting. So wherever and whenever she prays and prophesies, she is to be covered. 1 Corinthians 11 has application to both the church meeting and the non-church setting, depending on whether the man or the woman is in question.

(ii) Some commentators insist that praying and prophesying require 1 Corinthians 11 to refer to a formal church setting. “The two verbs ‘pray and prophesy’ make it certain that the problem has to do with the assembly at worship.”^{xxviii} The two verbs, however, do not “make it certain” that a church meeting is in view. Do Christians never pray together outside of a formal church gathering? Of course not! For New Testament examples of Christians praying together outside of an official church gathering read the following Scripture texts: Acts 9:40; 16:25; 20:36; 21:5; James 5:14-16; 1 Cor. 7:5.

Is the utterance of prophecy restricted only to the church meetings? Of course not! Here are some possible examples of the prophetic Word spoken outside of a formal church meeting: Acts 19:5-8; 21:10-14; Rev. 11:3-10.

Chapter 12 provides instruction on spiritual gifts. Are the spiritual gifts of chapter 12 exercised only in the church meeting? Of course not! Much of our service and exercise of spiritual gifts find use outside the formal church gathering. Furthermore, chapter 14 regulates prophecy in the church meeting; it doesn’t limit it exclusively to a church meeting.

A further point to note: Even the Old Testament prophetesses’ ministry was different from the male prophets in that theirs was private and individual. This is true of Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, Mary, Elizabeth, and Anna. (Note carefully that two of the most moving and powerful women’s prophecies in the New Testament were given in homes, Luke 2:39-56.) Thomas R. Schreiner writes:

Both Deborah and Huldah...exercised their gift of prophecy differently from the men who possessed the gift. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and other male prophets exercised a public ministry where they proclaimed the word of the Lord. But note that Deborah did not prophesy in public. Instead, her prophetic role seems to be limited to private and individual instruction.... Note that Deborah did not go out and publicly proclaim the word of the Lord. Instead, individuals came to her in private for a word from the Lord. The difference between Deborah’s prophetic ministry and that of male Old Testament prophets is clear. She did not exercise her ministry in a public forum as they did. Note that even when she speaks to Barak she calls him and speaks to him individually (Judges 4:6, 14). And the song of praise in Judges 5:1 was sung by both Deborah and Barak together. A confirming argument for this view is found in the case of Huldah (2 Ki. 22:14-20). She did not publicly proclaim God’s word. Rather, she explained in private the word of the Lord when Josiah sent messengers to her. She exercised her prophetic ministry in a way that did not obstruct male headship. The prophetic ministry of Miriam is no exception to this, because she ministered only to women. “Then Miriam, the prophetess, Aaron’s sister, took a tambourine in her hand, and *all the women followed her*, with tambourines and dancing Miriam sang *to them*...” (Exodus 15:20, italics not in original)^{xxix}

(iii) The entire section of the letter from chapter 11 verse 2 to the end of chapter 14 demonstrates that 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 should not be limited to a church meeting. It is general in nature. It has application to both church settings and non-church settings.

- 11:2-16: head covering—general context (in/out of the church)
- 11:17-34: abuse of the Lord’s supper—congregational meeting
- 12:1-31: spiritual gifts—general context (in/out of the church meeting)
- 13:1-13: the priority of love—general context (in/out of the church)
- 14:1-40: abuse of tongues—congregational meeting

Chapter 11 verses 17 and 18 address a new topic: abuse of the Lord’s supper. Here Paul plainly and directly specifies the context in which this new topic applies: “when you come together as a church [lit. ‘in church’]” (please note other verses in this section which specify the church formally gathered 17, 18, 20, 22, 33, 34). Without doubt Paul is now dealing with the actual church gathering.

Observe also that Paul distinguishes in verses 17 to 34, between the church gathered, which would have been in a home, and non-church settings in the home (vv. 22, 34). This is not done in verses 2-16, so we should leave verses 2-16 general.

Next in chapter 12 Paul addresses the issue of spiritual gifts. The instruction in this chapter is not limited exclusively to the church meeting. Chapter 13 is also general in nature. But chapter 14 deals specifically with the abuse of tongues in the church meeting (see vv. 4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 26, 34, 35).

(iv) Some think verse 16 proves that 1 Corinthians 11:2-15 refers to a congregational meeting because of the mention of the word “churches”: “But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other practice, nor have the churches of God.”

The word “churches,” however, does not necessitate actual church gatherings. The word *church* can apply “to actual gatherings of Christians as such, or to Christians in a local area conceived or defined as a regularly-assembling community.”^{xxx} 1 Corinthians 14:33b, 34 provides an example of both these usage’s: “as in all the churches of the saints [as regularly constitute people of God in a locality]. The women are to keep silent in the churches [actual meetings]....”

Furthermore, not all as one scholar says, “Not all church-related conformity, however, referred to gathered public worship. The letter of the Jerusalem Council gave directions to all Gentile churches with reference to food and sexual immorality (Acts 15:29) The letter of 1 Corinthians seeks church-wide adherence in areas such as litigation and marriage (1 Cor. 6:1-11; 7:1-40).”^{xxxi}.

Paul’s point in verse 16 is this: It is the universal practice among the Lord’s people for women to cover their heads when they pray and prophesy, and for men to be uncovered. This practice of men being uncovered and women being covered is the universal teaching of both the apostles and all other church communities.

(v) 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35 is absolutely clearer on the setting for its instructions—the congregational gathering. Thus Corinthians 14 should help interpret 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, not

vice versa. 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35 states, “The women are to keep silent in the churches” and “it is improper for women to speak in church.” This instruction applies directly to the setting of the congregational gathering. This is an indisputable point. Thus, 1 Corinthians 14 has priority over 1 Corinthians 11. While we know the setting for certain the 1 Corinthians 14 instructions, the setting for the 1 Corinthians 11 instructions is at least questionable. So in the church meeting women do not prophesy or speak. 1 Corinthians 11 must not be made to contradict 1 Corinthians 14.

Most scholars today choose to resolve this apparent conflict by believing that 1 Corinthians 11:5 demonstrates that women prayed and prophesied in the congregational gatherings at Corinth, and thus 1 Corinthians 14:34, 35 must mean something other than what it appears to say. They force 1 Corinthians 14:34 to conform to 1 Corinthians 11:5.

Believing that 1 Corinthians 11 refers exclusively to a church worship service where women pray and prophesy has completely thrown interpreters off the right track. It has forced them to make 1 Corinthians 14 conform to an erroneous view of 1 Corinthians 11, thus also misconstruing the meaning of 1 Corinthians 14.

Therefore 1 Corinthians 11 must refer to general context including *both* the public church meeting when it applies as in the case of men and in non-church settings when it applies to women. 1 Corinthians 11 refers to wherever or whenever it is proper for a woman or man to pray and prophesy only she must have her head covered and he must not.

Women do audibly pray and prophesy, but not in a formal, official church gathering. Where then would a woman pray and prophesy with a covered head since she is not to do it in the formal congregational gathering of men and women? She can pray and prophesy when meeting with other women to pray and learn together, during a Sunday school class teaching children, when praying with her children, husband, or entire family, when friend or couples gather for prayer or study.

Of course there will be situations that will pose more difficult questions as to when to cover the head (e.g. in the privacy of one’s own family), but these will largely be determined by personal conscience and perspective.

(4) *The issue of disgracing the head.* The man disgraces his head if he prays or prophesies covered; a woman disgraces her head if she prays or prophesies uncovered. The reason for the disgrace is related to verse 3, the headship order. The covering or uncovering tradition cannot be isolated from the headship teaching of verse 3.

It is not altogether clear if by “his head” Paul means the man’s own head, or his spiritual head, Christ, or both. Does he disgrace Christ, or himself, or both? The same question is raised concerning “her head.” The text seems to favor the person’s own head for the following reasons. The direct antecedent to “disgrace his head” is “something on his head” which is plainly the man’s head, and in verses 5 and 6 the woman disgracing her head is likened to the disgrace of a baldheaded woman, which is her physical head. In this sense the head stands for the person, the part for the whole. Thus to shame one’s head is to shame one’s entire person.

The head is an especially unique part of the body. It is the crown of the body. It is the most noble, expressive, and visible part of the body. It is by the head that the whole body is directed. It leads us. It speaks, hears, and sees. It is the place of understanding. It represents us to others. Paul's point is that the *uncovered physical head* of the man teaches something about the *figurative headship of the man* in God's order. The literal head provides a visible object lesson for the figurative head. Under the new covenant God wills that when a Christian man prays or prophesies, his head is to be uncovered in order to display his created-headship position, he is the "head of a woman" (v. 3) and "the image and glory of God" (v. 7). Like Christ and God he is a head, a director, a leader, an authority figure. His bare head communicates a message for all to observe. It is to be an object lesson of his created headship status.

Thus when a man prays with his head covered "he is abdicating the sovereignty and dignity given to him by the Creator."^{xxxii} The Christian man praying or prophesying with his head covered "disgraces" his head, that very part of his body that should display the glory of God and male headship. And if his head is disgraced he is disgraced as a Christian man, his entire person as a male. If Christian people don't understand the shame caused by a covered head, God surely does.

The woman like the man can pray or prophesy. The statements are perfectly parallel. And like the man her physical head has a message to communicate. By covering her head when she prays and prophesies, the woman differentiates herself from the man although performing similar activities. Her covering herself relates to her subordinate role to the man (vv. 3, 10). She is "the glory of the man." He is head; she is helper and supporter of his leadership. The covering displays that she is under the authority of the man, her head (v. 10). Her uncovered head disgraces itself because it fails to communicate her subordinate position (v.3).

The second half of verse 5 explains why it is a shame to be uncovered: "for she is one and the same as the woman whose head is shaved." For a Christian woman to pray or prophesy uncovered places her in the same category with women who shave off their hair intentionally (Greek, *xyrao*, shaved head). Paul is using an analogy. A woman praying or prophesying uncovered is just like a bald, mannish woman. It is ugly and unnatural. The woman's hair has its own symbolic meaning. The significance of her hair is addressed again in verses 14, 15.

Women generally pride themselves on their hair. It is a statement of their beauty, womanliness, and character. Women are much more self-conscious of their hair than men. A woman, therefore, with a shaved head is unwomanly, mannish, unnatural, humbled, shamed (see Deut. 21:12).

To drive home the point further, Paul in a sharp tone continues the theme of womanly disgrace in verse 6, "For if a woman does not cover her head, let her also have her hair cut off." If a Christian woman refuses to cover her head for whatever reason, she disgraces her head (v. 5). So let her go all the way and cut her hair short (Greek, *keiro*, "cut short"). Let her really shame herself. Let her remove all head covering. Let her look like a man, since she refuses to act like a Christian woman. The Scripture is adamant about this matter.

The final bit of logic is easy to understand: “but if it is disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved [and it is], let her cover her head [imperative of command].”

The obedient Christian woman does not want to shame her head before the Lord or the believing community. But it is also true that in most cultures of the world it is a disgrace for a woman to have a shaved head. So a Christian woman will cover her head, which includes her hair, when she prays or prophesies.

Note, her hair is not the covering as some commentators claim.^{xxxiii} Paul’s reasoning is that if her head, which includes her hair, is not covered, “let her also have her hair cut off.” If Paul means to comment on women’s hairstyles (put her hair up) he has surely expressed himself in an obscure and confusing way. Paul is talking about an external head covering, not putting up the hair in a bun.

c. The Biblical Basis for Uncovering and Covering the Head: the Original Order of Creation, 1 Corinthians 11:7-12.

In verses 7-12 Paul presents a second line of reasoning to support why women should be covered, and men not, and why inappropriate covering or uncovering is shameful to one’s head.

Paul here turns to the original Genesis creation account of man and woman. He has already, in verse 3, laid down a profound theological reason for male-female distinctions, headship and subordination, in a hierarchical order reaching back to Christ and God. Now he further supports and confirms the argument of verses 3-6 with the original creation account. This is consistent with what Paul does in similar contexts regarding men and women (1 Cor. 14:34; 1 Tim. 2:12-14; Eph. 5:31, 32).

(1) *Man is the image and glory of God.* Paul starts with the man. A man “ought not” to cover his head. “For a man ought not to have his head covered, since he is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of man” (11:7). This doesn’t mean a Christian man should never wear a hat. The context requires us to understand what he means when a man prays or prophesies (v. 4).

As the verb “ought” expresses, the man has an obligation to uncover his head when he prays or prophesies. The reason he “ought not” to cover his head is, “since he is the image and glory of God.” This is a key reason for the uncovered head of the man.

Man as the “image” of God comes from Genesis 1:27, where it says that “God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.” To be created in God’s image means to be an exact representation of Him, like the picture of a person engraved on a coin. But not only is man made in God’s image, he is also “the glory of God.”

The God of the Bible reveals Himself to be the only true God, all other gods are false. Jehovah makes totally exclusive claims for Himself (Isa. 44:6; 45:5; 46:5). The God of the Bible also reveals Himself in male terms. Although the ancient world had many female deities, the Bible speaks of God in almost exclusively male terms and images. God is He, never she. God is Father,

mighty Lord of the armies of heaven, King, Judge, Husband to His people. He is never mother or mistress.

When God made the first human being He made a male human being (v. 8). The male species was created first and directly by God. God made him lord of the earth. Looking back at verse 3 the male is a “head” like Christ and God are both heads; this is not true of the woman. The male takes on roles that reflect God’s roles. Men’s roles over the earth picture God’s roles over all creation. “Men in their masculinity are like lenses which magnify various attributes of God Himself.”^{xxxiv} To be the glory of God means both to display God’s distinguishing characteristics and to give praise to Him. William E. and Barbara K. Mouser in their excellent books and courses entitled *Five Aspects of Man* and *Five Aspects of Woman* list the following ways in which man is the glory of God.

Males display the glory of God by their strength and authority in their bearing and physique. “God has given men the glory of strength. Their bones, muscles, and features are bigger, stronger, and more chiseled in appearance. Men’s voices are deeper and bespeak authority. The masculine bearing is characterized by self-possession, decisiveness, and initiative (Prov. 30:29-31). Ultimately, all strength, authority, and power reside in God. He granted to men the honor of displaying these characteristics in their physical bodies and bearing.”^{xxxv}

“By virtue of their masculinity, men share many of God’s roles with Him.”^{xxxvi} Males display the glory of God by “the created capacity to share and reflect God’s roles as: father, son, king, warrior, bridegroom, husband, and priest. In these roles men are uniquely stationed and personally equipped to be initiating lovers, providers, leaders, saviors, protectors, and husbandmen.”^{xxxvii}

Males display the glory of God by leading in worship. “Men were the family patriarchs of the Old Testament and help the offices of priest and king.... The New Testament teaches that men should be elders (1 Tim. 2 and 3), that men should have final responsibility for interpreting and defending Scripture (1 Cor. 14:29-40), and that men and women should observe and show respect for the created order in worship (1 Cor. 11:3-16).”^{xxxviii}

So if a Christian man covers his head while praying or prophesying he would symbolically be hiding the glory of God. Moses put a veil over his head in order to hide the fading glory on his face (2 Cor. 3:13).

(2) *Woman is the glory of the man.* In contrast, woman is “the glory of the man.” Paul avoids saying that woman is the image of man, she is not; the creation narrative expressly states she was created, like the man, in the image of God (Gen. 1:27). Both the man and the woman are image-bearers of God. In this they are equal. However, in their sexual roles they are created differently. Thus men’s and women’s glory is different. Secular women hate any idea of being the glory of the man, they laugh at it, but godly women rejoice in being the man’s glory because God made the man and woman to picture His eternal purposes.

By His own wise design, God made the man first and the woman to be the man’s helper, not vice versa. She is the glory of man by creation design. This is not a cultural issue or idea. It is divine

planning. This was not true of the animal world. Only among humans is the female taken out of the male and made a helper-companion to him. Thus she reflects his special glory. That she is the glory of man is illustrated and proven by the creation account. Verses 8 and 9 present what should be obvious creation facts.

God created Adam first and directly (Gen. 2:7). Out of the side of Adam, however, God formed Eve (Gen. 2:21). Verse 8: “For man does not originate from woman, but woman from man.” He states this in a way that emphasizes man’s primacy. He came first. It was not the woman. “For man does not originate from woman.” She was formed out of his body. In this sense “the woman is the glory of man.” Paul uses these same facts concerning the order of creation of male/female in 1 Timothy 2:13 to support male leadership in the church.

Verse 9 refers back to Genesis 2:18. God created the woman to be “a helper suitable for him [Adam].” Thus Paul says in verse 9: “for indeed man was not created for the woman’s sake, but woman for the man’s sake.” Her purpose was to help the man, the lord of the earth. She is for him. Her purpose is to complement and support him. In this she is his glory.

Woman was created to directly reflect the man’s headship authority by recognizing it, revealing it, submitting to and supporting his leadership; she is the man’s vice-regent.

Commenting on these verses and especially the phrase “the woman is the glory of man,” David Gooding, former professor of Greek at Queen’s University, Belfast, Ireland, best summarizes Paul’s thinking in this passage:

Chapter 1 of that book [Genesis] makes it clear (1:27-28) that as to essential nature and status man and woman were both made equally in the image of God and were intended, both of them, to share dominion over creation. But chapter 2 of Genesis explains (2:18-25) that when it came to their administrative roles there were significant, God-designed, differences between the sexes. The man was made first and had already begun his God-given tasks before the woman was made. He was, moreover, made direct and not out of the woman. As he stood alone, fresh from the hand of God, he was, says the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 11:7) the image and glory of God, God’s viceroy in creation, invested with God’s own glory as his official representative. The woman, on the other hand, says the Holy Spirit (11:7-9) is the glory of the man. He is referring to the fact that God made the woman out of the man and designed her role to be that of a partner, help and companion for the man, to complement the man in his God-given tasks. The woman, then, was the man’s glory as the man was God’s; and the man felt all that joy and delight in the woman and her role that God felt in the man and his role.

We know all too well how Satan spoiled it and diminished the glories of both their roles. But Christ, the Seed of the Woman, has come to undo the works of the Devil (1 John 3:8). In the church, angels, we are told (Eph. 3:10; 1 Cor. 11:10), are being taught the manifold wisdom of God, as they see man and woman restored to God and to the roles for which the Creator designed them, as they observe men and women out of love for Christ using the symbols which indicate their acceptance of the order which the Redeemer has laid down for them.^{xxxix}xiv

(3) *Conclusion: The woman ought to have a covering of authority on her head because she is the glory of man and because of the angels.* The inferential conjunction, “Therefore,” alerts us to a conclusion being drawn. Since woman “is glory of man,” because she was made from the man and for the man, Paul concludes, “the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head.” Just as the woman should cover her head because of the headship order and shame (vv. 3-6), so a woman ought to cover her head because of the creation design of man and woman vv. 7-9).

Using the same verb, “ought,” as in verse 7, Paul places the obligation on the woman to be covered when she prays or prophesies. Whereas the man “ought” not to be covered during the same activities.

Verse 10 confronts us with two surprises. The unexpected word “authority,” instead of head covering, and the mention of angels. In Greek the sentence literally reads, “For this reason ought the woman to have authority on her head because of the angels.”

What we expect Paul to write in verse 10 is: “Therefore the woman ought to have *a covering* on her head” (italics added). This would complete the thought started in verse 7 where he says of the man, “For the man ought not to have his head covered.” Instead Paul uses the word “authority.”

The Greek word for “authority” is *exousia*, the standard New Testament Greek term for “authority,” but also commonly translated “power” or “right.”

It is obvious that “authority,” an abstract noun, cannot be worn on the head, so we have good reason to think that the word “authority” is used here as a figure of speech for head covering. And that is the more traditional view favored by the majority of commentators.^{x1} This type of figure of speech is called *metonymy*. Thus the word “authority” is a *metonym* for head covering.

The word *metonymy* is a compound of the two Greek words: *meta*, here meaning “change” and *honoma* meaning “name,” hence the idea of change of name. In metonymy, the writer or speaker replaces his intended idea or word with another word that is closely associated in the mind of the reader; there is a substituting of one word for another. This requires that the reader understands the context and the associated word or concept.

For example, we hear on the news that, “The White House announced today that the President of the United States will run for a second term of office.” The listener knows that the building called the White House doesn’t literally have a mouth and tongue to speak. The White House is substituted for the spoke person (the true subject), who represents the President, who lives in the White House. The White House is a metonym for the spokesperson, who may be an unknown person to the listeners. Thus by saying that the White House announced thus and thus, credibility is given to the announcer and the pronouncement. Someone outside of the United States not familiar with the White House, however, would not be able to understand this metonym. So in order for metonymy to be effective, the listener and speaker must understand the substituted idea or word. Here are some more examples of metonymy.

“The pen is mightier than the sword.” “Put water on (the stove) for tea.” “The kettle is boiling.” Bible examples: “Then Jerusalem was going out to him” (Matt. 3:5). “For now I have chosen and

consecrated this house that My name may be there forever...(2 Chron. 7:16). “Is this blessing then on the circumcised...(Rom. 4:9).

In 1 Corinthians 11:10 the word “covering” is replaced by the metonym “authority.”

Metonymy - figure of speech

Authority = head covering

“authority”	----- substituted for -----	“head covering”
(not literal subject)		(literal, real subject)
(surface subject)		(underlying subject)

The word “authority” stands figuratively for the head covering. Authority is not worn on the head, but its implied underlying subject, the head covering, is worn on (Greek, *epi*) the head. The figurative word “authority” tells us that the head covering is a symbol of or sign of authority. The NASB has correctly supplied the words in italics “*a symbol of*” to the word “authority.” Larsen renders it “a covering of authority on her head.”^{xli}

Is this “covering of authority” something the woman exercises, her authority, or is it a sign of the man’s authority, something she is under? The entire context from verse 3 on and the arguments employed thus far assure us that Paul means that the head covering is a symbol of the woman being under authority, and not the woman having authority over someone.^{xlii}

In verse 3 the argument began with the overarching principle “the man is the head of a woman.” Thus she is to be subordinate to him. He is the one with authority. In verse 7 it is stated that the woman “is the glory of the man.” Verses 8 and 9 declare that the woman is made from (order) the man and for (purpose) the man. Thus the context demands that the “covering of authority” point to man’s authority. She is under authority, thus submissive. This also agrees with Paul’s overall teaching that the woman is to subject herself to her husband and not take authority over a man (Eph. 5:22-33; Titus 2:5; 1 Tim. 2:12). J. B. Phillips’s rendering of 1 Corinthians 11:10 is right on target, “For this reason a woman ought to bear on her head an outward sign of man’s authority for all the angels to see.”^{xliii} The head covering symbolizes the woman’s subordination to the man. *So for the woman the covering serves as a symbol of her subordination to the man and for the man the covering would hide his glory, thus he must not wear it.*

Because of cultural barriers we don’t understand very well the metonym “authority,” for head covering, but Paul and his readers did. We have a problem making a clear association between the original idea (covering) and the substituted word (“authority”). Just like the Corinthians wouldn’t understand the metonym White House for the presidential spokesperson.

By using this metonym the writer can say much more to his readers. In abbreviated, vivid style he can powerfully communicate the ideas of head covering as a significant symbol of authority and its symbolic function, being under authority. “It seems fairly clear that Paul is focusing on the *function* of the head covering, and he would lose that detail, if he only used a direct word for head covering.”^{xliv} As with all figures of speech, metonymy is an effective teaching device that helps the teacher communicate effectively and the reader think and more easily remember.

If we are not correct in our interpretation of the term *authority* the next best interpretation is that authority means that the covering is “her authority” to pray and prophesy. Even in this case she is still to wear a covering and it demonstrates her distinction from man.

The end of verse 10 adds a further reason for the conclusion that a woman ought to have “a covering of authority” on her head while praying or prophesying, the angels.

The issue of angels fits naturally here under the creation argument for covering and uncovering. The angels are related to the creation account. They were present at the creation and rejoiced (Job 38:4, 7). Thus Paul can make this short statement at the end. It fits the context of the male-female creation order. Angels observe our behavior. They are spectators of God’s people. They are concerned about propriety and creation order. Even among angels there is order and subordination; some angels are archangels (1 Thess. 4:16; Jude 9). They don’t want to see the truth of verse 3 violated. How disappointed they must be today to see God’s people in revolt.

Earlier in the letter Paul told his reader that he was being observed by angels. “For, I think, God has exhibited us apostles last of all, as men condemned to death; because we have become a spectacle to the world, both to angels and to men” (1 Cor 4:9; cf. Eph. 3:10; 1 Tim. 3:16). In chapter 6 he asked them, “Do you not know that we will judge angels (1 Cor. 6:3)?” Regarding dealing with sin among church elders Paul says to Timothy, “I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of His chosen angels, to maintain these principles without bias, doing nothing in a spirit of partiality” (1 Tim. 5:21). He expected them to know about the angelic world. Scripture informs us that angels watch us and learn from us (1 Peter 1:12). Jesus said, “And I say to you, everyone who confesses Me before men, the Son of Man will confess him also before the angels of God” (Luke 12:8). Angels minister to us (Heb. 1:11). They are involved with our prayers (Rev. 8:3). Edwards says that the angels are examples to the women of submission. They are ministering spirits, yet serve and submit.

Women also need to know that angels watch if they are submissive to God’s created order or whether they disregard God’s order for them. This is an important reason for a woman to cover her head when she prays or prophesies. Angels are watching. And Paul doesn’t want the women to *offend them* by insubordinate actions.

(4) *The mutual dependence of man and woman, vv. 11, 12.* Paul is sensitive to how easily the issue of male-female distinctions can be misunderstood and abused, especially by sinful men. So in verses 11 and 12 he counterbalances what he has said about female subordination by asserting the man’s and woman’s interdependence.

After asserting the creation order that “woman is the glory of man” and that woman was formed out of man and for his sake thus she ought to have “a covering of authority on her head,” Paul presents the interdependent dimension of the male–female equation. He doesn’t say they are interchangeable but interdependent. These verses should not be used to cancel everything said up to this point about man’s headship. Or be made the main point of the section.

Man is the head of the woman according to Paul in verse 3, but he is also dependent on woman and needs her in order to exist, vv. 11 & 12. The truth of verses 3 & 7 should never be separate from the truth of verses 11 and 12. Both the headship role of man and the submission role of the woman must always be taught in connection with the equality, interdependence, complementarity, mutuality of man & woman.

The literary structure of verses 11 and 12 parallel and balance out verses 8 and 9. Paul is not contradicting truths of the creation accounts (vv. 8,9). He is adding the balancing truths of the new creation in Christ Jesus, “in the Lord, neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman” (v.11).

A Christian man is not to despise, abuse, or demean a woman; in the Lord, he is not independent of her. He needs her as much as she needs him, there is a mutual dependence on each other. That is the way God has designed the two. In Christ we understand it better.

This dependence between man and woman is explained in verse 12. Just as Eve was formed out of Adam (so she is dependent on him), so also all men owe their existence to woman through whom they were born (he is dependent on her).

Whether it is man originating from woman or woman originating from man all things originate from God. Both the man and the woman equally came from the hand of God. He created them both. He is Creator. All are dependent on Him. Let no man or woman act as Creator or Lord. We came out of Him.

d. Nature a Basis for Uncovering and Covering the Head: Men’s and Women’s Hair, 1 Corinthians 11:13-15

Paul is not done making his point that a woman should cover her head when she prays or prophesies. At verse 13 he introduces a new line of reasoning. He directly addresses the individual Corinthian believers, not unbelievers. He challenges them to judge and respond to two questions:

(1) “[I]s it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?”(v.13)

(2) “Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her?” (v.14-15a)

Paul first calls on them to use their own intuitive sense of propriety and judgment. The issue to be judged is Christian womanly propriety at prayer. He expects they know the right answer. Here Paul shortens the two activities of praying or prophesying to “pray,” but he still includes prophesying. The *Good News Bible* again adds the phrase “in public worship.” This is not part of the original text and should not be included. It causes the reader to misinterpret the passage.

The question, “Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?” receives the answer, “No.” It is not proper for a sister to pray uncovered. They can judge because they had practiced this tradition for the past three years. They knew Paul’s teaching and practice. His present arguments were unassailable. So Paul calls on them to judge what Christian propriety

demands. By “proper” is meant “right behavior,” “fitting behavior,” “appropriate Christian behavior.”

The second rhetorical question in verses 14, 15 has two parts each implying the answer yes. “Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, is it a dishonor to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her?” This second question is important because it reinforces the question, “Is it not proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered” (v. 13)?

The issue to be judged is the propriety of Christian women praying to God uncovered. To reinforce that it is improper for a Christian woman to pray uncovered he asks his readers to look at nature; by the hair on a woman’s head nature teaches woman’s covering.

He personifies nature as a teacher. By “nature” is meant the natural order of things. There is a lesson to be learned about women’s covering from nature, from men’s hair and women’s hair: “[I]f a man has long hair, it is a dishonor to him.” Throughout history it is generally true that men wear their hair shorter than women. This was true in Paul’s day, as multitudes of ancient coins, reliefs, and busts reveal, as well as our own day.

Paul does not deal with exceptions to this lesson from nature. For example, Paul himself didn’t cut his hair for a period of time in order to fulfill a personal vow. Luke writes, “In Cenchrea he [Paul] had his hair cut, for he was keeping a vow.” (Acts 18:18). How long his hair grew we don’t know. Later Paul aided four Jewish Christian brothers who had undertaken a Nazirite vow and had let their hair grow (Acts 21:23-26). So there were times when men allowed their hair to grow for special religious purposes (Num. 6:1-21), but this only proves the rule.

As a general observation, man’s hair is worn shorter than women’s hair and a man with long hair loses honor in the sight of most other people. It is unnatural and effeminate.

In the matter of hair growth, there are distinctive physiologies between men and women. “Hair develops in three stages—formation and growth, resting, and fallout. The male hormone testosterone speeds up the cycle so that men reach the third stage earlier than women. The female hormone estrogen causes the cycle to remain in stage one for a longer time, causing women’s hair to grow longer than men’s. Women are rarely bald because few even reach stage three. This physiology is reflected in most cultures of the world in the custom of women wearing longer hair than men.”^{xlv} There are women who have been able to grow their hair up to 10 feet in length.

These differences are part of nature. In the beginning when God created man and woman, he made these differences for the purpose of distinguishing males and females at the crowning point of their head.

It is not his point to argue how long is long and how short is short; he is not even saying men must have short hair. But at some point a man’s hair is too long and thus it is a “dishonor” (Greek, *atimia*) to him; this is not true of women. His question is meant to make the Corinthians judge what is proper for a woman to do while praying (v.13).

But for a woman it is entirely different. She can wear her hair to the ground and it is her glory! It is womanly; it is beautiful; it is “proper.” By “glory” he means her distinguishing characteristic. In verse 6 Paul argued that it is a disgrace for a woman to have chopped hair. Her long hair distinguishes her from man. God built it into her genetic code when he formed the first woman from out of the man. A woman’s hair lives longer and grows longer (Luke 7:38). So what is a dishonor for a man is glory for a woman.

Paul is not exhorting women to wear long hair or never to cut their hair. He is not commenting on hairstyles. He says her long hair is a glory.

The reason her long hair is her glory is that “her hair is given to her for a covering.” The passive perfect verb “given” in Greek emphasizes that God gave her and continues to do so long hair for a covering. It is a gift from God. The Greek term for covering (*peribolaion*) is a general one meaning a cloth covering, like a garment, but here a head covering.

The woman’s hair is a natural covering. A man also has hair on his head, but the logic of Scripture does not require his shorter hair to be viewed as a covering. It is the woman who has the unique covering nature provides, not man. So to say that the woman’s hair is the covering and that she doesn’t need to cover her head and hair contradicts the entire flow of argument from verse 2.

Take a lesson from nature itself, Paul argues, God has already provided the woman a type of covering. So cover your head when you pray. Accent your natural covering with another. Just as hair on the head distinguishes a woman from a man, so too the covering distinguishes a woman from a man when praying and prophesying. This argument is to provide corroborating evidence that it is proper for a woman to cover her head when she prays.

The Greek preposition “for” (*anti*), commonly means “instead of,” “in place of,” one thing is replaced by another. If the correct meaning is “instead of” Paul is saying the woman’s long hair is given her by nature (God) “instead of” an external covering, the hair is a replacement for a cloth covering. But this contradicts all that Paul is arguing for, a cloth covering on the head.

Thus the majority of commentators reject this use of *anti*. The preposition can also mean, “for,” “as,” “one thing is equivalent to another.”^{xlvi} Thus her hair is given to her “as” a covering. “In 1Cor. 11:15 Paul’s point is not that a veil is superfluous for a woman since nature has given her hair *in place of* a covering, but rather, arguing analogically, he infers from the general fact that ‘hair has been given *to serve as* a covering’ ... that the more generous supply of hair that a woman has when compared with a man shows the appropriateness of her being covered when she prays or prophesies....”^{xlvii}

There are no other Scripture passages that speak of this issue. This is the only place. Of course, God doesn’t need to repeat a doctrine more than once to make it true or necessary (see 1 Cor. 7:15).

e. The Final Basis for Uncovering and Covering the Head: The Universal Practice of the Churches and its Teachers, 1 Corinthians 11:16.

In a tone of finality and abruptness Paul ends his argumentation: “But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other [such] practice, nor have the churches of God.”

Some of the contentious-minded believers were raising objections to the Pauline practice of uncovering/covering the head. Believing the matter to be important, Paul lays out his arguments in considerable detail (vv. 3-15) for women covering their heads and men uncovering their heads while praying and prophesying. Finally in verse 16 for anyone “inclined to be contentious” about this doctrine, he says, consider this: you stand against apostolic authority and “the churches of God.” Hopefully this form of argument will end their objections.

It is not certain if “we” refers to Paul alone (an editorial “we”), or Paul and Sosthenes (1:1), or Paul and the apostles, or Paul and all his churches. What is certain is that Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, has no such practice (tradition) of women praying uncovered or of men praying with their heads covered. He has no such practice as that which is being argued for by some contentious believers.

Furthermore Paul adds, “nor have the churches of God.” By this he means that all God’s people are in agreement on this issue. There is unity among the churches. There is a unified tradition on covering/uncovering the head. Paul is not asking the Corinthians to do anything that all the other Christians do not follow. So let them conform to standard Christian practice, let the women cover their heads when they pray, and let the men uncover their heads.

The Greek word (*sunetheia*) for “practice” does not prove that Paul is talking about something less than apostolic tradition or practice. The term’s exact shade of meaning must be determined by the context. This “practice” or “custom” is a binding Christian *tradition* as verse 2 indicates. It is a “practice” of Paul’s and the churches. Of the two Greek terms, “practice” (*sunetheia*) and “tradition” (*paradosis*), *tradition* is the definite term and defines the more moldable term “practice.” This “practice” is a tradition of apostolic authority. This “practice” Paul has been arguing for over the past thirteen verses. Thus they must “hold firmly” to this tradition, as Paul and the churches do.

- ⁱ F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1971), p. 102.
- ⁱⁱ Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 173.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Jack Cottrell, "Christ: a model for headship and submission," in *CBMW News* 2/4 (September, 1997): 8.
- ^{iv} John 14:28; Phil. 2:6-11; 1 Cor. 11:3; 15:28).
- ^v S. Lewis Johnson, Jr., "Role Distinctions in the Church: Galatians 3:28," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, p. 164.
- ^{vi} David Gooding, "Symbols of Headship and of Glory," in *Bible Topics*, 3 (Belfast: Operation O.F.F.E.R., n.d.), p. 2.
- ^{vii} Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, p. 169.
- ^{viii} David W.J. Gill, "The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," in *Tyndale Bulletin* (1990): 245.
- ^{ix} Richard E. Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11:4," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 492.
- ^x Richard E. Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11:4," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 490.
- ^{xi} *Ibid.*, p. 494.
- ^{xii} Richard E. Oster, "When Men Wore Veils to Worship: The Historical Context of 1 Corinthians 11:4," *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 484.
- ^{xiii} Cynthia L. Thompson, "Hairstyles, Head-Coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth," in *Biblical Archaeologist* 51.2 (June, 1988): 104.
- ^{xiv} Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Once Again," in *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 267. As the Greek Plutarch asked, "Why is it that when they [the Romans] worship the gods, they cover their heads?" *The Roman Questions* 266C; *Moralia*, 4.21.
- ^{xv} Ben Witherington, III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 238.
- ^{xvi} Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 369.
- ^{xvii} Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 173.
- ^{xviii} Ben Witherington, III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 236.
- ^{xix} ^{xix} David W.J. Gill, "The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," p. 251.
- ^{xx} Cynthia L. Thompson, "Hairstyles, Head-Coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth," p. 112.
- ^{xxi} Kistemaker, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 369.
- ^{xxii} W. Harold Mare, "1 Corinthians," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, 12 vols., ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976) 10: 255.
- ^{xxiii} Joachim Jeremias describes the veil of a Jewess woman of Jerusalem at the time of Jesus: "When the Jewess of Jerusalem left her house, her face was hidden by an arrangement of two head veils, a head-band on the forehead with bands to the chin, and a hairnet with ribbons and knots, so that her features could not be recognized" (*Jerusalem in the Times of Jesus* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969], p. 359).
- ^{xxiv} There is no object to the participle "having." So we are required to add "covering," or "something." "Having down from the head" is a way of saying a cloth covering as the parallel verse on the woman shows in verse 5. It doesn't mean hair coming down.
- ^{xxv} Jan Tuckwood, "If you want attention, wear a hat," *Fashion West* p. 32.
- ^{xxvi} Craig Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, The NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), p. 220. ???
- ^{xxvii} David Gooding, "Symbols of Headship and of Glory," p. 1.
- ^{xxviii} Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 505.
- ^{xxix} Schreiner, p. 216.
- ^{xxx} Robert Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 41.
- ^{xxxi} Harold R. Holmyard III, "Does 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 Prefer to Women Praying and Propheying in Church?," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 154 (October-December 1997): 469.
- ^{xxxii} Colin Brown, "Head," *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 2: 160.
- ^{xxxiii} The NIV inserts the following alternative translation to verses 5-7: "Every man who prays or prophesies with long hair dishonors his head. And every woman who prays or prophesies with no covering of hair on her head dishonors her head--she is just one of the 'shorn women.' If a woman has no covering, let her be for now with short hair, but since it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair shorn or shaved, she should grow it again. A man ought not to have long hair." This rendering by the NIV is utterly false and unworthy of such a dignified translation. In the most alarming way this alternative reading departs from the Greek text. The Greek text does not have the words "long hair" for men.

^{xxxiv} William E. Mouser, Jr., *Five Aspects of Man: A Biblical Theology of Masculinity* (Mountlake Terrace: Wine Press, 1995), 5.6.

^{xxxv} Barbara K. Mouser, *Five Aspects of Woman: A Biblical Theology of Femininity* (Mountlake Terrace: Wine Press, 1997), 5.5.

^{xxxvi} *Ibid.*, 5.12.

^{xxxvii} *Ibid.*, 5.5.

^{xxxviii} *Ibid.*, 5.5.

^{xxxix} David Gooding, "Symbols of Headship and of Glory," in *Bible Topics*, 3 (Belfast: Operation O.F.F.E.R., n.d.), pp. 3,4.

^{xl} For an excellent defense that Paul is using the figure of speech called *metonymy* read Iver Larsen, "1 Corinthians 11:10 Revisited," in *The Bible Translator* 48 (July 1997): 345-50. Also Thomas C. Edwards, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1885), pp. 276, 277; Charles J. Ellicott, *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians: With a Critical and Grammatical Commentary* (1887; reprint ed., Minneapolis: The James Family, n.d.), p. 205; Bruce K. Waltke, "1 Corinthians 11:2-16: An Interpretation," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (January-March 1978), p. 52.

^{xli} *Ibid.*, p. 349.

^{xlii} It is argued that the word "authority" (*exousia*) is always used in the active sense, authority exercised over, not in the passive sense, authority submitted to. Thus a woman has authority over herself to pray and prophesy as she desires. But if the word "authority" is a metonym, the active sense of "authority" is irrelevant to this context. Larsen explains why:

If we accept that "having authority on the head" is using a metonym where the surface subject is authority and the underlying subject is head covering, then it is the underlying subject which conceptually relates to the rest of the sentence. The way metonyms are used requires us to take the preposition *epi* with the head covering and not with the surface word "authority". It is therefore irrelevant to talk about what "authority on/over the head" might mean.... It is also irrelevant to claim that "having authority over" is always used in an active sense, because the construction does not combine "authority" with "have" and "over" (Larsen, p. 349).

^{xliii} J. B. Phillips, *The New Testament in Modern English* (New York: MacMillan, 1972).

^{xliiv} Iver Larsen, "1 Corinthians 11:10 Revisited," p. 348.

^{xlv} John MacArthur. *1 Corinthians*, p.262.

^{xlvi} Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, p. 73.

^{xlvii} Murry J. Harris, "Appendix: Propositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament" in *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978), 3: 1179.