

# DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

## Chapter 1 : Problem Passages: 1 Corinthians (Part 2: Head Coverings) – The Happy Surprise

*In 1 Corinthians , God's word says if it is shameful for a women to cut or shave off her hair then she should cover her head with long hair or veil. This long hair covering is the natural God given universal principle ( 1 Corinthians ) which Angels also looks into - 1 Corinthians*

The Head Covering 1 Corinthians This has got to be one of the more difficult texts I have encountered and tried to come up with an explanation that does not run into problems. Most scholars note that no matter what interpretation one comes up with, there is some sort of problem that comes up. We are going to look at 1 Corinthians 11 and I am going to do my best to explain this text. I would like to take this text as an exposition, essentially verse by verse, and then make some concluding points and arguments after going through the text.

The Exposition The thesis statement vs. Here the operation of authority is clearly stated. Christ has authority over man and man has authority over woman. This passage lays out the direction of where we are going in this text. This is the overriding rule. An important point to notice about the authority man has over the woman. That authority is compared to the authority that God has over Christ and Christ has over man. Too many men take this passage to show that they can be a dictator over women or some sort of boss. But we see clearly from the scriptures how this authority is to be used. Christ used his authority over man by doing what? Sacrificing himself, giving himself, loving us Ephesians 5: Does Christ push us around and act unreasonably because he is head over us? Along the same lines, since God is head of Christ and therefore has authority, does that mean that God the Father becomes an merciless dictator, running roughshod over Christ? Instead they show their authority by love and care. So also, just because man is head and has authority does not mean he can act however he wants. Instead man is to act like Christ did for the church and God does for Christ. Praying and prophesying vs. They are essentially the same, following the same format, and are therefore talking about the same actions. Paul is talking about spiritual gifts in this text. Prophecy was only by the power of God, and was only done through spiritual gifts. And this prophecy is tied to prayer. So it seems that Paul is talking about the spiritual gifts of prayer and prophecy. We know that women were praying and prophesying and had the power of spiritual gifts. See the four virgin daughters who prophesied in Acts Now there are a couple of very important points that need to be presented in this text. When is a woman to have her head covered? When she prays or prophesies. We cannot miss this point that Paul is making, otherwise we cause ourselves problems. The rest of this section of text is strictly dealing with and men and women who are praying and prophesying. The text says nothing about the need for covering at any other time. And this leads into the second critical point. Where are the women to be covered? Many take this passage to mean that women are to be covered in the assembly. Is this scripturally possible? What did Paul say for the women in 1 Corinthians The women who had these spiritual gifts were not allowed to use them in the assembly. Remember the context of 1 Corinthians 14, women who spoke were taking the lead in the worship when using their spiritual gifts. Paul says that is inappropriate and to remain silent with regard to those gifts. Now come back to 1 Corinthians Paul says to pray and prophesy with the head covered. Can this be referring to in the assembly? It cannot refer to being in the assembly. If it is, then what is Paul talking about in chapter 14? In chapter 14, why does not Paul just say women, wear a covering when praying and prophesying? No, that would be out of subjection and usurping authority from the man. So this text must be referring to outside the assembly, in public. I think this makes the text make more sense as we go along by having this understanding. Two key points, be covered when praying and prophesying, but cannot be in the assembly. Man, then, has the same exact point. Men when praying and prophesying in public must be uncovered. And we must note that obviously this means they are leading the pray and prophesy and not listening to it. This must be the assumption from the context. Now the question is why? Why must men be uncovered in public, while women are to be covered? The following verses answer this question. Authority of God vs. But if it is shameful for a woman to be shorn or shaved, let her be covered. This is not true for women. Women who were exercising their spiritual gifts in public needed

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

to have some sort of symbol upon their head to show that this was authority from God and that they are not usurping this authority from man. It seems that these women had taken their new freedom and liberty in Christ to mean that they could go against the culture and norms of the day. But not being covered in public while performing these functions brought shame upon the woman, which brought shame upon the husband, but especially brought shame upon God. It is tantamount to discrediting the gospel of Christ by our actions. It would be as if I went out preaching the gospel of Christ without any clothes on. I may be doing what is right by preaching the word, but I bring shame upon the church, upon my family and especially upon God for these actions, and I obviously discredit the message I teach by violating such a standard in our society. Both men and women are to live in such a way that brings honor to the Lord. It would be shameful for a woman to take upon herself such power as the gift of prophecy and not cover her head to show that she has authority from God for this action. The order of creation is to be remembered and where the authority is needs to be remembered. It is important to notice a few things in verse 3. Many commentators including conservative ones have tried to make this mean a symbol of subjection. We cannot treat the covering as a symbol of subjection. What does Paul mean by this is not clear. Many have taken guesses at it. But it seems simplest to say, and I believe, that this means that even the angels understand their need to keep their proper position and authority see Jude 6. Others state that this phrase means it is a symbol of the authority delivered by angels. The authority of God is on their heads. Others say even the angels understand authority and so women also wear this symbol of authority in keeping with the principle in verse 3. Equality of men and women vs. Again the founding principle is given in verse 3 that God is the head of Christ, Christ is the head of man, and man is the head of woman. But to make sure that we understand authority, Paul is going to tell us that there is equal standing men still have with women. Verse 11 tells us that man is not independent of woman and woman is not independent of man. They are meant to be together, again an argument from creation that it is not good for man to be alone. The two in the Lord are meant to be together and not independent. Man cannot stand up and say look at me I have all of this power and authority for this only has come from God vs. This distinction between men and women is not to lead to a war of the genders but is to lead for men and women to complement one another for that is what they are built to do. We are co-dependent upon each other even though the man is the head of woman. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? Paul wants the men and women who are praying and prophesying with their spiritual gift in public to judge these things for themselves. Paul first asks if it is proper for a woman to pray with her head uncovered. Paul asks what is the decorum of the day. Is it proper to go and pray uncovered? The answer is no. It would be like asking us if going outside in a loincloth would be proper? The answer is no, yet there are some places where it is proper. I am thinking of some of the tribes in Africa where that is proper.

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 2 : 1 Corinthians - NKJV

*The message of 1 Corinthians 11 is difficult to bear in these times: it is yet another passage that demonstrates that there is a hierarchy of authority and that the husband is above the wife in this hierarchy.*

The NET Bible includes a number of translator notes on this passage that are helpful. In verse 3 Paul describes a hierarchy of authority as follows: In other words, according to this view Paul does not mean that every man is an authority over every woman. Furthermore, viewing this as specific to a marital relationship dovetails into passages such as Ephesians 5 or 1 Peter 3 that use very similar language. Moving on to verses , Paul introduces a play on words, contrasting between men and women regarding a covering or symbol on their physical head, apparently in light of their metaphoric or spiritual "head". He also uses several different words for "covered" and "uncovered". To do so brings disgrace on his head - possibly referring to Christ, as opposed to his physical head. He also compares between the humiliation of a woman whose head was shaved or who had short hair - possibly a cultural reference, though I could find little information one way or the other - with a woman who did not have her head covered. The crux of his argument seems to be that it would be shameful for a woman to have short hair or a shaved head, but she brings the same shame by not having her head covered. So he establishes two contrasting statements: Verses , add a new dimension to the discussion. Skipping 10 for a moment Here, he says that a man should not have his head covered, because he is "the image and glory of God", while the woman is the "glory of the man". This has three implications: However, he does not specify exactly what this symbol should be. Perhaps this is another cultural reference. It is also possible that this refers to an external symbol representing her internal attitude of deference to male leadership in the church, particularly to her husband. An interesting aside also appears in verse 10 - she should have a symbol of authority on her head "because of the angels. In verse , Paul now discusses the matter of hair as covering. First, he asks a rhetorical question that assumes based on the sentence structure an answer of "no" - "is it proper for a woman to pray with an uncovered head? See definition of G above. Paul concludes in verse 16 with an appeal to the existing practice church-wide. In other words, his comments here mirror the orthopraxy of the church in a universal sense. Now then, how to apply this? Maybe a little too doctrinal here? If we assume from verse 2 that this was purely a Corinthian cultural teaching with no modern applicability, that seems to make it easy enough to ignore. Where does this then leave us on the application of passages like Ephesians 5? Paul seems pretty adamant in verse 16 that their violation of this is deeper than a cultural matter - it points to an issue of orthodox practice across the church. As well, he may also be pointing out the possible spiritual ramifications mentioned above. Some denominations therefore frown upon women cutting their hair or wearing short styles. True story, related by disconnected tangent: Likewise, the text seems to set up the point that, if a woman would not have the symbol of authority, she ought to cut off her hair too. Perhaps the scope of the passage is intended to mean a literal, external symbol such as a veil, covering or cap. This then needs to be discussed further, based on whether or not this literal symbol is still expected today. Some denominations do so, pointing to this passage as a scriptural mandate. If we assume that this is still expected today, then we would need to consider the following as well: Does this apply to all women, or only those who are married? Do other cultural symbols, such as a wedding band, supercede this? Does it apply throughout life, only within the church or even more narrowly only when actively engaged in a part of the worship service? Likewise, if we take the stance that this was a valid, external symbol for the culture but is not a matter of orthodox practice today, why not? As above, is a symbol such as a wedding ring seen as a symbolic replacement? Is this ignored today because of our own cultural reasons, because it is "difficult", or because of a simple lack of desire to do so? My understanding of this passage is probably colored by the fact that I grew up Mennonite - one of the denominations in which a physical veil or covering is still widely normative. There are several Bible.

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 3 : Head Coverings - 1 Corinthians 11 - NKJV

*But since it is shameful for a woman to have her hair cut or her head shaved, she should wear a covering. English Standard Version For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short.*

Would you please explain 1 Corinthians In 1 Corinthians 11, Paul sets forth the timeless principles of proper hairstyle and hair length for men and women. After explaining in 1 Corinthians But if it is shameful for a woman to be shorn or shaved, let her be covered. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? However, the following Biblical principles are helpful: This is not to say, however, that a husband should ever abuse his authority. The reason for the different choice of words may be seen in the fact that the Old Testament permitted a man on special occasions to wear long hair. In addition, he was not to touch a dead person, eat any fresh grapes or raisins, or drink anything made from grapes, including wine. This law was inseparably connected with the ritual law of sacrifices: At the end of the separation, the Nazarite had to bring several offerings, and he had to go through additional rituals before the priest. The long hair of the Nazarite vow reflected, in physical terms, the willingness of the person to be under authority – under the authority of God. Sometimes, certain people were consecrated from their birth as Nazarites, to be separated to God throughout their lives. Famous examples are Samson Judges Jesus, however, was not a Nazarite. Christ drank wine Matthew Archaeology and history have established that the Jews at the time of Christ did not wear long hair. Jesus did not wear long hair, either. He looked like a Jew – so much so that Judas had to kiss Him to identify Him to the soldiers that had come to arrest Him. After all, it was He – the Word of God – who inspired Paul to write that a man is not to wear long hair. In the early New Testament church, we do find occasional references to some who continued on occasion to make a temporary Nazarite vow compare Acts It is possible that even Paul made a temporary Nazarite vow for a short time compare Acts However, these vows ceased within the church when the temple was destroyed, as the purification ceremonies could not be carried out any longer. Today, the rules and regulations pertaining to a Nazarite vow are no longer of any consequence for us. We are rather to follow the clear principles given in 1 Corinthians 11 – that a woman should not wear her hair as to look like a man, and a man should not wear his hair as to look like a woman. If one cannot tell, by just looking at hair styles and hair lengths, whether a person is a male or a female, then the clear guidelines set forth in 1 Corinthians 11 have not been followed. Search Select categories to search within Booklets.

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 4 : Head Coverings!â€™An Exegesis of 1 Corinthians â€™16 Â» Ardent Fidelity Â» Chris Krycho

*The crux of his argument seems to be that it would be shameful for a woman to have short hair or a shaved head, but she brings the same shame by not having her head covered. So he establishes two contrasting statements: Head not covered -> cut off hair.*

Answer - Analogies of Why Accountability is Necessary: There are actually several analogies of contention and betrayal in this passage: Disputes within the Church; B. Betrayal of the Angels; C. Adultery from Numbers 5; D. Context - The Failure of the Angels: In Scripture, when the Angels fell - the angels betrayed their role to advocate for mankind, See Jude , Genesis 6: NASB, 1 Timothy 2: NASB, 1 Corinthians NASB, 1 Corinthians Context - Contention Within the Church: Translators wrongfully use "Discern, i. Metaphors of "Covenant Authority": In this context, "cover", "hair", and "head" are clear metaphors regarding "authority": Men are not "literally" the heads of women, nor could Christ literally be the "head" of a man Without question, "Authority" in 1 Corinthians Given the context - and at the very least - "Authority" is also referring to "Covenant Authority": The authority to protect rights attributed as a result of a marriage covenant, Numbers 5, et al ; And Generally: Personal amplified translation, as requested. Have taken a lot of liberty to interpret Man and Woman as husband and wife, following Numbers 5. It seems as though Paul uses "Head over" as metaphorical, and then uses the term literally, when shaming oneself. This interpretation suggests that Paul is intentionally employing equivocation, perisology: Probably the biggest objection to this interpretation, is in verse 7. In this verse, it seems more plausible that the heavy reliance on parallel and elliptical constructions in the Greek - should be understood consistently - and the "lack of obligation" should be expanded to include both men and women. For it is not man that followed after, or is of woman, but woman who followed after, and is of man; 9.

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 5 : 1 Corinthians - Judge for - Verse-by-Verse Commentary

*1 In addition to vv 2 and 16, there are several theological arguments within the passage that indicate the seriousness of the head covering for Paul. See discussion below. 2 J. B. Hurley, Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, )*

Surely you would not think it seemly for a woman setting aside the question of men and angels altogether to speak face to face with God in prayer? Benson Commentary 1 Corinthians Judge in yourselves “For what need of more arguments in so plain a case? Is it comely “Decent, suitable to female modesty; that a woman pray unto God “The Most High, with that bold and undaunted air which she must have if, contrary to universal custom, she appears in public with her head uncovered? Doth not even nature “The light of nature, or natural reason; teach you “Previous to any arguments on the subject; that if a man have long hair “Carefully adjusted, it is a mark of such effeminacy as is a disgrace to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory “An ornament; to her “Which does not incommode her, being suitable to her domestic state: And in all things merely indifferent the custom of each place was of sufficient weight to determine prudent and peaceable men. Yet even this cannot overrule a scrupulous conscience, which really doubts whether the thing be indifferent or not. But those who are referred to here by the apostle were contentious, not conscientious persons. In the abundance of spiritual gifts bestowed on the Corinthians, some abuses had crept in; but as Christ did the will, and sought the honour of God, so the Christian should avow his subjection to Christ, doing his will and seeking his glory. We should, even in our dress and habit, avoid every thing that may dishonour Christ. The woman was made subject to man, because made for his help and comfort. And she should do nothing, in Christian assemblies, which looked like a claim of being equal. She ought to have power, that is, a veil, on her head, because of the angels. Their presence should keep Christians from all that is wrong while in the worship of God. Nevertheless, the man and the woman were made for one another. They were to be mutual comforts and blessings, not one a slave, and the other a tyrant. God has so settled matters, both in the kingdom of providence and that of grace, that the authority and subjection of each party should be for mutual help and benefit. It was the common usage of the churches, for women to appear in public assemblies, and join in public worship, veiled; and it was right that they should do so. The Christian religion sanctions national customs wherever these are not against the great principles of truth and holiness; affected singularities receive no countenance from any thing in the Bible. I appeal to your natural sense of what is proper and right. Paul had used various arguments to show them the impropriety of their females speaking unveiled in public. He now appeals to their natural sense of what was decent and right, according to established and acknowledged customs and habits. The Grecian women, except their priestesses, were accustomed to appear in public with a veil - Doddridge. Paul alludes to that established and proper habit, and asks whether it does not accord with their own views of propriety that women in Christian assemblies should also wear the same symbol of modesty. Jamieson-Fausset-Brown Bible Commentary Appeal to their own sense of decorum. The thing as to which he would have them judge within themselves, and accordingly pronounce sentence, was, whether it were a decent thing for women to pray to God with their hair all hanging loose about their shoulders, or without any veil, or covering for their head and face. The apostle having gone through a variety of reasoning and arguments, showing the superiority of the man to the woman, by which he would prove, that the one should be covered, and the other uncovered, returns to his subject again, and appeals to the common sense and understanding of the Corinthians, and makes them themselves judges of the matter; suggesting that the thing was so clear, and he so certain of what he had advanced being right, that he leaves it with them, not doubting but that they would, upon a little reflection within themselves, join with him in this point: By way of appendix to the discussion, the apostle refers his readers “as regards especially the praying of the women, which had given rise to debate “to the voice of nature herself. Is it seemly, “judge within yourselves concerning it, “is it seemly that a woman should offer up prayers uncovered? It is here, as often

## **DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR**

in Greek writers comp also Romans 2: And even apart from this objection as to the form of expression, we cannot surely suppose that the apostle would find in a fact of aesthetic custom 1 Corinthians Comp also 2 Samuel This again implies that to wear a veil, as in the case in hand, is a decorous thing. Long hair on the head is a disgrace to a man in his eyes; because he regards it as a sign of human subjection.

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 6 : 1 Corinthians 11 Commentary - Bridgeway Bible Commentary

*Long hair is the only covering that Paul specifically mentioned in 1 Corinthians. However, some women may not have long hair and need another covering. The text reveals, "But if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering" (1 Cor ).*

Verse 23 Consideration of fellow believers If Christians think of others before they think of themselves, they will refrain from certain things in case others copy them and are weakened spiritually as a result The Corinthians should understand that the reason why they must not join in idol feasts is that eating involves fellowship with the idol and its demons. It is not that the physical properties of the food are in any way changed. Therefore, when Christians buy food at the market or eat in the house of pagan friends, they must not create unnecessary problems by asking whether the food has been offered to idols. If they do not know, it does not matter. They should eat the food and be thankful to God who gave it If, however, someone tells them the food has been offered to idols, they should not eat it. They do not want others to think they agree with idol worship. Christians do wrong when they use their personal liberty in a way that causes others to sin. If by eating food they harm others, their thanksgiving for the food becomes meaningless To summarize, Christians should be guided in their behaviour not by their knowledge of the rights they have, but by their consideration for the glory of God and the well-being of their fellows To start with, some of the Corinthian women were speaking in the church services without the veil over their heads. This was shameful by current social standards in that part of the world. Paul argues that Christians do not have to show their new-found freedom by rejecting the local customs of politeness and etiquette. In fact, these customs may reflect a basic God-given principle. Although he praises the Corinthians for their steadfastness in following his teachings 2 , Paul realizes that certain matters still need attention. He reminds them that the woman is under the authority of the man, just as the man is under the authority of Christ 3. The head covering may be seen as a sign of that relationship. To have her head uncovered is as shameful as to have it shaved bare Woman was made from man and for man, and though she has a special status as the glory of man, she is nonetheless under his authority The angels observe this order in the church This does not mean that the woman is inferior or that the man is superior. Neither man nor woman can exist without the other The Corinthians can see for themselves that it is shameful for a woman to pray with her head uncovered. It is as shameful as for a man to have long hair like a woman, or a woman to have short hair like a man. The environment in which they live should tell them what is natural and what is not, and this order should be reflected in the church Paul does not want to argue the matter further, but he reminds them that what he has just outlined is the common practice among the churches It caused Christians to break into opposing groups. The only advantage in this, Paul ironically points out, is that it enables a person to see how many good Christians there really are The common meal was called a love feast, but at Corinth it showed little sign of love. The rich greedily ate their own food without sharing it with others and without even waiting for everyone to arrive. So the poor went hungry, while the rich feasted and became drunk. Paul says that those who shame themselves and the church in this way would do better to eat at home The eating of bread and drinking of wine together is a communion with Christ, a spiritual sharing together in his body and blood cf. It is a fresh enjoyment of and proclamation of the benefits of his death. Nobody should join in this act of communion thoughtlessly. Indeed, some in the church have, because of their wrong behaviour, suffered such judgment in sickness and death Christians should examine themselves honestly to see what they are really like. If not, God may send them difficulties to bring them back from the wrong way and save them from the judgment that awaits sinners It is not just a feast

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 7 : 1 Corinthians 11 LEB - Concerning Head Coverings in Worship - Bible Gateway

*1 Corinthians 11 Lexham English Bible (LEB) Concerning Head Coverings in Worship. 11 Become imitators of me, just as I also am of Christ. 2 Now I praise you that you remember me in all things, and just as I handed over to you the traditions, you hold fast to them.*

The following paper was prepared for Dr. Overview First Corinthians The plain meaning of the text is straightforward: Paul argues that men ought to have their heads uncovered and women ought to have their heads covered when praying or prophesying in the church. The interpretive challenge stems from three interwoven issues. First, the interpreter must decide how to resolve a number of perplexing textual difficulties in the passage. Thus, correct interpretation must respect both the creation order and variations in cultural perceptions of propriety. Paul concludes by referring any would-be dissenters to the witness of the church at large v. Paul opens the text by commending the Corinthians for the ways they have held to the tradition he passed on to them before moving onto his critique. His compliment is apparently sincere, not ironic or sarcastic, and fits his general pattern of encouraging before critiquing. The same is true here: Heading and Argument From Culture 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, for she is one and the same as the woman whose head is shaved. 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. Paul begins his criticism with a much-discussed statement: In verse 3, he notes a set of inherent distinctions: Paul gradually elaborates on and reinforces this distinction in each section of the passage. As such, it serves as the theological foundation for his argument. He is at pains to make clear that the distinction between men and women cannot be ignored any more than the distinction between Father and Son. Having given his argument its theological basis, Paul clearly states his thesis verses 4â€”5a: By contrast, a man having his physical head shorn or shaven was perfectly ordinary; indeed, Paul shaved his own head Acts In other words, by praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, a woman was blurring the distinction God ordained between men and women, while a man dishonored Christ by covering his headâ€”by blurring the distinction the other direction. Since the wearing or not wearing of a head-covering is clearly a culturally bound practice, most scholars attempt to interpret these comments in light of Corinthian culture. Unfortunately, available evidence on head coverings in the first century is at best inconclusive. Contemporary art and literature suggests that women only sometimes wore their hair covered when in publicâ€”certainly not with the kinds of absolute moral implications assumed by many earlier commentators or associated with the Muslim world today. Moreover, the focus on Corinthian culture tends to distract from the simple formula with which Paul introduced the section, and for which he argues throughout the remainder of the passage 5bâ€” Paul expected the Corinthians to understand that eliminating the distinctions between men and women in worship was inappropriateâ€”regardless of the cultural practices around them. Paul hammers this home for the women in particular in verse 6: This is at most an incidental issue for Paul, though. Paul does not define headship in this passage; he rather assumes it. Argument From Creation Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. However, in the Lord, neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. For as the woman originates from the man, so also the man has his birth through the woman; and all things originate from God. Coming to the center of the chiasmic structure, Paul immediately reinforces the general rather than culturally-bound nature of his argument, arguing now from the creation narrative. He begins by summarizing his second argument for women wearing head coverings: The obvious inference from the final part of the verse is that a woman ought to cover her head because she is the glory of man. Man brings honor and glory to Christ with his head uncovered; woman brings honor and glory to man with her head covered. This corresponds neatly to the order Paul outlined in verse 3. As if anticipating the ways this passage would be abused, Paul quickly moves to restrict its interpretation in the

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

second sub-chiasm verses 11â€” Just as woman was originally formed from man, now all men are born of women. Thus, although woman was created from and for man, he cannot claim any superiority on that basis: The ontological relationship between the sexes that God established in creation is to be preserved, but characterized by mutual dependence and unity in Christâ€”not by domineering or abuse. Indeed, the primary challenge in interpreting this sectionâ€”and, arguably, of interpreting the entire passageâ€”is understanding verse 11. More likely, however, Paul means angelic beings, in which case there are several possibilities. Perhaps women are to wear head coverings as a sign of male authority; perhaps they are to exercise the authority they have over their own heads in loving service to the rest of the community by wearing a head covering self-sacrificially. Argument From Nature 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? For her hair is given to her for a covering. Finally, Paul repeats and further explains his thesis in verses 13â€”15a. He first charges the Corinthians to use their own judgment in this area, clearly expecting them to agree that a woman should not pray with her head uncovered. Then, repeating the key words from the preceding sectionsâ€”dishonor v. Long hair on a woman is valued in most places at most times; shorter-cut, more functional hair is the usual trend for men. As Paul explains v. 15. Paul concludes the passage by turning to the church universal. Instead, they are a part of the broader body of Christ. Any contentiousness about the practice of head coverings thus set them squarely against the practice of all the apostles and other churches. Just as they should not ignore parts of the tradition passed on to them, they should not cavalierly and arrogantly stand in opposition to the rest of the church. Paul confronted anyone who wished to argue the point with the reality that the issue was not up for debate. Men and women should live so as to show their right relationship to God and to each other: Head coverings, for the church in the first century, were a means of expressing this ontological reality in the worship of the church. Significance and Application Plainly, men should not dress like women, nor women like men, in the context of corporate worshipâ€”however the particulars of this admonition vary from one culture to another. There is a deeper significance here, though, and more to be gleaned from the seriousness with which Paul treated as apparently trivial an issue as head coverings. First, men and women are gloriously distinct, and a failure to honor these distinctions in worship is a failure to honor God. Throughout the passage, Paul is at pains to emphasize that the differences between men and women were not mere accidents in the creation order, but are ontological realities comparable to the distinction between God and Christ in the eternal communion of the Trinity. The unconsidered liturgy is therefore all but certain to include and therefore proclaim sub- or anti-Christian views. The God-fearing congregation therefore ought to make its liturgical decisions very carefully, with self-sacrificial love and right theology as the twin guards of orthopraxyâ€”right down to the details of clothing. Works Cited Bedale, S. *Studies on a Community in Conflict. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Edited by Thomas C. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. Edited by Ned B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, A Survey of 2, Examples. A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture. Edited by Dean O. Gibbs, and Kenneth C. Concordia Publishing House, Man and Woman, One in Christ: Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. Paul to the Corinthians. A Discourse Analysis of First Corinthians. Lockwood, 1 Corinthians, Concordia Commentary: A Theological Exposition of Sacred Scripture, ed. Bruce, and Gordon D. Fee Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, , â€”* The chiasmic structure is not quite perfect: This appears to be intentional: The relationship with 1 Corinthians Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, See Fee, , â€”; Linda L. *Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, ed. Thus the tradition which Paul advocated in 1 Corinthians 11 was, contrary to popular opinion today, not grounded in the social customs of Corinth, but opposed to them. Crossway, , â€” On the other hand, woman was created for man, which implies more to the relationship than mere origination. Belleville, ; Fee, â€”; Robertson and Plummer, ; Lockwood, â€”

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 8 : 1 Corinthians NKJV - Head Coverings - Now I praise you, - Bible Gateway

*Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity (1 Corinthians ) Introduction (2)I praise you for remembering me in everything and for holding to the teachings, just as I passed them on to you.*

Scott J Shifferd Comments Are Christian women neglecting the command for head-coverings in church? Some consider this section of Scripture as completely cultural and identify all parts as the custom of contention 1 Cor However, Christians cannot avoid that the apostle Paul commanded that Christians must maintain tradition just as delivered to them 1 Cor The interpretations of this passage vary among believers concerning whether the covering is spiritual, garment, or hair. Does the apostle Paul mean that head-coverings are a part of maintaining traditions from God? Are head-coverings merely a custom noted in 1 Corinthians Covering and Glory Long hair is the only covering that Paul specifically mentioned in 1 Corinthians However, some women may not have long hair and need another covering. Verse 5 indicates that a personal shame for a woman to shear or shave her head. Having long hair is a God-given glory to the woman 1 Cor God made male and female in His image and yet He has given each a different glory. In the Journal of Biblical Literature, Charles Cosgrove cited numerous ancient sources depicting how women let their hair down as an act of humility within the Greco-Roman and Jewish societies. In 1 Peter 3: The braiding of hair appears to mean putting up the hair against the head rather than hanging and covering the head. This practice of braiding with gold and pearls demonstrated a lack of humility and modesty. The braiding of the hair was very elaborate and ostentatious, quite unlike the simple braid of modern times. The items mentioned in the biblical texts were characteristic of the wealthy upper classes and those who imitated them. The immodest women in the church at Corinth most probably had put their hair up and probably elaborately adorned their hair woven with gold and pearls demonstrating immodesty, wealth, and authority. Headship implied servant leadership Mark Christ led by service, and so men are to lead women by service. By elaborately braiding and adorning hair with gold and pearls, women behaved or appeared as wealthy and immodest, and thus some women exercised authority over men. In the Greco-Roman world, the custom for powerful women of authority was to braid their hair with gold and pearls and dress as though higher than others. Pagan women in this time led worship to Diana and Dionysus, and thus women exercised power and influence through the cults. However, the shame of a woman cutting her hair short was her personal shame. This word also appears in 1 Corinthians The message is a matter of modesty between men and women under the headship of God and Christ. Christian women must display godly principles of modesty and humility even in dress. Women are not to shame their heads with claims of authority or shame of cutting her hair short. Because of contention, the apostle Paul affirmed that the churches of God have no such custom of women praying with their heads uncovered 1 Cor Christians must avoid contention over customs. In 1 Corinthians In 1 Timothy 2: Therefore, these Christian women were to pray with their hair hanging to cover their heads as is proper and fitting for demonstrating the headship that God established. In this setting, these Christian women were to allow their hair to hang down in humility because long hair is a God-given covering and glory. Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? However, those of the same sex who have sexual intercourse with each other is contrary to nature. Therefore, what is cultural does not necessitate what is natural. Christians should remain considerate of demonstrating humility and modesty. Verse 4 Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. Having his head covered Here is where the misunderstanding of this passage begins. This clause, as rendered in the popular versions, is commentary, not Bible. Lenski translated the sense correctly: Paul is simply affirming that short hair and hair drawn up on the head is the same as a cropped or shaved head. A literal translation is: Every woman praying or prophesying with head uncovered disgraces her head; for this is also one and the same as being shaved. For if the woman is not covered, she must also become sheared; and if this is a disgrace to the woman to become sheared or shaved, she must remain covered. When Nadab and Abihu sinned Leviticus Job shaved his head

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

when he learned his children were dead Job 1: Many examples of this usage could be cited. Verse 10 is referring to authority. This scripture shows how women should have authority on their heads. The woman who prophesies also receives revelation from God through angels to prophesy and angels also deliver prayers Heb 2: She is to serve with apparent respect and modesty. By not covering her head, the Christian woman dishonors herself being that God created her as the glory of man and in the image of God. The woman is subordinating to the man by her modesty and covering. Her hair hanging down is her glory for she is the glory of man. This is how the Christian woman honors the headship of God, Christ, and man. Jewish sources rather uniformly call for women to be veiled in public, but Greek and Roman sources are mixed in their evidence. In classical Greece the veil was worn outside the house by women who had reached sexual maturity – married and young women of marriageable age, and Jewish sources may be read the same way. In depictions in a Greek wedding, the bride lifts her veil to her husband. A Roman woman on her wedding day was given a red veil. Statuary makes clear that the Greco-Roman veil was the top of the garment pulled over the head; one should not think of the modern Arabic and Islamic veil that covers most of the face as well as the head. In Roman religion the men as well as women were veiled when offering a sacrifice. Only in 1 Cor. Thus again, the passage falls short of mentioning any kind of garment. It is crystal clear that Paul is not speaking of any kind of garment; because he said in 1 Cor.

## DOWNLOAD PDF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:13-16 : SHAMEFUL HEAD COVERINGS EXPLAINED AS HAIR

### Chapter 9 : Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity (1 Corinthians ) | [www.nxgvision.com](http://www.nxgvision.com)

*Head Covering - Paul is not saying wear a physical covering but a spiritual covering - and talking especially about some women who are causing problems in the Corinthian church and people are allowing it (1 Cor. ).*

Putting the good book to good use Problem Passages: Read more about the series here. But everything comes from God. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? For long hair is given to her as a covering. Although there is a lot of disagreement about what the individual verses mean; the main arguments, that refer to gender, center around three points. What does head mean? And how does that affect women in worship? Part 1 What is the principle that can be applied in our culture? Women may pray and prophesy, but should they cover their heads in those activities today? What kind of covering is required – spiritual or literal? Part 2 How should verse 10 be translated? Part 3 This post will detail point 2, what is the principle of head coverings? Culture of wearing head coverings Fashion, what we wear, indicates time and social constructs. Of course, there is much variety in fashion over the centuries and cultures. Does it matter to us today? Do we imitate Corinth culture or find a principle to apply in our own way? These are the questions that drive the debate about head coverings. He might have meant these apparel instructions are important for ALL men and women regardless of culture. What we do know, is that most ancient cultures used veils, shawls and cloaks more commonly than we do today in the western world. It was as common for them as a hoodie is for us today. Today, this is changing. But in most churches, men are bareheaded and women keep their hats on. Because Comps believe this passage details an authority hierarchy verse 3 , all Comps agree the principle Paul is teaching is that gender distinctions are important in worship for all time and cultures. Some ask their women to wear hats or kerchiefs which literally means to cover the head. Some say long hair is a sufficient covering. All Comps agree that if a woman prays or prophecies on her own authority, she is disgraced. Comps believe 1 Timothy 2: Some say prophesy is a spontaneous word from God which should be applied today as Scripture reading. Women may read Scripture aloud, but not prepare a lesson from it. Others believe a woman teacher is allowed as long as the responsibility or authority for her lesson is given to a man. Comps are a little vague and varied on what exactly that means. Verse 11 – 12 says, Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. Egals believe these verses are the great equalizer for worship in churches. As Christians, man and women find their origin not in Father Adam or even in their female mothers – but in God himself. In the Lord, we are interdependent on each other. Egals believe the English translations have suffered from patriarchal bias, and make these following points: Paul describes the practices he taught the Corinthians as traditions. This word describes a set of precepts passed along from person to person. Paul asks us to judge for ourselves the propriety of a woman praying to God uncovered. Egals believe the judgement is affirmative. Because a woman brings glory to her man, why should that glory be hidden? Jesus says let your good works show so it will be bring glory to God. There is controversy whether this verse should ask a rhetorical question. Instead, Egals claim it is a statement that hair is a suitable head covering, and prefer this translation: Women should not be silent as that ancient patriarchal society practiced. Egals believe it only proves Paul gave specific instructions for an incident that was occurring in the Corinthian church chapter 14 , but is not an indictment for all women since he instructs them to speak here, in chapter