**CHARTING THE LOGIC OF 1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **11:2-3** | **11:4-6** | **11:7-12** | | **11:13-15** |
| Praise for holding the “traditions”  The analogy of “head” and creation’s order:  GOD  CHRIST  Man  Woman  These are functional distinctions not qualitative.  Cf. 11:7-9 emphasis on inter-dependence also in analogy to creation. | “To cover or not to cover, this is the question!”  MEANING OF “HEAD”? “Source” or “Authority”? [SEE Below notes]  MAN ...dishonors “his head” to cover it (v 4)   * But compare the OT and Judaism ?? Nazarite vow? * What is the “cover”?   WOMAN ...to “uncover” is to dishonor “her head” (v 5)   * Point of analogy of vv 5c-6 | 11:7  Man ... glory of God  [“ought not cover”]  Woman ... glory of man  Yet 11:8-12  MAN AND WOMAN ARE *MUTUALLY DEPENDENT* ***AND*** *INDEPENDENT* IN GOD’S CREATED ORDER  11:10 is sandwiched between vv. 7-9 and 11-12. | | Paul draws on the analogy with nature for “cover” and “uncover.”  11:13 rhetorical question  11:14-15 “nature’s” pattern is to differentiate genders  11:16 “contentious” = those who “want to make an issue out of” the cover in order to “win” an argument (ATR4.162; AT, 846-847)  “Custom” = women’s validation of participation in public worship and prophecy |
| **ISSUES 11:2-3** | **ISSUES 11:4-6** | **ISSUES 11:7-12** | | **ISSUES 11:13-15** |
| Cultural issues pertaining to cover and uncover:   * Caesar/Roman religion and toga * Emergence of “new Roman women” and push back on veiling of married women. * Women’s “hairdos”   Why so much extra on the woman?  NOTE: Women **are** praying and prophesying in public worship (11:5)  What are the analogical implications of “God is head of Christ” to “man is the head of woman” ?? | **11:7-9** Creation logic focuses on mutuality  **11:10** is sandwiched in the middle of the two statements on mutuality. It is the “crux interpretum” of this text in terms of [SEE TEXTS]   * “ought to have authority” “over her own head”   + Sign of husband’s authority (some early Fathers)   + Metonomy for a “sign of power over”   (most Church Fathers)   * + Majority view = cover as a sign of woman’s “validated authority” to public worship and prophecy * “because of the angels” ... angelic beings or messengers? History of views:   + Fallen angels (Gen 6:2) looking for an advantage (Tertullian). Cover protects her.   + Angels as monitors/guardians of protocols (see Thiselton, 837-841)     - Bib and strong Jewish traditions     - Cover conformity = prophetic sign to angels of the “authority” of women prophets (Roesner 531)   + Messengers (Winter on term usage)     - Other churches (cf. Rev 2)     - Roman monitors who supervise codes/protocols for women (Winter, 90f)     - Elite class monitors   “for this reason” is a crucial connection   * Because woman was created for man (v. 9) * Or, because **if she follows decorum as a wife she has “control” over her own head**.   **11:11-12 interdependence** by God’s design | Arguments from analogy with nature.  11:10 See texts below | 11:15 is long hair “the” cover?  The cultic application of this text in some “holiness” movements. [SEE BELOW]  11:16 no “such” or no “other” practice?   * If “no such” KJV, NRSV, ESV, Fee   + Greek term toiau/thn , “no such” refers to the “contentious”   + Greek term sunh/qeian, “custom” * If “no other” NIVs, NLT, etc.   + “no other” is interpretive translation but correct!   + Paul is negating the “contentious”   + The use of “custom” over “tradition” seems to soften the point.   Important to note how Paul uses the broader Church practice as an argument in v. 16 | |

**EXPANSION OF DEBATED TEXTS** (in “debate” order)

**11:5** “But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head....”

Three major options on views about the “cover” (Fee, *in.loc*.):

1. Traditionally assumed view is the “veil” is some kind of external cover.
2. Long hair is the veil (11:15)
3. The issue is about “hair dos” (base on the fact that terminology is never “veil” but a “coming down the head”)

My opinion is that view 1 is the best option WITH an understanding of a wife’s relationship to her husband in 1st Century Roman culture (see lecture notes). I also view the surface idea of a “hat” as a Western assumption and not a biblical understanding.

**11:10**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SOME DATA ON 11:10** | | | | |
| GREEK | ESV | NIV84 | NIV2011 | NLT |
| 10 διὰ τοῦτο **ὀφείλει** ἡ γυνὴ ⸀**ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν** **ἐpὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς** διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. | 10 That is why a wife\* **ought** **to have a symbol of authority** **on her head**, because of the angels.  \*Note ESV is interpretive. “Woman” is the least interpretive translation. | 10 For this reason, and because of the angels, the woman **ought** **to have a sign of authority** **on her head.** | 10 It is for this reason that a woman **ought** **to have authority** **over her own\* head**, because of the angels.  \*Interpretive insertion. | 10 For this reason, and because the angels are watching, **a woman should wear a covering on her head to show she is under authority.\***  \*Interpretive bias on steroids |
| Note translation of Greek as “wife” or “woman”  11:10 is the most interpreted verse in ch. 11 on women issues. The interpretation hinge on the meaning of “head” and “authority.”  **“HEAD”** (11:3, 10; Col 2:19; Eph 5:23)   1. “Head” means “source” and refers to ‘origin.’ Man is the source of the woman’s origin (Gen) [Bedale, Bruce, Barrett, Fee, Murphy-Oconnor, etc. ... Egalatarian view]. This position sees man as the source of woman not to rule but to enable as equals in life’s decisions. 2. “Head” means “ruler” and refers to ‘authority over.’ Man rules over the woman in life’s decisions. [Grudem, Carson...Heirarchical view]   The “middle ground” in the gender debate is the “complementarian” view (but, be careful, because the heirarchicalists highjacked this term for their view.).  Conclusion... examples from Greek literature include both views on the meaning of “head” (see Troy Martin). Therefore, **gender issues cannot just focus on this text but appeal to the total narrative of Scripture to build a view.** View 1 has the most support, but that alone does not prove a full egalitarian view.  **“AUTHORITY”** ... “symbol”/”Sign of”/”to have”/”under” /// “on her head,” “over her own head,” “on...to show...under” | | | | |

**11:13-15** In what way is a woman’s hair a “covering”?

11:13-16 appeals to 3 arguments: common sense, nature and consensus. Up to this point Paul has argued that a woman be covered. Now he uses three ANALOGICAL arguments for cover. These arguments illustrate “cover” from nature etc. They are NOT direct but indirect. His previous statements are the “direct” portion. **SO, the answer to the identity of cover is NOT in this analogical illustration but in the direct teaching of the historical-culture context of public worship.**

“Judge for yourselves” is a rhetorical call to think about the world in general (again, signals illustrative speech)

In studies on this context, virtually no scholar sees hair AS the cover but something TO BE covered. Paul is using nature only as an illustration of the cover not the cover itself (on “nature” cf. Rom 1:26; 2:14). Ciampa and Rosner’s comment may help you to think through this difference.

“Some interpreters believe this passage suggests that the women did not need any other head covering because it is affirmed that God has given them long hair as a head covering. According to this view, the long hair itself, or a manner of pinning and fixing the long hair up (so that it served as a covering), could serve as the required covering so that no other covering would be necessary. **This seems unlikely.** [emphasis mine] **The woman’s hair is precisely what was perceived to be in need of covering in that culture and context, not its display.** [emphasis mine] However, it is more likely that Paul is suggesting that the pattern established by nature or human custom provided a clue that women’s heads should be covered. As Watson argues, “the point is that women’s long hair (as oppsed to men’s short hair) is *analogous* to the additional covering represented by the veil. In seeking to impose this extra covering on women but not on men, Paul is following the example of nature itself, what has similarly seen fit to provide women with an extra covering”.” (539-40)

Woman’s “long hair” is her “glory” as a distinguishing aspect of male/female creation...by “convention of gender differentiation.” “...yet Paul wants her to cover this ‘wrap-around mantle’ whenever she prays to God in public.” (Fitzmyer, 421). Throughout this chapter, the Greek term/s for veil (i.e. hat in our culture) are NEVER used. Paul’s term for the cover is peribo/laion, a noun only used twice in the NT (here and Heb 1:12). It means “an article of apparel that covers much of the body, covering, wrap, cloak, robe” (BDAG, 800a). Because of Paul’s language, there is a major view on the “cover” as “hairdos” rather than an article of clothing.

In the main context of 11:1-16, Paul is calling for the woman to have a “wrap around, cover” as a social convention for public worship. Whether it is a certain kind of “hairdo” or, more likely, maintaining her status as a wife with the conventional drawing up of her toga over her head, it is not just her normal hair. Paul is talking about a cover over her hair, not just the hair. Her hair is a cover by nature to distinguish her as a woman. Her validity in public worship requires more...the expected Roman custom for married women.