



## A Study of Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians

### Lesson 16: Head Coverings for Women.... 1 Corinthians 11:1-16

Now I made the point early on that the first part of 1 Corinthians is concerned with the reports that Paul had received from Chloe and others and that the second portion of the book is concerned with a number of questions that the Corinthians had posed to the Apostle Paul. Now we are not completely sure as to the spirit in which those questions were asked. They may have been honest and respectful or they may have been sarcastic and prideful.

We do know what a number of those questions were...not word perfect of course but generally. And the reason we know what some of those questions were is because of the way Paul frames his answers to the questions.

For example at the beginning of chapter 8 Paul writes this.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 8:1**...Now concerning food offered to idols: we know that "all of us possess knowledge." This "knowledge" puffs up, but love builds up.

That tells us that the section included in 1 Corinthians 8 through 10 is principally concerned with the issue of whether or not the Corinthians ought ever to be involved with eating meat offered to idols.

Now what we have been talking about in this class over the last three weeks is Paul's answer to that questions and what we discovered was that Paul's answer went something like this, **"It depends on whether you are talking about simply eating the meat itself or whether you are talking about doing so in front of weaker brothers and sisters without any care for what eating such meat might do to their spiritual well-being."**

He finishes up his discussion of the topic at the end of chapter ten. I might add that it is always a bit surprising to modern readers to see that Paul actually took three chapters of a 16 chapter book to deal with what we might think is a really culturally irrelevant topic. Anyway, he took three chapters of 1 Corinthians to discuss the topic and ending by saying like this, **"Now eating the meat that you buy in the marketplace that has been sacrificed to idols is one thing; eating the meat during a pagan feast is another thing altogether. You may not participate in any such feasts. For you to participate in such a feast is for you to participate with demons and don't give me any guff about the fact that the gods that are being worshipped aren't real. I know that but demons stand behind such things and you are not to be associated with things that stand contrary to your attachment to Jesus. And don't think that there is any sort of magical protection related to the Lord's Table to protect you from this sort of disobedience. All you have to do is look back to our fathers in the wilderness to see that that sort of thinking ends in death."**

Now I mentioned earlier that Paul carries on his discussion about meat sacrificed to idols for some three chapters...well that is almost correct. He actually carries it on for three chapters and one verse.

You can see that his thinking carries over into chapter eleven simply by looking at verse one. There he writes:

**ESV 1 Corinthians 11:1...**Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ.

Now you can see I think how that fits perfectly into Paul's argument earlier. You will remember, I hope, that Paul had earlier used his own life as an illustration of what it means to give up one's own personal rights and privileges for the sake of the Kingdom of Christ. You see Paul had talked earlier about giving up his right to eat whatever he wanted to eat. He had also talked about his giving up his right to take along a believing wife on his missionary journeys and finally he had talked about giving up his right to get paid for preaching the gospel when, in fact, he had every right to make a living from his preaching. He had talked about how he had given up those rights in an effort to advance the gospel and the implication was that the Corinthians ought to be able to give up their uncrucified lust for having their own way when it came to going down to the local pagan temple and participating in feasts of worship to false gods and that they ought to be able to give those things up for the advancement of the gospel.

That is why this summary verse at the beginning of chapter eleven fits so well with everything that has gone before and that is why, of course, it really ought to be the last verse of chapter ten. Still, custom has placed it where it has and even

there it works as a good transition into what Paul is going to address next and that is the issue of submission and authority.

Now to say that the section we are going to look at this morning is controversial is an enormous understatement.

It is one of the most discussed and often one of the most cussed passages in the Bible. There are those that say that the section shows beyond any doubt that the Bible is hopelessly mired in the cultural morality and beliefs of its time and that not only should we not trust it when it comes to instructing us with regard to the relationship between men and women but that because it cannot be trusted in this one particular area neither can it be trusted in other areas of sexuality and social practice. In other words, some people use this passage and argue like this, **“See, the Bible is culturally bound up in its on time and place and because it is we don’t have to listen to what it says about the relationship between men and women. Nor do we have to listen to it with regard to what it says about homosexuality or even marriage.”**

Now, obviously, I don’t agree with that and while there may in fact be some cultural practices involved in the text that are difficult for us to understand...the overall application or principle of the text is never lost because of that.

Now I making that point this morning because you may not like what I have to say...I can appreciate that fact...I am and I freely admit this...a highly flawed exegete who is limited not so much by his understanding of the original languages as he is by his biblical discernment and spiritual maturity. Still, while you may not approve of what I think Paul says you ought to be very careful in

rejecting what he says outright. I think...rather, I know...it is a very slippery slope when a person decides they are going to sit in judgment on the Word of God simply because they do not like what the text has to say and it is a mark of extraordinary pride to say to oneself something like, **“You know Paul must be wrong here and bound up by the cultural practices of his time simply because I don’t agree or like what he has to say.”**

It seems to me that that is what got the Corinthians in trouble in the first place. Instead of approaching the text that way, I think we ought to come to it with an attitude that goes something like this, **“Oh God, would you send now your precious Holy Spirit to direct and guide me in the truth of what this text has to say to me today. Would you send the Holy Spirit who is this text true author and therefore its infallible teacher to guide me in the truth of your Son? Would you not let my sin or my cultural preferences prevent me from understanding and applying what you want me to gain from this passage.”**

Now with all that said, let’s dig into this most difficult text this morning.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:2**...Now I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you.

Now the first difficulty arises here in this first verse.<sup>1</sup> It arises because it is almost impossible to understand why Paul would say such a thing. I mean if you have been here right along from the beginning you will know that so far the Corinthians do not seem to have gotten one simple thing right.<sup>2</sup> They have not done what Paul has asked them to do really with regard to one single thing he had asked. Nor do I want you to think that things are going to get much better

form here on out. They are not. In fact, things are really only going to get worse the rest of the way out. So it raises the question and you can see why it would, **“Is Paul being sarcastic here?”** or is he trying to communicate something else by using this opening praise that seems to be so far from what was actually occurring in Corinth.

Gordon Fee writes this:

More likely, (1) they serve in a more general way, as a kind of *captatio benevolentiae*<sup>3</sup> to introduce chapters 11–14, in which the apostle sets them up with praise with reference to *unmentioned* “traditions” that they are keeping so as to come down on them with greater force in the areas where they are *not*.<sup>4</sup>

You see what Fee is arguing then is that the Paul is praising what he can so he can make his criticisms toward the Corinthians in such a way that they might actually receive the correction he offers. One writer, Thomas Schreiner, thinks that is pretty important especially since Paul’s criticism of the Corinthians is going to extend on from this verse for a full four chapters<sup>5</sup>.

So Paul is praising the Corinthians for keeping the traditions that have been given to them. He is only going to praise them for a short while...you can see that by looking on down to verse 17.

**ESV 1 Corinthians 11:17**...But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because when you come together it is not for the better but for the worse.

But here he seems to be praising them. Now let’s dig into the controversy. Look at verse 3.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:3**...But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God.

Now the question...the real question...in this passage in this passage is how is the word **“head”** being used?<sup>6</sup> The Greek word itself is the word κεφαλῆ. But that it is not of all that much help to figuring out how it is being used here because it means pretty much the same thing in Greek that it does in English...technically, it means that round circular orb at the top of a person’s neck. The problem is that it can be used figuratively in Greek just like it can be in English.

For example, you could say that Lake Victoria is the head of the Nile River. If you said that you would not mean that Lake Victoria is the boss of the Nile River but rather that it is the source of the Nile River...that because it is, the Nile River is. You would mean that the Nile River flows out of Lake Victoria and is the origin of its flow. On the other hand, if you were to say that Vito Corleone was the head of Corleone Crime Family most likely you would not mean that he was the source of the family (that might be true in one sense but even Vito Corleone had a mother and a father) but rather that he was the boss of the family. In that particular instance, you would be emphasizing the fact that he was the authority of the family. Certainly if you were to say that the President of the United States was the head of the country you would not mean that he was the source but rather that he was the ultimate authority in power.

I bring that up here because when you as a reader make a decision that the word **“head”** here means **“source”** that is, **“origin out of which something comes”** or perhaps instead **“authority”** that is, **“one who has the right of rule over**

**another**” you have also made a decision as to how you are going to understand what the passage has to say to us today.

Let me show you what I mean in a really practical way.

Let’s take that passage, 1 Corinthians 11:3 and plug in our interpretive understanding of what the word **“head”** means. In other words, let’s plug in **“source”** for **“head”** and then go back and plug in **“authority”** for **“head”**.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:3**...But I want you to understand that the **head** of every man is Christ, the **head** of a wife is her husband, and the **head** of Christ is God.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:3**...But I want you to understand that the **source** of every man is Christ, the **source** of a wife is her husband, and the **source** of Christ is God.

Now I think you can see where that understanding begins to generate problems. There is no problem in understanding Christ to be the source of man. I mean we understand Christ to be the creative hand of God in making mankind in general. I think the text means **“Christian man”** here but I am willing to concede the point for the moment. And certainly I think you could argue that God is the source of Christ not in the sense that He created Christ but in the sense that Christ is eternally subordinate to the will of the Father. What I don’t think a person can argue very effectively is that a husband is the **“source”** of his wife. I am, for example, not the source of my wife. The source of my wife was Leonard and Betty Thyer. I am the source (partial source) of my son and daughter but I am not the source of my wife. Now proponents of this view have to argue that the normal relationship between a husband and wife is not what is being

discussed here...rather, they say, that the thing being discussed here is the relationship between men and women in general. That man and by man they mean Adam...is, in fact, the source of woman. Now I am willing to grant that point...to a degree. That is, the words for woman and man that are used here can mean man and woman instead of husband and wife...but the other side will have to acknowledge, I think, that the words used usually mean man and wife.

Now if you look at Ephesians 5, I think you can see what the words mean. Clearly there the idea is **“authority”** and not **“source”** and you can tell that not because of the words for **“man”** and **“woman”** but rather because of the verb **“submit”**.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>ESV</sup> **Ephesians 5:22**...Wives (γυναῖκες), submit to your own husbands (ἀνδράσιν), as to the Lord. <sup>23</sup> For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. <sup>24</sup> Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should **submit** in everything to their husbands.

Now you can see that if you understand the word **“head”** as **“authority”** in 1 Corinthians 11 rather than as **“source”** it makes the passage look almost just like Ephesians 5.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:3**...But I want you to understand that the **authority** of every man is Christ, the **authority** of a wife (γυναικὸς) is her husband (ἀνδρὸς), and the **authority** of Christ is God.

Understanding the passage that was makes the passage hierarchical. That means that just as God has authority over Christ and Christ has authority over men so men have authority over women.<sup>8</sup> Now, I am willing to admit that sometimes

when the word **“head”** is used it may mean **“source”** but the issue seems so clear here in 1 Corinthians 11 that at least in the first part of the section **“authority”** is clearly the issue at hand. You may not like the last part of that but you can see I hope how it is, at least, consistent.

Now look at verse 4.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:4**...Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, <sup>5</sup> but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, since it is the same as if her head were shaven. <sup>6</sup> For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short. But since it is disgraceful for a wife to cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head. <sup>7</sup> For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man.

Now I have to confess here and this would be true no matter which side I took...whether **“source”** or **“authority”** that sometimes the word **“head”** simply means **“head”** ...as in noggin, beaner or cabeza.

Now I am making that point because verse 4 can mean that:

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:4**...Every man who prays or prophesies with his head (meaning his noggin) covered dishonors his head (meaning his *own* noggin)...

Or...it can mean...

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:4**...Every man who prays or prophesies with his head (meaning his noggin) covered dishonors his head (meaning his *authority*...that is, Christ)...

That is, of course, what I think it means. In the same way verse 5 can mean that:

**ESV 1 Corinthians 11:5**...but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head (meaning her noggin) uncovered dishonors her head (meaning her *own head*), since it is the same as if her head (meaning her noggin) were shaven.

Or...it can mean...

**ESV 1 Corinthians 11:5**...but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head (meaning her noggin) uncovered dishonors her head (meaning her *authority*, that is her husband), since it is the same as if her head (meaning her noggin) were shaven.

Again, that is what I think it means.

You see, I think Paul's point is that there is a certain structure that I still maintained in spite of the redemption we have in Christ because it goes back to a point before man and woman needed redemption. That is, it goes back to the very act of the creation of man and women in the Garden.

You see what Paul is saying is that if a woman is not going to cover her head to show herself in authority to her husband then let her go ahead and shave her head and simply be a man and totally disregard the order of creation.

You can that that is his point in verse 6.

**ESV 1 Corinthians 11:6**...For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short. But since it is disgraceful for a wife to cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head.

Of course Paul is being sarcastic. He doesn't want a woman to cut off her hair or shave her head. In that culture for a woman to shave her head was just as bad as wearing her hair unbound.<sup>9</sup> A woman with a shaved head was thought of as a

cultic prostitute while a woman with unbound hair was thought of available.<sup>10</sup> Neither of those two cultural distinctions exists today but they were very real in Paul's day. What he wants her to do is to cover her head...to accept, that she is under the authority of her husband just as her husband is under the authority of Christ. For her to uncover her head in that culture was to say, **"I am not under my husband's authority but am my own authority...equal in every way or manner to my husband and unwilling to recognize now authoritative head other than God."**

Now for a man to cover his head meant exactly the opposite. Look at what Paul say in verse 7.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:7**...For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man.

Now in verse 8, Paul continues his argument based upon the order of creation.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:8**...For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. <sup>9</sup> Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. <sup>10</sup> That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

Now it seems to me that verse nine more or less puts to an end any question of whether **"head"** means authority or source. It seems to me that the whole argument right along has had to do with the issue of authority and the word for **"authority"** ἐξουσίαν is the word that is being used here. I should add, in fairness, that the phrase **"symbol of"** is not found in the text and is an interpretive understanding of what wearing a head covering means.

Now that little phrase **“because of the angels”** that occurs at the end of verse 10 is very, very tough.

I like what Charles Hodge says. He writes:

There is scarcely a passage in the New Testament which has so much taxed the learning and ingenuity of commentators as this. After all that has been written, it remains just as obscure as ever.<sup>11</sup>

Fee writes:

By all counts this is one of the truly difficult texts in this letter. It needs to be noted at the outset that our difficulties are directly related to the *ad hoc* character of the passage.’ The solution probably lies with what the Corinthians themselves have communicated to Paul; indeed, the key words “authority” and “angels” are very likely from them in some way. Our problem is that at this point we are left on the outside looking in, with these difficult words as our only clues. Hence we must forever be content to “look through a glass darkly” and learn what we can in the midst of admitting how little we know.<sup>12</sup>

Now there have been several interpretative tracks taken on this impossible passage. One that is almost certainly wrong has to do with the idea of women keeping covered up in worship in order not to attract the unhealthy interest of angels as did the daughters of men in the famous Genesis 6 passage. The problem with that view is that the angels there were wicked angels and the angels here are those that have been confirmed in righteousness. So it is attributing the same evil inclination to good angels as to bad angels which simply won’t work.

The other interpretation is that such an action makes the baseness of the sin of such self-independent women a point of outrage among angels. That was the view of Calvin. He writes:

When, therefore, women venture upon such liberties, as to usurp for themselves the token of authority, they make their baseness manifest to the angels. This, therefore, was said by way of amplifying, as if he had said, "If women uncover their heads, not only Christ, but all the angels too, will be witnesses of the outrage." And this interpretation suits well with the Apostle's design. He is treating here of different ranks. Now he says that, when women assume a higher place than becomes them, they gain this by it — that they discover their impudence in the view of the angels of heaven.<sup>13</sup>

Still, it is hard to know what to make of it. It may very well have to do with the fact that angels covered themselves in the presence of God and could not understand why women did not do the same in the presence of their lords. Still, I would not want to press that either. The central idea I think is that the angels are observers of all things in the church and that they are deeply concerned when the hierarchy of creation is ignored.

In verse 11, Paul returns back to the issue and adds a new twist and that twist is this. Neither women nor men are ever altogether independent of each other. Look with me at verse 11.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:11**...Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; <sup>12</sup> for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.

Paul's point is that women are from men (this is a place where the idea of source seems strong) and so now is man through the woman. The ESV does make the

point that the prepositions are different regarding men and women are different but it uses the wrong word. Verse 12 says that man is of woman but the Greek is very clear here...it is through the woman. I think, however, it is just as easy to say that while men have authority over women in that women came from men so women too have authority over men in childbirth in that they exercise dominion over them until they become men. And that this interdependence is designed by God.

Now in verse 13, the passage already difficult enough takes another really difficult twist. It seems to drop the whole idea of head coverings and switch to the idea of hairstyles. Indeed this switch of topic has led some commentators, most notably Gordon Clark, to assert that this is what Paul was really concerned with in the first place.<sup>14</sup>

Still, I don't think that has been Paul's point all along. Rather I think the point that Paul is coming to here at the end of the section is that even nature thinks it is fitting that women cover their heads...hence, the fact that in nature women tend to have long hair and men tend to have short hair.<sup>15</sup> Paul goes so far as to say that a woman's long hair is her glory...hinting that the fact of a woman being in subjection to a man is her glory.

Look at how he says what he says in verse 13.

**ESV 1 Corinthians 11:13...**Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered? <sup>14</sup> Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, <sup>15</sup> but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering.

Now the issue is not that the issue of hair is what Paul was really getting at all along. The issue is really that even nature illustrates the point that woman are covered differently than men.

And then finally the last verse of the section seems to be an appeal to the fact that women covering their heads in corporate worship was the practice of all the other churches. Look at what it says.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 11:16**...If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God.

Now what are we to make of all this. I think there are two things. First the Bible does teach the fact of the equality of all believers...that is, that in Christ there is no hierarchy. That is the point of Galatians 3:28

<sup>ESV</sup> **Galatians 3:28**...There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

But at the same time, the Bible does teach that in the church there is a difference of function...and by that I am saying that the Bible does teach male headship in the church and in the home. Paul makes it clear that in the church and in the home men are to lead. Now he does that even in 1 Corinthians. Look at what he says in chapter 14.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Corinthians 14:33**...For God is not a God of confusion but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints, <sup>34</sup> the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says. <sup>35</sup> If there is anything they desire to learn, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.

Now the difference between being equal and yet having different functions seems to be the issue that most feminists cannot get past and yet that issue is not one that stems from the fall and hence one that is done away with in our great redemption in Christ. No, it is one that stems from creation. You see headship does not flow out of Genesis chapter 3. It flows rather out of Genesis chapter 2. It is an ordinance of Creation and not an ordinance of the Fall and for that reason is still in effect.

It doesn't mean that women are inferior when they take a role of submission in the church any more than it means that children are inferior when they are required to take a role of submission in the home.

So what are we to make of the issue of head coverings here in 1 Corinthians 11? Are they to be put in place here? Should we expect our women to start wearing shawls that cover their heads in corporate worship? I don't think so. I think that part may have been the cultural symbol or flashpoint of an issue that transcended culture.

The issue that transcends culture...that indeed transcends all of Creation...is the headship of men. That means that if want to take Scripture seriously we will not submit to the cultural obsession to blur the difference in function between men and women. We can wear head coverings all day long and still blur that distinction or we can follow the dictates of creation and let our behavior, our dress, our very attitudes perform the same function that head coverings performed for the Corinthians.

Let's pray.

---

<sup>1</sup> C.K. Barrett, *First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1968), 247. Barrett writes, “The language was probably formulated in Corinth, but Paul uses it himself. (iii.6) *The traditions* (as the other references show) were the central truths of the Christian faith, handed on at this stage (before the emergence of Christian literature) orally from evangelist and teacher to convert, The context suggests that training in Christian conduct was included, Later (xv. 2) Paul will throw some doubt on whether the Corinthians did indeed *hold fast* the teaching he had given them; here he accepts at its face value their claim to do so. It is not dear what leads him to the subject discussed after this *captatio benevolentiae*; possibly the Corinthian letter contained an inquiry whether it was still necessary to observe conventional distinctions in a community in which there were no longer “male and female and women as well as men were manifestly moved by the Spirit to pray and prophesy.”

<sup>2</sup> David E. Garland, *1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2003), 513. He writes, “There is no reason to conclude that Paul means exactly the opposite of what he says. He is not resorting to irony or giving them only a backhanded compliment, commending them for holding on to his traditions, albeit in a mistaken fashion. This verse functions instead as a *captatio benevolentiae*. His affirmation of them is not ironic but designed “to placate them so that they will be receptive to critical advice.” This rhetorical strategy was recognized as a sensible prelude to frank criticism Though Paul begins on an encouraging note—they are to be honored—he does not praise them in 11:17, 22.”

<sup>3</sup> **Captatio benevolentiae.** Any literary or oral device which seeks to secure the goodwill of the recipient or hearer, as in a letter or in a discussion. Taken from Wikipedia. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glossary\\_of\\_rhetorical\\_terms](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glossary_of_rhetorical_terms)

<sup>4</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians NICNT*, (William B. Eerdmans Publishing: Grand Rapids, 1987), 500.

<sup>5</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, "Head Coverings, Prophecies, and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2-16," *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Woman hood*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossways Books, 1991, 2006), 125.

<sup>6</sup> John Calvin, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, 11:3. “When he says that there is no difference between the man and the woman, he is treating of Christ’s spiritual kingdom, in which individual distinctions are not regarded, or made any account of; for it has nothing to do with the body, and has nothing to do with the outward relationships of mankind, but has to do solely with the mind — on which account he *declares* that there is no difference, even between *bond* and *free*. In the meantime, however, he does not disturb civil order or honorary distinctions, which cannot be dispensed with in ordinary life. Here, on the other hand, he reasons respecting outward propriety and decorum — which is a part of ecclesiastical polity.” **Clearly Calvin thinks the issue is authority.**

<sup>7</sup> Garland, 515. “Garland writes, “Many recent interpreters who prefer this option seek to eliminate any hint of woman’s subordination.” **I, of course, agree but did not want to say so with my wife in the next room.**

<sup>8</sup> Charles Hodge, *Commentary on First Corinthians*, 11:3. He writes, “The head is that on which the body is dependent, and to which it is subordinate. The obvious meaning of this passage is, that the woman is subordinate to the man, the man is subordinate to Christ and Christ is subordinate to God.”

<sup>9</sup> Gordon H. Clark, *1 Corinthians: A Contemporary Commentary* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1975), 172-3.

<sup>10</sup> Garland, 519. He writes, “The assumption is that it was shameful for women to unbind their hair public, “a sign associated either with prostitutes or—perhaps worse from Paul’s point of view—with women caught up in the ecstatic worship practices of the cults associated with Dionysius, Cybele, and Isis.”

<sup>11</sup> Hodge, 233.

<sup>12</sup> Fee, 518.

<sup>13</sup> Calvin, 11:10.

<sup>14</sup> Clark, 175. He writes, “...it now becomes evident that hair, not hats, is the important matter.

<sup>15</sup> Garland, 530. He writes, “That he specifically mentions hair in these verses does not mean that hair has been the topic throughout the section. It is brought up only as a final illustration...”