

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

A1235 – August 26, 2012 – 1 Corinthians 11:2-6
Introducing Headcoverings

Okay, today we come to the controversial 1 Corinthians 11 and the issue of head coverings. What I'm going to ask you to do is not jump to any conclusions on this matter until we've completely worked our way through the entire section which ends in verse 16. Since that will take us a few weeks you have plenty of time to study through the text on your own as we work our way through.

Now the reason it will take us some time getting through this is because there are multiple variables in the passage. For example, grammatically, people argue in vv 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 the term "head" and whether it refers to "source," "authority" or both. People argue in v 4 over the kind of speaking these women were engaging in that concerned Paul; was it divine utterances, was it asking questions, was it all speaking and how does that relate to 1 Cor 14:34-35 where Paul says I do not allow women to speak in the church, and 1 Tim 2:11-15 where Paul says I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man? People also argue in verses 5, 6, 13 and 15 the nature of the covering itself and whether the covering is the hair or a little doily or a hat or an extension of the clothing. Further, people argue about the hair in verse 6, 14 and 15 and people also argue about the angels in verse 10 and why they are brought into the discussion. Do they lust after uncovered women, do they have a concern about rank, why because of the angels?

Secondly, there's the cultural background at Corinth. Were head coverings culturally significant to that culture? Did they have an agreed upon meaning? What did they mean? Who wore them? Since there are so many combinations and permutations I have to sort that out.

Thirdly, there's the high amount of written material on the passage. I literally could be reading on this subject matter for months; beyond the normal commentary literature there are books written on the topic, journal articles, Baptist bulletins, Methodist messengers, blogs, you name it; 1 Cor 11 is a hot topic of discussion in the modern or should I say postmodern church.

Finally, there's the emotional element that inevitably gets involved over the issue. Mention head coverings to a woman and you may get a not so happy response. So it's a highly emotional topic. I've personally looked at this passage probably ten to fifteen different occasions because people are up in arms about it; but on these occasions I was only able to form some preliminary thoughts because I didn't have time to look at the original text, I didn't have the time to do all this research on the historical background. So I've personally tried to suspend judgment on it for many years and if you ask my wife she'll say I tested some of those thoughts on her and she tested me back. At any rate it can be emotional but discussing the text with your spouse is important and I encourage you to do that.

Put this all together and it creates quite a sticky mess for a pastor-teacher to wade through. So it will take some time. I'm asking you to bear with me over the next few weeks. My focus is simply to get to the original intent of the text. Then we can see what application there is for us.

Today I just want to introduce the text to you and I can tell you now there's nothing to get emotional about. So just relax. I don't think the direction this takes is going to create any highly emotional responses. In fact I think you'll be quite interested and delighted at the conclusion I've come to. And you may agree or disagree but I'm only doing my best at trying to understand the text.

Now there are actually a few very simple observations that I think are pertinent to getting on the right track and avoiding a lot of the hoopla. So I want to start with those. Let's ask a question. "Is Paul arguing for Christian women wearing head coverings in the formal church assembly or in some other informal gathering?" That is, is the formal meeting of the church the setting for this instruction? Or is the apostle's concern regarding an informal gathering outside of the set meeting time of the formal church? Everyone can agree that there are both formal and informal meetings of believers that go

on, whether they involve prayer, Bible study or what not. So it's not too odd to imagine either situation could be in view here. Harold Holmyard III, a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary has written an entire article in BibSac arguing that Paul's concern is not the formal gathering in this section. Wayne House has argued in the same journal that such attempts to isolate this from the formal assembly are unconvincing. But this is a very crucial question to answer correctly. Is Paul addressing their conduct in the formal meeting or in informal gatherings?

Now if Paul is addressing the formal meeting of the church, by which I mean the normal church service that started at a certain time and place open to all those in the church, then how do you reconcile 1 Cor 11:5 with 1 Cor 14:34-35? In 1 Cor 11:5 Paul says a woman speaking by praying or prophesying in the church must have her head covered. But in 1 Cor 14:34 Paul says a woman is to keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak. So which is it Paul - can women speak in the assembly or must they remain silent?

This is a widely known apparent contradiction and there are just as many widely proposed solutions. Apart from all this one thing is certain, God cannot contradict Himself. So 1 Cor 11:5 and 1 Cor 14:34-35 must be in harmony with one another because ultimately they are the word of God. The only question is what is the proper harmony? And the important thing in finding that harmony is doing it contextually and not by imposing your ideas on the text. Context is king.

So what's the context of 1 Cor 14:34-35? Is this or is this not in the formal assembly of the church? Answer, it is the formal assembly. Notice verse 23, "Therefore *if the whole church assembles together...*" and verse 26, "When you assemble..." and verse 28, "he must keep silent *in the church.*" Women weren't the only ones who had to keep silent in the formal gathering of the church; there are at least five groups in the context that had to remain silent. So up to verse 28 the context is clearly in the church, the formal assembly. And notice verse 34, "The women are to keep silent" where? "*in the churches;* for they are not permitted to speak, but are to subject themselves, just as the Law also says. 35If they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is improper for a woman to speak in church." Verse 35 is given to qualify the issue of what about questions women may have?

And Paul is saying, it's good to have questions ladies, it's good to think theologically, just ask the question of your own husband at home because verse 34, women are not permitted to speak in the church and because verse 35 your husband is the spiritual authority in the home. And if you don't have a husband then you ask one of the elders outside the formal meeting, not a problem. But the general rule is women are to keep silent in the formal assembly. And don't let that bother you ladies, there are at least five groups in chapter 14 that were not permitted to speak in the church either. But our point here is simply to identify whether this is in the formal assembly or not and we have concluded that yes it is. So, Paul's instruction to women is that when the formal assembly is in session, you are not allowed to speak at all, period, but to remain silent and the reason is to show subordination to male leadership in the assembly.

Let's ask the same question of 1 Cor 11:5. What's the context of 1 Cor 11:5? Is this or is this not in the formal assembly of the church? Answer, it is not in the formal assembly. Let's look at the larger previous context and this will be our first line of evidence. What have we been talking about for the last two months? Meat. Eating meat sacrificed to idols in the local pagan temples? Can I do that as a Christian since I know there's no such thing as an idol? And we got Paul's answers. Question: Was the eating of meat an issue in the formal assembly? Absolutely not. Paul was simply talking about eating meat at the pagan temple, at an unbeliever's house as a private guest and at your own home. None of this has to do anything with the formal meeting of the church. So the previous three chapters have not been dealing with the formal assembly.

Second line of evidence, is there any indication around the end of chapter 10 or the beginning of chapter 11 that Paul is now shifting to address the formal assembly? Does he say anywhere, "when you come together" or "when you assemble together?" No, there's nothing. In fact, 10:32 would seem to argue that he has the whole society in view; Jews, Greeks and the Church of God. So the whole city of Corinth is in view and how believers relate to one another and unbelievers out in public life.

Let's turn to the third line of evidence; we've seen the larger previous context has nothing about the formal assembly, we've seen the immediate context has nothing about the formal assembly, now let's look at the following context,

verse 17, and here he's moving to the Lord's Supper and how that is handled. Now is that something in the formal assembly? You bet it is. And look what he says in verse 17, "But in giving this instruction, I do not praise you, because you come together not for the better but for the worse." Now is there any indication there he's talking about the formal assembly? Absolutely, "because you come together," so now we're talking about a formal gathering. And verse 18 another indicator, "For, in the first place, when you come together as a church" or technically, "in church," doesn't that signal that now Paul is addressing the formal assembly? Whereas before he has not been? And add the observation that Paul says in verse 18, "in the first place" indicating a sequence of enumerations. As the leading Greek lexicon says, "not infrequently Paul begins w. *πρωτον μεν* without continuing the series" and cites Rom 1:8; 3:2 and 1 Cor 11:18. So it seems the key to unraveling 1 Cor 11:5 and harmonizing it with 1 Cor 14:34-35 is to understand that Paul is not addressing the formal assembly in 1 Cor 11:5 whereas he is in 1 Cor 14:34-35.

This means that Paul taught that women were not permitted to speak in the formal assembly. Their silence was a tacit recognition of subordination to male leadership in the worship. Therefore I suspect they were not required to wear a head covering during the formal assembly. However, Paul also taught that women were permitted to pray and prophesy in informal gatherings. However, they were not to do so without their heads covered because the removal of the head covering while speaking was an outward display of insubordination to male authority in that culture. Therefore there is no contradiction between 1 Cor 11 and 14.

Now you may not have heard of this approach to the text before but it is held by a number of commentators and Bible students; Holmyard III, Darby, Olshausen, Ellicott, Vine, Beet, Lenski, Grosheide and MacArthur.ⁱ However, the majority approach is that both 1 Cor 11 and 1 Cor 14 are in the formal assembly. Yet if you take that route then you have to try and weave your way around the apparent contradiction. And I'm very aware of many of the ways this has been done. Some of them are creative, others ingenious and still others even convincing. But my point is that none of them are contextual. So let me show you some of them to show you I've been doing my homework. Some people have argued that the praying and the prophesying in 1 Cor 11:5 are done silently and therefore not violating 1 Cor 14:34-35. However, that's

obviously not supported by the context. Why would a woman need to cover her head if she were doing an activity no human or angel could even detect? Others have argued well, maybe Paul is saying they can speak in the church on the condition that they cover their head. But the problem there is that 1 Cor 14:34-35 is a pretty strong prohibition, not only on women speaking in the church but on at least four other groups. And those four other groups can in no way get around their responsibility to remain silent whether they are male or female. So that doesn't seem to fit. Another argument people have made is that Paul is not condoning a woman praying or prophesying in the church but it was happening and in the rare occurrence that it did happen a woman should have her head covered. But this is weak and unconvincing. Another argument is that Paul is saying women can pray and prophesy in the assembly, they just can't teach authoritatively. However, the Greek word group for teach includes authority and it is difficult to see how, if a woman raised her voice in the assembly it would not turn everyone's attention to her and put them in the subordinate role of listening. A more recent argument is that Paul is saying women can't speak in the assembly unless it's an utterance of the Spirit and the praying and prophesying in 1 Cor 11:5 are such. However, all the utterances in 1 Cor 14 are utterances of the Spirit so that argument fails. Another argument is that 1 Cor 14 is simply saying women can't ask questions in church. All these approaches take 1 Cor 11 as the primary passage on Paul's teaching of women and speaking in the church and then try to interpret 1 Cor 14 accordingly. However, the easiest and most straightforward contextual harmonization is to understand that 1 Cor 14:34-35 is in the formal assembly and 1 Cor 11:5 is not! 1 Cor 11:5 rather, is an informal gathering that may draw public interest. And that's the way I'm going to approach the text. I think the main idea in the text is that women are subordinate to men in both formal and informal gatherings and Paul is giving five arguments why this subordination must be recognized.

So now that I've set the stage for these verses notice verse 2. Paul praises them for two things, **Now I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you.** It should be mentioned that this is the first word of praise in the letter since chapter 1. Like Galatians which has no word of praise, 1 Corinthians has very little; the great portion is a rebuke. But here he says, **I praise you** and gives two areas of praise. First, **because you remember me in everything.** The verb **remember** means "to make mention" and

therefore seems to refer to prayer. They made mention of Paul in prayer, they lifted him up in prayer. Secondly Paul says **I praise you because you...hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you.** The noun **traditions**, *paradoseis* refers to the oral teachings of the apostle that were necessary until the NT canon was completed. This was a transitional period of time during which the NT canon was gradually being written and the only NT books available at the time would have been James, the Gospel of Matthew, Galatians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians. So because the NT canon was incomplete and copies of these inspired letters were not yet available to all congregations, oral tradition was important. When the NT canon was complete the oral traditions were included within the canon and there was only one authority, the canon of Scripture. There was no authoritative set of oral tradition growing up along the Bible. So Paul's reference to **the traditions...I delivered to you** is simply a way of referring to his teachings that were not yet written and part of the canon of Scripture.

After these two praises Paul limits the praise by an adversative *de*, indicating he is not praising them in everything, there is something Paul wants them to understand and apparently they do not understand it. The Greek word for **understand** is *eidenai* and refers to applicational knowledge, they do not understand how to apply this doctrine of headship, they understand it theoretically but they do not understand what they are supposed to do with it. So Paul says, **I want you to understand** how to apply the truth that **Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.** Evidently they were not applying it. The women in the Church at Corinth were acting like men. They were not respecting God's plan for male leadership and female subordination to that leadership. Now I don't know why, sure they were overall a licentious group, but maybe they got hold of what Paul wrote to the Galatians where he said, there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, and they took that and ran with it misapplying it to say that there are no distinctions between male or female when that's not what Paul meant. Paul was only talking about how one is justified and sanctified. And in those departments there are no distinctions between male and female. But there are still distinctions in role. And the role of men is to be the leaders; the role of the women is to be subordinate to male authority. Women are not supposed to lead and exert authority. So this is Paul's first argument for head coverings, and we have to understand that in that culture this article of clothing, which

we'll discuss in verse 5, symbolized subordination to male leadership, it was an accepted symbol agreed upon in the culture that meant recognition of male authority. So the first argument for Christian women wearing head coverings in informal gatherings is the Argument of Rank or Headship. And notice the argument in verse 3 is tied back into the Trinity, so if there is rank in the Trinity between the Father and the Son then there is rank in humanity between man and woman.

As far as the chain of command goes, Paul says **Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.** Now you never break the chain of command. A chain of command is very important and God has determined the chain of command. It doesn't matter how you feel, it doesn't matter how I feel, it matters what God says. And God says I am the ranking authority over Christ, Christ is the ranking authority over every man, and the man is the ranking authority over a woman. So then you should understand this; it's not just theory, it's supposed to work out in practice. And that was the problem at Corinth - when these informal gatherings occurred the women were not practicing this, they were acting as if they were the same rank as the men by praying and prophesying without their heads covered. So Paul has praised them, but he has also clearly stated that they don't really understand headship because they are not putting it into practice in these informal gatherings.

Verse 4, **Every man who has *something* on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.** Now the difficulty with many of these verses is mis-translations or questionable translations. You'll notice in this one the word *something* is in italics. That means it's not in the original text. The original text simply says, "Every man who has down from the head," and it's quite strange and you wonder what Paul is referring to, "down from the head," but if we understand it in contrast to verse 5 where we read "every woman who has her head uncovered" we pick up that "down from the head" refers to some kind of cover over the head. So we'd say, **Every man who has a cover on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.** Now a question is what do you mean by **head** Paul? You use it twice in the same verse, **Every man who has a cover on his head and disgraces his head.** Now the first one, **Every man who has a cover on his head** clearly refers to his skull, some kind of covering over his physical head. But then he says, **disgraces his head.** What does Paul mean by **head** here? He could

mean his own skull again, disgraces his skull in that he is making himself into a woman. But, if we go back to verse 3 who is the head of every man? Jesus Christ. And that seems more likely. So if a man covers **his head while praying or prophesying** he **disgraces** Jesus Christ. And we shouldn't disgrace Christ in this way because it's rejecting His authority as the ranking authority over us as men and the chain of command must be respected. Now it says while **praying** or **prophesying** and I take it these were the two main activities going on at these informal gatherings. **Praying** is self explanatory; there are four basic parts of prayer and if you don't have these elements in prayer you want to start thinking about them and add them into your prayer life. First of all praise, which is exalting God for who He is and what He does, His nature, His attributes, secondly, thanksgiving, thanking God for who He is and what He has done in your life and so forth; thirdly, requests, make your requests known to God and fourth, confession, acknowledging to God your sin, where you have violated Him. **Prophesying** is the other thing Paul mentions and this is not self-explanatory. There are three meanings of this word. First of all, it can simply mean to reveal a secret to someone else and that's clearly not the meaning here. Second, it can mean to foretell, to explain to others something about the future, which obviously involves divine revelation. And third, it can mean to proclaim something about the Bible, in a teaching sense, to make something known about God's word. And that's the sense used here. Paul is saying **every man who covers his head while praying or proclaiming something about the Bible disgraces** Jesus Christ.

Notice verse 5, the opposite is not stated when he turns to the exact same scenario but done by a woman. There are a series of contrasts between men and women. Verse 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.** Now a woman whose head was shaved in 1st century Rome was trying to appear as a man. She was rejecting her femininity and blurring the lines between man and woman. And this is apostasy in the Christian church. Women should not try to appear as men, God made women to be women, not to be men and so for a woman to try to look like a man and to blur the lines between man and woman is to reject the doctrine of headship in verse 3, that God is the head of Christ and Christ is the head of every man and man is the head of a woman. So Paul is saying that **every woman who has her head uncovered while praying**

or prophesying disgraces her head. And here we have **head** used twice again. This time it is used first of all of the skull, women were **praying and prophesying** with their skulls **uncovered** and this was disgracing **her head**. Who is **her head**? Go back to verse 3. “The man is the head of a woman.” She was disgracing her man; in this context we’d say the husband. So she was breaking the chain of command, she was disgracing her superior. And if she was disgracing her superior then she was disgracing every superior on up in the chain of command. She was disgracing Christ and God. So there is a chain of command and you don’t break the chain or you are breaking rank.

The logic of Paul as he goes on in the verse is that any woman who has her head uncovered while doing this is no different than a woman whose head is shaved. Now this word **shaved** is *xurao* which comes from *xuron* meaning “a razor.” So I see in verse 5 a woman whose head is completely bald. And Paul’s point is that if a woman engages in praying or prophesying with her head uncovered then she’s no different than a woman who has had her head shaved with a razor, trying to look like a man, a disgraceful thing. She was casting off male authority! She was insubordinate.

Now verse 6 and Paul is going to push the envelope in this argument, then we’ll come back and discuss what the covering was Paul is referring to in verse 5. Verse 6, and this is an explanation of verse 5, why they’re one and the same, **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 is pushing these women to the logical conclusion. **For if**, first class condition, meaning it was a real situation at Corinth, women were not covering their head, so the condition being fulfilled Paul says, **let her also have her hair cut off**; that is, let it be cut short, not bald but very short. The Greek word there is *keirastho* and the best way to take it in this passage is short but not bald. His point is they are equally disgracing conditions, they both disgrace her head, her husband; they break the chain of command. **But if** and here is another 1st class condition, this was the reality at Corinth, **if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved** and it was, then **let her cover her head.** Paul leaves no room for escape; a woman must cover her head. But notice Paul distinguished between a woman with **her hair cut off**, that’s the same word *keirastho* again referring to short hair, not bald but

short, and **her head shaved**, which is with the razor, bald. Now these were both disgraceful, short hair or bald head, they both indicated a woman was trying to be a man. But it's important he distinguishes between short hair and a bald head because it shows you hair is not the covering Paul is referring to in verses 5 and 6. So Paul says, woman, if you don't cover your head you might as well cut your hair short, but if it's a disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut short or to shave her head bald then **let her cover her head**.

Now I take it then, that the head covering in verse 6 cannot be long hair. And I say that because Paul says **if a woman does not cover her head let her also have her hair cut short**. So I am now dispensing of various notions about the covering. The covering cannot be long hair in verse 6; otherwise Paul could not say if she doesn't cover her head let her have her hair cut short. That would make Paul say a woman with long hair must have it cut short. And that is clearly not what Paul is saying. A woman with long hair is wearing her hair the natural way according to verse 14 and 15. So Paul would not tell a woman with long hair to cut it short. Verse 6 must be talking about an external head covering. Now a woman should not cut her hair short or shave her head, it's not according to nature for a woman to do that, and I agree with all that, but that's not what Paul is talking about in verse 6. As far as long hair and short hair are concerned, Paul says in verse 15, "but if a woman has long hair it is a glory to her. For her hair is given to her for a covering." So long hair is a covering of some kind but the very reason she must cover her long hair is implied in that her long hair is her glory. And the woman's glory is to be covered when she is praying and prophesying so that Christ will be glorified. So she must cover her glory, long hair, so that her head, the man is recognized as having ranking authority and since this will glorify Christ who is the head of man. Now, since we have established in verse 6 that long hair is not the woman's head covering for otherwise Paul would not tell her to cut her hair short, and verse 15 is implying that her covering of long hair is her glory, which must be covered for the sake of the husband and Christ's glory, then what is the head covering?

Well, it is not a hat. A hat is a fashion statement and I am not against hats, but that's not what it is. Nor is it a small doily that sits atop a woman's hair like some western women wear. The head covering key is found in the text of verse 6. **For if a woman does not cover her head**, the Greek word

translated here as **cover her head** is *katakaluptetai* and in the middle voice means “to cover herself up,” signifying a part of the clothing was taken up to cover herself. The BDAG Greek Lexicon says, “the covering of the clothes on the head is of such a kind that the whole face seems to be covered as with a mask.” Tom Constable says of the covering, “This was not a stylish hat, skull cap, or inconspicuous doily, as some western women do today, but a shawl that covered her entire head and concealed her hair.” Joachim Jeremias says, “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 [sic] with ribbons and knots, so that her features could not be recognized.”ⁱⁱ And it wasn’t just the Christian women that wore these. David Lowery in the Bible Knowledge Commentary states, “It cannot be unequivocally asserted but the preponderance of evidence points toward the public head covering of women as a universal custom in the first century in both Jewish culture ([apocryphal] 3 Maccabees 4:6; Mishnah, *Ketuboth* 7. 6; Babylonian Talmud, *Ketuboth* 72a-b) and Greco-Roman culture (Plutarch *Moralia* 3. 232c; 4. 267b; Apuleius *The Golden Ass* 11. 10). The nature of the covering varied considerably (Ovid *The Art of Love* 3:135-65), but it was commonly a portion of the outer garment drawn up over the head like a hood.”ⁱⁱⁱ Tom Constable states, “In Paul’s culture most women, Christians and non-Christians alike, wore such a covering whenever they went out in public. Conservative Islamic women still veil themselves when they go out in public.”^{iv}

So, what I’m trying to get you to see is that this was a cultural custom adhered to by Christian and non-Christian women alike, those who commonly rebelled against it were prostitutes and the like. And now Paul is addressing a group of Christian women at Corinth who were throwing off the head covering, perhaps because of their new found freedom in Christ. These women were probably libertarian women who reasoned that if there was neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, that there were no longer any role distinctions between male and female. Paul shuddered at the thought and what this was doing to the Church at Corinth’s reputation with the surrounding culture since the head covering symbolized in that culture subordination to male authority. For Christian women to throw it off would not only be offensive to the Church of God but also to Jews and Greeks, Paul’s audience in 1 Cor 10:32. This would not serve the interests of the gospel well; it would rather hinder the gospel from even getting a hearing. Since Paul instructed us to become all things to all men yet so we might save some, then

when they meet in this informal public assembly they should adhere to the local cultural custom of wearing a head covering so as not to offend anyone unnecessarily and hinder them from coming to Christ.

Now, for a modern question. Should Christian women in such gatherings today wear head coverings? I think not. We have no article of clothing in our culture that communicates subordination to male authority. Even the wedding ring which is commonly stated to be a substitute head covering does not communicate subordination because it is worn by both males and females and not females only. Since we have no agreed upon article of clothing in our culture that communicates subordination to male authority then there's no necessity to wear one. The modern parallel for Christian women would be to let their behavior speak for itself, subordinating themselves to male authority by dressing modestly and honoring their husbands in speech and action, serving them and deferring to them.

If however, and this is an important point to understanding how to apply this passage, if the local church was in Iran and you asked me the same question, I absolutely think the Christian women in that culture should wear a head covering. Why? To not unnecessarily offend and hinder the gospel message. Always the rule of thumb is that if it sends an offensive message to others then you shouldn't do it. As Paul said in 1 Cor. 10:32, "Give no offense either to Jews or to Greeks or to the church of God; 33just as I also please all men in all things, not seeking my own profit but the profit of the many, so that they may be saved." So if it is a culturally accepted custom then follow it so as not to offend. It's no big deal. What is a big deal is people's salvation.

So a direct application of this principle is culture dependent. But the indirect application of subordination to men is not, all Christian women of all time are to subordinate themselves to male authority in the formal assembly, in informal gatherings and in the home.

ⁱ Constable, T. (2003). *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible*. Galaxie Software.

ⁱⁱ Constable, T. (2003). *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (1 Co 11:5). Galaxie Software.

ⁱⁱⁱ Walvoord, J. F., Zuck, R. B., & Dallas Theological Seminary. (1985). *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures* (1 Co 11:5-6). Wheaton, IL: Victor Books.

^{iv} Constable, T. (2003). *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (1 Co 11:5). Galaxie Software.



[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2012