

**1 Cor. 11:<sup>2</sup>3-16:  
A Discussion  
On The Covering**

*Participants :  
Wayne Jackson  
and  
Calvin Wargula*

# Foreward

In 1971 I approached two brethren relative to a written discussion on the covering of 1 Cor.11:2-16. Both men are excellent representatives of their particular position. I don't believe anyone could have done a better job than these two. They approach the issue from a scholarly viewpoint.

The covering issue has "bothered" the church for many years. However, although brethren have stood for their convictions on both sides, this one issue has not been an instrument in dividing the church. We are thankful to God for that.

When this debate was originally planned, I wanted one between two brethren who did not know each other. This was planned to keep down personalities and keep the discussion on the issue. Although the two brethren in question did know each other, they kept personalities out of the discussion. I thank them for that.

Both of these brethren are friends. They have known one another for years. At one time, both held the covering viewpoint. Brother Negative changed his views later. This is another reason that makes this discussion interesting.

We hope and pray that this booklet will be read and studied with an open mind and Bible. If it helps someone who has been troubled over this issue, all our time and efforts have been worthwhile. We appreciate the many hours of study put into this debate by the two brethren who were involved. We are not giving their names here due to our agreement which was originally made. However, if at a later time one or both brethren wish to publish the discussion under their own name, they may.

The Publisher,

*Ray Hawk*

Wayne Jackson

# First Affirmative

I am delighted to enter into this written discussion with my brother in Christ. The proposition we have agreed to discuss is: **RESOLVED: 1 Cor.11:2-16 TEACHES THAT THE CHRISTIAN WOMAN MUST WORSHIP GOD IN THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY WITH AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING UPON HER HEAD IN OUR SOCIETY TODAY.** In many places the study of 1 Cor.11:2-16 has been virtually ignored; it is therefore refreshing that two brethren can agree to study the subject through the medium of debate in a spirit of love and meekness.

Ordinarily, I would first of all define the proposition. I think, however, it is rather self-explanatory; perhaps though, I can clarify a point or two. If my opponent wishes further elaboration, I shall be glad to oblige.

Within the context under consideration, Paul affirms, "Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head...." (verse 5). To my knowledge, it is almost unanimously agreed among Bible scholars that the teaching here enjoined by Paul was to regulate the activities of the church assembled for the purpose of worship. Some have assumed that Paul was merely cautioning Christian women about their "public appearance," i.e., they were to conform to public dress standards and not to violate the decorum of the age. But the truth is, there is not the slightest hint of this in 1 Cor.11:2-16. Paul is concerned with the Christian's appearance when *praying and prophesying*. Praying and prophesying represent the elements of public worship.

The apostle presents six arguments to support his affirmation that the woman must wear a covering (*kalumma* κάλυμμα) when worshipping God. They may be characterized as follows: (1) *Headship*, (2) *Equal to being shaven or shorn*, (3) *Order of creation*, (4) *Angels*, (5) *Nature*, (6) *Universal practice of the churches*. These will now be considered.

## HEADSHIP

The divine order of headship is thus: God, Christ, man, woman. (verse 3). Both God and Christ are over man; he is the image and glory of God, hence, man must worship God *uncovered*, otherwise he dishonors his spiritual head, Christ. Conversely, the woman (the glory of man), when

worshiping bareheaded, shames her head, man. Is it proper that she should so act? Positively not! Hence, let her be covered. It needs to be emphasized at this point that the "covering" here considered is an artificial one put on for the purpose of worshiping and thus should not be confused with her natural covering (*peribolaion*, περιβόλαιον) mentioned in verse 15. Now the question is: has God's divine order of headship become obsolete? Is God *still* the head of Christ, Christ the head of man, and man the head of woman? If not, what changed the relationship? If so, then the teaching based upon this principle still stands and both man and woman should conduct themselves accordingly.

## EQUAL TO SHAVEN

Next Paul uses the argument *ex concessio*, whereby he reasons from a point admitted by those whom he addresses. This is a legitimate means of establishing positive truth. The woman who worships uncovered is "one as if she were shaven." (verse 5) The Greek literally means "of equality." [Joseph Henry Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 4th print., 1965), p.87]. The woman worshiping bareheaded is equal to the shaven woman. It is admittedly shameful for a woman to have her head shaved. Hence, Paul admonishes, "let her be covered." (verse 6) The verb is present tense, middle voice, literally, "let her keep on covering herself." Again it can be stressed, if it is improper for a woman to shave her head in the 20th century, it is improper for her to worship uncovered, for they are equal!

## ORDER OF CREATION

It is next declared that man is not of (*εκ*, *out of*) woman; the reverse is true. Man was created first, the woman second. Notice how this argument goes all the way back to creation, rather than being founded upon some elleged "custom." Neither was man created for the woman, rather, she was fashioned as a help suited for him. (verses 8,9) (Cf. Gen. 2:18) Thus, because woman was created *from* the man and *for* the man, she is subordinate to him, and *for this cause* she ought to worship covered as a sign of her subjection to man. (verse 10) The phrase "for this cause" in verse 10 suggests a conclusion made upon the arguments previously presented. Notice that his reasoning has not been based upon pagan customs but upon the very order of creation. Paul argues similarly in 1 Tim.2:12,13 regarding woman's subordinate position as a teacher. There he prohibits a woman from teaching (delivering a didactic discourse [*Ibid.*, p.144] or exercising authority over the man. He reasons, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve." Since the woman's head-covering and her subordination to man are both tied to the same divine principle, there is no logical reason why she is not either bound to both, or released from both. In other words, if the woman may disregard Paul's argument on the order of creation in 1 Cor.11, and thus cast aside her covering, why may she not also ignore the apostle's reasoning in 1 Tim.2 regarding the order of creation and hence dominate man? This will definitely have to be dealt with, for some brethren are now contending that Paul's instructions regarding the subordination of woman were written in view of the "customs" of that day, hence not applicable today. They are even contending for women preachers and elders! In comparing 1 Cor.11:2-16 with 1 Tim.2, the Gospel Advocate Annual Lesson Commentary for 1964 says, "When these two passages are considered together, it is not difficult to see the reason for the relative positions of man and woman in the public assembly, and why women are required to give a demonstration of their recognition of the difference." (p.255)

## ANGELS

The word "power" (verse 10) is a figure of speech known as metonymy. It stands for the head-covering itself, which is a sign of man's power (authority) over woman. Paul says that the woman is to have ["wear," Thayer, Op. Cit., p.266] this on her head because of the angels. The allusion to angels is admittedly difficult and obscure. Henry Alford contends that the expression "*The angels*, absolute, never means any thing in the N.T. except the holy angels of God." [Henry Alford, New Testament For English Readers, p.1043]. Most commentators believe that the verse suggests the interest that angels have in human conduct in the worship services. But whatever the meaning here, it is perfectly clear that the argument is based upon a *spiritual premise*. And there is no reason for assuming that the same premise, as well as its application, would not be obligatory today. These arguments are much too weighty for the cursory treatment often afforded these verses. We need to think seriously about them!

\* In verses 11 and 12 it is affirmed that even though woman is subordinate to man, she is not inferior. Each sex has its own place in the Christian system and is reciprocally dependent.

## NATURE

The question is asked in verse 13: "Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" The term "comely" "refers to a necessity founded upon the inner fitness of things. (Cf. Heb. 2:10; Matt.3:15) It is better rendered proper." [Wycliffe Bible Commentary, pp. 1247, 1248]. Paul then asks, "Doth not nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." (verse 14 and 15) It is thus demonstrated that "The fact of short hair for men and long hair for women is a divine suggestion in *nature itself* that the man and the woman are to heed in their dress in the assembly." [Ibid.] In other words, the propriety of man being uncovered and woman be-

ing covered in worship to God is very appropriately and naturally illustrated in nature itself. Or as another scholar says, "It is natural to her to have long hair for her covering; she ought, therefore, to add the other head-covering, to show that she does of *her own will* that which *nature* teaches she ought to do, in token of her subjection to man." [Faussett, JFB Bible Commentary, VI, p.314].

## UNIVERSAL PRACTICE OF THE CHURCHES

Having concluded his argumentation based upon the sacred principles presented in the foregoing treaties, Paul closes with one final appeal. If one is inclined to disregard the divine reasons already suggested, and thus to contend against the apostle's words, he must realize that he is not only in violation of apostolic teaching, but in addition, he stands against the practice of the whole church! "If any man seemeth to be contentious (wishes to dispute the matter), we have no such custom (no such practice as violating the foregoing teaching, i.e., women worshiping uncovered), neither the churches of God." (verse 16) This clearly shows that Paul was not merely dealing with a local matter, but was enjoining upon the Corinthians that which was standard practice in all the churches.

W.E. Vine has pointed out that "The injunctions were neither Jewish, which required men to be veiled in prayer, nor Greek, by which men and women were alike unveiled. The Apostle's instructions were 'the commandment of the Lord' (14:37) and were for all the churches (vv.33,34)." [Expository Dictionary Of NT Words, IV, p. 176].

In summing up, may I point out that within 1 Cor.11: 2-16: (1) There is no allusion to the customs of heathenism, rather, the teaching is directly opposed to pagan practices. (2) There is no hint that Paul is merely urging Christian women to refrain from identifying with "loose women" in their dress, as some assert. On the other hand, it is apparent that the requirements are based upon a *spiritual foundation*. As W.E. Vine has said, "This

is no insignificant matter. It may seem small to the natural mind but it comprehends truths of the very highest order." [Commentary On 1st Corinthians, p. 149].

In his summation of the teaching, the scholarly Dr. Lange declared:

"But the Apostle, it will be observed, makes no allusion to the *customs of nations* in the matter, nor is even the mention of them relevant. This, it will be important to observe, since many are inclined to construe his instructions as applicable only to those early times, being fashioned in accordance with customs then prevalent. So far is this, however, from being the case, that he appeals for support, solely to the Divine ordinances in nature, and therefore imparts a lesson which is applicable alike for all times." [John P. Lange, Commentary On 1st Corinthians, p.227].

May I therefore urge both my worthy opponent and every reader of this discussion to consider this matter with the greatest care. If I am wrong, God help me to see it; if not, may I continue to speak the truth in love. (Eph.4:15)

I would like to present the following questions for my opponent's candid consideration. I feel these might help us bring the issue into sharper focus.

1. Do you believe that it would be appropriate for a man to worship with a covering on his head today?
2. Do you feel that had Paul been writing to a Jewish congregation that he would have commanded men to pray with covered heads in conformity with Jewish practice?
3. Do you feel that 1st century women were actually bound by Paul's teaching in 1 Cor.11:2-16? If so, approximately how many generations lapsed before the requirements could be ignored?

4. Do you believe that a Christian woman may have her head with God's approval?
5. Do you believe that 1 Cor.11:14 may be used as a rebuke to the fad of "Hippy-ism" with its characteristicly "long hair"?

Your brother,  
AFFIRMATIVE

Calvin Wazpula

## First Negative

The relationship of social customs and practices to Christian morality is a perennial problem that has troubled many members of the church of Christ. The teaching of 1 Cor.11:2-16 is a prime example.

Some Christian women at Corinth claimed equality with the male sex, overstepped the bounds of propriety, and prayed and prophesied without the customary head covering of females [Jameison, Fausett, and Brown, Commentary On N.T., 1 Cor. 11:3]. These women had thrown off their veils, the symbol of subjection, and had flaunted authority like the heathen priestesses of their day [Albert Barnes, Barnes' Notes On The N.T. (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1962), p.754].

In that oriental society the custom was for all women to wear veils in public [Fred H. Wight, Manners And Customs In Bible Lands (Chicago: Moody Press, 1953), pp. 98-100]. No woman was to be seen outside without a veil [Adam Clarke, Clarke's Commentary (Nashville: Abingdon Press, n.d.), VI, 250]. Barnes adds, "The veil is a token of modesty and of subordination....an emblem....of inferiority of rank and station....to remove that, is to remove the appropriate mark of such subordination, and is a

public act by which she thus shows dishonor to man" [Barnes, Loc. Cit.]. Since only harlots went unveiled [G. G. Findlay, The Expositor's Greek N.T., ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961), II, p.872] to depart from that custom would be to act out of character, and bring disgrace to the husband and scandal to the church.

Paul goes ahead to argue that if a woman is going to disregard her veil she may as well lay aside the other usual indication of her sex and rank in life and have her head shorn or shaven which would put her on the same level as a courtesan [Marvin Vincent, Word Studies In The N.T. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957), III, p.247].

The practice of dress and hair styles in the twentieth century and Western Hemisphere are greatly different from the first century and the oriental world. Today in our society a woman is not considered lewd or disrespectful to her husband if she appears in a public gathering with her hair cut or trimmed and without the oriental veil. "In Western countries a woman's hat has never had any symbolism whatever." [J. W. McGarvey and P. Y. Pendleton, Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans (Cincinnati: Standard, n.d.), p.113].

J. W. Roberts observes, "Throughout the passage the significance of the instruction grows out of the meaning of the veil and the meaning of the woman's being veiled and not being veiled. In a society where being veiled is not 'one and the same thing' with being shorn or shaven, it would seem that the command, 'let her be veiled' would not be binding. Where else would a conditional commandment be binding after the condition became untrue?" [J. W. Roberts, "The Veils In 1 Cor. 11:2-16," Restoration Quarterly, III (Fourth Quarter, 1959), p.198].

Today, a man *removes* his hat as a sign of respect in the presence of a woman, inside a house, to honor the dead, or as the flag passes by. Being bareheaded in today's etiquette indicates *subjection* whereas in the

Graeco-Roman world it was exactly opposite. In our society a man removes his hat in the presence of a woman or in a church assembly because he has honor, reverence, and respect, not because of any power, authority, or superiority he enjoys. [McGarvey, Loc. Cit.]

Paul mentions men to illustrate his principle. His teaching that they were to be uncovered agreed with popular custom. Plutarch said, "It is more customary for women to come forward in a public building covered, and for men uncovered." [14. 11. 267a, quoted by Roberts, Op. Cit. p.190]. Contrary to some commentators, Jewish men in the time of the apostles did not use a tallith (or head covering) in worship. Strack and Billerbeck have amassed the evidence to show that the tallith came into practice in the fourth century A.D. and not in the first [H.L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Meunchen: C.H. Beck, 1922), III. 423 ff., as quoted by Roberts, Op. Cit., p.188]. The same conclusion is reached by Robinson and Plummer [A Critical Commentary On First Corinthians, International Critical Commentary (N.Y.: Scribner's, 1911) p.326 ff.] and Conybeare and Howson (The Life and Epistles of St. Paul (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959), p.402].

Paul appeals to principles of headship, creation, and angels as a basis for his instruction. "These facts support the *fitness of the custom* to divine and natural law and *did not in themselves* establish the law" [Roberts, Op. Cit., p.198]. "Paul teaches the Corinthian women to respect the custom because of its symbolism and because of what the discarding of it symbolizes. The early Christians found the veil in use and were to respect its significance." [Raymond Kelcy, First Corinthians (Austin: R.B. Sweet, 1967), p.51]. Christians should acknowledge those "marks of respect which the customs of the countries where they live have established as expressions of respect." [James Macknight, Apostolic Epistles (Nashville: Gospel Advocate, n.d.), p.179]. Christianity should not "needlessly vary from the national customs of the day." [McGarvey, Op. Cit., p.110. Compare 1 Pet.2:12].

Paul also appeals to that which is "seemly" and that which "nature" teaches. "Seemly" is from πρέπω and means "to be becoming, fit" [J.H. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963), p.535]. A modern dictionary defines "seemly" as "fitting or proper in respect to conventional standards of good or taste; decorous." [Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1961), p.766]. Paul's teaching then is based on the form of decorum customary in the oriental society.

"Nature" is from φύσις and one definition is "a natural feeling of decorum, a native sense of propriety, e.g. in respect to national customs in which one is born and brought up." [Edward Robinson, A Greek and English Lexicon of the N.T. New York, 1850]. Hence this, too, may well refer to the situation of modesty and decorum of the ancient world.

The universal Christian practice of the church (verse 16) was a matter of social decorum and etiquette. "In the light of totally different social customs, we may well hold that the fullest acceptance of the principle underlying this chapter does not require in Western lands in the twentieth century women must always wear hats when they pray." [Leon Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1958), p.156].

The principles of headship, creation, subordination, modesty, and decency are binding upon every generation. However, purely local and temporary applications and historical peculiarities of these principles cannot be required of us in our society. [William Barclay, The Letter to the Corinthians (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), pp. 107-108].

If Paul was living in modern America and writing to the church in Nashville he might well say, "Celebrate the New Year's festivities with sobriety," and "Make your behavior on Independence Day worthy of the gospel," and "Greet each other with a handshake of sincerity." Would

any one dare say Paul would be binding on all future generations (even those two thousand years removed) the specific applications (New Year's, Independence Day, handshake)? Or would Paul merely be binding the principles of conduct? The same applies to the Jewish and oriental customs of the first century such as feet washing, laying on of hands, the holy kiss, and the veil.

This covers every one of my opponent's major points. Here are some questions for him.

1. The Greek word κατακαλύπτω means "that which hangs down," never a mere hat or handkerchief. The Greek word for "hat" is πῖλος and for "handkerchief" σουδάριον, but neither these, nor their derivatives, are used to describe the covering of 1 Cor.11. How can you legitimately substitute a "hat" (*pilos*) for a "veil" (*kalumma*) when you condemn the denominationalists for substituting "pouring" (χέω) or "sprinkling" (ραντίζω) for "baptism" (βαπτίζω)?
2. Both Paul and Peter bound the "holy kiss" (Rom.16:16; 1 Cor.16:20; 2 Cor.13:12; 1 Thess.5:26; 1 Pet.5:14). Both use the imperative mood to stress its necessity. This "kiss" was not a metaphorical or figurative greeting but an actual "touching of the lips." [S.H. Blank, "Kiss," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, p. 39]. Do you bind and practice the apostolic holy kiss as it was practiced in the first century or do you agree that it was a historical peculiarity whose principle only of love and fellowship is still binding?
3. Jesus commanded that we "wash feet" (John 13:14,15) and an enrolled widow must have done so (1 Tim.5:6). In our society, though, fully ninety per cent of the Lord's church have never washed anyone else's feet as Jesus commanded, though they certainly have expressed the humility and service Jesus demanded. Do you bind and practice this same custom in the same way the early church did or is this a historical peculiarity whose

principle only is binding today?

4. What significance or symbolism does a veil (*kalumma*) have in our Western society today? What significance or symbolism does a hat (*pilos*) worn by a woman have in our society today?
5. Would a woman who worships God in the public assembly today without a head covering be just as guilty and worthy of disfellowship as a person or congregation who worships God in the public assembly with instrumental music?

Now to my opponent's questions.

1. *Do you believe that it would be appropriate for a man to worship with a covering on his head today?*  
(1) It would not be appropriate for a man to worship God with a covering on his head in our society today because social etiquette still demands a man remain bare-headed. As McGarvey said, "We today as males worship with uncovered heads in consequence of Paul's instructions, but not for his reasons. It is now an expression of reverence...." [McGarvey, Op. Cit., p. 113].
2. *Do you feel that had Paul been writing to a Jewish congregation that he would have commanded men to pray with covered heads in conformity with Jewish practice?*  
(2) As already shown, Jewish men did not cover their heads in worship at this time. There were Jews in the church at Corinth (1 Cor.10:1,2).
3. *Do you feel that 1st century women were actually bound by Paul's teaching in 1 Cor.11:2-16? If so, approximately how many generations lapsed before the requirements could be ignored?*  
(3) Yes, first century women were actually bound by Paul's teaching. Feet washing and the holy kiss were also bound. When the commands based on social etiquette no longer had any symbolism or significance in society, like feet washing and the holy kiss, then they were no longer

practiced. I might ask my opponent: "How many generations lapsed before the requirements for the veil (*kalumma*) were ignored and the hat or handkerchief took its place?"

4. *Do you believe that a Christian woman may shave her head with God's approval?*  
(4) No, a Christian woman may not shave her head with God's approval because it is a shameful practice today as it was in the first century. However, it is not a shame for a woman today to be "shorn," that is, have her hair cut or trimmed, so long as she does not appear "manish."
5. *Do you believe that 1 Cor.11:14 may be used as a rebuke to the fad of "hippy-ism" with its characteristicly "long hair"?*  
(5) 1 Cor.11:14 may be used to rebuke the fad of "hippy-ism" with its characteristically long hair if the length of the hair is condemned by the custom of society. However, one must keep in mind that hair styles change. Many of our former presidents of the United States and 19th century gospel preachers look somewhat strange to us when we look at their much longer hair and beards (as compared to our socially accepted lengths).

Brother NEGATIVE

## Second Affirmative

I am happy to reply to my brother's article. My opponent's initial mistake is revealed in his first sentence. He makes one gigantic assumption to which he holds throughout the entirety of his article, namely, that 1 Cor.11:2-16 is based upon "social customs and practices." Actually, this is the only thing he can claim, though there is no proof whatever for the assumption. As was

pointed out in my first affirmative, there is not even the slightest allusion to "customs" among the apostle's arguments; he reasons from spiritual premises. Thus, until my brother can show, from the context of 1 Cor.11:2-16, that "social customs" are involved, my affirmative stands untouched!

Brother Negative quotes from several sources as to the proper dress of first century women when appearing in public. That has nothing to do with this discussion. Paul is concerned with how they appear *when worshipping God*. There public decorum is of no consequence here. Paul argued that women must be covered when worshipping God for the following reasons:

- (1) Headship
- (2) Equal to being shorn
- (3) Order of creation
- (4) Angels
- (5) Nature
- (6) Universal church practice

I wish that my opponent had seen fit to examine these arguments individually and thus show how each was related to "custom." This he did not do. But let us review his article in detail.

Our brother alludes to Paul's arguments based upon headship, creation, and angels, and acknowledges that these serve as a basis for the apostle's instruction. And yet, he quotes J. W. Roberts that "these facts support the fitness of the custom to divine and natural law and did not in themselves establish the law." It is true that these principles did not in themselves establish the law; *Paul, an inspired apostle, established the law*, and facts he introduces support that law.

I pointed out that the woman who worships with an uncovered head is equal to a woman with her head shaved and such practice is shameful, or a "moral indecency." [F. Godet, 1st Corinthians, II, p.119].

My opponent replies that:

- (a) Paul did not want the woman to be on the same level with a prostitute,
- (b) Hair styles (being shaven or shorn) are now different from Paul's day,
- (c) In our society where being shaven is not equal to being unveiled, Paul's command would not be binding.

My reply:

- (a) In the first place, there is no allusion to prostitutes in 1 Cor.11:2-16. Secondly, "There is no evidence for the statement of some commentators that prostitutes in Greece shaved their heads." [Richard Kugelmann, Jerome Bible Commentary, p.270].
- (b) The reason hair styles are now different is because many have disregarded Paul's teaching.
- (c) C. K. Barrett says that it is "necessary to ask the question whether Paul is here simply dependent on custom, so that 'in communities where it is no longer a disgrace for a woman to be "shorn," the argument has lost its point.' This is probably not so; Paul thinks that *nature* (see verse 14) expects a woman to be covered, so that for her to be uncovered is not only an offence against custom but also an unnatural act." [C. K. Barrett, The First Epistle To The Corinthians, p.251].  
Further, when Paul says that the woman's hair is given  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$  her for a covering ( $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ ), his verb is in the perfect tense, suggesting that her long hair is to be her *permanent* covering. Hence, her permanent covering (long hair) will be a *permanent argument* for veiling in worship, for they are "equal."

In my first article, I emphasized that Paul argues for the covering on the grounds that man was created first, woman second. And for the same reason the apostle limits a woman's "teaching" and "authority" in 1 Tim.2:12, 13. I reasoned, - if the woman may disregard Paul's teaching on the order of creation in 1 Cor.11, and thus

cast aside her covering, why may she not do the same regarding 1 Tim.2, and hence dominate man? In spite of the fact that the argument took fully one third of a page, my opponent completely ignored it! He cites William Barclay to the effect that "local and temporary" applications and "historical peculiarities" are not required of us. Barclay makes the same assertion of 1 Tim.2. He says, "This is a passage which cannot be read out of its historical context....All the things in this chapter are mere temporary regulations laid down to meet a given situation." [William Barclay, Letters To Timothy, Titus and Philemon, pp.76,78]. Actually, Barclay is more consistent than my opponent; he dismisses Paul on both counts. Brother Negative, we would like to have you comment on this.

My brother amuses me when he quotes Webster on "seemly" (verse 13) to the effect that "conventional standards" are suggested by the term. Webster also defines baptism as "sprinkle." The word *prepo* is found some seven times in the N.T. and is never used of "conventional standards." (See quote in first article.) Also Edward Robinson's statement about φύσις (nature, verse 14) being in "respect to national customs," *was not a part of his definition*; it was his personal comment as an interpreter. Brother Negative knows better than to represent that as *definition*. One of Vine's definitions for φύσις is "the regular law or order of nature." [Vine, Exp. Dict., III, p.103].

My opponent contends that "The universal Christian practice of the church (verse 16) was a matter of social decorum and etiquette." That is just not so. In fact, Paul's admonitions were contrary to the customs then prevalent. Note: Paul's teaching was against JEWISH practice wherein men worshiped covered. [Vine, Lightfoot, Edersheim etc.]. My opponent denies this but consider his witnesses.

(1) Strack and Billerbeck admit that Jewish men used a tallith when "under some kind of curse or affliction." [W.F. Howard, Abingdon Bible Commentary, p.1185].

(2) Robertson says the matter is "uncertain." [Robertson,

Word Pictures, IV, p.159]. And Conybeare and Howson deny the usage of the tallith only when the Jew was "officiating" in worship. Secondly, Paul's teaching was against GREEK practice. "It used to be asserted by theologians that Paul was simply endorsing the unwritten law of Hellenic and Hellenistic feeling for what was proper. But this view is untenable." [A. Oepke, Kittel's Theological Dictionary Of The N.T., III, p.562]. Oepke even refutes the exact quotation of Plutarch used by my opponent, pointing out that Plutarch alluded to Roman custom about which he was probably ill-informed. He says "it is quite wrong that Greek women were under some kind of compulsion to wear a veil in public." [Ibid.] Greek women worshiped bareheaded. [Robertson, Op. Cit., p.159]. Finally, Paul's instruction was contrary to ROMAN practice. "Veiling was customary among the Romans at sacrifices,....but this did not apply to the Greeks. In neither case was there any distinction of sexes. Hence Paul was not thinking of these customs." [Oepke, Op. Cit., p.562fn.]. Summing up we note: There was a universal, standard practice of veil wearing among Christians. But there was no standard, customary practice among the pagans in this regard. Hence, Paul's teaching was not based on custom, but was the command of the Lord. (1 Cor.14:37)

Now let me consider brother Negative's answers to my questions.

1. *Do you believe that it would be appropriate for a man to worship with a covering on his head today?*

(1) He contends that a man should not now worship covered because of custom, however, this logically means that if enough men would go ahead and do it anyway, it eventually would become all right!

2. *Do you feel that had Paul been writing to a Jewish congregation that he would have commanded men to pray with covered heads in conformity with Jewish practice?*

(2) Dealt with above.

3. *Do you feel that 1st century women were actually bound*

by Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. 11:2-16? If so, approximately how many generations lapsed before the requirements could be ignored?

(3) a. He says first century women were bound by Paul's teaching here. Those who violated it sinned; but after enough martyrs established the practice, it became right.

b. Since I believe that the covering (*kalumma*) required by Paul is still required today, my opponent has no parallel.

4. Do you believe that a Christian woman may shave her head with God's approval?

(4) He does not believe a woman may shave her head, but he believes that if it becomes fashionable (as a recent style expert predicted it will), such will not be wrong, and accordingly (5) men could grow their hair as long as woman's. In fact, this is the style in places now. [Look Magazine, Feb. 18, 1969, p. 53]. And where "Hippy-ism" is the vogue, my opponent cannot oppose it.

#### ANSWERS TO BROTHER NEGATIVE'S QUESTIONS

1. The Greek word κατακαλύπτω means "that which hangs down," never a mere hat or handkerchief. The Greek word for "hat" is πιλός and for "handkerchief" σουδάριον, but neither these nor their derivatives, are used to describe the covering of 1 Cor. 11. How can you legitimately substitute a "hat" πιλός for a "veil" κάλυμμα when you condemn the denominationalists for substituting "pouring" χέω or "sprinkling" ραντίζω for "baptism" βαπτίζω?

(1) The proposition states that the Christian woman is to wear an "artificial covering" when worshiping in the church assembly. As far as this proposition goes, I am under no obligation to prove any style of covering is obligatory. First we must determine if anything is required. It is superfluous to argue the mode of baptism if the command is unessential in the first place. However, I deny that a *kalumma* must necessarily involve something that "hangs down." But let me ask our brother this. If 1 Cor. 11 deals exclusively with a covering that "hangs down," could a man worship wearing a hat, since it does

not "hang down"? We will be waiting to hear about that.

2. Both Paul and Peter bound the "holy kiss" (Rom. 16:16; 1 Cor. 16:20; 2 Cor. 13:12; 1 Thess. 5:26; 1 Pet. 5:14). Both use the imperative mood to stress its necessity. This "kiss" was not a metaphorical or figurative greeting but an actual "touching of the lips." [S.H. Blank, "Kiss," Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, p. 39]. Do you bind and practice the apostolic holy kiss as it was practiced in the first century or do you agree that it was a historical peculiarity whose principle only of love and fellowship is still binding?

(2) The kiss of greeting was not bound upon the early church. The imperatives regarding this were concerning its proper practice. It was to be a holy kiss (not a lustful one) and a kiss of love (not one of treachery). (Rom. 16:16; 1 Pet. 5:14, etc.) "It should be noted that the apostle did not enjoin kissing as a method of greeting; the custom already prevailed. His words were designed to insure that the custom would be observed in keeping with the morality and chastity characteristic of the high calling of Christianity." [Guy N. Woods, Commentary On Peter, John and Jude, (Nashville: Gospel Advocate Company, 1960), p. 136].

3. Jesus commanded that we "wash feet" (John 13:14, 15) and an enrolled widow must have done so (1 Tim. 5:6). In our society, though, fully ninety percent of the Lord's church have never washed anyone else's feet as Jesus commanded, though they certainly have expressed the humility and service Jesus demanded. Do you bind and practice this same custom in the same way the early church did or is this a historical peculiarity whose principle only is binding today?

(3) I am amazed that my opponent says that Jesus commanded "that we 'wash feet'." He contends that the early church bound and practiced this. I have debated the "holiness" on feet-washing, but I never expected to have to meet one of my brethren on the subject. I am ready to sign another proposition with my opponent denying that the

early church was obligated to practice foot-washing. Brother Negative, you do not have a parallel there and you know it. The truth of the matter is, the early church was commanded to practice the teaching of 1 Cor.11:2-16. But it was commanded neither to kiss or wash feet, hence no parallel exists.

4. *What significance or symbolism does a veil (kalumma) have in our Western society today? What significance or symbolism does a hat (pilos) worn by a woman have in our society today?*

(4) The covering has the same significance today as it had in the first century by those who are familiar with 1 Cor.11:2-16. Immersion has little meaning today to some.

5. *Would a woman who worships God in the public assembly today without a head covering be just as guilty and worthy of disfellowship as a person or congregation who worships God in the public assembly with instrumental music?*

(5) No. I think it is a matter of spiritual knowledge and growth. I would not advocate disfellowship from a woman who refused to sing; I would be patient and endeavor to teach her. But brother Negative believes a man ought not to worship covered. Would he advocate disfellowship from one who did? He claims a woman's hair ought not to be "mannish." Would he disfellowship one who was man-nishly shorn? Tell us about that, brother.

Our brother tries to parallel 1 Cor.11 with certain American traditions. It will not work. Can you imagine Paul saying, "Celebrate New Year's Day because God is the head of Christ, etc." Or, "Observe Independence Day because man was not created for woman but woman for man." Or, perhaps, "Greet one another with a handshake because of angels." As I have repeatedly stressed, the divine reasons suggested within this context are much too weighty to simply be relating to pagan customs. As Godet pointed out, Paul's reasons for woman's head-covering "have not changed to this hour, so that it must be said either that the apostle was wholly wrong in his reasoning, or that his

reasons, if they were true for his time, are still so for ours, and will be so to the end." [Godet, Op. Cit., p.133]

The position advanced by the affirmative is the safe position beyond all question. Brother Negative's position is the questionable one. No one contends that the woman who worships covered is doing wrong; there is, however, considerable question on the other side. Read these articles again closely. And now, consider brother Negative's second reply.

Your brother,  
AFFIRMATIVE

## Second Negative

The issue in this discussion boils down to this one point: Are Paul's teachings in 1 Cor.11:2-16 newly created Christian doctrine based entirely on spiritual premises with out regard to social decorum and modesty? Or, do Paul's teachings on the wearing of the veil take their root in the Graeco-Roman-Oriental world and its standards of decorum and modesty with Paul requiring the practice of social customs of that day because they support the divine order and spiritual subordination of male and female? It is my thesis that this second alternative is the truth.

### CONSIDER THE BACKGROUND OF THE VEIL

All the authorities agree that no respectable woman in the eastern world went outside in public without a veil. If she did, she would automatically be judged to be a lewd woman of loose character. [See Marcus Dods, "The First Epistle To The Corinthians," The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), V, 679; H.A.W. Meyer, A Critical And Exegetical Handbook To

The Epistle To The Corinthians, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879), I, 321; A. P. Stanley, The Epistles Of Paul To The Corinthians, (London: John Murray, 1876), p. 179; Jean Hering, The First Epistle Of St. Paul To The Corinthians, (London: Epworth, 1962), p. 105].

My brother made reference to Oepke but did not quote him fully. ["Kalupto," Theological Dictionary Of The N.T., ed. by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965), III, 556-592]. Oepke says the general meaning of *kalupto* is "to conceal" or "to cover" and quotes Plutarch and Proclus on the "prying removal of the veil" of the goddess Isis-Athene was a "violation of her virginity" (pp. 556-557, 559). Philo allegorically says "virtue veils itself....like Tamar at the crossroads (Gen.38:14f) in order that curious wayfarers may see her virgin beauty when she unveils it" (*anakalupsantes*) Congre. 124. This clearly shows the *kaluma* to be a veil, not a small hat or headband. Oepke affirms that "the veiling of women is a custom in Israel" (p.561). It is true that Paul "was not ~~think~~ing of the customs" of the Greeks and Romans in *sacrificing* because there was "no distinction of sexes," but in *daily life* and *social concourse* there was a distinction of sexes and the church assemblies would come under this *public decorum*. (See II below). Plutarch said men normally go about uncovered in public and women covered (as quoted in my first negative), and Oepke arbitrarily says Plutarch "may not have been too well-informed." Where is the *evidence* to justify Oepke's judgment and set aside Plutarch's testimony? He further argues from silence and Jewish history two hundred years later in North Africa. Oepke believes the "veil was oriental rather than distinctively Jewish" and cites the Middle Assyrian Law Code which says women and widows must be veiled in public places and harlots unveiled [See J. B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts, (Princeton: University Press, 1950), p.183b, par.40]. Oepke concludes, "Paul is thus attempting to introduce into congregations on Greek soil a custom which corresponds to oriental and especially Jewish sensibility rather than Greek." (p.563). Thus Oepke clearly shows the practice to be a custom of that age.

## QUESTIONS FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE

1. Do you agree that respectable Jewish and Grecian women wore veils in public?
2. Do you agree that lewd women went unveiled in public?
3. Do you agree that the veil was a symbol of subordination in the first century?
4. Do you agree that courtesans were shorn or shaven as marks of character and/or punishment for their sins?
5. Did Paul find the veil already in use or did he create the practice?
6. Is every perfect tense in the N. T. a permanent argument for the permanent existence of a certain practice?
7. Are there any situations or practices of the first century church that you would describe as historical peculiarities that are not binding on us in the twentieth century?

### II. WHY DOES PAUL SPECIFY THE VEIL WHILE "PRAYING AND PROPHECYING"?

The specific application of the woman being veiled while in worship is because this is where the problem was occurring! The Corinthian women thought that Christ gave them freedom from social propriety while in a spiritual service [Barnes, Loc. Cit., Jameison, Fausett, and Brown, Loc. Cit.; and Dods Op. Cit., pp. 679-681]. Grosheide states, "The point of the apostle is that a woman must conduct herself in praying and prophesying as she always would when appearing in public" [F. W. Grosheide, Commentary On The First Epistle To The Corinthians, N.I.C. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1955), pp. 252-254]. Further, "that which a woman is obliged to do under different circumstances, she must do also when she worships" (p.254). Stanley says the **problem** existed because of the "abandonment of the usual Grecian

head-dress by the Corinthian women, when they met in Christian assemblies" (Op. Cit., p. 179). Hering sums up Paul's teaching: "Do not come before God in a way considered elsewhere as indecent" (Op. Cit., p. 109).

The arguments used by Paul are not based on office or capacity but creation and subordination and the socially accepted marks of such and apply to social and common life, as well as religious assemblies. If this is the case and the first century marks of subordination are still binding, then the specific applications of the veil are binding in *all social and common life*, as well as religious, just like *they were in the first century!* If this is not the case, then

1. A woman who is shorn outside the worship service (v.6) is not shamed until worship time begins, and
2. Men could have long hair as long as they were not in the worship services!

### III. DEFINITIONS AND ARGUMENTS CLARIFIED

A. Did Jewish men worship covered? Strack-Billerbeck, Robertson-Plummer, and Conybeare-Howson, as well as others, say they did not in the first century! My brother partially quoted W. F. Howard. Note his full statement: "Strack and Billerbeck show that in the N.T. period there was no obligation for men to pray with covered head, except when under some kind of curse or affliction" ["1 Corinthians," The Abingdon Bible Commentary, ed. by F.C. Eiselen, E. Lewis, and D.G. Downey (N.Y.: Abingdon, 1929) p. 1186]. My brother quotes Robertson and Conybeare-Howson who either refute the idea or stress its uncertainty! If the tallith was in use then, are the commentators right who say Jesus used the long shawl over his head when he read in the synagogue in Lk.4:16-21? If this is so, then did Jesus violate the "nature" of 1 Cor.11:14 as understood by my opponent?

B. What is "seemly" of 11:13? I quoted Thayer on *prepo* and Webster on "seemly." My brother is amused because Web-

ster gives "baptism" as "sprinkling." After the Greek-English Lexicon defines "baptism" as "immersion" then an English dictionary must define "immersion." This is exactly what I did with *prepo*. Every Greek word in the Greek N.T. must be defined with a Greek-English Lexicon and the English definition defined with an English dictionary. Grosheide says *prepo* means "what everybody

thinks" (Op. Cit., p.255) and Charles Hodge, "becoming or decorous" [Commentary On The First Epistle To The Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 213]. It has never been required by any western society that a woman worship veiled in order to be "becoming, proper, fitting"! My opponent, in answer to my question # 4, tacitly admits that a woman's headdress has no significance for our society. That in itself is the appropriate answer to "Is it seemly?"

C. What is "nature" of 11:15? Kugelman says it is "conventional concepts of what is proper" [The First Letter To The Corinthians, The Jerome Bible Commentary (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968), p. 270]. Meyer says it is "the native, inborn sense and perception of what is seemly. This instinctive consciousness of propriety had been established by *custom and had become phusis*" (Op. Cit., p. 329). Hodge points out, "The instinctive sense of propriety in an eastern maiden prompts her, when suprised by strangers, to cover her face. In an European it would not produce that effect." (Op. Cit., p.213). This shows the veil to be relevant only to eastern societies. If "nature" always means the "objective creation of things" then what does that imply in Eph.2:3 and Rom.2:14?

D. What is the veil? All the authorities say the veil was a "mantle, hood, or shawl" which covered the whole head, neck, ears, and sometimes part of the face and upper body [Hering, Op. Cit., p. 109; Hodge, Op. Cit., p. 209; T.T. Shore, "The First Epistle To The Corinthians," Ellicott's Commentary On The Whole Bible, ed. C. J. Ellicott (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, n. d.), VII 328; "Kalumma," "Kalupto," "Katakalupto," as defined in A Greek-English Lexicon Of The N.T. And Other Early Christian Literature by W.F.

Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Cambridge: University Press, 1957), pp. 401-402, 412; plus Barrett and Oepke quoted above]. The drawings of the veil of antiquity show it to be much more than a small hat or headband [See James Yates, "Peplum," Dictionary Of Greek And Roman Antiquities, ed. William Smith (London: John Murray, 1866), p. 885]. A fresco in the catacomb of Callixtus in Rome shows a Christian woman praying with her head veiled, not with just a small hat. [See a picture of it in Michael Avi-Yonah and Emil G. Kraeling, Our Living Bible (N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 345].

My opponent refused to answer question # 1 in my first negative (see page 9). He cannot answer it and be consistent! He says it is "irrelevant" and compares it to the purpose of baptism. Yet it is a fact that Alexander Campbell learned the *purpose* of baptism while studying for the debate with Walker on the *design* of baptism. If my opponent would face the truth as to the design of the veil he would arrive at the purpose of the veil! No man sincerely seeking the truth and confident in his position is afraid to examine any inquiry. Will he answer question # 1?

Since my opponent believes the *kalumma* (veil) is still required, then he must,

1. Show us how the modern hat can meet the requirements for a veil,
  2. Where it is so defined in history and antiquity, and
  3. That in the first century the modern woman's hat or headband would have sufficed to meet the demands of Paul.
- E. Why was it a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven? Plutarch says that Greek women cut their hair as a sign of mourning (Quaestiones-Romanae 14; cf. Deut. 21:12). Lucian says women with shaved heads were held in great contempt (Dialogue To The Courtesans, V 13; Drapetai, 27). It was punishment among the Jews to compel a woman to remove her hair (Num.5:18). Weiss says that women who

were guilty of unnatural prostitution wore their hair short (Quoted by Grosheide, Op. Cit., p. 245 n.5). The loss of hair, in Greece as well as in Judaea, was considered as a special mark of infamy to women (Aristopanes, Thesmophoriazusae, 838). A shorn head was a sign of disgrace indicating a woman was an adulteress (Meyer, Op. Cit., p. 321).

In our society it is not a mark of an adulteress, slave, mourner, or harlot for a woman to have her hair trimmed or cut decently. Therefore, the conditional commandment "let her be veiled" (v.6) no longer applies because the condition ("if it be a shame") has become untrue!

#### IV. THE HOLY KISS AND FEET WASHING

By what hermeneutic did my brother ever arrive at the conclusion that the kiss was not binding in the first century when Paul and Peter five times command "*Salute one another with a kiss of love*" (1 Pet.5:14, et. al.) The same logic, reasoning, and history by which my brother says that the *kiss* itself is not binding is the same logic that demands that the *veil* itself is not binding! Every argument my brother makes against the *kiss* can be made against the *veil*! Woods is correct when he says the kiss was a method of greeting already in use in apostolic times and the church used it as a form of social greeting; but note the parallel: The veil was a method of subordination already in use in apostolic times and the church used it to demonstrate that subordination.

On feet washing Jesus said, "You also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an *example* that you should *do* as I have done to you" (John 13:14,15). This clearly shows that Jesus adopted the common social hospitality of the day and demanded that his disciples practice it as it was needed in that sandal-wearing society. Would my brother enroll a widow who has never "washed the saints feet" as Paul required? (1 Tim.5:6). The same logic that shows that the social hospitality of feet washing is not required today shows that the social decorum of the veil is

not required today!

As to 1 Tim.2:11,12, here Paul teaches the *subordination* that is the very principle behind 1 Cor.11:2-16. The function and capacity of women are limited by the creation and the fall of man. In 1 Cor.11:2-16 Paul deals with precedent (v.16), moral indecency (v.6), propriety (v.13), and general consciousness (v.14) as arguments for the veil. These may change with each particular expression of subordination (as the veil) but the subordination itself as a principle never changes. The subordination, as taught in 1 Tim. has always been true since creation and bound by God in all times. Yet the veil of the first century was not generally practiced by the ancient Hebrews. If my brother's views of "seemly," "shame," "nature," and the permanence of the veil are correct, then the veil would have of necessity been binding throughout all the ancient history of the O.T.

BROTHER NEGATIVE

## Third Affirmation

My opponent is right about one thing; this whole discussion does boil down to one point. Is the teaching of 1 Cor.11:2-16 based upon "spiritual premises without regard to social decorum," or is the apostle merely dealing with the "social customs of that day"? Brother Negative assumes the latter. The reader must determine which of us has more nearly based our arguments upon the biblical text itself.

Our opponent once again treats us to an ostentatious array of quotations which are singularly unimpressive since they are not germane to the issue discussed in 1 Cor.11. Brother Negative, there is no virtue in profuse documentation *per se*. As I have said before, the issue is not the *public habits* of ancient women, but rather, how Christian

women were to appear when *worshipping God*. Any quotation not pertaining to this point is totally irrelevant! Paul's instructions regarding the wearing of the head-covering when *worshipping God* fits no ancient custom *concerning worship*. I quoted scholars to show that Paul's admonitions harmonized with neither Jewish, Greek or Roman religious customs. Alfred Edersheim, himself a Jew, says, "...the pious Jew would cover in prayer his head with this mysterious fringed garment;" (Jewish Social Life, p.220). (I demonstrated that the quotations of my friend to the contrary were inconclusive). Findlay shows that "Amongst the Greeks both sexes worshiped with *uncovered* head, although women covered their heads at other times (Plato, Phaedo, 89 B.C.), while Roman men and women alike *covered* their heads during religious rites (Servius ad AEn., iii., 407)." (Expositor's Greek Testament, II, pp. 872, 873). My quotation from A. Oepke is still valid for it dealt with *worship*.

However, if Paul was simply teaching Christians to conform to social custom, as my opponent contends, then:

1. Why did not Paul instruct the Christian woman to *stay out of the public*, for Greek women rarely appeared in public since this was conducive to a bad reputation? (Vincent's Word Studies, II, pp. 246, 247).
2. Why did he instruct the man to be *uncovered* when the man of the Graeco-Roman culture could wear a hat in public without any reproach? (H.E. Dana, The New Testament World, p. 225).
3. Why must a woman be covered when worshipping since:
  - (a) worship was often conducted in private homes (Rom.16:3-5; 1 Cor.16:19; Col.4:15; Philemon 2) and
  - (b) ancient women were not required to be veiled within a private dwelling?

Brother Negative is still contending that "seemly" (*prepo*) in verse 13, ties this context to social customs. Jesus was baptized in order to do that which was *seemly*.

"....it becometh (*prepon*) us to fulfill all righteousness." (Matt.3:15). Brother Negative, was Jesus baptized because such was in harmony with Jehovah's will, or merely to conform to popular *custom*? This example also shows that something can be "seemly" and yet not binding throughout "all the ancient history of the O.T." Hence, it may be "seemly" for a woman to worship covered in the N. T. age, while such was not binding in the O.T. period.

My opponent poses some questions (please re-read them). Questions 1 thru 4 are not relevant to this discussion. I couldn't care less whether ancient women wore "toe-sacks" on their heads in public, or whether prostitutes went nude! Our study deals with "praying and prophesying." 5. The wearing of the covering as a worship regulation is a N.T. institution. 6. Dealt with later. 7. All *specific* commands bound upon early Christians are bound upon us today.

But what is the covering? My opponent insists that I am under obligation to affirm some *size* of a covering, and I deny it. The proposition doesn't involve that and he knows it. If the text demanded a covering to the ground, we would be obligated to so teach. But brother Negative speciously reasons: the covering of 1 Cor.11 is one that hangs down and covers the whole head; but such would be inappropriate in our Western culture, hence Paul's teaching is not binding. Would he thus argue: Baptism is immersion; but such is inconvenient in cold climates, hence baptism is nonessential! Such logic!

However, for the sake of the record, consider the following.

1. The Christian woman was to be covered (*katakalupto*) with a covering (*kalumma*) when worshiping God. The verb *katakalupto* literally means "cover down." It does not necessarily mean a covering "hanging down from the head," but may mean "down on" the head. "Hering takes kata to mean not 'coming down from,' but 'coming down upon' - thus with a head-covering'." (C. K. Barrett, First Epistle To The Corinthians, p. 250). If, however, *kata-*

*kalupto* requires a covering that "hangs down," may a man properly worship wearing a hat, since such doesn't hang down? I asked brother Negative that last time and he ignored it. Now, dear brother, as you have so wisely declared: "No man sincerely seeking the truth and confident in his position is afraid to examine any inquiry," will you answer the question???

2. T.W. Davies points out that the Hebrew term *masveh* (*kalumma* - LXX) is a "general" term and should not be translated "veil." Other words denote veils in the strict sense. (Hastings' Dictionary Of The Bible, IV, p. 848).
3. W.E. Vine did not feel that a *kalumma* was of specific design as he said, "Whatever the character of the covering, it is to be on her head as 'a sign of authority'...." (Expository Dictionary, IV, p. 175).
4. *Kalumma* may denote *armour* or *shield* used in battle (1 Maccabees 4:6; 6:2), or a *skull* (as the brain's covering), Nic. Th. 906., the covering of the gills of fishes, Arist. HA 505 92, *sheathing planks* for a roof, Inscriptions Graecae 2<sup>2</sup> 1668. 57. (See Liddell & Scott, Greek Lexicon, p. 871).
5. There was a controversy over the size of the covering in the second century; Tertullian contended that the veil must come down at least to the top of the dress. However, as Smith and Cheetham point out, "Tertullian's rigorous views were not those of the Church at large; as a general rule Christian women have worn the head-dresses of their country and station, and have covered their heads in the place of assembly." (William Smith and Samuel Cheetham, A Dictionary Of Christian Antiquities, Vol. I, p. 761). In conclusion, it is admitted that women of the first century may often have worn a *kalumma* which hung down, but that such is *demanded* by the term, we deny.

Brother Negative wants to know, "Why was it a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven"? He then cites Plutarch,

Lucian, etc. in answer to his query. Why not just accept PAUL as the authority? It was a shame because Paul, by the Spirit, said it was! When baptism was commanded of Cornelius (Acts 10:48), he did not demand a discourse on the historical significance of "ceremonial washings." He meekly submitted to the divine command. Brother Negative says, "the conditional commandment 'let her be veiled' (v.6) no longer applies because the condition ('if it be a shame') has become untrue!" Which means conversely, as long as the condition "if it be a shame" remains true, the commandment "let her be veiled" will still be binding. Now watch this. As long as it is a shame for a woman to be *shaven* OR *shorn*, she must worship covered. This my opponent has admitted. However, in his first speech he forthrightly declared that for a Christian woman to be shaven today would be as shameful as for the first century woman. (1st Negative speech final paragraph, p. 10). Thus, according to brother Negative's own logic, the covering is still binding today. It will be interesting to see how he tries to get out of this one!

Again, I emphatically deny that "kissing" was a first century command for Christians. (See my former speech). If the early Christians were given a *specific* command, i.e., to kiss, it would still be binding today. My opponent contends that they were given such a *specific* command, but the "handshake" may be substituted today. How many other specific commands have present-day substitutions? May "play" be substituted for "sing"? And in John 13, Jesus was not commanding feet washing as an act to be performed. This is evident from Jesus' statement, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter," (v.7) and his subsequent question, "Know ye what I have done to you?" (v.12). They knew he had been literally washing feet, but this was not his point. He was teaching an object lesson in humility. But apparently brother Negative "knoweth not" what he did either! Also, *humble service* is the qualification in 1 Tim. 5:10, not the literal washing of feet. Brother Negative is simply grasping for some parallel to 1 Cor.11 whereby he may dismiss it.

In my first affirmative, I demonstrated that the apostle Paul introduced six arguments to back up *his inspired instructions* that a woman ought to worship with a covering on her head.

1. HEADSHIP - Woman is to wear the covering because she is subordinate to man; he is her head. This divine order has not changed (my opponent admits). The command to be covered is thus still applicable. To express it logically,
  - a. If man is woman's head, she should be covered.
  - b. But he is her head.
  - c. Therefore, she should be covered.
  
2. EQUAL TO SHAVEN -
  - a. Worshiping uncovered is equal to being shaven.
  - b. It is improper for a woman to be shaven (even today, says brother Negative).
  - c. Therefore, it is improper for a woman to worship uncovered. I pointed out this will always be the case since woman's long hair was given to her as a permanent covering, as indicated by the perfect tense in v. 15. But he asks if the perfect tense is always used to suggest permanency? I am not obligated to discourse on the general use of the perfect tense in the whole N.T. You just deal with this particular argument, brother Opponent. In discussing the perfect tense, G. B. Winer says of 1 Cor.11:5 that woman has her long hair "by permanent arrangement of nature." (Grammar Of The Greek New Testament, p.339). (See also Robertson's Word Pictures and Expositor's Greek Testament). Thus, a woman's permanently given long hair serves as a permanent argument for being covered in worship.

Again, it was emphasized, and this was argument,

3. Paul in 1 Cor.11:8,9 and in 1 Tim.2:12,13, reasons from the ORDER OF CREATION that women are subordinate to men

and this subordination must be demonstrated in the wearing of the covering. Brother Negative finally did refer to this but erroneously assumed that since woman had been subordinate since creation, this would imply a covering-obligation from the beginning. Not so. Our brother fails to recognize that a *principle may exist* long before a *specific application* of it is required. After the work of creation, God rested on the Sabbath; that day was not required as a holy day, however, until Sinai, hundreds of years later. (Neh.9:13,14). The principle of living *by faith* has been incumbent upon man since creation, but certainly the N. T. has specific regulations for demonstrating this that were not binding upon previous ages.

- . Because of ANGELS a woman should worship with a covering which is a *symbol* of man's authority over her. Our opponent's position is that the symbol may be dispensed with as long as the principle is entertained. Might one dispense with the Lord's supper, the symbols of Christ's body and blood, as long as the principle is kept in mind? Also, if angels still have an interest in the affairs of Christians (1 Cor.4:9; 1 Tim.5:21; Heb.1:14), the "sign of authority" should be retained.
- . Paul introduces NATURE as a corroborative argument. Nature *per se* would not establish the practice, but it does back up and harmonize with Paul's *inspired* injunctions. And finally,
- i. The UNIVERSAL PRACTICE of the churches shows that the innovators at Corinth were out of step with the general practice of the churches. The churches of God had no such custom (practice) of violating apostolic authority in this regard. The term "custom" (*sunethos*) has been a stumbling block to some. It simply means an "established practice." (Bagster, Greek Lexicon, p. 389). And it may denote a practice that is in conformity to *divine law*. (See Josephus, Antiquities, 10, 4, 5). This further reveals that Paul's teaching in this context was not according to pagan tradition. The pagans had no standard practice, regarding the wearing of head-coverings

by men and women in their *worship*, which is the theme of the apostle's instructions.

In conclusion, let me list some things which my opponent must establish if his position is to arrest our attention.

1. He must show that Paul alludes to social decorum, e.g., the demeanor of harlots.
2. He must prove that there was a universal practice among the pagans regarding their worship, to which the Corinthians were urged to subscribe.
3. He must show how 1 Cor.11, if dealing with *public* conduct, would apply to worship within *private* dwellings by the assembled church.
4. He must show why a "hat" violates the principle of 1 Cor. 11 for the man, and yet a "hat," according to him, does not demonstrate the principle on behalf of woman.
5. He must establish that the New Testament sanctions the "shearing" or "shaving" of a woman, as opposed to the "shame" which 1 Cor.11 attaches to the practice.
6. He ought to show what objection he would have to a woman shaving her head if such was the accepted "custom."
7. He must tell us how a woman can honor God's principle of subordination, while rejecting the very symbol designed to demonstrate it.
8. He must prove that *time* can make a New Testament regulation obsolete.
9. Finally, he must show how a person, having access to *only the New Testament*, could ever come to the position which he has advocated in this debate. I respectfully submit that it could never be done!

With just a final word, may I express genuine apprecia-

tion for brother Negative's find spirit in this debate and the study which was a necessary part of his preparation. I have a high regard for him personally, and though our arguments were pressed with fervor, we love one another as Christian brethren, and urge our fellow-brethren to study this matter with the greatest of precision. And remember, there is a safe course one can pursue. Let us all strive to gain heaven.

BROTHER AFFIRMATIVE

## Third Negative

The reason the veil was so important in the Corinthian church is that universal social custom had dictated that respectable women always wore the veil in public places. The veil "was the most significant part of the woman's dress. Among the Greeks it was the universal custom for the women to appear in public with the head covered....Both sexes looked upon the veil as the truest and most treasured emblem of woman's position." (Dods, Op. Cit., p. 680). Paul's major thrust in 1 Cor. 11:2-16 is that a woman's relation to Christ does *not* dissolve her relation to society. She must appear pure, decent, modest, moral, and respectable before others. My opponent says woman's dress is not germane to the issue at all. I emphatically deny this and so does the entire world of historical and Biblical scholarship! Even the symbolism of the veil of the modern bride goes back to the ancient ideas of modesty. T.W. Davies says, "The veil plays a much more important part in woman's life in the East than in the West. No respectable woman in an Eastern village or city goes out without it, and if she does, she is in danger of being misjudged." ["Veil," A Dictionary Of The Bible, ed. James Hastings (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), IV, 848]. Joachim Jeremias quotes the Jewish law of Jesus' day that a husband could divorce his wife if she went out bareheaded (Op. Cit., pp. 359-360). The Cyclopedia Of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, edited by John McClintock and James Strong, says "For Christian women to have departed in such a matter from the general

practice of the countries where they resided would inevitably have brought reproach upon the Christian name" [(N.Y.: Harper and Bros., 1881), X, 739]. "In Oriental lands the veil is the power and the honour and dignity of the woman" [Wm. Ramsay, The Cities of St. Paul, Their Influence On His Life and Thought, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), p. 204]. Hering emphasizes, "It is certain that among the Jews, as among the Greeks moreover, it was, for one reason or another, considered as lacking in decency for a woman or girl of good family to appear bareheaded in public" (Op. Cit., p. 105). Paul appeals to universal consciousness, custom, and common practice (11:13-16) and in doing so bases his teaching for the veil on social propriety, not on the unchanging rule of God.

Paul's instructions perfectly harmonize with daily oriental custom and regular social decorum *in public places*. The fact that the Greek and Romans had no distinction of the sexes in *sacrificing to idols* is irrelevant because "such sacrificing and praying was not in any way like the Christian service in a public assembly of men as well as women" [J. Massie, "Corinthians," The Century Bible, (London: Le Bas and Co., n.d.), p. 213, n. 2]. In *daily life and decorum* the Greeks and Romans definitely observed a strict distinction of sexes, and the church assemblies would fall under such regulations. Strack and Billerbeck have proven that Jewish men did not wear the long shawl or tallith at this time (Loc. Cit.). It would have been a shame for a man to appear with a feminine article of dress, i.e., a veil, because this would denote subjection (1 Cor. 11:4,7). To answer my brother's question, the small hat the men wore daily is not a *kalumma* (veil), is never so defined, is not a feminine article, and does not come under the prohibitions of Paul in 1 Cor. 11. Paul's teachings do agree with the regular, customary practice of the first century world in veiling and unveiling.

Contrary to my opponent, it was not conducive to a bad reputation for a woman to appear in public, but it was to appear *without a veil!* It is true that some of the churches met in private homes, but the nature, size, and composition

of the assembly in the home fell under the rules of social decorum. Outsiders would even come in (1 Cor.14:23-25). Because the church was heterogeneous and its assemblies open to all willing to be taught, its assemblies fell under the rules for social modesty and binding custom.

"Seemly" (v.13) is always used in the New Testament to describe what is "fitting or appropriate" in view of the situation. It is true Jesus was baptized because it was "fitting" - but this is not the reason anyone else has ever been baptized. Jesus was the only person ever baptized who had never sinned and this shows in itself that something can be "seemly" for one person (or one age of the world) and not "seemly" for other persons (or other ages of the world). The veil was seemly for the first century but today has absolutely no significance for anybody in the Western world.

#### WHAT IS THE COVERING?

I presented lexicons, dictionaries, commentaries, and even drawings to prove that the *kalumma* of the first century covered the head, hair, neck, ears, and sometimes part of the face. My brother did not refer to any of the evidences or references I presented. Hering does say that "*kata* with the genitive generally means 'coming down from'" and gives examples from Plutarch, *kata tes kephales echon to himation*, "having his cloak over his head," (Apophthegmata regum, 200E) and Esther 6:12, *lupoumenos kata kephales*, "observed mourning by having something on his head," (LXX). Even if Hering is correct and the Greek did mean "coming down upon" instead of "hanging down from," the point is still true that every use of *kalumma* or *katakalypto* and the derivatives means "concealment" or "covering," as illustrated by the above examples, not just a hat or headband. The same is true of every one of the examples given by my brother. Thayer says *kata* occurs in "verbs naming that with which anything is covered, concealed, overwhelmed, etc., as *katakalypto*..." (Op. Cit., p. 329). A.T. Robertson says the same thing in his A Grammar of the Greek New Testament In The Light Of Historical Research (1919, p. 606f). In the apostolic fathers, the Shepherd of Hermas definitely uses the word to mean

a complete covering with a veil (Hv. 4, 2, 1). The only time the word *kalumma* occurs in the New Testament is in 2 Cor. 3:13-16 where it must refer to a veil that conceals. Again I ask: Where is the evidence a small hat (*pilos*) or handkerchief (*soudarion*) is a *kalumma* (veil)? Davies definition of *kalumma* have to do with "garments" or "clothing" that conceal, again not a small hat, and when used with a headdress "to cover," not just to decorate or ornament. Both sides of the discussion in Tertullian's time called for a complete covering of the head and hair, not just a headband! Again I ask: Where is the proof for my opponent's position? Does my brother actually believe that a woman appearing with a small hat or headband in the assembly in Paul's day would have fulfilled the requirements for the *kalumma* (veil) and would have been recognized as being "covered" or "veiled"?

Since it is true that "Christian women have worn the headdresses of their country and station" and Western culture and countries have never had any headdress with any type significance or symbolism, then it follows that for women in these countries the headdress is not required. In Paul's age, modesty, nature, seemliness, shame, and precedent demanded the veil. Today none of these are in any way related to the presence of the veil or the absence of the veil!

Today a woman being "shorn" decently indicates absolutely nothing about her character! Paul's argument is based on the fact that *both* being "shorn or shaven" indicated immodesty and immorality. Since my brother believes a woman must be veiled in worship because it is a shame to be shorn or shaven, does that mean then that a woman could be shorn or shaven and it not be a shame *if she is not in worship*? Either my brother must bind the veil *at all times* (worship and otherwise) or admit that the "shamefulness" of being shorn or shaven does not require the veil today! Further, if woman is to wear the veil because she is subordinate to man, why doesn't she wear it *all the time in public* (like they did in the first century) since she is subordinate to man all the time, not just when worshipping?

## THE HOLY KISS AND FEET WASHING

My brother refused to notice my challenge that *every argument made against the kiss and feet washing can equally be made against the veil*. Note the parallels:

1. Both the kiss and the veil existed before Paul.
2. Both the kiss and the veil had spiritual overtones and implications.
3. Both the kiss and the veil passed out of significance.
4. Both the principles of the kiss (love and brotherhood) and the principles of the veil (modesty and subjection) are still binding.
5. If a brother or sister wants to practice the kiss and the observance of the veil today, they may.
6. If a brother *binds* the kiss or the veil on others today he is anachronistic, creates division, and is guilty of sin. Thus neither the binding of the kiss or the binding of the veil is the "safe" position.

Jesus truly gave a lesson on humility when he washed feet, but he told us to do the same thing (John 13:14,15). The Greek word for "example" is *hupodeigma*, the same word that is translated "pattern" in Heb.8:5. If my brother can see that the literal "pattern" of feet washing is not bound on us 1900 years later since it is not needed in our "shoe" society, then why can't he see that the wearing of the veil is not required of us in our Western culture since it has never had any significance to us?

My brother's rule of hermeneutic is that "every specific command bound upon the early church is bound upon us." Then why does he not bind the kiss? It is specific, it is imperative, it is commanded five times. My brother completely overlooks historical peculiarities. What about these following commands? Are they bound upon us *the exact same*

*way with the exact same application* they were upon first century individuals and/or churches? "Render unto Caesar" (Matt.22:21), "Honor the king" (1 Pet.2:17), "Anoint with oil" (Ja.5:14), "Drink a little wine" (1 Tim.5:23), "Take these and purify thyself" (Acts 21:18-26), "Bring the cloak,

come before winter" (2 Tim. 4:13,21), "It is better not to marry" (1 Cor.7:2, 26-27), "Contribute for the poor in Jerusalem" (1 Cor.16:1-3). *All Scripture having to do with acts or facts of history must be understood in the light of that historical context and interpreted in the light of that initial setting.* If this is not so, then every one of the specifics mentioned above is binding upon us *in the same degree and in the same way* they were binding upon those to whom they were addressed! I contend that a more accurate rule of interpretation is "All situations and specific applications of principles which describe purely local and temporary peculiarities in the New Testament are situations and specific applications of principles which are not required of Christians today."

Paul introduced the theological premises of headship, creation, and angels because they support the general principle of subordination and modesty, not because they themselves, *in themselves*, require a veil in every age of the world. Otherwise the veil would reside in the very nature of existence and would have been binding since creation. If all the reasons the sabbath was kept were present in the creation, then the sabbath would have been observed from then (see Deut.5:15), but my opponent believes all the reasons the veil is binding were present at that time. God's doctrinal laws do change with each dispensation but his moral laws have never changed since creation and the veil is a *moral precept* ("shame" and "seemly" indicate this) having to do with a relationship to society and its marks of respect. My opponent's position would require us to *actually resurrect the first century clothing habits and the ideas they symbolized!*

A careful study of the New Testament coupled with sound principles of Biblical interpretation, logic, and reason, refute my brother's position. He refuses to distinguish be-

tween the principles of subordination and the marks of that respect peculiar to each culture. His position must be rejected as unsound and unsafe.

BROTHER NEGATIVE