

Chapter 12: Orderly Public Worship: Part 1

1 Corinthians 11:2–34

In 1 Corinthians 11:2, Paul transitions to a new subject that he will address through chapter 14: orderly public worship. As we have observed, Paul often uses the phrase “now concerning...” to introduce new subjects (1 Cor. 7:1, 25; 8:1). While Paul will introduce the subject of spiritual gifts in public worship with the phrase “now concerning...” (1 Cor. 12:1), he does not do so here in 1 Corinthians 11:2. This may possibly indicate that the Corinthians had not directly asked Paul’s opinion, but that Paul is instead addressing an issue he observes on his own.¹ Paul begins by commending the Corinthians for maintaining the “traditions” that he delivered to them (1 Cor. 11:2). In this, Paul acknowledges that the situation isn’t entirely bad, even though he does recognize a situation he needs to address in regard to the conduct and appearance of men and women in worship. In this regard, Paul teaches that *it is glory for men to rule, and it is glory for women to reveal*. Then, in the second half of 1 Corinthians 11, Paul critiques an area where the Corinthians are failing to uphold the traditions, in their observance of the Lord’s Supper. There, Paul teaches the absolute importance of the Lord’s Supper as he insists that *Christ delivers himself to us in the Lord’s Supper*.

Glory for Men; Glory for Women (1 Cor. 11:2–16)

The first half of 1 Corinthians 11 is a notoriously difficult and controversial passage. We should begin our study, then, by making a few preliminary, framing observations. First, the *details* of Paul’s advice to the Corinthians may have been clear to the Corinthians, but they are no longer clear to us. The phrase that the ESV translates in v. 4 as “with head covered” might be literally translated “having down from the head.”² Translated this way, the difficulties become obvious. What would it mean to “have down from the head”? Many have understood this to mean some kind of veil or cloth head covering; however, the word “veil” does not appear in the text. Others have understood this to refer to an arrangement of the hair, whether “let down” or bound up on top of the head.³ Some have insisted that, for a woman to appear in public (especially public worship) without some kind of head covering would have suggested that she was flouting her husband’s authority or making herself sexually available to other men, while others point to a variety of cultural meanings among Romans, Greeks, and Jews for wearing/not wearing a head covering.⁴ Thus, we should be hesitant to draw any absolute practical conclusions about the original instructions from Paul to the Corinthians. Then, we should be even more cautious about drawing a straight line from those cultural practices to any such practices in our own culture, today.

Second, while the *details* of Paul’s advice is murky, we should also recognize that Paul’s *doctrinal* understanding and rationale is quite clear. As elsewhere, Paul argues that husbands are the heads of their wives (v. 3; cf. Eph. 5:22–24), but he also teaches that husbands should look upon their wives as their “glory” (v. 7; cf. Prov. 12:4; Eph. 5:25–33). Paul insists on different roles for men and women in

the church (v. 4–5), while also insisting that neither men nor women are independent of the other, since all things come from God (v. 11–12; cf. Gal. 3:28). So, as we interpret this passage today, we should be slow to draw hard conclusions about specific rules for today about what men and women should wear, or about how they should style their hair.

Nevertheless, this passage forces each of us to consider *why* we are wearing what we are wearing, and *why* we are styling our hair in a particular way. Are we doing all things to the glory of God (1 Cor. 10:31)? Are we seeking to live as is “proper” to testify to these theological truths within the context our own cultural context (1 Cor. 11:13)?⁵ As Charles Hodge writes, “Dress is in a great degree conventional. A costume which is proper in one country, would be indecorous in another. The principle insisted upon in this paragraph is, that women should conform in matters of dress to all those usages which the public sentiment of the community in which they live demands.”⁶ So, while the underlying theological principles remain the same, the cultural symbols which *reflect* those theological principles may change. Ultimately, the effect of not having enough information to know what exactly Paul is instructing the *Corinthians* to do in their own dress and hairstyles, forces us to reflect more clearly on what *we* are doing in our own dress and hairstyles. That is, this passage does not so much tell us *what* to do as to help us reflect critically on *why* we are doing what we are doing.

Headship: The Rule of Christ in the Church (1 Cor. 11:3–6)

In 1 Corinthians 11:3, Paul introduces the first major theological truth that we should reveal in the way we dress: *headship*. The idea of *headship* has to do with *authority*, as the parallel passage in Ephesians 5:22–24 makes clear: “[22] Wives, submit to your own husbands, as to the Lord. [23] For the husband is the head of the wife even as Christ is the head of the church, his body, and is himself its Savior. [24] Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit in everything to their husbands.”⁷ Also, this meaning of *headship* is clear in Colossians 2:10, where Paul writes saying that Christ “is the head of all rule and authority.” Christ’s *headship* is his rule and authority.

So, when Paul writes that “the head of a wife is her husband,” he is saying that God has given husbands authority over their wives. This is not a cruel, tyrannical authority, where the husband can do whatever he pleases, and the wife must follow her husband, even into sin. No, the authority given to a husband is meant for good, similar to the authority given to civil governments (cf. Rom. 13:1–7). God will judge those who abuse the authority entrusted to them, whether authority in the world, or in the church, or in the home (cf. Ezek. 34:1–10). The abuse of authority, however, does not negate the goodness of the authority itself, including the authority that God has given husbands over their wives.

Some have sought to avoid the of a husband’s headship over his wife by arguing that *head* (*kephalē*) means “source,” rather than “authority.” While this meaning may make some sense, especially in light of v. 8, there is very little evidence from any ancient Greek sources that “head” was ever used this way, and “no Greek lexicon offers this as an option.”⁸ Furthermore, as one egalitarian author admits, “Even if Paul is thinking here primarily of man as the source of woman rather than authority over woman, this still serves as the warrant for a claim about his ontological preeminence over her, as vv. 7–9 show.”⁹

Then, in 1 Corinthians 11:3, Paul reminds the Corinthians that Christ has authority over every man, and that the husband has authority over his wife. In regard to *redemption*, women and men are on the same footing (Gal. 3:28), so that women have direct access to Christ along with men. There is

one high priest for us all, the Lord Jesus Christ. What Paul is saying here, though, is that in regard to *roles* within ordinary life in the home and in the church, distinctions of authority remain between men and women. We should note that Paul first points out that “the head of every man is Christ.” In this, Paul is insisting that men are *not* independent. Yes, wives are under their husbands’ authority, but men are under the headship of Christ. Men may not act however they please, as though they were accountable to no one but themselves. Unless men recognize that they are accountable to Christ himself for how they lead and sanctify their wives, they will ever use their authority wrongly. God has not entrusted men with headship of their homes so that men may boss their families around according to their own whims. On the contrary, headship of the home requires men to love their wives as Christ loved the church, by giving themselves up self-sacrificially to purify, nourish, and cherish their wives (Eph. 5:25–33). Christ’s self-sacrificial love at the cross provides an everlasting pattern that men ought to imitate to exercise the authority God has granted them (cf. 1 Cor. 11:1).

For men, though, passivity and self-indulgence has been a besetting sin ever since Adam abdicated his responsibility in the garden of Eden. God gave Adam alone the mandate to “keep” (i.e., “guard”) the garden holy (Gen. 2:15). So, when God created Adam from a rib in Eve’s side, she came as his helper, fit to help Adam on the mission God had given him (Gen. 2:18). Adam had headship over Eve in the garden, and God designed this relationship to be for their mutual joy (Gen. 2:23–25). Nevertheless, Adam passively allowed his wife to conduct negotiations with the serpent, and then he listened to his wife’s voice to take and eat the forbidden fruit (Gen. 3:6, 17). To this day, indwelling sin draws men generally to follow in the footsteps of Adam. For women, on the other hand, indwelling sin draws them to follow in the footsteps of Eve by seeking to fill the void of their husbands’ abdicated leadership. After the original sin, God declared that women would no longer experience the life-giving joy of being the helper of their husbands, but would experience the headship of their husbands as a curse: “Your desire shall be contrary to your husband, but he shall rule over you” (Gen. 3:16). From that point, all the way up to Paul’s day, and even into our own, we need to be reminded that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of a wife is her husband.

What, though, does Paul mean when he writes, “the head of Christ is God” (1 Cor. 11:3)? Isn’t the Son the Second Person of the Trinity, fully God himself? Yes, but Paul is not writing about God the Son, considered according to his divine nature. According to that divine nature, the Son existed in the “form of God,” having “equality with God” (Phil. 2:6). Yet, the Son “emptied himself, by taking the form of a servant” as the Christ, the God-Man (Phil. 2:7). During his earthly ministry (what theologians call his “estate of humiliation”), Christ humbled himself by becoming obedient to the will of the Father, even to the point of death on a cross (Phil. 2:8).¹⁰ As John Calvin writes on this verse, “Inasmuch as he has in our flesh made himself subject to the Father, for, apart from this, being of one essence with the Father, he is his equal. Let us, therefore, bear it in mind, that this is spoken of Christ as mediator. He is, I say, inferior to the Father, inasmuch as he assumed our nature, that he might be the first-born among many brethren.”¹¹

After stating this theological principle, Paul moves on to the addressing his specific concern: the roles of men and women in public worship. When Paul speaks of praying and prophesying in v. 4, he is talking about the work of leading public worship in the church.¹² Whether leading the church in public prayer (cf. 1 Tim. 2:1–8), or leading the church in prophesy by building them up in the word of God (cf. 1 Cor. 14:5), Paul insists that *how* we do such things matters. The way we dress may either underscore or undercut what we are doing. Particularly, Paul teaches that if a man prays

or prophecies publicly while “having down from the head” (ESV: “with his head covered”), his dress dishonors his head. Again, we don’t know the specific details of what this head covering might be. The covering itself is not important however, but only the theological implications of such a covering.¹³ Christ has appointed this man as his lieutenant, to speak his words, and to lead the congregation in prayer to him.¹⁴ For this man to cover his *head*, then, would symbolize dishonor toward his *head*—that is, toward Christ. This might be the equivalent, perhaps, of the *faux pas* of wearing a baseball cap to a formal dinner.¹⁵ Not only would this be rude (cf. 1 Cor. 13:5), it draws attention to the man wearing the baseball cap, “when all eyes should be elsewhere, not least on the glory of God.”¹⁶

On the other hand, if a woman were to pray or to prophesy with her head *uncovered*, Paul adds that she would dishonor *her* head—that is, her husband (1 Cor. 11:5). Paul is not saying that a woman may lead in prayer or publicly prophesy in corporate worship if her head *were* covered, for he later says that “the women should keep silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be in submission, as the Law also says” (1 Cor. 14:34).¹⁷ Rather, his point in 1 Corinthians 11:5 is to contrast the headship of the man with the submission of the woman. It would be similar for a parent to say, “Every time you disobey me and lie about it, you dishonor me.” By saying this, the parent is not authorizing disobedience, so long as the child is honest about it. Rather, the parent is focusing on the disrespectfulness of the lying, without commenting on the disobedience itself. In the same way, Paul is focusing here on proper and improper use of a head covering, and he will pick up the question of who may lead the congregation in prayer and prophesy in 1 Corinthians 14.¹⁸ So, Christ calls *men* to pray and prophesy. *Men* must minister Christ’s prophetic word to Christ’s people, and *men* must speak to Christ in prayer on behalf of all Christ’s people. For men to pray or to prophesy publicly with a covered head would be to dishonor the authority of their head—that is, of *Christ* himself (1 Cor. 11:4).

But, for a woman to pray or to prophesy publicly, much less with an uncovered head, would be to dishonor her own head, her husband (1 Cor. 11:5a). She would be bypassing her husband’s authority not only in her actions, but also in her dress. This is the theological principle, but then Paul shifts back to appealing to the cultural symbol of that theological principle when he urges any woman who would lead in public worship with uncovered head to shave off all her hair (1 Cor. 11:5b–6). Again, there are many suggestions about the precise cultural meaning of a woman’s cutting her hair short, but it is better to focus on the doctrine Paul is pointing us toward.¹⁹ If you are rejecting the role that God has given you as a woman, why not go all the way and reject you’re femininity altogether? Instead of asking *which* hairstyles we may or may not have, we should instead ask *why* we want this or that hairstyle. Does it bear witness to the honorable position God has given to us by creating us male and female? Or, does our hairstyle function as a cultural symbol that advocates *rejecting* God’s good purposes in creation? If so, then our hairstyle is a disgrace.

Glory: The Revelation of Christ in the Church (1 Cor. 11:7–16)

In v. 7, Paul introduces the second set of theological concepts: *image* and *glory*. Here, Paul gives an additional reason that a man should not cover his head, namely that the man is the image and glory of God. The woman, on the other hand, should have a symbol of authority on her head (v. 10), because the woman is the glory of man. An *image* is a reflection of someone or something else. Here, Paul is saying that the man is a reflection of the glory of God, while the woman is a reflection of the

glory of man. As above with the concepts of *headship*, it is important that we distinguish different aspects of *image*. Just as the woman relates to Christ as the head of the church directly along with the man (Eph. 5:23), so the Bible tells us that the man and woman *together* constitute the image of God in relation to knowledge, righteousness, and holiness (Gen. 1:27).²⁰

Here, though, Paul is not talking about the man and woman as the image of God *in general*, but the man as the image and glory of God in one area *particularly*: the dominion and rule of Christ in his church.²¹ There are three reasons for the special function of the man as the image and glory of God. First, as Paul reminds us, the man was created first, and the woman from the man (v. 8). Second, the woman was created *for* man, not man for woman (v. 9). Third, God gave his original mandate to Adam alone, before Eve was created (Gen. 2:15–17). Therefore, Adam was responsible for working and keeping the garden in a way that Eve was not. Furthermore, God gave Adam alone the warning not to eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, so that Adam was responsible for the original sin in a way that Eve was not. Even though Eve was the one deceived (2 Cor. 11:3; 1 Tim. 2:14), “sin came into the world through *one man*...” (Rom. 5:12), and “in *Adam* all die” (1 Cor. 15:22). In the order of creation, God has appointed man to bear the responsibilities, rewards, and consequences of exercising *God’s* dominion and authority in the world. *Man* is the image and glory of God.

Women, then, are the *glory of man* (1 Cor. 11:7b). Relatedly, we read in the Proverbs that “An excellent wife is the crown of her husband, but she who brings shame is like rotteness in his bones” (Prov. 12:4). However high a man may rise in exercising dominion in this world, he gains no higher *crowning glory* than he finds in an excellent wife. This is not a demeaning role for the woman, but “it is a great honor that God has appointed her to the man as the partner of his life, and a helper to him, and has made her subject to him as the body is to the head.”²² As Charles Hodge explains, “She is the glory of the man. She receives and reveals what there is of majesty in him. She always assumes his station; becomes a queen if he is a king, and manifests to others the wealth and honour which may belong to her husband.”²³ As such, everything she does (including her dress) must reflect the authority of her head (v. 10)—that is, her husband. This word “authority” is a *metonymy*, where something related to the idea (in this case, a head covering) is used as a symbol for the idea itself (in this case, authority).²⁴ By the *symbol* of authority she wears, she bears witness not only to her husband’s authority over her in the created order, but to the glory of Christ’s authority over his whole kingdom. Even the angels have some interest in this, although Paul does not explain more (v. 10).

In v. 11, Paul reminds his readers that men and women are not independent of one another. The woman may have come *from* the man, having been created *for* the man, but now all men are born of women—and, furthermore, all things (men and women alike) come from God (v. 12). Next, Paul once again appeals to the cultural symbols of these theological principles. He asks them to evaluate whether it is *proper* for a woman to pray with an uncovered head (v. 13).²⁵ Then, he asks rhetorically whether nature itself teaches that long hair is a disgrace for a man, but the glory of a woman, as her covering (v. 14–15). Last, Paul insists that he will not enter into a fruitless debate with a contentious person, for the churches of God do not have a practice of quarreling (v. 16).²⁶ Again, the point is not that we should draw hard conclusions about the *specific* clothing and hairstyles we should have. Rather, we should live in a way that conforms with the order God appointed for our lives at our creation.

Glory for Men; Glory for Women

God created men to exercise his dominion and authority in the world. Having Christ as their head, men should lead the spiritual lives of their homes and lead the public worship of the church. As men do this, they *image* God and reflect the *glory* of God through ministering the dominion of Christ himself through word and prayer. The besetting sin of men, then, is to shrink from this high calling back into passivity. Rather than actively rising to deal with challenges, men are so often tempted to abdicate their leadership, slinking to the sidelines of their homes and their churches as they wait for women to fill the void of their leadership. Like Adam, they are content to wait in passivity until Eve passes out the fruit. May it never be for us! It is glory for men to *rule*, exercising the dominion of their head, the Lord Jesus Christ.

This does not mean, however, that men may abuse their power in any respect. On the contrary, just as the Father delighted to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ, and just as Christ willingly gave himself up for his Church, so husbands must look upon their wives as their *crowning glory*. Men must live not to lift *themselves* up at the expense of their wives, but to lay down their lives in order to lift up *their wives* as their crown and glory. Thus, just as Jesus willingly submitted to the will of his Father during his earthly ministry, and just as the church must submit to Christ in all things, so wives ought to submit to their husbands as their *heads*. But, while passivity is the besetting sin of men, usurping the authority of the husband is the corresponding besetting sin of women. Nevertheless, it is glory for women to *reveal* the honor of their husbands in their conduct, speech, and even in their dress and hairstyles.

Divisions in the Church (1 Cor. 11:17–22)

While the Corinthian church needed some correction regarding the roles of men and women in corporate worship, we should remember that Paul began the previous section with a commendation: “Now I commend you...” (1 Cor. 11:2). Now, as Paul begins to address their handling of the Lord’s Supper, he says the exact opposite: “But in the following instructions I do not commend you...” (1 Cor. 11:17). The issues that have drawn Paul’s criticism surround how the Corinthians have administered the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:20); however, verses 17–22 deal more generally with schisms and factions in the church, a subject that Paul has been addressing since the beginning of this letter (1 Cor. 1:10–17; 3:1–4). Earlier, Paul addressed factions that arose from competing personalities and philosophies. Now, Paul addresses divisions that arise from socioeconomic divisions between the poor and the rich. That is, the divisions that Paul addresses here are not principled, philosophical differences among the members of the Corinthian church, but something much more petty. In this case, the poor are being excluded from the “cliques” of the rich.²⁷

“When You Come Together as a Church” (1 Cor. 11:17–19)

Paul’s rebuke in v. 17 is extraordinary: “when you come together, it is not for the better but for the worse.” This word for “come together” appears five times in chapter 11 and twice later in this letter to describe the gathering of God’s people together for corporate worship (1 Cor. 11:17, 18, 20, 33, 34; 14:23, 26).²⁸ As I write this, the church around the world has been unable to come together for the last several weeks, scattered into our own homes because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

During this time, many of God’s people (including me) have learned how much we have taken for granted the ability to “come together”—that is, to come together in the same place for corporate worship together. When we come together, we receive the means of grace that God has promised to bless: the word (hearing, reading, singing, praying, and preaching), prayer, and the sacraments. Because these elements are so *ordinary*, though, we have often failed to see how valuable they were, until we come to a moment in history when we cannot have them. What we wouldn’t give to come together again!

As bad as it has been *not* to gather during this time, Paul tells us that there is something worse: gathering together in the wrong way. Paul informs the Corinthians that when they have gathered together, their gatherings have not been for the better, but for the worse. The Lord made similar statements to the Israelites about their corrupt worship: “Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hates; they have become a burden to me; I am weary of bearing them” (Isa. 1:14). In that case, the issues had to do with moral corruption and injustice. Here, Paul explains that, by their divisions, the Corinthians have not only failed to glean the benefits that God has appointed for corporate worship, but they have also incurred guilt.²⁹ Their corruptions are so bad that, when they come together as a church, they are more divided than when they are scattered (v. 18). The words Paul uses to describe these divisions are *schisms* and *heresies*, but the basic meaning of *heresy* in Greek means “an act of choice.” Thus, Paul is not talking about a willful choice to cling to a false doctrine (an *ecclesiastical* heresy), but simply a willful choice to separate from fellow believers.³⁰ Paul describes this problem as the “first” he plans to address, but he never clearly identifies a “second” issue, which makes Paul’s concern about these divisions all the more emphatic.³¹ These divisions are the main problem, even though Paul will also address the abuse of spiritual gifts and other problems in corporate worship in chapters 12–14.³²

Reluctantly, Paul acknowledges that these divisions in the church should not surprise anyone: “And I believe it in part, for there must be factions among you in order that those who are genuine among you may be recognized” (1 Cor. 11:18b–19). The phrase, “there must be,” translates a little word in Greek, *δεῖ* (*dei*), which conveys some kind of necessity. In this case, Paul does not specify the reason for the necessity, so that commentators offer a variety of possibilities as to what Paul may have meant. In my judgment, the best arguments understand Paul as saying that these divisions are necessary in light of the sovereignty of God over all things, in this case toward the purification of his people.³³ This does not mean that Paul is justifying the behavior, for, in some mysterious way, human beings are responsible *and* God is sovereign *both*.³⁴ Instead, Paul’s point is that believers who are distressed by these factions should recognize that God is still working out his plan of refining his people *through* these divisions, so that the genuine believers may be recognized through these trials.³⁵

Not the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:20–22)

These divisions are so serious that Paul judges their meal to be no Lord’s Supper at all (v. 20). This is the only place in Scripture where communion is called the “Lord’s Supper,” that is, “the supper instituted by the Lord, one to which he invites the guests, and which is celebrated in commemoration of his death.”³⁶ Leon Morris writes, “The adjective *kyriakon* (only here and Rev. 1:10 in the New Testament) stresses the connection with the Lord. The disorders at Corinth are so serious that it is not *the Lord’s* supper that is eaten; it has a different character (cf. 10:21). Chrysostom points out that what is the master’s is common to all the servants; to make a difference means that it is no

longer the master's."³⁷ Instead of being the meal where the many become one body together in Christ as they partake together of one loaf of bread, this so-called Lord's Supper has the opposite effect of dividing Christians from one another (cf. 1 Cor. 10:17).

Instead, the Corinthians were eating their own meals, so that some went hungry, while others became drunk (v. 21). It is difficult to understand precisely what Paul has in mind by verse 21. Some argue that Paul is describing a situation where the rich ate privately (with better food) in a small dining area called the *triclinium*, while the poor were excluded to eat elsewhere, with a lower level meal—perhaps something like coach passengers on a plane looking longingly at the passengers in the first class section.³⁸ Others point to the command “wait for one another” in v. 33, arguing that the rich were not waiting for others to arrive before they ate.³⁹

As with what Paul wrote about head coverings, this passage is a place where the *details* are obscure, while the *doctrine* is clear. The celebration of the Lord's Supper is not a place for feasting and drinking. If anyone wants to eat and drink, they may hold a private event in their own houses (v. 22). But, when the rich feast and get drunk, while the poor go hungry, they have despised the “church of God” and humiliated the poor. Paul closes this section by stating again that he will *not* commend them for their actions in this regard (v. 22; cf. 1 Cor. 11:2, 17).

Part of the problem arose from the fact that the Corinthians were celebrating the Lord's Supper as a part of what was called a Love Feast (*Agapē*). Rather than a sacrament within the context of a corporate worship service, the celebration of the Lord's Supper was often observed early on in the context of a larger meal. Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper, we should remember, in the context of the Jewish Passover Feast (Matt. 26:17–29; Mark 14:12–25; Luke 22:7–23). This connection to Passover is significant, since the celebration of the Passover underwent an observable development. So, the first celebration of the Passover in Egypt had unique features that were never again repeated (e.g., the lamb smeared over the doorpost; the coming of the Destroyer through the land of Egypt). Then, the celebration of the feast developed some when Israel celebrated Passover during their wilderness wanderings and during the conquest into the Promised Land, especially as the Lord made provision for keeping Passover in the second month for any who were ceremonially unclean in the second month (Num. 9:1–14; Josh. 5:10–12). Finally, the celebration of the feast developed even further once Israel settled in the Promised Land, since all the males of the nation had to journey to Jerusalem each year to celebrate the feast at the same time, in the same place (Lev. 23:4–8; Deut. 16:16).

In the same way, the Bible reflects that the celebration of the Lord's Supper also underwent a similar development. So, there were elements of the first Lord's Supper that were never again repeated (e.g., observance in an Upper Room; celebration in the context of a Passover feast; only males present). Then, early on, when Christianity had largely only reached the Jews, the earliest reference to the widespread celebration of the Lord's Supper among the first Jewish converts describes the “breaking of bread” as taking place “from house to house” (Acts 2:42, 46)—just as the Passover feast had been observed (Ex. 12:3). Later on, however, the practice developed significantly, so that disciples came together on the first day of the week to “break bread” in the context of a larger worship service that included lengthy teaching (Acts 20:7, 11). Feasting is no longer the primary characteristic of this setting, but the “breaking of bread” of the Lord's Supper is celebrated in the context of a worship service. Paul's statement in 1 Corinthians 11:22, then, expresses the final word on the subject: when the church comes together as a church for the Lord's Supper, the context must

be a corporate worship service, not a feast. Christians may feast (“eat and drink”) in their own houses, but they may not substitute feasting for the ordinary elements of worship that God has appointed for his people in the word, prayer, and sacraments.

We do know from broader church history, though that many continued to practice the Love Feast. But, as time went on, the Love Feast became less a solemn setting in which the Lord’s Supper was administered, and more a riotous party that resembled the pagan idolatrous feasts that Paul condemned in chapters 8–10. Ultimately, the church forbade Love Feasts at the Council of Laodicea in 364 AD, a decree that was subsequently reiterated at the Third Council of Carthage in 393 AD.⁴⁰ Importantly, we should recognize that the church was not legislating new laws for the church. On the contrary, they were simply applying ministerially the implications of 1 Corinthians 11:22 to the church’s worship practices.

The Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:23–34)

In 1 Corinthians 11:2, Paul commended the Corinthians because “you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions [παράδοσεις; *paradoseis*] even as I delivered [παρέδωκα; *paredōka*—from the same root as “traditions”] them to you.” Paul has already expressed twice that he does not *commend* them in their practices at the Lord’s Supper (1 Cor. 11:17, 22), and he now goes so far as to restate the exact tradition of the Lord’s Supper, according to its words of institution.⁴¹ The word for “received” (παρέλαβον; *parelabon*) and “delivered” (παρέδωκα; *paredōka*) are, respectively, the specific terms for receiving and passing on *traditions*, words that Paul will use again in 1 Corinthians 15:1, 3 regarding the gospel that the Corinthians “received” from him (1 Cor. 15:1), which he “delivered” to them” (1 Cor. 15:3).⁴² In our culture, “tradition” is not always looked upon as a positive thing; however, Paul uses the language of tradition positively. Jaroslav Pelikan’s famous quotation is helpful in this regard: “Tradition is the living faith of the dead, traditionalism is the dead faith of the living. And, I suppose I should add, it is traditionalism that gives tradition such a bad name.”⁴³

When Paul says, “For I received from the Lord...,” there is some debate about whether Paul is referring to a direct, personal revelation that he received from the Lord Jesus, or whether he simply means that he received the tradition that ultimately traces back to the Lord Jesus’ words at the Last Supper. Elsewhere, Paul insists that he did not “receive” (παρέλαβον; *parelabon*) his gospel from any man, but by a revelation from the Lord Jesus (Gal. 1:12). On this basis, some argue that Paul must have also “received” these words of institution directly from the Lord Jesus.⁴⁴ Others, however, point out that Paul refers in Galatians to the *meaning* and *message* of the cross (public events that could only be understood by revelation after the fact), while Jesus’ *words* of institution for the Lord’s Supper were received by his original apostles, and subsequently handed down as a tradition to the entire church.⁴⁵ In my judgment, Paul’s words are better interpreted by the latter meaning, so that Paul has received *this* tradition from others (especially the original disciples present at the Last Supper), very differently from how he received the gospel by direct revelation from Christ (Gal. 1:11–12). The important point, however, is that these words were instituted by Christ, and not upon the authority of any other person(s).⁴⁶

Of all the details recorded for us about the Last Supper, when Jesus originally instituted the Lord’s Supper, Paul only delivers a small subset. Thus, as Charles Hodge writes, the tradition of the

Lord's Supper does not require us to eat "at night, after a meal, and at a table covered with provisions, etc. Protestants...do not hold that the church in all ages is bound to do whatever Christ and the apostles did, but only what they designed should be afterwards done."⁴⁷ In these words of institution, Paul reminds the Corinthians of certain aspects of the original Lord's Supper (i.e., "on the night when he was betrayed..."), and we are to repeat these words, not to re-enact them. Just as the original Passover meal had unique features that were not observed in later Passover feasts, so the original Lord's Supper had unique features that we do not observe today as we celebrate the Lord's Supper. With the final word on the right administration of the Lord's Supper, the Church has only received what Paul delivers to us here.

More than this, we should recognize that the word for "delivered" (or, "given/handed over") is the word translated as "betrayed" [παρεδίδετο; *paredideto*] later in v. 23. Judas "betrayed" Jesus in the sense of "handing over" his master to the Jewish authorities. It is worth noting that the Latin language has words with the same flexibility, so that our English words "tradition" and "traitor" both derive from the same Latin root word, meaning "to hand over." Richard Hays, however, points out that Paul elsewhere uses this word not to describe Judas's "handing over" (i.e., *betrayal*) of Jesus, but God's delivering up of Jesus: "...who was *delivered up* [παρεδόθη; *paredothē*] for our trespasses and raised for our justification" (Rom. 4:25), and "He who did not spare his own Son but *gave him up* [παρέδωκεν; *paredōken*] for us all..." (Rom. 8:32). In turn, those passages seem to echo the Septuagint's Greek translation of two passages in Isaiah: "and the Lord *gave him up* [παρέδωκεν; *paredōken*] for our sins" (Isa. 53:6), and "And he bore the sins of many, and on account of their iniquities he *was handed over* [παρεδόθη; *paredothē*]" (Isa. 53:12b). Thus, when Paul writes, "on the night when he was betrayed," Hays argues that Paul did not have the action of Judas in mind, but of God's gracious handing over of his Son for our salvation.⁴⁸ Or, we might simply note that Christ's being handed over/delivered up happened *both* by Judas's betrayal *and* according to the Lord's definite plan and foreknowledge (cf. Acts 2:23).⁴⁹ Even more, we might also note that this word appears in an active sense, to describe Jesus' own, loving, willing "giving-over" of himself as a sacrifice for us: "...And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and *gave himself* [παραδόντος; *paradontos*] for me" (Gal. 2:20; cf. Eph. 5:2, 25). What Judas meant for evil, the Father planned—and the Son endured—for good, out of his love and mercy toward us.

The Words of Institution (1 Cor. 11:23b–26)

In the second half of v. 23, Paul states the tradition itself. First, Paul reminds them of the context of when the Lord Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper: "...on the night when he was betrayed..." Second, Paul addresses the bread, the first element of the Lord's Supper: "...took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, 'This is my body, which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me'" (1 Cor. 11:23b–24). We give thanks in a prayer of consecration for the same reason that the Lord Jesus originally gave thanks, for the mercy of God demonstrated through his love to offer up Christ for the salvation of his people.⁵⁰ While there has been considerable debate as to whether this bread should be leavened or unleavened, or whether the bread must contain gluten or may be gluten-free, the Scriptures give no precise recipe for the bread. While a Greek word for "unleavened bread" exists (cf. 1 Cor. 5:8), the word both here in 1 Corinthians 11:24 and earlier, in 1 Corinthians 10:16–17, is simply, "bread," referring either to leavened or unleavened bread. Whereas the Old Testament offered precise recipes to foreshadow Christ with accuracy (e.g., Ex. 30:22–25), now that

Christ has come, we no longer need the outward glory of the ceremonial law. Instead, the elements we use in the New Testament worship (especially in the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper) may be simpler, more common, and plain, since by them Christ himself is held forth with "more fullness, evidence and spiritual efficacy."⁵¹

Specifically, this common, ordinary bread holds forth Christ to us as it is *broken*. For this reason, the early church often called the Lord's Supper the "breaking of bread" (cf. Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11). This does not mean that Christ's body was entirely broken, since we know that not one of his bones were broken (John 19:31–36). Instead, the breaking of the bread bears witness to Christ's body being *sacrificed* "for" us.⁵² Thus, we break, take, and eat the bread "in remembrance" of Christ—that is, in remembrance of his person and his work for us for our salvation. Charles Hodge carefully notes that this *remembrance* is more than a mere calling to mind of Christ's person and work, but something much more far-reaching: "that we profess faith in him as the sacrifice for our sins; that we receive him as such; that we acknowledge the obligations which rest upon us as those who have been redeemed by his blood; and that we recognize ourselves as constituent members of his church and all believers as our brethren."⁵³ By this sacrament, Christ really and truly makes himself present to us, not physically (since his body remains in heaven), but spiritually.⁵⁴

In the same way, Christ took the cup, after supper, giving similar words of institution as with the bread (1 Cor. 11:25a). Undoubtedly, this cup would have contained wine with alcohol at the Last Supper, since they had no way of preserving the non-alcoholic "new wine" of freshly squeezed grapes very long before it fermented. Nevertheless, just as with the bread, the Scriptures give us no instructions on the alcohol content of the wine we should use in the Lord's Supper, only so long as we utilize the juice of grapes, as the "fruit of the vine" (Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:18). In our own tradition, Presbyterians have historically recognized the rights of individual Sessions to decide for their own congregations what constitutes "wine."⁵⁵ Again, the emphasis is not on the ceremonial, outward features of the wine, but on its significance: "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Cor. 11:25b). This language echoes the ratification of God's covenant with his people at Mount Sinai, which was sealed with the blood of animal sacrifices: "Behold the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words" (Ex. 24:8).⁵⁶ When the Lord Jesus institutes a "new" covenant, he uses the word *καινή* (*kainē*), meaning "renewed," rather than *νέα* (*nea*), referring to something that did not previously exist.⁵⁷ By the blood of Jesus' sacrifice, the *new* covenant secures everything that the *old* covenant promised by the blood of animal sacrifices. As with the bread, we drink the cup, however often we drink it, in remembrance of Christ (1 Cor. 11:25c).

Handing Down the Tradition (1 Cor. 11:26)

Paul summarizes the significance of this sacrament, then, in v. 26: "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." In part, this refers to the proclamation of the Lord's death proclaimed as the presiding minister announces the words of institution. More than that, however, every communicant proclaims the Lord's death by eating the bread and drinking the cup as a profession of faith.⁵⁸ It is for this reason that many churches confess creeds or confessions about what they believe before receiving the Lord's Supper together, so that the words of our confession may match with our actions of eating and drinking at the Lord's Supper. Unbelievers in the service come to hear clearly the gospel that we hold by faith, and fencing the

Table on the basis of that belief draws a clear distinction to underscore the importance for them to repent from their sins and believe in Christ for their salvation.

What this means is that the church of Jesus Christ is indispensable for passing on the *tradition*—that is, the gospel of Jesus Christ—from generation to generation. This does not mean, as Roman Catholics argue, that the church has authority *over* the tradition, for the exact opposite is true. The Scriptures are the divine charter *for* the church, governing every aspect of her message and methods. Instead, what this means is that God himself has appointed the church as the vehicle for passing on the message of the Scriptures to each subsequent generation. He could have simply given a Bible to everyone individually, but instead, he called out a people for himself, with the intention that this people would build one another up in the gospel.

Particularly, this is important as we consider how the gospel is passed down among our covenant children. We baptize children as non-communing members, since they cannot do what Paul requires of those who would receive the Lord's Supper in the next section of this passage: to examine themselves (v. 28), to discern the body (v. 29), and to judge themselves before coming (v. 31). God promises to be God to our children after us (Gen. 17:7; Acts 2:39), but as our children see some part of our worship to which they do not have automatic access, they begin to ask questions. Just as children's questions prompted explanations of God's great works of redemption in the Old Testament (Ex. 12:26–27; Josh. 4:6–7), so our children's questions prompt us to tell them about God's great works of redemption in the New Testament. As they ask why we are going to the Table, we can tell them that Christ's body was broken, and his blood shed, for all those who believe in him. By this powerful witness, the tradition of the gospel is passed down to every generation of our children after us until the day when Christ finally comes (1 Cor. 11:26).

Eating and Drinking in an Unworthy Manner (1 Cor. 11:27–32)

The sum of the preceding statements about the Lord's Supper, along with Paul statements in 1 Corinthians 10:16–17, affirm that the Lord's Supper is a spiritual experience by which we participate in the benefits of the broken body and shed blood of Jesus Christ. As a result, Paul gives three main exhortations about how we should receive the Lord's Supper. First, Paul warns us that to receive the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner will incur guilt “concerning the body and blood of the Lord” (1 Cor. 11:27). This does not mean that we must be sinless to approach the Lord's Table, for part of Christ's very purpose for feeding us from his Table is to strengthen and encourage the weak and doubting.⁵⁹ David Garland puts point this well: “Although no one is worthy of the Lord's Supper, one can eat it worthily.”⁶⁰

In the immediate context, Paul is clearly warning those who would continue to despise the church of God, and to humiliate the poor, during the administration of the Lord's Supper (cf. 1 Cor. 11:17–22). More generally, however, Paul's words warn all those who would abuse the Lord's Supper by coming without true faith in Christ, or by willfully harboring any unrepentant sin (cf. 1 Cor. 5:11; 6:9–11).⁶¹ This would include anyone who eats and drinks from the Lord's Supper with the primary design of feeding the belly, not of feeding on Christ by faith (1 Cor. 11:21–22, 34). When Paul writes that someone who thus eats and drinks in an unworthy manner will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord, this does not require us to interpret Paul's words as teaching that Christ's body and blood are in the elements on the sacrament. Rather, Paul means that to misuse or to abuse the Lord's Supper is to treat irreverently the symbols (i.e., “signs”) that portray Christ's

broken body and shed blood, and in this way does someone incur guilt concerning Christ's body and blood. As Charles Hodge points out, just as trampling a nation's flag is irreverent to the nation itself, and just as mistreating a representative of the king is irreverent to the king, so also is mistreating the bread and the cup irreverent to our Lord Jesus himself.⁶²

Second, Paul insists that we must examine ourselves as we come to eat of the bread and drink of the cup (1 Cor. 11:28). If we believe that eating and drinking wrongly may incur guilt, then we need to examine ourselves actively to discover whether there be any offending sin in our lives or our attitudes as we approach the Lord's Table. Third, Paul insists that we must discern the body (1 Cor. 11:29). What does it mean to "discern the body"? Some take this as a reference to distinguishing the holiness of the Lord's Supper from common food.⁶³ Others take this as a requirement to meditate on the loving, sacrificial death of Christ's "body" on the cross, resulting in transformed attitudes toward fellow believers.⁶⁴ It is probably better, though, to understand Paul as referring to discerning/recognizing the *church* as the body of Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 10:17).⁶⁵ That is, to approach the Lord's Supper worthily requires us to recognize the way the sacrament gives us communion with Christ (1 Cor. 11:27; cf. 1 Cor. 10:16) and with our fellow believers (1 Cor. 11:29; cf. 1 Cor. 10:17). As we prepare to receive the Lord's Supper, we should examine ourselves how we relate toward each member of our fellowship and communion (1 Cor. 11:28).

If we do not, then Paul gives an explanatory warning: failure to examine ourselves in regard to how we are treating Christ and Christ's church may result in temporal judgment of weakness, illness, and even death, just as some of the Corinthians have already experienced (1 Cor. 11:30). Thus, we must not only *examine* ourselves, but *judge* ourselves by condemning our sin in repentance to the Lord (1 Cor. 11:31). If we judge ourselves in repenting from any sin we discover in ourselves, we may find discipline from the Lord, but we will avoid condemnation along with the rest of the world (1 Cor. 11:32).⁶⁶ This last verse echoes what the author of Hebrews writes elsewhere when he urges us to endure God's discipline, since by it we may know that we are sons, and not illegitimate children (Heb. 12:7–17).

Wait Upon One Another (1 Cor. 11:33–34)

In v. 33, Paul once again identifies for us the implications of his preceding statements, using the same conjunction of result, "so then" (ὥστε; *hōste*), as in v. 27. When the Corinthians "come together" (i.e., as a church for corporate worship), they must "wait for one another" (1 Cor. 11:33). While this verb often does carry the idea of waiting *for* other people (cf. Acts 17:16; 1 Cor. 16:11), in the context of meals, this word in ancient Greek often carried more of the idea of welcoming, demonstrating hospitality and compassion for one another, especially by sharing food.⁶⁷ To put this into an English idiom, we might translate this not as waiting *for* one another (a matter of time), but as waiting *on* one another (a matter of hospitality). If this sense accurately captures Paul's meaning here, it would connect well with what Paul criticized earlier in vv. 17–22. The rich should not feast and get drunk, but they should share what they have with the poor who have nothing.⁶⁸ Even more, the Lord's Supper should not be treated as a feast to satisfy hunger, so that people should eat first at home, and then come together for the exclusive purpose of receiving the Lord's Supper in the context of corporate worship (v. 34a). Finally, Paul states that he has other directions to give, which he will relate when he comes (v. 34b).

The Body and Blood of Christ

We will close with a brief word on the whether the bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper is in any way transformed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. First, as many have pointed out, the primary dispute that Protestants have with Roman Catholics is not whether the bread and wine are connected with the body and blood of Christ, but as to whether the elements really remain bread and wine at all. Roman Catholics believe that, while the bread and the wine look, feel, smell, and taste like bread and wine, in fact, they are not bread and wine but Christ's body and blood. This understanding conflicts with Paul's plain words in v. 28: "Let a person examine himself, then, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup." As Leon Morris observes, "The bread remains bread at the moment of reception."⁶⁹

This point does not force us into a strictly memorial view of the Lord's Supper, where we are merely calling to mind the memory of Christ's sacrifice for us. Indeed, we confess that we do receive Christ by faith through the Lord's Supper: "Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements, in this sacrament, do then also, inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally but spiritually, receive, and feed upon, Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then, not corporally or carnally, in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet, as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses."⁷⁰

While Roman Catholics and Lutherans insist that we must take literally Christ's statement, "This is my body," we should notice that Christ tells us how to interpret this language in reference to his blood: "This is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Cor. 11:25; my translation).⁷¹ Matthew records this language as, "This is my blood of the covenant..." (Matt. 26:28), and Paul's language shows us the proper interpretation. This is not a crassly literal statement, as though the cup *were* the blood of Jesus; on the contrary, the cup shows forth, exhibits, and confers to us the blessings of the new covenant in Christ's blood. The same kind of language appears in Genesis 17:10 regarding circumcision: "This is my covenant, which you shall keep...." Circumcision was a sign and seal of the *blessings* of the covenant—namely, that God will make his people righteous by faith (cf. Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:11). By eating the bread and drinking the cup, we genuinely participate in Christ's broken body and shed blood (1 Cor. 10:16), but we do so by faith.

Discussion Questions

1. What does Paul teach about the headship of men (1 Cor. 11:3)? Why does the headship of men require them to exercise the open rule of Christ by leading in public worship? How does this relate to keeping their heads uncovered (1 Cor. 11:4)? What does Paul teach about the responsive role of women in worship (1 Cor. 11:5; cf. 1 Cor. 14:34–35)? How does this relate to keeping their heads covered (1 Cor. 1 Cor. 11:5–6)? How might we apply these doctrines to the details of our current culture?
2. What divisions exist between you and others in the church? Are these philosophical divisions, personality-driven divisions, or petty divisions? What personality rifts might create tensions that your church must navigate? Jesus tells us to leave corporate worship, if necessary, in order to

reconcile with a brother before returning to worship (Matt. 5:24). With whom might you need to reconcile before attending corporate worship again? What practical steps can you take this week to heal those divisions?

3. What do you think about “tradition” (1 Cor. 11:2, 17)? Where have you seen tradition undercut the spirit of worship, by descending into traditionalism? Where have you seen tradition undercut the truth of worship, by establishing practices outside of what God commands in his word? What do we mean when we talk about the tradition of Christ’s being given over for us? How have you received that tradition? How are we passing that tradition on to the next generation?

4. What does it mean to eat the bread and drink the cup “in an unworthy manner” (1 Cor. 11:27)? What does it mean to “be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord” (1 Cor. 11:27)? What does it mean to “discern the body” (1 Cor. 11:29)? What does it mean to “judge ourselves” (1 Cor. 11:31–32)? What does it mean to “wait for one another” (1 Cor. 11:33)? In light of Paul’s exhortations, what is one change you might make in how you prepare for and receive the Lord’s Supper?

Notes

1. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 429.

2. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 517.

3. Barnett, *1 Corinthians: Holiness and Hope of a Rescued People*, 196. This particular suggestion for interpreting v. 4–5, though, has the difficulty of seeming to clash with Paul’s later statements in v. 14–15 about a woman’s long hair as her “glory.” (Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 548.)

4. For a good summary, see Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 557–65.

5. “For as a man’s dress or gesture has in some cases the effect of disfiguring, and in others of adorning him, so all actions are set off to advantage by decorum, and are vitiated by the want of it. Much, therefore, depends upon decorum (τὸ πρεπον,) and that not merely for securing for our actions gracefulness and beauty, but also to accustom our minds to propriety.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 350. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)

6. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 204–05.

7. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 225.

8. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 515.

9. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 184.

10. For “estate of humiliation,” see *Westminster Larger Catechism*, questions #46–50.

11. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 353. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>

12. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 207–08.

13. “All of this shows us that Paul is not laying down an absolute rule that is to be observed by Christians of all times in regard to covering the head or leaving it uncovered during worship. Not the custom as a custom is vital but the *significance* of a custom....Hence Paul explains it to the Corinthians at length and bids them to abide by their custom. For to abrogate it and to fly in the face of it means, in their case, not only to violate that significance but at the same time to disavow that significance.” (Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 435.)

14. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 355. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>
15. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 184.
16. Thiselton, *First Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical & Pastoral Commentary*, 173.
17. As we will see in our study of 1 Corinthians 14, this does not mean women are prohibited from speaking during the responsive parts of congregational worship, but only prohibited from worship leadership, whether in prayer or prophecy (i.e., preaching).
18. “It would not, therefore, be allowable for them to prophesy even with a covering upon their head, and hence it follows that it is to no purpose that he argues here as to a covering. It may be replied, that the Apostle, by here condemning the one, does not commend the other. For when he reproves them for prophesying with their head uncovered, he at the same time does not give them permission to prophesy in some other way, but rather delays his condemnation of that vice to another passage, namely in 1 Corinthians 14.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 356. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)
19. The strongest explanation may arise from the humiliation of shaving the head of a foreign slave before and Israelite could marry her in Deuteronomy 21:10–14: “[10] “When you go out to war against your enemies, and the LORD your God gives them into your hand and you take them captive, [11] and you see among the captives a beautiful woman, and you desire to take her to be your wife, [12] and you bring her home to your house, *she shall shave her head* and pare her nails. [13] And she shall take off the clothes in which she was captured and shall remain in your house and lament her father and her mother a full month. After that you may go in to her and be her husband, and she shall be your wife. [14] But if you no longer delight in her, you shall let her go where she wants. But you shall not sell her for money, nor shall you treat her as a slave, since *you have humiliated her.*” (cf. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 209.)
20. “God created man male and female, after his own image, in knowledge, righteousness and holiness, with dominion over the creatures.” (*Westminster Shorter Catechism*, #10)
21. “The same question may now be proposed respecting the image, as formerly respecting the *head*. For both sexes were created in the image of God, and Paul exhorts women no less than men to be formed anew, according to that image. The *image*, however, of which he is now speaking, relates to the order of marriage, and hence it belongs to the present life, and is not connected with conscience. The simple solution is this — that he does not treat here of innocence and holiness, which are equally becoming in men and women, but of the distinction, which God has conferred upon the man, so as to have superiority over the woman. In this superior order of dignity the glory of God is seen, as it shines forth in every kind of superiority.” (Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 357. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>)
22. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 357. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>
23. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 210.
24. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 358. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.i.html>>
25. “The point of the question turns on *πρέπον*, whether it is ‘proper’ for a woman to pray or to worship with her head uncovered. The verb *πρέπω* means ‘to shine forth,’ ‘to be distinguished’; hence the adjective == excellent, worthy, fitting, or ‘proper.’ We thus see that the obligation mentioned in v. 7 and v. 10 is one of propriety. This is general propriety since the next question turns on the teaching of nature; yet as far as the Christian is concerned, who does everything to the glory of God (10:31), even general propriety carries a Christian influence with it. Paul is quite certain what the answer will be, v. 2. When the Corinthians consider the custom they have they will certainly not call it improper.” (Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and*

Second Epistles to the Corinthians, 448.)

26. “*To be contentious*, i.e. disposed to dispute for the sake of disputation. With such persons all argument is useless. Authority is the only end of controversy with such disturbers of the peace. The authority here adduced is that of the apostles and of the churches. The former was decisive, because the apostles were invested with authority not only to teach the gospel, but also to organize the church, and to decide every thing relating to Christian ordinances and worship. The authority of the churches, although not coercive, was yet great. No man is justified, except on clearly scriptural grounds, and from the necessity of obeying God rather than man, to depart from the established usages of the church in matters of public concern.” (Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 214.)

27. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 217–18.

28. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 594.

29. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 364–65. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.ii.html>>

30. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 218.

31. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 537.

32. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 260.

33. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 367. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.ii.html>>

34. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 241.

35. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 596–97.

36. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 219.

37. Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 155.

38. e.g., Hays, *First Corinthians*, 196.

39. Barnett, *1 Corinthians: Holiness and Hope of a Rescued People*, 211.

40. For these three paragraphs, see Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 214–16, 219, 234–36.

41. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 604.

42. Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 157.

43. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Vindication of Tradition: The 1983 Jefferson Lecture in the Humanities* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 65.

44. E.g., Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 221.

45. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 606–07.

46. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 373. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

47. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 223.

48. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 198.

49. The Apostle Peter captures this idea in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2:23, although he uses the word ἑκδοτος (*ekdotos*; lit., “given out”) rather than παραδίδομι (*paradidōmi*; lit., “given over”): “...this Jesus, *delivered up* according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified and killed by the hands of lawless men.”

50. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 374. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

51. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 7.6.

52. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 381. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

53. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 226.

54. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 382. Available online:

<<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

55. “Acts and Deliverances of Other Presbyterian Denominations on Fermented Wine,” from *The Historical Development of the Book of Church Order*. <<http://www.pcahistory.org/bco/dfw/58/wine.html>>. Accessed May 5, 2020.

56. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 227.

57. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, 471–72.

58. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 384. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

59. Q. 172. May one who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation, come to the Lord's supper?

A. One who doubteth of his being in Christ, or of his due preparation to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, may have true interest in Christ, though he be not yet assured thereof; and in God's account hath it, if he be duly affected with the apprehension of the want of it, and unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity: in which case (because promises are made, and this sacrament is appointed, for the relief even of weak and doubting Christians) he is to bewail his unbelief, and labor to have his doubts resolved; and, so doing, he may and ought to come to the Lord's supper, that he may be further strengthened. (*Westminster Larger Catechism #172*).

60. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 551.

61. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 385–87. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

62. Hodge, *A Commentary on 1 & 2 Corinthians*, 230.

63. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 389. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iii.html>>

64. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 552–53.

65. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 623–24.

66. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, 392–93. Available online: <<https://ccel.org/ccel/calvin/calcom39/calcom39.xviii.iv.html>>

67. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 554–555.

68. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 249.

69. Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 160.

70. *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 29.7.

71. Morris, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 157–58.