

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

only have started from one point—the real consent of Christendom at a time when the grave had hardly closed over the last of the Apostles—that those Gospels, and no others, were the authoritative record of the Life of Christ.

There is a parallel in these matters between the more minute criticism of the text and the larger criticism, of which we have been speaking, which deals with books as a whole. The Latin tradition may be wrong; the Syriac tradition may be wrong; even the best Alexandrine Text may be open to doubt; but where all these three are clear and combined, their evidence cannot be resisted.

W. SANDAY.

BECAUSE OF THE ANGELS.

I CORINTHIANS XI. 10.

My purpose in this paper is to discuss, and, if possible, elucidate, one of the most difficult verses in the New Testament, and the argument of which it is the culmination.

After treating at full, in Chapters viii.—xi. 1, a matter on which the Corinthian Church had sought advice, the Apostle introduces in Chapter xi. 2 a new subject, without giving any hint whether it was mentioned in the letter he had received from Corinth (Chap. vii. 1), or had been brought under his notice in some other way.

It is not difficult to harmonize the warm *praise* of Verse 2 with the severe reproof contained in other parts of the Epistle. The words *all things* must, like all universal expressions everywhere, be limited by

the writer's mental horizon at the moment of writing. And since throughout the Chapter St. Paul speaks only of his readers' behaviour at Church meetings, of such matters only he probably now thinks. In all these things the Corinthian Christians remember the Apostle, and the directions he gave. And we notice that the misconduct mentioned below does not imply forgetfulness of anything St. Paul had actually said. Touching the head-dress of women he had probably said nothing at all. And although about the Lord's Supper he had given them instruction (Verse 23), he had most likely said nothing touching the specific abuses which, after his departure, became prevalent at Corinth. Indeed, this Verse is a proof that underneath the disaffection implied in the Church parties there lay a genuine loyalty to the Apostle. Of this loyalty the mission of Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, was accepted by St. Paul as pleasant proof. And, as we learn from 2 Corinthians vii. 11, an enthusiastic outburst of it was evoked by the letter before us. This remarkable and unexpected coincidence may be accepted as one of the many proofs of genuineness which strew the pages of both Epistles to the Corinthians. Another coincidence is found in the fact that in this Verse St. Paul does not say expressly, as he does in Philippians i. 4, 2 Thessalonians i. 3, that his praise embraces every one of his readers.

The traditions were no doubt directions given by St. Paul at Corinth about Church matters generally. The definite article suggests a somewhat definite body of instructions committed by each Apostle to the various Churches under his care. In 2 Thessalonians ii. 15, and iii. 6, the same definite expression is found ;

referring in the one case to Apostolic doctrine, in the other to Apostolic precepts about private life. In the passage before us, St. Paul declares that at Corinth the committal of these traditions had been met by a corresponding retention of them on the part of the Church.

Before so much as mentioning the matter he is going to discuss, St. Paul states a broad principle which he uses as a platform of approach to it. He reminds us that subordination is a law of the kingdom of God; that every man is under the direction of Christ, that woman is subordinate to man, and that even within the Eternal Trinity the same law of subordination is found. This last assertion, which contains a truth sometimes obscured by an exaggerated conception of the divinity of Christ, is in strict accordance with Chapters iii. 23, xv. 28, and with the words of Christ recorded in St. John iv. 34, v. 19, 36, xiv. 28, and in many other passages.

From this secure and broad platform of truth St. Paul moves easily to the specific matter in hand. For they who remember that even upon the throne the eternal Son bows to the eternal Father will not resent the teaching that woman must not cast away the badge of her subordination to man.

We cannot infer from Verse 4 that at Corinth men were in the habit of speaking in Church with covered heads. For the statement it contains is sufficiently accounted for by St. Paul's habit of contrast, and of prefacing a truth by its converse. Instances of this habit are found in Verse 7, in Romans viii. 4, 10, 12, 15, and elsewhere abundantly. Only by contrast with opposites can mental conceptions become clear. And in the matter before us everything depends on the

contrast. Since the statement in Verse 4 is given only for contrast, a mere unproved assertion is sufficient now. But in Verse 7 a reason is given for what is here asserted.

The complete contrast of Verses 4 and 5 is made the more conspicuous by the close similarity of phrase. To different persons by different means comes the same result.

That St. Paul speaks at all of women prophesying, seems at first sight to contradict his own severe words in Chapter xiv. 34, and in 1 Timothy ii. 11, 12. And this difficulty is not removed by saying that he deals first with a matter of detail, the head-dress, and then with the whole subject. For, if the whole were wrong, it is inconceivable that the Apostle would stop to speak of the manner of doing it as wrong. If he had wished to speak only of the head-dress, apart from the public speaking, of women, he would simply have forbidden them to come together in Church unveiled. And in reality the two directions are not inconsistent. St. Paul forbid, in strongest terms, that women should speak in the ordinary public assemblies in which "the whole Church came together." But doubtless in more private gatherings, especially among their own sex, women were permitted and encouraged to exercise the gift of prayer. In such assemblies, probably, the daughters of Philip (Acts xxi. 9) spoke under the special influence of the Spirit of Prophecy.

The assertion of Verse 5 was doubtless true, and was intended to be understood, in reference not only to those women who spoke in the assemblies, but to all others. Only of the former does the Apostle write expressly, because their conspicuous position made

their shame more conspicuous. But his readers would feel that the arguments which follow cover the case of all women attending the worship of the Church.

The assertion that the woman who prays with unveiled head puts to shame her head, is supported by the assertion that *she is one and the same with the shaven woman*. The very definite words, *the shaven woman*, would recall to readers at Corinth a very definite conception, but one with which I cannot soil the pages of this journal. The shaven head of the women referred to was a mark that they had abandoned, as far as they could, every trace of womanhood. The use here of the words *one and the same* has an evident bearing upon the meaning of our Lord's words at the Last Supper. But neither his words there, nor those of St. Paul here, may be toned down so as to mean nothing at all. The woman who prays with uncovered head acts from the same motive, and is really doing the same thing, as the shameless woman here referred to. For both are obliterating that distinction of dress by which, in all countries and ages, the distinction of sex is indicated. Now, to abandon this distinction of dress, is evidently an attempt to abandon, in some measure, the subordinate position of which woman's distinctive dress is a mark. But this is a self-inflicted shame. For to every one the divinely appointed position is the place of honour. And since this dishonour comes through the woman's treatment of her head, it is a disgrace done to her own head, to the noblest and most conspicuous part of her body. Upon her uncovered head now sits the shame involved in a desertion of her divinely appointed, and therefore honourable, position of subordination.

The assertion, *For it is one and the same, &c.*, is given without proof. St. Paul leaves his female readers to test for themselves its truth by comparing their own motives in laying aside the veil with the motive of the degraded woman referred to. But he develops the force of the proof which this assertion contains, that to pray with uncovered head is a disgrace to the head, by urging the woman who is determined to pray without a veil to carry her own practice to its logical result, that thus she may see the direction in which it is leading her; or, if she be conscious of the disgrace of this, to act consistently and abstain from conduct which differs from it only in degree. This use of a second *γίψ*, not to prove or account for a foregoing assertion, but to develop its argumentative force, is very common with St. Paul, as with all argumentative writers.

The declaration in Verse 6, that it is a shame for a woman to do what men do, constantly demands, and in the following Verses receives, an explanation and a reason. A man puts to shame his head by praying covered, because he *ought* to be uncovered: for to abstain from what we ought to do is always a disgrace. Of this obligation a reason is found in man's relation to God and to creation. The male sex, as supreme on earth, is an *image*, a visible pattern, of the Ruler of the universe; and, as such, he is a *glory*, an outshining of the splendour, of God. By looking at man we see in dim outline what God is, and God's greatness. But woman has an earthly superior, whose *glory* she is. For that so noble and beautiful a helpmeet was created for man reveals the greatness of man. This subordinate relation of woman St. Paul proves by pointing to

the origin of the race, and to the fact that man was the source of woman. This historical fact in the order of creation he explains by reminding us that it is distinctly taught in Genesis that woman was second not only in the order of time, but also in the purpose of the Creator. As usual, *καὶ γάρ* introduces an assertion which is both an addition to, and supports, a foregoing assertion.

St. Paul has now proved that the distinction of sex belongs to the very essence of humanity; for it dates from the creation, and entered into the creative purpose of God. He goes on at once to say that on this distinction rests an obligation: *because of this the woman ought*. This obligation he describes in the words, *to have authority upon the head*; and supports it by a further motive, *because of the angels*. These very obscure phrases now demand attention.

The whole context implies that the obligation *to have authority upon the head* is practically the same as the obligation, which St. Paul is here enforcing, to have the head covered while praying or prophesying. Indeed this is demanded by the obscurity of the expression. For had the Apostle wished to assert an obligation not mentioned before, he would have stated it in simple and unmistakable terms. Whereas, for a restatement of something already asserted twice, he appropriately chooses terms less explicit but more graphic. We must, therefore, seek for an exposition which will make the word *authority* practically equivalent to *unveiled* in Verses 5 and 13, and which will account for the obscure expression here used.

Of *ἐξουσία*, as its derivation from *ἔξεστιν* suggests, the simplest meaning is liberty of action unimpeded by the

prohibition of law, human or Divine. (So 1 Cor. viii. 9; ix. 4.) Very frequently this liberty of action implies control over others. (So St. Matt. x. 1; St. John xvii. 2.) This brings into great prominence the superior Power which gave this authority; as in the passages just quoted, and in St. Matthew ix. 8; xxi. 23; xxviii. 18. Sometimes the superior Power is entirely out of sight, or altogether absent, as in Acts i. 7, where we read of the authority of God. We have here the simple conception of unimpeded liberty of action, implying control over men and things and events. But even here the idea of social order is not absent. God is free to act because of his rank in the graduated scale of the universe. Usually, however, the word denotes liberty of action, frequently involving control over others, derived from that superior Power to which are subject both he who exercises and they who submit to the authority. When there is no reference to control over others, the force of *ἐξουσία* may be reproduced exactly by rendering it "a right," as in 1 Corinthians ix. 5, "Have we not a right to lead about?" &c.; and 1 Corinthians viii. 9, "Beware lest this right of yours become a stumblingblock."

The Authorized rendering, "power," *i.e.*, capacity for producing results, a good rendering of *δύναμις*, is altogether insufficient as a translation of *ἐξουσία*, and has done much to obscure the sense of this Verse.

But what is the authority which, by wearing a veil, woman carries on her head? Not a liberty of action or control over others which she herself exercises; for of such we have no mention in the whole passage. The only authority here is that to which, by the ordinance of the Ruler of the universe, she is subject.

And this authority, looked upon as representing the great abstract principle of authority, which is the law of the kingdom of God, she ought to bear upon her head.

But how can she do this? By wearing on her head the distinctive dress which proclaims that she belongs to the subordinate sex, and that she accepts her divinely appointed position; for of the authority to which she bows, her headdress is a visible embodiment. Just so, in a frequently quoted passage (Diod. Sic. i. 47), a diadem is a visible embodiment of triple royalty. But would not this be better expressed by saying that she ought to have "submission" on the head? No. This would represent a correct idea, but not that in the Apostle's mind. He wishes to give prominence, not to woman's subjection, but to the abstract principle of *authority* which is glorified in her submission. Similarly, a soldier's obedience reveals the majesty of military authority. And it was the honourable privilege of the Christian women at Corinth to bear aloft on their own veiled heads, before the eyes of men, that great principle of authority which is the universal law of the kingdom of God and a source of infinite blessing to all who bow to it.

This exposition accords with the sense of the whole passage, and accounts for the difficult phrase before us. To have used again the word "veil," would have been a mere empty repetition. The word actually used teaches the true significance and the honour of the veil.

The argument up to this point is so complete that the following words, *Because of the angels*, seem to be not only obscure but needless. But we cannot doubt

their genuineness, and must therefore seek for an exposition of them which will justify their presence.

The preposition *διὰ* suggests a parallel, more or less exact, with *διὰ τοῦτο*. These words give the ground of the woman's obligation to wear authority on her head, viz., the order and purpose of creation. We expect, therefore, to find in the words we are now studying a further motive supporting the same obligation. For such support St. Paul appeals to *the angels*.

Since the days of Tertullian, many have thought that the angels referred to here were those who fell (Jude 6), and that St. Paul appeals to the common Jewish exposition of Genesis vi. 2, an exposition embodied in the Alexandrian manuscript of the Septuagint. The reference in the preceding Verses to the story of the creation lends plausibility to this suggestion; and the difficulty of the passage makes expositors thankful for any explanation. But it seems to me that this explanation cannot be accepted. Elsewhere in the New Testament the word *angels* never denotes, without further specification, fallen angels; and it is not likely that St. Paul would so use it here without any hint whatever of his meaning. Nor do I see how the fate of the fallen angels could be a practical motive deterring living women from praying with uncovered heads. Surely the Apostle would not seek to move them by fear of some injury which these degraded spirits might possibly inflict. And the effect produced on the fallen angels could be no motive for human action. Nor can I conceive that St. Paul has in view the possibility of the holy angels being tempted to sin, and thus led to destruction, by the uncovered heads of Christian women. For if they are exposed

to temptation, a temptation which may be fatal, by the sight of a woman's face, their position is terrible to contemplate. Even if women kept their faces covered at Divine worship, there are many occasions in life in which female beauty must be exposed to angelic gaze in a manner still more seductive; unless we suppose that the angels never see a woman except at public worship. If they are in danger of being led into sin by sight of a woman's face, the angels of God are much weaker, in the matter of sensual desire, than are average Englishmen of the present day. And it is impossible to conceive women moved to keep on their veils while praying by a consideration for the spiritual safety of these weak celestial brethren. A motive so powerless is unworthy of the earnestness of the Apostle.

But is there any aspect in which the angels furnish to women a real motive for veiling their faces at public worship? I think there is. The distinction of sex is so radical and so important that it ought to be clearly set forth in the dress of the sexes. This is taught by a genuine human instinct, which has found expression, in every age and country, in the different dress of men and women. And the same true instinct condemns as shameful all attempts of women to make themselves look like men, either by cutting their hair, or by disowning a woman's head-dress. Now every correct instinct is strengthened by the felt presence of the good. A good man before our eyes gives fresh force to every good principle in our hearts. This influence is felt and acknowledged in various ways by all men, good and bad. Therefore St. Paul, after appealing in Verse 6 to his readers' instinctive sense of the impropriety of that which he condemns, and after sup-

porting his appeal by tracing this instinctive sense to its source in the original constitution of the sexes, now supports it further by bringing his fair readers into the presence of superhuman goodness. He appeals to the common Jewish teaching that in the worship of God's people the angels of heaven join. This teaching commends itself to us at once. If angels take interest in men, and afford them invisible help, surely they will take most interest in us in those moments when we are nearest to God. Without hesitation we may say that when God's people on earth bow together to their Father in heaven they join the worship of the one great family of earth and heaven. And no thought is more powerful than this to repress all impropriety in public worship, by strengthening every true instinct of propriety. St. Paul knew that he had an ally in a deep-seated and divinely-implanted instinct; and to his appeal to this instinct he gives force by drawing aside the veil which hides from our view the great company of heavenly worshippers, that his readers may feel the influence of the presence of these celestial companions.

This interpretation retains the ordinary sense of the word *angels*, and gives a real and powerful motive. And it is the only interpretation known to me which fulfils these conditions. I therefore accept it with perfect confidence. And I am but following in the steps of the greatest of the Greek commentators, Chrysostom, who expounds the passage thus: "If thou despisest the man, respect the angels."

To this powerful appeal St. Paul adds, in Verses 11, 12, as his wont is, a corrective; by shewing that if woman is subordinate to man, she is nevertheless essential to his very existence. Then follows another

appeal to the instinct of propriety, strengthened this time by an appeal, not to the angels who join our worship, but to the Great Being to whom it is directed. This is brought out very strongly by the conspicuous position of τῷ θεῷ before προσεύχεσθαι and immediately after ἀκατακάλυπτον. St. Paul's teaching is further supported by an appeal to nature, and by a warning against the spirit of contention, which lay probably at the root of the whole matter.

The teaching of the passage I have been attempting to explain is not without force now, even in reference to its specific matter. The total dissimilarity of ancient and modern clothing makes so much more conspicuous the maintenance in all ages of a complete difference in the dress of the sexes. But perhaps never more than now have women tried to ape the dress of men. And are not extreme cases of this an indication of a desire to abandon the restraints which belong to woman's subordinate position? Not seldom the wearers of such dress are treading a path from whose easily reached goal they would shrink back with horror. And their attire, be it ever so costly, is but a visible mark of their disgrace.

But be this as it may, the specific teaching of this passage is an embodiment of principles which apply to all. To every one the place of duty is the place of honour. And the outward marks of our position in life, however humble in the sight of men it be, are in reality, to those who accept their lot as from God, and strive therein to serve Him, marks of honour. For it is a man's highest honour to play well on the stage of life his divinely chosen part. On the other hand, to abandon a position which duty bids us retain cannot be

other than a disgrace. And every visible badge of such abandonment, be it ever so brilliant, is in the sight of the inhabitants of heaven a mark of shame.

Again, by accepting cheerfully our subordinate lot we are really lifting up for the admiration of men the authority to which we bow, an authority which is a source of life and infinite blessing to all who submit to it. The marks of our submission are the insignia of the King whom we serve. And upon the throne of God our Divine King wears as royal jewels the marks of his own obedience to the Father, an obedience even unto death.

Lastly. We belong to a family not confined to earth. We have brothers in the skies. Holy spirits who never sinned look upon us with affection and delight. They watch our conflict and help us in our need. And side by side with us they bow in absolute submission, although robed in the glory of heaven, to the common Father of them and of us. To think of them will repress all vain ambition to put ourselves in a position for which God never designed us.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

VII.—THE INTERVENTION OF ELIHU.

THIRD DISCOURSE (CHAPTER XXXV.)

JOB had sustained his charge of injustice against the Almighty Lord and Ruler of men by contending that, under his rule, the righteous were none the better for their righteousness (See Chapter xxxiv. 9, with Note on it). It is to this subsidiary charge that Elihu here