

Public Prayer and Prophecy | 1 Corinthians 11:2-15

verses 2-12 included on session 25

- Verse 13- Keeping the rules of the passage given in verse 3, the question is, should a **woman pray unto God** in public (which has been the only matter under discussion, not private prayer) without the *covering* of her husband? Paul asks the readers to **judge for yourselves** based on the evidence he has given, and the example from nature that he presents in the following verses.
- Verses 14-15 –
 - Paul's use of the word **nature** does not imply a biological **shame** in a man's long hair, but rather that the *natural cultural response* to a man's **long hair** is going to be a **shame unto him**
 - The word **shame** is ἀτιμία [atimia], which is *timiea* (honor) with the negation of the *a* thus *dishonor*.
 - Even outside the Judeo-Christian world, there has never been a time in recorded history when it was culturally honorable for men to have long hair.
 - Through history, however, it has been a **glory** for a woman to have **long hair**.
 - Some speculate that this is glorious for a woman because it implies that she is well-cared for, not having to work in the fields or around machinery, and able to spend the time on the upkeep that longer hair requires. If this is indeed the root of the glory of a woman's long hair, then it ties in with Paul's argument for a woman having the protection of a man.
 - Incidentally, it has most often been the feminist who would cut hair short, giving implication that she could "do her own work" and didn't need the covering of a man.
 - Note: this is cultural speculation and should be taken as speculation. Paul does not fully explain how **nature itself** teaches the shame of a man's long hair and the glory of a woman's long hair.

Contentions and Divisions in the Church | 1 Corinthians 11:16-22

- Verse 16 - Paul, changing subjects, appears to say that the matter of long hair (not the matter of a woman being under the spiritual leadership of a man) is a **custom**. However, there is **no such custom** when it comes to being **contentious**. Paul declared in Romans 16:17 that those who **cause divisions** should be marked and avoided.
- Verse 17 - The declaration of Paul concerning their public worship (which relates to the conversation which precedes and which follows, though that which follows is directly related) is that their gatherings were **not for the better, but for the worse**. How much of this could be said of modern church gatherings?
- Verse 18 - Paul often speaks against **divisions** in the church. This time he uses the word σχίσμα [schisma], which speaks of *schisms*. Paul's remedy is never a false unity, but eliminating the source of bad theology.
- Verse 19 - Just like God allowed the enemies of the Israelites remain in the land so that they would be tested and molded into warriors (Judges 3:1-2), He has allowed **heresies** to remain in order to test/prove and thus make **manifest** those who understand the truth. Note that **approved** is the result of *proving* and has nothing to do with a Calvinistic type of selection of the saved.
- Verse 20 - The Corinthians church was, in a sense, unable to **eat the Lord's supper** because of the **divisions** (v. 18) and **heresies** (v. 19) within the congregation. The **Lord's supper** requires a unity that

simply was not present in that congregation. When they, therefore, took the elements of the Lord's supper, they were really just taking bread and wine, with no spiritual meaning.

- Verse 21 - The ancient church had the practice of the *Agape Feast* that was done in conjunction with the Lord's Supper. It appears that the Corinthian church, at this pre-Lord's Supper feast, was so schismatic that some were able to fill their plates and indulge to the point of drunkenness, while others were left **hungry** altogether.
- Verse 22 - Paul is not prohibiting eating in a church (the interpretation of the Church of Christ), but rather is prohibiting allowing a church meal to be a tool for **shame** for **them that have not**. This is not praiseworthy, and Paul will not allow them to **despise...the church of God** in this way. It was supposed to be an *Agape* feast, not a selfish-gorging feast.

The Observance of the Lord's Supper | 1 Corinthians 11:23-26

- Verse 23 –
 - Paul claims that he **received** this information **of the Lord** (literally, *from* the Lord).
 - It is significant, I think, that Paul did not say that the Lord **took bread** on the Passover, but rather on **the same night in which he was betrayed**, thus the night prior to the Passover (compare John 13:1-2).
 - Paul uses the Greek term for *leavened bread*.
 - Note that in 1 Corinthians 5:7-8 Paul speaks of **Christ our passover** and uses the Greek word for *unleavened* bread (words which cannot be easily mistaken: *azymos* (leaven-free) and *arton* (loaf)).
 - Surely if the Lord had used *azymos* on the night of the last supper, he would have used that unmistakable term when He made the revelation to Paul.
- Verse 24 - The Lord was instituting a ceremony of **remembrance**. Paul would continue the ceremony for this dispensation in v. 26. The bread was not **my body** but was symbolic of the Lord as the **bread of life** (John 6:35).
- Verse 25 –
 - The **cup** symbolized the sealing of the **new testament** (i.e.: covenant) **in my blood**.
 - That covenant had been promised (Jeremiah 30:31) and described (Jeremiah 30:32-34) but never delivered.
 - Now, having not delivered the covenant, the Lord seals it in his blood.
 - When a believer in this dispensation takes the cup of the Lord's Supper, he/she is being reminded of the death of the Lord which provides forgiveness and of the fact that the **new testament** will someday be fulfilled.
 - The use of the terms Old Testament and New Testament are catholic in origin (from Jerome), and should ultimately be rejected by those who want to speak strictly Biblically.
 - The so-called Old Testament is as valid as the so-called New Testament.
 - Furthermore, the so-called Old Testament contains several covenants (Noahic, Abrahamic, Davidic, etc.) which are still in effect (thus not *old*) and the New Testament does not include the future period in which the *new covenant* will be established (even those who believe we live in the new covenant would have to admit that it would not come until the Day of Pentecost, which is in the book of Acts).
- Verse 26 –
 - The participation in the symbolic Lord's Supper is the most effective means of *proclaiming* the **Lord's death**. The word **shew** is καταγγέλλω [katangello], which is *angelos* (to proclaim as a messenger) and *kata*, the prefix which emphasizes to the strongest degree).
 - In doing this **till he come** we participate in a *communion* with believers of all time. It is one of very few aspects of Christian worship that has been a constant through the centuries.