

The Naked Bible Podcast 2.0

Number 86

“The Head Covering of 1 Corinthians 11:13-15”

Dr. Michael S. Heiser

With

**Residential Layman
Trey Stricklin**

February 7, 2015

The Head Covering of 1 Corinthians 11:13-15

This episode begins a series of topical episodes following the end of our series on Leviticus. The topic for this episode is the controversial head covering reference in 1 Cor. 11:13-15. The discussion summarizes the material discussed in a scholarly journal article published in 2004 by Dr. Troy Martin entitled, “Paul’s Argument from Nature for the Veil in 1 Cor. 11:13-15: A Testicle instead of a Head Covering” (*Journal of Biblical Literature* 123:1 [2004]: 75-84). Martin summarizes his approach as follows: “This article interprets Paul’s argument from nature in 1 Cor. 11:13-15 against the background of ancient physiology. The Greek and Roman medical texts provide useful information for interpreting not only Paul’s letters but also other NT texts.” The article (and the author’s subsequent responses to criticism, also published in academic literature) presents a compelling case and is, to Dr. Heiser’s knowledge, the only approach that provides a coherent explanation as to why the head covering warnings are important, in the words of Paul “because of the angels” (1 Cor. 11:10). This warning ultimately takes readers back to the incident with the Watchers (sons of God) in Gen. 6:1-4.

The nature of this material is overtly sexual, so this episode is for adult listeners.

Papers referenced:

**Paul’s argument from nature for the veil in 1 Corinthians 11.13-15: A Testicle instead of a Head Covering
Why Should Women Cover their Heads bc of the Angels**

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 86, The Head Covering of 1 Corinthians 11:13-15. I'm your layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey Mike, how are you doing?

MSH: Very good, very good. Just did some recent travel and sort of glad to be back home and kind of get back into the normal routine.

TS: How was Florida, teaching the class?

MSH: It was fun. It was a nice small class. It had sort of a seminar feel to it. The first part of the trip was Sarasota so we had a number of hearty souls come out for that and listen to Unseen Realm content. That went well, and drove over to Fort Lauderdale for three, basically, all day, like eight hour days. They weren't quite eight hours, but to teach, not necessarily through the book because I assume people had read the book, but they got to hear things that would go into book 2 which includes material that I haven't even brought up in Unseen Realm but also sort of things we could drill down on in more detail.

TS: How was the response with the student?

MSH: Very good. They really enjoyed it.

TS: Any push back?

MSH: No, there were good questions but there was nobody that sort of ran to the Dean's office and asked why I was there.

TS: You didn't get picketed or protested?

MSH: No pickets. No protests. No one built a place to burn me at the stake outside or anything like that.

TS: I've got something else funny, Mike, is that while you're away, I was doing some research on the podcast to see how we were doing and as of last week, congratulations Mike, we are number 10 in Romania in iTunes. On the Christian chart we are number 10 and it doesn't end there. In Finland in the Christian podcast segment of iTunes, we are number 14.

MSH: True that.

TS: How about that? How about that? I would officially like to thank Romanian and Finland, are they Finnish? What's proper?

MSH: I think Finnish is the way you would refer to that.

TS: People for listening. If I knew the Finnish thank you word, I guess we could say shalom, or what's thank you?

MSH: I don't know. I'm not familiar with Finnish.

TS: What's the most ancient thank you that you can think of?

MSH: I don't know if there is anything other than shalom. Shalom is peace and that shows up everywhere. In other words, you part as friends. Whatever transaction or arrangement you were discussing ended on good terms.

TS: Shalom Romania and Finland.

MSH: That works pretty much everywhere. That's the big news Trey.

TS: That will get this podcast started right.

MSH: Thanks for that in-depth research.

TS: I'm excited about this topic. This is our first of six topic episodes and I'm really interested in this one about the head covering and the long hair on the male and the females.

MSH: Everybody where I've sort of dropped hints as to what's going on here, every time I do that, people want to hear the full story so we're finally doing an episode on it. And trust me, if there's an episode of the Naked Bible podcast you will not forget, it's going to be this one.

TS: Well that's good because I let my hair grow out. I have long hair now and I need to know by the end of this podcast if I need to get a haircut or not. That's the goal.

MSH: I'll sort of let you judge that. I'll try to remember to ask you what you think. We're going to start in ESV here. I'm going to read basically the whole chapter, chapter 11, not the whole chapter, the first 16 verses, the whole a segment is probably a better way of saying it as it pertains to the head covering issue. So here we are in 1 Corinthians 11. Paul says,

Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ.

² Now I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you. ³ But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God. ⁴ Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, ⁵ but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, since it is the same as if her head were shaven. ⁶ For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short. But since it is disgraceful for a wife to cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head. ⁷ For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. ⁸ For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. ⁹ Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. ¹⁰ That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. ¹¹ Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; ¹² for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God. ¹³ Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered? ¹⁴ Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, ¹⁵ but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering. ¹⁶ If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God.

MSH: So there are a couple of key things here just to sort of plant in our minds. Paul is making an argument from nature, as he understands nature, and this is an issue of either disgrace or not. To repeat Paul's question in verse 13, 'Judge for yourselves; is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered?' Again, this whole thing about this being an argument from nature, he's going to answer that question and he's going to be thinking about "nature". And he talks about a woman having long hair, it is her glory and then he says, 'for her hair is given to her for a covering.' So the hair is supposed to be this covering, whatever this covering is he's talking about. And the word for covering in this passage is the Greek word *peribolaion*, and we're going to be hearing that a couple of times as we proceed. Now what I'm going to do here, I can just preface it by saying this. What I'm going to say in this episode about the head covering, no one, unless you've read the article I'm going to reference or have heard me talk about this, you have never heard this before. Just trust me. You've never heard this before. This is going to sound like crazy town.

This is going to sound totally bizarre. But I'm going to make you a promise. At the end of this episode, you're going to think back on this episode, of all the crazy stuff you've heard, and you're going to think this thought. Boy, does that make sense. That makes total sense out of the passage as crazy and bizarre as this material was. If this is what was floating around in their head, in Paul's head when he wrote this and when Corinthians heard, when people read it in this time period, if this is what's going on in people's minds, that makes perfect sense. And not only that, but the line about all of this being tied to some problem with the angels, because of the angels, Paul was writing this as well, it's going to make perfect sense. So hold onto your hats as it were. I'm just prefacing it telling you you're not going to forget this one and it's going to sound completely bizarre but it's good to have a high degree of explanatory power for this passage. Now, what we're going to talk about really extends from a series of articles. Actually, it was an exchange of articles between two scholars starting in 2004 and ending in 2013.

That ought to give you another indication of how long it takes journals to process material. So it's over the course of nine years, believe it or not. But I'm going to focus on the original article that started the whole thing off and the article's title is this. This will tell you right away you're in for a good ride here. Troy W. Martin, the article is entitled, "Paul's Argument from Nature for the Veil in 1 Corinthians 11:13-15: (subtitle) A Testicle Instead of a Head Covering". Again, this is not from Billy Bob's website. If your name is Billy Bob, I apologize for that reference. But you get the point. This is not from Christian Middle Earth, the wild world of the Internet. This is from the Journal of Biblical Literature, which is one of the premier journals in biblical studies in a 2004 episode. Now this article got a response some seven years later from Mark Goodacre.

Goodacre wasn't buying the argument. His article was entitled, 'Does Peribolaion mean testicle in 1 Corinthians 11:15?' And then Martin responded to Goodacre's protestations with a third article, "A Peribolaion as testicle in 1 Corinthians 11:15, A Response to Mark Goodacre". And I'll be transparent here. I think Martin, especially in the last article when he addresses Goodacre's concerns and criticisms, I think Martin eats Goodacre's lunch. I think he builds a powerful argument from primary sources for his view. And we're going to focus for our talk here on the first article. And that first article, we're going to make that available on the podcast website so you can get the argument. You can get the primary sources. But to set it all up, here's

what Martin explains in his approach in his first footnote in the article. Here's what he writes, he says,

“This article interprets Paul's argument from nature in 1 Corinthians 11:13-15 against the background of ancient physiology. The Greek and Roman medical texts provide useful information for interpreting not only Paul's letters but also other New Testament texts.”

MSH: So what he's going to do is he's going to dive into Greek and Roman medical texts, mostly Greek material, people like Hippocrates. We're familiar with Hippocrates, the Hippocratic oath. The Greeks and Romans wrote mounds of medical literature that give us a pretty detailed picture of what they thought about human physiology in the first century and earlier. And that's what Martin's article is going to focus on. And I think you're going to find it fascinating. The content of the episode as I've telegraphed before on the website is going to be the very sexual in nature but that's anatomy. That's physiology, and this is where Martin is going to argue that this is where this language comes from, this stuff about head covering, *peribolaion*, and long hair versus shorthair, and all this kind of stuff. Women's hair length, men's hair length, all of this, believe it or not, is tied to ancient Greco-Roman medical “scientific” thinking of the day.

We're not going to think this way at all because we know more in terms of science. And what you're going to hear is not scientific at all in terms of what we now know. But back in the day, back when Paul was writing, back in the first century, this was the cutting-edge science and Martin's argument is that Paul knows this. He's familiar with this material. He's familiar with this worldview. And so when Paul writes 1 Corinthians 11, this is what he's thinking with his terminology and his recommendations, so on so forth. And it has a lot to do with human sexuality. So the key verse, “but if woman has long hair, it is her glory,” that's part of the question for her hair is given to her instead of, for a head covering. So what I want to do is jump into Martin's article and I'm going to read you excerpts. And I'm going to start here, the first couple pages of the article and then I'm going to read you long excerpts that he has from Greco-Roman medical literature. And you're going to see pretty quickly how that relates to what Paul writes in 1 Corinthians 11. So Martin says,

“While many features of this argument in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 require explanation, the argument from nature in verses 13 to 15 is particularly problematic. The rationale for the natural shame of a man with long hair obscure, especially problematic is the statement that woman's long hair is given her instead of a covering in verse 15. As traditionally understood, this statement nullifies the previous argument that a woman should wear a covering since her long hair apparently serves that purpose. A satisfactory explanation of this argument from nature should resolve the apparent contradiction and enable this argument to support Paul's contention that women should wear the veil, have a veil in public worship.”

MSH: Now, this is going to be page 77 of the article. What I just read to you is leading up to this. Once you look up the article you can sort of land where I'm landing here. I'm going to read through series of sections of the article within which Martin is going to quote from classical Greco-Roman texts. Just follow along as I read. It's going to sound bizarre but it's going to make

a lot of sense when we're at the end here and the lights will probably go on for you, even before we get to the ending summary. Martin writes at the beginning or at the top of page 77,

“Since περιβόλαιον is contrasted with hair, which is part of the body, the physiological semantic domain of περιβόλαιον in 1 Cor 11:15 becomes particularly relevant. Euripides uses περιβόλαιον in reference to a body part. He casts Hercules as complaining, "After I received [my] bags of flesh, which are the outward signs of puberty, [I received] labors about which I [shall] undertake to say what is necessary". A dynamic translation of the first clause would be: "After I received my testicles (περιβόλαια), which are the outward signs of puberty." In this text from Euripides, the term περιβόλαιον refers to a testicle

Achilles Tattius plays on this meaning of περιβόλαιον in his erotic description of a garden in which Clitophon seeks an amorous encounter with Leucippe. Achilles Tattius describes the entwining of the flowers, embracing of the leaves, and intercourses of the fruits. He portrays this erotic garden by allusions to male and female sexual organs. The term περιπλοκαί alludes to the female hair, the term περιβολαί to the testicles in males, and the term συμπλοκαί to the mixing of male and female reproductive fluid in the female.

Ancient medical conceptions confirm this association. Hippocratic authors hold that hair is hollow and grows primarily from either male or female reproductive fluid or semen flowing into it and congealing (Hippocrates, Nat puer 20). Since hollow body parts create a vacuum and attract fluid, hair attracts semen. Appropriately, the term κόμη refers not only to hair but also to the arms or suckers of the cuttlefish (see Maximus of Tyre, Phil 4.5). Hair grows most prolifically from the head because the brain is the place where the semen is produced or at least stored (Hippocrates, Genit. I). Hair grows only on the head of prepubescent humans because semen is stored in the brain and the channels of the body have not yet become large enough for reproductive fluid to travel throughout the body (Hippocrates, Nat. puer.20; Genit. 2). At puberty, secondary hair growth in the pubic area marks the movement of reproductive fluid from the brain to the rest of the body (Hippocrates, Nat. puer. 20; Genit. I). Women have less body hair not only because they have less semen but also because their colder bodies do not froth the semen throughout their bodies but reduce semen evaporation at the ends of their hair (Hippocrates, Nat. puer. 20).

According to these medical authors, men have more hair because they have more semen and their hotter bodies froth this semen more readily throughout their whole bodies (Hippocrates, Nat. puer. 20). The nature (φύσις) of men is to release or eject the semen. During intercourse, semen has to fill all the hollow hairs on its way from the male brain to the genital area (Aristotle, Probi. 893b. 10-17). Thus, men have hair growth on their

face, chest, and stomach. A man with hair on his back reverses the usual position of intercourse. A man with long hair retains much or all of his semen, and his long hollow hair draws the semen toward his head area but away from his genital area, where it should be ejected. Therefore, 1 Cor 11:14 correctly states that it is a shame for a man to have long hair since the male nature (φύσις) is to eject rather than retain semen.

In contrast, the nature (φύσις) of women is to draw up the semen and congeal it into a fetus (Hippocrates, Genit. 5; Nat. puer. 12). A woman's body is simply one huge gland, and the function of glands is to absorb (Hippocrates, Gland. 3).

This author also writes that glands and hair fulfill similar bodily functions. Just as glands absorb the excess bodily fluid that flows to them, so also hair collects the excess, frothed fluid that rises to the surface (Hippocrates, Gland. 4). What glands do within the body, hair does on the surface of the body. As one large gland designed to absorb male reproductive fluid, a woman's body is assisted by long hollow hair that increases the suction power of her hollow uterus (Aristotle, Gen an. 739a.37-739b.20). Consequently, another author, Pseudo-Phocylides, appropriately states, "Long hair is not fit for males, but for voluptuous women".

This conception of hair as part of the female genitalia explains the favorite Hippocratic test for sterility in women. A doctor places a scented suppository in a woman's uterus and examines her mouth the next day to see if he can smell the scent of the suppository. If he smells the scent, he diagnoses her as fertile. If he does not smell the scent, he concludes she is sterile because the channels connecting her uterus to her head are blocked. The suction power of her hair cannot draw up the semen through the appropriate channels in her body. The male seed is therefore discharged rather than retained, and the woman cannot conceive.

This conception of hair probably explains the frequent depilation of women's pubic hair. Although sometimes inflicted on male adulterers, depilation of the pubes is common among Greco-Roman women and enhances their attractiveness to males. Plucking, singeing, and applying caustic resins are the means of removing the hair, but singeing is the most effective in enhancing fertility. In Aristophanes' Ecclesiazusae (13), Praxagora praises the lamp for singeing the flowering hair. Vase paintings depict women engaged in singeing the pubes;

In contrast to plucking the hair, singeing seals the opening in the hair and more effectively removes the suction power of the pubes. Thus, depilation of the pubes and especially depilation by singeing enhances female fertility by removing the pubic counterforce to the upward draw of the hair

on the head, and postmenopausal women cease or should cease depilating the pubes (Martial, Epigram 10.90).

Finally, this conception of hair explains why prepubescent girls were not required to wear the veil whereas adult women were. Before puberty, a girl's hair is not a functioning genital and does not differ from a boy's hair. After puberty, however, this situation changes. Tertullian draws an analogy between prepubescent children and Adam and Eve, who were naked before they became aware of genital differentiation. Afterwards though, Tertullian notes, "They each marked the intelligence of their own sex by a covering" (Virg. 11 [ANF 4:34]). Noting the growth of the pubes to cover the female pudendum, Tertullian exhorts, "Let her whose lower parts are not bare have her upper like-wise covered" (Virg. 12 [ANF 4:35]). Tertullian's analogy and exhortation presume that hair becomes a functioning part of a young woman's genitalia at puberty similar to the way testicles begin functioning at puberty as part of the male genitalia in facilitating the dissemination of semen. Prepubescent girls, therefore, need not cover their hair, but pubescent young women should, and Tertullian recommends that the extent of the veil be "co-extensive with the space covered by the hair when unbound" (Virg. 17 [ANF 4:37]).

The masculine functional counterpart to long feminine hair, then, is the testicle. Aristotle calls the male testicles weights that keep the seminal channels taut (Gen. an. 717a.30-717b.5). Their function is to facilitate the drawing of semen downward so it can be ejected. Without them, the seminal channels draw up inside the body, and the male becomes unable to dispense semen into the female. The female is not given such weights but instead develops a hollow uterus and appropriate vessels to draw the semen upward (Gen. an. 739a.37- 739b.20). Thus, testicles do not develop at puberty for females as they do for males. Long feminine hair assists the uterus in drawing semen upward and inward.

This ancient physiological conception of hair indicates that Paul's argument from nature in 1 Cor 11:13-15 contrasts long hair in women with testicles in men. Paul states that appropriate to her nature, a woman is not given an external testicle (περιβόλαιον, 1 Cor 11:15b) but rather hair instead. Paul states that long hollow hair on a woman's head is her glory (δόξα, 1 Cor 11:15) because it enhances her female φύσις, which is to draw in and retain semen. Since female hair is part of the female genitalia, Paul asks the Corinthians to judge for themselves whether it is proper for a woman to display her genitalia when praying to God (1 Cor 11:13)."

MSH: The answer would be of course not. This would be lude. This is why Paul says of course, you should have your hair, which is part of your "genitalia", covered. You would cover your hair in church or when praying to God. How lude could you possibly be thinking? It's very natural for Paul to be telling the Corinthians look, if you can't figure this out, if you can't judge for

yourselves whether this is proper or not, for a woman to leave her hair uncovered, to display her genitalia when praying, then you got a problem. This should be obvious. Remember back in our series in Leviticus, we hit an episode where the priests had to wear undergarments when they ascended the altar because you could see under the robe? You didn't display genitalia when you were doing priestly things. For the New Testament, every believer is a priest. In Paul's thinking, we're all engaged in God's service and when we're praying to God, of course we would seek to be modest.

“Informed by the Jewish tradition, which strictly forbids display of genitalia when engaged in God's service, Paul's argument from nature cogently supports a woman's covering her head when praying or prophesying. In Isa 6:2, the seraphim who participate in the divine liturgy have six wings. Two are for flying, two cover the face for reverence, and two cover the feet for modesty. The term feet euphemistically refers to the genitals of the seraphim. The priests in Yahweh's service receive special instructions for approaching the altar so that their nakedness is not exposed (Exod 20:26).

MSH: So what Paul is commanding here just is sort of again to them. One last part, one last paragraph,

“Informed by this tradition, Paul appropriately instructs women in the service of God to cover their hair since it is part of the female genitalia. According to Paul's argument, women may pray or prophesy in public worship along with men but only when both are decently attired. Even though no contemporary person would agree with the physiological conceptions informing Paul's argument from nature for the veiling of women, everyone would agree with his conclusion prohibiting the display of genitalia in public worship. Since the physiological conceptions of the body have changed, however, no physiological reason remains for continuing the practice of covering women's heads in public worship, and many Christian communities reasonably abandon this practice.”

MSH: I'm hoping that was easy enough to follow but you see how they're thinking. Since a woman's hair was part of her genitalia, this is the rationale for what Paul says in this chapter about women weren't given a covering like a man. Their hair, her hair is a covering and this is part of her femininity. It's part of her sexuality. It's part of her genitalia. It's part of how we get babies. It's part of fecundity. Of course you would cover this, but we don't look at things like this now. Our science is a lot better, let's be honest, a lot more accurate, so we've lost this conception. So Martin and I would agree to say physiologically, there's no reason to look at 1 Corinthians 11 and follow this physiological argument and say women should have their heads covered. Now you can come up with some other reason.

Maybe in a particular culture, it's a symbolic way of demonstrating modesty. That's a little more legit. But when Paul initially gives this command, he's basing it on this sort of bizarre science and it's also why he says that it's a shame for a man to have long hair because the long hair in a man's case prevents the semen from flowing downward to be ejected because that's

what men are supposed to do. That's how we have children. So that's counter to nature, counter to a male's nature. It's very clear. It just sounds crazy because scientifically, it is crazy. If this is what is floating around in their head, if this is their conception of how all this works and what hair, long hair, male or woman, what it means, what Paul says here makes perfect sense. It's very consistent with the Greco-Roman science of his day. So there's no mystery here if you have the first century person living in your head, which is always my contention with so much of what I do, with Unseen Realm and whatnot.

This is the kind of topic that I'll cover in a follow-up book because it's just a great example of how you really can't possibly understand the passage unless you have the first century person living in your head. Now, let's go to the 'because of the angels' line. Now when I first read this article, what got me first I was the title. The word testicle in a journal title of Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, I thought what in the world is this guy talking about. When I read the article, it's like holy cow this just makes so much sense. It has high explanatory power for what's going on here. I noticed that he didn't say anything in the article about what I'm going to be talking about here is important because of the angels. So what I did was I sent Troy Martin an e-mail and I said hey, I read your article, really enjoyed it, thought it was great but I have a question. Do you think that this worldview that you explained so well using primary sources in your article, do you think that this worldview is the backdrop for when Paul says that this is important because of the angels, that what he's thinking back to is Genesis 6? Is the Genesis 6:1-4 offense, sons of God and daughters of men, is he thinking of the Enochian Watchers worldview that there was a strong stream of in the Second Temple period? Is this what Paul's thinking of in Jewish terms, in Old Testament terms, which is why he sort of throw this in?

And Martin wrote me back and said, absolutely. He said it's certainly what he was thinking about and he told me a little bit about it. I didn't include it in the article for this, that, or the other reason. He was giving a paper at SBL and so-and-so forth. So if this is really what is going on in Paul's head, and I think I get it makes complete sense, then the issue with the commands within a church context are about modesty because this is associated with genitalia. But the other material about the man is the head of the woman and you got to cover the head and had to have this symbol of authority on you and all this other stuff because of the angels, what it really means is that women needed to be very careful to be modest, to show modesty with respect to their hair because in the back of Paul's mind he's, concerned that what happened in Genesis 6 might happen again.

For Paul, that is a possibility. We do not want another problem like this because in Second Temple Jewish thinking, we might do in the future at some point want to say more about the Second Temple Jewish tradition about the proliferation of evil, why is the world as wicked as it is? If you ask a Second Temple Jew that, if you asked Irenaeus that and a few other early church fathers, they would not say because of the fall in Genesis 3. They would say because of the Watchers. Now in biblical theology, there are three events that explain why the world is as bad as it is. But in typical evangelical churches, in typical evangelical teaching or Christian teaching, you only get one. Here are the three fundamental events. You have what happened in Genesis 3 in the garden that was the initiation of divine and human rebellion. So the fall is an important thing. The second event, though, is what explains why evil just multiplied and proliferated throughout the earth and that is the sin of Genesis 6:1-4, the sin of the angels. The angels that sinned is how Peter refers to it and other texts referred to it. The sons of God, the Watchers, that was a huge deal in Second Temple Judaism.

It's not in typical Christian teaching today because we have stripped the supernatural out of the passage and we have consigned it to the shelf where it can be forgotten. The third critical event that explains why the world is as bad as it is for a biblical person, a person living in the biblical period was the Tower of Babel incident, Genesis 11 or Deuteronomy 32:8-9 when the nations were disinherited, put under the authority of other lesser gods, elohim, sons of God, and then they wind up rebelling and seducing God's own people to idolatry. So why is the world the bad place that it is, because humanity and divine beings decided to rebel back in Genesis 3. Genesis 6 just multiplied the evil because you had more, multiple sons of God, multiple divine beings transgressing heaven and earth and corrupting people. And then third, because the nations of the earth except for God's people, God's place, God's piece of turf, the cosmic geography concept, because all that is under dominion of hostile wicked gods, powers of darkness.

That is why the world is the way it is. But we don't get that in church. We don't get that really anywhere except for what I'm trying to do here and what the sources that I refer listeners and readers to. It's all out there in the scholar literature. This is a no-brainer in terms of the scholar literature. It just never filters down to the pew. Scholarship never makes its way inside the walls of the church. So this is what we have and when Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, it's very evident that Paul has Genesis 6, the Enochic idea, floating around inside of his head and because of what he believes about what the hair of a woman, what all that means, his advice to her is when we do spiritual service, we want to be modest but then we also have a problem here with making sure that we're in the right relationship, not only to husbands and wives and all this stuff, but we need to show it. We need to have this symbol of modesty and submission and authority, whatever you want to call it, we need to not be lewd for another reason and that is because of the angels.

We know that bad things happen like this in the past and so for Paul, he was concerned. And so he judges it necessary to take care of this issue, the issue of sexuality. But oddly enough for us, bizarrely enough for us, it is connected in his mind to this whole hair/head covering issue. now I'm going to post a second article that Troy Martin recommended to me, in addition to his own work, dealing with the 'because of the angels' phrase. That article was written by Loren Stuckenbruck. Many of you will recognize that name because he is probably the leading scholar on Enochian stuff today. I've referenced his work a number of times but he actually has an article. It's difficult to find on this particular issue and Martin said basically, he didn't tell me if he disagreed with everything in it or not. There might be something that would be disconnected with what I'm saying and something I might say in Unseen Realm. That's not the point. The point is that they see a clear connection between the Enochian problem in Genesis 6 and the head covering passage here in 1 Corinthians 11.