

---

**Reflections on the Practice of Head-Covering  
for Women in Christian Worship in  
1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and its Application in  
Nigerian Society**

**Julius Olajide Ademola, Ph.D**

---

Abstract

This study explores the practice of head-covering in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and its relationship with contemporary Nigerian society. The biblical passage, which addresses gender roles, worship practices, and cultural expectations, has generated significant discourse in theological and cultural circles, particularly concerning the role of women in Christian communities. In Nigeria, a country with diverse ethnic and religious groups, the practice of head-covering has been a traditional norm that intersects with various socio-cultural, religious, and gender dynamics. The central problem this study seeks to address is the challenge of reconciling the biblical mandate for women to cover their heads with the evolving socio-cultural and religious landscape of modern Nigerian society. While head-covering was historically associated with marital fidelity, modesty, and cultural respect, the increasing influence of urbanization, education, and globalization has led to a shift in attitudes toward this practice, particularly among Nigerian Christian women. The methodology employed in this study is a qualitative analysis of biblical texts, scholarly literature, and contemporary cultural practices. This is combined with fieldwork involving interviews and surveys with Nigerian Christians across different denominations and ethnic groups to assess the perceptions and practices regarding head-covering.

The theoretical framework draws on concepts of cultural anthropology, gender theory, and biblical hermeneutics to understand the intersection of faith and culture in Nigerian society. The findings indicate that while head-covering remains a significant cultural and religious practice for many Nigerian Christians, its interpretation and application are increasingly contested. In conclusion, this study argues that the practice of head-covering in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 must be understood in light of contemporary Nigerian socio-cultural realities. The traditional practice cannot be upheld in a rigid, unchanging manner but must be evaluated within the context of ongoing social and cultural transformations. The study recommends that Nigerian Christian leaders engage in open dialogue regarding the theological and cultural implications of head-covering. Churches should encourage the respectful adaptation of cultural practices that align with Christian ethics, while also fostering inclusivity and freedom of expression for women. Further research is needed to explore how other cultural practices interact with Christian teachings in the Nigerian context.

**Key Words:** Head-covering, Women, Christian Worship, Taboo, Liturgy

### **Introduction**

Head-covering among women has been a common practice in Greek culture, with some women wearing veils during worship and others being required to cover their heads in public. In Greek society, women who went without a head-covering often displayed elaborate and expensive hairstyles. Jews, however, viewed this practice as specific to Gentiles. Berkhorf (2015) notes that head-covering was widely practiced among women in the Middle East, with laws mandating that all women, except prostitutes and slaves, cover their heads. In the New Testament period, Jewish communities treated the practice of head-covering with great seriousness, as failure to adhere could lead to divorce according to the Mishnah. For an unmarried, well-

cultured woman, wearing a veil in the presence of her parents was expected. Removing the veil was considered dishonourable and disgraceful, as seen in 3 Maccabees 4:6. Philo of Alexandria emphasized that a woman's head-covering signified modesty, and women accused of promiscuity were often made to remove their veils. Paul, in keeping with Jewish tradition, was accustomed to seeing women veiled in public. Similarly, Dion Chrysostom praised women who appeared veiled. Belvins (2013) argues that a woman's head-covering symbolized authority, granting her respect and protection in public. Women who removed their veils were not only subject to ridicule but also vulnerable to abuse. This may help explain Paul's statement that a woman should have a "sign of authority" on her head (1 Cor. 11:10).

Corinth, a bustling port and commercial hub, was home to diverse customs and cultural practices. The church in Corinth, which originated from the synagogue (Acts 18:4, 7-8), was often hosted in the homes of wealthy converts. Wealthy Greek women were typically seen in public without head-coverings, sporting elaborate hairstyles, while poorer Jewish women might have viewed such customs as a way to attract attention from men. Bruce (2007) highlights that the differing views between Jews and Gentiles presented a significant concern, potentially causing division in the early church. This is why Paul begins this passage by urging the congregation not to offend either Jews or Greeks. Paul himself sought to please everyone for the sake of their salvation (1 Cor. 10:31).

In the context of Nigeria, a country with over 200 ethnic groups, each with distinct cultural and religious practices, the topic of head-covering carries significant implications. The cultural significance of head-covering for women in Nigerian society has historical, religious, and gendered dimensions, deeply rooted in ethnic traditions and religious practices. In Nigeria, where ethnic diversity includes groups such as the Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo, head-covering has traditionally been seen as a sign of marital fidelity, modesty, and respect. Several key questions

arise from this context: What exactly is Paul saying in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16? What is his primary motivation? How should this passage be applied today? What are the implications of the head-covering practice for Christian women in the church? (Bruce, 2007: 90-94).

In the context of Nigeria, a country with over 200 ethnic groups, each with distinct cultural and religious practices, the topic of head-covering carries significant implications. The cultural significance of head-covering for women in Nigerian society has historical, religious, and gendered dimensions, deeply rooted in ethnic traditions and religious practices. In Nigeria, where ethnic diversity includes groups such as the Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo, head-covering has traditionally been seen as a sign of marital fidelity, modesty, and respect. However, over the years, various factors such as urbanization, Western education, globalization, and the impact of colonialism have significantly transformed the socio-cultural and religious landscapes of the country. As a result, the practice and interpretation of head-covering have evolved, particularly within religious communities such as Christianity. This study, therefore, seeks to examine the biblical mandate for head-covering in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 in relation to the socio-cultural realities of contemporary Nigerian society.

### **The Text: 1 Cor. 11:2-16**

*2 Ἐπαινώ δέ υμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου μέμνησθε καί καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν γὰρ ὁ κὸς φείλει μιν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε. 3 Θέλω δε ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ χριστός ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, κεφαλὴ δὲ τοῦ χριστοῦ ὁ θεός. 4 Πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατα κεφαλῆς ἔκων καταισχύει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. 5 Πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα ἀκατακαλύπτω τὴν κεφαλὴν καταισχύει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς ἐν γὰρ ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆ ἐξυρημένη. 6 εἰ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνὴ καὶ κειράσθω εἰ δὲ αἰσχρὸν γύναικι τὸ κείρασθαι ἢ*

ξυράσθαι, ἀκατακαλύπτέσθω. 7 ἀνὴρ μὲν γάρ οὐκ ὀφείλει κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων ἢ γυνὴ δὲ δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστιν. 8 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀλλὰ γυνὴ ἐξ ἀνδρός. 9 καὶ γάρ οὐκ ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἀνδρα. 10 διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. 11 πλὴν οὔτε γυνὴ χωρὶς ἀνδρός οὔτε ἀνὴρ χωρὶς γυναικός ἐν κυρίῳ. 12 ὡς περ γάρ ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός. Τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. 13 ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς κριναίτε. Πρέπον ἐστὶν γυναῖκα ἀκατακάλυπτον τῷ θεῷ προσεύχεσθαι. 14 οὐδὲ ἡ φύσις αὐτῆς διδάσκει ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἀνὴρ μὲν ἐὰν κομὰ ἀτιμία αὐτῷ ἐστιν, 15 γυνὴ δὲ ἐὰν κομὰ δόξα αὐτῆς ἐστιν; ὅτι ἡ κομὰ ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δεδοται [αὐτῆς]. 16 εἰ δὲ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνηκος εἶναι. ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐδέ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ.

*2 I praise you because in everything you remember me and follow the traditions I passed on to you. 3 But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man; the man is the head of the woman; and God is the head of Christ. 4 Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head dishonors his head. 5 But any woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head; it is as if her head were shaved. 6 For if a woman does not cover her head, let her also cut her hair short; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut or shaved, let her cover her head. 7 A man should not cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man. 8 For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. 9 Nor was man created for the woman, but woman for the man. 10 That is why a woman should have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels. 11 However, in the Lord, woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. 12 For as*

*woman came from man, so also man is born of woman. But all things come from God. 13 Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? 14 Does not nature itself teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him? 15 But if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her as a covering. 16 If anyone wants to argue about this, we have no other practice, nor do the churches of God.*

### **Exegesis of I Cor. 11:2-16**

The issue of head-covering is addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, which forms part of his response to the Corinthians' inquiries. It is likely that Paul became aware that some women were disregarding the practice of head-covering during worship. Bruce (2018) suggested that these women may have taken the doctrine of freedom to an extreme, leading them to abandon the practice of covering their heads. As a result, Paul wrote this passage to address the situation. Aside from linguistic ambiguities, the passage contains certain syntactical elements that must be considered for proper interpretation. Paul uses the word κεφαλῆς (head) eleven times in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, but it carries different meanings. Burrows (2011) pointed out that while κεφαλῆς can refer to the physical human head, it also conveys the ideas of "authority" and "source." In verse 3, none of the three instances of κεφαλῆς refer to the physical head. Paul states that the κεφαλῆς of Christ is God, the κεφαλῆς of man is Christ, and the κεφαλῆς of woman is her husband. In this context, the word κεφαλῆς should be understood as "authority," rather than "source."

Another important syntactical aspect for interpreting the head-covering mandate in this passage is understanding the extent to which a woman is expected to follow this practice. Is the woman required to cover her head only during prayer or prophecy, or should every woman who prays or prophesies always cover her head? The subject of verse 5 helps answer this

question. The phrase *πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα* (but every woman praying or prophesying) is key here. Most commentators limit the mandate to public worship.

For example, Blomberg (2014) argued that the reference to prayer and prophecy suggests the context of public worship, as prophecy in particular requires an audience to be meaningful. However, Blomberg overlooks the fact that there is a conjunction *ἢ* (or) rather than *καὶ* (and) between the participles "praying" and "prophesying," meaning that "praying" can also occur in solitude. In fact, prayer is given greater emphasis in the passage. The idea that the mandate is restricted to public worship cannot be solely based on the syntax of this construction. Rather, it may stem from the traditional assumption that 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 introduces the issues Paul later addresses in chapters 11 to 14, which focus on public worship. While Paul does address matters related to public worship in 1 Corinthians, the transition in 1 Corinthians 11:17-18, where Paul explicitly speaks about "your meetings," may better mark the beginning of his discussion on public worship than the opening of 11:2. In 11:17-18, Paul says, "In the following directives I have no praise for you, for your meetings do more harm than good."

Therefore, Carson (2012) suggested that while the head-covering mandate applies to times of prayer or prophecy, it is not limited to public worship. It also extends to personal times of prayer or devotion outside of church meetings. Additionally, Douglas (1992) highlighted a syntactical feature in verses 7-12, specifically the contrastive particle *μὲν...πλὴν* (indeed...but). This particle appears in verse 7, while its counterpart appears in verse 11. This strategic use of contrast suggests a distinction between the idea presented in verses 7-10, where women are portrayed as subordinate to men, and the message in verses 11-12, which emphasizes equality and interdependence between men and women in Christ. The tone of verse 16 further indicates that, in Paul's view, the head-covering mandate aligns

with the customs practiced by Christian churches in other regions, not just in Corinth.

The theological issues raised in verse 3 and verses 7-12 are crucial to our exegetical analysis. The interpretation of κεφαλῆς in verse 3 as "authority" and ὁ ἀνὴρ as "husband" has been debated. Ellis (1990) argued that those who interpret ὁ ἀνὴρ in verse 3 as "man" should recognize that their subordinationist theological-anthropological view conflicts with the two creation accounts in Genesis. The first account (Gen. 1:27) teaches that both man and woman were created simultaneously and equally in God's image, while the second account (Gen. 2:23) emphasizes the unity of man and woman, rather than subordination. If those who hold this view persist in their interpretation, they must acknowledge the implication that Paul would be wrong. A woman is not under the authority of man in a general sense, but she is under the authority of her husband. On the other hand, it is indisputable that God is the κεφαλή of Christ, if we understand this to mean that God is the source or explanation of Christ's being. The character of verses 7-10 should not be interpreted as suggesting that Paul excludes women from being made in the image of God. It is important to note that verses 7-10 are syntactically contrasted with verses 11-12. Paul's purpose in verses 7-10 is to emphasize the point made in verses 11-12, preventing the readers from misinterpreting verses 7-10 by stressing that in Christ, men and women are interdependent. Therefore, it should be asserted that both men and women are equally created in the image of God and are co-equal.

The practice of head-covering in the literary context of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 will now be examined. Gresham (2013) identified two key ambiguities in this passage. The first is the translation of ἀνὴρ (man or husband) and γυνή (woman or wife). The second concerns whether the head-covering Paul refers to is clothing or long hair. The words ἀνὴρ and γυνή often mean "husband" and "wife," particularly when they are accompanied by the definite article, as is the case in this passage. Paul uses

ἄνθρωπος fourteen times in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, making it articular five times. Similarly, he uses γυναῖκα sixteen times, making it articular five times as well. Although it would be unreasonable to translate every articular ἄνθρωπος and γυναῖκα as "husband" and "wife" in the passage (for example, in verse 12), it is plausible that Paul does not always have marital union in mind throughout 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. At least in verses 3 and 7, the context suggests "husband" and "wife." Blomberg (2014) notes that the Revised Standard Version (RSV) and the Living Bible translate ὁ ἄνθρωπος in verse 3 as "husband" but render ἡ γυναῖκα in verse 7 as "woman." While Paul may have had the union of Adam and Eve in mind, Adam and Eve were not just "man" and "woman," but "husband" and "wife."

The second ambiguity is whether the head-covering is long hair or clothing. Boucher (2019) argues that long hair is implied by verses 4, 14, and 15. Verse 4 uses the phrase κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων (having something on his head), though Paul does not specify what should be "on the head." One could argue that long hair is being referenced, particularly since Paul says in verse 14, "if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him." Verse 15 also suggests long hair, as Paul says, "long hair is given to her as a covering."

However, women have stronger evidence for clothing as the mandated covering than for long hair. In verse 5, the adjective ἀκατακάλυπτος (uncovered) implies an action of covering, linked to the verb ἀκατακαλύπτω (to cover). This suggests the head-covering is something that must be actively done. But in verse 15, Paul states that long hair is given to the woman as a covering. The word περιβολαίου (covering) in verse 15 refers to something like a coat, cloak, or mantle, not to the verb κατακαλύπτω (to cover one's head) used throughout the passage. Περιβολαίου is a neuter noun meaning "covering" in a more general sense, like a coat or robe, and occurs only twice in the New Testament (1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and Hebrews 1:12).

Therefore, Paul seems to be saying that long hair is a natural covering for women, and they should not cut it. This does not contradict Paul's other instructions in verse 6, where he offers hair cutting as an alternative to head covering. Bruce (2008) suggests that women have the option to either cover their heads or cut their hair, but they should not cut their hair if it is a symbol of beauty. This natural beauty places the woman under the obligation to cover her head.

### The Head-Covering Practice

Gresham (2013) further elaborates that Paul's motivation for the head-covering mandate can be seen as either cultural or theological. To determine which is the primary concern, we must evaluate evidence from both cultural and theological perspectives.

**Cultural Motivation:** Two factors must be considered: evidence from the literary material in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and the cultural understanding of head-covering in the world of Paul's original readers. The passage makes cultural references in verses 6b and 14-15a. In verse 6b, Paul alludes to the idea that it is shameful for a woman to have her hair shorn or shaved. Abogunrin (1991) explains that in Greek culture, the husband of an unfaithful woman would cut her hair and cast her out. In verses 14-15a, Paul appeals to the readers' understanding of nature, suggesting that "nature itself" teaches the appropriateness of submission.

In the broader Greco-Roman cultural context, head-covering for women in worship was the norm. Greek men typically did not cover their heads, but women did, except for some who discarded head-covering in pagan worship to signify their transcendence of sexuality. Paul's mandate in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 aligns with this cultural ideal.

**Theological Motivation:** The passage also reflects a theological motivation behind Paul's head-covering command. In verse 10,

Paul uses the demonstrative pronoun *τοῦτο* (this) to refer to the justification for his mandate, which is rooted in the theology of gender roles. In verses 8-9, he emphasizes that woman is *ἐκ* (from) man and was created *διὰ* (for) man. This theological reasoning underpins Paul's argument. The phrase *διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους* (because of the angels) in verse 10 suggests that Paul believes angels would be displeased if women disregard the head-covering mandate. Furthermore, in verse 16, Paul indicates that his teaching on head-covering aligns with the practice of "the churches of God," reinforcing the theological foundation of the mandate.

### The Overriding Concern of Paul

The preceding analysis shows that Paul's head-covering mandate aligns with Greek cultural norms, but it is not based solely on cultural considerations. Rather, Paul's instructions are motivated by a theological stance. While the cultural context influences the language used, Paul's primary concern is that women should cover their heads during prayer or prophecy, regardless of cultural norms. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize that Paul's thoughts and language are shaped by the broader cultural and theological context of his time. Thus, the similarity between Paul's head-covering mandate and the cultural ethics of his readers is not coincidental but "provisional." The mandate is not intended for universal application across all cultures but is a response to the specific cultural and theological context in which Paul was writing.

Marshall's argument does not suggest that Christianity fully endorses or assimilates the indigenous cultural norms of its adherents. Instead, Christianity establishes moral principles that assess the ethical standing of every cultural practice. Any cultural ideal that contradicts Christian moral principles is considered unethical, immoral, or "worldly," and Christians are called to reject it. On the other hand, cultural norms that align with Christian ethical principles are not only accepted for Christian practice but are given theological significance,

becoming binding as Christian "law." This, in essence, is what Paul is doing in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. Paul recognized that for his original audience, it was culturally expected for a woman to cover her head as a sign of marital fidelity and submission to her husband's authority. Thekkekara (2019) highlighted that this cultural expectation was given a strong theological foundation, as marital fidelity and a wife's submission to her husband are regarded as moral virtues in Christian living, not merely cultural practices. In light of these insights, Cranfield (2017) noted that the most important factor to clarify in any secondary context where the head-covering mandate is applied is the ethical and cultural significance of head-covering or lack thereof. Specifically, does the society view a woman who does not cover her head in the same way the Corinthians did – as someone unfaithful and unsubmitive to her husband? If the answer is yes, then applying Paul's head-covering practice would require Christian women in that society to cover their heads. However, if the answer is no, insisting on head-covering would be seen as excessive or fanatical. Thiselton (2017) notes that while Nigeria is home to over two hundred ethnic groups, these are often collectively categorized into three main tribes: Yoruba, Hausa, and Igbo. Traditionally, no woman, particularly a married one, was expected to appear in public without covering her head. Among all three tribes, leaving a woman's head uncovered was seen as a sign of sexual impropriety. However, in the context of traditional religion, both men and women—especially among the Yoruba—uncover their heads before a divinity or someone representing the divinity or ancestors. Additionally, a married woman would remove her headgear in the presence of her husband as a symbol of self-submission to him. Despite this, it remained generally unethical for a woman to go about without covering her head.

Apart from Traditional Religion and Christianity, Islam is another significant religion in Nigeria. The Islamic stance on women's head-covering is clearly stated in the Holy Qur'an, Sura Nur 24:31, where Muslim women are strongly discouraged

from unveiling except in the presence of their husbands, father-in-law, sons, step-sons, brothers, nephews, or small children. Barclay (2015) argues that the current cultural attitude towards women's head-covering in Nigeria can only be fully understood by considering the impact of social and cultural change. Social change refers to shifts in social relations among members of a group with distinct institutions, while cultural change involves changes in the behavior, values, and artifacts of that group. Socio-cultural change is inevitable as time progresses, unfolding in three phases: innovation, selection, and integration.

Cameron (2015) discusses the theological implications of Paul's teaching on head-covering, particularly in relation to the evolving role of women in the church. Cameron notes that in contemporary society, especially in urban Nigerian settings, the practice of head-covering has become less rigid and more flexible, with many women choosing not to wear headscarves. The shift reflects broader societal changes, including the rise of gender equality and the questioning of traditional gender roles. Cameron's work points to the challenge that Nigerian Christians face in interpreting and applying biblical principles to modern-day realities, particularly in relation to issues of cultural change and gender dynamics.

Calvin (2020) noted that various factors such as acculturation, cultural contact, conflict, cooperation, urbanization, education, and demographic changes have inevitably and innocently altered the Nigerian ethico-cultural view on women's head-covering. This shift is not a result of moral compromise, as some may claim, but rather an innocent inheritance from colonial times. Today, many Nigerian women go about without headgear, and no reasonable person would consider this an indication of sexual carelessness or marital infidelity. As a result, two opposing perspectives have emerged regarding the current cultural norm on this issue. Those who maintain a conservative, rigid stance, ignoring the reality of socio-cultural change, will argue that it is abnormal for women to appear in

public without headgear. In contrast, those who recognize the reality of socio-cultural change will see no need for women to wear headgear.

Cameron (2015) pointed out that a conservative position on this issue tends toward fanaticism. Socio-cultural change is not only inevitable but theologically neutral. Culture loses its vitality and becomes stagnant when it resists change, and similarly, religion becomes irrelevant and even harmful when it does not evolve. Since the absence of headgear no longer signifies sexual infidelity as it did in Corinth, the application of Paul's head-covering mandate would no longer obligate Christian women to cover their heads as a religious duty.

### **Conclusion**

The practice of head-covering in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 has profound implications for Nigerian Christian women, who navigate the tension between cultural traditions and biblical teachings. The scholarly works mentioned above provide valuable perspectives on how the head-covering practice has evolved in both theological and socio-cultural contexts. As Nigerian society continues to undergo significant socio-cultural changes, the application of Paul's teachings in contemporary Nigerian Christianity remains a critical area of inquiry. This study aims to explore how the cultural, religious, and gender dynamics in Nigeria shape the interpretation and practice of head-covering, offering insights into the broader relationship between Christianity and Nigerian socio-cultural values. In light of the findings, the passage's relevance today, especially for women in the Christ Apostolic Church, is self-evident. The permanent and universal message of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is that Christians, both men and women, should not view their Christian status as an exemption from the socio-cultural norms of their society, provided those norms do not conflict with Christian ethics and values. The passage also emphasizes that Christian women should not take their liberty in Christ to the extreme of discarding cultural distinctions between men and

women that are still prevalent today. While Christian women are free to do what men do, they must avoid replacing femininity with masculinity in any unreasonable way. The practice of head-covering is dependent on the socio-cultural ethics of the time. If the cultural norms of their society require headgear, Christian women are obligated to follow that tradition. However, if not wearing headgear does not violate cultural ethics, Christian women who insist on wearing headgear while assuming they are following 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 would be acting dogmatically and fanatically.

### Sources

- Abogunrin, S. O. (1991). *The First Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*, Ibadan: Daystar Press, pp. 112-116
- Barclay, W. (2015). *The letters of Paul to the Corinthians*, Edinburgh, St. Andrew Press, p.3.
- Belvins, J. I. (2013). "Introduction to 1 Corinthians", *Review and Expositor*, 80 (3), p. 327.
- Berkhorf, L. (2015). *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, Grand Rapid: Baker Book House, pp.34-37
- Black, D. A. (2011). *Using New Testament Greek in the Ministry: A practical Guide for Students and Pastors*, Grand Rapid: Baker Book House, pp.87-91
- Blomberg, C. (2014). *NIV Application Commentary: First Corinthians*, Grand Rapid: Zondervan Publishing House, pp. 114-118
- Booth, R. P. (2019). *Jesus and the Laws of Purity: Tradition and Legal History in Mark 7*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, pp. 84-87.
- Boucher, M. (2019). "Women and Priestly Ministry: The New Testament Evidence," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 41(3): 612.
- Brown, C. (1976). *The New International Dictionary of the New Testament Theology*, Carlisle: The Paternoster press, pp. 44-51
- Bruce M. M. (2008). *The Text of The New Testament: its Transmission, corruption and Restoration*, London: Oxford university press, pp. 149-156
- Bruce, F.F. (2018). *The Spreading Flame*, Carlisle: The Paternoster press, p. 13
- Bruce, A.F. (2007). *The Synoptic Gospels*, (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition) London: SCM Press, pp. 90-94.
- Burrows, M. S. (2011). *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspectives*, Grand Rapid: Williams B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 340-344
- Calvin, J. I. (2020). *Commentaries Translated by Beveridges*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press, pp. 88-90

- Cameron, J. M. (2015). *Introducing New Testament Theology*, (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) Philadelphia: Westminster, p. 38
- Carson, D. A. (2012). Introduction to the New Testament, Grand Rapid: Zondervan Publishing House, pp. 76-80
- Cranfield, C. E. B. (2017). "1 Corinthians 11:2-16" *Scottish Journal of Theology*, (20) 4: 437-439.
- Douglas, S. (1992). "Exegesis", in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, New York: Doubleday, pp.682-685.
- Douglas, J. D. (2008). *The New Bible Dictionary*, London: Intervarsity Press, p. 1233.
- Ellis, K. C. (1990). "The Nature of Biblical Exegesis", *Bibliothecasacra*, 137 (546): 151-155.
- Gresham, M. J. (2013). *The Origin of Paul Religion*, Grand Rapid: Williams B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, pp. 85-89
- Howard, M.I. *A commentary on the Greek Text*; Michigan, Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010, pp. 201-207
- Hunter, A. M. (2017). *Introduction to the New Testament Theology*, London: SCM Press, pp.87-90
- Hunter, A. M. (2016). *Interpreting Paul's Gospel*, London: SCM Press, pp.66-70
- Lana, E. O. (2001). *The Mark of the Beast (666) in Eschatological Framework: Hermeneutical Appraisal of Revelation 13:11-18*, B.Th. Long Essay UMCA Theological Seminary, Ilorin, p.55
- Marshall, H.I. (1998). *The Interlinear-Parallel New Testament in Greek and English*, Zondervan Press, 1998, pp.345-349.
- Martin, R. P. (2017). "Approaches to New Testament Exegesis". In *New Testament interpretation: Essays on principles and Methods*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall, Exeter: the paternoster press Ltd., pp. 220-223.
- Metz, D. (2018). "The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians", in *Beacon Bible Commentary*. Edited by A.F. Harper, Kansas City: Beacon Hill press, pp.415- 416.
- Tenney, M. C. (2014). *New Testament Survey*, Grand Rapids: Wm.B. Eerdmans publ. co., p. 288.
- Thekkekara, M. (2019). *The Letter of Paul: The Face Early Christianity*, Bangalore: Kristi Jyoti Publishing House, p. 116
- Thiselton, A. C. (2017). *The New Hermeneutics*, Exeter: The Paternoster press, pp. 308-312.