

General Topics :: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen

HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/9/28 15:59

What does the Bible teach about head-covering for women in the church meetings?

This has become a controversial subject in churches in Western countries and among Westernized Christians in India.

Further: 99% of sisters who do cover their heads when praying and prophesying do not know WHY they do so.

And 99% of brothers who keep their heads uncovered when praying and prophesying do not know WHY they do so.

We begin this study with the conviction that the entire message of the Bible is the Word of God without any error.

There are two fundamental truths that we must bear in mind as we seek to understand God's Word for us today.

On the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), God abolished the old covenant and began to deal with man thereafter under the terms of the new covenant (Heb.8).

There are historical and teaching sections in the New Testament. We must find the basis for new covenant doctrines only in the teaching sections. The historical sections merely tell us what the apostles and early Christians did. Many false teachings have developed from doctrines based only on the Acts of the Apostles - two examples being: (i) all believers must speak in tongues (based on Acts 2:4); and (ii) all believers must share a common purse (based on Acts 2:44).

Jesus told His disciples just before He went to the cross, "I have many more things to say to you, but you cannot bear (understand) them now. But when the Spirit of truth, comes, He will guide you into all the truth" (Jn.16:12,13). Jesus wanted to teach His disciples many more truths than He did while He was on earth. But they would not have been able to understand them until the Holy Spirit came to dwell within them and renewed their minds and gave them revelation. Some of these truths are what we find written in the New Testament epistles. So the epistles also contain commands from the Lord Jesus - but given through His apostles.

If we reject any command in any of the New Testament epistles, saying it was only for the time and place when it was written and not for us today, then in order to be consistent, we must give equal freedom to other people to reject other commands in the epistles and in the teachings of Jesus as also being only for that time and not for us today. For example, we must, in that case, give freedom to people to teach that forbidding homosexual behavior and same-sex marriages and divorces and premarital sexual intercourse, etc., were only for the first century and not for us today. Otherwise we will be inconsistent.

It is inconsistent, therefore, to say that every command in the New Testament is relevant for us today, and then to reject just this one command to women to cover their heads when they pray or prophesy (1 Cor.11:1-16).

(Note: We must distinguish between commands given by God and mere greetings given by the apostles. For example, the apostles give greetings and good wishes such as these in their letters: "Greet one another with a holy kiss" (Rom16:16) and "I pray that in all respects you may prosper and be in good health, just as your soul prospers" (3 John 2). These were obviously mere greetings and good wishes - and not commands or promises given by God - for there is no Divine principle taught in those verses, as is the case with head-covering, water-baptism and breaking of bread(Rom.6; 1Cor.11)).

Meaning of head-covering

There are at least three reasons given in the New Testament why a woman should cover her head when she prays or prophesies in the meetings of the church:

First: The Bible says, "A man should NOT cover his head..." - and the reason given is: ... because he is the image and glory

y of God". In contrast, we are told, "but the woman is the glory of man" (1 Cor.11:7). The glory of man must be covered in the church - and since woman is the glory of man, she testifies to this fact by covering her head. This is the plain and simple meaning of this verse.

Second: The Bible says, "A woman's long hair is her glory" (1 Cor.11:15). The glory of the woman also must be covered in the church, just like the glory of man. And so she must cover her head which has the glory of her long hair. Almost all women are conscious that their long hair is a major part of what makes them look attractive - and that is why even among those women who do put a covering on their heads, most of them cover only a part of their hair!! If a woman does not want to cover her head, then the only alternative that the New Testament offers is to remove that glory, by shaving her head completely: "If a woman does not cover her head, let her also have her hair cut off; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her cover her head" (1 Cor.11:6).

Third: The Bible says: "Man was not created for the woman's sake, but woman for the man's sake. Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels" (1 Cor.11:10). The head-covering symbolizes the fact that a woman accepts her God-appointed role as having been created "for man's sake" as his helper and therefore her willingness to be submissive to male authority - whether as a wife to her husband, or as a daughter to her father, or as a sister in the church to the church-elders. It is significant that the disappearance of the head-covering from women in Western churches (on a large scale) coincided with the time that the movement for "Women's Liberation" (a phrase used in a book in 1949) began to spread in Western countries - about 60 years ago. The "angels" mentioned in this verse could refer either to the fallen angels or to the angels in heaven. So it could either be a reminder to women to bear in mind that the fallen angels fell because they were not submissive to authority. Or it could mean "A woman should wear a covering on her head as a sign that she is under man's authority - a fact for all the angels (in heaven) to notice and rejoice in" (as The Living Bible paraphrases that verse).

1 Corinthians 11:16 says that every church that is a church of God, will insist on this head covering for women when they pray or prophesy. The Holy Spirit recognized that 20 centuries later this would become a controversial issue; and so He made Paul to state (in this same verse) that if anyone was going to be argumentative about this matter, he would not argue with such a person. He would just allow that person to continue on in his/her disobedience and inconsistency.

Some Questions

Some may say that the head-covering is only a symbol and therefore not so important. But baptism and the breaking of bread are also only symbols. The first half of 1 Corinthians 11 (v.1-16) explains the meaning of the symbolic head-covering for women. The second half of the same chapter (11:20-34) explains the meaning of the symbolic breaking of bread. In the same way, Romans 6 explains the meaning of the symbol of water-baptism. Would we say that the Lord's table and baptism also are unimportant, because they are only symbols? If we insist on baptism and breaking of bread as essential for believers, then we are inconsistent if we say that head-covering for women is not essential.

Some may say that head-covering for women is mentioned only once in the New Testament. Breaking of bread also is mentioned only once in the epistles. Likewise, the truth that God loves us as much as He loved Jesus is also mentioned only once in the whole Bible (Jn.17:23). But once is enough - to know this glorious truth. If Almighty God has given a command, then even if it is given only once in Scripture, that is sufficient. The importance of a command is determined by the importance of the Person Who gave it.

In ancient Babylon, Daniel stood for a law (Dan.1:8) that had been commanded only once in the Scriptures (about food in Lev.11; and wine in Prov.23:31). In the same way, in the midst of Babylonian Christianity today, we also stand for the commands of God - whether small or big, whether mentioned once or many times.

Some say that since we are commanded to pray at all times (Lk.18:1; 1 Thess.5:17), therefore a woman should cover her head all 24 hours of the day. Scripture must always be read in its context, if we are to understand it aright. The entire section (1 Cor.11:1-34) is dealing with the meetings of the church (Verses 16 and 18 make that clear). So it is obvious that the Holy Spirit was referring to church meetings when He gave this command. If we add to that, and insist that women should cover their heads at all times, then we will be adding to the Scriptures.

And further: If those who preach a 24-hour head covering are consistent, they must also teach that men (who should also be praying at all times) should never cover their heads at any time - and therefore should never wear a cap or a hat, at any time - whether it be hot, raining, or snowing. Such teachers must also then teach that women should keep their heads covered even when sleeping or showering/bathing (=24 hours). But they do not preach that - proving that they are inconsistent.

onsistent in their teaching. We can safely ignore such inconsistent teachers.

I have also observed that many sisters who practice a 24-hour head covering do not cover their entire heads. They cover only the back portion of their heads or just the small part of their hair that is tied up in a bun at the back of their heads - so that the glory of their hair is still visible. A small piece of cloth at the back of the head however is only an excuse for a head-covering - and not a head-covering at all, because the head and the glory of the hair are still not covered. Such "na mesake head-coverings" are worn by legalists only to ease their conscience and to appear "holy" before others. But their teachers do not object to this, because they themselves are inconsistent in their teaching.

Some say that the hair itself is called the head-covering for women in 1 Cor.11:15. If one has understood the Divine principle taught in the first 14 verses of this chapter, then this verse will not cancel out the need for a woman with long hair to still cover her head with a covering. Paul could not possibly have taken 15 verses merely to teach that a woman should have long hair! That could have been stated in just one sentence! What does not come out in the English translation of the Bible is the fact that in the original Greek language (in which Paul wrote his letters), the Holy Spirit prompted him to use a different Greek word for "covering" in verse 15 than the one He used in verse 6. The Greek word used in verse 6 is *katakalupto*; whereas the word used in verse 15 is *peribolaion* (which is translated as "mantle" in Heb. 1:12). This makes it crystal clear that the mantle of hair referred to in verse 15 is not the head-covering referred to in verse 6 or in the rest of the chapter. Another proof of this is: If hair is the "head-covering" being referred to in this section, then every man who prays or prophesies would have to have his head completely shaved, if he is to obey this Scripture that tells him not to have his head covered!! The clear teaching of the Holy Spirit in this chapter is that the "mantle of hair" that nature has given a woman as her glory must be covered with a covering, when she is praying or prophesying.

Finally, we must bear in mind that:

- If we ignore any command of God in Scripture (however small) we will suffer some eternal loss (Rev.22:19).
- Those who cancel (or teach against) the smallest command of Scripture will be called "the least in the kingdom of heaven" (as Jesus said in Matt.5:19).
- The truths of Scripture are hidden from the clever and the intelligent and revealed only to the humble ("babes" - Matt. 11:25 with Matt.18:4). The teaching of 1 Cor.11:1-16 will be simple and clear to the humble, childlike person. But one who depends on his human cleverness and intelligence will argue against the plain meaning of these verses.
- God tests our honesty in the way in which we deal with such verses of Scripture. He does not see whether we understand and everything in His Word, but He does see if we are honest in dealing with His Word. The Lord says, "To this one I will look, to him who is humble and contrite of spirit, and who trembles at My word" (Isa.66:2).

If a sister is still in doubt about what this passage of Scripture teaches, let her consider this: Isn't it better for her to do more rather than less - and especially so, when there is no inconvenience or cost involved. What will she lose by covering her head when she prays and prophesies? Nothing. But think of what she will gain by covering her head, if she discovers at the judgment-seat of Christ that this was indeed God's command? She will have the joy of having pleased her Lord on earth, in spite of what other Christians taught and practised. So, every woman, if she is wise, will cover her head with a covering, when she prays and prophesies.

And in conclusion, as to the practice in our churches: We do not force any sister to cover her head (against her wish/conviction) in our meetings - because if she does this under compulsion, it will be a dead work; and God wants only cheerful givers of obedience (2 Cor.9:7). We will not judge such a sister either. We will graciously assume that she does not have light on this subject. But at the same time, if she does not cover her head, we will not permit her to publicly pray or prophesy in our churches - because we understand this to be the command of God - as explained in this article. We also believe that this is how it is practiced "in all the churches of God" (1Cor.11:16). We do not judge other churches that do things differently from us, in this or in any other area. But we fear God and desire to obey Him fully, even if some sisters (or their husbands) are offended by our stand on this matter and as a result, leave our churches.

"If anyone is truly determined to do God's will, he/she will definitely know whether this teaching is from God" (Jn.7:17).

Those who have ears to hear, let them hear.

Amen.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by rnieman, on: 2011/9/29 10:01

I respect brother Zac tremendously, but disagree lovely with his interpretation of this. I think he misses the principle of this passage.

""Some say that the hair itself is called the head-covering for women in 1 Cor.11:15. If one has understood the Divine principle taught in the first 14 verses of this chapter, then this verse will not cancel out the need for a woman with long hair to still cover her head with a covering. Paul could not possibly have taken 15 verses merely to teach that a woman should have long hair! That could have been stated in just one sentence! What does not come out in the English translation of the Bible is the fact that in the original Greek language (in which Paul wrote his letters), the Holy Spirit prompted him to use a different Greek word for "covering" in verse 15 than the one He used in verse 6. The Greek word used in verse 6 is katakalupto; whereas the word used in verse 15 is peribolaion (which is translated as "mantle" in Heb. 1:12). This makes it crystal clear that the mantle of hair referred to in verse 15 is not the head-covering referred to in verse 6 or in the rest of the chapter. Another proof of this is: If hair is the "head-covering" being referred to in this section, then every man who prays or prophesies would have to have his head completely shaved, if he is to obey this Scripture that tells him not to have his head covered!! The clear teaching of the Holy Spirit in this chapter is that the "mantle of hair" that nature has given a woman as her glory must be covered with a covering, when she is praying or prophesying.""

The principle is not submission through outward appearance, but rather submission in the Holy Spirit to God given authority and structure(New Covenant). The context of the passage is the Church at Corinth having a difficult time separating itself from its pagan culture, so that is why Paul is writing this. I've heard Zac preach on this before and was in much of agreement with him until he wrote off verse 15, and didn't get to the principle of the passage which I already stated. russ

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by narrowpath, on: 2011/9/29 17:04

One of the best articles I have come across on this topic. Well explained, easy to understand. I see God's intention in for man and women consistent with his attributes and character.

Thanks for positing this, Greg.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/9/29 19:01

Interesting article. I would like to share a few observations.

The head-covering as taught here in 1Corinthians is not a weather garment. It is a covering designed for one particular purpose: to be obedient to the command and principles outlined there. There are males who do wear a religious head-covering - the Orthodox Jewish men, the Catholic bishops. These are not for protection from the weather. As I understand this scripture one is to not confuse the two.

I know of no one who does wear it 24/7 although some may. But those who are devoted to the Word will wear it during waking hours.

I wish Zac would have explored the ministry of angels and the principle of having power on her head. These two principles are so powerful...they go beyond logic.

My personal experience is that it is a huge blessing.

God bless.

Re: , on: 2011/9/29 19:06

Why, oh why, oh why???

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/9/30 15:24

What is sad to me is that brothers and sisters will claim they surrender all to Jesus and that He can have their entire lives and time, money, energy etc. But when God asks of us simple commands of obedience that would set us fully apart from society (this world system) we balk at it and consider it just something that was for the first century.

This is a tragic mistake that many evangelicals are making in our day. We must get ourselves out of the culture of evangelism and get back to the clear word of God and obedience to the leading of the Spirit of God.

I feel this teaching on headcoverings is one of these commands that are not obeyed as well as women not teaching in the assemblies etc.

May we contend and seek for a true Apostolic church in our day and in our generation. God wants to revive and restore the body of Christ on this earth visibly in purity and power with the Lord Jesus Christ as its head not men, traditions or a cultural mindset.

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/9/30 16:12

It is very sad that you think that, Greg.

May God help you to surrender your rigid stance and judgmentalism.

Headcoverings are not a sign of anything internally and you should know that.

Nothing you can wear on the outside determines whether you have a submissive heart.

Sad, that you think and judge a lot of sisters are in disobedience.

I am sure many sisters wish being submissive was as easy as putting on a doilie.

I wish it were, too. I'd take a shower with a hat on.

Sisters should not feel condemned and should reject this legalistic teaching.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/9/30 17:00

My wife and I have spoken about this at length several times. While she appreciates those who are obedient to how they interpret that particular passage of Scripture in I Corinthians, she simply doesn't interpret it to mean that women must wear a piece of cloth upon their head. She has explained that, for her, wearing it would be solely out of obedience to the standard of someone else rather than being obedient to what she believes to be the direction of God.

I am not sure what to make of the thought of a compulsory command to wear a particular garment. I understand where some say that it is an "outward sign of inward obedience." However, the same can be said of circumcision. As a member of the circumcision, I can testify that it has little to do with the heart. There are plenty of men who are circumcised on the outside but dead on the inside as they live for themselves. Similarly, I have known several women who wore head coverings who lacked propriety in other areas...including deference to both God and their husbands.

It might be an outward sign; but, as such, it can profit as little as a painting of an apple would provide any nutritional value.

While I cherish the messages shared by Brother Poonen, I do disagree with his conclusion on this matter. I do not feel that we are bound to any sort of outward display of holiness such as a physical garment. We are commanded to live a h

oly life as God commands. However, as my wife sincerely said, this would amount to obeying a man rather than as led by the Lord out of obedience with a clear conscience. However, we hold those who feel such a need with respect, and I wouldn't have any problem with someone in ministry who holds such a view.

Re: - posted by sarahsdream, on: 2011/9/30 19:08

Chris,

That was very, very well said! Remember, Zac is just a man and may be influenced by his culture in this respect. That does not negate any of his other teachings and many of them are very fine.

Sarah

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/9/30 19:27

Sarah, where do you think Zac got the inspiration to write the article he did?

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2011/9/30 19:40

Just for the sake of making my point, I will not share what my position is about head-covering.

Here is what I have observed:

- Greg posted an article about head-covering because he felt we needed to learn something from God's Word.
- Some people agreed with his position, others didn't.
- Some who agreed with Greg gave their additional comments.
- On the other hand, some who disagreed with Greg swiftly threw off the gloves. There was no love in their comments, although they claim that they are in the right.

Now, I have observed that many on this forum tend to get ugly when someone writes something that they disagree with. Let me give this exhortation: "Instead of just attacking the poster, you should make a good case from God's Word. If truth is on your side, you will not need to attack, nor call names. If truth is not on your side, you should submit to God."

For instance, in another discussion about speaking in tongues, after sharing my position, I saw two different reactions:

- 1) If I remember correctly, it was Appolus who respectfully disagreed with me and gave his position in a godly way. "Chapeau" to him. Praise the Lord for such brothers.
- 2) Someone who shall remain unnamed just tried to intimidate me by sending me a condescending private message. When I asked him to give Scriptural backing for his position, he simply ignored it, and refused to confess his sin and humble himself when I challenged him about his unloving attitude. To this day, he has still to repent.

Now, this kind of behavior is not uncommon. I plead with everyone to not give room to the devil. The Bible says that the man of God should be "kind to everyone, able to teach, patiently enduring evil, correcting his opponents with gentleness" (2 Timothy 2:24-25). Please give consideration to the way you react to a brother's convictions.

Now, I understand that some people may be upset at me for writing this, so please send me an e-mail at plr777@hotmail.com, and I would be more than happy to discuss the issue in a polite, loving, and humble manner. I am not in to "get" anybody. I just care about honoring God and felt this needed to be addressed.

Love in Christ Jesus,
Renoncer

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2011/9/30 20:14

Hi Renouncer,

I hope that you didn't take offense to my post. I had hoped that my words were shared with gentleness and in true humility.

Issues like this can often be divisive because people have their own prayerful conclusions about the issue. Like many issues, people can easily "react" to either the manner by which the disagreement is shared or to the differing conclusion itself (or both).

Still, this issue can be discussed with respectful disagreement (as you mentioned). I disagree with the conclusion of Brother Poonen, but I respect him and anyone else who holds a differing view with a clear conscience. I think that it is good to avoid any presumptuous assumption that those with whom we have a differing conclusion about this are "less spiritual" or "lacking light" on the matter.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen, on: 2011/9/30 20:27

This may be one way to split the Body.

Carter Conlon, Pastor of TSC being at the Conference - how would this division go over in a case like TSC?

Sad that we must draw such lines in the sand, yet we all fellowship on this forum and allow almost any other doctrines go by without any corrections or bold statements on behalf of SI's stand. Are there any others that are preaching in Oct that don't take this strong stand? Is it really worth to 'split the Body' over this and not doctrines that truly affect one's salvation?

Re: , on: 2011/9/30 21:09

I hope there would be freedom to this forum to share and even differ in our understanding of scripture. As we all do see through a glass darkly. But I feel very little freedom does exist here. People get ugly and do attack one another. I know that I have been asked to leave the forum and not come back. There are days I wonder if that might not be a wise option.

Blaine

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2011/9/30 22:04

ccchhhrrriiisss,

Your response is exemplary. I pray that others may follow your example.

In Christ,
Renoncer

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by Joyful_Heart, on: 2011/9/30 22:11

This is exactly what our enemy wants people. A division right before the conference. Don't give into it. None of us agree 100% on everything. So, why this now?

So, let's turn our eyes upon Jesus and not give in to the devil in division.

Re: Head Coverings - posted by Questor, on: 2011/9/30 23:21

I do not like to disagree with so eminent a teacher as Zac Poonen, but there are some instances in this message covered above that are not quite accurate according to the original meaning and intention.

The word for 'covering' is or , which means to cover wholly, as with a veil or head scarf.

2619

katakaluptw

katakalupto

kat-ak-al-oop'-to

from kata - kata 2596 and kaluptw - kalupto 2572; to cover wholly, i.e. veil:--cover, hide.

When the correct meaning as used (1st Corinthians, 11:4-6) with women is accurate, and particularly in reference to public prayer and prophesying by a woman. The requirement for wearing such a covering in Temple or synagogue is to show the true deference to the man who covers her, whether her father, her husband, or in the case of a widow, Yeshua.

1 Corinthians 11

1. Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.
2. Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you.
3. But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.
4. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head.
5. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven.
6. For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.
7. For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.
8. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.
9. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.
10. For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.

The word angels is a KJV distortion of the word , being made out to be because the pronunciation of aggelos sounds like angelos. In the use of the katakalupto , the meaning becomes to proclaim, preach, and teach. I won't go into the obvious point about a woman preaching or teaching, as that is another kettle of worms entirely. My point is about men covering their heads when they preach, teach, and evangelize.

2605

kataggellw

kataggello

kat-ang-gel'-lo

from kata - kata 2596 and the base of aggelov - aggelos 32; to proclaim, promulgate:--declare, preach, shew, speak of, teach.

11. Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord.
12. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God.
13. Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?
14. Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?
15. But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.
16. But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

The reason for the head covering, in public, for a woman not to distract a man from her words by the beauty of her hair, and the sensual connotations that went with that ornament, then thought of as a woman's most glorious physical feature, and to be shown only within her family, and particularly in intimacy with her husband. To not wear it in Temple or Synagogue would be downright offensive to the body, whether speaking or not in prayer or prophecy.

Therefore for a man to wear such a covering, a down drooping and face covering veil, such as Dominican Monks still wear to this day, covering the whole head, and being pulled forward to completely shadow or keep from view their face, is considered wrong as a type of cross dressing. However for a man to wear no head covering at all when speaking publicly is in complete disregard for the commandment given directly to Moses by YHVH at the burning bush.

In the wilderness of Caanan and any Mediterranean country, to go without a head covering as normal part of clothing is downright dangerous, and generally referred to a head cloth, or turban, often covered by the outer garment, a full length shawl, to provide a measure of shade in the heat.

However, for a man to not take into consideration whether wearing the garb of a servant of Yeshua, which any servant in the first century wore, which was a small, wrapped head covering to denote servitude, being under the obedience of the man in headship over him, but also to be bare foot as a sign of submission to YHVH.

In Temple or Synagogue the ritual hand washings and foot washings were done before entering the Temple or Synagogue proper, that treading on sacred ground would be in a righteous statement of man to YHVH, even as YHVH told Moses, not to uncover his head, but to bare his feet, before Moses was to approach the burning bush.

Exodus 3

1. Now Moses kept the flock of Jethro his father in law, the priest of Midian: and he led the flock to the backside of the desert, and came to the mountain of God, even to Horeb.
2. And the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.
3. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt.
4. And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I.
5. And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.

As men and women in Yeshua are priests and kings (Our High Priest Yeshua wearing the Crown as our High Priest, are, if you will not take the mitre (as the Pope does, and all Bishops in Yeshua are all priests before YHVH, one should wear the garb of a the High Priest, and at the least Catholic Liturgy), one should, if you are requiring women to keep customs that are from another epoch, as is just and traditional, yet not in conflict with the Torah, then men also should wear the kippah, or a cap or hat, when at Temple or Synagogue.

Exodus 29

4. And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water.
5. And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod, and the breastplate, and gird him with the curious girdle of the ephod:
6. And thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre.

“If we reject any command in any of the New Testament epistles, saying it was only for the time and place when it was written and not for us today, then in order to be consistent, we must give equal freedom to other people to reject other commands in the epistles and in the teachings of Jesus as also being only for that time and not for us today. For example, we must, in that case, give freedom to people to teach that forbidding homosexual behavior and same-sex marriages and divorces and premarital sexual intercourse, etc., were only for the first century and not for us today. Otherwise we will be inconsistent.

It is inconsistent, therefore, to say that every command in the New Testament is relevant for us today, and then to reject just this one command to women to cover their heads when they pray or prophesy (1 Cor.11:1-16).”

“1 Corinthians 11:16 says that every church that is a church of God, will insist on this head covering for women when they pray or prophesy. The Holy Spirit recognized that 20 centuries later this would become a controversial issue; and so He made Paul to state (in this same verse) that if anyone was going to be argumentative about this matter, he would not argue with such a person. He would just allow that person to continue on in his/her disobedience and inconsistency.”

I myself have no objection to going head covered, and barefoot before speaking or praying in the house of YHVH, only that the fullness of the traditions that are not against the Torah being carried forward to do honor to YHVH are done by both sexes.

Something to consider.

Q

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/1 1:48

Various thoughts have been shared concerning this issue. I now have a question: would any be willing to listen to the spiritual, practical benefits one experiences in wearing a head covering? Yes? or No? (This would be largely testimonial.)

Re: , on: 2011/10/1 1:51

After you share Ginny, I want to share the spiritual benefits of wearing a tie with a cardigan sweater.

Re: - posted by neen, on: 2011/10/1 4:19

yes ginnyrose i would be very interested in hearing, after reading this post i am considering wearing a head covering . i would love you to share this with us please. Im still unsure wether it is something you should wear only in church and when praying with others or if it should be worn all the time, could you help me a little with this please.

Re: Wearing a Head Covering - posted by Questor, on: 2011/10/1 4:39

Ginnyrose, as you are a member, I believe, of a Mennonite Church, and thus wear a head covering of some type, I would be delighted to know what the experience is like.

Please do discuss your church's teaching regarding men wearing hats as well.

Q

Re: - posted by raguas (), on: 2011/10/1 6:56

I love SI because of the great messages shared here. The spirit of this ministry and those attracted here is, for the most part, great. This should be a safe place to share and ask. During Jesus' ministry He was confronted to respond to actions that appeared to go against what was taught in Scriptures. His response was focused the priority on the condition of the heart. So let us remember or consider 'why do we say what we say' or 'do what we do'. If we disagree, what kind of attitude are we responding in? I think the way we are to respond is something we can all agree in.

Jesus' heart is that we would be one and that we would love one another. These things did not take Him by surprise. God knows these things would happen. I still have many questions I am trying to work out regarding doctrine. I have heard strong intelligent and logical support for both sides of many issues and I have seen genuine love in both sides. Even if the facts that one bases their stand on is wrong and the heart is right, we know God is gonna weigh the heart and motive. We can 'give our bodies to be burned' and it could be in vain. We'll probably never get everything right but let us get the 'main' thing right. I think if we can at least get 'charity' right, we've done well. But if we get all the 'other' stuff right but failed miserably on the subject of love, that would be inexcusable.

So let us go ahead and even be strong in making our point but let us do so with gentleness and patience. Give grace to your brother/sister who disagrees. If their reason for doing so is wrong then the Lord will judge them and if it is right let them follow their conviction without condemnation. If we truly have a right heart, we would pray for them with love.

"...in all things charity". I asked my brother many years ago , what do you think is more important, having love or having your doctrine straight but there was wisdom in his answer. He said 'I think if you have love, it will keep your doctrine straight' to add to that and perhaps he meant this too, if you have love, it, or I should say, God will straighten out your doctrine.

ne eventually. As I understand my Bible, I believe it was written to primarily address the heart and it's condition in relation to God and also to each other.

Know that I am also speaking very much to myself and not as though I got this down.

Fyi, at TSC the head covering is not practiced or taught. Women, such as Pastor Carter's wife, Teresa, preach/teach frequently. I believed God was moving there mightily when I was going to church there. I believe He still does. Does that mean TSC has got it all right. I'm sure they don't.

So first, let us strive to maintain unity and love with humility and patience. Lord help manifest the fruit of your Spirit in us as we seek to follow You more wholly. Help us in the shortness of time to live in the unity of the Spirit. Teach us and reveal to us your truth. We're a zealous bunch here, even when we lose our way in our attitudes, help us to come back together and break bread again in peace and in joy. Bind us together as we are bound to you.

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/10/1 9:42

Wow, the excuses are amazing. Thanks so much for posting this, Greg.

As it's been simply put so many times, if the hair was the only covering, then men would have to shave their heads! All of you men who believe it's the hair but won't shave your heads aren't following your own argument. However, the men of God in the Bible obviously didn't shave their heads, so that poses a problem.

savedtoserve

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2011/10/1 10:16

I have been hesitant to post to this thread because I have seen in the past it can turn into a heated discussion. I have studied this topic in the past and shared with my husband as well as some other brothers that I know are walking with the LORD and sought out their understanding of these passages as well. After much prayer and seeking GOD on this issue I do not feel convicted to wear a covering on my head at all times but I do personally feel led to cover my head when I pray. At this time I keep praying and seeking GOD and if HE were to change my heart on this matter I would gladly wear a hat(covering) but I do not feel led to do so all the time now and I think if I did it just because another told me to it would not really be out of obedience to GOD but just going along with what men say. I love everyone here on SI. Ginnyrose I know wears a covering and I think she is an awesome woman in GOD who I often go to for advice and counsel. She mentioned sharing the blessing she has in doing so and I would love to hear from her on this. For me personally I have read several teachings on this and will keep seeking because I know GOD is not going to lead me out of HIS will as long as I keep my heart soft and open toward HIM in this and all things.

Thank you for sharing the article Greg. I will continue to pray and follow the LORDS leading in this.

God Bless
mj

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/1 11:29

Questor, you are very observant. I have been here on SI for many years and you are the first to ask me this question - if I recall. In any case, you are right. I deliberately refrained from mentioning this because of the images this evokes in a person's mind. It will usually close minds to whatever a Mennonite will have to say - makes no difference what it is there is that instant loathing and/or reserve that many times follow this knowledge which means that people will close their minds to whatever we have to share.

Some of this 'loathing' can be justified, I suppose, because most Mennonites are in great need of revival. Apostasy is so great and it happened so fast, I would say in 60 years...and this is right on the heels of great revivals that swept the Mennonite Church in the 1940-1950s.

Ok, back to our subject of head-coverings.

The wearing of head-coverings is NOT a Mennonite doctrine. The reason many believe so is because as a body of Believers, it is usually found on conservative Mennonites, Dunkards, Brethren, Hutterites and Amish. There are other churches that are wearing it, some Baptists and perhaps some Holiness people.

The wearing of head-coverings were done by all Christian professing women until about the 1950s. By then they were wearing only hats to church. The abandoning of this practice is of recent origin. If one is observant, when you see pictures of Christian ladies back in the 1800s and earlier you will see many of them wearing a head-covering, and they were not Mennonites. A few years ago we visited Williamsburg, VA and walked through that village. In one of the 'shops' a re-enactor lady was dressed in period costume and she wore a head-covering. (It was quite fancy, actually.)

Walter Beachy, a retired Anabaptist historian whose series on Anabaptist history is in the SI archives, talks about his Amish mother. He said when she was a young woman, was in town and a Lutheran lady was nearby you could not tell which was Amish or which was Lutheran from across the street. Their appearance was so near alike.

It is true there are many who will wear it for the wrong reasons. I am familiar with all of them, but this is like a lot of other things the Scripture teaches: the devil will take God's word and pervert it and this is no exception. Actually, do you know of any Bible doctrine the devil has not perverted? Off-hand I do not know of any.

This is all I will say for now. I have to go, but will be back, Lord willing. We plan to be gone most of the day and tomorrow and when I come back I will write more...

God is still good and He is Good all the time. Right?

Re: , on: 2011/10/1 14:09

I posted accidentally under another thread (ironically about the Amish) about being troubled about this thread. There is an aggressive Islamic agenda that is pushing an extreme devotion to the Koran. The teaching is called sharia. It is sharia that mandates women wear the veil or hijab. One would say that this is a religious spirit taken to the extreme. I wonder if this thread is not giving in to that same spirit?

If one chooses to take the head covering as a matter of conviction then Amen. But I am not certain if this should be a command of the New Covenant.

The other thing that concerns me is we are looking to externals. Did not Paul tell us that circumcision is nothing or uncircumcision is nothing, keeping God's commands is what counts. Those commands would be articulated by Jesus in love of neighbor and love of God. Does not the scriptures say that God looks at the heart but man looks upon outward appearance? Is God not looking to hearts that are loyal to him?

If I read the New Testament correctly then our loyalty to Christ is defined by a heart alignment to Jesus and not external observance.

Blaine

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/10/1 14:55

Martyr, you are right. It's like Roman's 14.

Rom 14:1 Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.

Rom 14:2 For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.

Rom 14:3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.

Rom 14:10 But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

A lot of Christians think they should wear certain clothes or eat certain foods, some think having a TV is against scripture, others think striving for a better career is worldly, while others believe carrying any kind of life insurance or medical insurance is a lack of faith and trusting of God. Some even think going to a Doctor is a lack of faith. And then there are the ones that think women should not speak in meetings especially without a head covering. I believe all those caught up in legalism are actually weak in faith in need these "things" as their personal props. Ok. So be it. But we don't have to make doctrines out of them and make sisters and brothers feel inferior to us and disobedient to God. This is one reason why Brethren people hang out with Brethren people, Mennonites with Mennonites, etc. But, if we were all in a prison camp together

ether, it is amazing at how easily these non-essentials will fall away.

Let's major on the essentials.

Rom 14:13 Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way.

Mike

Re: - posted by raguas (), on: 2011/10/1 15:07

We should not question or judge the motives of those who do not agree with this practice of head covering if their conviction is genuine but this should also be the same way we treat those that believe in this practice. I would not accuse them of being legalistic. Maybe some are but I really believe many here are doing it out of obedience and surrender as they have come to understand and interpret these passages. Let's not pass judgment on them.

Rom 14:13...good scripture find.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/10/1 17:22

Quote:
-----ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
While I cherish the messages shared by Brother Poonen, I do disagree with his conclusion on this matter. I do not feel that we are bound to any sort of outward display of holiness such as a physical garment.

Well said brother and I am in total agreement.

God bless,
Sister Lisa

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/10/1 17:47

Hi Raguas,

You are right and I stand corrected. Neither side should judge.

However, the Christian has a calling to vigorously oppose any gospel that is a false gospel, as Paul vigorously opposed Peter's gospel in Galatia.

But, I do not sense that those in favor of headcoverings are propagating it as part of the gospel.

Mike

Re: - posted by raguas (), on: 2011/10/1 19:55

Thanks Mike.

"However, the Christian has a calling to vigorously oppose any gospel that is a false gospel, as Paul vigorously opposed Peter's gospel in Galatia. "

I agree with you.

"But, I do not sense that those in favor of headcoverings are propagating it as part of the gospel."

If that is the case, we need to guard our hearts from that and recognize it.

Ricky

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by nathanogbu, on: 2011/10/1 21:20

"What did Paul mean when he wrote, "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonors his head. But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, for that is one and the same as if her head were shaved" (1 Cor. 11:4,5)

Was he talking about long and short hair? Was he addressing something unique to Corinthian culture? We don't have to guess about the matter, because the historical evidence is strikingly clear.

The historical record reveals that the early churches all understood Paul to be talking about a cloth veil, not long hair. The only thing that wasn't clear to some of the early Christians was whether or not Paul's instructions apply to all females or only to married women. The reason is that the Greek word *gyne*, used by Paul, can mean "a female" or it can mean "a married woman."

Around the year 200, at Carthage, North Africa, Tertullian wrote a tract entitled, "The Veiling of Virgins." Tertullian makes the argument that the passage applies to all females of age—not just to married women. Of course, Tertullian's personal view is of little concern to us. But what is so valuable about this work of his is that he discusses the practices of different church in various parts of the world. Here are some key excerpts from his work:

I also admonish you second group of women, who are married, not to outgrow the discipline of the veil. Not even for a moment of an hour. Because you can't avoid wearing a veil, you should not find some other way to nullify it. That is, by going about neither covered nor bare. For some women do not veil their heads, but rather bind them up with turbans and woollen bands. It's true that they are protected in front. But where the head properly lies, they are bare.

Others cover only the area of the brain with small linen coifs that do not even quite reach the ears.... They should know that the entire head constitutes the woman. Its limits and boundaries reach as far as the place where the robe begins. The region of the veil is co-extensive with the space covered by the hair when it is unbound. In this way, the neck too is encircled.

The pagan women of Arabia will be your judges. For they cover not only the head, but the face also. . . . But how severe a chastisement will they likewise deserve, who remain uncovered even during the recital of the Psalms and at any mention of the name of God? For even when they are about to spend time in prayer itself, they only place a fringe, tuft , or any thread whatever on the crown of their heads. And they think that they are covered!

Earlier in his tract, Tertullian testified that the churches that were founded by the apostles did insist that both their married women and their virgins be veiled:

Throughout Greece, and certain of its barbaric provinces, the majority of churches keep their virgins covered. In fact, this practice is followed in certain places beneath this African sky. So let no one ascribe this custom merely to the Gentile customs of the Greeks and barbarians.

Moreover, I will put forth as models those churches that were founded by either apostles or apostolic men. . . . The Corinthians themselves understood him to speak in this manner. For to this very day the Corinthians veil their virgins. What the apostles taught, the disciples of the apostles confirmed.

Clement of Alexandria, an elder writing from Egypt around the year 190, counseled:

"Let the woman observe this, further. Let her be entirely covered, unless she happens to be at home. For that style of dress is grave, and protects from being gazed at. And she will never fall, who puts before her eyes modesty, and her shawl; nor will she invite another to fall into sin by uncovering her face. For this is the wish of the Word, since it is becoming for her to pray veiled."

Hippolytus, a leader in the church at Rome around the year 200, compiled a record of the various customs and practices in that church from the generations that preceded him. His Apostolic Tradition contains this statement:

And let all the women have their heads covered with an opaque cloth, not with a veil of thin linen, for this is not a true covering.

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/10/1 22:37

Sad, Nathan Ogbu, very sad.

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2011/10/2 6:03

Quote:- What is sad to me is that brothers and sisters will claim they surrender all to Jesus and that He can have their entire lives and time, money, energy etc. But when God asks of us simple commands of obedience that would set us fully apart from society (this world system) we balk at it and consider it just something that was for the first century.

Answer me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?

For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.

Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.

Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.

So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free.

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

Re: - posted by looserchapel (), on: 2011/10/2 7:49

Quote:

-----Answer me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?

who is the author of this verse? Paul. who wrote 1 Cor 11? Paul. So, let me answer by quoting Paul again...

5 What, after all, is Apollos? And what is Paul? Only servants, through whom you came to believe—^{as} the Lord has assigned to each his task. 6 I planted the seed, Apollos watered it, but God has been making it grow. 1 Cor 3

I believe we are losing so much time in pointless debates of those kinds. I believe Paul MEANT headcovering for ALL women of ALL ages, I believe any other apostle might have disagreed with him. I believe they were still able to fellowship. I believe they have had greater disagreement on other topics. I believe they were way more effective than we are now. I believe the disciples turned the world upside down in its fullest sense, it was not just an hyperbole. I believe they were full of the Holy Spirit (in a sense that He was not grieved nor quenched). I see our modern church (and i'm in) so weak and so blind. I see our modern church so inoffensive in this present evil world. I believe that it is a good thing that God is grace, because we need a great amount of grace to move forward.

I believe we act as those who know NOTHING of God when we begin to use the SWORD OF THE SPIRIT to wound each other (it's stupid and it won't work, using Paul to attack Paul it's so... I am particularly thinking about the calv/arm debate). I believe the Bible is a guide, a lamp to our path and light to our feet, but in our modern world we'd like it to be more precise on some matters, we use it as though it is an encyclopedia or any other "practical and comprehensive" manual. Thus, I believe there are SO many stuffs we don't know about, for instance the (FULL)early church history. I believe God purposely skipped it, because again, I believe the Bible is given to us so that we BELIEVE, not in the sense that we would have ALL the answers on ANY matter. I believe the Bible is inerrant, that it is our model as christian. I believe God worked thru Augustine when he separated the Canon with the Apocrypha. I do NOT believe one second that the Bible is the WHOLE revelation of who God is (it takes the second part of eternity to know HIM ^^) but I believe the Bible is MORE T

HAN ENOUGH (My grace is enough to you)for us to go thru this life. I think I'm done.

Blessings,

Lalaina.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/10/2 9:03

Excellent post Nathan. Surely something for everyone to think about. The witness of the early church fathers many times goes against 100% what modern evangelicalism believes. We have to be open to the Word of God and the Spirit of God in these matters to ask the honest question are we wrong and they were right?

--

Clement of Alexandria, an elder writing from Egypt around the year 190, counseled:

"Let the woman observe this, further. Let her be entirely covered, unless she happens to be at home. For that style of dress is grave, and protects from being gazed at. And she will never fall, who puts before her eyes modesty, and her shawl; nor will she invite another to fall into sin by uncovering her face. For this is the wish of the Word, since it is becoming for her to pray veiled."

Hippolytus, a leader in the church at Rome around the year 200, compiled a record of the various customs and practices in that church from the generations that preceded him. His Apostolic Tradition contains this statement:

And let all the women have their heads covered with an opaque cloth, not with a veil of thin linen, for this is not a true covering.

Re: - posted by rnieman, on: 2011/10/2 9:16

The Early church is certainly a great testimony, however is there not room for progressive illumination? Just look at Eastern Orthodoxy(the early church's view) vs. Western Orthodoxy on the atonement, whose view is the correct view? There definitely is a solid place for the history of the church as long as you leave room for progressive illumination. thanks russ

Re: , on: 2011/10/2 9:22

It is so striking to me that so many who would argue that the ladies should have their heads covered(some even arguing for a total covering) because nothing has changed from the first century, in regard to what the Scriptures teach, are the very same people who would teach that the sign gifts of the Holy Spirit no longer apply today because something supposedly changed in the fourth century.

Can you see that brothers and sisters? Arguing over the gnat while swallowing the camel. What is the greatest disaster for the church? A woman goes without a veil or the church goes without the Spirit?

Little men argue over little things and would spy out liberty and pursue it with chains, while their own chains rattle.

Having said all of that, I see no reason why that which was practised in the early church should not be practised today. For the same reason I would argue for the sign gifts, I would argue that a woman should cover her head when praying, at least publicly. I myself would never wear a hat when I am gathered with the brothers and sisters seeking the presence of God. Yet, hats and head covering are such a trivial thing in comparison to the denial of the Holy Spirit. If a man was presented to me who was bleeding to death and also had the flu, I would stem the flow of blood and save his life, then after that, we would consider the flu.....brother Frank

Luk 11:42 But woe to you, Pharisees! For you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and pass over judgment and the love of God. You ought to have done these, and not to leave the other undone.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by nathanogbu, on: 2011/10/2 12:12

Greg has simply expounded on a piece of New testament scripture this needn't have caused contention or division but rather could have brought about a mature and enriching discussion upon Christian doctrine and practice. Sadly some have preferred rather to throw accusations of legalism e.t.c rather than join him in his discussion and offer alternative interpretation to the passage.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2011/10/2 13:01

The problem is that when you get a bunch of different people from different denominations, at varying levels of maturity and doctrinal leanings you are going to get responses like this when you bring volatile issues such as head coverings, tithing, Bible versions, baptisms, etc. Which is unfortunate. A sign of maturity in Christ is the ability to sometimes bypass and hold your peace when you are tempted to bring reproof unto others' convictions.

There is certainly nothing wrong in bringing reproof, for this is one of the things the Word of God is profitable for (II Tim. 3:16), but we need to watch out for the spirit our reproofing is done in. This can make or break a discussion. Zac Poonen is justified by his convictions in writing the article, and you and I are certainly allowed to disagree - only without contention or mockery. For me personally, I do not have light on this topic, and I make no pretense as though I do. If and when God gives me light I will obey by His grace and power the prompting of the Holy Spirit. Until then we must study to be quiet and to do our own business (I Thess. 4:11). If you are able to keep your mouth and tongue, you will, in the end, keep your soul from many troubles (Proverbs 21:23). Brothers and sisters, I believe this is a good area to practice that proverb.

Re: - posted by looserchapel (), on: 2011/10/2 13:03

Quote:

-----Brothers and sisters, I believe this is a good area to practice that proverb.

AMEN

Re: Are we even praying or prophesying?, on: 2011/10/2 13:39

Question. Why the argument? You are putting the cart before the horse. You are debating whether it is proper for a woman to pray or prophesy with her head uncovered when the church is doing neither. Until you get prayer and prophesy back into the church this discussion is moot.

You should be asking, even debating why the church is not praying and prophesying. I think it is kind of funny we are trying to prescribe guidelines for sisters to pray when the men in the church are not praying.

That leads me to another question. How many of you men are praying? How many of you men wake up at 2 or 3am and cry out for the lost? Cry out for revival? How many of you men lead in prayer meetings in your churches? How many of you men lead in prayer in your families?

We are good at telling the sisters how to pray and what they must wear to pray. But who does the praying? I tell you it ain't the men. I have prayed in many a prayer meeting and on many con calls and except in the rarest of occasions it is the women who pray. The men are strangely absent. Yet these are the men who want to tell and prescribe to the women how they must pray.

Men get some credibility in your life. If you want the women to listen to you about how they should pray then you yourselves start praying.

Then maybe we will see revival in the church.

Blaine

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2011/10/2 13:59

Amen Blaine. Amen.

Re: , on: 2011/10/2 14:16

Amen brother Blaine, focussing back onto the " camel," and laying aside the "gnat."brother Frank

Re: , on: 2011/10/2 14:35

Hmm. Me chockum on that camel sometime. Easier to smokum. Chuckle.

Blaine

Re: - posted by lovejt (), on: 2011/10/2 19:18

Yes, to follow or embrace this is not legalism. You can be legalistic about this if you force women NOT to wear it when they have the conviction to wear it. It can go either way. GW North and Watchman Nee have some additional writings on this for further study. Most women that I have known who practice this understand that it doesn't make one 'holy'. It's a visible reminder of the inner-life. That's the point. But it doesn't guarantee you will be holy. Only the Holy Spirit can do that... not a cloth.

Re: - posted by Enochh (), on: 2011/10/2 20:42

So Blaine I must assume you get up at 2 am a lot and cry out to God for the lost and revival. I must assume you lead in the prayer meetings at your church and with your family. You wouldn't be trying to get a speck out of my eye with a beam in yours would you?

Re: - posted by ArtB (), on: 2011/10/2 22:30

by sermonindex on 2011/10/2 6:03:05 writes:

"Excellent post Nathan. Surely something for everyone to think about. The witness of the early church fathers many times goes against 100% what modern evangelicalism believes. We have to be open to the Word of God and the Spirit of God in these matters to ask the honest question are we wrong and they were right?"

I fully agree, Nathans' post is excellent.

The word for woman leans toward wife in the Greek:

NT:1135

gunē (goo-nay'); probably from the base of NT:1096; a woman; specially, a wife:

(Biblesoft's New Exhaustive Strong's Numbers and Concordance with Expanded Greek-Hebrew Dictionary. Copyright © 1994, 2003 Biblesoft, Inc. and International Bible Translators, Inc.)

I thought the other word was a 'veil'. Apparently Paul is speaking about a Hat or scarf for woman. Which was very common on up at least through the 1960's. Veil in my mind is a face covering. Pardon my English.

Re: Wearing a Head covering, Pt. 2 - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/2 22:41

What follows is my testimony as to why I wear one.

I will not go into the Scriptures to explain why: this has already been done. But I will share my experience with the struggle to obey it.

I grew up in a church where it was practiced as I suppose many of your grandparents or great-grand parents, if they were church-going people, did as well. It was well taught and expected that its members would make application.

When I was 18 years old in 1965, I had a severe struggle with it: I did NOT want to wear it! Period! I did not like to look like a sore thumb in any crowd: I wanted to look like everyone else. After all, there are many Christian ladies out there who have a wonderful testimony and they do not wear one, so why do I have to???

I was at Rosedale Bible School that year and I shared my struggle at chapel one day. Prayer was had for me and the struggle became history for fourteen years when the struggle took on a new turn. I was sick and tired of dealing with long hair. They were long: I could sit on them when hanging and that was very annoying when they were drying after washing. Not only was the length an aggravation so was the thickness: they were thick. And I was tired of caring for long, thick hair. My weariness of caring for them got so severe I made sure I did not have a scissors nearby when I worked with them lest I would on impulse cut them. I knew if I cut them it would be very wrong and I did not want to do wrong. God saw my plight because before too long I conceived (surprise!) and in the process of carrying this child I lost almost half of my hair, never to grow back again. (You can't tell me God does not have a sense of humor!)

When I was forty years old I began working at the Crises Pregnancy Center. (Not until later did I learn they were reluctant to hire me because I looked different and they did not know how the clients would respond to me.) From experience I was well aware girls may be intimidated by my appearance so I depended on the LORD to help me surmount this wall. What followed was nothing short of amazing: the girls warmed up to me and they could feel my love because it was God given - and the director was pleasantly surprised. (I shared my concern with an Independent Methodist pastor about this issue and he said if people can sense your love they will not care what you look like! Excellent advice!)

As I worked with the other staff members I quickly noticed a difference between them and me. These ladies were the best in their churches: they were the most spiritual, knowledgeable in the WORD in their brotherhood. They came from the Charismatic, Assembly of God, Baptists, Presbyterian and Catholic traditions. They were skilled, smart and caring ladies: I loved them, learned a lot from them. But they had fear - fear for their own personal safety - their fear was foreign to me. I had none. I expected God to take the responsibility for my safety.

One time there was a murder committed two blocks away and the murderer was never found to my knowledge. Now the director was scared spitless. She insisted we keep the door locked and if anyone wanted in we had to go unlock it! This got to be pure aggravation, if you were alone there with clients. You were busy in another part of the building and then you had to go answer the door! I decided eventually to leave the door unlocked, like before, and if anyone wants to kill me, so be it! It is God's job to protect me from murderers! And He did. Later the director commented on this fact that Sandra is not scared of anyone!

I had come to this conclusion: that it is God's job to protect me! I am physically weak, short - less than 5' tall - I am no match for anyone who desires to overpower me. I cannot fight to protect myself, and since I belong to God it is his job. This faith is rooted in the WORD where it says that we are to cover our heads because of the angels - who are God's ministering spirits to his children. Since my safety from evil men rests in the hands of God, I do not worry about it at all! I wear my covering at home, in the public to honor my Saviour. He has not let me down and I certainly do not want to let him down - He did so much for me, more than I can ever do for him so why should I not want to be obedient to him in such a small way? I am not ashamed of Him or to stand out in a crowd. My sticking out like a sore thumb is no match to hang naked from a cross like He did for all to gawk at! Jesus said if we will be ashamed of Him, he will be ashamed of us. So, I joyfully wear something that marks me as a child of the KING!

More to come later...

Enochh, on: 2011/10/2 22:58

Brother to answer your question I do get up in the early morning hours and pray and listen to my New Testament on my digital Bible. Most of the time the hour varies from 2am or 3am. My time of prayer can be from 2 to 3 hours. This is not on my knees. But I P and P, pace and pray. I have come to value these times with Jesus as the early morning hours as they are the clearest time I can hear his voice without the distractions of the day. I begin to see why Jesus valued the night and early morning times of prayer. It was communion with his Father.

I am single and not involved in a church. But I lead a conference call 3 times a week where we pray for the persecuted church. I might add that most of my intercessors are women who pray heart felt, powerful prayers. Very few men come on our calls though it is open to them. We are also planning a 12 hour con call for the IDOP in Nov. I am one of 2 people working on that call

Forgive me if this sounds like boasting but I was trying to be honest about my prayer life. Am I trying to get the speck out of your eye and not get the plank out of my own? No. Is my prayer life perfect? By no means. Am I going to tell a sister how to pray or what she must wear to pray? No.

My post was to challenge men in the church to set the standard and pray. When I have been involved in churches many times the women carry the burden of prayer. It just seems pretty hypocritical to mandate a head covering for women to pray or prophesy in the church when very little of either is done.

Bless God if you are a praying man and your church prays. Yours would be the exception. But for the most part the church in America is not a praying church. Just look at the state of the church and you see what I mean.

Blaine

Re: GinnyRose - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2011/10/2 22:59

Thank you for the testimony sister GinnyRose,

I am so thankful that this has been brought up.

Every man praying or prophesying, having head covered, dishonoureth his head (1 Corinthians 11:4).

I enjoy spending time outside alone with God. And it was cold outside so I went to grab a hat and the Holy Spirit kept prompting me to leave it behind. So I just obeyed his voice. The Lord has truly blessed me with his guidance.

In Grace,

Travis

Re: Dealing with opposition, pt. 3 - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/3 0:21

Dealing with opposition

In the course of living, wearing a covering, I have met with opposition to this practice. There is one incident that remains forever imprinted in my memory.

We attended a funeral of my husband's aunt in FL. At lunch I sat across the table from the wife of my husband's cousin. She was a very religious woman who did not grow up in a religious home at all. They professed to be very good Christians.

As we visited Corrie (not her real name) took it upon herself to convince me that I should cut my hair. She waxed eloquent...I sat there, my head down, wondering how on earth I will respond to her arguments. But I knew one thing from my experience at working at CPC: God will give me the words to say when I need to speak, and more so if I have no clue how to respond.

As Corrie talked something strange happened: I heard her well, but could not comprehend it at all. This disturbed a tad but it, but did not worry me. I did wonder how I am going to answer her when I have no clue what she said! I waited for the voice to stop and when it did, I knew a response was expected, but what was I to tell her? I did not understand a word she said. I looked up and said, "Corrie, I have wanted to...." and then the strangest thing happened! She quickly pushed her chair back and she ran hard from the room! She never did ask me what I was going to say!

Why did she respond like that? I suspect, and feel certain, she saw something, someone which I only suspected, and it frightened her to no end! God took care of my problem! Now, isn't He wonderful!

More to come...next time I plan to share incidents of God's supernatural intervention in the lives of his daughters in dangerous situations.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/3 0:22

God bless you, Travis. It is so encouraging to me to hear of others' sensitivity to the voice of the Holy Spirit.

God bless you, brother.

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 0:56

"I plan to share incidents of God's supernatural intervention in the lives of his daughters in dangerous situations."

Ginnyrose, do you truly believe that those who do not wear 'something' on their heads, do Not have marvelous testimonies as well? Women who have served GOD overseas or in City Streets or those who are now in Heaven, who's writings are listed here on SermonIndex? Or our fellow Sisters that have even posted here, over these last 9 yrs?

This is not to be seen as "opposition" to anyone's personal convictions but just some thoughts that consider the "all" in the Body of Christ world-wide, both present and past.

I certainly would defend to the hilt, anyone's right to wear a head covering - though these early church quotes are saying for faces to be covered as well. So be it, for those who do cover their faces as well, as the Angels that cover their faces with two of their wings while they cry, "Holy, Holy, Holy" - but now to make it as a way to judge the holiness of other churches, fellowships or individuals if they don't where a veil is disastrous.

One thing that I have witnessed this custom do - unless the covering is only used when a woman prays or prophesies, is to make men get tempted even more if they see a Sister in The LORD showing her hair. We are now making the showing of "hair" as a sex symbol when it never was before - unless it is intentionally "styled" to be a focal point. But plain hair is not a stumbling block for the vast majority of Brothers and they're used to seeing their sisters at church with conservative hair and it's not been a stumbling block in the least ... but once you make the hair of a women a sex symbol, that you claim will cause a man to stumble - you've just injected a new thought into the men and now they can't even look at the Sisters in their fellowships without thinking of that.

What a shame for those Great Churches and Fellowships out there that practice Holiness in every way, yet don't wear "the veil". But as I've asked elsewhere - what have we allowed here, within this last year, by not correcting towards the important issues of sanctification?

I very much respect my sisters who do wear whatever on their heads - but must say that it is extremely unfair to countless women who live extremely consecrated lives but don't feel led by THE LORD to now begin to wear this loosely defined head/face covering and to throw these blanket pronouncements and condemnations at them all. Some risking their lives, as we speak, around the world to rescue any perishing. Those that only read Christian literature and only listen to such - that fast often and sacrifice all that they have and are for the Love of Christ yet don't wear whatever on their heads because they have searched it out and have been taught that it is cultural in nature or merely a personal preference, these should not be judged.

Laying this on All, everywhere, irrespective of the country where they live, all of the fellowships or individuals that this thread lambastes and even condemns, should be an unthinkable action, as we have most of the Classic Preachers of old here, that demanded no such thing, not even the old revivalists, and yet we praise them and have grown up in The LORD on them. And on this particular forum, this particular year, it's appears a complete contradiction of the sacred term of keeping 'TRUE holiness' among us all. Eph 4:24

If perchance, we're not the type to keep a watch on world events and think we'll see our children's children's children or children at all - I'd like to warn that once these fires of chaos, immorality, war, food shortages, riots, etc raze this nation, as they're right at our door-step now, 'then' will we put these type differences behind us and realize the only 'true holiness' that lasts, goes much much much deeper than what we all wear or don't wear on our heads.

In His Love.

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 0:56

"I plan to share incidents of God's supernatural intervention in the lives of his daughters in dangerous situations."

Ginnyrose, do you truly believe that those who do not wear 'something' on their heads, do Not have marvelous testimonies as well? Women who have served GOD overseas or in City Streets or those who are now in Heaven, who's writings are listed here on SermonIndex? Or our fellow Sisters that have even posted here, over these last 9 yrs?

This is not to be seen as "opposition" to anyone's personal convictions but just some thoughts that consider the "all" in the Body of Christ world-wide, both present and past.

I certainly would defend to the hilt, anyone's right to wear a head covering - though these early church quotes are saying for faces to be covered as well. So be it, for those who do cover their faces as well, as the Angels that cover their faces with two of their wings while they cry, "Holy, Holy, Holy" - but now to make it as a way to judge the holiness of other churches, fellowships or individuals if they don't where a veil is disastrous.

One thing that I have witnessed this custom do - unless the covering is only used when a woman prays or prophesies, is to make men get tempted even more if they see a Sister in The LORD showing her hair. We are now making the showing of "hair" as a sex symbol when it never was before - unless it is intentionally "styled" to be a focal point. But plain hair is not a stumbling block for the vast majority of Brothers and they're used to seeing their sisters at church with conservative hair and it's not been a stumbling block in the least ... but once you make the hair of a women a sex symbol, that you claim will cause a man to stumble - you've just injected a new thought into the men and now they can't even look at the Sisters in their fellowships without thinking of that.

What a shame for those Great Churches and Fellowships out there that practice Holiness in every way, yet don't wear "the veil". But as I've asked elsewhere - what have we allowed here, within this last year, by not correcting towards the important issues of sanctification?

I very much respect my sisters who do wear whatever on their heads - but must say that it is extremely unfair to countless women who live extremely consecrated lives but don't feel led by THE LORD to now begin to wear this loosely defined head/face covering and to throw these blanket pronouncements and condemnations at them all. Some risking their lives, as we speak, around the world to rescue any perishing. Those that only read Christian literature and only listen to such - that fast often and sacrifice all that they have and are for the Love of Christ yet don't wear whatever on their heads because they have searched it out and have been taught that it is cultural in nature or merely a personal preference, these should not be judged.

Laying this on All, everywhere, irrespective of the country where they live, all of the fellowships or individuals that this thread lambastes and even condemns, should be an unthinkable action, as we have most of the Classic Preachers of old here, that demanded no such thing, not even the old revivalists, and yet we praise them and have grown up in The LORD on them. And on this particular forum, this particular year, it's appears a complete contradiction of the sacred term of keeping 'TRUE holiness' among us all. Eph 4:24

If perchance, we're not the type to keep a watch on world events and think we'll see our children's children's children or children at all - I'd like to warn that once these fires of chaos, immorality, war, food shortages, riots, etc raze this nation, as they're right at our door-step now, 'then' will we put these type differences behind us and realize the only 'true holiness' that lasts, goes much much much deeper than what we all wear or don't wear on our heads.

In His Love.

Re: GinnyRose - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2011/10/3 1:02

Sister,

What a blessing to hear about how the Lord has watched over you. It truly encourages me. I know that the Lord will continue to hold you as the apple of his eye and be a wall of fire around you. And he would hold you as an arrow in his quiver (For the weapons of our warfare not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) - 2 Corinthians 10:4.

Love in Jesus Christ our Lord,

Travis

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 1:05

Why do I think of Saudi Arabia when I view this thread?

Blaine

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/3 2:25

Among moslems the principle behind ""hijab" is modesty. In his letter to the Corinthians, wearing of veil (a sort of) among women in Christian assemblies, the apostle Paul's emphasis is submission, and that it is proper for Christians to observe this practice.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2011/10/3 2:41

I would like to mention that something about the claim that has been repeated here and elsewhere that says that it was typical for women to wear "head coverings" or hats until the 1960s.

I have spoken to many elderly brothers and sisters in the Lord about "the old days" -- and I have even brought this subject up inquisitively. My grandmother and great-grandmother (very sincere believers) rarely wore them (and never out of compulsion). We have photos of my grandparents, great-grandparents, great-great-grandparents and even a couple of photos of my great-great-great-grandparents -- all of them who proclaimed Christ -- and I haven't seen any cloth "head coverings" (other than an occasional hat or bonnet).

I have seen many photographs, paintings and etchings as well from the 1800s where women -- dressed in their "Sunday best" -- didn't wear any sort of cloth "covering" upon their heads. You can even use Google and search for photos from the 1800s and find many photographs of women without cloth head coverings or hats. I even found quite a few photographs of Billy Sunday and others preaching, and few of the women in the meetings were wearing a cloth covering or hat.

Now, it was undoubtedly a part of the style of some to wear cloth coverings (and it was even vogue to wear stylish hats for some). However, I feel that it is incorrect to say that it was "typical" or even "normal" behavior for women to wear such things until the 1960s.

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/3 3:06

1Co 11:1 Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.

1Co 11:2 Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you.

It seems clear that one of those ordinances instructed by Paul as the apostle to the gentile Christians is the wearing of head covering of women during Christian assembly.

Especially in occasions where they have to say something, such in corporate prayer or prophesying.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/3 9:22

Chris,

The head coverings I am referring to worn by females in other churches were hats. I do not doubt for one minute that eventually its significance was lost to its wearers - it had simply become a matter of fashion. I do not know what pictures you were looking at, but I have seen many where the ladies wore 'hats' during worship services. You are right, not all did, but neither was it an uncommon practice. Actually, if you are aware of its practice you will begin to notice it. Many people do not notice it unless it is pointed out.

Years ago nurses used to wear caps when practicing. Did you know its origin began by obedience to this scripture? How

ever, most nurses had no clue about its origins. Today one rarely sees an RN with a cap - I miss seeing it, if for no other reason that it looks so unprofessional!

The style of head covering in the west in the past was more cap-like then veil-like. In Communist Russia it was a scarf tied under the chin - these pictures are quite common. Sabrina Wurmbrand used to wear a broad headband which was also in common use among Christian ladies of the communist bloc countries. (This is the style worn by Brandy.) There is a modern trend among some groups to wear a flowing veil. And if you sure wish you wouldn't have to wear one, you wear a small doily! In our church we have ladies who wear the white cap and the white flowing veil.

Blessings.

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/10/3 9:26

After breaking away from the Catholic church doctrinally, the Protestant church however retained many of the structural traditions. And they have up until today.

Catholics wear "doilies" or lace headcoverings on their heads. And some parts of Protestantism do the same thing.

Mike

Re: - posted by mikey2, on: 2011/10/3 9:28

When I was in the military, I prayed much with my helmet on and the Holy Spirit never told me to take it off.

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 9:39

I think the nature of this thread is very sad, but also very revealing.....brother Frank

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/3 9:55

QUOTE:

Ginnyrose, do you truly believe that those who do not wear 'something' on their heads, do Not have marvelous testimonies as well? Women who have served GOD overseas or in City Streets or those who are now in Heaven, who's writings are listed here on SermonIndex? Or our fellow Sisters that have even posted here, over these last 9 yrs?

JIG, I am not judging other ladies who refuse to wear one. This belongs to God.

I have said before that I know beyond a shadow of a doubt that wearing one will not guarantee one's entrance into heaven. Refusing to wear one? I do not know. This is not my business to discern. My business is to be obedient and to encourage others to do likewise. That is all.

I know there are many uncovered women who can challenge you with their Spiritual insights but I still do not know where they are in their walk with God. Same with males. There are many wonderful preachers out there who are inspiring but this does not guarantee they have a living walk with God. I judge no man or woman - unless I am in the presence of raw evil. If anyone feels convicted, it comes from the LORD, not me - I cannot convict anyone.

Yes, I agree, there are females out there who ministered faithfully for the kingdom, e.g., Corrie ten Boom - I love her writings, btw. I want to assume they will go to heaven, but never having been there, I do not know whether they made it or not. God did not tell me and I am not going to allow this to bother me - it is beyond my scope in life. My duty is to be faithful to the WORD and its Author.

JiG, in your criticism of me, have you ever stopped to consider that I am well aware that my belief on this issue is not popular on this board? But that I still post? Ever think about that? What do you make of it? Want me to tell you? I consider people as humans who are on a spiritual journey, being changed from glory to glory. This process includes the sharpening of iron with iron - there will be friction to accomplish this. But you get sharpened and much more useful. We are here on this planet to encourage others in their walk with the LORD and this is a growing process. We are like trees planted by the rivers of living water - and did you know a tree does not stop growing until it dies? You see, one never comes to th

the place in which there is no need of growth or change. My 84 YO mother has changed radically in the last couple of years, going from a bitter old woman to a sweet one...Change - it is always in the present and in the future. Which way will you go?

Blessings.
ginnyrose

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 10:18

Criticism?

Ginnyrose, the first two lines were written to you, the rest as you can see from the spacing was written before I even read your posts. I added the top two after coming online with this unsecured wireless connection that fades in and out. I went offline/dial-up in Aug and my reasons have been posted on a few threads last month.

You may have not been openingly judging anyone, but this thread is and that was the bulk of what I addressed and wrote offline before C&P it here.

Quote:
-----Yes, I agree, there are females out there who ministered faithfully for the kingdom, e.g., Corrie ten Boom - I love her writings, btw. I want to assume they will go to heaven, but never having been there, I do not know whether they made it or not. God did not tell me and I am not going to allow this to bother me - it is beyond my scope in life. My duty is to be faithful to the WORD and its Author.

GR, this sounds a little iffy. "I want to 'assume' they will go to heaven" (?)

Your last paragraph is not written in the spirit that I expected for a reply to mine. I'm half Jewish and was just about to correct Mikey because my other half of the family and where I had to go my first so many yrs of church-going was catholic ... and they stopped their doilys decades ago. In fact they dress anyway they want now.

You may "still post here" but there are hints in these posts on this thread now of how you feel about those who do not cover, that as I said above just now, are iffy in the wording concerning those who don't and Heaven - which the majority of most Protestant churches don't cover and that's where I see the problem on this thread.

I will wear the 'physical' covering in those places that I visit that do, such as Messianic gatherings, and as I said - defend this practice for others - but to judge the salvation, holiness, consecration to GOD by this issue is very wrong, considering the many groups represented here and in the world that are doing more to win true converts than others. The conservative-reformed church that I attended before moving to the north, are doing more for missions than I've ever seen in a denomination and I started up there, only because they were teaching Holiness.

Yes, we're all growing - but you don't know how many uncovered women are giving more of their lives, in every area of their lives and being poured out like a drink offering for Christ yet don't cover and WILL indeed go to Heaven, as the women before them that were truly Regenerated and had Christ as their covering have.

I 'clearly' expressed my respect for those Sisters of mine that do cover but - This topic is Not a Salvation issue and THAT needs to be brought out here.

Again - In His Love!

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2011/10/3 10:44

I have been praying more about this thread and wanted to ask, of those who do feel led to wear head covering all the time, would someone who does not wear a head covering keep you from having fellowship with that person?

Just seeking to understand this issue better

God Bless
mj

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 11:13

Quote:

----- Refusing to wear one? I do not know.

This statement is a bit troubling (regarding this issue as potentially being a deal breaker concerning eternity), if I can be completely honest.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/10/3 11:14

Brethren,

Let us think of this rationally and biblically. The New Testament Scriptures clearly teach on modesty for women in the church. Yet in evangelicalism in North America women dress just like the world in very revealing attire. There is not difference in most cases how women dress in the church and in the worst places in the world system.

The scriptures teach clearly in the New Testament that women are to submit to men in the home and men are to lead. Also in the church that women are to be silent in most cases and not teach over the men. This is God's method and order. yet in evangelism in North America most women act in the same way that flagrant feminists do in the world usurping control and authority from men or desiring offices in the church.

The scriptures clearly teach about a headcovering and specific emphasis on women being "mindful" of being covered (even if that does not mean putting on a covering) it should at least be something that is practiced in the heart. But in modern evangelism almost all the women in churches do not think about this scripture or principle and are not mindful of the need of covering in the presence of God.

These are just a few principles that in church order are not practiced or are considered legalistic by many. But they are clearly biblical principles and are not taught, exhorted and practiced in the modern church in many circles.

If Jesus Christ has full control of our lives and they are truly not our own then why would we argue with him on these matters. Why would we try and explain them away? May God give us a Spirit to simply obey Him and love Him in all things.

Sadly many people want Church their own way and in their own style and do not bother to ask the Lord exactly what He wants. Can people have these external things right and be far away from the Lord in their hearts, yes! But that does not stop us who are close to the Lord in our hearts to follow Him in obedience in these areas.

May we come to maturity saints and agree with God on all Scriptures no matter how much it will set us apart from the world.

--

And no we do not judge sisters if they do not cover their heads nor judge them if they do. May every person be convinced

d in his own mind. And may we all be open to truth hence this article being written for our edification.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/3 11:32

QUOTE:

of those who do feel led to wear head covering all the time, would someone who does not wear a head covering keep you from having fellowship with that person?

I fellowship with you, do I not? Did you not know before now that I cover?

ginnyrose

Re: Greg, on: 2011/10/3 11:55

Brother several years ago I was part of a church that was Calvinistic, baptistic had teaching elders. The church employed a dialogue form of teaching. The men were allowed to speak and vote in the church. The women, while not wearing the head covering, were not allowed to speak or vote in the church. The church continually hammered into the women they were to do their duty and submit and submit to the men. This they were told was Biblical holiness.

In the course of all of this instructing the women in Biblical holiness someone forgot to tell the elders about sexual purity. Two of our teaching elders were found to be having a five year homosexual affair, with each other. The results were disastrous and the church is no more.

My point is the head covering is being made a standard of holiness. Holiness is a heart issue wrought by the Holy Spirit in one's heart. Should we not focus on the fact we are new creations in Christ? Should we not exhort believers to live out that new creation through the fruit of the Spirit? Do the righteous live by faith or by sight? Is not more important that we be clothed with Christ than a cloth?

Brother the older I get the more I see the need for grace in our walk of faith with Jesus. Just some food for thought.

Blaine

Re: Incidents of God's Protection of Ladies who cover, pt. 4 - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/3 11:56

INTRODUCTION:

Under no circumstances would I ever regard the application of the wearing of the covering to work as a good-luck charm. The protection of these sisters and brother came from the LORD at the hand of his ministering spirits, the angels. We know little about their ministry outside of the written Word. But we know they are there and sometimes the evidence of their presence is overwhelming. The Lord allows his daughters to experience this because we do need encouragement. And if bad things do happen, we know God allowed it for some as yet unknown reason...

Incidents of God's Protection of Ladies who cover

There was a single girl who went to NYC to do volunteer work for a mission. She hailed a cab, gave the address of her desired destination to the driver.

Unknown to her this driver worked for a pimp so he dropped her off and told her this is the place she wants to go. As she

mounted the steps she sensed this was a bad place. A man led her in, took her to a room and locked the door. Now she was scared! She heard screams, unholy sounds coming from adjoining rooms. She prayed.

Before too long, she heard footsteps, a man came to her in the room. She immediately felt she could trust him. He told her to follow him and she did. They passed out the doorway, through rooms with other people but they seemed oblivious to their presence. They did not even see them! They went out to the street and walked a ways until he pointed out the house she was to go to. As she turned to thank him for assisting her, he had vanished from sight! She knew she was delivered from evil by an angel.

One time a veiled lady met with a gruff, evil man who guffawed at her attire. Pointing to her head-covering he mockingly said, "Now that is enough to scare the devil!"

"And that sir," she replied, "is exactly why wear it!"

[illegible]

Out in Oregon, many years ago, a single lady worked as a nanny to a wealthy family, living in their house.

One evening the lady of the house was gone and she was left alone with the children and husband. He was drinking and got too friendly with her. She quit her ironing and went up to her room and closed the door to escape him. Before long she heard him come up the stairs and knew he was going to come to her room. She was scared because she could not lock it and she prayed. He opened the door, came in and lunged for her. As he did it was as though he hit a wall: he fell back onto the floor! He picked himself up and left her alone.

Another similar story: a man, Martin, was working as a volunteer in a prison, ministering to inmates. An inmate got so angry with this man that he told him that if he would ever see him again, he would kill him!

The day came when it was time for Martin to visit this prison, knowing full well the danger he faced, but he asked the LORD to protect him.

As he and the chaplain walked down the corridor they came to this inmates cell. The doors to the cells were open so the inmates could come and go. When Martin came to this cell, this rough man saw him and he growled, yelled and lunged for Martin. As he came to the door, it was as though he hit a wall, and he fell back onto the floor. There is no logical reason for this to have happened apart from the intervention of God's angels.

[illegible]

There was a preacher who was married and together they had four children. She was quite sickly and fell behind on her work in caring for her family.

On this particular day, He had to go to a meeting with other preachers and left her alone with her work and her not feeling good at all. Before too long, a lady knocked on her door, and she answered it. The caller asked if she could come in and help her today? The caller exuded trust and confidence so she agreed to allow her to help her. This lady told the pastor's wife that she should just go lie down and rest: she will take care of things for her.

The pastor's wife slept for several hours. When she awoke she was surprised to find her house cleaned up, clothes washed - all put away in the right closets and drawers. And there was supper all ready cooked, ready to eat on the stove. In addition to this, the table was set for the family with one additional plate. Now, this was an error the visitor made, or so she thought - otherwise, everything else was perfect.

Soon the pastor-husband called telling her he is leaving and will be home shortly. He also said he knows she is not feeling well, but there is a man there that needs supper and I hope you do not mind if I bring him home to eat with us?

The pastor's wife is convinced this helper was an angel...

[illegible]

Recently we sisters at church were discussing this issue when one young mother related this incident about her sister - will call her Lora for the sake of the story - I do not remember her name.

Lora was traveling with some other ladies by plane. At the airport a young friendly woman came to them and started talking. She said, "Oh, you must be one of us! We also wear black veils in our church." So Lora asked her, "what church does she go to?" She said, "the church of Satan!"

This knowledge scared this girl so bad she resolved to never again wear a black veil.

There are reports of ladies wearing black veils in Satanic rituals. They say these black-veiled women have greater power with the spirits than if they are not veiled.

[illegible]

More to come.....

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2011/10/3 13:23

by ginnyrose on 2011/10/3 5:32:33

QUOTE:

of those who do feel led to wear head covering all the time, would someone who does not wear a head covering keep you from having fellowship with that person?

I fellowship with you, do I not? Did you not know before now that I cover?

ginnyrose

Yes Ginnyrose I knew that you wear head covering. I was asking of others who keep to the practice of wearing head coverings all the time. I am sorry I was not more specific in my question. Thank you for taking the time to answer me though :)

God Bless
mj

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 15:12

Well, now I feel led to share again why I went off of dial-up last month on August 24th.

The content being PERMITTED on this forum this year has been vulgar, as I mentioned on a few threads now and the responsible party was never corrected but kept up until finally after some time, a few members teamed up to stop at least some of it - but what happened with all of that, was that it opened a door here of allowing more posts and more men to come on here and openly discuss issues that they'd never stand up in Church in front of women and children and declare.

I couldn't take it anymore and went offline. While offline, I saw that my computer was connecting to the internet by these unsecured wireless connections, so I prayed and asked The LORD what I should do. I trust Him enough to know that if He wanted me on or offline, that He would show me.

Sometimes the signal will hold long enough for me to download a whole sermon - and sometimes it will close as fast as I hit a Homepage. I've given Him the reins of when it's on and when it goes off and trust Him whole-heartedly that He 'is' in control of even things of this nature - but all I knew last month was that I did not want to be able to get on at a whim.

As far as if I've prayed over and researched this issue - I have indeed - as I do every move I make with The GOD Whom I fear with all of my heart, as equally as I love Him. For 35 yrs I've laid my life down for Him to lead and direct in any way that He would have me to go - even in the little things and I have been left with - my purpose on earth, just as everyone else's, is different and HE has told me to become "all things to all mankind", as long as it's in humility and chaste. Modesty in dress and a brokenness of submission to both men and GOD is not contingent upon me staying covered.

I think I'm done here.

Shalom~Shalom to those I'll see in Heaven.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by narrowpath, on: 2011/10/3 17:05

I believe the bible is quite clear about the subject. It only becomes confusing when you have already decided that this is not an ordinance and try to explain it away. I asked my wife to cover herself during the service though I do not believe that the bible requires to do it outside of meetings. Sadly, we are the only ones in the church who practice this and so far nobody has asked us about why my wife does it neither do I actively propagate it to others. However, if someone would ask me, I would explain it. I shared it with one couple who both love the Lord dearly and they now practice it. Interestingly, they later served God in Russia and attend a conservative Pentecostal church where head covering is practiced!

You can only explain head covering in the context of headship. If you are not in complete submission to Christ and his word, head covering appears like a stumbling block. If you desire to be in complete submission to Christ and whatever he says, head covering is a pleasant thing - honoring God and your husband. Paul praised the Corinthians for keeping the traditions he delivered.

1. Cor 11:2-3

2 Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions just as I delivered them to you.

3 But I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.

4 Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonors his head. 5 But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head,

So if the man is the head of the woman she dishonors her husband if she does not cover it while she prays or prophesies.

There are big commandments like love your neighbor as yourself and seemingly "small" commandments like headcovering.

My question for you:

If Christ saves us to the uttermost, is He not worth keeping all his commandments be they big or small?

If this is in the bible, why do I not delight in pleasing him in this matter?

What is so difficult about head covering? Such a small thing to keep, certainly a lot easier than to love my neighbor or my enemy.

Are you afraid to be labelled a legalist and lose the esteem of certain people?

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by nathanogbu, on: 2011/10/3 18:24

Amen!

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/10/3 18:27

Quote:
-----of those who do feel led to wear head covering all the time, would someone who does not wear a head covering keep you from having fellowship with that person?

As someone who wears a head-covering all the time... My answer is NO.

Of the many people I know who cover, this really isn't an issue...It's the ones you STILL WISH to fellowship with (who do n't cover) that usually back off. More often than not, the person not covering usually breaks fellowship in some way or another with the person covering. Because they believe you're under the law, or majoring on the minors, or just getting "to o far out there." (And the reasons go on...) Many times, it can be God's way of choosing your friends!

I have many friends who don't cover, but were not really close and intimate as they don't allow that. Obviously many times what you wear will choose who will associate with you.

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/10/3 18:29

Quote:
-----If Christ saves us to the uttermost, is He not worth keeping all his commandments be they big or small?

Amen! So many would people would give up their lives for Christ, but few will give up their wardrobe and appearance. Something to really think about.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2011/10/3 20:03

hi All,I have been trying to follow this interesting thread and a question arose.Later in the chapter Paul says the consequences of taking the Lords Supper in a wrong way is that many are sick among you.What is the consequence of not wearing a head covering when a woman prays or prophesying?
Thanks Staff

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2011/10/3 22:01

Well staff, if you look at it that way, the danger would be in wearing the covering while not being in submission. It would seem to me that the bigger danger would be in taking pride in the wearing of a head covering. The Bible does not say what the consequences are for not wearing a covering, but is most clear about the consequences of being proud.

Jesus Christ saves. Head coverings do not save. This whole thread is focused upon head coverings and has served to distract us from that which we should be focused upon, which is our LORD, and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Those that are focused upon the LORD will be brought into submission if their heart is set upon HIM.

It would be a very sad thing to hear that because of this discussion some sister did not call upon the LORD because her head was not covered in a moment of need. It would be sadder still to hear that someone fell from the faith because they thought that they could not measure up to what some have prescribed on these pages - of hearing the law without the knowledge of Grace.

Re: , on: 2011/10/3 22:36

Greg,

I haven't followed the whole thread, so I am not sure if someone has mentioned this to you. but if you feel so strongly about this, to the point that you subtly accuse fellow christians of being worldly, why do you have Pastor Carter preaching at your conference? TSC does not practice head coverings and Theresa Conlon is an associate Pastor of Times Square Church. They actually call her "Pastor", not "Sister", and Pastor David appointed her. Not only that, she is now President of Mt. Zion School of Ministry and has authority not only over the male staff, but the male students who are preparing for ministry all over the world.

I'm sincerely confused...

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/3 23:11

Yes it is confusing, but it is anyone's choice, either you listen to the apostle Paul or follow other man's example.

Jesus Christ saves. Head coverings do not save. Amen to that, but whether someone is doing it amiss or not, the fact is, the apostle Paul taught to observe this, in spirit of submission and humility.

If someone thinks that this instruction are among those with expiration date, then let's hear the argument.

Re: , on: 2011/10/4 0:22

1Co 11:5 But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonors her head; for that is even the same as if she were shaved.

Who would argue with Scripture? A plain reading of the text should leave no one confused. If a woman prays or prophesies in the church, she should have her head covered as a symbol. This discussion has veered of somewhat and we have made the symbol some kind of Spiritual thing. The Spiritual thing is the praying and the Prophesying. Do you ladies pray and Prophecy in your churches? Do you gentlemen who are so anxious for the ladies to cover their heads and are so focussed on submission and authority, do you allow the ladies to pray and prophecy? Do you even believe in the gift of Prophecy? Do you believe in any of the sign gifts? And if you do not, what ones no longer exist and what is the Scriptural proofs that you would bring that would nullify these gifts?

Okay, I really do not want to start a cessationist discussion, I merely wish to point out the hypocrisy of many of the "conservative," brothers and sisters. It is argued strongly that it is there in Scripture so it should be followed, no questions asked, and many of these people are the very people who would not accept the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, who would run a mile from a brother or sister who spoke in tongues. And of course there is a wealth of Scriptures for the sign gifts in comparison to the "veil," Scripture. One must be consistent. If you are not praying or exercising the gift of Prophecy in your congregations, then why even speak of the veil that is used to cover you as you do this?

And of course, we are not just talking about the veil. Pants would be unacceptable I believe for many of these sisters, but I am not sure, perhaps Ginnyrose (a dear sister in Christ) could tell us.....brother Frank

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2011/10/4 0:33

Quote:

-----I haven't followed the whole thread, so I am not sure if someone has mentioned this to you. but if you feel so strongly about this, to the point that you subtly accuse fellow christians of being worldly, why do you have Pastor Carter preaching at your conference? TSC does not practice head coverings and Theresa Conlon is an associate Pastor of Times Square Church. They actually call her "Pastor", not "Sister", and Pastor David appointed her. Not only that, she is now President of Mt. Zion School of Ministry and has authority not only over the male staff, but the male students who are preparing for ministry all over the world.

Brother, I am not judging others for my last statement was clear I believe that this is not an issue to judge and accuse others of. But each person must be convinced in his/her own heart. Many of the godliest ministries and sisters alive right

now do not practice headcoverings, this is just a fact. It is not a instant godliness choice in any way. I fully do not judge or think a church less spiritual if they don't practice head coverings.

Also even if a sister is a teacher who is anointed of the Holy Spirit though a more biblical place is for her to teach over women (which Teresa does powerfully in her women's ministry) but she also preaches at church over men and though I feel personally it is more biblical and better not to have this happen, I fully support TSC and her in the role God has her there. I believe that TSC is more of a prophetic (anointed) church rather than an example of a normal local church. But I do have allowance for this personally (this really does not matter for others for it is my own personal conviction) and I am only sharing this conviction to allow people to see the liberty in my heart on this issue.

Thus I am fully supportive and allowing for women who teach and also that do not cover their heads. But I do have a personal conviction that the Scriptures teach against both and feel it would be more ideal and better if many local assemblies practiced obedience to these Scriptures.

All of this discussion started from an article by brother Zac Poonen that was posted. I felt it would be informative to post it and was not trying to "impose" something like this on everyone but there are those that are feeling led by the Spirit to consider these things and some because of lack of knowledge do not cover or know about this tradition in the early church.

So we hope it is beneficial to some who are seeking the Lord's will in these areas. And we do not put it as a yoke of bondage for the unwilling. I find it interesting that some vehemently oppose it.

At the least I find headcoverings a wonderful expression of inner modesty also and feel it is a good testimony in that way to the world.

Re: - posted by amranger (), on: 2011/10/4 1:14

Brother Greg,

I just wanted to say I really appreciate what you said in your last post, and the spirit in which you said it.

Re: Greg - posted by El-Bethel, on: 2011/10/4 3:26

Bro. Greg, I appreciate your conviction and the allowance you give for those who disagree.

If we have seen the glory of God, we'll do anything the Word of God asks us to do, even the least of the commandments. I don't know if the Lord had given any commandment to the Seraphims to cover their face and feet when they would stand in His presence.

The awe and wonder the seraphims experienced on seeing the glory/holiness of God, made them to cover their face and feet. Like Leonard Ravenhill would say, five minutes into eternity, we will all say "Oh! I wish I obeyed more". I pray God would help me to obey every one of His commandments.

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by HisDelight, on: 2011/10/4 11:38

I know I am new here but I hope those who feel so zealous about this issue and desire to know the truth in this matter would take the time to read this link.

<http://www.godswordtowomen.org/badge.htm>

Re: , on: 2011/10/4 12:08

Welp, I wrote that "I 'think' I'm done here" but I've been uneasy since and feel to just ask one thing, just for better closure but first -

Ginnyrose, you wrote - ""I know there are many uncovered women who can challenge you with their Spiritual insights but I still do not know where they are in their walk with God.""

No question that there are Sisters here who I've gleaned some great things from here, but how do you judge where 'any' Sister is "in their walk with GOD" from a forum? How do we judge where you are in your walk with GOD?

Have been there with the emails and had to admit, they sure do explain/expose a lot more than just the forum has. On a

number of posts this year I stated plainly that "I'm not a teacher". A person may know The Word well and the languages, etc and so forth but not feel called to "teach" per say.

You teach Sunday School at your meetings but I wouldn't because I'm not called to do so - most especially, not in a mixed gendered group. Of the five ministry gifts, that's not the one that He's called me to and appreciate those who are. In our exchanges, I wondered if, as a Mennonite, if the foot-washing or anything else is also required, that we are not following as well, that would more qualify us for Heaven if you can't answer if someone like Corrie Ten Boom is in Heaven or not? I haven't any doubts that she is - but for some reason, if you can't feel sure that she is, I wondered if it is because of any of the practices of the Mennonites that she, or even us other ladies didn't perform that may cause that question in your mind.

I truly need my heart rested from this thread and that was my last query. I need to understand how specific Groups/denominations that do have the other practices that aren't carried out by others, would affect their view on who is Heaven bound and who is not. Living in the Bible Belt, I learned a lot about different Groups that aren't here up north and each have their own particular variety of beliefs or practices. Had to learn quite a bit down there. One group doesn't cover but keeps long hair, regardless of age, etc, but are the hardest-legalistic bunch with the hardest eyes I've ever seen - calling themselves a "Holiness" group and met other groups that I had never experienced before living down there. Thanks in advance for educating me on your particular views from your particular Group's stand-point. I am still learning!

Glory to GOD!

Re: Appoloud, on: 2011/10/4 13:04

Frank raised some valid issues in his post a short ways back. You are arguing over whether it is appropriate for a woman to pray or prophesy with her head uncovered. Ok. How many of your churches have prayer meetings where women can actually pray. And now for the trillion dollar question. How many of you actually believe in prophesy. I dare say the great majority of you are cessationist.

So hear is the question. You have a sister who has the appropriate head covering and she wants to prophesy. Are you men going to let her?

Blaine

Re: - posted by savedtoserve, on: 2011/10/4 15:12

Blaine,

I know of MANY churches that practice head-covering and at the same time don't deny or teach against REAL prophesy. And yes they allow it, always up to trial by the word of God.

Your reasoning is kinda like the reasoning one man that was arguing against home-schooling used--he would meet home-schoolers who were more excited to meet fellow home-schoolers than to meet fellow Christians. His point? "If you home-school, that's how you'll become!" And I object, "But what about all the ones who AREN'T LIKE THAT??"

It's called the "Amalakite syndrome" -- picking on the weakest, feeblest ones (who believe in whatever you're against), while ignoring or staying away from the ones who are ready to take you on.

If everyone said "yes" to your question, would you look into the matter more deeply? Or is this a loaded question from a mind already made up?

God bless you!
savedtoserve

Re: What happens when a church group discards the veiling? pt. 5 - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2011/10/4 15:54

What impact did the discarding of the application of headship principles have on the Mennonite church?

If any one wants to have a clue what church history looks like in miniature, all you have to do is study what has happened to the Mennonite Church in the past 140 years. The details I am sharing here is not uncommon. The same devil that worked to undermine God's people uses the same methods from one era to another, from one church group to another.

During the 1800s the Mennonite church had fallen into serious spiritual decline. Alcohol and tobacco use was widespread as was rumspringa, or partying with its associated sins.

John F. Funk was living in Chicago when he experienced conversion (1858) and became closely associated with D.L. Moody. He was so impressed with the revival that followed Moody, Funk decided to move to Elkhart, IN to work among the Mennonite people. He began by starting a publishing house which printed his literature which had a profound impact on the Mennonite church.

In time God rose up evangelists that ministered to the people and revival set in. Conviction against sin, burden for the lost became the norm, as did assisting the poor, helping those in distress. Missions were started and youth went there to minister. Sunday Schools were introduced to the churches, vacation Bible Schools as well. In time winter Bible Schools were held at churches for intense Bible study for the parents.

Until Funk, most of the ladies - at this time - wore only their head coverings for prayer and worship services. Teachings concerning divorce and remarriage came to the fore and were dealt with.

In the meantime there were several evangelists that went from community to community preaching, convictions growing, holiness becoming part and parcel of life; revivals commonplace. Among them was George R. Brunk II, Andrew Jantzi. Their ministry had a profound impact on my parents' generation. (I remember them both, as well.)

In the meantime, the devil worked feverishly to undo the spiritual fervor that had gripped the Mennonite people. He began by asking questions, exactly like he did to Eve, "Yay, hath God said?"

About this time - in the 1960s - people had gotten richer, got more educated, thanks to the Mennonite colleges that came on the scene years earlier in response to the high drop-out rate of the Mennonite youth that attended secular schools. And the Vietnam war era came on the scene with the mindset that it is fashionable and acceptable to challenge the elders in matters that were long assumed to be true! Unfortunately, there were among the Mennonite scholars/professors minds that were ready and willing to challenge the old paths and they did. Since they were so eloquent in their rhetoric they succeeded quite well.

Among the Bible issues challenged was the doctrine of the head-covering. Many church leaders decided it was no longer essential so it was discarded. But like a lot of other things being discarded there were other doctrines that fell by the wayside: the virgin birth, e.g.

Before too many years, a problem, that here-to-for was practically non-existent showed up: people were getting divorced! Now you had divorced people here who wanted to remarry and since they are such wonderful people, we need to allow them to remarry. And they did. It was not long until this became the norm for the general Mennonite church. (Today the issue many are grappling with is same-sex marriage and many are accepting it.)

Today, the larger Mennonite church is so liberal that we conservatives find a greater kindred spirit with Paul Washer than we do with liberal Mennonites! In fact most of us are very ashamed of them...we wish we could be known by another name instead of Mennonite!

The point is that the path from revival to apostasy was very short, very rapid. When ladies, with the help of the men, discarded the principles of headship and its practical application, you saw rapid spiritual decline, evidenced by divorce and remarriage. The home broke down!

Re: , on: 2011/10/4 16:13

Greg,

Please go back and honestly read your second post. C'mon bro...

Re: , on: 2011/10/4 16:20

About the link that HisDelight posted, etc -

This time, my wireless connection only held long enough to post and then quickly download the two pages that were given to us through the link that was posted -- that I've just read and have to say that I disagree with their conclusions completely.

I do not at all believe that we should discourage another Sister from wearing a veil when praying or prophesying within their fellowship. I do have strong feelings against doing so, regardless of our differences on opinions on what the "veil" is and when it should be worn.

It is important to understand the customs of the days in which Paul wrote this command and understand that in the Greek, the "veil" that he was speaking of, covered the face of the woman as well and he 'was' referring to the angels with the 6 wings that covered their faces, as I posted earlier - and the word "covered" as we can see by looking under Strong's for the word Paul uses in 1Corth 11:6 as "covered" being #G2617 = "to cover wholly, hide".

The "shaven head" was a sign of an adultress and of a slave girl. Some say that in Corinth, which was a Greek city and a very corrupt one at that, that women with short hair were also of ill-repute, so the article posted by that link is not correct in saying that Paul was speaking to Jews in Corinth and is incorrect to allude that there are "female angels" - Angelos is a masculine gendered noun ... and surprisingly enough, the Jewish women did not veil as much as the Greek women did - but did or were to veil, when praying or prophesying in the Christian congregations at that time.

Just one more Greek expositor - Vincent,

"1Co 11:5 "Her head uncovered"

Rev., unveiled. The Greek women rarely appeared in public, but lived in strict seclusion. Unmarried women never quitted their apartments, except on occasions of festal processions, either as spectators or participants. Even after marriage they were largely confined to the gynaeconitis or women's rooms. Thus Euripides: "As to that which brings the reproach of a bad reputation upon her who remains not at home, giving up the desire of this, I tarried in my dwelling" ("Troades", 649). And Menander: "The door of the court is the boundary fixed for the free woman." The head-dress of Greek women consisted of nets, hair-bags, or kerchiefs, sometimes covering the whole head. A shawl which enveloped the body was also often thrown over the head, especially at marriages or funerals. This costume the Corinthian women had disused in the christian assemblies, perhaps as an assertion of the abolition of sexual distinctions, and the spiritual equality of the woman with the man in the presence of Christ. This custom was discountenanced by Paul as striking at the divinely ordained subjection of the woman to the man. Among the Jews, in ancient times, both married and unmarried women appeared in public unveiled. The later Jewish authorities insisted on the use of the veil.

"All one as if she were shaven"

Which would be a sign either of grief or of disgrace. The cutting off of the hair is used by Isaiah as a figure of the entire destruction of a people by divine retribution. Isa_7:20 Among the Jews a woman convicted of adultery had her hair shorn, with the formula: "Because thou hast departed from the manner of the daughters of Israel, who go with their head covered, therefore that has befallen thee which thou hast chosen." According to Tacitus, among the Germans an adulteress was driven from her husband's house with her head shaved; and the Justinian code prescribed this penalty for an adulteress, whom, at the expiration of two years, her husband refused to receive again. Paul means that a woman praying or prophesying uncovered puts herself in public opinion on a level with a courtesan."

And this from Wesley -

"1Co 11:5 But every woman - Who, under an immediate impulse of the Spirit, (for then only was a woman suffered to speak in the church,) prays or prophesies without a veil on her face, as it were disclaims subjection, and reflects dishonour

on man, her head. For it is the same, in effect, as if she cut her hair short, and wore it in the distinguishing form of the men. In those ages, men wore their hair exceeding short, as appears from the ancient statues and pictures."

Trying to just nutshell here, we should never try to remove the veil from those who use it as Paul has described - but my only feelings are that we should never condemn those who do not as well - as the Church tradition of veiling varies much, from one group and another.

Having been forced since '76 to be a "Church hopper" because of being in the military when I got saved and because of how very-very many times I've moved ever since. I've enjoyed Black-Methodist Churches, CoG, AoG, Independents, Messianics, house church, the PCA and not a few others ... anywhere that born-again believers congregate and I truly respect each and every one for their practices, as long as they demonstrate and preach a Holiness, as unto The LORD and His Love.

GOD's Blessings!

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/4 18:30

We seek for ways if we really want to do a thing, otherwise we will seek for excuses and alibis.

Man is a rational being, but we tend to only see what we want to see.

It is written in a plain language but we make them overly complicated.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2011/10/4 18:40

Hi again,

I have been listening to a couple of other sermons on 1 Cor 11.

Chuck Missler: Made these points

That when Corinthian women put aside their headcovering it was a form of rebellion. She was renouncing her subordination of her husband.

He said that Paul was also talking about and arguing against the blurring of the lines or the distinction between man and women. Basically men should be men and women should be women.

Chuck Smith said this:

That in their new found freedom in Christ women began coming to meeting without veils which was the custom.

However the Pagan temple in Corinth was supported by Prostitution and these women didn't wear any veil. The Christian women then opened themselves up to being misidentified as a prostitute and thus dishonouring their husbands. Paul urges them to continue in the custom of Corinth.

I will look around and see can I find some more sermons on the subject.

Yours Staff

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/4 19:17

Head covering that I saw people wearing when they go to church.

<http://www.headcoverings-by-devorah.com/images7/WhiteLaceVeniseTrimmedShawlKippahSet3.jpg>

<http://www.headcoverings-by-devorah.com/images/GrayTaupeLaceUNTRMveil.jpg>

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2011/10/4 19:25

Hi Passerby,
They are a little lacey aren't they!lol
That's not exactly what Paul was talking about I would say!
yours staff

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/4 19:30

Quote: That's not exactly what Paul was talking about I would say!

In my current state of thinking, it is good enough for me. I believe in head covering, but I really don't want to overdo this thing either.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2011/10/4 20:23

Hi Passerby,
Thanks for the pictures anyway, it gives me an idea what we they look like. I'd like to see examples of what Paul was talking about and see would there be a rush to buy one!
As I understand it the veil covered part of the face and head. I would say that if you were going to take that scripture as for today as it pertains to the actual covering then you would have to use a full veil and head covering which I think would be a nonsense.
I think the importance of the subject is the headship of Christ over man and man over women.
I am interested in the specific relationship between covering and headship and prayer and prophesy.
We could have a Christian woman that use head covering in rebellion to her husband or you could have a Christian woman with no head covering that is under correct subordination to her husband and Christ. I think the Christian women that is not in proper authority may effect the woman's prayer and prophesy in some way and thus effect the Church.
The veil or head covering was common place in Corinth seemingly but today would not achieve the desired effect of being a symbol of headship. Today it would just look wierd in a lot of churches and would be a stumbling block for potential new converts. The Holy Spirit still uses Christian women that don't use head covering and of all the Christian women I know I never hear them say God told me to wear one but all know their position as it pertains to headship. I don't hear the husbands saying they are dishonored either. Head covering will not be a hinderance in any way to revival but incorrect headship will be.
Yours Staff

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2011/10/4 20:57

I don't want to suffocate somebody or cause anyone unnecessary discomfort or obsession. Head covering represents submission and loyalty to our faith.

What it represents is the real point, although others will do or overdo it, or do not submit to it at all for some other reasons.

Although women we so admire and respect do not practice head covering, is it proper for us to teach and encourage otherwise and still be loyal to the scriptures when asked point blank?

Re: HEADCOVERING FOR WOMEN by Zac Poonen - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/10/4 23:34

Thank you to the moderator for posting something so religiously incorrect.

It seems to me that the issue of the headcovering, and the great angst it causes, reveals a great deal about not only ourselves, but also about our entire modern western Church today.

Those of us that have read the early Church fathers know what their general practice was. We know that the Corinthians (the ones to whom the practice was expounded), practiced a real cloth veiling of not only their wives, but of their unmarried women as well. For those of us that have studied the issue with total abandon, there is no doubt as to the proper meaning of what the covering is in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16.

However, there is grave doubt about our modern western Church. We live today in a bubble culture of "me." We were a

It taught in government school or by a near-sighted society, that "truth is relative" and "culture is relative." We are all almost completely disconnected from history, and instead look around and see the Muslim women and the so-called "legalistic" denominations like the Mennonites wearing coverings.

Compounding all of this is that the vast majority of us came to Christ through modern Christian denominations. All of our faith-traditions are less than a few hundred years old. Most of these denominations were "reactionary-movements", reacting for the most part against either the spiritually dead Roman Catholic Church, or later against her many backslidden "daughters." Some of these reactionary movements jettisoned what they viewed as unnecessary external "Catholic" practices at that time. The rest got rid of what they deemed to be unnecessary externals later on. Thus, the ancient, apostolic, and biblical practice of headcovering fell out of general use in the west, and now these western faith traditions are "stuck."

Compounding all of this is the nature of "conservatism." Good Bible-believing Christians want to be conservative with the truth they have received from their faith-traditions. But what does this mean? Conservatism generally equates change, (any change), with error. Therefore women trying to revive the practice of covering are viewed suspiciously, or are outright attacked.

Compounding all of this is the peer pressure women experience in our western culture. Women are treated as objects. They are expected to comply with the culture's expectations of them. Should they cover their hair, they could face the wrath of others. (For instance, I know of one case where the young woman's own mother ("a Christian"), would have nothing to do with her after she began covering).

Brothers: What do you expect the women to do? They are being crushed by the culture, by their recent, conservative faith-tradition, by the women they know in their lives, and by their own carnal expectations of personal beauty that the false culture constantly foists upon them. Don't you think when faced with all of that, they are going to bring up every argument they can against it? Appealing to demonstrably false theories about the original reasons for the headcovering, appealing to a recent faith-tradition bible teacher's exposition against it; appealing to the authority of other nice Christian ladies who were members of recent faith traditions who also didn't wear the headcovering but still did good things for God, etc.

Dear Brothers: Let patience have her perfect work...

"...let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear: For our God is a consuming fire." Hebrews 12:28-29

But for the grace of God, there go I...

Grace and Blessings to all.

Sincerely,
Doug

Re: - posted by HisDelight, on: 2011/10/5 11:31

I want to just state that many of you are defending this tradition on the premises that the Holy Spirit inspired Paul to write that women should veil then goes on to contradict Himself in all revival moments even now throughout the world where women, UNVIELED are preaching, healing the sick, raising the dead, and prophesying. I speak as someone from a part of the world that there is a real revival going on right now and I am so sad to see those who could usher in revival here quibbling about these silly things... putting half the body of Christ in bondage to doctrine of men. Now we need to understand that translators are not flawless and can be biased (we cannot worship any man however saintly they are). Especially when it comes to passages regarding women. Quick examples then I will deal with head covering:

The literal greek translation says "Who can find a valiant wife? (The word *chayil* means "forceful," "mighty," or "valiant"...) Why translate it "virtuous" then... God forbid a woman be VALIENT/MIGHTY?

Psalms 68:11 Clark's commentary: "Of the female preachers there was a great host." Such is the literal translation of this passage... but is that what your bible says? Why did the translator leave out

women? In the revival of the last days GREAT WILL BE THE WOMEN WHO PROCLAIM THE GOOD NEWS OF JESUS.. it's really ok if that doesn't sit well with you. God will always find another generation. Amen.

Now on the veiling. I recommend the site at the bottom but here is a summary of a Godly women used by him as a missionary in China.. a Greek and Hebrew scholar .. who reads the Greek plainly like this:

But I wish you to understand that of every man Christ is the Head; but of a wife the husband is a head ; and God is Christ's Head. Any man praying or prophesying, having his head covered dishonors his Head . But any wife praying or prophesying bareheaded dishonors her head , for it would be one and the same thing as her head shaved. For if a woman is not covered, let her be shorn. Now if it would bring disgrace to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered. For a man ought not to veil the head because he is the image and glory of God. But woman is the glory of man. For man is not originally from woman , but woman is from man. Nor was the man created for the woman , but the woman for the man . For this cause ought the woman to have authority over her head because of her angels . Nevertheless, in the Lord, the woman is not apart from the man, nor the man from the woman. For just as woman came out of man, so is man through woman and all Christians born of God. Judge of this matter among yourselves. It is proper for a woman to pray unto God unveiled. Nor is there anything in the nature of hair itself that teaches you that if a man wear it long it is a dishonor to him, while if a woman have long hair it is a glory to her, for her hair has been given her instead of a veil. But if any one thinks to be contentious , let him know that "we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God."

**** "For if the woman be not covered, let her be shorn." Paul refers to the Oral Law of the Jews. (and you MUST know that neither Paul or Jesus ever cared for or defended these oral laws (extrabiblical) but vehemently opposed their "doctrines of men".)

**** Then why did Paul not command unveiling outright? It's the principle of not offending in anything/bearing with the weak at play: An unveiled Jewish wife might, then, be tried for adultery; and when so tried, be "shorn or shaven." Paul here cites this obstruction to commanding women to unveil, but he permits it (verse 10). "Now if it is a shame," The word translated "but" (de) readily admits of the translation "now" in this sense, see John 6:10, 19:23; 1 Corinthians 15:50, etc. That is, if it be a case in which disgrace and divorce would follow, she is permitted to cover her head, "Let her be covered." A little historical evidence at this point ought to go a long way. If the Apostle, as is so often assumed, was accustomed to forbid women unveiling, how did it come to pass that women "sat unveiled in the assemblies in a separate place, by the presbyters," and were "ordained by the laying on of hands," until the eleventh canon of the Church Council of Laodicea forbade it, in 363 A.D.?

<http://godswordtowomen.org/lesson%2032.htm>

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2011/10/5 15:14

Then why did Paul not command unveiling outright?

Paul beleived that a woman must be covered that's why..

Paul begins to outline in (v 3-10) the building blocks that a woman does indeed need a head covering when praying or prophesying. Everything that Paul says through (v 10) is something that Paul firmly believes. He believes that woman was created in the image of man; he believes that woman are dependent on man and that man was created independent on woman—he believes all of this to be true. But he does not believe it to be the whole truth. Yes, woman was, in a sense, created in the image of man (v 7) (it was from Adam that Eve was created), but ultimately she, too, was created in the image of God (v 12). Yes, woman are dependent upon man for her initial existence (v 9), but so are men dependent upon women for his further existence (v 11-12)

But then Paul shifts his tone in (v 11) "In the Lord, however," and from that point on begins to explain how this principle correctly applies to the church.

In (v 13-14) Paul asks the Corinthians two questions:

- 1) "Judge for yourselves: Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered?"
- 2) "Does not the very nature of things teach you that . . . if a woman has long hair, it is her glory?"

The two questions are to be answered as a set. The second question is intended to buttress the first. In other words, by answering the second question first, the answer to the first question should then be obvious

To answer the second question first: yes, a woman's long hair is her glory (that is, it keeps her from the "shame" of being uncovered). This makes the answer to the first question obvious: no, it is not proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered.

Paul says woman's long hair, is the glory of a woman (v 15). he further argues this point in the very next phrase: "For, long hair is given to her as a covering." The word "as" here is anti, and means literally "instead of." The word for "covering" in this verse is not the same as has been used by Paul up to this point. Everywhere else in this passage Paul has used *katakaluptos*, which is a very generic term for "covering." Here Paul uses the word *peribolaos*, which means literally "that which is wrapped around."

In other words, Paul is saying that, yes, women do need coverings (*katakaluptos*) on their heads when praying or prophesying. But, "in the Lord" that covering is not a *peribolaos* (cloth wrapped around the head) but rather the woman's own long hair. In fact, "in the Lord" (i.e., in the church), long hair is given to a woman "instead of" (not "as") "that which is wrapped around the head." Women in the church have a ready-made covering and are therefore not necessarily in violation of the principles expressed in v 3-10.

Re: - posted by staff, on: 2011/10/5 20:30

Hi Murrcoir,

Thanks for that teaching, that makes sense to me.

I think the principle is very important. I am getting hard to articulate what I think about the subject. I hope Zac Poonen doesn't have this high on his list of priorities and it is only a one off message. Head coverings isn't going to bring about revival but God's grace will.

I don't think I could personally bring potential new Christians into a church that would say a woman can't pray or prophesy unless they wore a cloth around their head and for me it would point to further problems in that church.

I don't see the results of revival will be a church full of head covered women nor do I see it help with bringing about revival,

yours staff