

Scriptures and Doctrine :: What is happening beneath the headcovering?

What is happening beneath the headcovering?, on: 2016/11/21 18:07

1 Corinthians 11:5

But every woman who has her head uncovered while "praying" or "prophesying" disgraces her head, but she is one and the same as the woman whose head is shaved.

1 Corinthians 11:13

Judge for yourselves, is it proper for a woman to "pray" to God with her head uncovered?

Brothers and sisters my understanding of 1st Corinthians 11:1-16 is that the woman in the assembly wears a head covering to show that she is under authority as she is praying or prophesying. If she is a married woman, she would be under authority of her husband. If she is a single woman then presumably under authority of the men who lead the church. Or could be under the authority of her father. I'm only guessing in the case of the single woman.

But it seems to me that based upon the wider context of 1st Corinthians 11 at least the first part. The head covering is an outer representation of an inward reality that is taking place in the sister. That is she is either praying or prophesying. The head covering shows that she is under authority either of her husband or the church and she does this.

Yet it seems that in all of the discussions that take place in this forum regarding the head covering. The focus is on WHETHER OR NOT the sister should wear the head covering. Yet the WHY are the head covering is often neglected. At least I have never seen any serious discussion take place as to why the sister must wear the head covering in the assembly.

Now I humbly and gently ask a question of you who hold to the position that the sister must wear the head covering in the assembly. Do you allow the women who wear the head covering to pray or prophesy in your assembly? Let me humbly and gently repeat my question again. Do you who hold to the position that the sister must wear the head covering allow the sister to pray or prophesy in the assembly?

If you insist that the sister must wear the head covering in the assembly. But do not allow her to pray or prophesy. May I ask why?

Just some questions I have based on the context of 1st Corinthians 11 the first 11:1-16.

-bbs-

Re: What is happening beneath the headcovering? - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/21 18:42

What if she wore a sign or badge that says "under authority?"

Re: , on: 2016/11/21 18:45

Todd:

If she wears the sign on top of her head it would cover all the bases.

Re: , on: 2016/11/21 18:47

But brothers the question. Is the sister allowed to pray or prophesied in the assembly if she wears the head covering? This is a question I'm seeking to address.

-bbs'

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/21 18:56

Arguably if the scripture is taken plainly she SHOULD be able to do so.

If she covers her head and is still not allowed to pray or prophesy in the public meeting, I would say the men are abusing their authority very badly.

Re: What is happening beneath the headcovering? - posted by savannah, on: 2016/11/21 19:09

bbs,

You stated,

"If you insist that the sister of must wear the head covering in the assembly. But do not allow her to pray or prophesy. May I ask why?"

You've asked a question which, if those holding to the practice of veiling, would honestly face, cannot support the requirement of doing so due to the other doctrine which they hold, namely that the women are to be silent in the assembly.

Those who would be of the anabaptist persuasion (Amish, Mennonite, Charity and the like), and even some reformed congregations, believe that the women are to be silent. This negates by default, any need for her to be veiled.

Ironically, others who allow the women to speak and even teach in the assembly, do not believe in the practice of veiling.

Evidently, for some period of time, under the inspiration of the Spirit, the women did both pray and prophesy. In such cases, the Word of God from Paul commands such women to be veiled.

Note: There's absolutely no warrant from the Scriptures to claim that the passage speaks of silent praying.

Re: What is happening beneath the headcovering? - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/21 19:26

I actually penned an article on the subject of God's order and one of the main reason if not "the" eternal hidden reason for the headcovering:

The Head Covering And God's Order

But I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God. — 1 Corinthians 11:3

The topic of head covering has never been such a heavily debated topic as in the last 50 years of the Church. Scores of liberal thinking, humanistic and cultural ideas have led to the place where people have repudiated the idea that women should wear head coverings. Multitudes of examples have been given on why someone should not wear a head covering but the interesting fact is very few of these arguments address the clear references to the biblical truth of the meaning behind head covering. Everyone is quick to try and dismiss the need for a piece of cloth on the head yet why is this practice even done in the first place? Some will quickly read over the passage in 1 Corinthians and say it is just a requirement for women to pray in that culture or time. But many statements in the passage clearly show there was a deep spiritual meaning and significance behind the practice. It was not simply a requirement of order for prayer but a much deeper reality of the Church, concerning the angels, and the government of God.

In our modern culture the individual's rights reign supreme and there is a casting off of restraint, an unwillingness to submit to anyone or anything. This is a republic type thinking where each individual is autonomous, free to have their own rules and ideas. As Christians, though Christ sets us free from the old covenant and the power of sin, yet believers are not free to live any way they please or practice Church as they best see fit. Rather God has established leaders, practices, traditions and godly symbols in the Church that we are to follow, as are all who gather in His Name.

Head Covering is one of the New Covenant practices that God has instituted as a symbol of great significance. In fact, in 1 Corinthians 11:6 we find a statement that seems extreme to our modern minds but should at least give us pause, — "If a woman does not cover her head, she should cut off her hair" — Again in verse 10 Paul hints at the importance of it

he practice by clarifying that, "the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels."

In regard to how universally it was practiced among the early believers, Paul the Apostle was emphatic, "we have no other practice" nor do the churches of God (1 Corinthians 11:16). If someone was wanting their own way and did not want to submit to this, Paul was saying to the Corinthian believers: if you want to be part of the Church this is the way we are all obeying our Lord.

We should realize there is grace is not being forced to do something, but if our Lord commanded it and all the Churches practice it, there is wisdom in the Lord's timing to do the same. If we carried the same idea over to water Baptism, and someone simply refused to do this, what would you think? You cannot have your own way, if you commit your life to the Lord, the simple clear command is to be baptized. There should be no fighting or arguing over this. To be dipped in water seems just as strange as to wear a piece of cloth covering the head in the eyes of the world.

Now, let us for a moment look at this matter of God's government and why it is important for not just sisters in the Church to learn this. We clearly see in this head covering portion of Scripture that God speaks to us about His order of headship. God, Christ, man and then woman. This is not about inferiority but rather role and place. When a sister in the Church obeys the Lord and covers her head she is testifying to God and the unseen realm of her willingness to obey God's order. Just as Jesus Christ obeyed the Father in Heaven and humbled himself (Philippians 2:1-5).

Watchman Nee speaks of this wonderful responsibility and privilege sisters in the Church have:

"It is the sisters who are responsible to have the sign of obedience upon their heads. God specifically requires women to have their head covered when praying or prophesying. Why? Because they ought to know God's government when they come before Him. In going before God to pray for people or in going before people to prophesy for God, whether in praying or in prophesying, whether in that which goes to God or in that which comes from God, in whatever is related to God, head covering is demanded. The purpose is to manifest the government of God." (1)

Just as water Baptism speaks of the new life in Christ, Communion speaks of the death of Christ, Head Covering speaks of God's order. It is not just a rule that brings pressure on a sister but there is a great spiritual reality that is manifested when this is practiced to the Lord. Sisters should feel greatly humbled to be able to represent this before the world and angels as a testimony of obedience. See the great spiritual meaning behind the practice, just like Baptism or Communion, it will set you free on a wonderful journey with the Lord to see really why this practice is there. God has a significant role for each part and member in the body of Christ and only as a whole can we fulfill God's eternal purpose (Ephesians 3:11).

from: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com/articles/the-head-covering-and-gods-order>

Re: your article - posted by savannah, on: 2016/11/21 20:13

Greg,

In light of your article, and the strong stand you take regarding this practice, why do you promote women preachers and teachers who'd be out of God's order according to your own view on this issue?

Please clear this up as it appears contradictory.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/21 21:52

Quote:
-----In light of your article, and the strong stand you take regarding this practice, why do you promote women preachers and teachers who'd be out of God's order according to your own view on this issue?

I am not dogmatic on the issue meaning that I would not ever dis-fellowship on this and also I am very glad to even hear a sister sharing who is anointed of God or called of God. We can be so right we can become wrong. We can always learn from others and sometimes those who seem to look the best and have all the right things in order on the inside are full of unreality and sin.

I am glad to believe what I do about headcoverings and do believe it is good to share this with others, but do not want to exclude or hurt others in the process.

There are other things that are more important such as the blood of the precious son of God shed for all true believers.

Re: Greg, on: 2016/11/22 6:29

Brother if I might respectfully ask. In light of the context of 1 Corinthians 11:1-16. Would you allow a sister to pray or prophesy in the public assembly if she wore the head covering?

-bbs-

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/22 7:08

Quote:
-----Brother if I might respectfully ask. In light of the context of 1 Corinthians 11:1-16. Would you allow a sister to pray or prophesy in the public assembly if she wore the head covering?

dear brother,

Of course sisters would have that freedom as led by the Holy Spirit. I would say in most cases sisters should not share more than brethren, they usually should not be "elders" or be submitted under a brother's authority.

I also respect those denominations or meetings where sisters are silent and do not pray or prophesy, each gathering of believers has a strength and weakness. Obviously the best is to have the entire body active and strong eldership giftings in each local assembly.

Re: Greg , on: 2016/11/22 7:21

Brother appreciate your answer. I find myself in agreement. I was speaking with a close friend last night. She made the wise observation that these discussions are going to come up when the church in America goes underground. This was why I opened up this thread.

-bbs-

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/22 23:35

Quote:
-----But brothers the question. Is the sister allowed to pray or prophesy in the assembly if she wears the head covering? This is a question I'm seeking to address.

I believe that head covering is a command that should be followed by all sisters. But like Greg, I am not dogmatic about it. In the fellowship that I attend I have noted certain sisters not covering their head. It does not even bother me. They are answerable to God for what they choose to obey. But if they ask my view, I will tell them to cover the head, even if they get offended and leave the Church. I will never tell anyone to ignore any of the God's command.

Now regarding allowing the sisters to pray and prophesy in Church; I am one of the brothers leading the fellowship and I do encourage sisters to pray and prophesy. Many times I specifically ask any sister to pray for the meeting, so those with burden will pray. But Bible very clearly restricts sisters to teach. I do not teach myself, I only prophesy or share what God's word has done in my life. Teaching is only for those who have authority in Church to teach the word. But all brothers and sisters are free to prophesy according to their proportion of faith.

I find Jackie Pullinger as the best example for women who prophesy without any spirit of teaching. I have heard many of her sermons here on SI. She always speaks what the Lord has done in her life or in the life of people she knows. I really appreciate the way she speaks within her boundaries as a women. I believe that is why God has blessed her ministry so much.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/22 23:49

It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head but having a gentle and meek submitting spirit. I have seen sisters who cover their head but do not have a real gentle submitting spirit but I have not seen the vice versa. I am not saying there is no sister like that. But I am yet to see one.

This observation of mine makes me hold the view that the disobedience in head covering command is closely linked with feminist movement of false equality. We falsely confuse equality with roles and responsibilities. For example in my office I and my manager are equally important for the success of project but our roles and responsibilities are different. I have to seek his permission whenever I need to take a break from work. Just because I am equal in the eyes of company does not mean I do not need to submit to him. Similarly in God's eyes both man and women are equal, but they have different roles and responsibilities. For example man cannot give birth to babies, period, no matter how much he believes in equal rights! So even in church roles and responsibilities matter. So if a women is expected to cover her head then she has to, no matter how much she is equal to a man in the eyes of God.

Again it is just my personal observation, I can change my views the more I see the Christian world.

Re: , on: 2016/11/23 0:53

"It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head but having a gentle and meek submitting spirit."

I have never seen an gorilla in the jungles of Africa and yet I have walked those jungles. Not sure what relevance it has if you have not seen a sister who does not cover but still has a meek submitting spirit? It just means that they exist outside of your circle of friends. And besides do you have any idea how insulting that comes across to christian women who do not cover their heads?

"I have seen sisters who cover their head but do not have a real gentle submitting spirit..."

Yes so have I, but again...so what? You seem to be searching for some magical correlation between head covering and a meek and humble spirit? I'm sorry but I do not believe it exists.

"This observation of mine makes me hold the view that the disobedience in head covering..."

So now we have the truth coming out that exposes the hearts of many men who take a hard line on this subject. They believe that women who do not cover their heads are in disobedience to God. If that is the case, is not all disobedience in fact sin? So women who do not cover their head are in sin? If that is the case, what is the consequence of this continual sin? How can they even hope to walk in the light and fellowship with God if they are living in continual sin?

I am not being facetious nor am I seeking an argument, I do however want the brothers who teach these things to explain to all these sinful woman what the ultimate consequences is going to be for their sin? Do they lose their salvation, do they lose their reward? Are they somehow shut out of from the blessings of the Lord? Do they stop growing in maturity or becoming more Christlike?

And if that be the case, is not then the simple solution to all these consequences to simply throw a covering on their heads? And thats it? All the bad consequences cease? These are sincere and genuine questions that I have had for a very long time.

And one more thing. Who comes up with the rules for head coverings? How much of the head or hair should be covered ? I have seen woman cover their entire head in mid-eastern fashion and then others just cover the back of their head...barely? Which sister is more holy? Who should decide on the amount of the head being covered? Is it left to their discretion or do the elders set the rules? And when should the head be covered, during the prayer time, during the singing and the preaching? What about during the fellowship afterwards? If not why not? What happens if in a fellowship gathering that is not officiated by the elders that the head is not covered...is that sister in sin? What does she do if she ever should forget her head covering? Would any old covering suffice? A sweater? A newspaper or anything else handy at the time? Another question young people have asked me is would the wearing of a beanie count as covering the head? Again these are sincere and genuine questions that I have.

Thank you for putting up with all my questions.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/23 7:27

I have been in churches of a certain persuasion where the head covering is a reason to wear a flashy hat to be noticed.

I have also wondered if a young girl wears a "sock hat" does that satisfy the requirement? What about a ball cap?

The verses mention "veiling." Not sure what this means, but when I think of veiling I think of the head and face being covered.

My understanding is that in the Corinthian church the hair style for men was short, and that certain women were keeping their hair short which was a sign of rebellion at that time. Paul wanted them to stop this practice.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/23 10:11

It should not matter the exact way a sister does this, as there is no biblical exacting of it, it is simply an outward action of an inward reality just like water baptism.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/23 10:14

Sree wrote : ///I find Jackie Pullinger as the best example for women who prophesy without any spirit of teaching. I have heard many of her sermons here on SI. She always speaks what the Lord has done in her life or in the life of people she knows. I really appreciate the way she speaks within her boundaries as a woman. I believe that is why God has blessed her ministry so much.///

Sree wrote : ///It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head but having a gentle and meek submitting spirit. I have seen sisters who cover their head but do not have a real gentle submitting spirit but I have not seen the vice versa. I am not saying there is no sister like that. But I am yet to see one.///

Does Jackie Pullinger use a head covering ?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/23 10:42

RE : ///The verses mention "veiling." Not sure what this means, but when I think of veiling I think of the head and face being covered.///

Define what the Head is : "the head of every man is Christ"
"the head of the woman is the man" "the head of Christ is God."

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/23 10:56

Sree wrote: "I believe that head covering a command that should be followed by all sisters. But like Greg, I am not dogmatic about it. In the fellowship that I attend I have noted certain sisters not covering their head. It does not even bother me. They are answerable to God for what they choose to obey. But if they ask my view, I will tell them to cover the head, even if they get offended and leave the Church. I will never tell anyone to ignore any of the God's command."

Bother Forgetting what one believes about the issue., this paragraph you wrote is full of contradictions. Maybe it is your English, but anyway....

Contradiction 1: "I believe that head covering is a command that should be followed by all sisters"..but I am not dogmatic about it."

Contradiction 2:"...certain sisters not covering their head. It does not even bother me."..."But if they ask my view, I will tell them to cover the head, even if they get offended and leave the Church."

Are you dogmatic about it or does it not bother you?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/23 12:07

Sree-

You mentioned in the submission thread about the ridiculousness of asking about the size of the head covering, how much it should cover, etc.

It is not an insincere or silly question, although I admit there is a rhetorical reason for asking it.

The question is important because it goes to the legalism of the issue. Let's say a woman wants to use a head covering. She might wear a little hat. But she might be judged by other women who would say she should not wear a little hat but rather a scarf or a veil. And those women might be criticized because they cover all their hair but none of their face.

My wife, who went to a catholic elementary school, says that when they went into church the girls were expected to have something on their head. If they did not, they were given a Kleenex to pin to their hair.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/23 12:53

Quote:

-----Are you dogmatic about it or does it not bother you?

I am not dogmatic or adamant about it. Which means as Greg said, the head covering will not prevent me from fellowshiping with another sister. Like I said I have sisters in my church who do not cover their head. I really value them and encourage them to pray and prophesy in the Church just like any other sister who covers her head. But if this sister asks me a question about head covering, I will tell her what I believe is right. Does it make me dogmatic or adamant about my belief in head covering? I do not think so.

For example many men of God in the past like John Wesley believed in infant baptism. I do not believe it is right. But if Wesley was alive today, I will take every step to meet with him or visit his church. It will not prevent me from fellowshiping with him. But if I get an opportunity to discuss infant baptism with Wesley then I will tell him straight that he is wrong.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/23 13:10

Quote:

Does Jackie Pullinger use a head covering ?

I certainly do not know whether she covers her head or not. Neither am I interested. A quick search on her pictures reveal that she does not cover her head. But I believe the head covering command in the context of public prayer and prophesying in Church. So I am not sure whether Jackie covers her head in the context of prayer and prophesying. Even if she does not, it will NOT change my opinion about her. The very first time I heard her, the first thought that came to me is, if a woman has to prophesy, then this is how it should be.

Now regarding submitting spirit, I am not sure about Jackie. My observation is based on people I have met and fellowshiped with. For example I consider Annie Poonen as having the gentle and submitting spirit that a woman is Biblically expected to have. I have fellowshiped with her and experienced the same. Anyone who has talked to her will agree with me on this. I have also witnessed some other sisters having that gentle spirit. They all cover their head in the context of public prayer and prophesying.

I have not seen the vice versa. I am not one who restricts my fellowship boundary to only my Church. I do as much outreach as I can, especially to Christians. I am yet to see a sister who does not cover her head but having a Biblical submitting spirit. I am not saying they are not there. But I have not met one.

The point I am inferring from my observation is very simple, I connect disobedience to this command with feminist movement. I know a Godly speaker in SI who also holds this view. I am not trying to infer anything else from my observation like "all sisters who do not cover their head are evil" etc. If I have such a view then I will honestly admit it. I do NOT have one.

Re: , on: 2016/11/23 14:15

I surely hope you brothers are telling the truth when it comes to this subject because I have met many women who do not cover their heads but have a submissive spirit. I have also met women who cover but who I have observed as NOT having a submissive, gentle and quiet spirit. I have seen traits of them being bossy, busybodies, aloof, elitist, standoffish, unkind, impatient, gossips, full of pride and judgmental of others. If that is what you guys consider as a submissive spirit then it's all yours:-) I think what you are really observing in some cases is a pretense of a submissive spirit. Unless you live with these head covering women on a day to day basis there is no way you can really know their hearts. And the same goes for those women who you judge and say do not have a submissive spirit. It just happens that they do not cover their head. My take on this is that you are superimposing your disappointment in these non-covering women because in your eyes they are disobedient and thus do not measure up. But hey, that's not dogmatic...no not at all (wink).

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/23 14:36

I am friends with some girls that grew up with the head covering, their parents told them that they did not have to wear it if they did not want to, But they continued to wear it as respect to their parents. But the day they got married they took it off, Their husbands did not want them to wear it. I believe those girls acted correctly in both of the situations.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/23 18:17

I agree PP.

Re: , on: 2016/11/23 18:34

PP, Todd, yes I agree with that statement too.

I think is wrong and judgmental and legalistic to say that a woman is in disobedience to God for not covering her head. A better way to approach this is for every local fellowship to agree among themselves what their practice should be. If they cannot agree then the elders need to make a ruling and everyone else should submit to the elders in this regard. Then every woman in that fellowship should comply with that local church practice out of a spirit of submission. I believe this spirit of order and submission will please the Lord, not whether or not the women cover their heads. Of course this is my opinion and much more renowned men than me would disagree with me on this.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/23 18:41

Quote:

-----There husbands did not want them to wear it. I believe those girls acted correctly in both of the situations.

I do not ask in a way to challenge you. Though it appears that doing what your husband says is wise, it does not sound to me like Godly wisdom. If head covering is a command of God (which many including me believe) then no husband has the power to ask his wife to disobey a command of God. In many areas a wife has to submit to the opinion of husband, like what kind of dress is modest etc, because there is no clear distinction in God's word here. For example how much covering is modest, how much jewel is permitted, they are all grey areas. But when it comes to obedience of God's word, which is a simple and clear command, I believe God has higher authority than husband.

If you believe that head covering is not a clear command and just an optional thing, then what you say appears right. So it all depends on how serious one is about obeying even a simple command of God.

For example in Ananias and Sapphira case, the wife agreed to the lies of the husband which was a lie against the spirit. They did not even lie with their mouth, just pretended as if they submitted the whole money. Both husband and wife died.

Head covering is told as a symbol for angels, not to husband. If it is for angels then where is husband coming here?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/23 19:30

Why do the angels need to see a head covering on a woman?

Re: , on: 2016/11/23 19:48

Brother Sree,

You never answered my other email brother? If it is a command from God then it is disobedience and therefore blatant sin.

What are the consequences of this sin in your understanding?

And if so many believers do not agree with you and have the Holy Spirit within them, then why does not the Holy Spirit convict them of this blatant sin?

You see brother where you are wrong? This is what always happens when we follow a man's opinion about such a confusing subject rather than allow the Holy Spirit to convict each person as to how they are going to approach this. You said before you disagree with John Wesley and will tell him to his face where he is wrong. Why are you so adamant that your leaders who taught you are right about this matter then? Are they completely infallible but the great John Wesley isn't?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/23 21:43

Quote:

If it is a command from God then it is disobedience and therefor blatant sin.

Yes any disobedience to God's word is a Sin. But God also looks into the motives. I believe there are lot of false teaching around this simple command where people have twisted a simple scripture to deceive many women. Hence if it is based on deception which is a kind of ignorance then God overlooks it.

The only danger I believe a woman who does not cover her head will run into is, she might hinder God's grace reaching her in the area of submission. Submission is a serious problem to all women, no one can say it comes naturally to them. Just like how men struggle with lust of eye, women struggle with submission. I can prove it scripturally. So God's grace is only solution for a woman to have a real biblical submissive spirit.

When God has given a command asking women to cover their head as a sign of submission then any woman who honestly looking for God's grace in this area of submission will obey even the smallest of command in order to not hinder God's grace. She will not think twice whether it is needed or not.

But the real danger is for those men who teach the little ones to disobey the God's command and thereby causing them to stumble. It is better for them to tie a mill stone and jump into a well. If these words sound harsh then please blame Jesus!

Quote:

-----And if so many believers do not agree with you and have the Holy Spirit within them, then why does not the Holy Spirit convict them of this blatant sin?

I have already answered this question. Just because many do not believe head covering is a command does not mean it is not a command. Just because they are not prompted by Holy Spirit, does not mean they are correct. The same example of John Wesley that I gave previously is answer here as well. We all know Wesley was wrong with infant baptism. It was clear disobedience of a conscious baptism needed. So does it mean that because Holy Spirit has not prompted Wesley to correct his stand, infant baptism is correct? DO YOU SEE A FAILURE OF YOUR LOGIC?

Many times our eyes will be blinded by the traditions of men that is why many Godly people have failed to see some simple truths in Bible.

Quote:

-----You see brother where you are wrong? This is what always happens when we follow a man's opinion about such a confusing subject rather than allow the Holy Spirit to convict each person as to how they are going to approach this.

First my view on head covering is based on word of God not based on opinion of men. In fact it is people who believe that "because many do not believe in Head Covering in recent times, it cannot be a command" are those who value opinion of men more than God. Not a person like I who cares the least about opinion of people.

There is absolutely no confusion about this scripture. The confusion is brought by those who look into the scripture to find the reason for ignoring it. If we apply cultural background to one scripture then why not to rest? I have not heard even of clear explanation on why this command can be ignored.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/23 22:04

It is interesting that John Wesley speaks on this about "the angels" and says in his short commentary:

For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.

For this cause also a woman ought to be veiled in the public assemblies, because of the angels - Who attend there, and before whom they should be careful not to do anything indecent or irregular.

--

It seems we should have a reverence for God when coming to worship together and sisters also exemplify this in their obedience to wear a headcovering.

I personally think the most important way to approach and think about this apart from it being the Word of God and in Scriptures, is that the utmost majority of christian movements and godly men throughout history believed this headcovering as literal and important it is only in the last generation that it has been questioned so much by liberal theologians that it has been lost in many churches.

Towards it being sin, I would think it would only be sin for a sister who is convicted by the Holy Spirit to obey this Scripture and she denies it knowing God wants her to.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/23 22:17

RE : /// Many times our eyes will be blinded by the traditions of men that is why many Godly people have failed to see some simple truths in Bible.///

I 100% agree with that.

I would encourage each individual to set aside all preconceived views, set aside what your favorite preacher told you.

And prayerfully and carefully study the text.

Believe what is written and be willing to change your view on the subject.

Keep in mind the overall theme of 1 Cor. that started in chapter 1.

Pay attention to the theme of the previous chapter.

Pay very close attention to the word "But" in verse 3.

Pay very close attention to what the heads are.

And use a literal translation and use a concordance and do a word study on words such as : exousia

And seek a Break through from the Lord on the Text and do so with your spouse.

edit : clarity

Re: , on: 2016/11/24 0:34

So let me see if I have this straight. Millions of non-covering women believers in America are disobedient and in sin. But they are deceived so it's not really sin. And you have never met a single one of them who had a submissive spirit. And the consequences of them not covering is that they might not ever become submissive. But all they would have to do would be to cover and then they would receive God's grace to become submissive. But if they didn't cover it would be ok because it's not really sin. But the real problem is their husbands who do not agree with you and force their wives to cover. In fact you suggest they could even lose their salvation over that.

Does that about sum it up?

So what do you do with a woman like my wife? She has never covered in her life but she would if I asked her to. If I really put my foot down and "beat" her into submission with my words over such a non-essential doctrine issue, she would s

submit to me, But that would not make her any more submissive or non-submissive to me. She is the most submissive wife I know but it disturbs me that people like you have such a low view of wives like mine.

I have no dog in this fight. I could not care if a person believes women should not cover or if they believe women should cover. What I take issue with is the judgmental spirit that calls people sinners over non-essential doctrinal issues.

That my dear brother Sree is a religious spirit and is very close to what the Pharisees had. I doubt you will hear this from me though.

That's all I have to say on this subject. God bless you all. Very grieved over the state of Christianity in this country. Very few safe enclaves left.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/24 6:47

Quote:
-----But the real problem is there husbands who do not agree with you and force their wives to cover. In fact you suggest they could even lose their salvation over that.

Brother Mark,

I do not see that being said by the brother. Millions of Americans are doing something that has not been done in church history or at least in the anomaly.

the Holy Spirit said through Paul:

1 Corinthians 11:16

16 If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practiceâ€”nor do the churches of God.

So essentially if he says if someone wants to argue, contend about this, the Churches all over the world had no other practice, this is what all sisters did.

Towards sisters who do not cover there is grace, Sree also said that he gives grace to sisters who do not cover. I have mentioned this scripture a few times to saints in public settings and on the forums but it is not a huge hobby horse. But it is a portion of Scripture that is part of the New Testament.

A thread like this is good that it should cause saints to re-read the Scriptures for themselves carefully and come to personal conclusions.

As brother Mark you have said it is a more important issue for sisters themselves to consider an especially local Church elders to consider.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/11/24 8:49

Brother Greg,

I just want to say I appreciate your attitude and spirit with this. It can't be easy to moderate in some discussions :)

Just one question. The interpretation of verse 16, quote "16 If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practiceâ€”nor do the churches of God."

You seem to take it as saying all the churches at that time were practicing this custom, while other translations indicate differently: that if any one argues this this is NOT the custom of the churches (but Paul's recommendation only)?

I think this is a part of the confusion surrounding this.

Blessings,

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/24 9:01

Yes, I was in the process of addressing this verse.

Greg, I hope you don't mind me pointing this out.

The NIV is the only translation I see putting 'no other practice'. All the others say 'no such practice', which when you look it up seems to be the correct translation. It would clearer to translate it ' we have no practice like this'.

So this puts a whole issue on what Paul meant when he said that, as he could only be referring to the 'such' as the practice he has just been talking about. So the churches have no 'such' practise of head covering. This seems to me to be in keeping with what Paul put on (or not) the churches he established.

Why if the Apostles went to great effort to make sure that the gentile churches were not bound by the Law of Moses would they find another 'new Law' to put on them. Makes no sense to me, but who am I? Make up your own mind.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/11/24 9:11

Okay, to answer my own question :) I checked a few commentaries and they all agree that Paul is saying the apostles and churches of his time had no common custom of women praying uncovered etc. So the meaning seems to be that all churches had the same custom concerning women covering their head. I copy one commentary here:

"Pulpit Commentary

Verse 16. - But if any man seem to be contentious. St. Paul cuts the question short, as though impatient of any further discussion of a subject already settled by instinctive decorum and by the common sense of universal usage. "Seem to be contentious" is (like the Latin *videtur*) only a courteous way of saying "is contentious." If any of you wish to be disputatious and quarrelsome about this minor matter of ritual, I must content myself with saying that he must take his own course (for a similar use of the euphemistic "seem," see Philippians 3:4; Hebrews 4:1; James 1:26). We have no such custom. The emphatic "we" means the apostles and the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem and Antioch. Such custom. Not referring to "contentiousness," but to the women appearing with uncovered heads. Neither the Churches of God. If you Corinthians prefer these abnormal practices in spite of reason, common sense, and my arguments, you must stand alone in your innovations upon universal Christian practice. But catholic custom is against your "self opinionated particularism." "

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/24 9:19

I would encourage each individual to set aside all preconceived views, set aside what your favorite preacher told you. ((Set aside church tradition)) ((set aside the commentaries)) ((set aside your circles view))

"And prayerfully and carefully study the text.

Believe what is written and be willing to change your view on the subject.

Keep in mind the over all theme of 1 Cor. that started in chapter 1.

Pay attention to the theme of the previous chapter.

Pay very close attention to the word "But" in verse 3.

Pay very close attention to what the heads are.

And use a literal translation and use a concordance and do a word study on words such as : *exousia* ((But do not use a commentary))

and when you come to a portion which is too difficult to understand quiet your mind and remember :

"..the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you.."

And seek a Break through from the Lord on the Text and do so with your spouse."

If you have not done the above I would encourage you not to

belabor your view and if you have done so I believe that you will not try to belabor your point but seek rather to get others to have a break through of the Text for themselves.

Remember the context starting from 1 Corinthians 1 has been to not be followers of men but rather of Christ.

I believe this is one of the most misunderstood portions of Scripture through out history and one of the reasons that church history is a history of contention and division)

edit : add

Re: William - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/24 9:36

William,

The question then needs to be asked, why do these commentators assign the 'such custom' to being an uncovered custom rather than a covered custom? Is it because that is their pre-conceived view??

Re: , on: 2016/11/24 11:09

Brother Greg,

You also seem to be missing my point. I don't mind if a woman covers or doesn't cover, let her convictions decide. And if she is a part of a covering local assembly let her comply with the practice there.

The ONLY PROBLEM I HAVE WITH THE WHOLE THREAD/ISSUE...

...is telling women who do not agree with your doctrine that they are disobedient and sinful.

And then to tell the husbands that don't agree with their doctrine that they will have a millstone hung around their neck and cast into the sea.

You seem to be defending Sree for saying these things? If so then I guess I don't know you as well as I thought.

Re: , on: 2016/11/24 11:18

What about women who die their hair? That's a covering right? Or should the entire head of hair be covered in an opaque material so that no hair is seen?

What's missing here?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/24 14:13

Quote:
-----But all they would have to do would be to cover and then they would receive God's grace to become submissive. But if they didn't cover it would be ok because it's not really sin.

I never ever said this. In fact I have said the opposite that there are sisters who cover their head and still do not have a submissive spirit. Anyone who reads my posts here will agree with me on this. You seem to have a preconceived notion about me and those who believe head covering as a command of God. You try to put words in their lips by questioning about salvation of those who do not cover their head.

Salvation belongs to God, no one can judge the state of salvation of others with respect to any external sign. I believe you know this very well. Then why are you questioning me with respect to salvation? I find these questions very similar to Sadducees who questioned Jesus about resurrection when they themselves did not believe in one. So none of the answers Jesus gave will ever make any sense to them.

The reason I did not answer many of your questions is, I do not believe they are asked in teachable spirit.

I think it is better we put this discussion to rest. I do not believe my stand here is legalistic. In front of God I can testify that I am totally comfortable to fellowship with sisters in my church who do not cover their head. A legalistic person will not be able to say so.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/24 14:34

Sree,

You wrote just a few pages back...

"It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head but having a gentle and meek submitting spirit. I have seen sisters who cover their head but do not have a real gentle submitting spirit but I have not seen the vice versa. I am not saying there is no sister like that. But I am yet to see one."

Can I appeal to you as a brother. There seems to be a lot to misunderstand in what you have written and what you think you have written. Maybe it is down to your English or lack of checking what you write, but it is not clear what you said above is what you claim you did not say. Maybe you should clarify this statement as it is written in a confusing way using double negatives, etc.

Please don't accuse people of being pharisees because they misunderstand you, when it is possible the fault may be with how you write.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2016/11/24 15:09

Don't know Dave but will be doing a bit more studying on this.

Maybe the Greek scholars among us can clarify.

Blessings,

Re: , on: 2016/11/24 15:10

brother Sree,

Sorry to hold your feet to the fire like this but perhaps there are some older brothers here you could learn from?

You said:

"But the real danger is for those men who teach the little ones to disobey the God's command and thereby causing them to stumble. It is better for them to tie a millstone and jump into a well. If these words sound harsh then please blame Jesus!"

That sounds very much as if you are damning these husbands who tell their wives it's okay if they do not cover their heads...to hell because that is exactly what Jesus meant.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/24 15:46

Quote:
-----And then to tell the husbands that don't agree with their doctrine that they will have a millstone hung around their neck and cast into the sea.

You seem to be defending Sree for saying these things? If so then I guess I don't know you as well as I thought.

I said in an earlier post: "Towards it being sin, I would think it would only be sin for a sister who is convicted by the Holy Spirit to obey this Scripture and she denies it knowing God wants her to."

So to re-word it, it is not sinful or wrong if a sister does not have light and does not feel an urging of the Holy Spirit in her personal relationship with God. I hold no sister to have to wear headcovering apart from this.

But I would share it in a local setting if the scripture arose in discussions and from time to time on the forums here.

What I think Sreeram is saying is that if someone feels it is "bad" to have headcovering and speaks against it and convinces other sisters and young people to "not" wear it then that could be going against God's will and potentially be sinful to do.

Paul the Apostle himself leaves the sisters and brothers to a freedom but says that we do not have any other practice or such custom. The Majority of Christian believers from all sects and remnant groupings held to this also mostly not "forcing" but the elders and leaders teaching it as the Biblical custom. We should NOT go beyond this and force or speak down on sisters that do not wear a head covering.

To me it is the same on many other issues, I can have grace on a divorced and married couple but once they go and start encouraging everyone to divorce and then remarry that can become sinful and cause problems.

Re: , on: 2016/11/24 15:48

brother Sree,

"Anyone who reads my posts here will agree with me on this. You seem to have a preconceived notion about me and those who believe head covering as a command of God."

Not, not at all. I have no preconceived ideas at all I am only commenting and holding you to your own words. Maybe you are not aware of the way your words are coming across?

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2016/11/24 16:50

I do not know what is the fuzz about this all.

If you are willing to obey this commandment of scripture it is plain and simple.

If you do not want obey it even the brightest theologian and Greek scholars will get confused about it.

I pray that our dear sister Sherri who raised an honest question will not get confused when she reads through this blog.

Matthew 11:25 At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.

- posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/24 16:54

I would encourage each individual to set aside all preconceived views, set aside what your favorite preacher told you. ((Set aside church tradition)) ((set aside the commentaries)) ((set aside your circles view))

"And prayerfully and carefully study the text.

Believe what is written and be willing to change your view on the subject.

Keep in mind the over all theme of 1 Cor. that started in chapter 1.

Pay attention to the theme of the previous chapter.

Pay very close attention to the word "But" in verse 3.

Pay very close attention to what the heads are.

And use a literal translation and use a concordance and do a word study on words such as : exousia ((But do not use a commentary))

and when you come to a portion which is too difficult to understand quiet your mind and remember :

"..the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you.."

And seek a Break through from the Lord on the Text and do so with your spouse."

If you have not done the above I would encourage you not to

belabor your view and if you have done so I believe that you will not try to belabor your point but seek rather to get other

s to have a break through of the Text for themselves.

Re: , on: 2016/11/24 17:38

I said in an earlier post: "Towards it being sin, I would think it would only be sin for a sister who is convicted by the Holy Spirit to obey this Scripture and she denies it knowing God wants her to."

So to re-word it, it is not sinful or wrong if a sister does not have light and does not feel an urging of the Holy Spirit in her personal relationship with God. I hold no sister to have to wear headcovering apart from this."

So the Holy Spirit convicts some but not others regarding head covering. it is a sin if we believe it is a sin but not a sin if we do not believe that it is a sin .

Selective conviction sin it seems . The Holy Spirit in your view only convicts some but not all about this practice, How so ?

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2016/11/24 18:33

Quote:

-----by Sree

Just like how men struggle with lust of eye, women struggle with submission.

Women struggle with submission and need to prove they are submissive spirit by wearing a head covering to prove they are obedient; am I correct Sree?

Men struggle with lust of the eye but what do they need to do outwardly to prove they have a submissive spirit and are obedient in that area?

Only reason that I ask is that YOU are the one who equated the two in the quote above.

Iâ€™ll wait.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/24 19:43

Quote:

-----Women struggle with submission and need to prove they are submissive spirit by wearing a head covering to prove they are obedient; am I correct Sree?

Lysa, I did not mean that head covering is a proof of submission. It is just a symbol of submission. The point I was making is, submission is such a difficult area for women. Which you cannot disagree. So a women will need all the grace she can get in this area. Since there is a command given to women to cover their head as a symbol of submission, a women in need of grace in this area will not think twice to cover her head. She will not allow this disobedience to such a simple doable command to hinder God's grace.

For example if there is command that men should cover their head as a symbol of Not Lusting with their eyes, then I will not think twice to cover my head in Church, no matter if all men decide not to cover their head. No matter who calls me egalist for covering my head! I do not want to take a chance in hindering God's grace.

Yes there is actually an external command in relation to Lust for men which is 2 Tim 2:22, "flee from youthful lust". If a man does not flee from a place where he is tempted to lust like a swimming pool filled with provocatively dressed women, then how will God give him grace to overcome the lust? A person who disobeys a simple doable command, will only fool himself if he believes even by being among such women he can become an overcomer by God's grace. Do you agree with me in this case? I am just applying the same logic in head covering as well.

Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2016/11/24 22:52

Does any one else think it's weird that there are 1500+ views on this post and 37 on the Ethiopian girls being jailed for their faith?

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/25 3:42

Quote:
-----So the Holy Spirit convicts some but not others regarding head covering. it is a sin if we believe it is a sin but not a sin if we do not believe that it is a sin .
Selective conviction sin it seems . The Holy Spirit in your view only convicts some but not all about this practice, How so?

James 4:17 New International Version (NIV)

17 If anyone, then, knows the good they ought to do and doesn't do it, it is sin for them.

Philippians 3:15-16 New International Version (NIV)

15 All of us, then, who are mature should take such a view of things. And if on some point you think differently, that too God will make clear to you. 16 Only let us live up to what we have already attained.

Re: Nigel , on: 2016/11/25 6:28

/// Does any one else think it's weird that there are 1500+ views on this post and 37 on the Ethiopian girls being jailed for their faith? ///

Actually brother it is now 1649 views on this thread and 59 views on the Ethiopian sisters jailed for their faith. (Wonder if they wore the head covering?)

Yes it is wierd. But not surprising. Brothers and sisters in persecuted nations are dealing with heavier issues. As a dear sister would remark to me, they have bigger fish to fry.

-bbs-

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2016/11/25 7:09

Quote:
-----by bearmaster
Actually brother it is now 1649 views on this thread and 59 views on the Ethiopian sisters jailed for their faith. (Wonder if they wore the head covering?)
Yes it is wierd. But not surprising. Brothers and sisters in persecuted nations are dealing with heavier issues. As a dear sister would remark to me, they have bigger fish to fry.

Bro, I am not trying start a war with you but if I may say so, every time you or drifter click on this thread to make a comment or to even see what's being said, you do know you are contributing to the amount of views as well?

God bless,
Lisa

(edited for clarity)

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2016/11/25 7:13

Quote:

-----by Sree

Since there is a command given to women to cover their head as a symbol of submission...

16 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

How is it a command when the Apostle Paul ends with that?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/25 7:59

Quote:

-----6 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

How is it a command when the Apostle Paul ends with that?

The right translation for this word is - NO OTHER practice. Which means other than this (head covering) there is no other practice. It makes no sense for Apostle Paul to write so many strong verses against women who do not cover their head and then end up telling we do not have this (head covering) custom in our church.

I have listened to all the reasons given by those who do not believe Head covering is a command of God, none of them even makes any sense. One can easily prove them all wrong. Finally one may say, there is enough confusion so let us not consider it as a command. Now because there is confusion, is it wise to ignore a doable command or keep it? I find absolutely no reason for not keeping it. Or find any harm in keeping it. But one can seriously hinder God's grace by not obeying a simple doable command.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/25 8:37

Quote: "The right translation for this word is - NO OTHER practice."

Sree, can you show us evidence this is the correct translation? I think you will find (as I posted to Greg earlier) that only the NIV translates it so. All the others, including KJV correctly translate it 'such'.

Greek word 'such' is 'toioutos' = 'of this sort'; 'like'; 'such'. i.e No practice LIKE THIS.

You need to check out things before state things as fact.

edit: Additional to this, is it a custom or a command?

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/25 8:51

Sree,

You never responded to my earlier post about your confusing statements by your use of words and grammar. I was not trying to be rude, I wanted you to see that for all your posting your writing is sometimes ambiguous and that could be the reason you think you are being mis-quoted. I was hoping you would clarify it in more straight forward English.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/25 9:12

Quote:

Sree, can you show us evidence this is the correct translation?

I as far as I know, I answered your post where you thought there was some contradiction in logic. Please check the thread again. I win bread for my family writing programming logic, I hope know at least something about logically correct statement.

I agree that the verse 16 can also be translated as no SUCH, but that translation makes no sense. There is no sense in the Apostle writing strong verses from 3 to 15 supporting the need for head covering and giving everything up in verse 16, saying "we do not follow this custom".

Verse 10 clearly sounds like a command :- 10 Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

I do not find any confusion in this scripture unless someone really tries to dig it up to find reasons for not obeying it. If anyone reads it with an open mind to obey, they will definitely end up with conclusion that this is a command of God.

Re: Sree - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/25 9:42

Well Sree, unless you have a different version of the SI forum than me, I can see no answer to my post. The only posts you have made since that one of mine was to answer Lysa twice. You certainly have not clarified the quote I highlighted. Also it is not being very humble of you to say that you write programming logic, so therefore your statement was logically correct. Maybe that's the issue. Computers and people don't use the same language! lol :)

What you wrote above is wrong. It is not that it 'can' be translated 'such', but 'such' or 'Like' is what the actual word means. It cannot mean 'other' and to prefer that as a translation, just because it seems to make more sense to you is not a good argument. You are changing meanings to fit your presumption.

Either way, is it a custom or a command?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 9:58

verse : 10 For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels

This is why I wrote : ///And use a literal translation and use a concordance and do a word study on words such as : exousia///

The word "symbol" does not seem to be in the Greek.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/25 10:07

Quote:

-----Quote:

Are you dogmatic about it or does it not bother you?

I am not dogmatic or adamant about it. Which means as Greg said, the head covering will not prevent me from fellowshiping with another sister. Like I said I have sisters in my church who do not cover their head. I really value them and encourage them to pray and prophesy in the Church just like any other sister who covers her head. But if this sister asks me a question about head covering, I will tell her what I believe is right. Does it make me dogmatic or adamant about my belief in head covering? I do not think so.

For example many men of God in the past like John Wesley believed in infant baptism. I do not believe it is right. But if Wesley was alive today, I will take every step to meet with him or visit his church. It will not prevent me from fellowshiping with him. But if I get an opportunity to discuss infant baptism with Wesley then I will tell him straight that he is wrong.

This the posting I made in response to your post where you pointed out that there is a contradiction in my logic.

As a person who is not legalistic about head covering, it is not fitting for me to post so much on this thread. I have made my point clear. If people judge I am legalist because I uphold the word of God then I can only say that I am dead to their opinion.

My English language skills are on par with anyone here. Unlike those who are born in USA, a person working in USA as a legal immigrant has to prove his English language skills to enter this nation. My only problem is I type at express speed because I type day in and day out! I am a very poor proof reader. Normally people who do programming are very poor in testing. Hence I can make mistakes in my typing.

Re: , on: 2016/11/25 10:12

People tend to follow the customs of the church they were raised in and leaders that they are most heavily influenced by. Particularly when they are first saved. This is an indisputable fact imho.

I am surprised that more is not being discussed about this aspect?

Now when you have very strong and strict leadership it is almost impossible to change the customs and practised of that movement until the founders either pass on or die.

This is the way it has been since the beginning.

And as customs and practices are changed with the changing of the guard some people become very uncomfortable and leave those churches. They eventually find a church that they are more comfortable with or they start their own.

This is why we have so many denominations and groups and this is why we have strict customs being followed by all the churches under the authority of strong leaders. There is nothing wrong with this. It is normal and perfectly acceptable.

Where it does get squirly in regard to non-essential issues; is when those leaders and churches claim that they are right and everybody else is wrong but not just wrong, actually in sin.

This is the bigger issue here and why so many believers are interested in this topic. It's not that they have a morbid fascination with brothers and sisters fighting over this, it is more that they are confused and want answers.

However it doesn't help them to speak up when those who take a hard line stance on this suggest that they are disobedient or sinners and or unsubmitive wives if they question this custom. And that is what you have happening here. Maybe that is not the intent but that is what is being perceived by many onlookers and until grace and humility is shown over non-essential doctrines you will only have a few people speaking up.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/25 10:32

Sree, Do you ever admit when you have made a mistake??

Edit /Added: I do see you admit to typing mistakes, but not admitting a mistakes in particular. This is the post I mean, not the one you refer to.

Sree,

You wrote just a few pages back...

"It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head but having a gentle a

and meek submitting spirit. I have seen sisters who cover their head but do not have a real gentle submitting spirit but I have not seen the vice versa. I am not saying there is no sister like that. But I am yet to see one."

Can I appeal to you as a brother. There seems to be a lot to misunderstand in what you have written and what you think you have written. Maybe it is down to your English or lack of checking what you write, but it is not clear what you said above is what you claim you did not say. Maybe you should clarify this statement as it is written in a confusing way using double negatives, etc.

What I mean about double negatives is this. If I say "I don't have no knowledge about computers", that is a double negative and could be read that if you don't have 'no knowledge' that means you 'DO have knowledge about computers'.

So your statement "I have NEVER come across a sister who DOES NOT cover her head BUT do not have a real gentle submitting spirit" (Caps added to clarify words that cause a problem) is not clear in what you are saying. Are you saying 'EVERY sister I have come across who does not cover head DOES NOT have a gentle and submitting spirit' or 'EVERY sister I have come across does have a gentle and submitting spirit'?

If she DOES NOT have a gentle and submitting spirit, why would you ask them to pray and prophesy in your meetings?

Re: , on: 2016/11/25 11:12

brother Dave,

I think it is clear from Sree's writings that of all the women he has met, in his opinion none of them displayed a gentle and meek, submitting spirit.

A better use of the English language would be to write the statement like this:

"It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head AND YET HAS a gentle and meek submitting spirit."

Sree only mentioned that sisters are allowed to pray and prophecy in his church but these are sisters who cover their head.

This is the custom in all CFC churches. Sisters are not required to cover their heads however if they want to pray or prophecy then they must cover their heads.

Re: - posted by drifter (), on: 2016/11/25 11:16

"Bro, I am not trying to start a war with you but if I may say so, every time you or drifter click on this thread to make a comment or to even see what's being said, you do know you are contributing to the amount of views as well?"

Yes I know, and I am trying lately to avoid endless debates about this kind of thing. Not to say people shouldn't have legitimate questions answered, but should some question about head covering be more important than persecuted saints and what we can do to help them? I think the numbers speak for themselves; not many people really want to know about persecuted saints, because that would require time to care, to pray for them, possible financial help etc. I am not trying to browbeat any one on here, but please saints, these people need your help.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/25 11:17

Mark,

That may be so....but then this statement above from Sree would not make sense.

"Like I said I have sisters in my church who do not cover their head. I really value them and encourage them to pray and prophesy in the Church just like any other sister who covers her head."

Unless he means he makes them cover their head if they want to prophesy and pray, even though they don't practice that custom?? I don't know it's beyond me!!

Edit: Anyway I'm off to make dinner for my wife now. Hope that's not frowned upon. Just something I like to do occasionally on a Friday.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/11/25 11:28

Quote:
-----Heydave...Anyway I'm off to make dinner for my wife now. Hope that's not frowned upon. Just something I like to do occasionally on a Friday.

Brother Dave, I'm sure someone is looking for a scripture right now to see if that's ok. :-)

Re: to Sree, on: 2016/11/25 11:29

hi Sree,
I just wanted to say something publicly to you my brother. First I am sorry if I slighted you or gave you the impression of slighting you in our back and forth comments. Please forgive me. Second I respect you for your zeal and your commitment towards the Lord in every respect of your christian life. That is commendable and you are a godly example for others to follow. Thirdly I thank you for your service in the Kingdom and in the local body of Christ in which you serve, again a tremendous example in this day and age.

I just wanted to say those things to you because in the heat of these discussions it is easy to become discouraged, even in a small way. That has happened to me many times in the past but I sense from your words you probably are not discouraged at all about all this. Even so it is a sticky subject and many have been hurt by churches who "appear" to be legalistic and condemning. I do not sense that is in your heart at all but it could be construed by some of the things you have written.

That's all I have to say about this matter brother, we will never solve these differences so eventually we must put them aside and live in peace with one another. I pray you will continue to be a light and a help to those you serve alongside in His Body.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/25 11:38

Quote:
-----So your statement "I have NEVER come across a sister who DOES NOT cover her head BUT do not have a real gentle submitting spirit"

Quote:

Sree,

You wrote just a few pages back...

"It is my personal observation that I have never come across a sister who does not cover her head but having a gentle and meek submitting spirit."

If I compare what you have said that I have written and what you have found as a mistake in what I have written. They do not match! It appears that I did not say "but do NOT have".

I admit the use of double negative is very specific to certain culture which others find very difficult to understand. Also double negatives are interpreted differently by different people speaking the same language. For example in India, "I do not see nothing" means you saw something. But in US it means they did not see anything!

All I meant is very simple, I have not fellowshiped with a sister who does not cover her head and also have a gentle submitting spirit. I do not see them go together. This is just my observation, which is bound to change. I do not infer anything substantial from this observation other than the connection between uncovered head and feminist movement.

Quote:

-----If she DOES NOT have a gentle and submitting spirit, why would you ask them to pray and prophesy in your meetings?

That is a good question. I do not believe only gentle sisters should pray or prophesy in the church. We all know God gives his grace only to Humble people but resists the proud. But we all keep identifying some kind of pride in us every now and then (at least I do). Does it mean we (or I) should stop praying and prophesying in the Church because we still keep finding pride inside us?

Praying and prophesying is not for perfect people. If God is patient with a person then why should any church leader lose his patience with a sister? I rather test the spirit of prayer and prophesying in my church. If the spirit is right then I do not mind what level they are in attaining gentle and submitting spirit. If the spirit is not right, after the meeting I might have a word with them.

Though I said that I do not find them having a gentle and submitting spirit, it does not mean they are rebellious sisters. They may not have attained the level of Biblical submission or they might be struggling in the area of submission. But as long as they are fighting the good fight, I do not have any problem with them. In fact if I get a chance to speak about Head Covering, I will encourage them to cover their head, so that God's grace will not be hindered in their good fight.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/11/25 11:56

So someone picked out "one" topic in the word that's created almost 2000 views and 72 responses, and I have no problem with that. Now does this same person adhere, absolutely and totally to all scripture themselves? I don't think it's wise to come here condemning others on scripture on head coverings, and not be following every scripture in the word of God completely in your own life, isn't this what we call being a hypocrite?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/11/25 11:57

Quote:

Even so it is a sticky subject and many have been hurt by churches who "appear" to be legalistic and condemning.

Dear awakened, I always appreciated you for your honest testimony. Which is again visible in your post. God has great purpose for honest people, I have no doubt about it. Even recently a brother in my Church was talking about your honest testimony, that you shared in one of the Zac Poonen conferences and how it helped him. Even without you knowing, you have influenced other believers! This is greatness of the Gospel that we believe. It can impact lives that we do not even see.

I totally agree with the above quoted verse of yours. In fact during our heated discussion here, I knew exactly where you were going. Since as far as I know, I was not legalistic about this subject, it did not bother me much. Maybe the more I grow in the Lord I will change. Even my wife did not like some of my posts here, especially on my observation! She felt people could misinterpret them easily. Again I am sorry if I have hurt anyone by posting my observation, maybe it was my foolishness and immaturity. Again like I said in my very first post, I am willing to change my observation the more I see the Christian world. I am not holding my observation as an absolute truth.

I know how legalistic stands taken by Church leadership, especially those claiming to hold the complete truth, can hurt innocent sheep. I was personally a victim of few legalistic church leaders, I will share my testimony when we meet again. Those were not easy times at all. If not for God's grace and mercy, I would have easily got offended and fallen from my faith.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 12:30

RE: /// I have not fellowshiped with a sister who does not cover her head and also have a gentle submitting spirit. I do not see them go together. This just my observation,..///

I know of a Preacher that is represented on SI (the following statement is not on SI) :

He was asked about the issue of head covering : One of the things that he said while speaking on the issue was basically this :

I do not know what it is but it has been my observation that most of the woman that I know that wear a head dress are very disrespectful to their husbands.

I Believe he was telling the truth as to his observations. I also believe that you are telling the truth by your observations but such provocative statements have no need in such discussion.

edit clarity

Re: to Sree, on: 2016/11/25 12:41

Thank you brother Sree, that is very encouraging to me.

I too have a wife who is much wiser than me:-) I have learned when I listen to her things go well for me and when I ignore her counsel I usually end up with egg on my face:-)

On that subject I asked her this morning that if I had an epiphany (and I am open to it) about women and head coverings and if I was adamant that they wear them in church, would she submit to me? She told me that she would reluctantly do so. I believe her. She has followed me across the world and I have put her into many, many difficult church situations and she has been through the mill with me. And all the while she has submitted to me even when I have been wrong. In my mind that is a submissive wife and yet she does not cover her head. So now you can no longer say that you do not know a meek, submissive woman who does not cover her head:-)

sree - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 12:56

RE : /// Again I am sorry if I have hurt anyone by posting my observation, may be it was my foolishness and immaturity.//
/

What I wrote was before reading this post.

Thank you Sree

Re: , on: 2016/11/25 13:06

"I do not know what it is but it has been my observation that most of the woman that I know that wear a head dress are very disrespectful to their husbands."

I can understand that being the case - if the woman feels like she is being forced to do things that she does not agree with. And I am not talking about head coverings now...just normal day to day life living as husbands and wives.

I would humbly submit this scripture below applies to us if and when we "force" our wives to comply with our rulings.

"In the same way, you husbands must give honor to your wives. Treat your wife with understanding as you live together. She may be weaker than you are, but she is your equal partner in God's gift of new life. Treat her as you should so your prayers will not be hindered." (1 Pt 3:7)

The irony of this passage is that when we force our wives to do something that we believe is scripturally correct but they are very uncomfortable with - we can easily "provoke them to wrath" or resentment towards us as husbands.

I am not making an excuse for resentment at all, just trying to understand why that teacher would have observed that about women who covered their heads.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/25 13:55

Saints,

Praise the Lord that this thread has ended on a good note and that brethren humbled themselves preserving the unity of the faith in some cases in this discussion.

It is interesting that the thread was started by a sister humbly seeking counsel and looking for the truth of this practice as she was led by the Holy Spirit. No brother was forcing her or telling her, she was being "taught of God". That is the best place to leave this and it is not wrong to discuss it but in the end only in a sisters personal relationship can they really get from the Lord the confirmation to wear a head covering.

If a brother forces it on their wife I am not sure what fruit if any would come from that. That is why I believe if an assembly believes in headcovering they should not force all to wear it but all the sisters to come to faith in the practice as honouring the Lord.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/25 14:09

Ok thank you Sree for your recent posts. I can see from the things you post and obviously those who know you that you are quite a gracious brother in person. Just sometimes our words can be much more harsh and don't match our actions, but we all can be guilty of that.

just finished the dinner I made for my wife and I. It was an Indian curry ironically! Not being funny, I like to make authentic curries with fresh spices, etc. I think she enjoyed it!

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/25 14:31

Your'e a good man Dave. I love Indian cuisine- unfortunately my wife can't stand it. She says it tastes like "perfume."

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/25 14:40

Here is a quick summary of my understanding of the issue:

- 1) this letter of Paul was written to a specific church in a Greek cosmopolitan city
- 2) the specific church had a lot of issues because of its culture
- 3) one of the issues was women cutting their hair, perhaps in the worldly style of their day, to look like the short hair that men wore in Corinth
- 4) these women were trying to take over the church in Corinth
- 5) Paul wanted to put a stop to this specific problem in this church
- 6) Paul's practical solution for this specific church was that women should grow their hair longer and wear a head covering as a sign of submission to male leadership.
- 7) If this was a universal command for all churches, it would seem strange that this is mentioned nowhere else in scripture.

Re: TMK - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 15:01

RE : /// 7) If this was a universal command for all churches, it would seem strange that this is mentioned nowhere else in scripture. ///

That is a good point.

The rest of what is written I personally can not except, I can not except the cultural argument or the specific case argument.

- posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 15:14

The covering represents men having an influence over the conscience of other men. (covering between the Man and His Head which is Christ)

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 15:23

The Womans covering is the influence of her Husband, She is to : "be in subjection" to him in as much as he does not lead her into sin.

Add : "the influence" for technical clarity

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 15:35

Every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered that is to say (not under the subjection of her husband) dishonoureth her head (which is her husband)

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/25 15:38

Take those first little steps that I just gave and continue reading for yourselves : This is what I did and I encourage every one else to do it for yourselves :

I would encourage each individual to set aside all preconcieved views, set aside what your favorite preacher told you. ((Set aside church tradition)) ((set aside the commentaries)) ((set aside your circles view))

"And prayerfully and carefully study the text.

Believe what is written and be willing to change your view on the subject.

Keep in mind the over all theme of 1 Cor. that started in chapter 1.

Pay attention to the theme of the previous chapter.

Pay very close attention to the word "But" in verse 3.

Pay very close attention to what the heads are.

And use a literal translation and use a concordance and do a word study on words such as : exousia ((But do not use a commentary))

and when you come to a portion which is to difficult to understand quiet your mind and remember :

"..the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you.."

And seek a Break through from the Lord on the Text and do so with your spouse."

If you have not done the above I would encourage you not to

belabor your view and if you have done so I believe that you will not try to belabor your point but seek rather to get other s to have a break through of the Text for themselves.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2016/11/25 18:41

I'm guessing all the women, married or single, all around the world, that have accepted Jesus Christ into their lives, that maybe can't read, or just don't have a Bible, will be forgiven, from having no head covering?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/25 21:05

Yes they will, Bill, but only if their end-time view is correct.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2016/11/26 7:18

Quote:
-----I'm guessing all the women, married or single, all around the world, that have accepted Jesus Christ into their lives, that maybe can't read, or just don't have a Bible, will be forgiven, from having no head covering?

Brethren,

As the thread was ended well let us not end it with frivolous jesting which really is not acceptable in the forums overall. I have seen christian discussion boards full of these type of posts and in the end it becomes something of less value. Thousands of people from hundreds of countries daily and weekly reference these topics and learn from the forums. What are we teaching them by our posts and interactions?

To seriously answer your question, the majority of the church in history has always carried on the "tradition" (1 Corinthians 11:1) by practice and example. Of course its root is in Scripture. It is mostly by the influence of German, english scholars in the last 50-70 years that have given excuse "not" to do this practice. So essentially 1900 years of Christianity practiced this and only the last generation we have decided it is not necessary.

we will lock the thread at this point as it seems the topic has been discussed enough. I will re-post the Scripture here for saints to reference again:

1 Corinthians 11:1-16 New International Version (NIV)

11:1 Follow my example, as I follow the example of Christ.

On Covering the Head in Worship

2 I praise you for remembering me in everything and for holding to the traditions just as I passed them on to you. 3 But I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God. 4 Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head. 5 But every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head—it is the same as having her head shaved. 6 For if a woman does not cover her head, she might as well have her hair cut off; but if it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, then she should cover her head.

7 A man ought not to cover his head, **since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man. 8 For man did not come from woman, but woman from man; 9 neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. 10 It is for this reason that a woman ought to have authority over her own head, because of the angels. 11 Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. 12 For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman. But everything comes from God.**

13 Judge for yourselves: Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? 14 Does not the very nature of things teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him, 15 but that if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For long hair is given to her as a covering. 16 If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice—nor do the churches of God.