



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Woman's Head Covering

Woman's Head Covering - posted by luke133, on: 2007/1/13 10:10

I was just wondering if anyone had listened to the message by Ross Ulrich on the headcovering and what the general consensus on that subject was. repentorperish133@yahoo.com

Re: Woman's Head Covering - posted by vico, on: 2007/1/13 11:38

I can't wait to see where this goes :-) this could get interesting!

I come from a Mennonite background, and the head covering is an area of tension within the churches; having come out of the traditional Mennonite churches.

Over half of the women in our fellowship wear a head covering, and it's kind of said that if you feel that the Lord wants you to wear one, wear one, and if not, then don't. Now, I don't agree with that. I think that we need to go one way or the other (although I'm not saying which way I go...yet ;-)).

Well I hope this is edifying, and that the body of Christ is blessed ;-)

victor

Re: Woman's Head Covering - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2007/1/13 12:00

This topic has been covered a few times before, you may wish to peruse the following threads for a plethora of thoughts on this matter...

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id9669&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) No Custom? Or No Argument?

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id4351&forum35&post_id&refreshGo) Headcovering Question

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id11698&forum36#91119) Do The Bibles Statement s on Head Covering Apply Today?

In Christ,

Ron

Re: Woman's Head Covering - posted by Meriwether, on: 2007/1/13 12:10

Head covering is nowhere near an essential doctrine. The only people wearing head coverings with whom I am personally acquainted are in many, MANY theological ditches. They are trying to revive many aspects of living under the law.

We are saved by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone. See Galatians for my scripture support... mostly 3:10 - 6:10

Mrs. Meriwether

Head coverings, dietary restrictions, Sabbath issues, you name it. Grace covers it.

Re: Womans Head Covering - posted by luke133, on: 2007/1/13 12:43

How can grace cover direct persistent disobedience? It can't! God can only forgive that which we are willing to forsake. Also, to equate the woman's head covering (a NT teaching that was accepted and practiced by virtually ALL Christians until the last 150 years) with dietary laws and Sabbaths (OT types and shadows that were fulfilled in Christ) is certainly muddying the theological waters. The mistake that so many people make is to equate obedience with legalism. They think if anyone says "The Bible teaches that we must DO THIS..." whatever, that they are trying to bring folks back under the law, but how can this be when these things are NT doctrines! Sure you can make a law out of the NT but if our hearts are to obey the Lord because we love Him then this hardly qualifies as legalism.

Re: Womans Head Covering - posted by luke133, on: 2007/1/13 12:50

P. S. To reject a teaching of the Bible because you are acquainted with folks that hold this teaching and are in error in other areas is a MAJOR mistake. Rather than throw the baby out with the bathwater let's go to GOD's Word and see what it says, if it says a lady should not pray or prophesy without a covering then she should wear a covering, *if it says men should wear an orange cone on their head, let's do it!*

Re: head coverings - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/13 14:10

My head is always covered. Because the spiritual beings in the heavenly realms can see it, they know to whom I belong.

"...because of the angels,
the woman ought to have
a sign of authority on her head." 1 Cor. 11:10

... and you have been given fullness in Christ, who is the HEAD over every power and authority." Col. 2:9

Diane

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/1/13 14:31

Quote:
-----I was just wondering if anyone had listened to the message by Ross Ulrich on the headcovering and what the general consensus on that subject

Here is the sermon that is being discussed, you can listen to it here:

The Doctrine Of Headship by Ross Ulrich
<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=9313>

Description: An exegesis of I Corinthians 11 on the teaching of the head covering as it relates to God's headship. This is a very straightforward teaching on the subject. Contains a clear explanation as to why the hair is not the prayer veiling.

Re: - posted by Meriwether, on: 2007/1/13 15:11

"Wherever and whenever women do pray and proclaim the Word appropriately, they must do so maintaining a proper distinction from men. In the culture of Corinth, a woman's covered head while ministering or worshiping was a symbol to signify a subordinate relationship to her husband. The apostle is not laying down an absolute law for women to wear veils or covering in all churches for all time, but is declaring that the symbols of the divinely-established male and female roles are to be genuinely honored in every culture. As in the case of meat offered to idols (chaps. 8,9), there is nothing spiritual about wearing or not wearing a covering." --John MacArthur

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/13 16:21

Quote:
-----Head covering is nowhere near an essential doctrine. The only people wearing head coverings with whom I am personally acquainted are in many, MANY theological ditches. They are trying to revive many aspects of living under the law.

If you are ever over here let me know and I will introduce you to a whole bunch of sisters who are free in God and who cover over their heads in the meetings. :-)

Re: - posted by luke133, on: 2007/1/13 18:07

That's an easy statement to make but a bit harder to support. In 15 verses of direction given on the covering Paul NEVER ONCE appeals to culture to support his argument. His reasons are based on the roles of men and women, order in creation, Christ's relationship to the Father and to men, and the testimony of nature, all of which transcend culture.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2007/1/13 18:13

Brothers and Sisters,

I do believe this is a profitable discussion. I do think it would be a good first start for people that want to go in depth in this thread to listen to the sermon mentioned in the first post which you can download here:

The Doctrine Of Headship by Ross Ulrich

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=9313>

Description: An exegesis of I Corinthians 11 on the teaching of the head covering as it relates to God's headship. This is a very straightforward teaching on the subject. Contains a clear explanation as to why the hair is not the prayer veiling.

Secondly, I do think we should post more scriptures on this subject if the discussions are going to continue in such a manner. We all have our opinions which are important but when it comes down to it, the word of God is our final authority.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/15 13:16

I have just listened to Ross Ulrich's message on this topic. It has been a noisy experience with my little study ringing with 'amens!' This is unusual for me especially on this topic. I hardly ever hear preaching on this topic but so many of Ross's conclusions are my own.

There are some points where I would want to add a comment or two. The issue of 'long hair' I think is capable of another view. One area where there were no 'amens' was the latter part where Ross insists that this is not only for 'public assembly'. I disagree that it is 'man's assumption' that this passage is related to 'the public gathering'. Ross claims that the instructions come before Paul mentions the 'coming together' and therefore is applicable in every context. I think this is a mistaken view. He bases his position on the repetition of the KJV phrase 1Cor. 11:18 For first of all, **when ye come together** in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it.

1Cor. 11:20 **When ye come together** therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper. ..as though the 'when you come together' is distinct from earlier instructions in the chapter. The KJV phrase 'when ye come together' does not imply that the chapters preceding verses apply to every context. It is simply the Greek verb 'coming together'. The whole context is of 'praying and prophesying', do we envisage this happening in the market place? And we need to remember that this injunction is part of a matched pair. However we interpret the context of the woman and her covering we must apply to the man and his uncovering. If a woman must cover her head at all times, then the man uncover his head at all times. Is it likely that this is what Paul was saying?

The second point where I would take issue with this teaching is in the use of the phrase 'long hair'. The words used are only used in this passage of scripture so it is impossible to compare them with other contexts. "Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man has **long hair**, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman has **long hair**, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering." (1Cor 11:14-15 NKJV) The Greek words used are both verbs and nouns. Thayer's Lexicon has an interesting comment about this word. komē differs from thrix (the anatomical or physical term) by designating the hair as an ornament (the notion of length being only secondary and suggested) The significance of this is that

at the 'hair' is being regarded as an ornament rather than has a physiological fact. A more scholarly description with lots of Classical Greek quotations can be found (<http://www.zhubert.com/word?word%CE%BA%E1%BD%B9%CE%BC%CE%B7&root%CE%BA%E1%BD%B9%CE%BC%CE%B7&number682690>) here There is a further expansion of the meaning of the word here too the hair of the head (locks, as ornamental, and thus differing from 2359; which properly denotes merely the scalp) This is viewing the hair by function rather than by length. This is not essentially 'long hair' but 'coiffeured hair' ie 'hair as an ornament'.

A Nazarite (Numbers 6) was required to leave his hair uncut and if he did this for a long period it would no doubt become 'long hair' in the English sense of the word but it would not become 'coiffeured hair'. A nazirite's hair would never become hair coiffeured ornament. The 'length' of the hair then is only significant as an aspect of the grooming rather than something which could be measured.

I have worked with Christians of many cultures and natures and have often asked the question 'is it a cause of shame in your culture for a man to have long hair'? Often the answer is 'no'. In many cultures long and unkempt hair was part of the uniform of the warrior, so there was no hint of effeminacy. If you ask would it be cause of shame for a man to have elaborately styled hair; the answer, almost invariably, is 'yes'.

So the cheering and the amens were a little less in the latter part of the sermon, but I do agree with the spirit and much of the detail of this audio file.

Re: - posted by ginnYROSE (), on: 2007/1/16 10:31

Philogos wrote:

Quote:

-----The whole context is of 'praying and prophesying', do we envisage this happening in the market place?

Brother, the answer to this question is unequivocally "Yes!". Females do pray and prophecy in the marketplace. I do. I pray a lot; prophecy in my conversations with people. Most of my praying is done when I work, drive or shop...very little while in formal worship service, comparatively speaking. Brother, a few years ago we attended our sons' graduation exercises from Mississippi State University. When the invocation was given I noticed the males removing their caps. Not so with the females. Wonder why? Nature, instinct at work?

Brother, I wear a headcovering during all waking hours. In my early morning toilet I will put it on after combing my hair. One morning I forgot, was on the way to work at the Crises Pregnancy Center when I reached up and noticed I forgot to put it on. I stopped, went back home to remedy this. Brother, I felt so naked, vulnerable! I would never have dared to minister to anyone without it...I needed the Holy Spirit's guidance desperately and in no way was I going to go anything to hamper that ministry to my heart this day.

I have worked with many ladies who profess to be Christians at CPC. They come from many denominations: Baptist, Assembly of God, Presbyterian, Charismatic, Catholic. There is one attribute common to all: they experience an excessive amount of fear for their own personal safety! This is so unlike what I witness among the sisters who wear a white veiling of some kind. Seriously! Would you know the director of CPC (back then) carried a pistol in her purse for personal protection! Brother, there is something wrong here.

I am short, one inch less than 5' tall. The reality is that any male could overpower me and do me harm if he would have the notion to do so. So what do I do? Cower in fear because of it? I could...but I do everything I know the Scriptures tell me to do and then depend on the protection of Angels. They know it as well as Christ. Physically, there is no way I can protect myself from evil men. I am totally dependent on supernatural protection for my well-being. Consequently, I seldom ever experience fear. If I do, I know I am in danger and must take extra precautions and I pray more fervently.

Ron, I have read testimonies of evil men who had intentions of harming females but when they saw how they were modestly garbed with a white covering, they could not do it and told the potential victims so which left them in awe of the protecting power of God.

Here is something else that needs to be considered, IMHO. Another poster mentioned how the application of 1 Cor. 11:

1-16 was common among all Christian groups years ago. Today the only groups wearing it in the USA are Mennonites, Brethren, Hutterites and Amish, all Anabaptist groups. In the past 50 years there has been a wholesale abandonment of this practice among all of these groups except for the Amish. What has happened? The incidence of divorce and remarriage rose, females clamoring to be ordained as pastors....Any connection? I see this in my own kinfolks...do not need a research group to tell me this!

This is my conviction on this issue. I know the temptation of using the headcovering as a good luck charm. This is the devil working to pervert something God has directed. We do not see people discarding anything else, like marriage, because the devil works to pervert it.

Ron, I welcome your comment on whatever I have written...

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/16 11:40

Quote:
-----Brother, the answer to this question is unequivocally "Yes!". Females do pray and prophecy in the marketplace. I do. I pray a lot; prophecy in my conversations with people. Most of my praying is done when I work, drive or shop...very little while in formal worship service, comparatively speaking. Brother, a few years ago we attended our sons' graduation exercises from Mississippi State University. When the invocation was given I noticed the males removing their caps. Not so with the females. Wonder why? Nature, instinct at work?

This provides the next obvious question. Do I, as a male, have to remain without a headcovering 24x7? No hard-hat on the building site? No bobble hat on the sledge run?

Do you sleep in it? Do you make breakfast in it? Do you shower in it? :-D :-D

Your answer of 'yes' isn't really answering the question I asked. I was really asking if we envisage Paul requiring, by the Spirit, that the woman remain covered at all times. If there is a single exception to this rule your position is undermined. I was carol-singing in a shopping area just before Christmas and was aware that some carols are actually prayers. Ought I to have removed my hat for these verses? (that would certainly have shortened my songs; I have no hair and the night was cold!)

Quote:
-----In the past 50 years there has been a wholesale abandonment of this practice among all of these groups except for the Amish. What has happened? The incidence of divorce and remarriage rose, females clamoring to be ordained as pastors....Any connection?

Not necessarily.

Years ago I was speaking in a large Pentecostal church in Belarus. The man who introduced me raised to cheers from the congregation by introducing me as 'the man who has 7 children and who attends a church where the women cover their heads!' But these cheers were from conservative people who regard traditional values as 'godly'. This is a dangerous assumption. We must constantly examine the scriptures to know 'whether these things are so'.

Your testimony/anecdotes are interesting illustrations but we must base our teaching on the book. I love, BTW, the Ross' introduction when he says, something like...
"there are important doctrines in the scriptures, and there are some doctrines which are more important than other doctrines, but there are no unimportant doctrines".

So I believe strongly that there are important issues at stake with the teaching of 'head covering'. I am always surprised that we haven't asked the even more?! significant question. "why, when hundreds of years had demanded it, does Paul now say that men must **not** cover their heads?" For many women to 'continue' to cover their heads would not have taken many by surprise but why should the male now be told that he must not cover his head in the meetings?

Re: - posted by myfirstLove (), on: 2007/1/16 12:18

could you guys read this and tell me what you think.

thankyou

Head Covering
By Eric Svendsen

1 Co 11:12-16 clearly states that women should have their heads covered while praying or prophesying. It also ranks among the most difficult of all passages in the NT. The intent of this article is not to give an exhaustive analysis of this passage, and so no attempt will be made to deal with every issue that surrounds this passage. Rather, this chapter will show whether or not Paul sees head covering as a normative church custom; or indeed, whether Paul sees this as a valid custom for any church, even for those of his own time.

Interpreters of this passage have found themselves in one of two camps when deciding what relevance this passage has for the church today. On the one hand, there are those who see this passage as having relevance for churches in Paul's day (though perhaps not all churches in Paul's day) and either no relevance for today or a modified relevance for today. Those in this camp include Christian feminists who see absolutely nothing in this passage to speak to the church today, as well as traditionalists who see an abiding principle of headship and submission but no binding custom of head coverings for women. In the other camp are those who see not only headship of men and submission of women, but also a command from Paul that head coverings for women are to be a custom of church practice throughout the ages. Concerning the position of those in the first camp, it is unwise to explain away NT commands using the guise of cultural relativity. Cultural relativity is a very dubious principle upon which to operate. It can, in fact, be used to dismiss any or every part of the NT. Needless to say, we can't have that!

But even if one wanted to make an exception to the rule that commands in Scripture cannot be considered culturally relative, there still is no basis for doing so in this passage. There is absolutely nothing in this passage to suggest that Paul sees a cultural limitation to his injunction about head coverings. On the contrary, every reason Paul gives for his injunction is arguably timeless and universal in scope. His reasons include the chain of headship (God-Christ-man-woman, v 3), the priority of creation (vv 8-9), the angels (v 10), and nature itself (v 14). None of these things is temporary or culturally limited, but rather timeless, and indicate that Paul's injunction must be seen as timeless. Moreover, Paul calls this practice a "custom" of the church (v 16), and a "tradition" which he has handed down and to which he expects churches to hold (v 2).

Those of the second camp (i.e., those who see head coverings as a binding church practice) obviously enjoy the luxury of being able to argue the previous points. They also have the advantage of taking Paul's words at face value and can apply the passage without compromising hermeneutic integrity. Theirs is the stronger position based upon the preponderance of evidence. However, four or five points of grammar in this passage force a look at a third position.

Before positing the third position it will be necessary to look at several key elements of Paul's argument in this passage. First, it is notable that Paul takes one tone from vv 3-10, but from vv 11-16 takes quite another tone. Verse 11 seems to be the pivot point of the two tones. The key phrase in v 11 is "In the Lord, however." In the passage immediately preceding this phrase Paul makes several observations that, after v 11, he seems to balance. For instance, in vv 8-9 Paul seems to be arguing that man is completely independent of woman and, indeed, that woman is completely dependent on man ("for man did not come from woman, but woman from man; neither was man created for woman, but woman for man"). Paul's point seems to be two-fold: 1) man does not rely upon woman for his existence, and 2) woman does rely upon man for her existence, and, indeed, her existence is for the very purpose of benefiting man.

Yet, beginning with v 11, Paul seems to add balance to what he said in vv 8-9. Paul argues in v 11 that, yes, while it is true woman is not independent of man, "in the Lord" neither is "man independent of woman." The statement in vv 8-9 is true in itself, but does not go quite far enough. Man and woman are interdependent; neither one can claim independence. Paul expands upon this in v 12. In essence he says, yes, it is true that woman was made from man, but "also the man is born of the woman"—hence, interdependence, and hence, vv 8-9 are balanced by vv 11-12.

One last balance seems to be between v 7 and v 12. In v 7 Paul seems to argue that man was made in the image of God but woman was not. Instead, she was made in the image of man. The phrase "image and glory" is what is technically referred to as a hendiadys (lit., "one through two") and means simply that Paul uses two words to refer to one

thing. So, when he says that man was created in the "image and glory of God" and that woman was created in the "glory of man," he means the same thing in both instances (Paul uses only one word, "glory," in the second phrase to represent the entire phrase "image and glory"). However, the idea that woman was made in the image of man (not untrue in itself, but misrepresentative of the fact that both man and woman were made in the image of God—see Ge 1:27) is balanced in v 12: "But everything comes from God." If v 9 makes the point that woman has her source in man, v 12 places it in proper perspective by pointing out that "everything" (i.e., both man and woman) has its source in God.

So, why does Paul make statements in vv 7-10 that he later must balance in vv 11-12? Before answering this question it will be necessary to reconstruct the occasion of Paul's response in this section of his letter. The best starting point is in v 16. There Paul gives us a clue as to what is going on. He says, "If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice—nor do the churches of God." It seems relatively clear from Paul's words that someone (or, perhaps more likely, some group) was insisting that the church take a specific position on women's head coverings. Most standard translations (including the NASB and the NIV) render Paul as saying, "we have no other practice." This would indicate that the "contentious" group was insisting that women should not wear head coverings. Paul then would be correcting this group by appealing to a universal church custom of head coverings for women. What is so surprising (and what is the very thing that caused me to rethink this passage) is that the Greek word translated "other" in v 16 (toioutos) never means "other" anywhere else; and, in fact, means only "such" ("we have no such custom"). Needless to say, this drastically changes the meaning of Paul's words. If Paul is saying "we have no such custom of women wearing head coverings," then obviously the "contentious" group was insisting that women should wear head coverings. Moreover, when viewed this way, it becomes increasingly clear why Paul would make several points before v 11 only to counter them after v 11. It also explains why at the beginning of this passage Paul praises the Corinthians for not giving in to the pressure of the contentious group but, instead, for "holding to the teachings just as I passed them on to you" (v 2).

Based upon this information we may assume the following to be true of the Corinthian situation. The "contentious" group had been trying to get the rest of the Corinthians to adopt a custom of women covering their heads with some kind of garment when praying or prophesying. The Corinthians, uncertain as to what to do in this situation, include a section about this teaching in a general letter which they wrote to Paul (see 7:1 for evidence of this letter). In the letter they may have said something to this effect: "There are some Christians who have come to us and told us that we are supposed to have our women wear head garments during the meeting. We don't recall you saying anything about this. So far we have not changed the way we have been doing things, but we would like to get your thoughts on this teaching." To which Paul replies, "I praise you for remembering me in everything and for holding to the teachings just as I passed them on to you." In other words, "I praise you for not changing the way I taught you to do things, especially in light of the fact that you were under pressure by this group to modify your meetings."

Paul then begins to outline in vv 3-10 the building blocks upon which those in the "contentious" group have built their teaching that women need to wear garments as head coverings. The important thing to remember here is that Paul does not disagree with the building blocks used by those in the "contentious" group to develop their theology of garments as head coverings. On the contrary, he agrees 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 is dependent on man and that man was created independent of 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 is dependent upon man for her initial existence (v 9), but so is man dependent upon woman for his further existence (vv 11-12).

So, while Paul does not disagree with the theological foundation of those in the "contentious" group, neither does he think they have gone far enough in building their theology. At best they have a lopsided view of a woman's status before God. Likewise, Paul does not disagree that, on the basis of male headship, women should have a "covering" on their heads when praying or prophesying. His disagreement is with the application of this principle (i.e., the type of covering).

All through this passage (vv 3-10) Paul has been insisting that a woman must have a "covering" on her head. The Greek word he uses here is katakaluptos. Here he is in agreement with those of the "contentious" group. They, too, have been insisting that a woman have a covering on her head. 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 vv 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. A wise sales manager might ask his sales team: "Is an increased sales effort something that we want to do away with" and then buttress that with: "Don't we want to see an increase in our bonuses next month?" By answering the second question first (yes, we do want to see an increase in bonuses), the answer to the first question then becomes obvious (no, an increased sales effort is not something that we want to do away with).

Paul uses the same reasoning here. 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.

But here Paul is thinking about a specific kind of covering. Up until this verse Paul has consistently used the word *katakaluptos* ("covering") to insist that a woman be covered while praying or prophesying. Paul agrees with the contentious group that a woman does need a covering. What he disagrees with is their application. The contentious group insisted that the covering be a garment (a veil or shawl), whereas Paul is arguing that, in the case of the church ("In the Lord, however," v 11), the covering is the woman's own hair. Long hair, Paul argues, 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 vv 3-10. Overall then, 1 Co 11:2-16 is a very liberating passage. In it, women are freed from the bondage of wearing religious head garb.

On which side of this issue do I then fall? In practice I do not at all differ from those who see this passage as culturally relative and who therefore do not practice garment head coverings for women. Hermeneutically, I am more closely allied with those who see no cultural relativity in this passage and who believe Paul is here laying down a custom for the church of all ages and cultures. Although I disagree with it regarding the exegesis of this passage, this view is far more faithful to Paul's intent than is the former view. Still, neither view seems to grapple with the literary structure of this passage (the point/counterpoint dialogue that pivots around v 11) or the points of grammar brought up in this chapter (the use of *anti* in v 15, and the use of *toioutos* in v 16). My reconstruction, though admittedly not without its own inherent weaknesses, goes much farther in unraveling a difficult passage about which there is much dispute. I hope that it will be of help to those who seek to follow apostolic tradition.

Re: head coverings - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/16 14:56

my two cents...

I have long hair because I am too cheap to go to the hairdresser every month and deal with all the fashion stuff. I'm content to tie it back and be done with it. But more important, my husband does not want me to cut it. Now, even though that sounds pious: submission and self-denial, I do not myself attribute any spiritual virtue to my practice, and I don't see that Paul would either.

Frankly, I have yet to see in real life where there is a close connection between the observance of the practice and a high degree of spiritual maturity. Usually it is closer to the contrary. In religious settings where the practice is meticulously observed, I have seen all kinds of ungodliness in relationships. There is a lack of submission to the Spirit. Legalism practically suffocates the church. Now, I don't wish to generalize, just point out that to a fair degree the church seems to be missing something.

I've heard David Bercot present a compelling argument for veils. He also explains why they cannot be transparent or lacy (as the Brethren practice) but opaque, and must touch the shoulders. While I cannot disagree with his argument, I have to admit that there is something missing. Surely for me to go to church looking like a nun in a Presby church would do little to glorify my Lord. It would be most distracting — drawing attention to myself.

Maybe what's missing is the Spirit of the issue.

Consider Paul's words: "Does not the nature of things teach you

The natural elements are replete with prophetic pictures of spiritual realities. Perhaps we, in our intellectual sophistication, have lost the ability to read them. The nature of things, that is, all creation tell me that there is a sovereign God and we're not him. In other words, we must align ourselves under him – submitted to his authority and his redemption.

The head covering makes more sense to me if I regard it as a prophetic picture given to remind us of the relationship between Christ and the Church. The wife (bride) is a symbolic picture of the Church and the husband is a symbolic picture of Christ. The Church cannot be united with Christ in divine matrimony without having her sins covered with his blood, which I believe is prophetically pictured by a woman's long hair (or a head covering). "Long hair... is her GLORY" because it is a visual picture of the glory of Christ covering the Church. As his bride, the Church is covered with the GLORY of Christ.

Paul asked: "Is it proper for a woman to pray with her head uncovered?" 1 Cor. 11:12 Prophetically speaking, the answer is 'No,' because no one can approach the Lord without being covered by Christ's mercy and forgiveness. That's why God doesn't hear the prayers of someone who rejects salvation, that is, is not covered by his blood.

However Christ himself is without sin and therefore does not need a covering. That is why, "if a man has long hair it is a disgrace." It would be a disgrace to portray Christ as in need of a covering because that would deny his sinless perfection and his deity.

In the days of the early church any woman who had short hair and kept her head uncovered communicated a clear message: She was not living under the covering of her husband in a relationship of fidelity. Instead, she was available as a prostitute. In Paul's day the churches could easily have equated the meaning of this cultural practice to the meaning of the Church's relationship to her spiritual husband - Christ.

We have lost this picture. Because of this, it has been easy to use this head covering references to create gender distinctions that are more worldly than biblical. The man may think that he needs no covering (spiritually) and fail to submit to God's authority. (Really as part of the Bride, he needs a Spiritual covering) The man may falsely assume that he is her Savior (her Head) or he may usurp the authority in her life that belongs to the Spirit. Or people may develop superstitions like mentioned above: "Man was made in the image of God and woman was not." That theology sounds more pagan than Christian.

That is, what I believe, the outcome of trying to figure this thing out apart from seeing the bigger picture of divine truth.

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/17 10:56

Quote:

-----by myfirstLove on 2007/1/16 17:18:11

could you guys read this and tell me what you think.

Eric Svendsen is right in drawing attention to verse 16 "But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God." (1Cor 11:16 NKJV) and in saying that there is evidence of some group which wanted to question the current pattern. The problem is that, although the latter part of 1 Corinthians is aimed at answering various questions addressed to Paul by the Corinthian church, we cannot categorically restate the exact questions. Consequently we are trying to build up hypothetical questions from Paul's answers. This is not easy.

It may, of course, have been the case that the question was "Would it be right for us to abandon the head covering tradition?" The answer which ends in "we have no such custom" would then imply that this suggested innovation was just another

vidence of Corinthian independence. This somewhat haughty attitude seems to have drawn out Paul to say...“Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says. And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church. Or did the word of God come originally from you? Or was it you only that it reached?” (1Cor 14:34-36 NKJV) This comment is essentially in the same part of the letter where Paul is dealing with the way in which the 'body gathers together'. (this is one of my reasons for saying it is 'church based' and not an injunction for the whole of life.)

Also against Svendsen's interpretation would be the way that Paul introduces this topic...“Imitate me, just as I also imitate Christ.

Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things and keep the traditions just as I delivered them to you. 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.” (1Cor 11:1-3 NKJV) He refers here to 'the traditions'. These are truths and practices that Paul consciously 'handed down' to the young churches. In fact, Breaking Bread which follows in this chapter is another such 'tradition'. Tradition then, is not always a bad thing. It all depends on where it came from. Paul's practice and his doctrine were equally important.

So also was the 'corporate testimony'. In an era when travel was difficult and communications were not so easily authenticated as now it was important that the collective witness of the community was considered. You can see this too in “And the things that you have heard from me **among many witnesses**, commit these to faithful men who will be able to teach others also.” (2Tim 2:2 NKJV) In 1 Cor 11:16 Paul is actually calling upon the corporate witness of 'all the churches' and upon his own statement. He is really saying 'such a custom is unheard of'.

Later in this chapter Paul writes:“And if they want to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for women to speak in church. Or did the word of God come originally from you? Or was it you only that it reached? If anyone thinks himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write to you are the commandments of the Lord.” (1Cor 14:35-37 NKJV) The word 'commandments' is in the plural and Paul says they have come from the Lord. Remembering that this section of 1 Corinthians is only split into chapters and verses for our convenience and was not as Paul wrote it, these 'commandments' will include all his teaching in the earlier part of 1Cor 11.

A further point against Svendsen's position is that if it were true then Paul is going to extraordinary lengths simply to say 'it doesn't matter'. I think this sits very uneasily with the way Paul writes.

well... that's what one of 'the guys' thinks, anyway...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/17 10:58

Quote:
-----Frankly, I have yet to see in real life where there is a close connection between the observance of the practice and a high degree of spiritual maturity.

This may well be true but it is also true of water baptism and holy communion. The cure for wrong use is not non-use but right use.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/17 11:23

Ron wrote:
Quote:
-----For many women to 'continue' to cover their heads would not have taken many by surprise but why should the male now be told that he must not cover his head in the meetings?

Ron I read your response two days ago and have done a lot of thinking about it since. And Greg made a good point in suggesting one needs to stay close to the Scriptures and discuss it from that point of view. (Hope I said it right.) Anecdotal evidence is not adequate in understanding Scripture because you can get off a limb so quickly. So the issue is what does the LORD say? And how important is it for us to understand the reason motivating God's directives/commandments? Is it essential for us to understand that motive before we obey?

As I was thinking about this issue yesterday while I was working, I was reminded of Hebrews 11, the faith chapter. Also Galatians 3:5-6: He therefore that ministereth, to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the wor

ks of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." What would have happened had Abram debated with God's command to go sacrifice his son? He could easily have given a lot of logic reasons why it was not essential to do this thing. So, it comes down to faith: do we believe God's commands and are we willing to obey even though we do not understand the reasons? Is this not what Hebrews 11 details in the life of the saints?

Thanks for this intellectual jolt, Ron.

ginnyrose

PS: Ron, I do stand by the statement of what has happened to the Mennonites on this side of the pond during the 20th century. Ask any conservative Mennonite pastor and he will tell you the same.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/17 11:37

Diane wrote:

Quote:
-----Surely for me to go to church looking like a nun in a Presby church would do little to glorify my Lord. It would be most distracting -- drawing attention to myself.

Diane, doing so just might challenge others to rethink the issue! Ever thought about that? When we stand before the Almighty, whatever embarrassment we have suffered for the sake of Christ will count as nothing, right? Try it and see what happens! When you do you will have to ask the LORD for strength to face your fears and how to cope with them. I suspect you will discover something new and refreshing about the grace and mercy of God.

Quote:
-----The man may falsely assume that he is her Savior (her Head) or he may usurp the authority in her life that belongs to the Spirit.

Diane, this happens oftener than we like to think. I have heard variations of this expressed: "Well, my husband has decided this is not essential.." Like our pastor used to say: that man did not die for her salvation! Good point, IMHO.

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: why the rituals? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/17 11:39

Quote:
----- This may well be true but it is also true of water baptism and holy communion. The cure for wrong use is not non-use but right use.

And yet, in the pursuit of the "right use" of these New Testament rituals there has been much divisiveness -- for centuries. That is very strange, especially when none of them can be used as a measuring rod of one's true spiritual condition.

Yet baptism, Eucharist, and headcoverings are all tangible pictures of the same vital spiritual truth. I wonder if the universal church traditions of baptism and communion, by being etched into Christianity, have served to arouse the conscience, to provoke the question, "Why do we do this?" If one really wants to know, he will be brought straight to the pure truth of the gospel -- to Christ himself.

In that line of reasoning, I can certainly see the value rituals such as head coverings/long hair -- as something that speaks far more than the wearer may be communicating by her personal life.

not sure... just thinking....

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/17 11:54

Quote:

-----Yet baptism, Eucharist, and headcoverings are all tangible pictures of the same vital spiritual truth.

I think this is a key element which we have not yet developed.

Re: sermon review -re headship - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/26 18:40

Last night I listened to the sermon, (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid9313>) The Doctrine of Headship as suggested earlier, and would like to share my observations:

The preacher explained that the woman's hair is the glory of man. He pointed out, from Scripture, that she must cover her head at all times in order to cover the glory of man (revealed in her hair) when praying in the presence of God. Since she might be praying at any time of the day, she must cover her head at all times, not just in church.

He also explained that any woman with short hair is living in rebellion, and may as well shave her head, it's that bad. He illustrated his point (I suspect, I couldn't see it) by pulling a wig off of a mannequin so all could see just how repulsive a woman looks in a bald head.

He said he sees an "Ichabod" hanging over the head of any woman with cut hair. Essentially he views her as a prostitute, in a state of rebellion.

According to him the only reason that man and women need each other is to reproduce.

I felt that he was locked in concrete thinking. He seems to believe that the head covering has a special power in itself. While he presented a compelling argument, he failed to set it in the wider context of the Word. He is still living according to law, and has no idea of the work of Christ within the heart.

Clearly he has no concept of women (or anyone) submitting to the Lord, and sees her only calling is to submit to a man. In fact, in his conclusion, he exhorted the women by saying, "Now women, which is more important, that piece of cloth, or submitting your heart to a man?" His final instruction was for every woman to "submit your heart to a man". If she was single, she should submit her heart to her father, and if he was too infirmed or not around, she should submit her heart to her pastor.

I pity the pastor who happens to be good looking - for he could find himself with a lot of lonely single women all submitting their hearts to him. Of course that could make him feel reeeal good (!) Seriously, I wonder how many affairs or abusive situations are harbored in this kind of environment. Of course it would be hard to tell because of the silence barrier.

I have come to believe that the danger in any false teaching is not so much in what is actually spoken but what is NOT spoken. In this case the pastor never once spoke about surrendering to Christ, or about the need to mature in the Lord, or about trusting God. He essentially drives all the women (and men) AWAY from Christ, and attempts to keep them in a state of immature dependency - especially on him. (a formula for a multitude of relational/emotional problems)

This cultist-style leader reminds me of the "hired man" that Christ speaks about. He has no love for the sheep, but steals them from the Shepherd. He heavily controls their minds using shame, but yet leaves them exposed to the enemy. Instead of turning people to Christ, he sends them into eternal darkness - all under the thin covering of "Biblical teaching".

For that reason, I believe we must reject this man's teachings, and frankly, him as a spiritual authority. He is promoting a destructive heresy.

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/27 5:20

Quote:
-----For that reason, I believe we must reject this man's teachings, and frankly, him as a spiritual authority. He is promoting a destructive heresy.

This is pretty heavy stuff, Diane. I share some discomfort with you at what I feel is a certain legalism in these circles but I think you have completely misjudged the spirit of the man. Certainly there is an historical mind-set here which is unsettling for some, but I get no impression of this man as a hireling or as one lording over the flock.

We really have to be very cautious before we bring these kind of judgements against anyone. To judge a man's words and ideas is necessary, to judge his intentions and disposition is much more dangerous.

If there are things he said that you want to discuss I am more than willing to oblige, although I don't personally believe that the head covering has any significance outside the gathering of the saints.

Here is a link to the writing of a man whose life greatly impacted my own. He is with the Lord now, and knows even as he was known. I recommend it as dealing with the same topic from a very different perspective.
(http://mp3.biblebase.com/download_44.html) A Sign of Authority.

Re: HEAD COVERINGS - posted by ilive4only1 (), on: 2007/1/27 7:22

Has anyone read what Zac Poonen has written concerning this subject.
<http://www.cfcindia.com/web/mainpages/articles.php?display=article24>

Let me know what you think about what he says.

Although the speaker makes some good points, especially for this day and time, **I personally agree with Diane.**

I listened to The Doctrine of Headship this morning and some of what this man is teaching troubles me. And I quote him "When a woman comes into the presence of God with the glory of man unveiled it is repulsive to God. Just like when I first saw that shaved woman"

It troubles me to think (if I take this man's word literally) that every time I have come into the presence of God I have repulsed Him because I have been unveiled. I was actually brought to tears. :cry: A woman is usually bald due to sickness, disease, or stress? How about just simple old age. Women can inherit baldness. :-)

Having gone through a bout of cancer and chemo, I saw women weekly with "bald heads" and they were not repulsive, and I was not shocked. They were beautiful.

A single woman if not married and has no father, is to be subject to the pastor? Been there, done that. Not good instruction, but I won't even go there.

Also, is a wig considered as a head covering?

One other thing, the speaker says women should have long hair. Speaking as woman of African decent, some of our women have a hard time growing their hair long. It gets to a certain length and that is usually it. How long is long?

Any comments.

Dee :-)

Re: to Ron re headcoverings - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/27 8:17

Hi, Ron, Thank you for the link. It's exciting to read an article that expresses many of the same truths the Spirit himself has been teaching me. He also parallels headcoverings with the ordinances. He even presents an observation that came to me recently, regarding the practice of religious leaders wearing special headpieces while dispensing the ordinances. I believe their headpieces are symbolic of their view of their own authority: they have attributed to themselves an authority that is not theirs – and in that way they have, though likely unconsciously, refused the headship of Christ (as the author pointed out).

I agree with the author that rebellion towards headship filters down through the relationships – even to the children. You see that in family life and in church life, in human institutions. You'll never fix the troubles of rebellious teens without going back to the existing authorities (even as far up as the government's leaders)

Let's admit, the church (I speak of the modern day church institution in general) has usurped the glory of God and has preferred to display man's glory: via the music, the buildings, the traditions, etc etc. Man (including women) crave for status in the church, position, etc to glorify themselves not the Lord. Side note: If I were to honestly symbolize the modern day church I would be best to keep my head covered and have short hair. A headcovering would be a mockery in that sense. (Hang on..)

Regarding gender distinction he says: "Equal but not the same" I embolden that for a reason. Herein, I believe lies a fundamental truth. The woman's role is to represent the Bride of Christ, and that certainly is very exciting. Do we not stand in awe of the marvel of the Church – the workmanship of our Lord? No, we can't as long as we view it as a product of man's efforts!

I agree that when we lose the gender distinctions we also muddle the distinction between man and God – we mix the two together. So man tries to play God and man makes God in his own image. We humanize God's attributes. We try to save our own souls with our own efforts.

In fact, when I deal with unbelievers or those who are disillusioned with the church, I consistently discover that in their minds they have equated God with the church. They have muddled the two together. So I find myself needing to unravel that before we can go on in any discussion.

It cannot be argued that as our society drifts further from God, it also melts down female and male distinctions. Fashion is one obvious example. It is not merely about females refusing to wear hats. (In my experience they rather like covering their heads, even from childhood).

The entire headcovering/hair doctrine seems to underscore the absolute distinction between the two: The Church and Christ – and for this reason I see the importance of pursuing this topic.

However we will not come to an understanding of it all apart from coming to the bed-rock foundation of our faith – rooted in authentic salvation. When we get that right, the rest should fall nicely into place, And the outcome is magnificent: "She becomes a better woman and he becomes a better man." All for the glory of God!

Meanwhile headcoverings will always turn into an issue of custom or fashion, while viewed as a spiritual virtue. The author's caution is worth noting: "The practice of headcovering does not mean that a church is spiritual"

Certainly without the proper function of praying and prophesying (IN THE SPIRIT) in the church, the headcovering hardly has any meaning. After all, (a) man is really running the show, not the Spirit.

The author points out that a woman must put herself under the authority of men – even if he is carnal. There is a sense in which this principle works – even in the nature of things. I see it applied in a very practical way as a musician in the community. I am at times under the authority of a director who makes a poor leader, both in his musical skills and his leadership ability. I have seen musicians stomp off in frustration. Yet, there are those who see the value of submitting for the sake of the bigger picture. And so, in spite of poor leadership a great work of music is produced. A good example is the Handel's Messiah every Christmas. God has received the glory and the prophetic word has been proclaimed, even as a man takes his glorious bow at the end. God's name was glorified because enough people surrendered to a man IN THAT CAPACITY OF LEADERSHIP (not in any other way!)

The same goes for any other kind of relationship with church authority. I refuse to submit to the humanistic/feminist/liberal

al etc position of my denominational leaders at the top of the hierarchy. Yet I submit to those in my own local church lovingly, and it is clear to them that Christ is my Lord and my ultimate authority. (EDIT NB: They permit me that freedom at this time.)

Regarding my earlier comments about the preacher. Perhaps I could have tempered my words and given him more benefit of the doubt. Of course he means well, and wishes to see his flock adhere to the word. Yet, we could say that most in the RC, JW, Mormon C, etc also mean well. Also, any segment of them can take on cultlike qualities if the conditions permit it.

While this man may be less deluded than some, the outcome is potentially just as serious. God must be clearly given headship, not man. To live according to law in a Baptist or Brethren church is just as damning as it is in the RC church.

EDIT: Upon reconsideration of my earlier sermon evaluation, I admit, I cannot rescind any of my words (based merely on what I heard). However, in all fairness, the bigger picture is best assessed by listening to more sermons, and actually examining the congregational life. After all, the proof is in the pudding. There may be enough spiritual strengths within the Body to keep the ship from drifting entirely into cult-land.

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/27 9:58

Quote:

-----Let me know what you think about what he Zac Poonen, says.

I think we are all much affected by our cultures in one way or another and my reaction on reading Zac Poonen's comments is that I would want to broaden the woman's role somewhat from his position. eg "As the Holy Spirit invisibly and silently, yet powerfully helps the believer, even so the woman was created to help the man. The ministry of the Holy Spirit is 'behind the scenes'. So is the woman's to be."

I am not quite comfortable with this position. I do not believe that the woman was created to be 'behind the scenes'. She was intended to have her own place and it is important that the man 'gives it to her' but the concept of her being 'behind the scenes' is not I think adequate to express God's purpose for woman. If we see the woman as symbolising the church we can see what I am getting at. The church is not 'behind the scenes'. She is certainly not to exalt herself or draw attention to herself and this is symbolised in her covering of the head, but 'behind the scenes'? no, I don't think so.

Other than this personally I find a lot of common ground with Zac Poonen's view.

Quote:

-----One other thing, the speaker says women should have long hair. Speaking as woman of African decent, some of our women have a hard time growing their hair long. It gets to a certain length and that is usually it. How long is long?

Somewhere on this site I have shared earlier about what I think the significance of 'long hair' really means. The Greek word does not mean 'long' essentially but 'tended hair' which would generally mean 'long' but the length is not the essence; the essence is the 'hairdo'! It is appropriate, among the gathered saints, that the 'hairdo' is covered as a symbol of the hidden beauty of the church whose day of revelation is yet future.

Re: to Philologos - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/27 11:00

Quote:

----- If there are things he said that you want to discuss I am more than willing to oblige,

Philologos, Iâ'm going to take up your offer.

Quote:

----- I think you have completely misjudged the spirit of the man.

Something completely boggles my mind here, and I wonder if you can unboggle it. (I mean that humbly)

Maybe you are right regarding my opinion. I suppose the preacher merely needs to have his own Holy Ghost encounter, and for now we can overlook his flaws. Yet, I am wondering, if a spiritual authority in the church can pronounce an Ichabod on all females who don't wear head coverings and long hair, and essentially implies that same curse for all men who allow such "evil" practise, is that not a rather slanderous accusation against the Body of Christ? Surely that is a horrendous pronouncement of judgment against our brothers and sisters! Should we pass by that lightly?

Why should we temper our concerns regarding such people and offer them amnesty within the Body, while at the same time we pronounce strong reprimands against yet-unrefined saints who out of immaturity merely lose their temper and shoot out abrasive words they quickly regret when their anger subsides? (those ones really do little harm by comparison)

Quote:

----- Certainly there is an historical mind-set here which is unsettling for some

Of course, I am not unsettled by the practise per se, but I believe I have a reason to be unsettled about manner in which it is used in this particular case. Unless someone convinces me otherwise, I simply cannot pass a casual eye over the misuse of a Biblical teaching that I know from the testimony of many, many has caused untold damage. (I'm referring to the unbiblical interpretation of authority - and that doesn't necessarily imply that headcoverings even enter the picture.)

boggled,
Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/27 14:39

Quote:

----- Yet, I am wondering, if a spiritual authority in the church can pronounce an Ichabod on all females who don't wear head coverings and long hair, and essentially implies that same curse for all men who allow such "evil" practise, is that not a rather slanderous accusation against the Body of Christ? Surely that is a horrendous pronouncement of judgment against our brothers and sisters! Should we pass by that lightly?

I have heard people pronounce the word Ichabod with such venom that it made your toes curl, but this speaker is not one of them. I think his 'Ichabod' is a description rather than a judgment. For him it is a sign that the 'glory has departed' rather than a threat that it will depart. I don't agree with him in this but I want to give him the benefit of any doubt.

Quote:

----- I'm referring to the unbiblical interpretation of authority - and that doesn't necessarily imply that headcoverings even enter the picture.

You will hear no opposition from me on this general theme. I think biblical authority is tragically misunderstood in much of evangelical Christianity.

Re: - posted by bereangirl, on: 2007/1/27 15:42

This thread has been very interesting and thought provoking. I am honestly not sure where I stand on this issue. I'm a true fence-sitter here.

Headcoverings has never been part of my church experience so far. I did do some research on it on-line last year and found every opinion under the sun. I also found out that Orthodox Jewish women cover their hair completely once they are married. I'm assuming here (I'd have to do some history digging to find out for sure) that that practice may have been in Paul's day also. In that context removing a head covering would be equivalent to someone saying they don't have to wear their wedding ring anymore and taking it off. Perhaps that's why it is the symbol of authority. I will have to dig further on this one. :-D

As I'm not familiar with headcoverings, just out of my own curiosity, for the women here that do wear one, what do you wear? I'm just curious and thought it would be interesting to get some feedback. Please just send me a PM so we don't clutter up this thread with non-essential stuff.

Thanks!

Sonja

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/27 17:11

Quote:
-----I also found out that Orthodox Jewish women cover their hair completely once they are married. I'm assuming here (I'd have to do some history digging to find out for sure) that that practice may have been in Paul's day also. In that context removing a head covering would be equivalent to someone saying they don't have to wear their wedding ring anymore and taking it off. Perhaps that's why it is the symbol of authority. I will have to dig further on this one.

The place where this 'contextual' variation idea breaks down is in that Paul insists that men, and that would include Jewish men, should not cover their heads. This went against centuries of tradition.

Whatever is behind this has to fit both the 'uncovering of the man' and the 'covering of the woman'.

Quote:
-----As I'm not familiar with headcoverings, just out of my own curiosity, for the women here that do wear one, what do you wear? I'm just curious and thought it would be interesting to get some feedback. Please just send me a PM so we don't clutter up this thread with non-essential stuff.

It might be 'non-essential' but it will really add some local colour if you ladies answered it here. As for me, my head 'uncovering' is mostly pink with a little grey border! :-D

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/1/27 18:03

Quote:
-----As for me, my head 'uncovering' is mostly pink with a little grey border!

:-P

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/28 1:01

Philologos,

Quote:

-----It might be 'non-essential' but it will really add some local colour if you ladies answered it here.

So you want some color? How does white sound like to you? Is that ok?

I wear white. Now if you really want to get in a royal fight you can discuss color, the merits of black vs white. But methinks that is not edifying and destroys. What color one should wear should be between you and the LORD. The Scriptures do not dictate the color nor the style, so one must listen to the Holy Spirit for direction in this matter. Personally, I have good reasons to wear white but I will not expose this at this moment on a public forum.

What do you think about that, Ron? or anyone else for that matter...

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/1/28 4:47

Much affected sanctity may exist where there is a most proud and corrupt heart.

A man should be on his guard always against one who, under, pretence of extraordinary sanctity, professes to despise the ordinary dress and usages of society.

Not in any honour. That is, there is no real honour in these things; there is nothing to ennoble and elevate the soul; nothing that is to be commended.

Colossians 2:20-23 Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (Touch not; taste not; handle not; Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.

A Quote by Albert Barnes: "To the satisfying of the flesh." The only effect is, to satisfy or please the flesh; that is, the carnal and corrupt nature, for so the word flesh is often used in the Scriptures. The effect of these observances, on which so much stress is laid as if they would promote piety, is merely to gratify pride, self-righteousness, the love of distinction, and the other carnal propensities of our nature. There seems to be a great deal of humility and piety in them; there is really little else than pride, selfishness, and ambition.

This keeps the body of Christ in correction and control by the collective and chosen power the religious piety of church discipline supposedly has by special chosen scriptures that are taken out of context, so the higher powers in the church supposedly can keep control of the body, their church.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/28 4:55

Quote:

-----This keeps the body of Christ in correction and control by the collective and chosen power the religious piety of church discipline supposedly has by special chosen scriptures that are taken out of context, so the higher powers in the church supposedly can keep control of the body, their church.

What on earth does this mean? Are you saying that for a man to uncover his head is a carnal ordinance? How about wa

ter-baptism and breaking of bread?

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/28 22:15

Paul,

I told my husband about this thread and what you said, so he told me to ask you whether your "headcovering" is Biblical ?!! ;-) Then he reminded of what one preacher said: some preachers use their head to grow hair, others use their heads to think! :-P

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/1/28 22:46

If one under the religious fervor of the organized church uses head coverings, hair lengths, baptisms, breaking of bread, etc, it is a travesty to what God intended Jesus Christ to be to the Body of Christ, His Church. We are son's and if we are to emulate Jesus Christ the Son, then all these things being used to make the church, that is the organized church, used by man to control people and keep their pensions and medical Insurance, in their church. Yes they are carnal ordinances.

Hebrews 6:1-3 Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this will we do, if God permit.

There is nothing wrong with all ordinances unless they are used under the law and make not keeping them take away from the preciousness of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross. The love of God shed abroad in our hearts by Christ Jesus that is born again in us, will and gives back to God reciprocal Love on our part, all will take care of itself by the Holy Spirit teaching us this love and how we should give it and receive it, not only to God, but to each other as Jesus Gave Command; "Love one another as I have love you" and "gave myself for you".

Who loved us first, Who loved His Father and did the Father's Will above all. That is our capacity in Christ, to do the Will of God on this earth and Know Christ and make Him known.

Not argue and make people bad because they have long hair or short hair and if their head is covered or not.

Jhn 14:28 Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.

Jhn 16:27 For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.

2Cr 12:15 And I will very gladly spend and be spent for you; though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved.

John 14:31 But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence.

John 14:27-28 Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid. Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/29 2:00

Quote:

-----Then he reminded of what one preacher said: some preachers use their head to grow hair, others use their heads to think!

If these are the only alternatives my choice was made for me! ;-) The whole purpose of this thread is that we should 'think' and consider the significance of this topic. It reminded me of the old saying that "God gave some men good looks and to the others he gave hair!" :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/29 2:04

Quote:
-----If one under the religious fervor of the organized church uses head coverings, hair lengths, baptisms, breaking of bread, etc, it is a travesty to what God intended Jesus Christ to be to the Body of Christ, His Church.

Who is talking about the 'organised church'? and who is talking about any kind of compulsion? We are just trying to understand the significance of a piece of inspired scripture.

Re: Woman's Head Covering - posted by enid, on: 2007/1/29 2:13

What about wigs? I'm not being funny, just trying to establish if a wig is seen as a head covering or not.

I do know of women who wear wigs, but not head coverings, so are their heads covered or not?

Also, is it okay for men to wear wigs? Some do.

If a wig is not seen as a head covering, then it should be okay for men to wear them in church, yes?

I know there is nothing in scripture about wearing wigs, I think, but what do we say about it?

Just food for thought.

God bless.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/29 3:53

I don't think this would constitute a ban on wigs. (Gee, some of the things we discuss here! :-D) But the symbolism of 'covering the woman's glory' would not allow, I think, for a wig to be a substitute for a covering, anymore than these verses allow 'tended hair' to be a substitute for a covering.

One of the themes in this topic is that a covering was intended to make the woman/church less conspicuous. If you wear the latest Paris fashion and everyone admires your hat, you have probably missed the point. ;-)

As regards men and wigs? I feel unqualified to comment. I have just never been able to get into the mind-set of men who wear wigs or pierce their bodies. I am not saying it is wrong, just that I just cannot understand it! :-? ...added to which I reckon I can spot one from a 100 meters away!

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/1/29 10:46

Quote:
-----I reckon I can spot one from a 100 meters away!

Yeah, especially on Increase Mather or Matthew Henry. Those Puritans were *dead* giveaways!

:-o

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/1/29 15:41

I have not gone back and read every post on this thread, but I saw the post about wigs and had to say something.

I believe that women should wear headcoverings in church, but not in everyday life. Now I don't care if they were one all the time, but I don't think it's a command in Scripture.

The woman's hair isn't the covering because the Bible says men shouldn't be covered, so if it was the hair all of us guys would have to shave our heads bald. :-P

As for the wig, since the hair is not the covering, some substitute hair wouldn't matter would it?

Jordan

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/29 17:51

Phillip,

Do you call Jesus your LORD? How to you relate to a lord? Who calls the shots, you the servant, or the lord and master ? Do you have the right as a servant to argue with the lord's demands?

Just wondering...and would like to hear your response...

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/29 18:23

Quote:
-----Do you call Jesus your LORD? How to you relate to a lord? Who calls the shots, you the servant, or the lord and master? Do you have the right as a servant to argue with the lord's demands?

Here's an interesting juxtaposition of verses for you...

Â“For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, as **Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord**, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.Â” (1Pet 3:5-6 NKJV)

Â“But God said to Abraham, Â“Do not let it be displeasing in your sight because of the lad or because of your bondwoman. **Whatever Sarah has said to you, listen to her voice**; for in Isaac your seed shall be called.Â” (Gen 21:12 NKJV) ;-) ;-)

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/29 18:32

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----Here's an interesting juxtaposition of verses for you

Â“For in this manner, in former times, the holy women who trusted in God also adorned themselves, being submissive to their own husbands, as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters you are if you do good and are not afraid with any terror.Â” (1Pet 3:5-6 NKJV. Â“But God said to Abraham, Â“Do not let it be displeasing in your sight because of the lad or because of your bondwoman. Whatever Sarah has said to you, listen to her voice; for in Isaac your seed shall be called.Â” (Gen 21:12 NKJV)

LOL - only Ron would think of this! :-D

ginnyrose

Re: which head covering????????? - posted by roadsign (), on: 2007/1/29 18:55

Quote:
----- one of the themes in this topic is that a covering was intended to make the woman/church less conspicuous .

Ahhhh, Ron, you almost had me convicted there. I have scarves ready to put on my head next Sunday. But IÂ’d stand out for sure Â– big time, as I am always at the front. I really donÂ’t know what I could put on my head that would NOT make me conspicuous Â...

..oh, yeah, I do have some nice plain dark-colour bows and beretsÂ... TheyÂ’d work. .. Would they???

Diane

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/1/29 19:46

Ginnyrose, Jesus is first my life, it is no longer I who live but Christ who lives in me. I am no longer a servant but a son. Jesus Christ is my Brother and His God and Father are my God and Father. I do as Christ does by His Spirit that is in me. Jesus Christ is My Life and all that I do is in and through Him. The Holy Spirit teaches me this Jesus who is my life and that life is full of all that He is. The Love of the Father, The love of My Brother, Jesus Christ and the Soul/Mind taught by The Holy Spirit is who I am and that makes me in all humility that Christ is, learning the same as He learned by the things I suffer. How much more can I make Jesus Lord, God my Father and The Holy Spirit my Teacher, by what God Has Done, by making me a new Creature in Christ Jesus as my Lord, Life and All that I am.

I don't do as a servant, I do as beloved family member of God My Father and His Son my Brother and Lord, The Holy Spirit, His Teacher, because of Love that was birthed in me when I was Born Again from Above, where I am now seated in Heavenly Places with Jesus Christ and only waiting for resurrection morning to physically be with Them, for I am with Them in spirit and soul NOW.

1Cr 7:21 Art thou called a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use rather.

1Cr 7:22 For he that is called in the Lord, a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, free, is Christ's servant.

Gal 4:1 Now I say, the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all;

Gal 4:7 Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.

Are we Free in Christ, In Christ we are servants, not because He demands it but because He is a Servant also by decree of God our Father.

Galatians 5:1-6 Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, who soever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

Let us not allow works to take over again, when we are saved by Grace By Faith which is Gods.

Galatians 5:7-13 Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth? This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. I have confidence in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be. And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased. I would they were even cut off which trouble you. For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.

Servants of each other by the Servant that is Born Again in us: Phillip

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/1/30 3:03

Quote:

-----LOL - only Ron would think of this!

It had a serious point too. We must resist every notion in this thread which would bring in a sense of woman being 'subservient' to man. There is nothing 'less' about the woman. This is voluntary submission, as the church to Christ, not a heavy handed imposition or a servile cringing.

Sarah was not afraid of Abraham and at this time in particular she 'had the word of God' but her whole disposition was one in which she submitted to her 'lord'. This phrase, which is applicable to us all, comes to mind "your servants, for Jesus'sake".

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/30 7:16

Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----It had a serious point too. We must resist every notion in this thread which would bring in a sense of woman being 'subservient' to man. There is nothing 'less' about the woman. This is voluntary submission, as the church to Christ, not a heavy handed imposition or a servile cringing.

Ron, you are exactly right!

Many think that by veiling ones head, we are in effect declaring we are inferior to males. I suggest that by applying the headcovering, God is raising us females up to a level unknown to the general population.

At the time of this being written, females were held in low esteem. I am told males would thank God they were not created females! (How arrogant can a body get!!) Actually, they thanked God for three things and this was one of them.

We have to rely on history recorded elsewhere about males attitudes towards females. During the time of Christ it had sunk to a low that reflected the attitudes of the pagan society in surrounding cultures. (The Jews had imbibed this mentality during their time of captivity in foreign nations. Thanks! Alvin Schmidt, author of "Under the Influence".) When Jesus came, he came to restore ALL things, among them to raise the level of appreciation of ALL humans, including females. This is the essence of love: love your neighbor, be it male or female.

The apostles did this. Consider how they related to females - read the book of Acts. Then read Romans 16. There you will read how Paul instructs the church in Roman to render assistance to the women who needed it and he expresses appreciation for services rendered by females...this is hardly the attitude of a woman hater, is it?

Since Eve was the first to move in disobedience to God's command, women have been held in contempt ever since: She is not one to be trusted! However, with the act of submitting to the wearing of a covering, she is saying now to all who will see her: I am now acting in submission to God! I will only speak and act in accordance to His will, not my own! God, speaking through the Holy Spirit inspired Paul to teach this principle to all the churches (1Cor. 11:16.) (1Cor. 14:37.). If we refuse to bow to this sign, are we not again repeating the sin Eve committed in the garden by doing it our own way because we think that to display our hair in all its glory is a "delight to the eyes", "it is desirable to make one wise"?

Now read 1 Corinthians 11: 1-16 again.

Blessings,
ginnyrose

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/1/30 7:46

Phillip,
Thanks for replying to my question. I did not notice your reply until now...

About servanthood: Paul in many places identifies himself as a servant of Jesus Christ. The terms servant and lord always indicate a relationship of order in authority. The servant obeys his master who calls the shots. The scripture uses these terms quite liberally.

Now about faith. What is faith? Does not the application of faith ALWAYS means action on my part? Consider Hebrews 11. There you have the rollcall of OT saints who acted in belief to God's commands and were accounted for righteousness. It was their behaviours that earned them this distinction. The behaviours resulted from obedience to God's will. The commands God exacted from them were not some that were written down for inspiration, but those that were inspired by their love for God (and likely the prompting of the Holy Spirit although the Scriptures do not explicitly say so.)

So then, being free from the bondage or weight of sin, we are free to run with Jesus the race that is set before us. And when you run you are not sitting idly by doing nothing. Heb. 12:1.

Nowhere did I indicate that the application of 1 Corinthians 11 will guarantee one entrance into heaven. The application of this scripture is in no sense a bondage, unless you call baptism, communion bondage. Or perhaps loving ones enemy is bondage, or the command to not commit murder, or steal, or commit adultery being bondage. Are his commands grievous? I suggest they are if you serve self. When self has been crucified, these behaviours will characterize the life of the believer. It is not the actions one does that impresses God, but they result from our love and appreciation for who He is by being obedient. Jesse Yoder, a now deceased pastor used to say: "Spiritual maturity is reached when obedience becomes a joy!" I agree. This is the essence of my post.

ginnyrose