

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: We need to cover head covering**

**We need to cover head covering - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/10 19:54**

I admit that this is not the first post and perhaps not the last about this topic.

In this audio verse-by-verse bible study Zac Poonen explains the head covering in 1. Cor 11 1-16 in a masterful way.

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=16268>

I recently convinced my wife and daughter about it and they practise it since. It caused me and my wife to take a deep look into these issues, and I too had closer look into my responsibility as the head of the household under Christ. It was quite a discovery for me.

Our church does not practise head covering although some women do. For me head covering is the outward display of an inward conviction about godly authority. The reason we have so many objections and find this commandment so difficult to introduce in our churches is I think is because of the confusion Satan has caused in the perception of true manhood and womanhood in the world and in the church. Head covering seems to be a small and "nasty" commandment to obey so that many think it is not that important. If you practise it you may quickly be branded as legalistic and narrowminded. I think our attitude to head covering reveals a lot about our understanding of godly authority.

Poonen debunks the typical 2 arguments against it which are the believe that the women's natural hair is her covering during the worship service and the other argument that this was only for the first century (Another form of cessationism, is n't it?)

Paul ends this teaching with a strong statement:

1. Cor 11:16 If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God.

Philip

**Re: We need to cover head covering - posted by enid, on: 2008/2/11 7:22**

All I can say is let battle commence.

God bless.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 9:54**

Oh boy... I can see already whats on the menu this week... **legalism**.

I posted the following just a few minutes ago on the Sabbath thread... and it applied here too, since your relying more on Poonen than scripture:

*Just an observation here... but why dont people on here argue their points using scripture anymore? Everyone quotes Spurgeon, Pink, Pratney... etc... as tho their words were God breathed.*

*I love Spurgeon, but if something he said doesnt jive w/ scripture, I'll dump Spurgeon in a heartbeat. (Same is to be said for Poonen or whoever your favorite teacher is)*

*This is the same type of mentality that got me caught up in the Charismatic/WOF movememnt when I was first saved. I listened to mens opinions about the Bible instead of studying to show myself approved. But then... I was newly saved and very immature in the faith.*

*Just wondering...*

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 9:56

Quote:

-----Oh boy... I can see already whats on the menu this week... legalism.

-----  
Yep, the curse of Christianity.

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 9:59

I do want to point out that if someone is wholly convinced in their heart that they should wear a head covering, then I say God bless you. By all means, wear it! If you were convinced you should, and you didnt, then you would sinning against your own conscience.

The trouble comes in when we try to convince others that they should as well, and we make a law out of it... which I have seen happen over and over and over again with subjects such as this.

Krispy

Re: We need to cover head covering - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/2/11 10:03

We practice head coverings as well, although I have to admit it is for a totally different reason. It was -15f with a -35f windchill yesterday. It is now a balmy -7f out. :-) :-) :-)

In all reality, if this works for you and your household, go for it. If you are doing this to show a reverence for the Lord, great. If you are doing this to show your reverence to man, not so great. Regardless, I am sure that you understand that you and your family are not bound by headcoverings in order to be a believer.

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 10:54

Quote:

-----In all reality, if this works for you and your household, go for it. If you are doing this to show a reverence for the Lord, great. If you are doing this to show your reverence to man, not so great. Regardless, I am sure that you understand that you and your family are not bound by headcoverings in order to be a believer.

-----  
And thats pretty much what I was trying to say as well. Amen.

But the title of this thread hints at legalism... "We **Need** A Head Covering".

And scripture clearly says "no we dont".

Krispy

Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/11 10:58

Can I just say briefly that head covering and 1 Corinthians 11 has to do with headship. i.e.

*3But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.  
(1 Cor 11 v3)*

This principle is the key in my opinion. It ties in with Paul's other teaching about a woman's position in the church. In fact it goes back to the Garden of Eden.

*11Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.*

*12But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.*

*13For Adam was first formed, then Eve.*

*14And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.*

*(1 Tim 2 v 11-14)*

In my experience this teaching has become unpopular which is unfortunate because it is the way God has it and His way is obviously the best way for all of us. There has been many reasons for this namely

1. Abuse of position by men.
2. The intrusion of liberal thinking in churches.
3. Picking and choosing scriptures we like.

I could go on but don't mean to bore you. This is not a sexist argument. Men and women are equal. It's all about our **position** in the Body of Christ.

*11Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord.*

*12For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God.*

*1 Cor 11 v11-12*

Should women wear hats (or other form of head covering)? I think for a born again believing woman she could consider this a privilege and not a sign that she is beneath her male counterparts.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 12:00**

Amen Krispy.

If I might add as well.

If your doing it because you think it will make you righteous before God, our righteousness is not obtained by what we do, but WHO we trust in. If any righteousness comes from us, it's a result of what He is doing in us, and not by our will.

But regarding "head covering". Your wife's headcovering is YOU. As men, our head covering is Christ, and Christ head is God.

It was Eve who stepped out of line in the garden, therefore she needs to submit to her husband. It has nothing to do with clothes, it all has to do with a submission. A wife can put on all the clothes to "act" the appearance of a submitted woman but in her heart she might be rebellious.

"The Letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life".

If she can wear it without attaching righteousness to it, by all means, be blessed. If not, then you've fallen from grace.

Some things to consider carefully.

Quote:

-----Galatians 3:6 Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.  
-----

Quote:

-----Ephesians 2:8 For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:  
-----

Quote:

-----1 Corinthians 11:3 But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.  
-----

Quote:

-----Galatians 2:21 I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

-----  
**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/2/11 12:14**

Hello...

Recently, my wife and I were discussing the concept of physical "head coverings" by various individuals. We don't believe in or practice such a thing, but we were interested in the rationale behind such a practice.

Are there any other verses, outside of the single passage in I Corinthians, upon which this doctrinal persuasion is based? Are there any examples from the Bible (old or new Covenants) in which we see women required to wear such things?

Anyway, thanks (in advance) for the help!

:-)

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/11 12:47**

May I suggest everyone to listen to Zac Poonen's Bible study first to see where I/he is coming from. He really explains it well.

I am either right or wrong, I do not think this truth is up to our own conscience such as drinking wine, eating meat or keeping certain days.

Thanks,  
Philip

**Re: We need to cover head covering, on: 2008/2/11 12:56**

"But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for hair is given her for a covering."

I don't get this. Paul's comments say that a woman's hair IS her covering and that it is a shame only if her head is shorn and uncovered.

no place does it say that a woman who has hair on her head should be covered.

bub

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/11 13:31**

Quote:

-----"But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for hair is given her for a covering.

I don't get this. Paul's comments say that a woman's hair IS her covering and that it is a shame only if her head is shorn and uncovered.

"

-----  
Following your rationale, verse 4 of 1 Cor 11 states

*4Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head.*

This would mean a man would have to have his head shaven to pray. ???

**Re: - posted by mission101 (), on: 2008/2/11 13:36**

So does this mean that everything that is not agreed upon by all Christianity is Legalism??  
I do believe the doctrine of the head covering is in scripture. It is an outward sign of an inward submission to authority. It is based in 1 Corinthians 11. One thing that really spoke to me is that if you were to try and replace the word covering with another word such as hair or husband or father of a daughter the verses don't make any sense!

I am wondering...Have you ever taken the time to examine a subject from someone else's point of view; or will those of us who are labeled as Legalists always be trodden down for believing things that are vague to the greater part of Christendom??

One last thought, the man is the head of the woman and she is the glory of man... wouldn't we want the glory of man to be covered?

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 13:45**

Quote:

-----So does this mean that everything that is not agreed upon by all Christianity is Legalism??  
-----

No, that's not what I said at all... it becomes legalism when we take something such as head coverings and make that the focus and the measure by which we judge spirituality.

There is nothing wrong with a woman wearing a head covering, especially if she is doing so out of pure heart toward the Lord and her husband.

But many times it becomes a stumbling block because those who do wear head coverings can sometimes begin to look down upon those who do not.

And the same can happen for those who don't wear them.

The focus and measure of our spirituality... of our faith... is Jesus.

Period.

Anything else is an idol.

Quote:

-----I do believe the doctrine of the head covering is in scripture. It is an outward sign of an inward submission to authority.  
-----

... and in the OT that was all part of what the Old Covenant was about. Head coverings, circumcision, etc etc. It was all symbolic outward type stuff. And didn't Jesus come against that stuff IF there was nothing inside?

Jesus called the pharisees "white washed tombs"... beautiful on the outside but filled with dead men's bones. In other words, Jesus wasn't interested in what the outside looked like, He wanted to know what the INSIDE looked like.

I know women who wear head coverings, and for the most part they seem spiritual and submissive and sweet... and I'm sure they really are. HOWEVER, I've known a few that I wouldn't give you 2 cents for. (Not that I'm in the business of buying women! You know what I mean tho...)

On the outside they have all the signs and symbols of submission and spirituality... but on the inside they stink.

Kinda like when I make my 4 yr old son sit down at the dinner table instead of standing in his chair. He may be sitting on the outside... but I can tell by his face he's still standing on the inside.

Jesus did away with all that outward junk. I'm not talking about dressing modestly and humbly. Scripture does have a lot to say about those things. But we don't have to wear special head coverings and what not in order to be in a right relationship with God.

You certainly wouldn't demand that a 35 yr old man who just saved to go get a circumcision, would you? That was an outward sign just like a head covering is. Well, why then would you insist that Christian women need to wear a head covering?

Besides, there is no way you can get from scripture that a NT woman is to wear head coverings. Paul is very plain about the whole issue, and Bubba nailed it. Go back and read his post.

Now, as said before... I'm NOT against head coverings. It's none of my business if someone other than my wife wants to wear one. But you can not demand that of others.

Quote:

-----May I suggest everyone to listen to Zac Poonen's Bible study first to see where I/he is coming from.  
He really explains it well.  
-----

As for hearing Poonen's discussion about it... I respect the man, but I couldn't care less what he has to say on the subject. I care about what scripture says. And I would love to hear **YOUR** thoughts and impressions about it instead... since you're here and you're who we are talking to.

Rather than bring this topic to the forefront of the forum, and then defer to Poonen when we have questions we want to ask of you, why not just tell us what **YOU** think?

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 14:00

Quote:

-----I am wondering...Have you ever taken the time to examine a subject from someone else's point of view; or will those of us who are labeled as Legalists always be trodden down for believing things that are vague to the greater part of Christendom??  
-----

I see you're new. Welcome to SI! Glad you're here.

Before you begin to label everyone and condemn us for things we haven't done or said, I would recommend you avail yourself of the literally THOUSANDS of different discussions that we have all had with each other over the **years**.

You're welcome to join in, and I'm looking forward to talking to you... but don't start out this way, my friend. You don't know any of us yet. At least give us time to make you hate us! :- ) (kidding of course)

And it might surprise you to know that I have been labeled a legalist as well... and I've been labeled the opposite of a legalist. I guess it's all in the eye of the beholder... kinda like a log.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 14:13**

In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things love.

Head coverings is hardly an essential, my brothers and sisters.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by mission101 (), on: 2008/2/11 14:23**

Well I agree with your statments about taking doctrins and using them to make ourselves look more spiritual than others. We should only look at each person as being in Christ. Like if you were to draw a big circle and put the God's perfect will as a dot in the center everybody in that circle could be considered in Christ. some might be on the left and some on the r ight but we are all IN CHRIST.

I'm sure it looks to the rest of the SI community that I'm starting off in a very bold condemning way...IT was not meant th at way at all and if anyone out there is scared to death of my first post don't be... I just thought I'd join in the fray so to sp eak. It will take some knocking around before I learn how to say things and how not to. A little toe stepping on from each of us is good. I really should do this the formal way and hopefully I will get to before I do to much more posting.

~ The new kid on the block

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/11 14:26**

Quote:

-----Head coverings is hardly an essential, my brothers and sisters.

OK, but it is pleasing to our Lord and Saviour because it reflects headship. If this is ignored then the outward expression is that we are ignoring headship which is rebellion against God in our hearts and this is serious and can't be written off a s a non-essential!

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 14:31**

Quote:

-----I'm sure it looks to the rest of the SI community that I'm starting off in a very bold condemning way...IT was not meant that way at all and if anyone out there is scared to death of my first post don't be... I just thought I'd join in the fray so to speak. It will take some knocking around befo re I learn how to say things and how not to. A little toe stepping on from each of us is good. I really should do this the formal way and hopefully I will ge t to before I do to much more posting.

Mission, dont sweat it! Your post wasnt that bad... I just wanted to make sure we're on the same page!

Like I said, I'm glad you're hear, and trust me... my mouth knows the taste of my foot quite well, and I hardly think you'll c ome close to saying the wrong thing at the wrong time like I have! lol...

Welcome!

Krispy

Re: - posted by mission101 (), on: 2008/2/11 14:32

Quote:

Head coverings is hardly an essential, my brothers and sisters.

Some people's essentials might differ from yours and is that acceptable??

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/2/11 14:33

**Exodus 29:18 (NKJV)**

Then burn the entire ram on the altar. It is a burnt offering to the LORD, a pleasing aroma, an offering made to the LORD by fire.

This was also pleasing to the Lord. Would you say that it is still permissible to burn rams in sacrifices because it "pleases the Lord"? How about incense? This is another pleasing aroma to the Lord. Do we still need to burn incense when worshipping in order to please Him?

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 14:33

Quote:

-----OK, but it is pleasing to our Lord and Saviour because it reflects headship. If this is ignored then the outward expression is that we are ignoring headship which is rebellion against God in our hearts and this is serious and can't be written off as a non-essential!

It's only pleasing to Him if that's how He meant to be interpreted thru Paul in that one section of scripture... which I wholly believe He did not. You don't have to understand much about grammar to properly understand that Paul was not saying that women should wear head coverings... she already has one. In fact, Paul stated that if someone wanted to contend with him on the issue, he wasn't interested (in so many words).

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 14:43

Quote:

-----This was also pleasing to the Lord. Would you say that it is still permissible to burn rams in sacrifices because it "pleases the Lord"? How about incense? This is another pleasing aroma to the Lord. Do we still need to burn incense when worshipping in order to please Him?

... or tithes, or circumcision, or temple taxes, or celebrating passover, or celebrating the feast of tents, or (fill in the blank)...

It's interesting that one thing leads to another with those who wish to pick and choose which parts of the OT law they want to obey, and convince others to obey them along with them.

Paul had a name for false teachers who did that: "Judaizers" (not sure I spelled that right)

**Galatians 3:1-2** O foolish Galatians, who hath **bewitched** you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Je



*...sus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?*

**Galations 5:2-4** *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, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.*

Soooo... basically, if you insist the believer must tithe, or wear a head covering, or be circumcised, or whatever... then YOU ARE OBLIGATED TO KEEP THE WHOLE LAW.

...not to mention that Christ has become of no effect on you.

I'll take grace. :-)

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 15:37

Quote:  
-----You certainly wouldn't demand that a 35 yr old man who just saved to go get a circumcision, would you? That was an outward sign just like a head covering is. Well, why then would you insist that Christian women need to wear a head covering?  
-----

OUCH!! Good Point! :-P

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 15:42

Yea... my vasectomy was bad enough. At least most of us don't remember circumcision! lol...

(watch... in about an hour there will be a debate over whether a Christian should get a vasectomy! It's shaping up to be that kind of week, I think!)

Krispy

Re: - posted by poet (), on: 2008/2/11 15:44

Let's look at this at another angle..

I want to go to Kenya,

I was invited by a missionary friend for my Wife and I to go and help during one of the tours he goes on.

My wife was told, oh by the way, you must wear a long dress there, NO PANTS.

I have a choice, either ignore him and let my wife wear pants, or humble ourselves or herself and wear a dress.

Why, because of the culture there at this time.

The people will not receive a woman who wears pants because they think the woman is elevating herself to a position of authority that does not belong, and to try and speak into someone's life with that apparent attitude will not work.

Her rights must be left on the wayside for the sake of the gospel.

In Paul's day when he wrote that verse about head coverings, I am quite sure that did apply, for the sake of the gospel they submitted to covering to not cause offense.

To try and make a doctrine over this issue is purely Legalistic.

If here in America men saw women as being non-submissive and it caused people to fall away from Christ because of head covering, I suppose we would ask women to cover their heads.

And as for men, if I was asked by my pastor I need to wear a suit and tie to church because someone was stumbling over it, I would buy a suit.

Christ is more important than our Rights, or whether our heads are covered or we have suits on, or can I have a coffee cup in the sanctuary.

Whew.. glad that's over...

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 15:52

Poet... thats pretty simple:

**1 Corinthians 9:22** *To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*

**1 Corinthians 10:33** *Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may be saved.*

**1 Corinthians 8:8-9** *But meat (HEAD COVERINGS) commendeth us **not** to God: for neither, if we eat (WEAR A HEAD COVERING), are we the better; neither, if we eat (WEAR A HEAD COVERING) not, are we the worse. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak.*

Krispy

Re: Quotable - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/2/11 15:52

Quote:  
-----Just an observation here... but why dont people on here argue their points using scripture anymore? Everyone quotes Spurgeon, Pink, Pratney... etc... as tho their words were God breathed.  
-----

Sure you will catch the irony here ... but to paraphrase a quote being quoted by Alister Begg, who was quoting someone else;

*The wise man quotes those who are wiser than themselves*

8-)

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 15:54

Good point Mike... I guess I should be quoting from everybody! lol

Krispy

Re:, on: 2008/2/11 16:00

Quote:  
-----And as for men, If I was asked by my pastor I need to wear a suit and tie to church because someone was stumbling over it, I would buy a suit.  
-----

Great Post Poet. Just a quick question though, how would someone stumble over me not wearing a suit and tie?

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/2/11 16:06

Compliments wrote:

Quote:  
-----  
...how would someone stumble over me not wearing a suit and tie?  
-----

How about those that might stumble if they saw *me* wearing a suit and tie? :-) :-) Can go both ways.

Would some stumble if they saw Adam and Eve wearing a fig covering?

**Re: - posted by poet (), on: 2008/2/11 16:28**

I dont know exactly all the workings of the mind.  
what offends one but not another?  
I suppose we must always go with the leading of the spirit in all situations.  
:-)

I once had a friend who's church split over the music.  
WOW.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 16:41**

I stumbled in a suit once... mainly because the cuffs needed to be hemmed up. Too long in the legs...

:-P

Krispy

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/11 16:42**

Quote:  
-----Then burn the entire ram on the altar. It is a burnt offering to the LORD, a pleasing aroma, an offering made to the LORD by fire.  
  
This was also pleasing to the Lord. Would you say that it is still permissible to burn rams in sacrifices because it "pleases the Lord"? How about incense? This is another pleasing aroma to the Lord. Do we still need to burn incense when worshiping in order to please Him?  
-----

1 Corinthians 11 has nothing to do with the Sacrificial Law. The Sacrificial Law was for the Jewish nation. The issue at stake here is order in the church or the assembly. This is New Testament doctrine we're dealing with and there's too much hiding behind 'legalism' in this thread as if we can just ignore what Paul is teaching the Church.

Today's modern churches have become so apostate and worldly that I admit to try and argue a case for head coverings borders on the ridiculous as most so called Christians don't understand the principle behind it, which I keep emphasizing is Headship. This is for our benefit!

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/2/11 17:26**

davym wrote:

Quote:  
-----This is for our benefit!  
-----

Hey davym,

Shouldn't this be for God's benefit? As in for glorifying the Lord?

Also, you want to take out the talk of legalism, but this is exactly what head coverings is accomplishing, creating a form of legalism on someone that is free from such. Head coverings is a work.

The mere fact that head coverings are included in the NT says something about the regard that it was given. I have by no means displaced this meaning, thus the comment of "if this works for you and your house...", but it is not a precept to salvation. To claim that it is, is totally against the teachings of Christ.

Is head coverings important? To some yes, to others no. Will not covering your head mean that you loose your salvation or not gain it? No. To preach such is heresy.

If covering of the head makes you feel more holy, then I would question why it is being done. It is being done to show reverence to the Lord, or to man?

### **1 Corinthians 11 (NKJV)**

Judge among yourselves. Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? 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. **But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.**

Also, do you mandate that a female pray with her head covered at all times? What about when a man is praying, should she cover her head? What about out to dinner, or in the car, or at home. Anytime you pray should the woman's head be covered?

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/11 18:27**

Hey Miccah

Quote:

-----Shouldn't this be for God's benefit? As in for glorifying the Lord?  
-----

Yes, very much so, but the issue of Headship (regardless of head coverings) is an important principle for practising Christians to enable us to live out a Christ centered life. Everything in our life should glorify God.

Quote:

-----Also, you want to take out the talk of legalism, but this is exactly what head coverings is accomplishing, creating a form of legalism on someone that is free from such. Head coverings is a work.  
-----

I understand the legalism argument i.e. Christ's death and resurrection has done away with the Law and we are no longer subject to it and the Law is now written on our hearts and we live it out by faith in Christ. I just feel the way it is being used sometimes has the danger of becoming a slippery slope especially for new believers. It appeals to their carnal nature.

Quote:

-----The mere fact that head coverings are included in the NT says something about the regard that it was given. I have by no means displaced this meaning, thus the comment of "if this works for you and your house...", but it is not a precept to salvation. To claim that it is, is totally against the teachings of Christ.  
-----

Of course it is not a requirement for salvation.

Quote:

-----Also, do you mandate that a female pray with her head covered at all times? What about when a man is praying, should she cover her head? What about out to dinner, or in the car, or at home. Anytime you pray should the woman's head be covered?  
-----

Especially when they're on the john! :-P

Sorry

The context of 1 Corinthians 11 is order in the church or assembly.

If a woman wears a head covering because of a desire to please her Lord because it reflects the Headship principle, is this not a beautiful thing? Yes, it has been taken too far by many, but the real issue here is why the desire for the Headship principle is leaving our churches. The 'anti-legalism' lobby will not help to reverse this trend.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/11 18:31**

Dear Krispy,

Let me take a look at some of your replies

Quote:

-----... and in the OT that was all part of what the Old Covenant was about. Head coverings, circumcision, etc etc. It was all symbolic outward type stuff. And didn't Jesus come against that stuff IF there was nothing inside?  
-----

Where did the law teach head-covering?

Where did I say that headcovering is a means of salvation?

Quote:

-----  
1 Corinthians 8:8-9 But meat (HEAD COVERINGS) commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat (WEAR A HEAD COVERING), are we the better; neither, if we eat (WEAR A HEAD COVERING) not, are we the worse. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumblingblock to them that are weak.  
-----

Now you are tweaking the scriptures. Here Paul talks about individual freedom in regards to food and drink or festivals and commends us to be considerate towards each other by neither tempting or condemning each other.

Quote:

-----Galatians 3:1-2 O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?  
-----

Head covering is not a work of the law and it is not a means of receiving the Spirit.

Now to my own interpretation of this passage.

First of all the letters to the Corinthians was written to a lively and thriving church where things got seriously out of order.

The issues he addressed were

Factions and divisions

A case of church discipline

Food and drink

Orderly use of the gifts of the Spirit

The Lord's supper  
and also Head covering

So he had to bring correction but he also took great pains to explain why. If head covering was a matter of personal preference I am sure he would have covered it together with food, drink and festival. He would not have ended with

Quote:

-----1 Cor 11:16 If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God  
-----

Paul pointed out the order in relations to and between man that God is the head of Christ, Christ the head of the church in its entirety. Man under Christ and women under man. All these relations should be patterned after the father / son relationship which are completely opposite from what we see in the world now.

Some brothers have already pointed out, it is a privilege and not a curse to submit to a godly husband. Sarah called her husband "master" which I do not expect my wife to do. She obeyed in faith and became the mother of all faithful women.

A God-fearing and husband-honoring woman is highly esteemed in God's eyes. Her trusting submission to her husband as unto Christ, her gentle and silent service can bring the rebellious wayward onto their knees - even without word. Womenhood is so distorted today. The world mocks this woman. Satan tries to tell her that she should be like man, just as he suggested that man can be like God. The world suggests the woman to look seductive as if pass on the seduction that she fell under when she listened to the snake.

A woman worshipping God under the veil states that she will listen to God and to her husband, rather than the snake. She also states that she does not need to seek attention by displaying beautifully braided, permed, dyed or whatever processed hair to the rest of the men in the or make other women jealous.

I am proud to have such a wife and feel obliged to return this honour with loving care for her as the weaker part. I still have a lot to learn and so does she, but we are on the way.

Now, is the woman's hair her legitimate covering?

Under every day circumstances that may apply but not in the worship service?

I agree with my brother who said that the man would dishonour God if he did not shave his head.

Is the husband then the wife's covering? Yes, in every day life, but in the worship service Paul required the woman's head to be covered.

Quote:

-----5For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6as Sarah obeyed Abraham,(A) calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and(B) do not fear anything that is frightening.  
-----

Quote:

-----1. Cor 11:10 That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.  
-----

How can a woman have a symbol of authority on her head if she has it by default by wearing her long hair? So this talk about a physical covering (hat, scarf etc. Paul is not specific here)

Quote:

-----1. Cor 11:5 but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, since it is the same as if her  
-----

This only makes sense if it means that the unveiled head dishonors her head, otherwise it would not make sense to draw the parallel to a shaved head.

When I just apply logic I come to the conclusion that headcovering means covering the women's hair, and it is for today and it is for the worship service.

Some may say that this is only for married women, this I cannot reprove.

Others say this was only for the first century Greek Christians. Well, I do believe that everything that was valid after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and taught in Scripture is for today.

If you take the scripture at face value in its plainest sense without trying to make any adaptations to modern days, I think head covering means head covering. If we believe that everything what Paul teaches is of God, then we should obey it.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/11 19:40**

The KJV says

Quote:

-----1 Corinthians 11:10 For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels.

It doesn't say anything about a symbol on her head, it says power.

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/2/12 0:55**

davym wrote:

Quote:

Especially when they're on the john! :-P

Sorry

Don't be sorry, that was great! :-)

All of a sudden this conversation seems very "who cares" when looking at some of the other threads where people are questioning the deity of Christ. Still think your wrong on the kipa, but love ya anyways (I know, but you get my point).:-)

Blessings brother.

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/12 4:53**

I spent the last while reading almost all of this thread. Here are my thoughts, for whatever they are worth...

After reading 1 Corinthians 11 and considering the opposing views of men such as Denny Kenaston, Zac Poonen, Matthew Henry, and others, I still have not concluded whether or not head coverings were instituted culturally or as a mandate for all Christians in all times.

What I have decided is that if somehow I have misunderstood the scriptures and it turns out head coverings are intended by God to be practiced by all Christian women, then it is simply our place to tie the laces tightly and accept it.

I have no certain idea if coverings are required, but I know this much: I am required to obey God regardless of how culturally unacceptable and offensive it seems. And I am required by the Great Commission to instruct others to do the same. Christ's words, "teach all nations... to obey all things whatsoever I have commanded you" includes what He taught through His apostles by the Spirit.

If I lead a man to the Lord tonight and that same moment a crook walked up and struck him in the cheek, I would need to tell the new convert what Christ said - "don't hit back." Would that fit his long-held conceptions? Does it matter? God is sovereign!

The same goes with head coverings. If somehow I came to believe that head coverings are mandated to all believers, then I am obligated by Christ's command to teach others to obey that command, not for justification but for practical holiness.

Is that not apparent?

That's why I cannot rush to burn the "head covering people" for doing what they can to obey the Great Commission.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/12 6:46**

Dear Openlife,

I like your honest and respectful way. You may have not come to my conclusion, but you want to do it to honour and obey God. You would make amendments if you should become convinced otherwise I believe.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/12 7:54**

Quote:  
-----Now you are tweaking the scriptures. Here Paul talks about individual freedom in regards to food and drink or festivals and commands us to be considerate towards each other by neither tempting or condemning each other.  
-----

Ahh... but I am not tweaking scripture here. Head coverings is a matter of freedom. Paul never condoned or condemned the practice. Therefore it is up to each individual believer to be fully convinced in his or her mind as to what they do with the issue of head coverings.

Frankly, in my humble estimation, debating head coverings is kinda like debating which side of the ark the elephants slept on.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by murdog (), on: 2008/2/12 8:13**

Saints,

I read 1 Corinthians 11 a couple of times because I wanted to see what Paul was saying. I believe he is talking about hair as a natural covering. Not to be shorn or shaven for the woman. And on the other side of that it is a disgrace for the man to have long hair.

If I am wrong, I believe the Spirit will make that clear to me. As He has done in many other areas. And continues to do.

Murray



**Re:, on: 2008/2/12 9:06**

Murdog... I agree with you. How someone can get anything other than what you wrote out of that scripture is beyond my comprehension. It's very clear and it's very plain. It's not cryptic at all. We really have to read into it to get "put a doylie on your head".

But no... we have to complicate scripture. We're good at it. And God just rolls His eyes.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by vico, on: 2008/2/12 9:09**

Quote:  
----- One last thought, the man is the head of the woman and she is the glory of man... wouldn't we want the glory of man to covered?  
-----

This is going back aways on this thread. Isn't anybody going to reply to this comment? Maybe someone did and i just did n't catch it. Personally, i love this particular argument for the head covering, it makes me laugh every time! :-D :-P :lol:

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/12 9:23**

Quote:  
-----Frankly, in my humble estimation, debating head coverings is kinda like debating which side of the ark the elephants slept on.  
-----

Because of their weight I feel they may have been kept in the middle of the ark. :-?

Yep, think we could debate this for a long long time. I personally think that there is a beauty in the practice, but of course that doesn't make it scripturally correct. Although I feel to say that the woman's hair is her covering creates some contradictions in the chapter.

**Re: Natural or man-made Covering? - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/2/12 11:04**

HelloÃ...

I asked a question earlier in the thread about the practice of Â“head covering,Â” but I didnÂ’t see an answer anywhere in the thread (forgive me if it is there and I didnÂ’t see it).

My wife and I have been discussing this issue lately. We donÂ’t believe in or hold this particular practice (head covering), but we were curious about the Scriptural motivation of those who do. Are there any other passages Â– besides the words found in I Corinthians 11 Â– anywhere else in the Scriptures (Old or New Testaments) that encourage or speak about this custom? Are there any examples that signify that this was a belief held by the Early Church (or even the Jews)?

I ask this because it is important. The Bible talks about a matter being established with the testimony of Â“two witnesses.Â” Of course, we realize that this is talking about a different type of testimony. We know that the Word of God is the only testimony that can cement our beliefs in any matter. But the Word of God, as we know, is collection of books of inspired Scripture. Surely, if this matter was of such grave importance, there would be some sort of supporting set of Scriptures?

There are some very questionable doctrines and practices that have been Â“rediscoveredÂ” by believers over the last couple of centuries. Mormons reinstituted the ritual of Â“baptism for the deadÂ” Â– and based it upon a single verse in I Corinthians 15:29. The practice of Â“taking up serpentsÂ” has become strangely practiced in some rural, mostly

southern communities, basing it upon the words of Jesus about "taking up serpents" (Mark 16:18). "Cuanderos," those Roman Catholic/voodoo faith healers found in Mexico and elsewhere in Latin America base their ideas about herbal folk healings upon Isaiah 38:21 (in healing of Hezekiah's illness).

Do you see the problem that could arise out of basing a doctrine or practice upon a single passage of Scripture?

When I read I Corinthians 11, it seems clear (to me) that this covering is not a man-made hair jacket. The scriptures seem to equate this "covering" with "hair" (I Corinthians 11:6, 14-15). Why else would there be two separate discussions within this single monologue (verses 3-16)? Is Paul discussing hair AND man-made head coverings...or is he speaking about the idea of a simple covering upon a woman's head?

In addition, what is the purpose for these instructions? Paul writes about how a woman who prays with her head uncovered "dishonors her head" (verse 5). A man is the "covering" (authority) of a woman just as Christ is the "covering" (authority) of the Church. Is it proper to show a "nude" head – or one that has been endowed with proper propriety? Women grow hair at a naturally more rapid rate than men, and it is simply the "nature of things" to see women with a complete scalp/neck covering of long hair. Likewise, men tend to abstain from long hair. It is simply not natural for men to wear their hair long.

During the decades preceding the birth of Christ, women in the Roman Empire began to experience a newfound "epiphany" of freedom. During this time, some women even began to shave their heads (look at images of Egyptians like Cleopatra) or crop it and clip it back (like women living in Greece) as a symbol of this new feminism. This practice "caught on" in Europe. Likewise, short hair was historically a reflection of a man. A woman who wanted to "disguise" herself as a man? She cut off her hair. In the rugged years before Mary Kay and Avon, this had a beguiling effect of changing the entire appearance of a woman. Even in the United States, women traditionally kept their hair long UNTIL the "roaring" 1920s, where "flapper" women experiencing another feminist period of "liberty" decided to cut their hair in an almost masculine way (like the "Bob and Shingle" – or "bob"). At the time, this hair was reflective of "counter culture" – much the same way that long hair became upon men in the 1960s and 1970s.

But why is this prohibited by Scripture?

Here is what I sense about this (so please take this with a "grain of salt"):

We realize that Christ is the covering of the Church and man is the covering of the woman. Thus, this *natural* covering displays the *natural* order that God created for the world. A woman is not to take upon herself the authority of a man. God made MAN (and angels) in his image, and woman was created in the image of man. Long hair has become a distinction between the two sexes. This could reflect the reasoning behind verse 10 ("...and because of the angels..."). A woman's natural covering (her hair) displays a different glory. This hair distinguishes her to be loved and cherished as a treasured gift that God gave to man.

"But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: **for her hair is given her for a covering.**" - I Corinthians 11:15

As Krispy eloquently pointed out, "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things love." I would never instruct a woman who feels a doctrinal need to walk about with a man-made covering to take it off. I would hope that those women (and men) who feel that a woman should wear such a man-made covering might realize that it isn't quite an essential dogma for living.

:-)

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/12 11:45

May I again suggest to take the time and listen to Zac Poonen explanations, he is a lot better expositor than my poor self.

Philip

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/12 12:16**

1Cor 11:15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.

Paul answers your question- Her hair is the covering.

Zac Poonen comes from a country where women are very much oppressed this has tainted his teaching. (Before you get on at me nobody is perfect Zac Poonen might have great teachings on other subjects on this he is wrong and it does not matter how well he explains it)

In India and other third world countries many churches do not allow men and women to sit together in the congregation. I don't if Zac Poonen does that in his church.

I grew up in the North East of Scotland where you the open and closed brethren they also practice this head covering. As well as the other things they practice.

To me this is bondage and you should run away from it as fast as you can.

Jesus came to free us from bondage not to put us into bondage.

**Why is it that Religion always tries to oppress of women?**

**Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2008/2/12 12:48**

murrcolr wrote:

Quote:

-----  
**Why is it that Religion always tries to oppress of women?**

-----  
As you know, I do not agree with headcoverings, but I don't see wanting woman to wear head coverings would be putting woman in oppression. I see this practice as cultural but not biblical mandated.

There is order between male and female and that order IS biblical, which should not be fought against. Head coverings is a debatable subject, hence the debate on it.

As for religion oppressing woman, who knows. In today's American culture (for those of us in America and/or influenced by America), the "religious" church oppresses everyone by allowing anything that goes. Women are far more active and "in control" in most backwards churches than there should be (again, on biblical order).

**Re:, on: 2008/2/12 13:07**

Quote:

-----Why is it that Religion always tries to oppress of women?  
-----

I have to agree with you here... religion does always seem to oppress women. No doubt.

HOWEVER, scripture is very clear about the role of men and women in regards to the church, in marriage, etc.

Women are forbidden to teach men in the church. Women are forbidden to be pastors or elders. This is not to oppress them.

em. It is so that there is divine order in the church and in Christian families, and Paul is very clear about why and how this order came to be. It is because of the fall.

To say or believe otherwise is then rebellion against God's Word, which is rebellion against God.

But also, it is not to be oppressive. Jesus certainly did not oppress women. Nor did He ignore the divine order that His Father established after the fall. He did not oppress the woman at the well, or the woman caught in adultery, or Mary Magdalene... He treated them with love and respect. But He also kept God's order in regard to the sexes as well. Notice none of the 12 Disciples were women, or were the 13 Apostles.

We have to approach these subjects with the balance that is found through-out scripture.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/12 13:33**

Acts 17:22

New American Standard Bible (©1995)

So Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus and said, "Men of Athens, I observe that you are very **religious** in all respects.

GOD'S WORD® Translation (©1995)

Paul stood in the middle of the court and said, "Men of Athens, I see that you are very **religious**.

King James Bible

Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too **superstitious**.

American Standard Version

And Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus, and said, Ye men of Athens, in all things, I perceive that ye are very **religious**.

Bible in Basic English

And Paul got to his feet on Mars' Hill and said, O men of Athens, I see that you are **overmuch given to fear of the gods**.

Douay-Rheims Bible

But Paul standing in the midst of the Areopagus, said: Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are too **superstitious**.

Darby Bible Translation

And Paul standing in the midst of Areopagus said, Athenians, in every way I see you given up to **demon worship**;

So using the bible to define religion-- superstitious, demonworship, given to much fear of gods(plural).

Christianity and Religion are not the same.

Christianity is a relationship with God where he becomes your Father.

There are those who do try and turn Christianity into a religion thinking they have to dress a certain way to please God and add a lot of does and don'ts.

Putting a thing on you head that you would wipe your nose with will not get you any favours with God. It won't impress him the least bit.

Yes we should dress modestly as not attract attention to your body both **men** and **women** but that should come out from the heart and should not be forced on anyone.

Remember we are justified by faith not works.

Re:, on: 2008/2/12 15:20

Quote:  
-----Frankly, in my humble estimation, debating head coverings is kinda like debating which side of the ark the elephants slept on.  
-----  
:-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P :-P

Re:, on: 2008/2/12 15:34

murrcolr... murrcolr... murrcolr...

Words can not express how painful it was to have to read thru all those perversions... er, I mean versions of the Bible. I think the KJV sums it up just fine without help from the "others". :-)

Quote:  
-----Christianity and Religion are not the same.  
-----

No one here will argue that with you since I think 99.9% of us agree with you.

Quote:  
-----Christianity is a relationship with God where he becomes your Father.  
-----

Actually, it's the other way around. **John 1:12** *But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name...* (But thats semantics... basically you are correct)

Quote:  
-----There are those who do try and turn Christianity into a religion thinking they have to dress a certain way to please God and add a lot of does and don'ts.  
-----

This is very true too... but the flip side is that most Christians turn freedom into license and ignore the clear commandments of God to His believers.

Quote:  
-----Putting a thing on you head that you would wipe your nose with will not get you any favours with God. It won't impress him the least bit.  
-----

First off... I called it a doylie earlier, and most folks realize I'm merely using humor. But there are some who are truly convinced that wearing a head covering is an act of obedience... and right or wrong, it's the attitude of their heart that matters. **Obedience** is what impresses God. And if a woman chooses to wear a head covering for no other reason than that she wants to be obedient to her Lord and Savior... son, God is impressed.

And telling women who do wear head coverings for the right reasons that they are wearing snot-rags on their heads... that doesn't impress God. Or me. There is a big difference between a doylie and snot-rag, my brother.

Quote:  
-----Yes we should dress modestly as not attract attention to your body both men and women but that should come out from the heart a

nd should not be forced on anyone.  
-----

Absolutely... I agree with you.

Quote:  
-----Remember we are justified by faith not works.  
-----

You're preaching to the choir, brother. I think most folks here have figured out this little nugget of truth. This website is not exactly "Christianity 101".

Krispy

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/12 15:37**

Dear murrcolr,

If I follow your logic, Paul just branded himself as a legalistic demon worshipper and undoes what he taught in Romans about justification by faith.

Did you ever consider why Paul taught the head covering in 1 Cor 11 in the first place? If the covering was the woman's husband or her hair in the fellowship, I think all his exhortations are next to pointless because you would rarely find a woman in her right mind shaving her hair.

The law has been fulfilled in Jesus. The covenant of grace is a even higher standard. In the old covenant you were allowed to hate your enemy as long as you do not kill him, in the NT you have to love him.

Headcovering is not in the Mosaic law, it was instated by Paul who is the foremost propagator of salvation by faith.

There is a reason behing Paul's teaching and it should be followed then. Truth meant to set us free, not into bondage.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/12 16:20**

Quote:  
-----in the NT you have to love him.  
-----

This is another law. If you have to love anybody it's a law. If you have received the Spirit of God it's His love for your neighbour that is coming out of you, not out of your 'have to'.

If I "have to" give to the poor, it's not out of love that I am doing it, I am doing it because of my importunity. (I was forced to do it)

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/12 17:00**

Please I grew up in a town where there are lots of these people. They never talk to you never mix with you and thats when you are a Christian.  
Never mind when you where a sinner.

### **What else goes along with head covering**

Things Exclusive Brethren can't do

The activities below are forbidden for members of the Taylorite Exclusive Brethren because they are too worldly:

watching television  
listening to the radio  
visiting places of entertainment  
reading newspapers  
reading fiction  
using computers and the internet (they believe that these are being used by 'the man of sin' referred to in the Book of Revelation)  
using mobile phones - or any other device that uses radio waves  
owning pets (these rules have been relaxed and some members are now said to own pets)  
remarrying after divorce, even if they are the innocent party  
taking out life assurance  
going to university (this exposes young Brethren to morally unhelpful influences)  
standing for political office  
voting in elections  
bearing arms (though Brethren do serve in the non-combatant corps of the armed forces in times of war)  
Contact with outsiders is limited  
Members of the Exclusive Brethren are very limited in their contact with outsiders. Taylorites must not:

visit other churches  
join any other religious organisation  
join a trade union  
join a professional organisation (this excludes members from professions such as medicine and pharmacy)  
join any group that includes people outside the Exclusive Brethren  
live in the same building, including apartments and semi-detached houses, as outsiders (this means that members can't share a house with a spouse or with children if the spouse or child has been expelled from the Exclusive Brethren)  
share a driveway with an outsider  
share private drainage facilities  
marry outside the Exclusive Brethren  
Many Exclusive Brethren work in Brethren-owned companies in order to reduce contact with outsiders. If they leave, or are expelled from the Brethren, they have to give up their jobs as well as their family and their home.

There are several Taylorite innovations that Jim Taylor Jr added to the list of dos and don'ts for members. He instructed them to:

marry early  
be clean shaven (men)  
keep hair short (men)  
not to wear ties (men)  
keep hair uncut (women)  
wear white or blue scarves (women)  
start communion services at 6 a.m.

Withdrawing from

Members who break the rules are likely to be withdrawn from. This means that they are banned from worship meetings and will be ostracised by members of their own family and other Exclusives.

They can lose their home and, if they work for an Exclusive company, their job.

The Exclusive Brethren only withdraw from a member if they commit a serious sin and will not repent about it. They believe that they are following the teaching of St Paul in doing this:

But now I have written to you, if any one called brother be fornicator, or avaricious, or idolater, or abusive, or a drunkard, or rapacious, not to mix with ; with such a one not even to eat.

1 Corinthians 5:11

Remove the wicked person from amongst yourselves.

1 Corinthians 5:13

'Shut up'

Members who sin can also be 'shut up'. This is based on the Biblical procedure for the treatment of lepers, and involves being isolated from family and friends and only allowed to see specially chosen church members until local church leaders believe that God has forgiven the person.

It's not quite as drastic as it sounds, since the person may be allowed to work and to have a telephone and a car, but it is psychologically stressful.

**A form of Godliness without the power.**

**Re: - posted by bluinos, on: 2008/2/12 17:04**

Quote:

-----in the NT you have to love him.

-----

Perhaps

It is a commandment

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/12 18:05**

Dear murrcolr,

Thank you for sharing that. Now I see you in a completely different light.

Maybe for you head covering is associated with the sort of legalism you just described.

You see, I came out from a liberal charismatic church where there was little understanding the holiness or fear of the Lord. I was involved in the Toronto Blessing movement and prophetic movement, WoF, seeker sensitive, Kingdom Dominion, Spiritual warfare and other nonsense.

I was misunderstood a lot when I talked about holiness and fear of the Lord in my former church.

Both legalism and license is carnality. The carnal will always object the spiritual, like Cain who slew Abel.

I have seen so often that people from a legalistic background fall into license and the people who come from a babylonian watered down Christianity fall into legalism. The pendulum does not have to swing the other way.

Philip



**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/12 18:08**

Quote:  
----- in the NT you have to love him.  
-----

May be better, I can love my enemy.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/12 19:52**

Quote:  
-----I was misunderstood a lot when I talked about holiness and fear of the Lord in my former church.  
-----

Our legalistic church that I was attending was talked about as well for their "holiness" teachings. I liked the preaching, but I never gave into the legalism. I was casual in my dress, I never came to that church "dressed" up for a show. I've seen the ladies wear dresses and they "looked" holy, but when some of them got home, the pants were on and the dress was off.

I was talked about too because I never did fit into their 'holiness' message. However the Pastor liked me and we got along great. I wanted to fellowship with real people living real all the time and not 'dressing' up on a Sunday and being something different on a Monday.

Where law was abounding, sin was abounding as well. When a man takes scriptures and uses the ordinances for his righteousness before God, secret sins will be working in that man's life. (I couldn't begin to tell you the stuff that went on in that church by the professing holiness crowd)

Quote:  
-----Romans 3:20 Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.  
-----

But if a man can take those same ordinances and do them unto the LORD without using them as a cloak of righteousness and he can keep himself from looking down at others who are not measuring up to his "holiness" he will be blessed of God.

However, in my humble opinion, it would be better if that man just lived a moderate life before God and used no ordinances whatsoever. Because the pride of life gets a hold of man and if people don't measure up to his standard of holiness, people are condemned. I've seen this working in too many lives, that's why I can't accept it. I've seen too much destruction as to what legalism does, just a little leaven leavens the whole lump.

A balance is far better, not going too legalistic and not going too liberal.

Quote:  
-----Proverbs 11:1 A false balance is abomination to the LORD: but a just weight is his delight.  
-----

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/13 0:55**

If there was ever an article that presents a compelling case for head coverings, it must be this one by Watchman Nee:

(<http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>) Nee on Head Coverings

I read it tonight with an informed young woman who has never accepted head coverings and, to my surprise she went a way in support of them as symbols of grace!

By the way, Compliments, you wrote,

Quote:  
-----However, in my humble opinion, it would be better if that man just lived a moderate life before God and used no ordinances whatsoever.  
-----

-----  
I must quote from the very passage in question,

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

:-)

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/13 3:36**

Quote:

-----  
theopenlife wrote:

I read it tonight with an informed young woman who has never accepted head coverings and, to my surprise she went away in support of them as symbols of grace!

-----  
I am sure you could also get a few million Moslem women to say how they like being dressed in the Burka.

Luke 16:15 And he said unto them, Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God.

Rom 2:28 For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh:

Rom 2:29 but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

I am a different person because God has changed my heart.

One thing I have learned about God is this God start on the inside at he works his way out. Men start on the outside and work there way in.

Salvation is obtained by faith.  
Holiness is also obtained by faith.

There is nothing we can do to get either.

Jesus and John the Baptist said some of the harshest words to the religious elite of the day. Calling them white washed tombs nice and clean on the outside but dead inside.

Men look on the outside....God deals with your heart. He is the ultimate heart surgeon he takes away the heart of stone and gives you a heart of flesh.

If Paul says you are not Jewish because of the circumcision of the flesh you are Jewish because of the circumcision of the heart.

Paul understood that God looks at your heart not the outward appearance.

A perfect heart makes a man/woman perfect not any outward sign.

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/13 3:58**

Reading through this thread I've noticed that it is mainly male comments. Are there no ladies out there who feel one way or another on this issue? After all, it mainly affects you.

I also believe the legalism argument doesn't stack up. We all agree that we shouldn't obey ordinances to please man and that head coverings are not necessary for salvation, but does that mean we have a free for all? Should we do away with the Lord's Supper because it's not necessary for salvation? (note that Paul deals with this in the same chapter i.e. 1 Cor 11).

Dave

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/13 4:34**

Dear murrcolr, surely you agree that desiring to obey the bible is not legalism, even when doing so requires outward adjustments. When a vain, wealthy woman gets saved, she must come under Peter's command to not be decked with expensive clothes, jewels, or elaborate hairstyles. Those are external, but the changes are biblical and founded in grace.

Perhaps - or perhaps not - the same is true of head coverings. Again, I am inconclusive but I suggest reading Nee's article for a well presented case for head coverings as a sign of grace.

I found him to be more scripturally consistent than any of the others I've read on the subject - John Gill, Matthew Henry, Denny Kenaston, Zac Poonen, the Geneva Notes, Chuck Smith, etc. Frankly I was struck by the lucidity and justice that seemed to be done to the scriptures in his presentation.

**Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/13 4:57**

Quote:

-----desiring to obey the bible is not legalism

-----

I agree, but I feel 'legalism' is being used as an excuse for not obeying the Bible or to pick and choose the scriptures we obey. I sometimes wonder if God accepts 'legalism' as an argument.

Thanks for suggestion of reading Nee's article. I will have a look.

Dave

EDIT: sorry, what I said above is drifting off the subject of the thread. The discussion on head coverings has been very interesting.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/13 7:47**

1Pet 3:1-4 In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives; Or manner of life beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear. Or manner of life Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel; but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

**Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel**

**But let it be the hidden man of the heart**

**in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit**

Peter is talking to the sisters he says In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands.

He says let it not be the outward adorning, but let it be the hidden man of the heart.

Men take the scripture and apply it to the outside all the time.

It does not matter if it with Salvation, Holiness and or Authority it is always a inward dealing.

Many can and do submit outwardly to authority but not in there heart.

Open rebellion or inward rebellion both are the same rebellion.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/13 8:10**

Fact is... there is nothing wrong with a woman wearing a head covering if she does so from a pure heart.

And there is nothing wrong with a woman not wearing a head covering if she does so from a pure heart.

If you read Paul's comments about head coverings in the context of the whole chapter it is quite clear that this is NOT a commandment that Paul is laying down, and in context it is quite obvious that long hair is the woman's head covering. There is no other way to interpret this, unless some convoluted modern version has done a hatchet job on that chapter.

Anyway... it's not a commandment, it's not a requirement in order to be in a right relationship with God. Therefore, let every man (woman) be fully convinced in their own heart, and work out their salvation accordingly.

Krispy

**Re: We need to cover head covering - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/13 9:41**

Quote:

-----  
narrowpath wrote:

**I recently convinced my wife and daughter about it and they practise it** since. It caused me and my wife to take a deep look into these issues, and I too had closer look into my responsibility as the head of the household under Christ. It was quite a discovery for me.

Our church does not practise head covering although some women do. For me head covering is the outward display of an inward conviction about God's authority. **The reason we have so many objections and find this commandment so difficult to introduce in our churches** is I think is because of the confusion Satan has caused in the perception of true manhood and womanhood in the world and in the church. **Head covering seems to be a small and "nasty" commandment to obey** so that many think it is not that important. If you practise it you may quickly be branded as legalistic and narrowminded. I think our attitude to head covering reveals a lot about our understanding of God's authority.

-----  
Some clearly think it is a commandment

**Re:, on: 2008/2/13 10:50**

Quote:

-----Some clearly think it is a commandment  
-----

In this case... some are mistaken.

**1 Corinthians 11:15** *But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.*

I don't know how much more clear Paul could have been.

And if this isn't clear enough, Paul makes it clear that in the churches he is associated with, they did not exercise this "custom". (Notice he says "custom", and not "commandment")

**1 Corinthians 11:16** *But if any man seem to be contentious, **WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM**, neither the churches of G*

od.

There is simply no other way to interpret this... yes, a woman should have a covering, and yes God has provided one for her... her long hair. Period.

Ever wonder why only a very very small percentage of women are naturally bald? What do they call baldness in men? Male pattern baldness. Yes, women lose their hair as a result of radiation during cancer treatment, but what do they naturally desire to do? Cover it with a hat or a wig. That's a God-given desire.

Men go bald and no one thinks it's weird. Yes, some try to cover it up... but that's another issue. For the most part though, it's not a big deal to anyone when they see a bald man.

Bruce Willis shaves his head and no one cares... Brittany Spears shaves her head and the media had a field day with it for a month.

It's a natural thing in us designed by our Creator.

God **gave** woman a natural covering.

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2008/2/13 12:00**

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

Quote:  
-----Colossians 2:20 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?  
-----

By the way, why would Paul put mill stones around people's necks knowing full well that Christ abolished the law contained in ordinances?

Quote:  
-----Ephesians 2:15 Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;  
-----  
:-?

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/13 12:16**

Hi Krispy,

If the normal hair was the women's covering then the whole passage would be pointless.  
It is as if I command someone to use his legs to walk or to open his mouth when speaking.

Following your logic the man then would be violating God's command when he prays wearing his normal hair and only bald men obey God when praying. And again, the only command here is for the women not to shave her head.

You have to come with something more logical than this to convince me.

Philip

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/13 13:30

Krispy wrote,

Quote:  
-----"There is simply no other way to interpret this... yes, a woman should have a covering, and yes God has provided one for her... her long hair. Period."  
-----

Read Nee's article, he has another way and (to me) it seems more consistent with the text.

(<http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>) Nee on Head Coverings

Maybe skip down to the head covering sub title?

Here's an excerpt...

-----  
God is Himself the head; He sets up Christ as head; and He further makes man to be head. These are the three great principles in God's government.

For God to be Christ's head does not touch upon the matter of who is greater; rather, it is simply an arrangement in the government of God. Likewise, under God's government Christ is the head of every man, and man is the head of woman. Such are God's arrangements; such are His appointments.

Philippians 2 is clear enough: the Lord Jesus in His eternal essence is equal with God; but in God's government He became Christ, and as Christ, God became His head. Christ Himself acknowledges in the Gospel of John that: "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing: for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner" (5:19); "For I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (6:38); "I have many things to speak and to judge concerning you: howbeit he that sent me is true; and the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world" (8:26); and "I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things" (8:28). Today Christ takes His place in the government of God. According to God's counsel, He is Christ and as Christ He needs to listen to God. God the Son has no need to listen to God the Father, for God the Father and God the Son are equal in honor and glory in the Godhead. But, in God's government Christ does not stand in the place of God the Son; rather, He stands in the position of Christ, the One sent of God.

Some day the whole world will know that Christ is the head of all men, for this is God's governmental decision. Today this is known only in the church; the world has no knowledge of it. But the day will come when all the people of the world will realize that Christ is the head. He will have the preeminence in all the creation. He is the firstborn of all creation and the firstfruit. Everyone must be in subjection to the authority of Christ. Likewise, God's appointment of man as head of woman is also known only in the church today. Do you get the point? Today the church alone knows that Christ is the head of man and that man is the head of woman.

We have already seen how grace can never overthrow God's government. I trust our lesson will become clearer as we learn that grace is to support God's government, not to destroy it. How can anyone be so foolish as to attempt to use grace to interfere with God's government? The government of God is inviolable; His hand always sustains it. No one, just because he has believed in the Lord, can overthrow the Father's authority, or even undermine the authority of any government. We must not say that because we are Christians we do not need to pay taxes. No, nothing of the sort! The better Christian you are, the more you will maintain the government of God.

We are here today to maintain God's testimony in the world. God has shown us that there are three different heads: God is head, Christ is head, and man is head. This is not a matter of being brothers and sisters; it is basically a governmental arrangement. Grace is concerned with brothers and sisters, but government is different. God has sovereignly willed that the head of Christ is God Himself, so Christ must obey; the head of man is Christ, so man must obey; and the head of woman is man, and so woman should have the sign of obedience on her head.

"Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven" (1 Cor. 11:4-5).

The meaning of head covering is: I submit myself to God's government; I accept God's appointed position; I dare not nullify His government by the grace I have received; I do not even dare to think about it; on the contrary, I accept God's government. As Christ accepts God as His head, so should every man accept Christ as his head. Likewise, woman should representatively accept man as her head. In covering the head, the woman signifies that she is not head, that she is as if she has no head—for it is covered.

Let us remember that although in practice it is only the woman who has her head covered, yet, in reality, Christ has His head covered before God and every man has his head covered before Christ. Why, then, is it that God only requires woman to have the practice of having her head covered? This indeed is marvelous, for it involves a very deep principle.

I often feel that it is impossible to talk with some brothers and sisters about head covering because they have no knowledge of God's government. Before anyone can understand head covering, he or she must first know God's government. The whole question is settled once one sees that Christ has His head covered before God. How much more ought I to cover my head before Him! I must cover it so that it is no longer seen or exposed, for God is my head. As a matter of fact, everyone's head must be covered before God. Since Christ is my head, I cannot have my own head seen or exposed.

Here I would like to tell Christian women that God has appointed man to be woman's head. In these days when God's authority is unknown in the world, the Lord demands this order only in the church. It therefore affects the very fact of our being Christians. God requires us in the church to accept what He has appointed governmentally.

Re:, on: 2008/2/13 13:34

Quote:  
-----Following your logic the man then would be violating God's command when he prays wearing his normal hair and only bald men obey God when praying. And again, the only command here is for the women not to shave her head.  
-----

Paul addressed that in the same passage of scripture when he discussed long hair on a man.

Quote:  
-----You have to come with something more logical than this to convince me.  
-----

Sorry bro... scripture is all I got. If you're looking for something more than scripture, pass me by.

Krispy

Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/13 14:42

*But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering*  
1 Cor 11:15

It is too convenient to take this verse as an excuse for annulling all the previous teaching on the need for a woman to wear a covering on her head when she prays or prophesies. This 'covering' can't be the same 'covering' under discussion in the previous verses.

After a little study I've discovered that Paul uses a different word altogether here from the ones he has used elsewhere in the chapter. He uses the word *peribolaion*. It denotes something thrown around someone. It is a composite word made up of *peri* (around) and *ballo* (to throw). The thought behind the word is that a woman's long hair is a mantle, a wrapper, provided by nature for a woman's covering. Her hair, indeed, is her glory. Many women, indeed, know how to make the most of it and use it to advantage to catch the eye and excite the admiration (or envy) of others. As long hair on a man is a shame to him, so long hair on a woman is a glory to her.

This only adds weight to Paul's previous ruling. The woman, when she prays or prophesies, **must put another covering over this natural covering**. When she stands up to participate in worship she must not draw attention to herself. She must not put her hair on display. That would draw attention away from her words to her person. Her glorious, natural covering must be veiled. Only in this way can she honorably participate in audible public worship. The man, then, is to have short hair, the woman is to have long hair. The man is to participate in public worship with his head uncovered, the woman is to participate in public worship with her head covered. The man, with his head uncovered, acknowledges the headship of Christ. The woman, with her head covered, acknowledges the headship of the man.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/13 19:07**

Some have asked me about an article from Zac Poonen about this subject. Here is one that touches on the subject.

<http://www.cfcindia.com/web/mainpages/articles.php?display=article24>

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/13 20:27**

Is Paul God? If we were to list all the things that Paul had listed for do's and don't's it would make the law look like a student instead of a school master.

MODERATION, MODERATION, MODERATION.

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/14 1:04**

I found this on a related site:

Myth #5: Paul is the one who gave this command (rather than God)

This myth attacks directly at the inspiration of Scripture. This myth is often cloaked in terms like: "what Paul was saying was", "Paul was writing to address..." It makes commands in the Bible into doctrines of men. God, not Paul, is the author of 1 Corinthians. Paul was only the secretary, not the author of 1 Corinthians. The Holy Spirit told Paul what to write. Paul did not write on his own authority. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." (1 Corinthians 14:37). There is no basis historically or otherwise to say that Paul gave this command rather than God.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 1:19**

I'm a female. Someone asked where we were on this thread.

I have more of a question than comments.

The verse is talking about when the Church is gathered, right ?

And then says, every woman praying or prophesying.

My question is, how many of those who have posted on this thread so far, allow a woman to pray out loud or prophesy during your 'services' or meetings?

It *appears* that those are the only two times that she must wear the covering, from the passage.

**Re: - posted by PraiseB2God, on: 2008/2/14 1:51**

Well, I am also female and I have to say what caught my attention was this comment, "I recently convinced my wife and daughter about it and they practise it since."

I guess this bothers me because you had to convince her to do it. The Word of God was not enough? Don't get me wrong, I understand the man is to be the head of the household, but if you are just convincing her to do it and it's not something that she is convicted of, then what purpose does it serve? I have absolutely no problem with women who wear head coverings but only if it's for the right reason. I have seen plenty of women who "look right" on the outside (head covering, dress, long hair...) but they are nasty and bitter on the inside. Maybe it's because they are doing something that they feel



forced into?

A few months ago I was convicted to start wearing skirts instead of pants. This was something that the Lord had to show me and convict me of. No amount of outside influence could ultimately convince me that it was what I was supposed to do. There were many times that I was tempted to, but now looking back I know that it would have just been a burden. Since I decided to follow the Lord's plan for my life, I LOVE it! I love wearing skirts and I can't imagine ever going back to pants! You couldn't have convinced me of this a year ago.

But the fact that I was convicted of this, doesn't mean that I think every woman MUST wear skirts. I believe that a woman should be modest and if she can do that in pants then that is wonderful. I don't believe that wearing pants makes a woman less godly or spiritual and by no means do I think that by me wearing skirts am I more spiritual. What makes me closer to my Savior is when I do what He tells me to do. Doing what someone else tells me is right, when I have no conviction of it, just causes bitterness and legalism.

That's my two cents.

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2008/2/14 5:33**

I would ask that before any man asks or tells their wife and daughters to submit to the head covering doctrine.

That they should try it out for a 3 months.

Don't be wearing a hat or anything else that is normally on your head. It has to be a cloth.

Just use a cloth say 6" x 6" you are allowed to get any colour and can have a nice pattern if you so desire.

You must put it on in the morning when you get up and take it off before you go to bed.

I am only asking that you do this out of Love for your Wife and Daughters.

Eph 5:28-29 Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his own wife loveth himself: for no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ also the church;

Eph 6:4 And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord.

That you would be a true leader in house and say do as I do, not as I say. Be an example to them as Christ was an example to you.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/14 7:35**

Hi murrclor

No, I understand that Paul is only talking about the public Christian meetings, where prayer and prophesy takes place, not in general.

Philip

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/14 8:25**

Hello PraiseB2God,

I am glad some ladies finally come forward to discuss this.

I did not command my wife, but we discussed it.

Yes, I took the initiative after the revelation of this truth to me. I would not have done God justice if I had not shared this truth with her.

It has to be explained because it goes absolutely against the grain of our surrounding postmodern world and apostate temporary Christianity. Demanding it without explanation would perhaps make her resentful and she would not know how

to respond when ridiculed. So far no one has ridiculed her about it, praise God.

My wife understands it and she has a witness of the Spirit about it which I am very glad about. We are actually in the midst of re-assessing our whole marriage relationship under God. Her head covering in meetings does not elevate me to a superior standing over her. On the contrary, her submission symbolized and expressed in head covering reminds me of my great responsibility to be a godly and caring husband to her. God will call me to account how I have treated her during our earthly life. I will be a miserable hypocrite if I do not live up to this.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 9:56**

I reiterate it again, if you take the head covering as a means to obtain righteousness before God, Christ is no longer the object of our faith/and or salvation. However, if it's done because of conscience sake and you feel that God is speaking to you regarding it, then be blessed in it.

Righteousness is not a result of our actions, righteousness is a state of being that only comes by putting our faith in Jesus Christ. We can do righteous deeds, but our deeds are not a merit to obtain the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus our LORD; that is freely given by those who put their trust in Him.

God Bless you as you obey the LORD.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/14 10:42**

Please read this in depth as it will set you free if you open.

#### THE VEIL

According to Rabbi Dr. Menachem M. Brayer (Professor of Biblical Literature at Yeshiva University) in his book, *The Jewish woman in Rabbinic literature*, it was the custom of Jewish women to go out in public with a head covering which, sometimes, even covered the whole face leaving one eye free. He quotes some famous ancient Rabbis saying, "It is not like the daughters of Israel to walk out with heads uncovered" and "Cursed be the man who lets the hair of his wife be seen a woman who exposes her hair for self-adornment brings poverty." Rabbinic law forbids the recitation of blessings or prayers in the presence of a bareheaded married woman since uncovering the woman's hair is considered "nudity". Dr. Brayer also mentions that "During the Tannaitic period the Jewish woman's failure to cover her head was considered an affront to her modesty. When her head was uncovered she might be fined four hundred zuzim for this offense." Dr. Brayer also explains that veil of the Jewish woman was not always considered a sign of modesty. Sometimes, the veil symbolized a state of distinction and luxury rather than modesty. The veil personified the dignity and superiority of noble women. It also represented a woman's inaccessibility as a sanctified possession of her husband.

So we can see out of this extract from a book that in the Jewish Tradition women wore veils.

1Cor 11:2 Now I praise you that ye remember me in all things, and hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them to you.

Tradition meaning: The passing down of elements of a culture from generation to generation, especially by oral communication.

1Cor 11:5 But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven.

If the woman is unveiled it the same as if she was shaven this is what the scripture say.

1Cor 11:6 For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn: but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled.

Same thing here if the woman is unveiled let her be shorn but if it a shame let her be veiled.

1Cor 11:13 Judge ye (1) in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?

Paul asks Judge for yourself is right that a woman pray to God unveiled.

1Cor 11:14 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him?

Another question what does nature teach us.

1Cor 11:15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.

1. A woman has long hair.
2. It is a Glory to her.
3. Her hair is given as a covering.

Paul is telling these people it's not right for a women head to be uncovered. Nature tells you that her head should be covered. **God in his wisdom has already taken care of it by giving her a covering her hair it's her covering.** Does not nature teach us that as Paul shows. **Paul is telling us women don't have to wear veils like in the Jewish Tradition.**

1Pet 3:1-2 In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear.

1Pet 3:3 Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel;

Peter says let it not be a outward adorning of braided hair, jewels, gold or apparel (Veils).

1Pet 3:4 but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

Let the adorning be of the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which in God sight is more costly than Gold. God looks at the heart.

Jesus said of the Pharisee they would strain at a gnat, but then swallow a camel.

In other words, they majored on minor points. They made a big deal about things that really didn't matter.

Women if are reading this and any man thinking about this you don't have to it. The covering for a women is her hair. Paul tells us this in scripture the very same ones the Devil has tried to use as bondage.

Narrowpath your are Pharisee and a blind man may you some day find the truth out.

2Cor 3:17-18 Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit.

I am glad I got involved in this thread I can know praise God that he is a good and frees us from bondage.

My eyes are know fully open to this false teaching of veiling your women and saying it's God.

Re: - posted by davym (), on: 2008/2/14 11:29

Quote:

-----I am glad I got involved in this thread I can know praise God that he is a good and frees us from bondage.

-----

But is this bondage?

Is it not just guidance as to how to make the assembly of God's people more orderly i.e. reflecting God's order (headship ).

Look at the instruction Paul gives as regards how the gift of tongues should be managed in the assembly for example.

If a believer sees the practise of head covering as bondage I guess they're better off not practising it. But I believe this will be to their own personal loss and to their assemblies.

I agree that there are more important things to consider in our Christian walk than splitting hairs over head covering, but I just believe it's a dying practice and it's a sad loss because the real tragedy is the headship principle is dying with it.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2008/2/14 12:23**

Greetings

As a sister in Christ I have gone back and forth about responding to this thread but feel led to so here goes. My real concern with the way this is being debated is because of statements such as these:

---

I agree that there are more important things to consider in our Christian walk than splitting hairs over head covering, but I just believe it's a dying practice and it's a sad loss because the real tragedy is the headship principle is dying with it.

---

A women worshipping God under the veil states that she will listen to God and to her husband, rather than the snake. She also states that she does not need to seek attention by displaying beautifully braided, permed, dyed of whatever processed hair to the rest of the men in the or make other women jealous.

---

These comments seem to imply that a woman who does not wear a head covering is in open rebellion to God or that she is not willing to submit herself to headship of her family or to the Lord. That bothers me because I know many women who love the Lord dearly and their husbands, that have a very humble heart and have a true desire to submit to the headship(husband/fathers) in their home. The Word tells us over and over again that God looks at the heart of the matter. IF the desire of my heart is for Jesus and daily my eyes and heart are centered on Him that is what He looks at, not outward appearances. IF your wife feels led to wear a head covering then she should do so with her whole heart unto the Lord, but please do not imply that those of us who do not wear head coverings have less love or desire to follow Jesus daily and have Him be Lord of our life.

Have a wonderful day  
God Bless  
MJ

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 12:38**

I find it so sad that some defiantly call obedience to Christ's commands bondage and yet profess to be Christians. Is not the kingdom of God like a treasure buried in a field? Is not His yoke easy and His burden light? Does He not conform our hearts into a gentle loving obedience to His word?... The head covering bondage... God forbid.

I do not write this to oppose the brethren that are undecided on the matter, or do not yet see the beauty of the head covering... only to those who mock the word of God with their haughty attitude. To not have the conviction, or to have a modern understanding that the covering is her hair is one thing. To call the commands and treasures of God religious bondage and to degrade women or families who practice this in love for God (and using a haughty tone) is quite another and is quite satanic as watchmen need will point here...

(We will all give account for every idle word typed on Sermon Index)

Watchmen Nee-

I often am amazed at this marvelous teaching that the sisters should have on their heads the sign of authority for the sake of the angels. We know the tragic history of how some of the angels sinned. Satan rebelled against God. Why? Because he desired to make himself equal with God. In other words, the angel Lucifer attempted to expose his own head before God and refused to submit to His authority. In Isaiah 14, Satan constantly reiterated, "I will." "And thou saidst in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God and I will sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the uttermost parts of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High" (vv. 13-14). Right in this passage we see an archangel falling to become Satan. Revelation 12 further shows us that when Satan fell, one-third of the angelic force fell with him (Rev. 12:4). Why did the angels fall? Because of their not being subject to the authority of God the head but trying instead to expose their own heads

Today woman has a sign of authority on her head because of the angels, that is, as a testimony to the angels. Only the sisters in the church can testify to this, for the women of the world know nothing of it. Today when the sisters have the sign of authority on their heads, they bear the testimony that, "I have covered my head so that I do not have my own head, for I do not seek to be head. My head is veiled and I have accepted man as head, and to accept man as head means that I have accepted Christ as head and God as head. But some of you angels have rebelled against God." This is what is meant by "because of the angels."

I have on my head a sign of authority. I am a woman with my head covered. This is a most excellent testimony to the angels, to the fallen and to the unfallen ones. No wonder Satan persistently opposes the matter of head covering. It really puts him to shame. We are doing what he has failed to do. What God did not receive from the angels, He now has from the church. Because some of the angels do not submit themselves to the authority of God and of His Christ, the world is subject to great confusion. The fall of Satan has caused much more trouble than the fall of man. But, thank God, what He failed to get from the fallen angels, He has obtained from the church.

When many of the sisters in the church take the place given to woman and learn to cover their heads, they send out an unspoken word of testimony to the angels in the air, to the effect that God has obtained in the church what He desires. Because of this, woman must have on her head a sign of authority, a testimony to the angels.

taken from (<http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>) <http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>

In Christ - Jim

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/14 12:47**

Quote:

davym wrote:

But is this bondage?

Is it not just guidance as to how to make the assembly of God's people more orderly i.e. reflecting God's order (headship).

Headship

1Pet 3:1 In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives.

This is speaking about headship do you agree?

1Pet 3:2 beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear.Or manner of life verse

1Pet 3:3 Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel;

Peter talks about headship and says let it not be a outward adorning. So if not a outward sign of submission to headship what?

1Pet 3:4 but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

A adorning of the hidden man of the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit.

So Peter tells you very plainly that in regard to Husband and Wives it is a inward adorning not a outward one that a wife should put on.

Gal 3:1 O foolish Galatians, who did bewitch you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified?

Gal 3:2 This only would I learn from you. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

Gal 3:3 Are ye so foolish? .Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now perfected in the flesh?

Did you receive Jesus by faith or by the law.

Why are you so foolish are you now perfected in the Flesh!

You have been bewitched and you are under a spell doing a thing which does not need to be done. The only way you'll ever see is when your eyes are open.

I was blind and now I see, I was deaf but now I hear. I hope that will be your testimony one day.

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/14 12:52**

Quote:

-----Narrowpath you are Pharisee and a blind man may you some day find the truth out.  
-----

Ouch... I'm wondering if that was that necessary or truthful. I haven't once heard Narrowpath say that head coverings are necessary to salvation.

I'm not resolved on this issue, but I cannot deny the merit of both sides either.

Let's get our ducks in order... Who has supported head coverings in the past? Augustine, Chrysostom, Luther, Calvin, Knox, Matthew Henry, Baxter, Watchman Nee. So the men who taught grace the loudest were slaves to a pharasaism? I think not. Perhaps they took a different view of the whole issue which translated not into bondage, but blessings.

Nee taught that women ought to wear a covering during congregational gatherings. Calvin, Nee, and Matthew Henry all agreed that coverings did not have to be any particular type, size, or color so long as they clearly indicated a "covering" over the head. Hair could be visible.

Men who prayed or taught publicly were to remove their hat briefly before doing so to indicate that Christ was their head, or basis of authority, when they represented Him in His Church. They could then put the hat back on to prevent sickness.

They did not teach that women must be covered at all times to pray, or else they would have had to teach men to be uncovered at all times to pray. Try that in sub-zero temperatures, or on a motorcycle, or construction site!

The issue is decorum and order. God's concern is order in the society of the church and it is a statement to the legions of angels who cast off their head, God, to show their own heads of authority. Likewise, the head of woman is man. She hi

des her head, so to speak, to acknowledge the authority given by God to man. Man's authority comes from Christ, and Christ's from God, so that there is only one head - that of God passing through Christ, represented in man.

Read Nee's article!

Re:, on: 2008/2/14 12:52

Quote:  
-----You have been bewitched and you are under a spell doing a thing which does not need to be done. The only way you'll ever see is when your eyes are open.  
-----

The exegesis and hermeneutics used to establish this comment are absurd. I don't know if I should laugh or cry.

Quote:  
-----I was blind and now I see, I was deaf but now I hear. I hope that will be your testimony one day.  
-----

Pure garbage.

-Jim

Re: We need to cover head covering, on: 2008/2/14 12:59

Just to drop in an out, if I may....

I used to go to churches where not to cover one's head would make it look as if one is in rebellion. Also, I've heard an elder say, (in an impromptu situation where not every woman had a head-covering with her) 'Have your head covered in your heart'. That made sense in that moment.

The best sermon I ever heard on head-covering began in the Old Testament, and explained why it was the men should take ~~their~~ head-covering off, because of believing in Christ.

I've heard other sermons, but this is the only one which made sense.

I wonder if any of the participants in this thread have any idea why Jewish men wore a head-covering, or, why in Christ it should be removed?

If this point has been 'covered' in this thread already.... I apologise.

As I can't remember how it was explained, I'd be grateful to hear from someone who can bring up the appropriate scriptures, to remind me. Thanks.

:-)



Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/14 13:08

But in vain do they worship me, Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.

Let them alone: they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit.

Re:, on: 2008/2/14 13:18

murrcolr - your fruit gives you away. The soon coming day of fire will reveal all things.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/2/14 13:27

Hi murrcolr...

Quote:

-----But in vain do they worship me, Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.

Let them alone: they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit.

???

Brother, you might reconsider the tone of your posts. Are you saying that anyone who doesn't agree with your doctrinal view about a man-made head covering is *worshipping in vain*? Since none of us have "arrived" to perfection in all things -- we should have charitable patience with the brethren (including those brethren with whom we disagree - I Corinthians 13:1-3).

In addition to my earlier post on this matter, I was wondering if there is a single passage of Scripture OUTSIDE OF the much quoted passage in I Corinthians chapter 11 that deals with this issue? Is there even a second passage upon which this practice is directly based? Is there even a truly historical anecdote that shows that this was a custom of the early Church (or even amongst the Jews)?

When I read I Corinthians 11, it seems clear (at least, to me) that this covering is not a man-made hair jacket. The scriptures seem to equate this "covering" with "hair" (I Corinthians 11:6, 14-15). Why else would there be two separate discussions within this single monologue (verses 3-16)? Is Paul discussing hair AND man-made head coverings...or is he speaking about the idea of a simple covering upon a woman's head?

"But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: **for her hair is given her for a covering.**" - I Corinthians 11:15

In addition, what is the purpose for these instructions? Paul writes about how a woman who prays with her head uncovered "dishonors her head" (verse 5). A man is the "covering" (authority) of a woman just as Christ is the "covering" (authority) of the Church. Is it proper to show a "nude" (shaved) head -- or one that has been naturally endowed with proper propriety? Women grow hair at a naturally more rapid rate than men, and it is simply the "nature of things" to see women with a complete scalp/neck covering of long hair. Likewise, men tend to abstain from long hair. Hair has long been equated with the variance in sexes -- especially in a time when everyone wore similar robes. It is simply not natural for men to wear their hair long (or women to wear it like a man).

During the decades preceding the birth of Christ, women in the Roman Empire began to experience a newfound "epiphany" of freedom. During this time, some women even began to shave their heads (look at images of Egyptians like Cleopatra) or crop it and clip it back (like women living in Greece) as a symbol of this new feminism. This practice "caught on" in Europe. Likewise, short hair was historically a reflection of a man. A woman who wanted to "disguise" herself as a man? She cut off her hair. In the rugged years before Mary Kay and Avon, this had a beguiling effect of changing the entire appearance of a woman. Even in the United States, women traditionally kept their hair long UNTIL the "roaring" 1920s, where "flapper" women experiencing another feminist period of "liberty" decided to cut their hair in an almost masculine way (like the "Bob and Shingle" -- or "bob"). At the time, this hair was reflective of "counter culture" -- much the same way that long hair became upon men in the 1960s and 1970s.

As I said earlier, it is with great caution that one should mandate a practice. The Mormons base their "baptism for the dead" upon a passage in I Corinthians chapter 15 (verse 29). The Pentecostal "snake handlers" of the Appalachians base their practice upon Mark 16:18. Even the Cuanderos (hybrid Roman Catholic/voodoo faith healers of Latin America) base the practices upon a passage in Isaiah chapter 38 (citing verse 21). Do you see the problem that could arise out of basing a doctrine or practice upon a single passage of Scripture?



Here is what I sense about this (so please take this with a "grain of salt"):

We realize that Christ is the covering of the Church and man is the covering of the woman. Thus, this *natural* covering displays the *natural* order that God created for the world. A woman is not to take upon herself the authority of a man. God made MAN (and angels) in his image, and woman was created in the image of man. Long hair has become a distinction between the two sexes. This could reflect the reasoning behind verse 10 ("...and because of the angels..."). A woman's natural covering (her hair) displays a different glory. This hair distinguishes her to be loved and cherished as a treasured gift that God gave to man.

:-)

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 13:29**

1 Cor 14:34

Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law.

How is it possible for women to prophesy with or without a head covering? According to Paul, they can't speak either way.

Paul's role was to spread the faith; not to make up rules for worship that Jesus didn't already voice for us. If something Paul says doesn't fit with what Jesus taught, you know who to follow.

(I know my sister in law, a pastor in the Lutheran Church, would lambaste me if I ever asked why she disobeyed Paul's injunction against women preaching, or questioned why she didn't wear a head covering in the pulpit.) :-?

bub

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/14 13:30**

#### THE VEIL

According to Rabbi Dr. Menachem M. Brayer (Professor of Biblical Literature at Yeshiva University) in his book, *The Jewish woman in Rabbinic literature*, it was the custom of Jewish women to go out in public with a head covering which, sometimes, even covered the whole face leaving one eye free. He quotes some famous ancient Rabbis saying, "It is not like the daughters of Israel to walk out with heads uncovered" and "Cursed be the man who lets the hair of his wife be seen a woman who exposes her hair for self-adornment brings poverty." Rabbinic law forbids the recitation of blessings or prayers in the presence of a bareheaded married woman since uncovering the woman's hair is considered "nudity". Dr. Brayer also mentions that "During the Tannaitic period the Jewish woman's failure to cover her head was considered an affront to her modesty. When her head was uncovered she might be fined four hundred zuzim for this offense." Dr. Brayer also explains that veil of the Jewish woman was not always considered a sign of modesty. Sometimes, the veil symbolized a state of distinction and luxury rather than modesty. The veil personified the dignity and superiority of noble women. It also represented a woman's inaccessibility as a sanctified possession of her husband.

So we can see out of this extract from a book that in the Jewish Tradition women wore veils.

1Cor 11:2 Now I praise you that ye remember me in all things, and hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them to you.

Tradition meaning: The passing down of elements of a culture from generation to generation, especially by oral communication.

1Cor 11:5 But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven.

If the woman is unveiled it the same as if she was shaven this is what the scripture say.

1Cor 11:6 For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn: but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled.

Same thing here if the woman is unveiled let her be shorn but if it a shame let her be veiled.

1Cor 11:13 Judge ye (1) in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?

Paul asks Judge for yourself is right that a woman pray to God unveiled.

1Cor 11:14 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him?

Another question what does nature teach us.

1Cor 11:15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.

1. A woman has long hair.
2. It is a Glory to her.
3. Her hair is given as a covering.

Paul is telling these people it's not right for a women head to be uncovered. Nature tells you that her head should be covered. God in his wisdom has already taken care of it by giving her a covering her hair it's her covering. Does not nature teach us that as Paul shows. Paul is telling us women don't have to wear veils like in the Jewish Tradition.

1Pet 3:1-2 In like manner, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, even if any obey not the word, they may without the word be gained by the behavior of their wives beholding your chaste behavior coupled with fear.

1Pet 3:3 Whose adorning let it not be the outward adorning of braiding the hair, and of wearing jewels of gold, or of putting on apparel;

Peter says let it not be a outward adorning of braided hair, jewels, gold or apparel (Veils).

1Pet 3:4 but let it be the hidden man of the heart, in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

Let the adorning be of the incorruptible apparel of a meek and quiet spirit, which in God sight is more costly than Gold. God looks at the heart.

Jesus said of the Pharisee they would strain at a gnat, but then swallow a camel.

In other words, they majored on minor points. They made a big deal about things that really didn't matter.

Women if are reading this and any man thinking about this you don't have to it. The covering for a women is her hair. Paul tells us this in scripture the very same ones the Devil has tried to use as bondage.

2Cor 3:17-18 Now the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit.

I am glad I got involved in this thread I can now praise God that he is a good and frees us from bondage.

My eyes are now fully open to this false teaching of veiling your women and saying it's God.

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/14 13:31**

Docas, I don't know how many times I'll mention this, but... read that article by Nee! :-) He comes from the perspective you mentioned, about why men ought to have their heads uncovered and vice-versa. It gave me a lot to think about. Thank you again for your irenic spirit which has maintained a love for truth. God's grace upon you.

Jim, by the way, I never got around to thanking you for a couple PM's you sent me. They have influenced me in self-denial, which, little by little, I am growing in. Thanks again.

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/14 13:37**

Bubba Guy wrote:

Quote:

-----How is it possible for women to prophesy with or without a head covering? According to Paul, they can't speak either way.  
-----

Calvin corrects you, friend:

"It may seem, however, to be superfluous for Paul to forbid the woman to prophesy with her head uncovered, while elsewhere he wholly prohibits women from speaking in the Church. (1 Timothy 2:12.) It would not, therefore, be allowable for them to prophesy even with a covering upon their head, and hence it follows that it is to no purpose that he argues here as to a covering. It may be replied, that the Apostle, by here condemning the one, does not commend the other. For when he reproves them for prophesying with their head uncovered, he at the same time does not give them permission to prophesy in some other way, but rather delays his condemnation of that vice to another passage, namely in 1 Corinthians 14. In this reply there is nothing amiss, though at the same time it might suit sufficiently well to say, that the Apostle requires women to show their modesty— not merely in a place in which the whole Church is assembled, but also in any more dignified assembly, either of matrons or of men, such as are sometimes convened in private houses."

As well, you wrote,

Quote:

-----Paul's role was to spread the faith; not to make up rules for worship that Jesus didn't already voice for us. If something Paul says doesn't fit with what Jesus taught, you know who to follow.  
-----

My friend, read this please,

Myth #5: Paul is the one who gave this command (rather than God)

This myth attacks directly at the inspiration of Scripture. This myth is often cloaked in terms like: "what Paul was saying was", "Paul was writing to address..." It makes commands in the Bible into doctrines of men. God, not Paul, is the author of 1 Corinthians. Paul was only the secretary, not the author of 1 Corinthians. The Holy Spirit told Paul what to write. Paul did not write on his own authority. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." (1 Corinthians 14:37). There is no basis historically or otherwise to say that Paul gave this command rather than God.

Please don't chip away at the plenary inspiration of the scriptures. :-o Your thoughts?

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 14:05**

Hi all. I asked a question a few pages back and not in any bad way, but it was a sincere question. If I may ask it again - it's maybe two pages back.

If my present Church suddenly required this, even though they don't have women praying or prophesying in the meeting/service, I would not leave my Church on that ground. I become all things to all men - but mostly when I visit other truly Born-Again Churches - so my question was not out of challenging mode, but a sincere curiosity of how many head-covering churches are also cessationists or where women must keep silent.

I don't see where Colin, for one, has gotten any more challenging than those who started this thread in the first place and the others who have basically told us that this is "the law".

I've read about this custom since I've been saved, wanting sincerely to know His Mind on the matter. Much study leads you back to the custom of the Jewish Culture at that time and that of those in Corinth. But I feel no need to get into that, because I respect those who wear coverings - but I respect more, truly "meek, submissive" Sisters. They are examples to me more than anything and I like learning as much as I can from them. I know a few.

What grieves me is that, have we actually been in His Presence to the point where it's breath-taking? Have we seen His Glory? Have we ever beheld Him to the fullest extent that a human body can take?

Our Asst. Pastor didn't know why those verses mentioned the angels, and it was just two weeks before he mentioned that he didn't know why in our Newsletter, that the Lord had shown me why - and it was/is quite the breath-taking experience for me when I read it.

Here were the verses --

Isa 6:1 In the year that king Uzziah died **I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.**

Isa 6:2 Above it stood the seraphims: each one **had six wings with twain he covered his face**, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly.

Isa 6:3 And one cried unto another, **and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.**

Still gives me that same affect of Awe.

If only we could "see The Lord" - if only we could experience this that Isaiah and others have. I think every woman should seek this - and our men. As much as humanly possible.

And seek the Spirit of Christ in prayer and prophesying through us all. He died to offer these blessings to us. I believe it is the Normal Christian Life. We should set our Sights, prayers and hopes for these blessings 'Higher' every day, I believe.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 14:17**

Quote:

-----Ouch... I'm wondering if that was that necessary or truthful. I haven't once heard Narrowpath say that head coverings are necessary to salvation.

I have to agree, I haven't read from Narrowpath that he attributes this headcovering to his or her righteousness, but rather something that he feels is right to do.

Indeed let's be zealous, but also read what's being said first before making rash judgements. Besides, were in danger of having this room locked, and it has been a good discussion so far.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 14:21**

Openlife:

So, are you volunteering to explain this to my sister in law, the pastor in the Evangelical Lutheran Church??

Seriously, what others have already brought up is the most important issue here; these are the only verses in the Bible that require head covering (and, if the length of this discussion is any indicator, Paul was very unclear in this passage, to boot.)

Let's not be confounded anymore. Jesus does not forbid women to speak, preach, prophesy, with or without a head covering. I'm going with that. The "plenary inspiration of the scriptures," as you put it, favors multiple injunctions for such things.

ngs. and thus citing Paul's passage in 1 Tim 2:12 as a second injunction against women speaking also does not stand up.

Consider that in Islam women's head coverings are taken VERY seriously. A woman venturing into public without one would be stoned or otherwise accosted. What does this headcovering say? it is indicative of the lesser stature and value placed on women in this culture. It says, 'men are in control' and 'women belong to men' 'just look, they wear the covering to prove it.'

bub

ps. PM me and i will give you my sister in law's phone number. :-)

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/14 14:28

Somebody mentioned Calvin

Speaking of decorous arrangements which take away confusion in the church, **Calvin says on page 1207** of Institutes Of The Christian Religion (Westminster Press edition):

There are examples of the first sort in Paul: that profane drinking bouts should not be mingled with the sacred supper of the Lord (1 Cor. 11:21-22), and that women should not go out in public with uncovered heads (1 Cor. 11:5).

After addressing matters related to proper order and decorum as mentioned above, Calvin goes on to say:

But because he did not will in outward discipline and ceremonies what we ought to do **because he foresaw that this depended upon the state of the times, and he did not deem one form suitable for all ages**, here we must take refuge in those general rules which he has given, that whatever the necessity if the church will require for order and decorum should be tested against these (Institutes Of The Christian Religion, Westminster Press, p. 1208, emphases added).

**What is Calvin's conclusion?**

Lastly, because he has taught nothing specifically, and **because these things are not necessary to salvation**, and for the upbuilding of the church ought to be **variously accommodated to the customs of each nation and age**, it will be fitting **as the advantage of the church will require** to change and abrogate traditional practices and to establish new ones (Institutes Of The Christian Religion, Westminster Press, p. 1208, emphases added).

If Calvin believed that the headcovering was an unalterable law of God, in all times and circumstances, **then why did he say it "ought to be variously accommodated to the customs of each nation and age...."** and that **".... it will be fitting (as the advantage of the church will require) to change and abrogate traditional practices and to establish new ones?"** This is inexplicable except upon the presupposition that he understood 1 Corinthians 11 to be speaking from a cultural perspective. **If the headcovering is an unalterable law of modesty, then what do the "customs of each nation and age" have to do with the headcovering?**

Re:, on: 2008/2/14 14:37

Quote:

theopenlife wrote:

If there was ever an article that presents a compelling case for head coverings, it must be this one by Watchman Nee:

(<http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>) Nee on Head Coverings

I read it tonight with an informed young woman who has never accepted head coverings and, to my surprise she went away in support of them as symbols of grace!

By the way, Compliments, you wrote,

Quote:  
-----However, in my humble opinion, it would be better if that man just lived a moderate life before God and used no ordinances whatso  
ever.  
-----

I must quote from the very passage in question,

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

:-)  
-----

We can disagree and still love one another Compliments. I only chose this one particular quote because that is where the word "law" came from.

I've seen nothing here so far worth locking - I've read the whole thread through last night --- but I'm hyper-sensitive when folks make me doubt if I'm following His Ordinances, because I fear HIM very much.

Ordinances is defined as -

G3862  
&#960;&#945;&#961;&#945;&#769;&#948;&#959;&#963;&#953;&#962;  
paradosis  
par-ad'-os-is  
From G3860; transmission, that is, (concretely) a precept; specifically the Jewish traditionary law: - ordinance, tradition.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/14 16:40**

Quote:  
-----  
HE\_Reigns wrote:

Quote:  
-----

I've seen nothing here so far worth locking - I've read the whole thread through last night --- but I'm hyper-sensitive when folks make me doubt if I'm following His Ordinances, because I fear HIM very much.

-----

What Jesus Christ came to do almost 2,000 years ago was not bring us back into bondage, but deliver us from it. He didn't come to set up a new system of laws and regulations to live by. He came to blow them all away so that we might now serve Him in newness of the Spirit and not in oldness of the letter (Romans 7:6). In fact, it was to the religious and the self-righteous of His day that Jesus had the most condemning things to say. Why? Because they were leading so many away from a true relationship with God through the enticements of the most wicked deception Satan has ever used against mankind - religion!

In Paul's letter to the Galatians, he sternly reminds them that it was for freedom that Christ set us free; therefore keep standing firm and do not be subject again to a yoke of slavery (Galatians 5:1). Like many still today however, the Galatians were not standing firm in the faith and had consequently returned to the bondage that Christ had rescued them from. They had become subject again to a yoke of slavery. Is it any wonder that Paul says these dear folks had been "bewitched"? After all, who in their right mind would ever want to give up the joy of freedom for the misery once again of bondage?

It is only those who have been bewitched, deceived, and confused by something that appears to be the real thing...and that something is religion.

Do not substitute religion for simple faith in Jesus Christ. Religion offers no hope for the hopeless, no rest for the weary, no peace for the distressed, no deliverance for the captives, and no life for the lifeless. It is in believing the gospel that you are saved from the bondage to religion. The more you confidently rest and the more firmly you stand in the faith, the more clearly you will see religion for what it truly is - a counterfeit.

Now is the time, today is the day, to leave the bondage behind for the freedom of the real thing...faith in Jesus Christ!

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 18:40**

Quote:

-----Consider that in Islam women's head coverings are taken VERY seriously

Are you kidding? Can you imagine our women in a Burkha?

\*\*\*\*\*

Quote:

-----but I'm hyper-sensitive when folks make me doubt if I'm following His Ordinances, because I fear HIM very much.

Do it with all your heart Sister. Keep in mind that if you do not see another Sister doing the same thing that you don't look down upon her and condemn her to hell if she is not living up to your standards of holiness. I've seen holiness in women who do not wear the head covering, and I've seen rebellion on those who do.

If you're one of those Sisters that don't do this, you're blessed. I count it a privilege to have known several such ladies that have this virtue.

God Bless You as you serve Him. :-)

**Re:, on: 2008/2/14 19:38**

murrcoir -

You twist scripture and sow strife to your own shame and judgment. I do not believe Phil or anyone else said we are justified by head coverings.

By your logic the Apostle Peter was a Pharisee. Let's take a look at some of what this Pharisee had to say using your logic.

"Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands" (what religious bondage this Peter places on the poor woman...)

"Do not let your adornment be external" (don't twist this to imply that a head covering is an external "adornment" and fits in this context either)

"Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered." (are you saying we have to earn the right to be heard Peter, don't you know we are only heard because of Christ's blood)

The dangerous thing about what you are doing friend is what I call using trojan horse debate tactics. That is, build a case against the law (which of course WE ALL agree with) then slip in the false statement that head coverings are a work of the law. Cleverly disguised arguments indeed.

I am not sure if you do these things willfully, but otherwise this is a great thread that many, including myself, have been sharpened and challenged by.

As I said before, your hermeneutic and exegesis used here is not great, you throw around scripture recklessly, and personally insult people who are serving the Lord out of a pure heart because their understanding and conviction differs from you. The external will always show the internal. If a woman loves the Lord and is convinced that the head covering is for her, she will naturally do what pleases her Lord. I want to make it perfectly clear that we fellowship with those who do and don't, and my comments are not aimed at those who disagree with the covering. Only those who seek to pervert the edifying discussion of it by carelessly throwing scriptures around, calling people Pharisees, and bringing unrighteous judgment on brethren (specifically Phil) who tend to show a generous amount of meekness and love on this forum.

-Jim

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/14 19:52**

Overall, what an informative and spirited thread this has been. Yay.

Compliments, you wrote,

Quote:  
-----Indeed lets be zealous, but also read whats being said first before making rash judgements. ...it has been a good discussion so far.  
-----

Agreed. Good stuff.

Murrcolr, thank you for taking time to search out the Calvin quotes; I'm not sure that he was referring to head coverings as dispensable, or just unspecified ordinances in general. It would be contradictory otherwise since he says so plainly elsewhere that women ought to use head coverings.

Just to throw this out there, recently while considering my beliefs I realized that I am classified as a New Covenantal Reformed Baptist?! What was more surprising was that when I googled that name, I found churches called that!!? How badly we need to be unified by the Shepherd. Hurray for heaven.

**Re: we need to cover head covering, on: 2008/2/14 20:26**

Brother, I had to go look up 'irenic' but thank you. :knockedout:

:~)

theopenlife said

Quote:  
-----we need to be unified by the Shepherd  
-----

This is one of my most zealous preoccupations. And one thing is certain, it cannot come through doctrinal compliance, but through the Holy Spirit. We have all been made to drink into one Spirit.

Let me justify my comment about doctrine. A Christian who wrote a book called 'Restoring the Kingdom' was brought up in a Pentecostal church - so much noise when it's dead to you - finally deciding to settle in the contemplative incense-swinging environment of the Russian Orthodox. I have no idea if this means he does or doesn't know the Lord after all. He writes as if he really understands the issues. But his life shows us clearly, that our antecedents leave a deep influence in our thinking, which we must *work* at giving to the Lord, that we may show forth His death and life.

Only through His death, whereby we abandon our own preconceptions, and stop holding others' against them with a similar integrity of attitude, *because* of the death of Christ, will we begin to find ourselves one in His life.

(Just in case anyone wonders, I'm not an ecumenical. I have seen what it does to ministers and Christians. It renders them impotent.)



Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/14 20:49

Dorcas wrote,

Quote:

-----One thing is certain, it cannot come through doctrinal compliance, but through the Holy Spirit.  
-----

Total agreement here. The Holy Spirit unifies the Church upon essentials; the Second Coming of Christ will unify the Church in all things peripheral.

I cannot expect to have entire doctrinal unity with a fresh-born saint, but I am already one with him because Christ prayed for it so! (John 17) Regeneration is true unification. We are born again into one body.

Back to the original subject...

Perhaps some of my sisters ought to be wearing coverings on their heads, but I can think of more than a few times I needed one on my mouth. We need to be meek and cautious as Ccchhhrrriiisss said, taking even the possibility of God's ordinances seriously, and not hotly trouncing upon what may become our beliefs tomorrow.

In a number of areas my views are backwards to what they were two years ago, and now I regret the arrogance with which I propounded my former views as if I had the final word to end all arguments.

Besides salvation by grace through faith, few subjects are so immovable in my judgment that I cannot speak softly when I declare my firm opinions about them.

The Holy Spirit is leading us into all truth, but our arrival will not come in this life.

Re:, on: 2008/2/14 21:05

Dear Brother - You've said just now that the Holy Spirit is leading us into all truth. One of my favorite scriptures and I've sought Him for Truth for 32 years. Even on these smaller issues.

I think what may have set some off was this quote -

"Our church does not practise head covering although some women do. For me head covering is the outward display of an inward conviction about godly authority. **The reason we have so many objections and find this commandment so difficult to introduce in our churches is I think is because of the confusion Satan has caused in the perception of true manhood and womanhood in the world and in the church. Head covering seems to be a small and "nasty" commandment to obey so that many think it is not that important.** If you practise it you may quickly be branded as legalistic and narrowminded. I think our attitude to head covering reveals a lot about our understanding of godly authority."

Brother Philip, that was a heavy post. You did call it a "commandment" and indicated Satan's activity in some of our lives if we don't obey this one "commandment". And that we who don't, call anything in His Word "nasty".

See? This is why some may have gone off in defending the opposing viewpoint.

Bottom of page 7.

I think we all should be lenient on this one.

I said I would wear one if I was at a Church that practiced this while "praying or prophesying".

Your title reads - "need" to cover this topic.

That goes along with the title "commandment" that you wrote above.

Maybe if those words "need" and commandment hadn't come up - Jim wouldn't be mad at Colin now.

Unity as Krispy said on "non-essentials" - but this quote above tells me that - anything that is a Commandment from our GOD is an Essential.

We need to be fair to each other.

I'm all for head-coverings for those who wear them and I'd fight for their Right to wear them.

GOD Bless His Body.

Edited correction.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/15 6:13**

Quote:

-----By your logic the Apostle Peter was a Pharisee. Let's take a look at some of what this Pharisee had to say using your logic.

My logic tell me how do you get to the point that I think Peter was a Pharisee. I pointed out that Peter said a woman should adorn the inner man with meekness and a quiet spirit. He understands God, he knows God and what he is like. He knows God is more interested with your inner man your heart than your outward man.

Quote:

-----"Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands" (what religious bondage this Peter places on the poor woman...).

Thats are your words not mine's...

Quote:

-----"Do not let your adorning be external" (don't twist this to imply that a head covering is an external "adornment" and fits in this context either).

If head covering is not external then what is it? Hahahahahahaha don't twist this Hahahahahahaha

The context is Authority because head coverers say it has nothing to do with Culture, Tradition and or the hair is not the covering but about God's Authority. To establish a matter we should not just look at one scripture but look to others to clarify and establish the truth. Peter is speaking to wives about submission to authority. He says don't let your adorning be external but an inward sign.

Quote:

-----"Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered." (are you saying we have to earn the right to be heard Peter, don't you know we are only heard because of Christ's blood)

The key to that scripture hinges on these words showing honor to the women since they are heirs with you. The woman is a joint heir with us even though she is a weaker vessel (physically) she is our equal in grace of life. He then says if you don't honor her, your prayers will be hindered. Check.....for any man who can't figure out why your prayers are hindered are you honoring your wife.

Quote:  
-----The dangerous thing about what you are doing friend is what I call using trojan horse debate tactics. That is, build a case against the law (which of course WE ALL agree with) then slip in the false statement that head coverings are a work of the law. Cleverly disguised arguments indeed.  
-----

Quote:  
-----law (which of course WE ALL agree with)  
-----

Gal 3:24-25 So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. **But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor**

Cleverly disguised arguments indeed. Oh that I had a brain that could do such a thing. I find it hard to spell never mind come out with cleverly disguised arguments. I am only trying put across what I see to be the truth.

Your thinking is still based on the law. Does your God keep a sinner in bondage and burn him in hell cause he is just not good enough, or is he like my God. Amazing Grace, how sweet the sound, that saved a wretch like me I once was lost but now am found, was blind, but now, I see. T'was Grace that taught my heart to fear. And Grace, my fears relieved. How precious did that Grace appear? The hour I first believed. Through many dangers, toils and snares we have already come. T'was Grace that brought us safe thus far and Grace will lead us home.

Quote:  
-----I am not sure if you do these things willfully, but otherwise this is a great thread that many, including myself, have been sharpened and challenged by.  
-----

Thank You

Well that was my point to challenge you then when you are fully upset the religious covering goes and what you really think comes to the surface. Your thinking is based on law.

Matthew 15, "Then there come to Jesus from Jerusalem Pharisees and scribes, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. And he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?"

Deut 19:15 One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established.

The law says two or three witnesses shall a matter be established.

Apart from what Paul says in Corinthians where else in the New Testament is it mentioned where women should have their heads covered.

It says it only once, there is only one witness (Paul teaching in Corinthians where he says hold fast the traditions) that could/or could not promote the head covering doctrine. According to the law this is not enough to establish the truth.

To try and say that heading covering doctrine knows becomes a law which Narrowpath did at the start of this thread is indeed breaking the law.

As it cannot be established by the law as there is only one witness.

Quote:  
-----Narrowpath said;

The reason we have so many objections and find this commandment so difficult to introduce

Head covering seems to be a small and "nasty" commandment to obey so that many think it is not that important.

I love, worship, revere, fear, obey and adore God because I have been forgiven much. I did not get forgiveness because of what I did or did not do. I shouldn't have been given anything.

Oh that day with my bloodied wife lying next to me on the bed. She should have been in hospital but didn't go cause she did not want me to get in trouble. I looked to God "I don't want to be like this anymore. Change me" I said. I was filled with the Holy Spirit on my bed and then spoke in tongues.

It was 3 months later before I was going to church but I had changed. The social services took the kids off the at risk register because they were no longer at risk. I was a new creation no longer in condemnation. Here in God's Grace I stand.

I deserved hell but he loves me. I have been forgiven much so I love much.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/15 9:01**

"Your thinking is based on law."

No it based on the the same grace the apostle Peter taught. Not an empty, mental grace, but a radical transforming grace of the Holy Spirit. Again, if a woman is convinced by the Spirit that the head covering is for her and she obeys it, this is because of the inward love for Christ not an outward law. She does nothing more than the woman who doesn't wear fancy adornments because of an inward love for Christ... you are actually acting as the judgmental pharisee in falsely accusing heart motives of a devoted woman of God.

murrclor - I do want to say it is obvious that you are writing based off your past experience with abusers of grace. This has jaded your judgment on this matter, though it helps me understand where you are coming from. You have no idea what the Holy Spirit of God is doing in His truly called out ones, regardless of if they wear a covering or not. You are the one judging unrighteously based on outward appearance.

-Jim

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2008/2/15 9:57**

Quote:

jimdied2sin wrote:

"Your thinking is based on law."

No it based on the the same grace the apostle Peter taught. Not an empty, mental grace, but a radical transforming grace of the Holy Spirit. Again, if a woman is convinced by the Spirit that the head covering is for her and she obeys it, this is because of the inward love for Christ not an outward law. She does nothing more than the woman who doesn't wear fancy adornments because of an inward love for Christ... you are actually acting as the judgmental pharisee in falsely accusing heart motives of a devoted woman of God.

murrclor - I do want to say it is obvious that you are writing based off your past experience with abusers of grace. This has jaded your judgment on this matter, though it helps me understand where you are coming from. You have no idea what the Holy Spirit of God is doing in His truly called out ones, regardless of if they wear a covering or not. You are the one judging unrighteously based on outward appearance.

-Jim

Yes that right my experience with people who practices this are that they dead, boring and religious. They seem to have

a different spirit than the one I do.

Quote:  
-----You have no idea what the Holy Spirit of God is doing in His truly called out ones, regardless of if they wear a covering or not.  
-----

Please read this and see how you are lifting yourself up above me.

Quote:  
-----  
You are the one judging unrightously based on outward appearance.  
-----

Matt 15:17 Perceive ye not, that whatsoever goeth into the mouth passeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught ?

**Re:, on: 2008/2/15 10:01**

I am done here. May the Holy Spirit lead us in all truth and keep us from errors on the right and on the left.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/15 10:08**

I just found this thread last night for the first time....kept me from sleeping well. I wanted to share my convictions on this doctrine but I had a beloved who reminded me how tired I was and needed to get to bed!

As I was thinking about this most of the night I wondered how I should respond? Philosophically? With Biblical exposition? Perhaps I will go for the latter because God will always have the last word on any issue that deals with Scripture. And I will not copy/paste anyone else's writings although I will copy/paste Scripture.

1 Corinthians 11: 1-16. (NASB)

Be imitators of me, just as I also am of Christ.

2 Now I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold firmly to the traditions, just as I delivered them to you.

Paul is advising people to imitate him! Can you rightly tell someone to follow Jesus like you do? Quite a mouthful, wouldn't you say? But the Holy Spirit inspired him to write this. Then he proceeds to compliment them on how they remembered him and that they keep the traditions *"just as I delivered them to you."*

v. 3: But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.

Seems to me a thorough understanding of this eternal principle will illuminate the verses following.

God (Elohim - literally Gods) consists of three persons: The Father, the Son - Jesus, and the Holy Spirit. Gen. 1: 26 says : " Then God said, "Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness;" Note the plurality of 'us', 'our'. Now Elohim made man in his own image, male and female created he them (v. 27). Scripture informs us that Adam and Eve were made in the image of God. We also learn from studying the scriptures that this 'Image' does not mean physical likeness in the sense that God is sexed. Now through out the OT we read a lot about the 'Jehovah' God. Scholars will tell you this Jehovah is none other then the pre-incarnate Jesus. Little is spoken of the HS in the OT, however, once Jesus appears He spoke often of him saying it is essential for him to go away so the Holy Spirit can come, and that His ministry will be great. Throughout the entire Scripture you will see the unity, the teamwork that existed in the godhead: the Father, the son Jesus and the Holy Spirit. The Father acted as the CEO of the three. In actuality one reads little about the Father. Jesus was and is the central figure. Jesus, while on earth received his instructions from the Father. Jesus also says the Hol

y Spirit will speak those things he hears. The point we see here is the unity, the teamwork that exists in the godhead of three persons. Each had a different function, all worked together for the good of themselves and ultimate mankind. There was absolute harmony.

Now, Elohim created male and female to operate in the same manner: in his image we are created. We are created to function in harmony, unity as they do. Think about that! But what happened? A beautiful creature that God created convinced Eve to question God's directive and Adam allowed her to listen to it and so this unity was broken. The result was a curse on both of them.

Now Paul sets forth the order of headship in this verse: God is the head of Christ, Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman. Now how are we to respond to this eternal order of things? We must remember this order did not originate with the fall: it was right there in the creation. But man sinned so we have another dimension to deal with here.

Now let us go on..."Every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head" - need any more clarification? Simply put, a male who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head - could be his own head and Jesus who is his head. (Have you even been to a commencement address at a state university and when prayer was said, the males would remove their caps but the girls left them on? Noticed this at Mississippi State University a few years ago.) And the woman how is she to acknowledge her head? v.5: "But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head, for she is one and the same as the woman whose head is shaved." In other words, if the woman does as the man she is dishonoring her head! If she does not want to cover her head, she is to shave it! Since this is dishonorable, cover it.

Now I need to skip a few verses because this is getting too long. But we need to see why the woman needs to cover her head: "Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels." Ah, have a symbol of authority on her head! Wow! So woman has authority? It says so! But how does one have authority? By being under authority, just as Jesus demonstrated while on earth: he was subject to the Father, took his instructions from him and acted only on them. Like one person said: "If you want authority, you must be under authority!" So, now the woman in order to have authority should wear a head covering for the sake of the angels. I will not expand on the possibilities of this concept except to say I think there is some awesome power here available to the godly, obedient woman. Angels ministering to women! Can you get that? Does that not about make you tremble in fear and delight that God would regard his lowly handmaidens as such? Amen!

So, how are we to exercise our authority? By listening to those over us: "how can I be of best use to you", "how can I help you?" "What do you want me to do?" (A practical point: my DH and I grow tomatoes hydroponically. He says he could not do this without me helping because I notice the small things which can make a difference in success or failure. Now my DH, on the other hand, cares for the mechanical which to me is out of my sphere of expertise - and perhaps ever capability of learning! We have learned to not downplay any concerns the other has in what is observed. This modus operandi has taught me a lot about submission, unity, teamwork, headship, cooperation - both working for a common good.)

v. 11:However, in the Lord, neither is woman independent of man, nor is man independent of woman. 12For as the woman originates from the man, so also the man has his birth through the woman; and all things originate from God. These verses would clearly spell out that the woman is not inferior to man, they are one and are to function as one with God being the head of both.

Some have suggested that for a female to be in submission to men makes her inferior, subjects her to abuse. Well, if that happens, SHAME ON THAT MAN! That is not at all what Paul is inferring. I have witnessed those who appear to have received convictions that a female should wear a head covering then proceed to abuse the wife! That man is not a godly man!

v. 16:But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other practice, nor have the churches of God. Paul informs the reader that if one is inclined to be contentious we have no other practice nor have the churches of God.

Ladies, Gentlemen, brothers and sisters, wearing a head covering provides a female with lots of opportunities to witness that males do not have. Since I wear one which cannot be construed as a hair ornament I have had many opportunities to speak for my LORD. Strangers will recognize it as having religious significance and will come and share concerns "pray for me" or whatever. This happens regularly to females who are obedient to this scripture.

May God be honored and praised!

ginnyrose

PS: If any respond to this post, I will be gone most of the day and cannot respond. My tomatoes keep growing and require pruning. God bless all of you.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/15 11:11**

He\_Reigns said :

Quote:  
-----The reason we have so many objections and find this commandment so difficult to introduce in our churches is I think is because of the confusion Satan has caused in the perception of true manhood and womanhood in the world and in the church.  
-----

Amen! Along with a great many other subjects as well.

Thanks for your post. :-)

**Re:, on: 2008/2/15 11:33**

Ginnyrose,

Great post. two questions:

Paul says that Christ is the head of the man. and the man the head of the woman.

Isn't Christ also the head of the woman? do women need a male intercessor between them and Christ?

Second question: Pruning tomatoes in February?? I gotta learn about this! (though i don't think it will work in Minnesota.)

bub

**Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/15 15:20**

GinnyRose, thanks for taking the time to respond. I agree with much of what you said but have differences in little areas. For instance, regarding angels, I'll quote Nee:

Quote:  
-----

"For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels" (v. 10). The Bible does not specify what is to be used for the covering; it only states that the head, where the hair grows, should be covered. Why should the head be covered? Because of the angels.

I often am amazed at this marvelous teaching that the sisters should have on their heads the sign of authority for the sake of the angels. We know the tragic history of how some of the angels sinned. Satan rebelled against God. Why? Because he desired to make himself equal with God. In other words, the angel Lucifer attempted to expose his own head before God and refused to submit to His authority. In Isaiah 14, Satan constantly reiterated, "I will." "And thou saidst in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God and I will sit upon the mount of the congregation, in the uttermost parts of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High" (vv. 13-14). Right in this passage we see an archangel falling to become Satan. Revelation 12 further shows us that when Satan fell, one-third of the angelic force fell with him (Rev. 12:4). Why did the angels fall? Because of their not being subject to the authority of God the head but trying instead to expose their own heads

Today woman has a sign of authority on her head because of the angels, that is, as a testimony to the angels. Only the sisters in the church can testify to this, for the women of the world know nothing of it. Today when the sisters have the sign of authority on their heads, they bear the testimony that, "I have covered my head so that I do not have my own head, for I do not seek to be head. My head is veiled and I have accepted man as head, and to accept man as head means that I have accepted Christ as head and God as head. But some of you angels have rebelled against God." This is what it means by "because of the angels."

I have on my head a sign of authority. I am a woman with my head covered. This is a most excellent testimony to the angels, to the fallen and to the un

fallen ones. No wonder Satan persistently opposes the matter of head covering. It really puts him to shame. We are doing what he has failed to do. What God did not receive from the angels, He now has from the church. Because some of the angels do not submit themselves to the authority of God and of His Christ, the world is subject to great confusion. The fall of Satan has caused much more trouble than the fall of man. But, thank God, what He failed to get from the fallen angels, He has obtained from the church.

When many of the sisters in the church take the place given to woman and learn to cover their heads, they send out an unspoken word of testimony to the angels in the air, to the effect that God has obtained in the church what He desires. Because of this, woman must have on her head a sign of authority, a testimony to the angels."

**Re: we need to cover head covering, on: 2008/2/15 15:46**

Colin said

Quote:

-----I had changed  
-----

Brother, I couldn't let your testimony pass without thanking God for all He has done for you and your family. Praise His name!

Quote:

-----The key to that scripture hinges on these words showing honor to the women since they are heirs with you. The woman is a joint heir with us even though she is a weaker vessel (physically) she is our equal in grace of life. He then says if you don't honor her, your prayers will be hindered. Check.....for any man who can't figure out why your prayers are hindered are you honoring your wife.  
-----

The mention of these verses (1 Pet 3), are often testimony in themselves.

Thank you for sharing your heart.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/15 19:50**

Quote:

-----Isn't Christ also the head of the woman? do women need a male intercessor between them and Christ?  
-----

Bubba,

I have never heard this question before. Nor even the idea. I am not sure if you are making fun or what???

Anyhow, as we look at headship on the human level we are talking about order in human relationships.

A woman needing another intercessor? Nowhere is this spoken of in the Scriptures. But you may want to take a look at 1 Peter 3:7 "Likewise ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered." Now how would you interpret this verse? Great responsibility on the husband, do you not think?

Pruning tomatoes in February! Yes sir! They are grown in greenhouses, pruned to a single stem from whom the tomato clusters grow and produce fruit. Clusters are pruned to 3 fruits each. By the end of the crop in July the vines can be at least 20 feet long! Now go dream about it but be sure to dream about the work as well! lol

ginnyrose



**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/15 20:01**

Actually, the way I came to understand headcovering discovered was through my 16 year old recently baptized daughter who read 1.Cor 11:1-16 and asked me why we do not practise head covering.

She read it and understood it in a literal sense that women should cover their head during the worship service. I researched the issue for myself and felt she was right. I only told her that when she does it, she should do it silently as unto God and do not show off. Ironically I bought a beautiful headscarf in India a while ago thinking if she would wear a headscarf one day, she would like her to wear this one.

From experience I know that you should take the discovery of a young and inexperienced believer seriously. God often discloses his mysteries to them to shame the mature. Was it not the little boy with the seven loaves and five fish whose answer made Jesus disciples look like dummies?

I read Watchman Nee's article posted here earlier and find he has been given deep insight by God. He does not come across as domineering or patronizing. He explains that in the Kingdom of God there is the realm of grace and the realm of government. Both co-exist and will do so until Christ's return without infringing each other.

If you try to see the head covering only in the realm of God's grace you will inevitably come to the conclusion that this is a lapse from grace and re-introduction of a law.

Only in the realm of God's government and grace, this whole issue makes sense. God gives everything to Christ

Christ submits and surrenders to God

Christ gives everything to the Church

The Church submits and surrenders to Christ

Man loves and cares for his wife.

The woman submits unto man as unto Christ.

There is also God ordained worldly government and its bodies on earth. Masters and slaves, elders, deacons, young and old etc that falls in the realm of God's government.

We see in the story of the Roman centurion that Christ's sovereign healing of his slave was in close conjunction with his understanding of government.

Mat 8:9 I tell this one, 'Go,' and he goes; and that one, 'Come,' and he comes. I say to my servant, 'Do this,' and he does it."

Here we see a striking example how grace and authority cooperate in receiving from God.

Grace without Authority becomes cheap presumptuous grace. Authority without grace becomes oppression.

By grace Christ becomes your saviour, by submitting to his authority and giving up every right of self, he becomes your Lord.

Satan has worked very hard to destroy these both doctrines, grace and government and he has come quite far recently. Soon the man of lawlessness will reign for a short period of time.

Why am I saying all this in respect to head covering? Because it shows you agree with everything that falls under God's authority. You will not be offended by this.

A woman who gladly submits to her husband is a powerful witness of Christ. She can convince without many words in her pure devotion to Christ and her husband. She covers her head during the service is absolutely content that man do the teaching and government in church. These women are a rare species and blessed are you man if you have found such a wife.

Watchman Nee's insight into God's authority has been tested and approved - during 20 years of imprisonment.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/15 20:25**

Dear Brother, I've read Watchman Nee since I first got saved. I believe The Release of the Spirit was the first of at least 30 of his books that I've read and I have another book that has a chapter each of quotes from 60 of his books. I do love that man. Can't agree with him on all things - such as there being 5 Raptures - and other things, I've discussed with Manfred - but as far as "walking in the spirit" and "dying to self" - he and T.A. Sparks were the best.

Women under man is a Commandment since the Garden.

I don't believe in women teaching or usurping Authority. I've posted on that here since I've joined and that I believe wives are to submit - whether their husbands are saved or not - and I do submit to my husband - as long as they don't ask you to sin.

Again though, to speak about covering one's head while "praying or prophesying" is the topic here and the title. I wish we could stay on topic, because your posts are making "the two one".

There are many brothers on this forum that have Holy & submissive Wives - but they don't wear a head covering when "praying or prophesying".

What are you saying to these brothers about their wives is the question. Please think of that and that only.

Thank you and GOD Bless you!

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/16 11:30**

HeadCovering Love One Another, CFP, by Watchman Nee

Quote:

-----  
The matter of head covering belongs to God's government. For those who do not know God's government, it is impossible to exhort them to have their heads covered. They will not be able to understand how much is involved in this matter. But those who have seen God's government in God's revealed Word are able to appreciate the tremendous connection between head covering and God's government  
-----

Nee promotes that head covering belongs to God's Government. He states that if you do not know God's Government, it is impossible to exhort them who do not understand to have a head covered. This statement above is dreadful and is cultish sounding.

Without saying anymore about the above statement and losing anyone, I will press on below Watchman Nee gives us some examples of God government.

Quote:

-----Examples of God's Government

1. ADAM

You remember the tragic story of Adam's fall. After God created Adam, He planted a garden and put man in charge of it. God literally gave this garden to Adam and Eve. "Eden" means "pleasure." So this first couple lived in a garden of pleasure. Then they sinned against God. Even though God gave them the promise of redemption, saying that a Savior would come as the seed of the woman, yet He drove them out of the Garden of Eden. It is God's grace to save, but that did not change God's government in driving out Adam and Eve.

Not only was Adam thrown out of Eden, but also God set cherubim to guard the garden so that Adam could not again enter. This too is God's government. Thus we can see that God's government and God's grace are two separate matters. Grace gives man the promise of a Savior, **but God's government drives that same man out of the Garden of Eden.**

## 2. THE ISRAELITES

Having arrived at Kadesh-Barnea, the Israelites refused to enter into Canaan; consequently, God denied them that privilege. Though they repented and then tried to enter, many of them were killed by the Canaanites, for God had barred the way. Their cries did not change God's decision (Num. 13 and 14). **God has His governmental act; He will not allow men to interfere with His government.**

## 3. MOSES

Moses did not sanctify the Lord before the eyes of the people when he smote the rock twice; as a consequence he could not enter into Canaan (Num. 20:7-12). Though God had mercy on him by bringing him to the top of Pisgah, He did not allow him to enter Canaan with His people. Moses could view the land with God on Pisgah, but he could not enter in (see Deut. 34). For Moses to see the boundaries of the land of Canaan from the mountaintop was God's grace; **for him not to be allowed to enter in was God's government.**

## 4. DAVID

After David sinned, God was gracious and merciful to him in forgiving his sin. God even gave him special grace after that incident by permitting David to have unusual fellowship with Him. Yet the sword never left his house (2 Sam. 12:7-14). **This is God's government.**

## 5. PAUL AND BARNABAS

Paul and Barnabas separated from each other because of Mark (Acts 15:37-39). Mark was Barnabas' relative (Col. 4:10). He deserted Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary trip, but Barnabas was willing to take him again on the next trip. Clearly this was due to their relationship in the flesh. After Barnabas was separated from Paul, he took Mark to Cyprus, their native place, indicating that they worked together according to the fleshly relationship. Though it may be that Barnabas was still used of God and still did a good work, nevertheless the Holy Spirit took his name out of the Bible thereafter. No doubt his name is in the book of life, but it is no longer recorded in the book of Acts. **This is God's government.** Under the government of God, man is not free to walk in his own way.

As you can see from the above quotes from Watchman Nee in point 1 to 5 which are highlighted Nee states that these acts are God's Government. These acts are acts of Judgment which are a part of Government. **Government does more than make Judgments.**

Think about the Government in your country know I know it can never stand up to God's Government. But the Government in your country does more than make judgements on situations or people. It's the same with God government to say that God government only judges even though that judgements are righteous is wrong and is not giving a full picture of God's government.

Look at this statement taken from above.

Quote:

----- Grace gives man the promise of a Savior, but God's government drives that same man out of the Garden of Eden.  
-----

## No God's government gives grace, saviour and judgement

-----  
Isa 9:6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.

Wonderful: excellent; great; marvelous, awesome, wondrous, miraculous, prodigious, astonishing, amazing, astounding, phenomenal, unique.

Counselor: a person who counsels; adviser, a lawyer, a trial lawyer; counselor-at-law, a faculty member who advises students.

Mighty: showing superior power or strength: mighty rulers, great in amount, extent, degree, or importance; exceptional: a mighty accomplishment.

God: the creator and ruler of the universe

Father: a man who exercises paternal care over other persons; paternal protector or provider: a father to the poor.

Prince of Peace: Jesus Christ, the Messiah

Isa 9:7 Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this.

**Jesus will uphold his Government with Justice and Righteousness.**

Justice: the quality of being just; righteousness, equitableness, or moral rightness: to uphold the justice of a cause, rightfulness or lawfulness, as of a claim or title; justness of ground or reason: to complain with justice.

Righteousness: the quality or state of being righteous, righteous conduct, the quality or state of being just or rightful

The meanings above of the names of Jesus who has the reasonability of Governing the Government show there is a great deal more to God's Government than Nee's explanation of God's Government. Yes judgment is part of it but not all of it.

On reading only a small part of this teaching of Nee's it concerns me.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/16 13:58**

Quote:

-----Anyhow, as we look at headship on the human level we are talking about order in human relationships.

Perhaps Bubbaguy gets this from what I have heard out there in Christendom that the Husband is the "Priest" of his home.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/16 17:43**

Hello HE\_Reigns

Quote:

-----Again though, to speak about covering one's head while "praying or prophesying" is the topic here and the title. I wish we could stay on topic, because your posts are making "the two one".

Well, I agree with Watchman Nee that you have to understand headship and authority first before you can understand head covering.

Quote:

-----There are many brothers on this forum that have Holy & submissive Wives - but they don't wear a head covering when "praying or prophesying".

What are you saying to these brothers about their wives is the question. Please think of that and that only.

I am not going so far as to say that a woman who is otherwise godly and does not cover her hair negates all her godliness by not following this command. However, Jesus says in

Matthew 5:19

Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven

n.

Here are some promises:

John 14:15

"If you love me, you will keep my commandments.

John 14:21

Whoever has my commandments and keeps them, he it is who loves me. And he who loves me will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him."

John 14:23

Jesus answered him, "If anyone loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him.

John 14:24

Whoever does not love me does not keep my words. And the word that you hear is not mine but the Father's who sent me.

John 15:10

If you keep my commandments, you will abide in my love, just as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love.

Head covering is a beautiful thing when you do it in full conviction that this honours God and your husband. It is only for the Christian assembly, not necessary in other settings as I understand it. It is not meant to display a holier-than-thou attitude.

As I see here in this forum the issue of head covering uncovers our hearts attitude. Why is this small and easy command so contested? Why not just keep it and...end of the story?

I think it is because it reveals our heart's attitude to godly authority.

Ask Christians in the middle East Africa or India about it and you will find less resistance to this teaching than in the West.

I also find that those who come out of strict evangelical churches find this teaching the most offensive.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/16 18:03**

Quote:

-----I also find that those who come out of strict evangelical churches find this teaching the most offensive.  
-----

Especially those that have come out from under ministries that have thrashed their women verbally. I know too many of such instances that would make you sick. My former Pastor told one of the Sisters that he didn't believe that a woman should cut her hair. She asked him if it was ok to take 2 inches off her long flowing hair because of the split ends. Because of what he said, she cut those 2 inches off anyway, wrapped her hair in a bun and slapped a hat over top of it and you should have seen the look on her face when she came to church that Sunday. She had a paranoid look on her face, probably hoping that no one would take notice of the 2 inches that was taken off.

The whole idea of a cloth on a woman's head has absolutely no meaning to me whatsoever. However, that doesn't take away my respect of those who do. I myself have no problems with women covering their heads, they are quite fashionable, especially those Indian ones that Narrowpath was talking about.

Re: we need to cover head covering, on: 2008/2/16 18:12

narrowpath said

Quote:  
-----it reveals our heart's attitude to godly authority  
-----  
Godly authority is more to do with a life laid down unto God, than anything other qualifying factor. The ladies will be dying to cover their heads for *that* man.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/16 18:45

Quote:  
-----  
<https://www.watchman.org/cults/onemasterchrist.htm>

HeadCovering Love One Another, CFP, by Watchman Nee

The matter of head covering belongs to God's government. For those who do not know God's government, it is impossible to exhort them to have their heads covered. They will not be able to understand how much is involved in this matter. But those who have seen God's government in God's revealed Word are able to appreciate the tremendous connection between head covering and God's government

-----  
This is what a cult leader would say to the people he controls. If you can't discern the controlling words that are used here you are in bad shape.

Quote:  
-----For those who do not know God's government, it is impossible to exhort them to have their heads covered.  
-----

So they who are listening to this man now come under pressure to say they know God's government.

Quote:  
-----But those who have seen God's government in God's revealed Word are able to appreciate the tremendous connection between head covering and God's government  
-----

Come on this is control in the fullest measure.

Am I the only one that sees it.

If you read Nee's teaching you will see that Nee calls God's Judgment, God's Government they are not the same thing.

I have done some research this is what I have come up with.

Quote:  
-----Watchman Nee learned this concept of delegated authority from the ethics of Confucianism. Confucius taught that parents should always be obeyed, that they were never wrong, but if they were they should still be obeyed. Among Confucianists loyalty is one of the greatest virtues and

d can lead to the blind loyalty described in Nee's statement  
-----

<https://www.watchman.org/cults/onemasterchrist.htm>

I beg please please be careful!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Please go before God with this please I beg!!!!!!

**Re:, on: 2008/2/16 20:05**

Let me put this thread in a different light.

Lets consider the ministry of David Wilkerson and Carter Conlon and the Times Square Church. Are these men in error and rebellion because their wives don't put on the head covering?

We can practically pull out hundreds of "godly" ministries that are out there and most would not have this set in stone, would anyone say that these ministries are in rebellion?

Now don't reply by saying, "I am not their judge", because thats a cop out. There has been enough bickering and judging in this thread to make a fair assessment of these ministries.

Picture yourself standing before Carter and his wife Theresa and tell them that they are in rebellion because the women are not wearing the head covering.

I can imagine their reply. They would look at you with compassion and say nothing. They would just stand there and look at you with compassion in their eyes while you would begin to melt under the conviction power of the holy Ghost.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/16 20:23**

Compliments,

your emotional scenarios do not change scripture... I am a bit suprised to see you take this avenue.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/16 20:34**

1Cor 11:6 For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.

Simple enough very easy to understand a woman should have her head covered.

The word covered here comes from The Strong's Greek number 2619. katakalupto to cover wholly, i.e. veil:--cover, hide

Looking at the word in the strong's Concordance it agrees a woman head is covered Wholly.

1Cor 11:7-9 For a man indeed ought not to cover head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.

1Cor 11:10 For this cause ought the woman to have power on head because of the angels.

I had to mention these words **power on her head** she needs power on her head because of the Angels. So I did a search to see what it meant. I like the words they use in Strong's token of control, authority, jurisdiction, liberty, power, right and strength truly God wants something special on a woman's head.

1849. exousia ex-oo-see'-ah from 1832 in the sense of ability; privilege, i.e. (subjectively) force, capacity, competency, freedom, or objectively mastery concretely, magistrate, superhuman, potentate, token of control, delegated influence:--authority, jurisdiction, liberty, power, right, strength

1850. exousiazo ex-oo-see-ad'-zo from 1849; to control:--exercise authority upon, bring under the (have) power of

1Cor 11: 11-12 Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman of the man, even so the man also by the woman; but all things of God.

1Cor 11: 13 Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?

So should a woman's head be uncovered. Not if she can get all those benefits above. I would say cover her head.

1Cor 11: 13 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?

Yes Paul I agree with you.

1Cor 11: 14 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for hair is given her for a covering.

The word hair comes from the following Strongs numbers 4018 and 4016. They use the word mantle, veil, covering and vesture

4018. neuter of a presumed derivative of 4016; something thrown around one, i.e. a mantle, veil:--covering, vesture

4016. to throw all around, i.e. invest (with a palisade or with clothing):--array, cast about, clothe(-d me), put on.

It is very easy for me to understand. A woman's hair is her mantle it's her veil, it's her covering and it gives her a token of control, authority, jurisdiction, liberty, power, right and strength.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/18 5:31**

This will be my last post on here.

If I have offended anyone by posting things I should not have posted I am sorry please forgive me.

Paul tells that our fight is not with flesh and blood. But against Spiritual forces.

I have enjoyed digging into my bible and looking through the scriptures I cannot get away from my last post that is what I believe.

Once again you will see in the future a different man posting in the future no matter how hot things get.

Jim I would say to you, I love you, I hope you can find it your heart to love me after our heated moments while posting.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/18 8:08**

Dear Colin,

I forgive you, too. Praise God for giving you a tender conscience.

By the way, just yesterday the Holy Spirit convicted me to go to someone and ask for forgiveness for acting in presumption. I did receive forgiveness.

I also had to go to 3 brothers and tell them about it because they were there when I acted wrongly.

Philip



**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2008/2/18 9:40**

At the end of the day we are Brothers and Sisters. Together we can cry Abba.

Your will be done your Kingdom come on Earth as it is in Heaven.

Together we shall see all of Gods people,  
moving in all of Gods Power, Reaping all of Gods Harvest, in all Gods of World.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/18 10:29**

Hello, I read a few of the posts on this not all of them. However I would like to add my two cents worth.  
Krisp mentioned legalism and also about if Spurgeon departs from scripture krisp will go with script.  
Concerning legalism, this is a label or buzz word that once someone gets labeled with it thats almost "it" as far as being considered on other subjects.

Also, MOST American christians judge people who where the headcovering as underbondage or legalist. Mennonites et c. get the label for it very quickly by those who are "free" in Christ.  
I believe that head covering is scriptural however because of the devisive teaching on it and the stigma of legalism attached to it I would not push the you need to have your head covered while praying. On this as krisp said all things charity.  
Concerning Spurgeon or any of these guys and the I'll go with scripture comment.  
I say this statement as well. However I recognize that "I" do not necesarly know what all scripture fully says about certain topics.  
So I would urge caution about this statement as well. Especially since people say the same about me, John got right here but not here so i go with scripture. First I say amen go with scripture over my error! but again be sure you aren't following your own error as well. out of the frying pan into the fire if you will.  
Sorry if I am now rambling. Also please don't think I'm sharpshooting you krisp I do appreciate your spirit and wisdom.  
God bless, John

**Re:, on: 2008/2/18 10:48**

Quote:

-----Also please don't think I'm sharpshooting you krisp I do appreciate your spirit and wisdom.  
-----

John...

No, not at all... in fact, I agree with you. I never meant for anything I wrote here to mean that anyone who wears head coverings is under legalism. I dont believe that at all.

Also, thanx for your kind words, but any wisdom that I may express on this forum is merely God bypassing my brain and speaking directly thru my finger tips.... lol

Krispy

**Re:, on: 2008/2/18 12:57**

jimdeid2sin said:

Quote:

-----your emotional scenarios do not change scripture... I am a bit surprised to see you take this avenue.  
-----

Thanks Jim. Your statement spoke volumes to me. I sometimes wonder if anyone really reads what I say here. I think that people see my post and skip right on by, but your statement was encouraging. I will be more careful as to how I write things down. And you are 100% correct in what you said. :-o

Re:, on: 2008/2/18 18:38

Quote:

-----Jim I would say to you, I love you, I hope you can find it your heart to love me after our heated moments while posting.  
-----

Of course brother. May we all continue into the fullness of Christ. Feel free to email me anytime (that goes for everyone), I will be taking another break from SI..

In Christ - Jim

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2008/2/19 1:59

Hello again. I've been out for a day or two.

Here's a question (I am still undecided on this issue)...

Suppose that a woman's hair is itself the "covering". If males ought not pray "covered" (hair now being the covering), then would it not be implied that men with hair (a covering) should not pray or prophesy? If the woman's covering is hair, and men should not prophesy with a covering, then men ought not prophesy with hair?!

Of course I don't believe that.

This reasoning makes it plain, at least to me, that there is *another* covering, intended to cover the woman's first, natural covering of hair.

Thoughts?

Murrcolr, thanks for the post about Nee's background. I was dismayed at the quote from his book. I wonder if it was from earlier in his life?

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/19 9:06

Quote:

-----  
theopenlife wrote:  
Hello again. I've been out for a day or two.

Here's a question (I am still undecided on this issue)...

Suppose that a woman's hair is itself the "covering". If males ought not pray "covered" (hair now being the covering), then would it not be implied that men with hair (a covering) should not pray or prophesy? If the woman's covering is hair, and men should not prophesy with a covering, then men ought not prophesy with hair

Of course I don't believe that.

This reasoning makes it plain, at least to me, that there is *another* covering, intended to cover the woman's first, natural covering of hair.

Thoughts?

-----  
1Cor 11:14 Doth not even nature itself teach you?

Male-pattern baldness

Even men who never "go bald" thin out over the years. Unlike those with reversible telogen shedding, those with common male-pattern hair loss don't notice much hair coming out; they just see that it's not there anymore. Adolescent boys notice some receding near the temples as their hairlines change from the straight-across boys' pattern to the more "M-shape"

ed" pattern of adult men. This normal development does not mean they are losing hair

Quote:

-----  
Murccolr, thanks for the post about Nee's background. I was dismayed at the quote from his book. I wonder if it was from earlier in his life?  
-----

Where Nee got his understanding of the church from is John Nelson Darby other Brethren teachers.

Where Nee got his understanding of Bible exposition and many other truths, John Nelson Darby other Brethren teachers

Have a look at Darby and Open and Closed Brethren. I mentioned the Closed Brethern on here earlier.

**Re: - posted by Rafiki, on: 2008/2/19 10:32**

EDIT: sorry, what I said above is drifting off the subject of the thread. The discussion on head coverings has been very interesting.

Oh, yes thank you. I will tell My Daughter to please come and speak on this thread yes, she is coming very soon very soon, thank you Jesus.

I have been following this thread and it is very interesting yes it is. My Daughter she is in Cambodia right now on a mission, but she is coming oh please wait for My Daughter. Hallelujah, thank you Jesus I will continue to read so that I can inform her of all the wonderful people that are speaking on this subject. Oh I praise the Lord thank you Jesus.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2008/2/19 11:08**

Hi theopenlife...

Quote:  
-----Suppose that a woman's hair is itself the "covering". If males ought not pray "covered" (hair now being the covering), then would it not be implied that men with hair (a covering) should not pray or prophesy? If the woman's covering is hair, and men should not prophesy with a covering, then men ought not prophesy with hair?!  
-----

Actually, I think that the idea of a covering is not *hair* alone -- but long hair. Nature teaches us that *long hair* is natural on women but *short hair* (or even *baldness*) is natural on men.

With this in mind, one could postulate that long hair is a covering for women (I Corinthians 11:15; perhaps long enough to cover the head from neck to scalp), while this sort of covering is unnatural in men (I Corinthians 11:14). In other words, men should not look like women and women should not appear like men. Hair was quite a notifier in the days where both men and women wore less fitting robes.

For those who embrace the notion of an additional covering (on top of the hair): **Are there any other Scripture passages, Scriptural anecdotes or even historical anecdotes upon which this practice is based?** I know that I asked this earlier, but I couldn't find any answer provided within the thread. I have always felt that there could be a problem when a doctrinal practice or requirement is based upon a single passage of Scripture. There have been quite a few odd practices that are typically associated with a persuasion about a particular passage of Scripture (such as *Baptism for the Dead* from I Corinthians 15:29; Pentecostal *Snake Handlers* from Mark 16:18; Folk Healers/Curanderos from II Kings 20:7 and Isaiah 38:21).

Are there anything other passages (scriptural or historical anecdotes) that validate such a practice?

When do those who practice such additional-to-hair covering wear them? When do they take them off?

Thanks for the help!

:-)

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/19 22:59**

Chris wrote:

Quote:  
-----Are there any other Scripture passages, Scriptural anecdotes or even historical anecdotes upon which this practice is based? I know that I asked this earlier,  
-----

I remember reading this and hoped someone else would answer your question, but since no one did I will try.

There is no other scripture that addresses this issue of a head covering. However, we have a total of 16 verses dealing with this issue in one place. You may want to consider this fact: how many verses do you find in one place that discusses baptism? of observing communion? or giving a lengthy explanation as to why it should be done. Another thought: how often does God have to tell us something before it becomes essential for Spiritual living?

Chris, I can say from personal experience, that if the Scripture would not teach us about this, I do not know of one woman who would wear a headcovering! It is not my idea of fun to stick out like a sore thumb. BUT since the scriptures teach it, we do well to be obedient, regardless how I feel about it.

And when do we wear it? This answer will vary. Andree Seu from "World Magazine" wrote recently how she started wearing one and that to worship services. Others wear it at all waking hours. But the scripture teaches that when "she prays or prophecies". Now when does this happen? Obviously, it would be a whole lot more handy to keep on at all times because we do pray a lot and think about God a lot. Then when we are with others prophecy flows naturally in our conversations.

I have been told the concept of females wearing a headcovering was a new one, that neither the Jewish women nor pagans exercised. I have also been told the Moslem's got this idea from the Christians. Modern day Orthodox Jewish ladies also wear it. This past summer we were in Williamsburg, VA and while there I was very interested in seeing the female interpreters of history, who wore period costumes, wear a white cap.

(When we were at Williamsburg, we saw an Orthodox Jewish couple and since they looked different, I talked with them and had a wonderful discussion. The lady told me the reason she wore a head covering was for modesty. I have never heard any Christian give this as a reason on why it is worn.)

Another place to look is at art that depicts Christian ladies, like early American first ladies. Will try to find more and come back with this info later.

I do not know if this has answered your questions...

Blessings,

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2008/2/20 5:12**

You have mentioned verses but did not quote any. We can't go by paintings or what a Jewish woman said. The subject at hand is head covering not baptism or communion and we have to go by the Word of God.

Quote:  
-----There is no other scripture that addresses this issue of a head covering. However, we have a total of 16 verses dealing with this issue in one place. You may want to consider this fact: how many verses do you find in one place that discusses baptism? of observing communion? or giving a lengthy explanation as to why it should be done. Another thought: how often does God have to tell us something before it becomes essential for Spiritual living?  
-----

Where are these verses.

Quote:  
----- I have been told the concept of females wearing a headcovering was a new one, that neither the Jewish women nor pagans exercised. I have also been told the Moslem's got this idea from the Christians. Modern day Orthodox Jewish ladies also wear it. This past summer we were in Williamsburg, VA and while there I was very interested in seeing the female interpreters of history, who wore period costumes, wear a white cap.  
-----

There was proof placed on here that's it was a Jewish Tradition.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/20 14:19**

Quote:  
-----Where are these verses.  
-----

1 Corinthians 11.

Quote:  
-----There was proof placed on here that's it was a Jewish Tradition.  
-----

I may have to back off on this because after doing some research I am finding conflicting info. One writer says both Jewish males and females wore some kind of head covering. And I have read in other sources that this was not the case. In any case, it does not matter who wore what or did not wear during this frame of time, what Paul taught through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit wrote for the church is still effective for today. If it were not, God in his power would have made sure it would not have been included in the canon of Scripture, I am sure.

If you take issue with this, may I also suggest you discard Paul's teaching on love (cha. 13)? baptizing of the dead (cha. 29?) or spiritual gifts (cha. 14)? lawsuits (cha. 6)? death (cha. 15)? or the remaining of Paul's writings...

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/20 14:40**

Quote:  
-----Are there anything other passages (scriptural or historical anecdotes) that validate such a practice?  
-----

Chris, it is with trepidation I work to answer this question because of the porcine mentality of a few humans. If I proceed will I dishonor the LORD? Or if I do not, will he frown on me for being weak?

Quote:  
-----historical anecdotes  
-----

What do you mean by this? Anecdotes from life? I could give you those, but would that prove anything? Does it matter what life demonstrates in the final analysis? Depends, right?

I am reminded of the incident Richard Wurmbbrand shared about Romania. They would take the candidates for baptism t

o the zoo, show them the large cats and instruct the youth that baptism could cause them to be thrown into the 'lions' and that they must be prepared for it. Are you willing to die? Baptism may bring this about...Obedience to the Word does not promise one comforts socially, nor make one popular either. One is obedient because he/she LOVES the LORD Jesus, no more, no less.

On the practical level, a veiled head will evoke questions from curious people which gives us a fantastic opportunity to witness.

The question has come up on this thread "How about all the godly women who do not cover their heads?" I am not God and he has not given me the right to judge them. They alone will have to face Him and what he will say. Not me.

I do not know if I answered any of your questions satisfactorily or not...

Blessings,  
ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2008/2/20 14:46**

The glory of the man is the woman but the glory of the woman is her hair.(1 cor 11)

evidently women are glorious?

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/20 15:52**

Well said, you must be a comedian.

lol :-D

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2008/2/20 18:02**

hi murrcolr, I did notice that the women in Pensacola fl. for some strange reason have the most beautiful hair i have ever seen in my life.

It is really uncanny.

I had to take a training class when we first got there and i sat a few rows back of a lady and her hair was just so beautiful

. It was extremely distracting and I would tell myself " dont look at her hair."

Since I was new to the area I kinda figured it was just me.

Then one day the man that sat behind her told her she had the most beautiful hair.

that did it for me. Even the locals noticed(what a relief)

So when I saw that scripture about the "glory of the woman is her hair" It just kind of stuck out.

David

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/20 18:52**

Let me give you an illustration. Two cars are driving down a freeway where there is hardly any traffic, no obstructions and the road is in perfect condition on a sunny Saturday morning. A speed limit comes up requiring them to slow down to 40 mph instead of 70 mph.

The first driver ignores the speed limit thinking that the road workers must have forgotten to take the sign down.

The second one reduces his speed to 40mph because of his conscience and because he does not want to break the law.

Which driver makes the better choice?

In General, I would say, even though one may not totally understand the doctrine of head covering, wouldn't it be better to cover your head with a scarf as a women in a Christian assembly believing that this honours the Lord and comply with scripture?

I am not a pastor or elder. If I were, I would not demand head covering but teach on marriage, authority and government and in the end recommend head covering for women. It is by far not the most important command, but that does not make it superfluous.

Nevertheless headcovering done in humble obedience and not in a begrudging or self-righteous manner is a wonderful thing and it displays an admirable spirit that is rarely seen in these days.

Why is this teaching so offensive? Because we have thrown off all fetters and bondages that we thought enslaved us and cut us back in our right of self-determination.

Is what I do not understand is not applicable for me?

1 Peter 3

1Likewise, wives, be subject to your own husbands, so that even if some do not obey the word, they may be won without a word by the conduct of their wives, 2when they see your(D) respectful and pure conduct. 3 Do not let your adorning be external—the braiding of hair and the putting on of gold jewelry, or the clothing you wear— 4but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God's sight is very precious. 5For this is how the holy women who hoped in God used to adorn themselves, by submitting to their own husbands, 6as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord. And you are her children, if you do good and do not fear anything that is frightening.

7Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered.

Philip

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/20 20:25

Quote:

-----  
narrowpath wrote:

Let me give you an illustration. Two cars are driving down a freeway where there is hardly any traffic, no obstructions and the road is in perfect condition on a sunny Saturday morning. A speed limit comes up requiring them to slow down to 40 mph instead of 70 mph.

The first driver ignores the speed limit thinking that the road workers must have forgotten to take the sign down.

The second one reduces his speed to 40mph because of his conscience and because he does not want to break the law.

Which driver makes the better choice?

-----

Narrowpath that's a bad example.

The first driver broke **the law** as the speed limit is forty as there is signs up.

What if there was no speed restriction and he slowed down anyway. He would get there in the end but along way behind everyone else.

-----

Quote:

Nevertheless headcovering done in humble obedience

Narrowpath I do want to offend anyone so please don't take this personnel. I just want to prove a point.

I believe God does not require head covering.

So then I would ask what being would I be humbly obedient to if it is not God asking me to do this.

As you can see the different mind sets in operation.

You say it's a law, I saw there in no law.

You say would it not be better to do it. I say no cause there is no law.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/21 9:24**

murrclor,

Will you admit there is scripture that presents this idea of head coverings?

ginnyrose

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2008/2/21 10:24**

I see scripture that says women need a covering but that covering has to be given by God not men.

We are dealing with Spiritual things. We can only get that Authority from God. God is a Spirit. This covering can only be provided by God as it a Authority given from him to women.

Men cannot give it to the woman by giving them a cloth made out of natural material. This would and will have no effect in a spiritual realm.

If you feel a knot in your stomach that means you are angry with me. Please remember our fight is not with each other, but against spiritual forces, so if I have offended you please forgive me. :-) :-) :-)

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/21 12:17**

murrclor said

Quote:

-----I see scripture that says women need a covering but that covering has to be given by God not men.

This is how I understand it:

This covering is given by God:

1.Cor 11: 14Does not the very nature of things teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him, 15but that if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For long hair is given to her as a covering.

This covering is for the women in the assembly, her (glory=long hair) has to be covered:

1.Cor 11:6If a woman does not cover her head, she should have her hair cut off; and if it is a disgrace for a woman to have



ve her hair cut or shaved off, she should cover her head.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/21 12:41**

I'm not amazed or shocked by much... but the fact that this thread is now 16 pages long and still going strong amazes and shocks me.

No matter which side of the debate you fall on, surely no one here can honestly say that it is worth all of this, can you?

I dont care that it's still going, just amazed.

Krispy

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2008/2/21 12:54**

Krispy,

You made it even longer! :) (My smiley doesn't work here :( )

I will NOT post on this thread anymore, I have said what I could have said about it.

Philip

**Re:, on: 2008/2/21 12:57**

Krispy,

the reason this thread is so long is that it is based upon one passage that is unclear in its intent and meaning. on one hand it says women should cover their heads while worshipping or prophesying. on the other hand it says women's hair is a God-given cover, a glory to her.

it says men's hair is somehow different from that of women because it isn't a covering for them. says men should not wear hats or coverings when they pray and worship because it dishonors their heads.

it says long hair on a man is a shame, but in every pictorial representation of Jesus I have ever seen, He has long hair?? ??? and as a child I was told that it was traditional for men to have long hair in those days.

so, what is the fruit of this passage???

confusion, speculation, and divisiveness.

it is better if we ignore such things that are so fruitless.

bub

**Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2008/2/22 4:19**

Quote:

-----  
narrowpath wrote:  
murrclor said

Quote:

-----I see scripture that says women need a covering but that covering has to be given by God not men.  
-----

This is how I understand it:

This covering is given by God:

1.Cor 11: 14Does not the very nature of things teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him, 15but that if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For long hair is given to her as a covering.

This covering is for the women in the assembly, her (glory=long hair) has to be covered:

1.Cor 11:6If a woman does not cover her head, she should have her hair cut off; and if it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut or shaved off, she should cover her head.

Philip

-----

Quote:

-----For long hair is given to her as a covering.

-----

In your very own writings you have given the answer.

Not that her hair has to be covered but that her hair is the covering.

**You can't take verse v6 at put it in after v 14-15 you must read it as Paul wrote it.**

Paul comes to the point after explaining it in the other verses. Verse 15 is his final explanation.

1Cor 11:15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: **for her hair is given her for a covering.**

If you look at the very last word in 1 Cor 11 v15 covering. The Greek Strong Number is 4018.

4018. peribolaion per-ib-ol'-ah-yon neuter of a presumed derivative of 4016; something thrown around one, i.e. a mantle, veil:--covering, vesture.

Using this as a way to better understand the issue.

Her hair is given as a mantle.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/22 7:53**

I would like to offer that vs 14 says "doth not even nature itself teach you".....

Paul here is appealing to the natural understanding of a natural covering,long hair, as a teaching to re-enforce the need for a physical covering spoken of in the earlier passages.

Also the "we have no such custom" vs 16 means no such custom of women praying or prophesying with head "uncovered".

The reason I add this is in hopes of contributing an understanding of the way Paul speaks. Peter mentions that some of the writings of Paul are hard to understand.

Also I would like to add that the testimony of the writings of the early church,(see Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs, by David Bercot) on this subject make it quite clear that they plainly understood the apostolic doctrine to mean a physical headcovering.

Finally as I stated in a previous post I do not say this to demand that christian women return to veiling. However I do hope that more realize that it is scriptural to veil and not just a teaching of men.

Let all veil in liberty or not veil in liberty.

God bless, John

God bless you all

**Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2008/2/22 8:12**

Hi all, have not posted for ages but this subject is one that I am re looking at with my wife.

Philogos aka Ron Bailey has an excellent resource website here is a Link to there with a page of pdf's of GW North's writings, there is one on 'sign of authority' which might help the discussion....

blessings

[http://wiki.biblebase.com/index.php?title=G\\_W\\_North\\_Writings](http://wiki.biblebase.com/index.php?title=G_W_North_Writings)

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/22 8:37**

1Cor 11:16 But if any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

You could read it like this?

Why are you fighting, we have no such custom of covering the head with a cloth, neither does the Churches of God.

Mennonite's practice head covering. So this book you promote would be biased towards that beliefs.

**David Bercot thinks liberal Protestant doctrines are not any more Biblical than the than the Jehovah's Witnesses.**

David Bercot is an Anabaptist (Mennonite/Amish, but in David's case, Mennonite) convert. Originally raised as a Jehovah's Witness, he left when he felt they were not completely honest in their interpretation of the Bible. He became a Liberal Protestant for a brief period, but he was not sure that their doctrines were any more Biblical than the Jehovah's Witnesses.

**Re:, on: 2008/2/22 9:19**

I had the pleasure of fellowshiping with David at his home fellowship in Tx. for about a year. This was back in early nine ties when he had written "Will the Real Heretics Please stand up.

I do not want to presume to speak for David but he always was sincere in his desire to serve the Lord in Spirit and in truth.

The Dictionary I recommended categorises all the saying of the early writers on all subjects concerning christianity. I have also read the Ante Nicene Fathers from which the dictionary references and I it is accurate to their writings.

Please remember just trying to promote liberty for both sides.

God bless, John

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/22 18:48**

In my searching I have found this it written by a Messianic Jew. Thought I would throw it into the pot as well.

<http://werunited.com/yhyby/?p=235>

Paul WAS NOT talking about beanies, fedoras, cowboy hats, kerchiefs or Easter bonnets at all! The entirety of this teaching in 1 Cor. 11 has to do with HEADSHIP! The head of the man is YAHSHUA and the man dishonors his "head", Yahshua, if he allows another man to be his "head" between him and the Holy one of Israel. A woman's Head is her man (her husband). She dishonors her head (husband) if she looks to any other man (Pastor, Evangelist, etc.) to rule over her in any way above her husband. If a man loves his wife as Yahshua loves those who believe in Him, then he must be the HEAD of the woman he loves. A woman must also then; if Paul is correct in teaching the Torah of headship, and he is; honor and respect her husband as her representative and intercessor before Yahweh. Paul was teaching nothing new or unique here and nothing to do with clothing, but rather pronouncing Torah principles given to Moses on the mountain by Yahweh. The HEADCOVERING of the Man is Yahshua the Messiah and the HEADCOVERING of the woman is her man. All Scripture upholds this principle and Yahweh expects us to obey and be blessed by our obedience to HIS instructions. When we willfully stray and cover our heads with others as our spiritual leaders (head), then Yahweh will walk away and we are on our own. Who is your unauthorized covering? Do you have one or 2 that you respect more than your spouse or, if a man, respect more than Yahshua? Think about it and I'll see you when the smoke clears. The bottom line is that there is no Scripture anywhere that requires any of us to wear a head covering.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/23 9:38**

murrcolr,

If you would study history, you will find that Christian females throughout the years have practiced the literal application of this scripture. It is gross ignorance on your part to suggest this is solely a Mennonite/Amish practice. It has been only in recent years that the larger evangelical church has abandoned it. For proof, look at old photos of church women.

murrcolr, your approach reminds me of someone who used to practice it but has abandoned it, and is now working hard to justify it.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/23 18:03**

Ginny I want to get it right and I am looking at every sermon or article posted on hear and reading it. I am not only reading sermons but looking at the men who wrote the sermons as well if possible. I have also dug into history. I am not telling you to give up your beliefs. I am only pointing out other options and other ways of thinking that I have going on in my head.

Here is an example of what I have found so far. Other religions at the time also practiced head covering. A lot of pagan practice was adopted by the early church around the time of Constantine so we can't really go by what the early church did and accept it as Gospel.

Vestal Virgins

This is probably where you get nuns from have a look at the man's title who presided over the rites of the ceremony.

Pontifex Maximus presides over rites, prescribed rules for public ceremony, and watch over the Vestals.

Their tasks included the maintenance of the fire sacred to Vesta, the goddess of the hearth and home.

The main articles of their clothing consisted of an infula, a suffibulum and a palla. The infula was a long headdress that draped over the shoulders. Usually found underneath were red and white woolen ribbons. The suffibulum was the brooch that clipped the palla together. The palla was a simple mantle, wrapped around the Vestal Virgin. The brooch and mantle were draped over the left shoulder.

-----  
One statement commonly cited as evidence about the headcovering customs of Greek women is in Plutarch's Sayings of Spartans (written during the first century A.D.). Concerning a Spartan he writes, "When someone inquired why they took their girls into public places unveiled, but their married women veiled, he said, 'Because the girls have to find husbands, and the married women have to keep to those who have them!'" This seems to indicate that in Sparta married women usually covered their heads in public and unmarried women did not.

-----  
Some on here have mentioned authority and also some sermons have also mentioned authority. In some of the sermons men have not fully understood authority and called judgement authority which I discussed earlier on here and on another thread.

1Cor 11:10 For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels. That word power means authority.

I would agree with anyone on here that says this portion of scripture in Cor 11 has to do with authority. But the need to cover a woman's head I would disagree with. I will keep digging it says in the bible seek and you shall find, knock and the door will be opened. It also says the truth shall set you free.

Please do not get upset with me, I do not mean to offend anyone, if I have please forgive me.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/2/23 18:49**

murrcoir,

I think it is pointless for me to continue this discussion with you. You have chosen to disregard the plain teaching of the Word.

And your slam at the Mennonites (in reference to David Bercot) is uncalled for. I find your attitude repulsive and arrogant . While I am likely old enough to be your mom (and maybe grandmother) I am very concerned that your approach to this issue could cause young, weak Christians to falter. I do not plan to continue this discussion with you anymore.

ginnyrose

**Re:, on: 2008/2/23 19:01**

Quote:

Compliments wrote:

Let me put this thread in a different light.

Lets consider the ministry of David Wilkerson and Carter Conlon and the Times Square Church. Are these men in error and rebellion because their wives don't put on the head covering?

We can practically pull out hundreds of "godly" ministries that are out there and most would not have this set in stone, would anyone say that these ministries are in rebellion?

There has been enough bickering and judging in this thread to make a fair assessment of these ministries.

Picture yourself standing before Carter and his wife Theresa and tell them that they are in rebellion because the women are not wearing the head covering.

I can imagine their reply. They would look at you with compassion and say nothing. They would just stand there and look at you with compassion in their eyes while you would begin to melt under the conviction power of the holy Ghost.

This is the only thing I feared - was division in the Body over this controversy.

I and others have said that we would fight for the right for sisters to wear a covering - though we don't at my Church or any AoG or CoG church I've been in.

I think Compliment's post wraps up an awful lot.

1 Corth 13

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2008/2/23 19:22**

Hi HE\_Reigns...

Quote:

-----This is the only thing I feared - was division in the Body over this controversy.

I and others have said that we would fight for the right for sisters to wear a covering - though we don't at my Church or any AoG or CoG church I've been in.

Good point.

I don't think that I had ever heard a person attack a woman who chose to wear a man-made head covering before. I've visited some fellowships where women freely and sincerely lived with such dress "obligations" (like head coverings, no pants ever, etc...). No one seemed to mind that they felt such a thing was required by Scripture. Nor did there seem to be any "whispering" by our "head fabric" wearing sisters about the "ungodliness" of those women who didn't wear them.

If it is a matter of choice -- well then, by all means, allow yourself to set your conscience at ease. I do find it difficult when such practices are forced upon everyone else. I've visited congregations where there was a mandatory set of rules for attendance or membership. Since I don't embrace the idea that an additional, man-made covering is what is spoken of in I Corinthians chapter 11, I suppose that neither my wife nor myself would be "accepted" in such a congregation.

In addition to Times Square Church, I've visited other congregations of sincere believers who don't practice or teach this particular custom. You know what? They were wonderful believers. In fact, I don't remember that Martha Ravenhill wore one during my visit with Brother Leonard. Nor did I see any lying around the house.

It is difficult for me to believe that this was the "norm" during history. While I have seen some photos of women wearing hats -- I have also seen many photos of Christian women WITHOUT them. I haven't seen anything that would cause me to believe that this was a common practice in the early Church, the underground Church or anything since then. In fact, I can't find a single Scriptural anecdote (or historic anecdote) that would "verify" the interpretation of the "covering" being anything but a natural covering of "hair" (as defined in I Corinthians 11:15).

But this shouldn't be such a divisive issue. If you feel that you must wear another "covering" (in addition to the natural one), then by all means -- keep it on the head! Either way, we shouldn't feel obliged or oblige others to fulfill something that they do not (in good faith) see as a binding ritual of the Church.

I suppose that the heart of the matter is for men and women to understand the roles given to them by God. Christ is our covering. Men should provide a "cover" for their wives with the love, protection and nurture that is prescribed in the Word. It is, after all, the natural order of things.

The Lord bless you all -- regardless of the physical condition of your scalp!

:~)

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2008/2/24 15:34**

Quote:

ginnyrose wrote:  
murrcolr,

I think it is pointless for me to continue this discussion with you. You have chosen to disregard the plain teaching of the Word.

And your slam at the Mennonites (in reference to David Bercot) is uncalled for. I find your attitude repulsive and arrogant. While I am likely old enough to be your mom (and maybe grandmother) I am very concerned that your approach to this issue could cause young, weak Christians to falter. I do not plan to continue this discussion with you anymore.

Well Ginny you sound upset. If you have a look at some of David Bercot quotes you'll find he has stated a lot of things that are very offensive to other Christians. I am not going to post any of them as I don't think it would be helpful.

For the young Christian who might be reading this, always question things even if they upset people. Don't always go along with what any man teaches, even if he has a bible in his hand. Always pray and ask for God to direct you and to protect you. Read your bible and ask the Holy Spirit to give understanding of it.

Acts 17:11 Now these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of the mind, examining the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so.

The days we live in are dark days and they will only get darker. You will have to stand on what you believe, not on what anyone else believes. We are living in a time which is different than it was 20, 30, 40 and 50 years ago, we must find out what God wants to do in this Generation. What God did years ago is long gone and we must stand up in this day and in this generation and get what God has for us. We must have the Spirit of God for this age, so we can live, challenge and confront the powers of darkness in this generation.

**Re: We need to cover head covering - posted by JoshPaul, on: 2008/4/23 18:13**

The Head Covering - A Biblical Perspective  
J. Boyd Nicholson, Sr.

### The True Women's Lib

The women's "Liberation" movement in society today is sadly behind the times. It has been one of the distinctive characteristics of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ that, wherever it has been preached, it has elevated womanhood from the degradation of heathenism to a place of nobility beside the man. Heathenism almost always has debased the woman; the gospel liberates her and entrusts to her a God-given ministry, uniquely fitted to her design and characteristics.

Of course, every flourishing fashion or movement in the world tends to overflow into the Church. The evidence of this may be seen in the styles and patterns of behavior that are becoming more common among believers. One of the most general of these is the increasing number of women who appear at assembly meetings without a head covering.

Some believers were discussing this one day and an "elder" happened to join them. When he heard their conversation had to do with the head covering, he dismissed the matter with the remark, "It's inconsequential." One can hardly blame many of these women who go with uncovered heads into an assembly of believers when they have not been taught by their spiritual leaders what is scripturally correct.

The question arises, "Is it tradition or truth?" Putting aside personal preferences for a few moments, let us try to find from Scripture what is taught on the subject, specifically from 1 Corinthians 11. It will be a help to the interested reader to have the Bible open for reference.

### Three Symbols

Some suggest that the first section of the chapter actually belongs with chapter 10 and is not church truth at all. Paul's discussion of matters that affect assembly gathering, they assert, does not begin until verse 17, "when ye come together." But this is missing the design of the chapter. The first section (vv. 1-16) begins with "Now I praise you." The second begins with "I praise you not" (v. 17).

There are three symbols in this chapter: the head, the bread, and the wine. The first portrays our relationship in the mystical Body, the last two teach us concerning the sacrifice of His physical body. Can we take the liberty of saying that one of these is inconsequential? If so, which one? Can we omit the bread or wine next week at the Lord's Supper? Such a flagrant departure would not be tolerated. Then by what principle of interpretation can the other symbol be relegated to the growing list of "inconsequentials" we hear about these days?

A reading of 1 Corinthians 11 readily shows that there are two distinct lessons in the first section of this chapter which deal with the head. First, there is a lesson in headship; second, a lesson in glory.

### Headship

Verse 3 sets the foundation for the lesson in headship. It teaches the divine order of authority. It is significant that even here the Spirit of God does not put the woman first, although that would be the logical order in the ascending scale of authority in the spiritual realm. "The head of every man is Christ: and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God."

Obviously there is no thought here of inferiority-superiority. The statement "the head of Christ is God" stands directly beside "the head of the woman is the man." We know that Christ is not inferior to God -- He is God. The issue is order, just as we have alphabetical order. Names beginning with the letter "A" in the telephone directory are not more important than names beginning with any other letter. So in His universe God has established order -- world order, home order, and assembly order. "Let all things be done decently and in (according to the) order" (1 Cor. 14:40).

In Ephesians, the headship of Christ is related corporally to the whole body of the Church. In 1 Corinthians, His headship in the assembly is related individually to the believer. In verse 4, the covered head of the praying or prophesying man is seen to be dishonoring to his head ("and the head of every man is Christ"). Here the simple words "to cover" are used. Thus Christ must not be dishonored by His symbolic concealment, the covered head of the man.

The woman is warned in verse 5. The uncovered head dishonors her figurative head ("and the head of the woman is the man"). The reason the man is not to be held in dishonor will be developed in the lesson in glory: "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God" (v. 7). The word "dishonor" is a superlative, "to thoroughly put to shame." In the context, when a man appears with his head covered, or a woman with her head uncovered, it is an implicit denial of the divine teaching regarding headship, whether intentional or otherwise.

### Glory

Now the Spirit leads Paul to press the issue and to show its solemn overtones by giving a lesson in glory, and strong reasons for compliance with this word of instruction. Glory might be said to be a visible manifestation of inward nature. The glory of a rose bush is the rose. That is not all of the rose bush, but the bloom is the manifestation of its nature. By the rose we learn the nature of the bush. The reason for the uncovered head of the man is given: "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God." Image is not likeness; these are distinctly different ideas. Likeness is similitude, being like; image is representation, whether like or not. The Lord Jesus is never spoken of as "being in the likeness of God." He cannot be "like" God since He is God.

Man must not, then, cover his head in the assembly because he represents God as His image. Further, he is the glory of God. If image is representation, then glory is manifestation. God's authority must not be hidden. This is the twofold reason for the uncovered head of the man.

The woman is not spoken of as the image of man, but as his glory. Here it is not representation, but manifestation. The glory of man must not be manifest in spiritual exercises, therefore that glory must be covered. No glory but God's is to be seen in the spiritual realm. Thus when the man sees the women's heads covered, he is reminded that his glory is covered there too. His public ministry is to be done so God alone receives the glory.

### The School of Angels

The reason for the woman's covering is also twofold. First, it is a natural one. Verse 8 shows that the man had precedence in the natural realm and is therefore an image of God, "for Adam was first formed" (1 Tim. 2:13). The woman, as steward of the coverings, aids the man in his responsibility.

Second, a spiritual reason is given in verse 10. "For this cause ought a woman to have power (a sign of submission to authority) on her head because of the angels." Why is this? Ephesians 3:10 gives a clue as to the importance of angelic observation. God uses the Church to teach them something of His manifold wisdom. How can these spirit beings learn the significance of the Lordship of Christ, the place of the Church and of the individual believer? Such things are an utter mystery to them. God shows them by object lessons or symbols.

Just as Aaron is a type of Christ in certain ways, though completely unaware of it himself, and just as the Lord used a little child to teach the disciples a lesson on entrance into the kingdom, although the child was oblivious to his role, so now, though we may be unaware of it, we are under the scrutiny of spirit beings. We are being used by God as object lessons to make known the glorious truths of authority and submission which otherwise would be unintelligible to them. How solemn! Yet Abraham grasped a higher truth when he said, "The Lord before whom I walk."

When a woman comes into a church gathering with her head covered, she performs a ministry to the hosts of heaven. She becomes to angels an object lesson of submission to divine headship. What a rebuke she is to the wicked angels! Their sin is that of rebelling against divine authority. What a delight to the obedient angels, as they see also the man's head uncovered portraying the unshielded glory of God and His accepted authority!

However, there is an assurance in verse 11 that positionally there is no thought of superiority because of gender. Paul states in verse 12 that even though the first woman came out of the man, ever since every man has come into the world by a woman. We are together, "in the Lord."

### The Double Cover-Up

Some excuse their uncovered heads by citing verse 15, "Her hair is given her for a covering." Since she has hair, these assert, that is enough. Surely a careful reading of the text would show such an interpretation to be a weak avoidance of the truth as it is set out. Notice that for the woman there are two glories involved. She is a glory: "The woman is the glory



of the man" (v. 7). But she also has a glory of her own. Her hair is a glory to her (verse 15). For the glory that she is (the glory of the man), God has given her a natural covering, her long hair. For the glory that she has (her hair), she must submit her will to cover that with another covering which she places over her own glory.

For all who can receive the ministry of the Word, there is a responsibility to obey. Elders and ministers of God's Word are also accountable to give needed instruction and not to shun to declare the whole counsel of God. If we fail to address ourselves to these matters, we should not be surprised when aberrations appear regularly, even brazenly, among us.

### Long-Haired Men

Long-haired men are not left out of these solemn verses (1 Cor. 11:1-16). In this day when even some believers follow the fashion, a word might be timely. Verse 14 teaches that it is contrary to the natural order for a man to have long hair. Why is this? Verse 15 shows us. Long hair is a glory for the woman. Therefore, for a man to be wearing this glory is a paradox in the sight of God and of the angels. The glory of the woman must not be seen in the Church, whether displayed by women or men.

To raise this subject usually calls forth some argument. Some say that the Lord Himself had long hair. Did He? How would we know from Scripture? Of this we have no certain knowledge. In any case, if those who so argue really desire conformity to Christ, it is clearly taught in Scripture that for the present it is moral likeness to His Son that God desires, not physical. The Spirit is working in our lives to transform us in heart and conduct to the Lord. Speculation is no excuse to contravene the clear instruction of the Word of God.

From where does this fashion of long haired men come? Not the Beatles, as many think. In Revelation 9, the hordes of hell erupt from the pit. They are seen as having the "faces of men and . . . the hair of women." Just as the Lord is transforming His saints into a moral likeness to Christ, so the arch-enemy seeks to conform a multitude into a likeness which portrays a confusion of God's natural order. Confusion of the sexes has always been a mark of depravity through the ages. It frequently has called forth the judgment of God.

Whatever long hair on men may have meant to our grandfathers or early brethren, we cannot say, but in our day it is the badge of rebellion. We must remember, too, that when men wore their hair longer a century ago, the hair of women was much longer, thus maintaining the distinction between male and female.

This is not to say that every man who wears his hair long is rebelling against God. Many are not consciously doing so, but in the light of Scriptures under consideration, they may be, all unwittingly, making themselves object lessons for the adversary against Scripture's standards.

### How Long is Long?

Some questions naturally arise out of the examination of this subject. Man's penchant for rules would have him prefer that the Lord lay down in inches "how long is long." The Lord wisely has not done so in this case, nor in many areas that affect our lives. The great principle of the Christian life is "faith." If a sincere desire is present, together with a submissive will, it will not be long before the exercised soul will know if the Holy Spirit is being grieved or not.

### For Today?

Is this for today? The relevance of these verses (the bread and wine symbols do not suffer from this argument) is sometimes brought into question. It is implied that this was a Corinthian problem and applied only to that church. However, all the teaching of this epistle is clearly directed in its introduction. It was written to the Corinthian saints "with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." Paul is not afraid to address cultural problems in Corinth. But in this chapter there is no mention of culture. Instead, he takes us back to creation to show us the basis for the order being discussed. Chapters 11-14, which form a unit, close with the warning, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."

### Other Questions

Sometimes the size of the head covering for women is the question. The word used to describe this covering is a superlative, and means to "amply cover." Tiny bows and almost invisible nets cannot be said to "amply cover." They may enhance her glory, not cover it.

Another query is sometimes raised regarding wigs. Do they cover? Yes, they cover the woman's natural glory, but they obviously defeat the spiritual purpose by providing an imitation glory. The onlooker sees a facsimile of her glory uncovered, and not a badge of submission.

At what age should a girl be expected to wear a covering over her hair? Should teenagers? Perhaps this could be easily resolved by asking how young should a boy be before he does not wear a covering? Perhaps it has been argued that these youngsters do not pray or prophesy and are therefore exempt. However, none can gainsay the exhortation to fathers to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Submission to the Lord is to be taught our children by example, by precept, and when necessary, by chastening. All parents would agree that it is easier and happier for all if this be learned at the earliest age.

But When?

On what occasions this scripture applies presents a more difficult problem. Obviously it includes church gatherings where the elders would be held accountable before the Lord. A meeting of the local church is not determined by geography, however. It is possible to have church order in a house (as the early church met), or to have home order in a church building (as with a wedding). Church order could be in effect in a field or forest, as with many during times of oppression. What determines the order is who God would hold responsible if anything went wrong. In world order, God holds government to be responsible. In home order, it is the husband or parent. In church order, the elders are held to account. There are, however, other occasions when a woman may exercise an oral ministry by prayer or testimony from the Scriptures. The principles laid down here would apply to such. Further instructions are found elsewhere in Scripture; for instance, in 1 Corinthians 14, governing the woman's silence in the assembly. Chapter 11 must be read in the light of these subsequent controls. But remember that devotion to Christ, not mere duty, is our guide.

When there is uncertainty as to the wearing or not wearing of the covering, it would seem, in the light of 1 Corinthians 11:10, that the exercised sister will not wish to risk grieving her Lord. Private home situations are clearly distinct, since in the home and family context the order of rule is not directly through the elders, but through the husband and father in the home.

Ire and Fire

It is a strange thing that there are few Scriptures that stir up the fire in some saints like this one. This may be the reason why the earlier part of 1 Corinthians 11 is taught less than the remainder of the chapter. Likely the apostle also felt the ire of some when he refers in verse 16 to the possibility of contention. It was the custom of the Jewish men of that day (and today) to cover their heads in the synagogue. It was also the custom of the Greek women to enter the temple with their heads uncovered. But, says Paul, "We have no such custom." The New Testament Church was distinct from the heathen temple; consequently, it stood in contrast to social and religious customs of the day. Christians were to behave differently in these matters.

Suffering Loss

The rebellious spirit can always find an argument and present picayune excuses which seek to discount both the relevance and personal application of this section of the Scripture. When we know that godly Moses suffered a soul-grieving loss as a result of spoiling a type of the glorified Lord, it should make us all tremble lest we too should be guilty of presenting to the eyes of believers, unbelievers, and the watching spirit world a distorted picture of our beloved Lord, His authority and glory.

Hair or Heart?

In conclusion, let it be clearly understood that while outward form should convey inward condition, it is not always necessarily so. A woman, with the most adequate head covering and modest apparel, may be as cold as an iceberg in her devotion to the Lord, and all the while proud of her conformity to a set standard. Likewise, a short-haired man may be greatly grieving the Lord in other significant areas of his life. The long-haired youth, or the girl with uncovered hair may, in their hearts, be devoted to the Lord to the measure of the biblical light they have. They may be deeply committed to His cause and living blameless lives in the wicked society around them, but through spiritual infancy, or the failure of the elders and the teachers, have never learned the solemn implications of 1 Corinthians 11.

While the outward sign does not necessarily convey spirituality, nor the absence of it bespeak carnality, it is axiomatic th at the submissive heart, willing to learn and to please the Lord who bought it, will be brought into the light of the Word of God suddenly or little by little, and will never risk a compromise.

<http://www.votbg.org/jabesr001.htm>