

## Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?

**Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/4 13:22**

Saints,

I believe this is a subject that is worth consideration. It is not a hobby horse or something we promote on SermonIndex too much, but from time to time it has been raised. This is not to accuse sisters who do not, but rather to simply make known what the Bible teaches and for sisters to make a decision. From Watchman Nee to K.P. Yohannan and from the early Church the majority of the Church has held to this practice. It is only in the last 50+ years that overall the practice has started to diminish.

If you strongly disagree with this subject, please consider not using this thread to debate it strongly, it is more for those who are just learning and feel the Lord wants them to re-consider this for the modern day.

Milton Vincent gives an excellent simple but very comprehensive overview of the doctrine of headcoverings for sisters in the Lord. I highly recommend this. I also highly recommend K.P. Yohannan's very simple short booklet on the subject:

(Pdf Book) Head Coverings by K.P. Yohannan

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=25173>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 1

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26139>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 2

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26140>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 3

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26141>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 4

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26142>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 5

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26143>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 6

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26144>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 7

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26145>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 8

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26146>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 9

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26147>

1 Corinthians 11 New International Version (NIV)

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

On Covering the Head in Worship

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

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

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

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

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by vasilef (), on: 2015/7/4 15:56**

thank you, I will definitely listen these messages  
after listening many messages I believe that we cannot prove using the 1 Corinthian 11 passage that the covering is physical or just a symbol

one positive argument for physical covering is the church fathers teaching about this

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?, on: 2015/7/5 9:54**

Quote:  
-----If you strongly disagree with this subject, please consider not using this thread  
-----

There is definitely wisdom in this statement.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/5 16:17**

My questions are.  
  
Should a Christian woman wear a head covering in church meetings  
only when she is praying as the scriptures states or should she wear the head covering the entire meeting even when she is not praying?

The scriptures also state women should keep silent in the church meetings. Therefore what would be the point of a head covering if she cannot pray publicly in the meeting? Unless of course a head covering covers silent praying as well.

For example if she visits her male doctor and if happens to be a believer should she put on her head covering if she starts to pray silently when he gives his grim diagnosis?

If she is walking down the street it would be assumed that some of the people she is passing are Christians and so should she not have her head covering on at all times just in case she starts to pray?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/6 1:18

Quote:

Should a Christian woman wear a head covering in church meetings only when she is praying as the scriptures states or should she wear the head covering the entire meeting even when she is not praying?

I have not heard or read the messages given in the link. I believe every command in New testament should be followed. There are very few external commands. Most of them are internal. I believe if you read those messages then you will get an answer. The point of this thread is not for someone to prove himself smart by challenging the Head Covering. It is for saints to read the truth that is supported by this site on this subject. So if you seriously have these questions then you should seriously consider reading those articles to get clarified. Or if you are using your questions to just prove a point that this command is not a clear one hence can be ignored, then I can only pray for you. Even Jesus himself will not be able to answer you satisfactorily if this is your intention.

Regarding covering the head all the time and all the scenarios that you have posted. These scenarios are all coming into your mind because you are trying to live by the letter and not the spirit. A person living by letter will be a old covenant man (not born again) who sees God as a person who is waiting to point figure at us, looking for areas in which he can catch us. This is the picture of God that your question is giving to readers.

Paul is talking 1 Corinthians 11, in the context of Church. So in Church women are supposed to cover their heads as a symbol to Angels not to Men. If someone wants to always cover their head then that is also Good, let it be according to their faith. But what is important is obeying the command instead of ignoring it.

Also women are asked to be silent in Church in the context of teaching not praying. If it is so then the scripture should not contradict itself. But according to Jesus himself, Scriptures do not contradict each other. Hence a woman is only prohibited from teaching men in Church. In our Church we allow women to pray publicly and testify publicly. But not teaching. Again we have to look into the spirit of the word.

All most all your questions are valid only when we live by letter and not by spirit. If you seriously experienced a spirit filled life, you will not have such questions. Remember always, Letter kills but spirit gives life.

Re: , on: 2015/7/6 14:24

Is it okay for women to wear table napkins as head coverings with embroidery in them or should they be woven so that no light penetrates the cover? Otherwise if light penetrates the cover they are really not covered at all thus disobeying your interpretation of the scripture.

Aslo

Even when a woman lives in disobedience to God by her lifestyle but as long as she wears a head covering when going to a church meeting she is okay right? The Spirit is with her because her head is covered right?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/6 14:45

Rev-

You have already been asked nicely two times to not raise objections to head coverings. This thread is for those who follow it or want to.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: , on: 2015/7/6 14:52**

This is a public forum that presents the opportunity to question disputable matters or are the moderators the only ones that can present interpretations of the scriptures with no questions being allowed? Why? Does wearing a head covering mean that much?

Acts 15: 29 English Standard Version

that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what has been strangled, and from sexual immorality. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell.â€

Where is the head covering here?

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/6 17:22**

Paul anticipated such arguments in 1Cor 11:16. There is nothing new under the sun...

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/6 17:28**

A very good article; it explains a difficult scripture passage very well. Understanding this only becomes a virtue when you follow it.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/6 17:55**

It says in 1 cor 11:15 that a woman is given long hair as a covering. Not a hat. I think bro enue is making that point.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/7/6 19:36**

Love your post, Sree.

QUOTE:

\_\_\_\_\_

So in Church women are supposed to cover their heads as a symbol to Angels not to Men.

\_\_\_\_\_

This point is ignored too many times.

Sandra

**Re: , on: 2015/7/6 22:53**

Quote:  
-----This is a public forum that presents the opportunity to question disputable matters or are the moderators the only ones that can present interpretations of the scriptures with no questions being allowed? Why? Does wearing a head covering mean that much?

Acts 15: 29 English Standard Version

that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what has been strangled, and from sexual immorality. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell.â€

Where is the head covering here?  
-----

If you read Greg's original post he said that he did not want any debate and that he was posting for people who were just learning about it.

That is why I am heeding his warning and not saying anything.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/7 0:27**

We appreciate brethren respecting this thread to be a safe place for people to ask honest questions and discuss head coverings in a way of seeking truth.

This is another place where there is alot of great content given on this topic: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com>

Essentially it was practiced by all saints until the last century so it is good women are seeking this again in the Church.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/7 9:36**

Why did Paul say this?

But if any man seem to be contentious, WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM, NEITHER THE CHURCHES OF GOD. (1 Cor 1 1:16)

I think Paul is saying, If they don't agree it's no big deal.

But, I can certainly respect cultures that do this.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/7 9:55**

Please stop questioning the interpretation of these scriptures in this forum.

If you are not in agreement with this private interpretation please do not post as I have learned even when in humour.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/7 11:02**

Quote:  
-----This is a public forum that presents the opportunity to question disputable matters or are the moderators the only ones that can present interpretations of the scriptures with no questions being allowed?  
-----

Hi Rev\_\_Eneue,

Greg wasn't prohibiting discussion on the topic, only requesting not to do it on this thread which he set up.

This headcovering topic has been brought up with some regularity in the past. Feel free to start a new thread, or participate in some of the older discussions.

We might not agree with every decision of the moderators on this forum. But a lot of times unnecessary conflict can be avoided with some shrewdness and tact. It is about preserving the peace, but it is also about conveying our message in loving and effective ways. Communication is more difficult when others feel threatened and take a defensive posture.

You can also seek clarification or voice dissatisfaction privately first via e-mailing Greg or the forum moderators. I believe there's a biblical basis for this - Matt 18:15-17. I've done this in the past, and I've found Greg to be approachable and courteous in responding to my concerns.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/7 11:23**

Some previous discussions on the headcovering topic:

[https://img.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic\\_pdf.php?topic\\_id=4351&forum=35](https://img.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic_pdf.php?topic_id=4351&forum=35)

[https://img.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic\\_pdf.php?topic\\_id=9669&forum=36](https://img.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic_pdf.php?topic_id=9669&forum=36)

[https://img.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic\\_pdf.php?topic\\_id=14218&forum=36](https://img.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic_pdf.php?topic_id=14218&forum=36)

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/7 11:23**

here are 2 good articles on the subject of headcovering from Zac Poonen:

<http://www.cfcindia.org/article/head-covering-for-women>

<http://www.cfcindia.org/article/head-coverings-two-spiritual-statements>

**Rev\_Enue's questions - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2015/7/10 10:54**

Quote - "Why? Does wearing a head covering mean that much?"

If we notice the context in which this was written, namely just before instructions on observing the Lord's Supper, we should at least be open to look at it closely and see whether it is relevant or not.

What makes this practice so important to me, is that it underlines the issue of headship, that when properly understood, will safeguard our families against the onslaught of feminism.

Quote - "Acts 15: 29 English Standard Version

that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what has been strangled, and from sexual immorality. If you keep yourselves from these, you will do well. Farewell.

Where is the head covering here?"

It is not there, as well as other practices like prayer, observing the Lord's Supper, fasting, singing etc, that is not there.

Bless you my Brother.

**Re: Julius21's question - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2015/7/10 11:12**

Quote -

"Why did Paul say this?

But if any man seem to be contentious, WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM, NEITHER THE CHURCHES OF GOD. (1 Cor 11:16)

I think Paul is saying, If they don't agree it's no big deal.

But, I can certainly respect cultures that do this."

I wrestled with this as well. To interpret it your way would mean that Paul just nullified everything he just said. In other words - wives should cover while praying or prophesying, but don't worry, neither we, nor the other churches do this. Such an interpretation would not make any sense. I understand Paul to be saying that - WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM (of praying uncovered), NEITHER THE CHURCHES OF GOD.

This is explained quite well in here -

Head-coverings in Worship Part 4

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26142>

Bless you my Brother.

Edit - link was Part 5, should have been Part 4

**Re: , on: 2015/7/10 12:07**

Quote:

-----I wrestled with this as well. To interpret it your way would mean that Paul just nullified everything he just said. In other words - wives should cover while praying or prophesying, but don't worry, neither we, nor the other churches do this. Such an interpretation would not make any sense. I understand Paul to be saying that - WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM (of praying uncovered), NEITHER THE CHURCHES OF GOD.

This is explained quite well in here -

Head-coverings in Worship Part 4

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26142>

Bless you my Brother.

Thanks, brother. I won't debate you at all. I will only share my understanding and appreciate you answering my question. I will check out the link.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

Could it have been cultural? It is well known that prostitutes in Corinth went around with their hair uncovered. Occasionally Paul had reasons other than theology for saying what he did. As I understand it, one could identify prostitutes in Corinth because while most women wore some type of hat or cover on their head, the prostitutes didn't. This became challenging when Christian women chose not to be bothered with this custom. The local reasoning made it difficult to tell Christian women from prostitutes. So, Paul recommended that women cover their heads. That's why this instruction is only in that letter and not other letters. There is no instruction to the other churches about this. The Corinthian letter went to the Corinthian church. Paul was addressing the Corinthian church regarding the culture surrounding them. Like many new religious movements, the Christians across the Roman empire were accused of sexual improprieties. (This has happened throughout history, even to this day.) Paul was giving them instructions for their own good- to protect the fledgling church, and to protect Christian women from defamation. I think Paul was in the right on this. Don't give the world cause to call your faith into question through their view of your outward appearance. Basically, don't embarrass your church by looking like a hooker. As he said in another place, all things may be permissible, but not all things are a good idea.

I think we have to be careful to latch onto a tiny, insignificant thing and try to treat that as the most important issue especially when it alienates other Believers, if not in practice, then maybe secretly in the heart?

I was in a house church once, and did not know this "custom". It was supposedly an "open" meeting where everyone could share what was on their heart and my wife shared a Psalm. I was informed afterwards that she would have to wear something on her head if she wanted to speak in the future. How would that signify to anyone that my wife was submissive to me? And why do we want to prove to everyone from an outward piece of clothing that we are submissive rather than displaying the fruit of the Spirit? Do you understand what I am saying? In other words, you can wear a doily on your head but that does not mean you are submissive.

Will check your link out, now.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/10 12:36**

Good response Julius21. I think the topic has now been well covered,

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/10 12:48**

Quote:  
-----Could it have been cultural? It is well known that prostitutes in Corinth went around with their hair uncovered.  
-----

from: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com/articles/is-head-covering-cultural-what-about-the-corinthian-prostitutes>

The Objection: In Paul's day, prostitutes wore their hair short and did not cover their heads. Because it was customary in that culture for women to wear a head covering, failure to do so would readily identify a woman as a prostitute. Since the situation was local, a head covering is not necessary today.

R.C. Sproul says, "If Paul merely told women in Corinth to cover their heads and gave no rationale for such instruction, we would be strongly inclined to supply it via our cultural knowledge. In this case, however, Paul provides a rationale which is based on an appeal to creation not to the custom of Corinthian harlots." 1) He goes on to say, "We must be careful not to let our zeal for knowledge of the culture obscure what is actually said." 2)

In 1 Corinthians 11 Paul appeals to the creation order, nature's witness and angels, all which transcend culture. He tells us that head covering is a part of official apostolic teaching and is the practice of all churches, everywhere. So that means a local situation in Corinth cannot explain head covering since it was the standard practice outside of Corinth as well. Earlier in Paul's letter when he had a command that was due to the situation at the time, he mentioned it. He recommended not to marry "in view of the present distress" (1 Cor 7:26). Paul could have done the same with head coverings, but he didn't because what was happening at the time wasn't the reason for the command. Additionally, the fact that he commands men to remove their coverings (1 Cor 11:4) in the same sentence cannot be explained by a situation that deals only with women.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/10 12:54**

Well, I am trying to listen to the link and I am taking notes, but need to stop for awhile as the speaker has a very forceful and caustic way of speaking. He is really wanting everyone to be convinced of it rather than just exegeting the scriptures . I won't post my notes in this thread as it will look like I am debating rather than reviewing an audio recording. So, I will open another thread for the purpose of reviewing it.

Blessings.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/10 12:54**

Hey Julius21 - I like that you brought up 1 Cor 11:16. It seems that translations can vary:

"But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God." (NKJV)

"But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other practice, nor have the churches of God." (NASB)

Here is the original Greek:

[http://biblehub.com/interlinear/1\\_corinthians/11-16.htm](http://biblehub.com/interlinear/1_corinthians/11-16.htm)

So is it "no other practice" or "no such practice"?

**Re: , on: 2015/7/10 13:01**

Quote:

-----by yuehan on 2015/7/10 12:54:36

Hey Julius21 - I like that you brought up 1 Cor 11:16. It seems that translations can vary:

"But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God." (NKJV)

"But if one is inclined to be contentious, we have no other practice, nor have the churches of God." (NASB)

Here is the original Greek:

[http://biblehub.com/interlinear/1\\_corinthians/11-16.htm](http://biblehub.com/interlinear/1_corinthians/11-16.htm)

So is it "no other practice" or "no such practice"?

Speaker says KJV is correct and I will go with that.

1Cor 11:16 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

Paul would not be saying, "We and the Churches of God do not have any custom of contentiousness". Of course not. That would be a ridiculous statement. Christians know "contentiousness and strife" would never be elevated to a Christian custom.

Anyway, I did finish the audio, and I prayed about whether I should review it or not and I don't think it would be safe for me to review it on SI. I think everyone should listen to this particular one and I am confident that if you have the Spirit of God, He will lead you into the truth.

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26142>



**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/10 23:56**

Quote:  
-----Paul would not be saying, "We and the Churches of God do not have any custom of contentiousness". Of course not. That would be a ridiculous statement. Christians know "contentiousness and strife" would never be elevated to a Christian custom.  
-----

Julius21 - I agree that the "custom" in 1 Cor 11:16 does not refer to a "custom of contentiousness".

What do you make of this verse? - "For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels." (1 Cor 11:10)

The implication here seems to be that the headcovering symbol is not so much for man, but as a declaration for the angels. I don't know enough to comment on this topic, but this verse doesn't seem to support the cultural argument for head coverings.

**Re: Discussion Forum? - posted by dspks, on: 2015/7/11 11:44**

TMK writes: "You have already been asked nicely two times to not raise objections to head coverings. This thread is for those who follow it or want to."

(not upset... just kinda confused)

What about a thread that shares the belief that Christians can consume alcohol? (Which I am not for)

Should THAT thread be only for those who follow it or want to??

This IS a "Discussion Forum"... isn't it??? :)

**Re: , on: 2015/7/11 12:09**

"This IS a "Discussion Forum"... isn't it??? :)"

It seems to be a discussion forum mostly when it fits the beliefs of some.

I have experienced the Holy Spirit move mightily among entire congregations and assemblies and ourselves when not a single woman in the place could be seen wearing a head covering. How does that work?  
How could God bless such gatherings if the women and men are in outward and obvious disobedience to what some here suggest are the commandments of God?

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/11 12:22**

Quote:  
-----I have experienced the Holy Spirit move mightily among entire congregations and assemblies and ourselves when not a single woman in the place could be seen wearing a head covering. How does that work?  
-----

Sister,

Yes, I believe no one is saying God cannot work in churches that do not practice this at all. This thread is simply open for honest discussion and questions for people who are more positive towards searching this truth out.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

The discussion forum is open to starting many discussions and for people to express their views. but this thread was started with a specific purpose to be more positive and encourage honest questions.

We just want it to be an open environment for saints to explore this truth for their personal lives and in church practice. We do not mean to offend those who do not feel led to practice this.

**Thanks Greg, - posted by dspks, on: 2015/7/11 12:29**

Not offended... was just confused... thanks for the clarification!

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/11 16:50**

Does it hurt to obey this little command? Why not just observe it in the most plain and simply way?

The churches used to obey this command for centuries and few objected. It was the done thing.

You will never understand this passage when you reserve your right to refuse to follow it.

Blessed are those who do so just because they want to please their Master in everything and trust that it is good and right so.

Head covering is about acknowledging headship. Father-Son-Man-wife. Satan's rebellion was against the headship of the Son. Surely he wants to draw us into confusion about headship and engaged Eve in a discussion about the forbidden fruit. For this very reason it says in verse 10

"the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels."

**Re: , on: 2015/7/11 18:50**

Quote:  
-----What do you make of this verse? - "For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels." (1 Cor 11:10)  
-----

I won't pretend to know what that means and don't think anyone knows. I have never been satisfied by any explanation that I have heard.

God gave a woman her hair for a covering. Her head is covered by her hair.

1Co 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 said, for that reason a man shouldn't have long hair because that's covering his head.

1Co 11:14 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?

If a man's long hair is covering his head (as the scriptures say), then a woman's long hair is covering her head.

So, it is just what Paul said it was. It (her hair) is a cover. So, a woman who has long hair when she prays or prophesies does not need an additional covering on her head. Now, if she is uncomfortable and doesn't think her hair is long enough and wants to wear a covering, then that's fine. But, I wouldn't tie women to a legalistic tradition just because some other writers favor it.

I really don't see what is so difficult about this passage of scripture except of course that bit about the angels.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2015/7/11 20:45**

Quote:

-----I really don't see what is so difficult about this passage of scripture except of course that bit about the angels.  
-----

Could the "angels" be referring to the messengers above the woman, those heads spoken of in verse 3. ?

**Re: , on: 2015/7/11 22:05**

Quote:

-----by proudpapa on 2015/7/11 20:45:31

Quote:

-----I really don't see what is so difficult about this passage of scripture except of course that bit about the angels.  
-----

Could the "angels" be referring to the messengers above the woman, those heads spoken of in verse 3. ?  
-----

Sure.

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2015/7/11 22:35**

Quote:

----- Sure.  
-----

It is the only thing I can see that fits.

because of the context that the connecting words demand : "For this cause" connects the end of verse 7 thru verse 9 to the subject matter being spoken of in verse 10

the first word of verse 11 is another connecting word : "Nevertheless" that means the thought in verse 10 is connected t o what is fixing to be said and that thought that continues through verse 12.

The preconcieved assumption that "angels" is referring to angelic beings does not seem to fit the context.

But the Bible defines the word "angels" sometimes not as angelic beings but also as "messengers" and that does seem t o fit the context.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/12 3:42**

Question: I am aware of the I Corinthians chapter 11 passage about coverings. Are there any other New Testament pas sages that are used by those who partake of this particular practice?

The reason that I ask is that there are many groups and sects that use a single passage as a mandatory doctrinal truth. Mormons made a doctrine of "baptism for the dead" because of a passage in I Corinthians chapter 15. Other sects and denominations do the same.

Scripture conveys the notion of the testimony of "two or three witnesses" (Deuteronomy 17:6; II Corinthians 13:1) establi shing/confirming a matter. When I read the apostles gathering or "council" in Jerusalem after listening to Paul's work wit h the Gentiles, it makes me wonder if such matters fall under grace (Acts 15:6-11).

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

Regardless, I haven't found any secondary or supporting passage from the New Testament that might serve to clarify or reinforce this particular practice.

**Re: - posted by staff, on: 2015/7/12 6:23**

hi  
by saying this is not a hobby horse does not take away from the fact that it is a hobby horse.ive seen your posts before o  
n the subject and although well meaning do not advance revival or the kingdom.  
we are missing authority in the church today but this isnt it,urs staff

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/12 8:19**

Bro Derek Prince set the bar HIGH for me. I have listened to many of his sermons and one day a small blurb in one whe  
re he said that he believed in head coverings.

BUT get this, he wouldn't teach on head coverings because it was not clear in the Bible. Imagine that, one of best Bible  
teachers (in my time or all time) and he said it wasn't clear in the Bible.

Now, what he did state was that it was a personal matter whether to where head coverings or not. And that was it!

Out of the 1,00,000's of hours Derek Prince spent in the Bible for the 1000's of sermons he taught, he concluded that he  
ad coverings WAS NOT A COMMANDMENT but a personal matter.

I'm going with a man of God who was honest enough to say it was not a clear teaching and not letting the rest of you still  
my peace on the matter!

God bless,  
Lisa

**Re: , on: 2015/7/12 8:58**

Quote:  
-----Question: I am aware of the I Corinthians chapter 11 passage about coverings. Are there any other New Testament passages that  
are used by those who partake of this particular practice?

The reason that I ask is that there are many groups and sects that use a single passage as a mandatory doctrinal truth. Mormons made a doctrine of "  
baptism for the dead" because of a passage in I Corinthians chapter 15. Other sects and denominations do the same.

Scripture conveys the notion of the testimony of "two or three witnesses" (Deuteronomy 17:6; II Corinthians 13:1) establishing/confirming a matter. Wh  
en I read the apostles gathering or "council" in Jerusalem after listening to Paul's work with the Gentiles, it makes me wonder if such matters fall under  
grace (Acts 15:6-11).

Regardless, I haven't found any secondary or supporting passage from the New Testament that might serve to clarify or reinforce this particular practic  
e.  
-----

Yes, I too wondered where the 2 or 3 witnesses of Scripture were for such a doctrine.

And, it did not seem important enough to tell the Gentile church about it in Acts 15.

Plus, if you look at a head covering in the Jewish Church, they will take almost a small blanket and cover their entire hea  
d when they pray so no one can see it. That is a headcovering!! A little piece of cloth or scarf today, does not cover the h  
ead. The head is more than the top of the head, it is the whole head.

And to staff's point, this does not produce unity, either. And does not produce submissiveness.

The reason that many cannot accept this is because only the fruit of the Spirit is a sign of submissiveness to God and hu  
sband and I should say, the husband should have the fruit of love towards his wife. An article of clothing proves nothing

and ensures nothing. Let's major on the Fruit of the Spirit which is Christ centered and not clothing, and now I see they are marketing stylistic head coverings, turning it into a little cottage industry. But this is not Christ centered, it is man centered. It draws attention to men.

And to Lysa's point about Derek Prince. Great observation and wonderful teacher.

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2015/7/12 9:52**

julius21

just wanted to say thanks for your posts in this thread. you have brought up many things that have helped further confirm in my mind and heart that God does not require of me to wear a head covering. everytime this topic comes up i spend time in prayer over it and have often walked away feeling confused but i can honestly say i have peace on this matter now.

rdg

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/12 10:33**

I wonder if anyone actually listened to or read the messages Greg posted here and then came to the conclusion that it is not for today.

The question came up about 1. Cor 11:10 For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

Eve was tempted by Satan the Archangel and was lured into disobedience to the one and only command they had to obey in those days. Please take note that Eve did not receive the command by God directly as Adam did, but she received it from Adam who got it from God. Eve had not been yet been created when the man Adam received the command.

By covering her head she expresses that she chooses submission and obedience to her husband and subsequently to Christ. In effect she proclaims to the angelic world:

"My great-grandmother Eve did not behold the command that Adam passed on to her and she left the authority she was under - but now I and my sisters in Christ express that we are subject to our husbands who is appointed head over us in the governance of God. We chose to keep God's commands down to small details of which head covering is a visible symbol.

The angelic world witness now the weak point where Satan managed to launch his epic attack on mankind has now been fixed and fortified by obedience.

Watchman Nee gives us wonderful insight into this reality:

<http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>

How to Cover the Head

“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” (1 Cor. 11:6). In other words, God tells the sisters to be thorough.

No woman can keep her hair and not have her head covered. If she is not covered, she should have her hair either shorn or shaven. If she feels shameful to have her hair shorn or shaven, then she should be covered. Everything must be done thoroughly, not in half measure.

“For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man” (v. 7). Since man represents the image and glory of God, he should not cover his head. But woman is the glory of man, so she should cover her head. If a woman does not cover her head, she cannot demonstrate that man is the head. “For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: for neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man” (vv. 8-9). These two verses make it very clear that the matter before us is concerned with government. “For the man is not of the woman” — this is God’s doing. In God’s creation

man did not come by woman, but woman from the rib taken out of man. Hence, the head was Adam, not Eve. Furthermore, "neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." Just by God's ordering in creation, woman should be in submission to man.

"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 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.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/12 10:42**

My reply:

The thing is that all the churches of God observed this practice and there was no need to reiterate it. Only in the Corinthian church some objections came up.

See: 1. Cor 11:16 But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.

2 or 3 witnesses are needed according to the Mosaic law to establish the guilt or innocence of a person in court, not the validity of scripture.

I wonder who came up with this strange idea to validate scripture with 2 or 3 appearances.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: , on: 2015/7/12 12:13**

Quote:

-----by narrowpath on 2015/7/12 10:42:44

My reply:

The thing is that all the churches of God observed this practice and there was no need to reiterate it. Only in the Corinthian church some objections came up.

See: 1. Cor 11:16 But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.

2 or 3 witnesses are needed according to the Mosaic law to establish the guilt or innocence of a person in court, not the validity of scripture. I wonder who came up with this strange idea to validate scripture with 2 or 3 appearances.

Are there any other doctrines of legality that are determined by only one passage? And speaking of legality, why is there such a legality required in the life of a Believer where who is freed from outward laws?

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/12 12:59**

Hi narrowpath,

Quote:

-----  
The thing is that all the churches of God observed this practice and there was no need to reiterate it. Only in the Corinthian church some objections came up.

See: 1. Cor 11:16 But if anyone seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.

2 or 3 witnesses are needed according to the Mosaic law to establish the guilt or innocence of a person in court, not the validity of scripture. I wonder who came up with this strange idea to validate scripture with 2 or 3 appearances.

-----  
I am asking whether the Corinthian passage is the only one in which this topic was ever discussed at any length (even as short as this passage is) in the New Testament. I've researched it, read commentary and, yes, read through history of "hair" traditions. I was just asking (without ulterior motives) whether there are other passages upon which this particular teaching is supported.

As for the notion of "two or three witnesses" applying to Scripture: I don't know if anyone else who "came up" with it, but I see the passage in both the Old and New Testaments (in Deuteronomy 17:6 and II Corinthians 13:1). In the II Corinthians 13:1 passage, Paul wrote about "establishing" a teaching through his presentations of it -- two or three times.

Paul wrote:

Quote:

-----"This is the third time I am coming to you. Every fact is to be confirmed by the testimony of two or three witnesses.' I have previously said when present the second time, and though now absent I say in advance to those who have sinned in the past and to all the rest as well, that if I come again I will not spare anyone, since you are seeking for proof of the Christ who speaks in me, and who is not weak toward you, but mighty in you. For indeed He was crucified because of weakness, yet He lives because of the power of God. For we also are weak in Him, yet we will live with Him because of the power of God directed toward you."

II Corinthians 13:1-4

-----  
I am not saying that we need two or three appearances to "validate Scripture," but it is very helpful for two or three passages to clearly establish or confirm a doctrinal teaching.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

For me, the I Corinthians 11 passage isn't clear in establishing a doctrine on the matter of women needing to have a man-made covering upon their heads (whether in public, private, prayer or "church" meetings). Let me be clear: If I did see this, I would present it to my wife as well and try to follow the teaching. However, I just don't see it.

I will also add the following:

Someone brought up their "great-grandmother Eve." Interestingly, there is nothing in Scripture to indicate that Eve wore a "head covering" (other than her hair). This was from the time of Creation through the fall -- a time in which angels were certainly present and gender differences were certainly obvious. Secondly, after the fall, the Bible states that God made coats of skins and clothed them. It doesn't mention that the Lord made a physical head covering (in addition to hair) upon Eve's head. This is, of course, prior to the Law of Moses -- a Law that we are now free from.

Referring to history could be helpful in setting a historical precedent. The problem, of course, is that there are other Roman and other pagan traditions, teachings and practices that have found their way into the church throughout history too.

Still, I would like to hear another New Testament passage other than I Corinthians chapter 11 that specifically supplements this teaching or the interpretations of the Corinthian passage. I have studied this off and on (usually because of something that I read on SermonIndex forums), so this would greatly help.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/12 13:03**

Quote:

-----Are there any other doctrines of legality that are determined by only one passage? And speaking of legality,-----

Some excellent responses and thoughts saints. Yes I would say Communion is not mentioned in all the epistles and chiefly in 1 Corinthians to correct an abuse of the meaning of the practice as well as headcoverings later on in 1 Corinthians.

Though it is true that Derek Prince did not teach it much publically, his wife wore a headcovering for every meeting.

Almost 95% or more of all Churches accepted it as a biblical and historical practice until the last 50-100 years. During that time also views on Divorced people being in ministry and pastoral positions has changed also but for all church history there was a keeping of a standard for those who would serve the Lord in this way. I am not saying that God cannot raise up a divorced couple into a leadership position in the Church.

just some thoughts for brethren to consider.

There are many questions answered here that can be helpful: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com/articles-series>

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by JFW (), on: 2015/7/12 15:22**

Luke 16:10 He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much.

Narrowpath- you speak well the truth with the wisdom of humility.

Much like with divorce the resistance to this clear teaching is not an issue of culture so much as it is pride, hard heartedness and a fear of man rather than God as this is indeed humiliating for a modern woman in the midst of a feminized world culture. Tho I submit that this one, seemingly inconsequential, thing may indeed be a definitive test as to whether a woman has the right heart before the Lord regarding her position in His governmental body.

Consider if you will for a moment the testimony of faithfulness that this act of obedience would produce not only to the world and the church at large but also to the husbands of said godly women? I believe it would be devastating to the kingdom of darkness which strangles our lands, because God uses the foolish things of this world to shame the wise...

Also 1 Peter 3 comes to mind when considering this issue;

1 Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;



- 2 While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear.
- 3 Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel;
- 4 But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.
- 5 For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands:
- 6 Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.
- 7 Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.
- 8 Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous:
- 9 Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing.
- 10 For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile:
- 11 Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it.
- 12 For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.
- 13 And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?
- 14 But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled;
- 15 But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:
- 16 Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation in Christ.
- 17 For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing.

A head covering would certainly be a sign of a meek and quiet spirit, with which the Lord our God can do great and wonderful things:)

#### Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by JFW (), on: 2015/7/12 16:08

A further step forward-

The world tells a woman to be mindful of her rights and to express these by the liberty of her outward appearance and her conduct. Tho the scripture declares that we all, men and women alike, are to crucify ourselves to the world which to do so is an act of obedience actualized by dying daily unto ourselves. Tho if we have and continue to do this an act of devotion will follow that is not commanded but implied by scripture, and this act of devotion will result in us not only crucifying ourselves unto the world but also crucifying the world unto ourselves. Meaning that it will no longer interest us, influence us or make us after its image. Many including myself have crucified themselves unto the world but hadn't crucified it unto ourselves and we were diluted by its influence and lost the effectiveness that comes from being consecrated unto the Lord.

Would not this act of a woman covering her head be an ultimate and final sign to both powers and principalities that she is forever dead to the world, consecrated unto the Lord and therefore alive in Christ?

Is it not written, "love not the world nor the things therein" and in another place, "to be a friend of the world is to be an enemy of God"?

Would this not be a certain issue of divorce on behalf of the soul of the woman to the world that chose to obey and not concern herself with the world or its customs or practices?

For which she would most certainly be reproached by both those inside and outside the church but indeed beloved of God.

So I ask,...what is it in you that resists this, is it the Spirit of God in you that says No! You should'nt do this? Can you with a clear conscience before God confess that is in fact He who reigns in Heaven that tells you that you should not abide by the traditions?

Or if Jesus Himself should attend service at your local congregation would He rebuke you or commend you for this humble act of submission?

In fact, we hope, He is in attendance and has indeed seen the hearts of those who claim His name.

I mean shouldn't we live differently than those who don't know Him and never met Him?

I pray the women who read this see that I'm not picking on you, but defending the faith for which our Savior spilled His blood. It is the world and its prince who attacks you with supposed rights and privileges, tho the Lord has made a way for t

those who seek it and are willing to take up their cross and carry it following after Him. Our cross is not what befalls us in this life but what and where we chose to obey even when it costs us, shames us and delivers us up to our enemies for the glory of His name.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/12 16:20**

Chris:

in 2 Cor 13 it does not talk about doctrine but about establishing the state of those who have sinned and and not repented after Paul's detailed discourse about sin and disorder in the Corinthian church.

Secondly, I am not suggesting that Eve wore a head covering. This would not make sense since the bible says they were naked and not ashamed.

Interestingly, it was after the fall God decreed that the husband shall rule over her.

Before the fall, the decree to rule over the wife was not necessary because Adam and Eve lived in a perfectly harmonious relationship.

Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

The head covering for women and uncovering for men came only into place in the New Testament church. Again, I strongly suggest to check out the links Greg mentioned in the beginning.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/12 17:14**

I am just afraid if all women wore a headcovering even if it went against their consciences regarding freedom in Christ and their understanding of said freedom, that then, that would not be enough by certain movements. Then, other outward dress, conduct, habits would be legislated, until you have a full blown cult that is more known by their habits than by the fruit of the Holy Spirit.

Let me ask a question: Is it ok, if women who see this passage of scripture as cultural, not wear a headcovering? If they believe long hair is a headcovering as Paul seems to indicate in 1 Cor 11? Will they be accepted into fellowship? Or will they be looked down upon and shunned? Can they expect to receive invitations to homes apart from church and friendship from the heart by sisters that "cover"?

The whole spirit of this outward piece of clothing just seems so anti-Spirit of Christ. I can understand it culturally applying to a local or regional church but not spiritually to the whole Body. Christians are known by the sweet smelling savour of Christ that they manifest not by a small article of cloth on their head.

Has anyone answered this question? I have not looked. Why do you think they did not tell the Gentiles to do this in Acts 15? This was not required of them. Yet, the Corinthian church was a Gentile church which kind of gives more evidence that this was cultural. The Gentiles that came to the Jerusalem conference were from the Antioch church.

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2015/7/12 17:39**

by Julius21 on 2015/7/12 17:14:54

I am just afraid if all women wore a headcovering even if it went against their consciences regarding freedom in Christ and their understanding of said freedom, that then, that would not be enough by certain movements. Then, other outward dress, conduct, habits would be legislated, until you have a full blown cult that is more known by their habits than by the fruit of the Holy Spirit.

-----

I am just thankful that the Lord looks at the heart and not outward appearances.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/12 17:52**

Quote:

-----rdg wrote:

I am just thankful that the Lord looks at the heart and not outward appearances.

Amen!!

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/12 18:30**

Quote:

-----Has anyone answered this question? I have not looked. Why do you think they did not tell the Gentiles to do this in Acts 15? This was not required of them. Yet, the Corinthian church was a Gentile church which kind of gives more evidence that this was cultural. The Gentiles that came to the Jerusalem conference were from the Antioch church.

-----

From my understanding the list in Acts 15 the letter written was about judaizers who were requiring mosaic cleansing rituals and circumcision.

---

The apostles and elders, your brothers,

To the Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia:

Greetings.

24 We have heard that some went out from us without our authorization and disturbed you, troubling your minds by what they said. 25 So we all agreed to choose some men and send them to you with our dear friends Barnabas and Paul— 26 men who have risked their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. 27 Therefore we are sending Judas and Silas to confirm by word of mouth what we are writing. 28 It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us not to burden you with anything beyond the following requirements: 29 You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and from sexual immorality. You will do well to avoid these things.

Farewell.

---

There is no mention of Water Baptism, Communion or any other practice of the Church so they were not writing about those things but Jewish regulations of the law or culture. Otherwise then all that churches would need to do in our modern day is:

You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals and from sexual immorality.

of course the Church does much more and there are practices we all agree to.

here is a great question and answer that helps answer some questions that have been asked on this thread:

from: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com/articles/is-head-covering-cultural-what-about-the-corinthian-prostitutes>

Is Head Covering Cultural? What about the Corinthian Prostitutes?

The Objection: In Paul's day, prostitutes wore their hair short and did not cover their heads. Because it was customa

ry in that culture for women to wear a head covering, failure to do so would readily identify a woman as a prostitute. Since the situation was local, a head covering is not necessary today. While looking at the culture of the time can often be helpful, it becomes dangerous when we start assigning reasons for a command that are different than what the author gives.

R.C. Sproul says, "If Paul merely told women in Corinth to cover their heads and gave no rationale for such instruction, we would be strongly inclined to supply it via our cultural knowledge. In this case, however, Paul provides a rationale which is based on an appeal to creation not to the custom of Corinthian harlots." 1) He goes on to say, "We must be careful not to let our zeal for knowledge of the culture obscure what is actually said." 2)

In 1 Corinthians 11 Paul appeals to the creation order, nature's witness and angels, all which transcend culture. He tells us that head covering is a part of official apostolic teaching and is the practice of all churches, everywhere. So that means a local situation in Corinth cannot explain head covering since it was the standard practice outside of Corinth as well. Earlier in Paul's letter when he had a command that was due to the situation at the time, he mentioned it. He recommended not to marry "in view of the present distress" (1 Cor 7:26). Paul could have done the same with head coverings, but he didn't because what was happening at the time wasn't the reason for the command. Additionally, the fact that he commands men to remove their coverings (1 Cor 11:4) in the same sentence cannot be explained by a situation that deals only with women.

#### 1000 Cult Prostitutes

In addition to exegetical grounds, there are also good historical reasons for rejecting a cultural explanation of head covering. The most appealed to reference in support of this position is the 1000 cult prostitutes at the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth.

Before we examine that claim, we're in need of a brief history lesson on the city of Corinth. Dirk Jongkind (PhD, Cambridge University) says "The City of Corinth had a glorious Hellenic past before its destruction by the Romans in 146 bc. Yet when it was refounded in 44 bc, it was not rebuilt as a Greek city, but as a Roman colony." 3) So Greek Corinth had been destroyed and it was rebuilt 100 years later as a Roman colony.

The primary source quoted to learn about these cult prostitutes is the Greek geographer Strabo (64/63 BC - 24AD). Strabo travelled widely and recorded what he saw in his work "Geographica". Here's what he said, "And the temple of Aphrodite was so rich that it owned more than a thousand temple slaves, courtesans, whom both men and women had dedicated to the goddess." 4) Take note of the past tense of the quote. Strabo wrote this about 30 years before Paul wrote 1 Corinthians and he was referring not to his present time, but to ancient times in Corinth's past. He later stated, "The city of the Corinthians, then, was always great and wealthy." 5) The key words are "then" and "was". In sharp contrast, in his day he saw on the summit "a small temple of Aphrodite" 6) not the "temple of Aphrodite" was so rich that it owned more than a thousand temple slaves" 7)

David W. J. Gill (PhD, University of Oxford) writing on "The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16" says:

Some have taken the urge for women to wear veils as Paul ensuring that they were not mistaken for prostitutes or hetairai. Part of the reason for this view lies in the interpretation of Corinth as a "sex-obsessed" city with prostitutes freely roaming the street. The 1000 hetairai linked to the cult of Aphrodite, and the corresponding notoriety of Corinth, belong to the hellenistic city swept away by Mummius in 146BC. In contrast, the Roman shrine was far more modest" 8) Dr. Gill agrees that Corinth did have a wild sex-obsessed reputation and 1000 cult prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite. However, that belonged to Greek Corinth which was destroyed about 200 years before Paul wrote 1 Corinthians.

#### Mistaken Identity

Going hand-in-hand with this view is the claim that if women were seen uncovered, they'd be mistakenly identified as a prostitute. However, this claim is unfounded and there's good reason to suggest that wasn't the case. Dr. Gill explains:

Public marble portraits of women at Corinth, presumably members of wealthy and prestigious families are most frequently shown bare-headed. This would suggest that it was socially acceptable in a Roman colony for women to be seen bare-headed in public. 9)

As he points out, the archaeological evidence supports the fact that it was normal for women to be seen bare-headed. This isn't an isolated piece of evidence but what is "almost frequently shown".

#### What About Men?

Since the Apostle Paul also commands men to remove their head covering when praying or prophesying (1 Cor 11:4) let us also see if men having something on their heads would be culturally out-of-step. Richard E. Oster, Jr. (PhD, Princeton Theological Seminary) writing on the "Use, Misuse and Neglect of Archaeological Evidence in Some Modern Works on 1 Corinthians" says:

This Roman custom can be documented for several generations before and after the advent of Christianity in Corinth. This custom is clearly portrayed on coins, statues, and architectural monuments from around the Mediterranean Basin. 10

Dr. Oster is saying that men covering their heads during this time in (non-Christian) worship has strong archaeological support. Since Paul instructs the men to go against a common cultural practice, a cultural explanation cannot be accepted. Dr. Oster then summarizes:

"the practice of men covering their heads in the context of prayer and prophecy was a common pattern of Roman piety and widespread during the late Republic and early Empire. Since Corinth was itself a Roman colony, there should be little doubt that this aspect of Roman religious practice deserves greater attention by commentators than it has received. 11)

Conclusion

Paul doesn't leave us in-the-dark as to why women are to cover their heads and men are to refrain. The fact that he says, "For this reason" (1 Cor 11:10 NKJV) means the answer will be found in exegesis, not cultural analysis. Having said that, when we do examine Roman cultural practices in that day we see that: 1) men did cover their heads in non-Christian worship and 2) women being seen without a covering was not an outrage or an association with prostitution. Since cultural arguments for head covering must ignore Paul's own explanation, they should be discarded.

from: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com/articles/is-head-covering-cultural-what-about-the-corinthian-prostitutes>

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/12 18:31**

Hi narrowpath,

Quote:  
-----  
in 2 Cor 13 it does not talk about doctrine but about establishing the state of those who have sinned and and not repented after Paul's detailed discourse about sin and disorder in the Corinthian church.  
-----

I disagree with what it is that you think the "two or three witnesses" means in this particular passage. Paul writes:

"This is the third time I am coming to you. Every fact is to be confirmed by the testimony of TWO or THREE witnesses.

I have previously said when present the SECOND time, and though NOW absent I say in advance to those who have sinned in the past and to all the rest as well, that if I come again I will not spare anyone, since you are seeking for PROOF OF THE CHRIST WHO SPEAKS IN ME, and who is not weak toward you, but mighty in you."

It seems to me that this Paul is confirming that Christ spoke in him THREE times to the Corinthians about the topics that he was bringing up in this epistle.

Still, this is something of digressing from the principle that I was trying to make. I wouldn't embrace the notion that Scriptures must address an issue two or three times for it to become a "doctrinal truth" (not at all). I am saying that many cults, sects, denominations and other groups have made dogma out of single passages of Scripture that they interpreted a particular way. It is easy to take a particular passage to mean something and turn that interpretation into something deemed "fundamental" or "foundational."

If there is anything that the corruption of Rome has taught us, it is that some groups will "strain a gnat but swallow a camel" when it comes to doctrine. They will take a single passage that is not absolutely clear and turn it into a "doctrine" that the sect finds indisputable for the faith. They will limit the extent of fellowship over matter like this -- not necessarily in te

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

rms of whether or not they can visit or meet with believers from that group, denomination or sect but whether they can be considered for ministry or leadership.

This is why I asked whether there are other verses in the New Testament that specifically support any sort of doctrinal "truth" regarding the wearing of a piece of material atop the hair as a "covering." I've read other passages about propriety -- but nothing else that I have found in the New Testament indicates an acceptance of a man-made "covering" that must be worn atop a woman's head. If there are passages pertaining to this, please let me know.

Quote:

Secondly, I am not suggesting that Eve wore a head covering. This would not make sense since the bible says she was naked and not ashamed.

Interestingly, it was after the fall God decreed that the husband shall rule over her.

Before the fall, the decree to rule over the wife was not necessary because Adam and Eve lived in a perfectly harmonious relationship.

When the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

This is why I brought it up. Eve did not exist in the Garden with a covering -- regardless of a "sign" for the angels about any particular natural God-ordained role (Adam was made first, Eve came from Adam). Even after the fall in the Garden and the subsequent curse upon man, woman and the serpent, God clothed Adam and Eve. The Bible does not say that God provided any sort of cover for Eve's hair/head. It simply states that God clothed them by making coats for Adam and Eve.

Quote:

The head covering for women and uncovering for men came only into place in the New Testament church. Again, I strongly suggest to check out the links Greg mentioned in the beginning.

I did look at the PDF of this. However, I still do not find any answer for my initial question. There doesn't seem to be a second or third mention of a head covering doctrine in the New Testament. I've read the Bible through many times. I searched for particular words about "coverings" and find nothing referring to such a head covering requirement other than how the passage in I Corinthians 11 is interpreted.

I am certainly not trying to be argumentative -- and I think that this should be clear (even if I might not agree at this point in my Christian journey). I am simply trying to understand the exact Scriptural basis (from the New Testament) for this sort of doctrine.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/12 18:53**

Quote:-----I did look at the PDF of this. However, I still do not find any answer for my initial question. There doesn't seem to be a second or third mention of a head covering doctrine in the New Testament. I've read the Bible through many times. I searched for particular words about "coverings" and find nothing referring to such a head covering requirement other than how the passage in I Corinthians 11 is interpreted.

I am certainly not trying to be argumentative -- and I think that this should be clear (even if I might not agree at this point in my Christian journey). I am simply trying to understand the exact Scriptural basis (from the New Testament) for this sort of doctrine.

Dear brother, I do believe it is wrong to require 2-3 scripture witnesses for something in Scripture if we did that then we would lose many godly commands, bible verse promises etc. If God says it once it should be good enough for us. Could the entire church be wrong for 1900+ years until feminism has had a great influence on the Church?

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

I do not judge nor look down on a sister that does not practice headcoverings, but it is good to honestly ask if this is biblical and if it is then sisters who want to practice it should feel at liberty and not being judged as religious, etc.

Does one need to be water baptised to be saved? no, but it is probably good one does it, and looking at church history and the scriptures it would be unwise not to be baptised in water and be almost considered disobedience to God's requirement.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/12 19:18**

I agree that in Acts 15 Peter, Paul and James were addressing a "sect of the Pharisees", Judaizers if you will.

And since the head covering was a Jewish custom, then the Judaizers knew that it was not for Gentiles so that is why they never mentioned it. They wanted the Gentiles to be circumcised, but they said nothing about their head covering custom.

I think we should listen to senior brothers like Derek Prince who would not mention it although his wife felt the freedom to wear one, and I have seen many in their congregation without one. It seems to be a personal choice. Stephen Kaung never preached about it and very few women wear one his Richmond fellowship, and Paul only mentioned it once.

Shouldn't we be like these three brothers and not major on (creating a movement) the putting on of apparel, but rather focusing on Jesus Christ and things which edify rather than divide?

Notice what Peter is majoring on in these verses, and also notice that "the putting on of apparel" is not the adorning that is important.

1Pe 3:1 Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;

1Pe 3:2 While they behold your CHASTE CONVERSATION (lifestyle) coupled with fear.

1Pe 3:3 Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, OR OF PUTTING ON OF APPAREL (could be head coverings)

1Pe 3:4 But LET IT BE THE HIDDEN MAN OF THE HEART, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/12 20:32**

Hi Greg,

I am not really saying that there must be two or three passages for a doctrine. I am just saying that it would be very helpful in areas that aren't clear to believers from Scripture. There are many different divisions within the Church over singular passages that are debated. I think that there are also many pagan and demonic teachings too that are devised by cults that take passages out of context or through the notion that a passage means something that isn't clear from the passage itself. The blessing of having an additional "witness" elsewhere in Scriptures that reinforce the matter provides great clarity.

I used the example of Mormons and their assertion about "baptism for the dead." Now, we understand that Mormonism is a cult that introduces a false Gospel that differs greatly from the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it is clearly written in the New Testament. Still, some of their doctrines are created by taking single passages from the New Testament and building obscure doctrines from it. The Roman Catholic Church was built out of many instances of this (along with combining the sacred with the pagan traditions of the day).

I think that it is good to compare the topic of head coverings with that of baptism. Whereas head coverings (as I understand it) is covered once in the New Testament, baptism is found several times in the Gospels as well as in the book of Acts and elsewhere in the epistles. There are localized and even organized churches that practice other traditions -- from "picking up serpents" to weekly foot washing ceremonies to many variances in what "communion" is supposed to consist of.

I would never think of judging a sister who does or does not practice head coverings (in any of the various ways that it is practiced). If she is convinced of this and follows the Lord as she is convinced, then she should not be commended for following what she believes to be from the Lord. At the same time, I would wonder how a local church, fellowship or group that embraces such a tradition would respond to a believing couple that did not embrace this practice. Would they be welcomed into full fellowship (like those who do practice it)? Would they be judged unworthy to engage in ministry or leadership roles within that local fellowship of believers? Would such a woman (or her husband) be rejected from teaching younger believers?

I have considered Church history in this matter. One problem is that much of Church history is mingled with certain extra-biblical traditions of men.

I have read websites that argued about the "history of the head covering" -- including some that had images from paintings, sculptures and mosaics that showed women wearing head coverings. However, I have seen other images contemporary to each of those where devout women (and unbelieving women too) were depicted without their heads covered. Thus, I do have questions about how much of a "norm" that it was in non-Roman, early Christian practice (for Jews and Gentiles alike). More importantly, I think that we can all agree that even thousands of years of practice or tradition might not necessarily make something "pure" in terms of Biblical doctrine.

I would definitely be open to reading specific references to head coverings in early church writings in the sense of it being a doctrinal practice. I would appreciate any citations or links to that end.

I would like to say that I am not "for" or "against" the head covering. I am for knowing what the Lord says of the matter and my mind (and heart) is soft and pliable to His Word. This is true on many matters upon which believers might not always agree. I don't think any differently of believers that disagree with me or even challenge me about something that I might believe. I don't think that we should ever take it personally when hearts are pure on any side of an issue or even a debate.

The Lord bless each of you. If anyone can provide me some Scriptural basis (if there is one in addition to I Corinthians 11) or citations/links to good well-researched history sources for this or writings of early church writers, I would appreciate it.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/12 20:59**

Brother,

Thank you for your deep thinking on this. Paul the Apostle said, "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)

So it is clear the passage in 1 Corinthians 11 is from the Holy Spirit of God. But the question needs to be what is the proper interpretation of the passage as you have stated.

Here is a good article: <http://earlychurch.com/HeadCovering.php>

an interesting perspective: <http://orthodoxinfo.com/praxis/headcoverings.aspx>

Here is a good link that shows "some" of church history and people that held to headcoverings with references. Again MOST every spiritual leader and Churches practiced this, it has only changed dramatically in the last 100 years slowly to lose this practice: [http://www.albatrus.org/english/living/modesty/headcoverings\\_in\\_scripture.htm](http://www.albatrus.org/english/living/modesty/headcoverings_in_scripture.htm)

People that held to the practice (just to name a few, we could literally put 90% of church leaders here in the first 1900 years of the Church):

Augustine  
John Knox  
John Calvin  
Matthew Henry  
A. T. Robertson  
John Wesley  
John Murray



George Fox  
Count Zizendorf  
J. Vernon McGee  
Charles Ryrie  
William MacDonald  
Martyn Lloyd-Jones  
R.C. Sproul  
K.P. Yohannan  
Zac Poonen

"It may be argued that since neither Finney, Wesley, Luther, or Calvin taught about the headcovering, why should we practice it? Some may 'hope' that these men didn't teach about it, but such is simply not the case. Of these men, some taught specifically about it, while others only wove it into their teachings on Modesty and Godly attire. Included in their teachings are exhortations to dress "exemplarily plain in your apparel; as plain as Quakers or Moravians", who, by the way, all wore headcoverings (Wesley Jour. Vol. VII pg. 116). John Wesley even stated that all Methodists should hear his "Thoughts upon Dress" read "at least once a year" (Wesley Jour. Vol. VIII pg. 307)." from: <http://rusbaptist.stunda.org/engl/headcovering.htm>

Quotes from early church fathers and leaders from: <http://www.earlychristiandictionary.com/Veil.html>

Now after I had passed the beast, and had gone forward about thirty feet, behold, there meets me a virgin arrayed as if she were going forth from a bridal-chamber all in white and with white sandals, veiled up to her forehead, and her head-covering consisted of a turban, and her hair was white. Hermas (A.D. 150) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.1 pg. 18

Although such a covering ought to be assumed as is requisite for covering the eyes of women. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 195) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.2 pg.265

It has also been commanded that the head should be veiled and the face covered; for it is a wicked thing for beauty to be a snare to men. Nor is it seemly for a woman to wish to make herself conspicuous, by using a purple veil. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 195) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.2 pg.266

And she will never fall, who puts before her eyes modesty, and her shawl; nor will she invite another to fall into sin by uncovering her face. For this is the wish of the Word, since it is becoming for her to pray veiled. Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 195) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.2 pg.290

Demanding then a law of God, you have that common one prevailing all over the world, engraved on the natural tables to which the apostle too is wont to appeal, as when in respect of the woman's veil he says, "Does not even Nature teach you?" - as when to the Romans, affirming that the heathen do by nature those things which the law requires, he suggests both natural law and a law-revealing nature. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.3 pg. 96

Christ is the Head of the Christian man - (for his head) is as free as even Christ is, under no obligation to wear a covering, not to say a crown. But even the head which is bound to have the veil, I mean woman's, as already taken possession of by this very thing, is not open also to a crown. She has the burden of her own humility to bear. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.3 pg. 102

But that point which is promiscuously observed throughout the churches, whether virgins ought to be veiled or no, must be treated of. For they who allow to virgins immunity from head-covering, appear to rest on this; that the apostle has not defined "virgins" by name, but "women," as "to be veiled;" Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.3 pg. 687

"Every woman," said he, "praying and prophesying with head uncovered, dishonors her own head." What is "every woman," but woman of every age, of every rank, of every condition? "Every man." As, then, in the masculine sex, under the name of "man" even the "youth" is forbidden to be veiled; so, too, in the feminine, under the name of "woman," even the "virgin" is bidden to be veiled. For indeed it is "on account of the angels" that he said women must be veiled, because on account of "the daughters of men" angels revolted from God. Who then, would contend that "women" alone - that is, such as were already wedded and had lost their virginity - were the objects of angelic concupiscence, unless "virgins" a

re incapable of excelling in beauty and finding lovers? Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.3 pg. 688

Why do you denude before God what you cover before men? Will you be more modest in public than in the church? Be veiled, virgin, if virgin you are; for you ought to blush. If you are a virgin, shrink from (the gaze of) many eyes. Let no one wonder at your face; let no one perceive your falsehood. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.3 pg. 689

Nay, rather banish quite away from your "free" head all this slavery of ornamentation. In vain do you labor to seem adorned: in vain do you call in the aid of all the most skilful manufacturers of false hair. God bids you "be veiled." I believe (He does so) for fear the heads of some should be seen! Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.22

It behooves our virgins to be veiled from the time that they have passed the turning-point of their age: that this observance is exacted by truth, on which no one can impose prescription - no space of times, no influence of persons, no privilege of regions. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.27

Throughout Greece, and certain of its barbaric provinces, the majority of Churches keep their virgins covered. There are places, too, beneath this (African) sky, where this practice obtains; lest any ascribe the custom to Greek or barbarian Gentilehood. But I have proposed (as models) those Churches which were founded by apostles or apostolic men. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.28

"If any," he says, "is contentious, we have not such a custom, nor (has) the Church of God." So, too, did the Corinthians themselves understand him. In fact, at this day the Corinthians do veil their virgins. What the apostles taught, their disciples approve. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.32-33

But even if it is "on account of the angels" that she is to be veiled, doubtless the age from which the law of the veil will come into operation will be that from which "the daughters of men" were able to invite concupiscence of their persons, and to experience marriage. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.24

And as they veil their head in presence of heathens, let them at all events in the church conceal their virginity, which they do veil outside the church. They fear strangers: let them stand in awe of the brethren too. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.35

For some, with their turbans and woolen bands, do not veil their head, but bind it up; protected, indeed, in front, but where the head properly lies, bare. Others are to a certain extent covered over the region of the brain with linen coifs of small dimensions - I suppose for fear of pressing the head - and not reaching quite to the ears. If they are so weak in their hearing as not to be able to hear through a covering, I pity them. Let them know that the whole head constitutes "the woman." Its limits and boundaries reach as far as the place where the robe begins. The region of the veil is co-extensive with the space covered by the hair when unbound; in order that the necks too may be encircled. For it is they which must be subjected, for the sake of which "power" ought to be "had on the head:" the veil is their yoke. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.37

Arabia's heathen females will be your judges, who cover not only the head, but the face also, so entirely, that they are content, with one eye free, to enjoy rather half the light than to prostitute the entire face. A female would rather see than be seen. And for this reason a certain Roman queen said that they were most unhappy, in that they could more easily fall in love than be fallen in love with; whereas they are rather happy, in their immunity from that second (and indeed more frequent) infelicity, that females are more apt to be fallen in love with than to fall in love. Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.37

To us the Lord has, even by revelations, measured the space for the veil to extend over. For a certain sister of ours was thus addressed by an angel, beating her neck, as if in applause: "Elegant neck, and deservedly bare! it is well for you to unveil yourself from the head right down to the loins, lest withal this freedom of your neck profit you not!" And, of course, what you have said to one you have said to all. But how severe a chastisement will they likewise deserve, who, amid (the recital of) the Psalms, and at any mention of (the name of) God, continue uncovered; (who) even when about to spend time in prayer itself, with the utmost readiness place a fringe, or a tuft, or any thread whatever, on the crown of their heads, and suppose themselves to be covered? Tertullian (A.D. 198) Ante-Nicene Fathers vol.4 pg.37

Trust that helps.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by dspks, on: 2015/7/12 21:41**

JFW writes: "Tho I submit that this one, seemingly inconsequential, thing may indeed be a definitive test as to whether a woman has the right heart before the Lord regarding her position in His governmental body."

Whew... head coverings are: "a definitive test" to whether a woman has the right heart before the Lord...???

Where in scripture does THAT come from???

Are there actually Christians who conclude that if a woman does NOT wear a head covering "her heart is not right before the Lord"??

**Re: , on: 2015/7/12 22:48**

Quote:  
-----JFW writes: "Tho I submit that this one, seemingly inconsequential, thing may indeed be a definitive test as to whether a woman has the right heart before the Lord regarding her position in His governmental body."

Whew... head coverings are: "a definitive test" to whether a woman has the right heart before the Lord...???

Where in scripture does THAT come from???

Are there actually Christians who conclude that if a woman does NOT wear a head covering "her heart is not right before the Lord"??  
-----

I know of no other doctrine/teaching like this that sets up men and women to be able to judge other women based on an outward piece of clothing or lack thereof. For this reason, I would have to reject this as anything more than cultural. This would also mean that a woman who wears a covering of some sort, is above being "tested" in this way. She is an untouchable, if you will. All she has to do is wear the covering and it proves her heart is right before the Lord. What?? How is that possible?

I knew none of this made good spiritual sense and I just read chapter 2 of "The Magna Carta of Women" by Jessie Penn-Lewis and glad I did. She does not even say it was cultural. I think this is a great explanation and makes a lot of spiritual sense. Our sister deals with why Paul was telling men not to wear headcoverings, too. It talks about Jewish Customs, of wearing headcoverings and why they did and where this practice came from.

<http://lighthouselibrary.com/searchdb.php?what=author&searchfor=>

Search under P for Penn-Lewis and then select Magna Carta of Women.

A veil or head covering was a sign of guilt and condemnation and a man who wore one was dishonoring his Head (Christ). The wife also, should not dishonor her head (the husband) by wearing a sign of guilt and condemnation.

The Jewish man would veil (wear a tallith) as a sign of reverence and for guilt and condemnation for sin. A Christian man dishonors the Lord by wearing one and a Christian woman dishonors her husband with the same.

Here is a small excerpt, but read the whole chapter as she uses teachings from Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Bushnell who actually traced this back to its beginnings.

"But why does Paul refer to hair at all? Again we need to understand Jewish customs. Perpetually Paul had to be counting not only the customs but the influence of Judaistic thought upon Christians only gradually emerging into apprehension

on of the full liberty of the gospel. The Apostle had just said that a woman should have "authority over her own head" to veil or unveil as she judged best. But the Oral Law had made unveiling so disgraceful a thing that Christian women would find it difficult to put away the veil, even when circumstances were favorable to doing so. The Apostle then meets this difficulty by saying that the woman already had a veil that was a glory to her; her own hair and so she need not be ashamed of uncovering it, whatever the Judaizers might say. Verse 16: "But if any man seemeth to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."

Here is the conclusion of the passage, and it should be read in the light of all that has preceded it. In effect Paul says: if the women under especially difficult circumstances wish to veil, they are to have "authority over their head" to do so or not, as they please. But "if any man seemeth to be contentious" about it, let him know that as Christians and as a church we "have no such custom" of veiling.

The summing up of the whole passage is given as follows by Dr. Bushnell. "Paul (1) forbids men to veil (since there is no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus); (2) permits women to veil; but (3) guards against this permission being construed as a command by showing that ideally the woman should unveil before God, man and angels; (4) shows that there is special propriety in women unveiling when addressing God in prayer; (5) declares that (contrary to the teaching of the Jews) there is nothing for a woman to be ashamed of in showing her hair, for it is a 'glory' to her; and (6) disavows veiling as a church custom."

In confirmation of the correctness of this interpretation of the whole passage, Dr. Bushnell remarks that a "little historical evidence... ought to go a long way" in proving that the Apostle did not forbid women unveiling, for it is an undisputed fact in church history (see Dean Alford in comments on 1 Tim. 5:9) that "women sat unveiled in the assemblies in a separate place, by the presbyters," and were "ordained by the laying on of hands" until the Church Council of Laodicea forbade it in 363 A.D. three hundred years after Paul had written the Epistle to the Corinthians. Dr. Bushnell has much more to say than this on the subject, for she devotes two further lessons to tracing back through church history how the misinterpretation of Paul's true teaching on the veil came into and colored the later versions of the English Bible."

**Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2015/7/13 0:44**

Dear dspks,

It appears I may not have been clear enough in making this statement, tho if you would notice I said "may be a test" not "is a test" as I was putting forth the idea that perhaps the issues of submission/pride/vanity etc... would/could be tested by the willingness to humble oneself and submit to something of this nature. The test, if it is one, would not be from man but from God. I say this is a possibility because their indeed seems to be contention over this practice in spite of the fact that the Apostle goes out of his way to make his point decidedly clear in vs 13-16 in an effort to dispose of, ironically, the debate we seem to be having here.

If you care to, a short word search in a concordance will quickly clear this up, as the word primarily interpreted as "covering" in these passages would be accurately rendered as "veil" and in vs 10 the word translated as "power" is in my concordance referenced as "authority" and in the 4th instance makes specific reference to the authority that a husband has over his wife and the subsequent veil propriety requires her to wear to demonstrate this. Also Brother Greg has provided a wealth of godly instruction from elder saints and leaders throughout the ages to testify to the fact of the matter.

You ask what scriptures does this come from? I submit to you that this has been the issue from the beginning, in the garden and continues unto this day. The issue is submission to authority out of a heart that wants to obey, not one that is coerced- one who obeys because they have already received something they didn't deserve and not because they're trying to get something. The whole of the scriptures confess this from beginning to end and I am submitting for consideration that the "veil/head covering" issue may in fact be a test as to whether a sister has the aforementioned heart. I say "a test" only because there seems to be much resistance to such a small and simple thing and surely no one has put forth a scriptural argument for not wearing one.

So perhaps it'd be better to put it this way,... What are you not willing to do for the Glory of God?

Is Christ the head of all your life except your head/hair?

That would seem a strange thing-

Also I know of no one who would deny fellowship over such a thing (tho it appears Paul might) nor is there any attempt on my part to create a distinct doctrine over such as this and am in no way seeking to "defame" a sister in Christ, tho I am and I understand Greg to be as well, submitting this for our thoughtful consideration as well seek to be completely conformed into the image of Christ.

I can assure you if I were a woman my head would be joyfully covered in service to my King as it is the least I could do:)

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

I wonder if there were a similar command for men to follow if it would be met with the same resistance? Does anyone here know of a comparable instance where men resist a command and don't by in large practice it?

**Re: , on: 2015/7/13 1:46**

Quote:  
----- The whole of the scriptures confess this from beginning to end and I am submitting for consideration that the "veil/head covering" is  
sue may in fact be a test as to whether a sister has the aforementioned heart.  
-----

A "test" for a sister to see if she has a submissive heart?

Quote:  
-----I say "a test" only because there seems to be much resistance to such a small and simple thing and surely no one has put forth a sc  
riptural argument for not wearing one.  
-----

If you give in to one legalism then it will be another and another. Look at the Jessie Penn-Lewis link I gave and you will see a scriptural argument for not wearing one.

Quote:  
-----So perhaps it'd be better to put it this way,... What are you not willing to do for the Glory of God?  
-----

There is no glory for God in legality.

Quote:  
-----Is Christ the head of all your life except your head/hair?  
-----

Is that a loving and edifying statement?

Quote:  
-----I wonder if there were a similar command for men to follow if it would be met with the same resistance? Does anyone here know of  
a comparable instance where men resist a command and don't by in large practice it?  
-----

As a matter of fact there is. There are some who believe that if you do not obey the 4th commandment you are in sin and I know a lot of brothers who resist such legalism.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/13 12:49**

Hi Greg,

Thank you for your post. I will take some time to read, study, consider and, of course, pray over it.

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/7/13 17:57**

I have read very few of the postings on this thread because there seems to be no new objection under the sun to this teaching. This means I weary of it.

To those who are new, I wear a head covering at all waking hours. I was taught it from childhood but when I became an adult I wrestled with the issue: I DID NOT want to wear it - I was tired of looking different - I wanted to fit in with the public. And there are a lot of other Christian women out there not wearing it so why do I have to????

I shared this struggle with others who prayed for me and before too long the pressure was off.

After a while I got sick and tired of having to deal with long hair. I made sure when I was combing them that there was no scissors nearby - was afraid that in a moment of weakness I would on impulse cut them. God saw my struggle and in His mercy I experienced a surprise pregnancy where I lost over half of my body hair, including that on my head.

Today I am 68 years old and as I look back I do have a few words of encouragement to those who struggle with this issue.

You do not have to understand all or any of the reasons why scripture enjoins a woman to cover. It does give a few - because of the angels, e.g., but it is not important to know - just be obedient and do it. Let me ask you a question: what would have happened to Abraham if he had debated with God about sacrificing his son Issac? He didn't, but went ahead with the process and God delivered both. This is not an isolated issue: what if all the faithful as noted in the WORD had debated with God? Those that did invited a severe rebuke. What marked a faithful person was one who obeyed with no objections.

Another objection: "What if my husband don't want me to wear it?" Let me ask you one: who are you wearing it for: your husband or God? Your husband cannot ever save you but God can. So one wears it for God's sake.

Faith in God and obedience to Him are inseparable. Just do it.

My testimony.

Sandra Miller

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2015/7/13 18:40**

ginnyrose

over the years i have appreciated your wisdom in many of your posts but sadly i can not agree with this one.i realize your post was not directed at me but i just wanted to respond as one who does not wear a head cover. my husband is the head of my family, and household. as such he has spent much time in prayer and seeking to know the Lord heart on this matter. after much seeking and council he has shared with me that he does not feel convicted nor do others he has spoken with that this is a commend from the Lord. if i were to follow your advice and "just wear it" i would not be submitting to my husband. i would go against him and in a sense saying i do not trust him in this matter. i know my husband loves the Lord dearly and i know he seeks to know what is best for our family so i will continue to honor God and submit to my husband in this matter.

i have no issue with women who chose to follow the convictions they have from the Lord and cover their heads(although i have come to realize there isn't even agreement among those who do cover on when to wear, what kind of cover to wear, and the issue of cutting ones hair).

i said it before i am so thankful that God looks at the heart and not the outward appearance. if my heart is seeking to live unto Him, then in His time He will show me all that i need to follow Him and He will show my husband all that he needs as well. i trust God in that.

thanks for sharing your testimony. i am glad you have found peace in this matter before the Lord and i hope you can be glad for me as well. i have peace in this matter just as you do.

rdg

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/14 12:09**

Just re-posting part of the 1st thread so saints can consider to listen to or read this ebook on the subject if they have questions or are seeking this out as sisters. we should not allow one person's comments to persuade or dissuade us but read the passage and subject honestly and pray before the Lord:

Milton Vincent gives an excellent simple but very comprehensive overview of the doctrine of headcoverings for sisters in the Lord. I highly recommend this. I also highly recommend K.P. Yohannan's very simple short booklet on the subject:

(Pdf Book) Head Coverings by K.P. Yohannan

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=25173>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 1

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26139>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 2

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26140>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 3

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26141>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 4

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26142>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 5

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26143>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 6

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26144>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 7

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26145>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 8

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26146>

Head-coverings in Worship Part 9

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=26147>

**Re: , on: 2015/7/14 13:29**

Many have prayed and refuse to follow the private interpretations of those who want to promote this practice. Why is this being pushed so much here?

Does it get you closer to the Lord, will you earn a better place in heaven?

Or is it just so that some men can continue to subjugate women in the name of religion?

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/14 15:01**

The passage is not only about head covering, it is also about women and men praying or prophesying.

I observed that in recent years public prayer in fellowship seems to be much in decline, let alone prophesying.

It has been a long while since I heard a man or a women prophesying in the name of the Lord in a public meeting.

Very few fellowships I know actually give room for public prayer and virtually no room for prophesy. We have shamefully disregarded this wonderful and precious gift to the church.

Maybe that is worth another thread.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2015/7/14 15:39**

Yes narrow path, even the definition of prophecy as been turned into just preaching ,which I think is a main problem

**Re: Power - posted by dspks, on: 2015/7/14 19:05**

Now, we are told that the lack of women having their "head's covered" explains why the Lord isn't communicating new s piritual revelations with us today.

Dear Brothers and Sisters... not to be comical but... in light of what has been written... should we all conclude... and sing :

"There is power, power, wonder working power in the cloth... on her head"?

Maybe so???

**Re: Power - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/14 19:10**

Brethren,

This is just one single discussion thread on SermonIndex, I would ask that people respect it and realize its importance fo r some believers. This was never a discussion topic much for the MAJORITY of Christian history because it was practice d and believed by MOST. It is only recently that alot of deviation of this practice has happened.

Let us allow saints and sisters especially who want to honestly ask questions feel free to do so. Mocking or joking about this where many Christians around the world feel it is a sacred important tradition of the Church is not right. Let us respe ct our sisters who practice this.

It should not be a pressure to force anyone by this thread existing, it simply is a way for honest questions and exploring of this tradition and practice of the Church to happen.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2015/7/14 19:20**

Quote: Maybe that is worth another thread.

Please do..

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/7/14 20:17**

Carmine,

It is NOT about males subjugatating women to men but about being obedient to God. It is all about submitting to the aut hority that belongs to God. When one is obedient to Him we will experience blessings. In obedience we are submitting to authority above us ONLY in ways that do not violate God's express command. (Peter says we ought to obey God rather than men.)

I have heard of husbands who wished their wives to dress immodestly because they want to show off to other men what female he snagged to bed with him. No godly woman will ever submit to that. Granted this is an extreme situation but th e principle is the same. We follow God FIRST and in following we serve - if we are married there will be a husband and c hildren; if you work in the marketplace it is to your boss; if you are driving on the road it is traffic laws. There are no situat



ions where one finds herself/himself that someone is not called to submit to another and we do it as Jesus would.

Submission is a dirty word in popular culture but we do not follow popular culture, do we?

Hope this makes sense.

Blessings.

Sandra

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/14 21:06**

Quote:

-----Submission is a dirty word in popular culture but we do not follow popular culture, do we?  
-----

Submission and head coverings are not synonymous.

Iâ€™ve noticed throughout this thread, the head-coverers use the word â€œsubmissionâ€ like they are the only ones who understand submission and are the only submissive ones.

You do realize there are hundreds of other ways each of us can submit to our Lord and Savior, right? Head coverings is not the golden egg of submission.

God bless,  
Lisa

**Re: Power - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/14 21:07**

Quote:

-----Now, we are told that the lack of women having their "head's covered" explains why the Lord isn't communicating new spiritual revelations with us today.  
-----

I caught that too!! Glad you called it out.

God bless,  
Lisa

**Re: , on: 2015/7/14 21:17**

Ginnyrose

Thank you for your response . My wife and I attended a brethren church in Toronto for the last 12 years, Unfortunately quite a number of the men in leadership had/have quite a problem with women, They are being treated as either inferior or objects of lust it seems. And most of them wore head coverings. Back to the pentecostals we go!

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2015/7/14 21:36**

it has been mentioned several times that this thread is for discussion for those who want to follow or ask questions about this topic and i don't have an issue with that. i do have issue with the condemnation and judging that is happening in this thread by those who do cover towards those who do not. so far woman who do not cover have been told they are not following God, not submitting to their husbands, not obeying God, they have been call feminists and that the reason prayer is not happening in this country is because woman will not cover their heads???

i have never felt so judged by any other thread since coming to SI as I have in this one.

rdg

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/7/14 23:54**

It is true that head coverings will not be a ticket to heaven, neither will it make one holy. All one is asked to do is to be obedient. It is a symbol for a deeper principle. Yet it has a literal benefit because it effects the angels. I treasure the ministry of these Beings...

Carmine, as long as you look at others and their inconsistencies in their walk with the LORD one would never come to Him...we are not called to do that. It is like Jesus told Peter, "what is that to thee, follow thou me." Instead of arguing about whether one should wear it why don't you just say, "I do not want to wear it, so there!" and be done with it. Why do you bother to debate it?

Sandra

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2015/7/14 23:57**

RDG,

I want to encourage you to rest in the Lord and his peace with the convictions that he has given to you. Don't let anyone rob you of the peace you have in Jesus.

I want you to notice a quote from Ginnyrose from her earlier post.

Quote-

I have read very few of the postings on this thread because there seems to be no new objection under the sun to this teaching. This means I weary of it.

To those who are new, I wear a head covering at all waking hours. I was taught it from childhood but when I became an adult I wrestled with the issue: I DID NOT want to wear it - I was tired of looking different - I wanted to fit in with the public. And there are a lot of other Christian women out there not wearing it so why do I have to????

I shared this struggle with others who prayed for me and before too long the pressure was off.

Quote-

Notice the struggle she went through because it was forced upon her from childhood. When she got older she was very unhappy with it and how it made her feel.

It seems that she never came to the conclusion on her own of wearing a head cloth in her own personal relationship to the Lord. She was being forced from those who practice it even beyond what the scripture teaches.

She shared the struggle with others who prayed for her. She had the choice to either accept the head cloth so she would be accepted by those of her family that she has only really known since childhood or reject it and not be accepted.

This is a cultural practice that many do to be accepted. They either honestly believe that this is the only way that the Lord will truly accept them or they do it so others will accept them because they are tired of not being accepted. This practice puts many in the bondage of legalism because they depend on this head cloth as their connection to God and their acceptance of those who are caught up in this legalism.

The bible plainly teaches that we are to have confidence to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. That we are to dr

aw near with a true heart by the one and only sacrifice of Jesus.

It is sad that so many well meaning Christians get caught up into legalism trying to please the Lord. God has always said that obedience was always better than any outward sacrifice. People become legalistic over so many things in the bible. They become legalistic over the form of baptism, the practice of foot washing, beards or no beards, and the wearing of certain types of clothing. The list goes on and on. They think that if somehow they can find the right formula God will really bless and use them. They think that if they don't do everything just exactly like the saints in the bible in every detail then they are not being obedient.

Many miss out on how to be truly obedient...that it is in being led by the Spirit and not the letter of the Law.

Also, the head cloth that the women wear today in those type of churches is not the veil Paul was talking about. This means that they are not wearing the same type of head covering they wore back then. Really the women who use their hair as a covering are the ones who are correctly following scripture as Paul stated in the bible. He says plainly that "her hair is given her for a covering". This cannot be disputed because it is clear in the scriptures. There is not any scripture that says that a head cloth can be used as a covering.

Blessings!

**Re: , on: 2015/7/15 0:12**

I agree Greg. This is no joking matter.

I have looked at many websites the last couple of days that teach about head coverings and without fail they all either imply or come right out and say that women who are not wearing head coverings are not obedient to God and in some cases they just flat out say they are being rebellious to God. Many group our dear sisters by implication into the feminist arena. I would have to say this teaching is not just bordering on slander and accusation but in actuality is slander and false accusation. Not to mention how it destroys fellowship and alienates one another. I cannot see how any fellowship that alienates others by such slander and judging can be blessed by the Lord.

This "movement", has all the earmarks of imposing law on sisters in Christ. I just want to plead with those who are pushing this that I think you should be in prayer about this and ask yourself why this is ostensibly the only teaching in the NT whereby someone can easily and simply know that a woman's heart is not right when they do not wear a piece of cloth on the top of their head. Is there such a teaching that exists that we may know if a man's heart is not right? Why is it our role to impose obedience upon one another?

It is like a Christianized Sharia law. I think sisters should take care not to receive a spirit of condemnation from this teaching. The Spirit of God leads peacefully and not through condemnation.

Dear brothers who are pushing this, you already are witnessing how distressed you are making other sisters and even brothers because you are prescribing law. Please pray about whether you should continue this. You will alienate a large section of the Church and you will be known not for Christ, not for love, but for Christian Sharia law.

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.

P.S. rbanks, great post. I think those who are pushing this will no longer be accepted in the head covering community if they don't continue to go along with this law and so that is why they do it. I also caught Sandra's struggle with it and thank you for showing it to all of us more clearly. Sandra was pretty much outnumbered and would have been in total isolation. I understand why she does it and I have great empathy towards her.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2015/7/15 0:48**

Julius,

I have enjoyed your writings very much in the Lord!

I haven't been posting as much lately but I look at the threads from time to time.

Thank you brother for all your posts on this thread. You are a great encouragement to the body of Christ!

Blessings!

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 1:18**

It is a pain to see this thread being hijacked by those who support women to not cover their heads. Such brothers were already advised to keep out of this thread. Whether one believes in Head covering or not, it is a simple command given in NT. In NT there are very few external commands, that can even be counted with our figures. Hence it should not be difficult to keep such minimal external commands.

It is pain to read brothers who support women ignoring this command. They do not understand that nor they have respect to this word from our Lord in Matthew 5-18:- "Whoever then annuls one of the least of these commandments, and teaches others to do the same, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven"

Why do you want to teach others to not follow a command? Why do you want to gain curse by taking words out of the Bible? If any man believes that women does not need to cover her head, it will be good for him to keep quiet than to spread such lies and gain curse. They do not understand the seriousness of removing words out of the Bible. Shows how shallow their salvation is.

Head covering and Submission are totally related to one another. I do not mean that a women who covers her head will submit but the vice versa will not. No it is not what I meant. But Head covering will show the seriousness of submission that a women has towards her husband. Biblical submission to Husband is a very high standard that cannot be attained by flesh. One needs greater grace to achieve such a high standard. So if a person really understands the value of submission and their inability in flesh to submit to husband then they will automatically cover their head. They will do anything that will gain them grace in this area.

Suppose there was a command that men should shave half of their head as a sign for the love they have to their wife then I will sit in Church with half of my head shaved. No matter how ugly it is, no matter if no men in Christendom follow the command, I will still follow it. Because I know how difficult it is for me to Love my wife like Christ loves the Church. If by means of shaving one half of Head if I can receive grace in this area then I will take no chance. I am not saying by means of our action we will win grace, NO but our disobedience can prevent God's grace from reaching us. I will give no room for such disobedience.

It is easiest thing in the world to follow any external command, compared to keeping the internal commands. There are many Pagans in the country where I live have better external standard of life than more than 99% of Church going Christians in US. So one does not need Jesus to have an external testimony. But inner life cannot come without Jesus. If there is so much disregard for such an easy task (external Command) then it can be found how serious such people are in keeping the internal commands that are very difficult to keep.

It is like a boy who fails in 1st grade how can he pass the 10th Grade?

**Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2015/7/15 1:33**

I believe it's time for me to back out of this thread and perhaps from posting on SI altogether. I pray for us all to walk with the Lord and patiently extend love to one another.

Rainydaygirl

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2015/7/15 2:31**

Hi sister ginnyrose (and anyone else who might have input),

Quote:

-----Yet it has a literal benefit because it effects the angels. I treasure the ministry of these Beings...  
-----

Could you explain what you mean?

I know that verse 10 (in I Corinthians) mentions "because of the angels." However, I don't see any particular explanation in the passage itself. I've assumed that angels are not really in need of any physical symbol -- as if they relied upon the symbol itself for one reason or another. After all, their fate is already sealed. Do you feel that their ministry work is somehow impeded if a head covering is not worn by believing women?

I have read through quite a few websites and writings about head coverings (particularly from those who interpret this passage as being a physical covering in addition to hair and a lasting ordinance to this day). Several of them mentioned the "angel" aspect as a primary reason for the need of such a physical symbol.

I would like to know more about this particular interpretation regarding this "angel" passage.

In addition, I asked a question in regard to the head covering and how those who might not embrace this particular tradition might be judged. Earlier in this thread, there were people who felt "judged" because they feel impressed to wear the covering. Others have expressed that they feel judged if they do not wear it.

Earlier, I wrote:

Quote:  
-----"I would never think of judging a sister who does or does not practice head coverings (in any of the various ways that it is practiced). If she is convinced of this and follows the Lord as she is convinced, then she should not be commended for following what she believes to be from the Lord.  
-----

At the same time, I would wonder how a local church, fellowship or group that embraces such a tradition would respond to a believing couple that did not embrace this practice. Would they be welcomed into full fellowship (like those who do practice it)? Would they be judged unworthy to engage in ministry or leadership roles within that local fellowship of believers? Would such a woman (or her husband) be rejected from teaching younger believers?"  
-----

For those who embrace this practice and fellowship among other believers (or congregations) that do, what would be the view of the local church or fellowship toward those who do not embrace it? Would they be welcomed into full fellowship (including ministry)? Would they be welcomed to attend meetings but be shunned from ministry or leadership?

If a believing husband and wife who do not embrace this practice began to fellowship with a local congregation or group, would they be permitted the same ministry and leadership opportunities as those who do embrace the head covering?

Thank you in advance.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 3:17**

Quote:

-----I know that verse 10 (in I Corinthians) mentions "because of the angels." However, I don't see any particular explanation in the passage itself.  
-----

I would like to give my answers though the question was not directed at me. I clearly emphasized the 'sign for Angels' because that proves that this practice is not a cultural one. Angels do not have culture like human beings. Hence those who explain this command based on culture are wrong.

## Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?

There is another place where Apostle Paul mentions that he has seen heavenly things that cannot be explained by human words. He gives no further explanation about his vision. Does that mean he has not seen it? Or does that mean a human cannot see heavenly vision? We cannot ignore any piece of scripture because there is no further explanation to it.

Quote:  
-----  
I've assumed that angels are not really in need of any physical symbol -- as if they relied upon the symbol itself for one reason or another. After all, their fate is already sealed. Do you feel that their ministry work is somehow impeded if a head covering is not worn by believing women?  
-----

Hebrews 1:14 says - Are they not all ministering spirits, sent out to render service for the sake of those who will inherit salvation?

There is some ministry that angels are assigned for the sake of believers. We do not know what it is. If they needed a sign then we better give them without asking question.

Do angels need sign? Yes, in Exodus 11 we read about the Angel of Death that killed the first born in those houses that did not have the sign of blood on their door post. Was it not a sign? Was it not a simple obedience to put blood on the door post that saved the Jews? Did they sit and ask questions like why do angels need sign? How tragic would it be if they use human intelligence and question why do angels need symbols?

Quote:  
-----  
In addition, I asked a question in regard to the head covering and how those who might not embrace this particular tradition might be judged.  
-----

I would like to answer this on behalf of all the sisters who complain about being judged or all the men who are so sensitive to the danger of sisters being judged.

See just because there is a reason to judge those who choose not to cover their heads, we cannot ignore a command. I do not believe in forcing a command on others. Brother Zac Poonen's wife Annie Sister, covers her head and she believes in not wearing ornaments. But many who attend their church wear ornaments. She even makes her view clear on taking the scripture literally regarding ornaments. But she has never judged or forced anyone to not attend Church due to them wearing ornaments. So holding to a command does not cause judgmentalism.

I was in a Church where I was judged for something that I believed was not sin. I did not mind being judged but as far as possible I did not let the weak stumble due to my convictions. But finally the Lord exposed their judgmental attitude in my matter and everything resulted in repentance and strengthening of Fellowship. But if I had got offended and left the Church because few were judgmental, I would have lost all the spiritual benefits that I gained from the Church.

Judas who was part of the Church of Jesus, he judged the women who anointed Jesus with perfume. It appears that even in the Church of Jesus there was a man with judgmental spirit. How much more in local Church do we not have such judgments? Let us not be affected by the view of others. If we all examine our self there is some degree of judgmental attitude in our flesh. As far as possible let us cleanse our self, instead of pointing fingers.

My wife who covers her head was attending a meeting in US held on behalf of Sermon Index. Except her no other sister covered their head (until Greg's wife joined). My wife asked me whether she can uncover her head because she felt odd. I told her not to do something for the fear of opinion of others. But I told her clearly, if she was judging those who do not cover their head then it is better for her to NOT cover her head than to judge other women who do not cover. Judgmental heart is a clear abomination to God than an uncovered head. She kept covering her head in the meetings, one day a senior sister asked her about this practice. She explained her the spirit behind this command, that sister was impressed and she too started to cover her head. Praise Lord for such Godly Sisters who do not care about opinion of others, but only concern about what God thinks about them.

In short worrying about Judgmentalism is not going to change anything. Let those who judge continue to judge, and those

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

se who get offended by them get offended and leave.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 4:04**

Sister RDG,

Quote:

-----  
cover. my husband is the head of my family, and household. as such he has spent much time in prayer and seeking to know the Lord heart on this matter. after much seeking and council he has shared with me that he does not feel convicted nor do others he has spoken with that this is a commend from the Lord. if i were to follow your advice and "just wear it" i would not be submitting to my husband.  
-----

I appreciate the fact that you consulted your husband. Though I do not agree with what your husband has said, he has only told you that he is not personally convicted. It does not sound like he has commanded you not to wear head covering. Correct me if I am wrong.

Now regarding submitting to Husband vs submitting to God. A person should choose God over it. As much as I appreciate your testimony, I am also concerned that some weak sister here might consider your testimony as standard approach. I do not want anyone to consider 'Ask your husband' approach as a standard solution in following the commands of God.

For example if your Husband wants to worship an Idol, you would certainly say no to him because it is clearly against God's command. I understand that people have complicated head covering and made this simple command complex. But it is still a command.

There was a case when my head covering wife choose not to obey me. I was raised as a Hindu. In Hindu culture we have a tradition of keeping bindi (a small mark) on forehead. According to me it is just a cultural sign of a women saying that she is not a Widow. So if a women does not have one then she is understood as widow.

During a marriage ceremony in my house, my wife was asked to keep this mark on her forehead. But I gave the choice to my wife. I told her to do it if she feels free. I told her my opinion that this is just a sign that your husband is alive. But she had a conviction that this sign is against her Christian Identity. In India only Christians and Widows do not have this sign. So she felt that she has to take a stand in this situation. Though I felt she was wrong, I let her take the decision. My family persecuted us for the stand that my wife took, we had to go through many tribulations. At certain stage I was so worried and asked the Lord about this stand that my wife took. I asked Lord to show why he is allowing this persecution on us.

The Lord answered immediately. A Hindu women met my wife and told her that, she was a secret Christian, but never got the courage to take a stand for Jesus. But hearing my wife's testimony from my family, she was very encouraged. She thanked my wife. Had my wife listened to me instead of listening to the Lord directly, she would not have encouraged this weak sister in Jesus. So at times women have to take stand irrespective of what their husband believes.

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by carters (), on: 2015/7/15 4:47**

This Thread is for someone like me :)

I have been convinced in the past that there is spiritual weight in head covering, I have bought many headcoverings BUT...

I have no problem with the headcovering BUT I feel like I go into the "odd" zone (no disrespect to anyone else)if I wear a headcover AND a skirt.

I have never been a skirt person. I will submit myself to wearing skirts in summer but I get freezing in Winter. I am truly a pants girl, I even got saved in pants! I would happily wear a headcovering but feel awkward wearing one WITH a skirt to.

The only other practical problem I have with headcoverings is that I get very bad headaches when I have something tied

at the base of my neck. This is true and no excuse. If I use pins, even worse headaches. My body does not like the pressure of the tying or the pinning.

Is it acceptable to wear a headcovering and jeans?  
How do I overcome the pressures and headaches.

I also wish to add that I am a huge brother Derek Prince listener and between the lines he completely believes headcovering is for today.

I read Tertullian's apparel for women and this book opened my eyes!

Through Him alone,  
Sherid

**Peace is possible even with headcoverings - posted by makrothumia (), on: 2015/7/15 5:14**

I have been a part of several fellowships where the head covering is practiced without judgment or coercion.

Those who practiced covering their heads did not consider it a "carnal" command or "law", but a spiritual instruction given from an apostle of Jesus Christ who understood the relationship between law and grace better perhaps than any man who ever lived.

If instructing women to cover their head is placing law upon other believers, consider the implication that suggestion puts upon the apostle himself, not to mention the other churches with elders and deacons in the time of the early church. For if instructing women to cover their heads is "legalism" today, was it "legalistic" when Paul wrote the instructions.

Greek scholars are not divided over whether the passage indicates an external cloth was meant. They exegete this from the grammar of the passage itself. They have no personal agenda to promote.

We should be careful not to be drawn into the scheme of the accuser of the brethren to bite and devour one another. It is possible for sisters in Christ to read Paul's instruction and believe they are to cover their head without in any way judging others who do not. If these sisters are asked why they cover their head and give a simple answer from the scripture that they believe Paul instructed women to do so - does this make them "legalistic"?

I realize that some in this thread have expressed a view that all women should cover their head? Is this legalism in and of itself?

I have learned from experience that one of the accuser of the brethren's greatest schemes is to subtly draw believers into positions "against" each other. While it may be true that some believers hold the view of wearing a head covering in a "legalistic" manner, this in no way makes the practice any less spiritual for the many sisters who simply do so in faith unto God without judging others.

Romans 14 warns believers against the type of doubtful disputations that this thread has turned into. Those who cover their heads and do so by faith unto the Lord should not judge those who do not and those who do not cover their heads by faith unto the Lord should not judge those who do.

Head covering itself is not a "legalistic" matter, nor is instructing sisters to cover their heads. If it were, we have thereby accused the apostle of grace himself, for he is the one who originated the instruction.

The beginning of this thread made an appeal that was simple enough. To the pure all things are pure. There are believers all over the world who have read Paul's instruction without fear of "legalism" and decided to wear a head covering. Some of these sincere believers go on to teach those under their care that they believe women should do this. I am grateful that God is able to see the simplicity and sincerity of the hearts of such believers.

Can women judge others who do not practice what they believe Paul instructed? Sadly, yes! Can women who see or understand Paul's instruction differently judge women who do what they do not believe they are to do? Sadly, yes!

This is what I observe in some of the responses in this thread. We are to "receive one another in order to bring glory to God." The type of argumentation in this thread that Greg sought to caution against is far more destructive to the body of



Christ than the topic of head covering.

makrothumia

**Re: a little letter makes a big difference - posted by makrothumia (), on: 2015/7/15 5:38**

I was reading through I Corinthians and found a discrepancy in my Greek text and the linguistic commentary I was using to help me.

The discrepancy involved the spelling of the word "sarkikos", the Greek word for flesh. In verse 1 of Chapter 3, my Greek translation had "sarkiKos", but the translation in the commentary had "sarkiNos".

One letter makes a big difference, the kind of difference that we could greatly benefit from if we could grasp it.

The Greek scholar explained the difference this way. By using the "N" instead of the "K", the word "carnal" used in verse 1 lacks the derogatory sense that "carnal" with the "K" does intend in verse 3.

What is the practical lesson to be gained from this little difference? Not fully understanding our immature decisions to align ourselves with a teacher or position is an indication that we have not yet grown out of a "carnal" state of infancy in Christ.

However, being involved in anything that is producing "strife, discord, and jealousy" is a work of the "sarkiKos" - carnal with the K!

Infants need time to mature to full grown spiritual men. We must bear with them and suffer long to see grace do its finishing touches. But men sowing strife, jealousy, and creating divisions in the body of Christ are "carnal" in the full derogatory sense of the word.

These type of believers are those Jude warns of "These are soulish men, causing divisions, not having the Spirit."

May the Lord give us His grace to learn the difference.

makrothumia

makrothumia

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2015/7/15 5:39**

Quote: Is it acceptable to wear a headcovering and jeans?

What does the law say?

A woman shall not wear a man's garment, nor shall a man put on a woman's cloak, for whoever does these things is an abomination to the Lord your God. Deut 22:5

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/15 5:44**

Some of the Tertullian quotes which Greg shared are interesting, particularly the one where he quotes from 1 Corinthians 11 ("on account of the angels"). Nice to know that 1 Corinthians was pretty much considered to be canonical by 198 AD.

However, I feel uneasy about some of the things Tertullian says:

1. Tertullian shares his ideas about what constitutes a proper headcovering - he insists that the neck must be covered, and likewise the whole head. I've seen pictures of Amish and Mennonite headcoverings, which would definitely fail Tertullian's criteria.

2. Tertullian alludes to the heathen Arabian women of his era who were covered so thoroughly that they only had "one e

ye free" (this was 400+ years before the Islamic religion was created by Muhammad) .

He speaks of these women "enjoying rather half the light than to prostitute the entire face", and that the headcoverings sheltered women from romantic entanglements and thus rendering them more attractive.

These notions are totally absent from the New Testament. Paul writes of headcoverings being a symbol of authority, period. There is no biblical support for other concocted 'virtues' of headcoverings - e.g. preventing seduction, or sheltering people from romance or lust.

I wanted to highlight these two points - because it shows that when discussing this topic, the dangers of falling into legalism are very real. And in my reckoning, such legalism will do more damage than any lack of headcovering.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/15 5:56**

Quote:  
-----Is it acceptable to wear a headcovering and jeans?  
How do I overcome the pressures and headaches.  
-----

Hi carters,

It's pretty common for Muslim women to combine headcoverings with t-shirts and pants/jeans. I'm not sure how wise it is for Christian folk to take dressing cues from Muslims though!

**Re: Caters - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 5:59**

Quote:  
-----  
Is it acceptable to wear a headcovering and jeans?  
-----

Yes it is absolutely acceptable. You may find wearing jeans against the command in Deuteronomy 22. But Headcovering is a new covenant command but Deuteronomy 22 is old covenant. We do not follow the Old Covenant in word but in spirit. Hence the spirit behind the word is - A man shall not intentionally dress like a woman or vice versa. It is the intentional fetish to dress like an opposite sex that is considered an abomination to God.

If we take this Deut 22:5 command literally then what will you advice men in India who wear Lungi that is a form of skirt. In China women were Pants as their traditional dress. Now are the men from India sinning or women from China sinning ? The dress are all cultural things, what is mans dress in one culture might be a women dress in another culture. Hence we need to live by Spirit.

Quote:  
-----  
How do I overcome the pressures and headaches.  
-----

Very simple, just pray that 'God I want to follow your simple command of head covering, I get headache when I cover my head, please heal me so that I can be obedient to you in everything'. If our prayers incline with God then he will certainly answer us. I have tested and proved it many times.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 6:12**

Quote:  
-----There is no biblical support for other concocted 'virtues' of headcoverings - e.g. preventing seduction, or sheltering people from romance or lust.  
-----

There is a Biblical Support for Headcovering to prevent seduction. Apostle Paul asks women who do not cover their head to shave their head. Which means let her lose her beautiful hair if she does not want to cover it.

If you read 1 Cor 11 carefully, we can easily understand the intention of the spirit is to hide the beauty or glory of women which is her hair. In those days women used to braid their hair with gold, 1 Peter 3:3. Even now most women who frequent beauty clinics spend a lot on their hair. Hence to ask a woman to cover their hair is to prevent unwanted attention by their glory which belongs to their husband and not for others to be distracted in Church.

One main reason for Headcovering to be thrown out by modern day women is they do not want to cover their hair that they spent too much to look glorious. The other reasons can be misinformed by fellow men who think themselves to be more intelligent than God who gave the scripture.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/15 6:23**

Quote:  
-----There is a Biblical Support for Headcovering to prevent seduction. Apostle Paul asks women who do not cover their head to shave their head. Which means let her lose her beautiful hair if she does not want to cover it.  
-----

Hi Sree - I believe 1 Cor 11 pertains to a church worship context, so I do not see the chapter (including the verse on women shaving their heads) to have anything to do with preventing seduction. That goes beyond what is stated in Scripture.

You raise an interesting point about headcoverings: you believe that women should have their head covered at all times, while others believe that headcoverings only apply to a church assembly context. It's good to be clear on this point - what do others think?

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 6:38**

Quote:  
-----  
Hi Sree - I believe 1 Cor 11 pertains to church meetings, so 1 Cor 11 (including the verse on women shaving their heads) has nothing to do with preventing seduction. That goes beyond what is stated in Scripture.  
-----

You are looking for exact word on seduction. Look at the spirit of what Apostle writes here. If glory of a woman is not her beauty then what else can it be? Why should women cover her beauty in Church or Public prayer?

Headcovering can be seen in 2 ways,  
1. Just take it as a pure sign to Angels and follow it.  
2. Understand the spirit behind the word, which is to cover the beauty to prevent unwanted attention in public prayers.

Both are right. I incline towards point 1. Point 2 is the spirit behind the command. I have heard many reputed preachers supporting point 2. If you look at the reason for women to stop covering their head then it makes point 2 undeniable.

I do not believe in covering the head all the time. The entire 1 Cor 11 is written in the context of Church. But the need for all the time head covering comes because of the command, 'Pray all the time without ceasing'. But again that word only

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

means that be in a prayerful spirit. Otherwise every second we spend in sleep we are disobeying this command. To stand and pray in public or to be part of a public prayer is a different thing from being in a prayerful spirit.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/15 6:45**

Quote:  
-----You are looking for exact word on seduction. Look at the spirit of what Apostle writes here. If glory of a women is not her beauty then what else can it be? Why should women cover her beauty in Church or Public prayer?

...Understand the spirit behind the word, which is to cover the beauty to prevent unwanted attention in public prayers.  
-----

I read 1 Cor 11 again, and absolutely do not see Scriptural support for this view.

The glory of a woman's hair is compared to the glory of her wearing a headcovering in a church meeting. Paul does not write about women wearing a headcovering to hide the beauty of their hair and thus preventing unwanted attention or lust. That is a Muslim belief, not a Christian one.

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/15 7:27**

Quote:  
-----by Sree  
Head covering and Submission are totally related to one another.  
-----

What I said was, "Submission and head coverings are not SYNONYMOUS." Yes, they are related but they are synonymous.

Synonymous means "having the same or nearly the same meaning as another word." Obviously, to you and your church they go hand in hand but outside the head covering movement, they are NOT synonymous.

And obedience and head coverings are not synonymous either! Many, many, many Christians outside your church and the head covering movement ARE obedient to God and submit to Him. It doesn't take a piece of cloth on a woman's head to prove any of this.

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/15 7:33**

Quote:  
-----ginnyrose wrote:  
It is like Jesus told Peter, "what is that to thee, follow thou me." Instead of arguing about whether one should wear it why don't you just say, "I do not want to wear it, so there!" and be done with it. Why do you bother to debate it?  
-----

Such is the actions of human nature!! I tried to have that attitude through the first 7 pages then crazy statements were made about no new revelations because sisters don't wear head cloths!! OR that a sister has to be tested on her submission by the same piece of cloth!

Let's turn the tables here, shall we? If I started a thread that blatantly stated 'you are not filled with the Holy Spirit UNLESS you speak with tongues...' I would thoroughly expect it to be descended upon by every Christian that does not speak with tongues!

But I ask you ginny, why bother to debate it? Why not say, "I do not want to speak in tongues, so there! I don't believe what you are saying, so there!"

That's why I say, "such is the actions of human nature," my friend, ginny!!

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/15 7:59**

A woman wearing a head covering (in our culture) would actually draw MORE attention to themselves. In Corinth in Paul's day, a woman NOT wearing a covering would draw more attention to herself.

In Israel in Paul's day it was not a disgrace for a man to have long hair (nazirite vow, eg). And in Israel men covered their heads in prayer (prayer shawls) not women.

This is so obviously cultural. Paul wished for the Corinthian women to uphold the customs of respectable women in their culture which were generally in conformity to the principle of patriarchy. He does not give many details about the custom because these were obvious to his readers. The lack of details makes it almost impossible to know how the practice should be duplicated. This dearth of details alone is evidence that Paul did not intend this as a command for all Christians everywhere and forever.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 8:20**

Quote:  
-----  
And obedience and head coverings are not synonymous either! Many, many, many Christians outside your church and the head covering movement ARE obedient to God and submit to Him.  
-----

Sister Lisa, when did I ever say that those who do not cover their head do not submit to their husbands? I thoroughly believe that there are women who have submit to their husbands to a higher degree than many women who cover their head.

Just curious, I continuously read in your posts that you make a point to say 'Submission to God'. There is no mention of submission to men or husband. The entire head covering is given as a sign for submission to husband not to God. If it is to God then even men should cover their head. It gives me an impression that you purposely do not post about submission to men.

I cannot believe any women can say that they have 100% Biblical submission to their husbands (like how Church submits to Christ). Every women I know struggles in this matter. There are those who acknowledge it and there are those who do not acknowledge.

My humble view is this, if any women is seriously seeing her weakness in submission then it is good for them to obey the simple command of God of head covering so that they do not stop his grace from reaching them in this matter. Those who are not sick and healthy submitting wives do not need head covering at all. Let the sick who needs grace do it!

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/15 8:29**

Quote:  
-----  
This is so obviously cultural.  
-----

I am sorry to say brother, first and foremost your post is against the intention of this thread. This thread is for those who wants to learn about Head covering. Not for convincing women to ignore this command.

I am also sorry to say that calling this command as Cultural is unscriptural. Instead of doing a research on how Corinthian women lived and how prostitutes lived. Just focus on God's word. Read it carefully. Here Apostle Paul clearly says that Head covering is a sign for Angels. Do Angels belong to only Corinthians? Are the Corinthian Angels alone looking for head covering? Do angels have culture like human being? None of those who support his cultural argument ever gave an answer to this.

The culture argument is derived by those who wanted to twist the scripture and find a reason to encourage women to avoid this command.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/15 9:14**

Hi Chris,

Quote:

-----I would like to know more about this particular interpretation regarding this "angel" passage.  
-----

I'm interested in this passage too. Angels are certainly watching, but I'm not sure if 1 Cor 11:10 implies that headcoverings affect them somehow.

The best explanation I've come across is along the lines of Ephesians 3:10 - "...that now the manifold wisdom of God might be made known by the church to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places".

Some resources:

1. "The Head Covering" by Watchman Nee: <http://bit.ly/1HxbrTa>
2. Audio sermon by Philologos: <http://bit.ly/1I2XPTj>

Philologos (who believes that head coverings are for today) has shared some good Biblical exposition on this forum. They are some of the most persuasive articles I've read on this topic:

1. <http://bit.ly/1K7g10j>
2. <http://bit.ly/1RyXi1F>
3. <http://bit.ly/1gBTxYQ>

Philologos' views in a nutshell:

1. "I think the deep significance of the symbol has to do primarily with the church and its Head, and that 'covering' is really only appropriate in the setting of the 'whole church coming together'."

"I think the whole context of the passages beginning in chapter 11 is the church at worship. And I think the church is very much the focus of this passage of scripture."

2. He points out that 1 Cor 11 also concerns men uncovering their heads during worship, which was contrary to both Jewish and Roman practice of that time. This point is usually glossed over when the issue of head coverings is discussed.

"Jewish men covered their heads in prayer... The High Priest was specifically commanded not to uncover his head nor to tear his garments; this would be a sign of grief not of celebration. Roman priests also covered their heads. The famous sculpture of Augustus as Pontifex Maximus (Great-Bridge or Chief Priest) has him with his head covered with his toga..."

"Remembering that only 5 verses earlier than this Paul has admonished the saints to 'give no offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles (Greeks almost certainly means non-Jews in this context) nor to the church of God', we can be sure that there is something of significance here which warranted Paul risking the offence of both Jews and Romans.

"The answer must be that something had changed, but what?"

"My answer is a very simple one; the Man has been revealed, and in the symbols of that the man ought not to be veiled. The Man's companion has not yet been revealed; it doth not yet appear what we shall be. The tradition of coverings has encapsulated this epoch in which we live. In the gathered church, it is the Man who is to be revealed, not the companion. In biblical truth the Woman (not womankind) was created as a help, answering to the image

e of the Man. So is the church; she is for His glory. She has a distinctive glory of her own, symbolised in her longer hair, but this is not the epoch in which it is to be revealed, so she covers it as an abiding testimony that the Man is now revealed, and she (the church) remains veiled."

May God lead us into the fullness of His truth, just as He has promised.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/15 10:15**

"Angel" can properly be translated "messenger." Just a thought.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/15 10:45**

It would seem that the burden is on those who believe that a literal material head covering is required to prove that is what the text means. The text, read plainly never states this. It states a woman's HEAD must be covered and vs 15 says specifically that the hair is the covering.

I think that is part of the resistance to this, namely that a material type of cloth covering or veil is being imported into the text. Both sides do this, but the anti side says it was cultural. But first it must be established that this is what the text means. Once again it never actually says that a woman must cover her hair. It says she must cover her head.

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/15 10:46**

Quote:

-----"Angel" can properly be translated "messenger." Just a thought.  
-----

Well, who are the messengers? And why the headcoverings for them?

**Re: - posted by iceman9, on: 2015/7/15 10:53**

I find it odd that someone would be concerned with drawing attention to themselves by wearing a head covering in our culture. People walk the streets with pink or purple hair, piercings and tattoos all over their faces and bodies and it is common for people to prance around wearing next to no clothing, yet people in this forum are concerned it will draw attention to someone to wear a head covering. How ridiculous!

Some will say it is a culture issue, it is NOT a culture issue; it is God's word. How easy it is to ignore things that may be uncomfortable and brush it off as a cultural issue. Nice try! This is a New Testament issue. We are living under the New Testament.

Christians are not supposed to have culture dictate to us how we should live; it should be God's Word. The Christians who allow the culture to tell them how to live are referred to as carnal Christians.

Those who think head covering is a cultural issue please let us know the other things in the Bible (specifically New Testament passages) that we should ignore. In fact why don't you rewrite the New Testament and either editing out the things that make you uncomfortable, I mean that are cultural or put some notes in the text to tell us what we should believe and practice or not, (because Paul and the Holy Spirit forgot to).

Based on the thinking of many of the people on these forums, if the culture accepts an adult marrying a child; we should accept it because the Church should get its guidance from culture and disregard God's Word. So the Church needs to accept abortion, same sex marriage, public nudity, and general ungodly behavior; they are all accepted in our culture.

If the Church was walking in the Spirit we would be dictating to the culture how to dress and behave in society, but instead the Church is allowing the culture to tell us what is acceptable. And we wonder why the world is in the mess we are... It is thinking like that.

I can respect someone who would read the text and choose not to follow the instructions of the text more than I can respect a person who just wipes a portion of God's Word away by an "it is just a cultural thing" comment.

Be very careful how you divide God's Word, you will answer for it.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2015/7/15 11:05**

Quote: This is so obviously cultural. Paul wished for the Corinthian women to uphold the customs of respectable women in their culture which were generally in conformity to the principle of patriarchy. He does not give many details about the custom because these were obvious to his readers. The lack of details makes it almost impossible to know how the practice should be duplicated. This dearth of details alone is evidence that Paul did not intend this as a command for all Christians everywhere and forever.

Have a read of the 1 Cor 11:2 - Now I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the tradition as even as I delivered them to you.

The Corinthians are encouraged to keep the "traditions" that were delivered to them by Paul. Since a good portion of the following verses will be discussing the head covering. Head covering is one of those "traditions"

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/7/15 11:25**

I do not know if anyone shared any input on the ministry of angels in connection to the wearing of the veiling, but will share what I have been told.

Why scripture does not give us more info on this issue remains a mystery to me unless the LORD considered a mere mention of it sufficient.

Scripture says she will have power on her head...NASB says a "symbol of authority on her head because of the angels." I have asked preachers and others to explain this phrase more fully but they seem to be at loss to do so other than what is written here.

There have been testimonies of ladies who started to wear one who have said they felt more protected now than before; also testimonies of veiled females - dressed modestly who were walking with the LORD - who experienced supernatural protection from evil men; there are stories of people playing with the Ouija board where it failed to work because someone was wearing a veiling but upon its removal it worked. Our retired pastor has several stories he has collected to prove this point. Is this protection limited to veiled females? I do not know that answer so will not venture an opinion on it because I do not know.

Then it mentions praying and prophesying...she will be empowered to do so, like the prophetess in the OT who shared the word of the LORD with others. We have a ministry and are called to faithfulness and need all the supernatural power to fulfill this mission. For many it is simply being a wife and a mom. And...it takes a LOT of supernatural power to be a mom - I know- we had five younguns.

There are males who feel intimidated by a strong veiled woman...dunno why unless he is a man who is not under authority. Males have to submit to authority as well and most find that almost impossible to do so. Females can detect this arrogance in males and will in their mind marginalize them which may be why some will resent the application of this symbol.

It may be of interest to some to know that female Satanists also wear a veiling but it is black. This is the reason we females wear white in order to not be confused with them.

In our brotherhood and others similar we would welcome people to attend our worship services but to become a part of the brotherhood we would expect them to uphold the doctrines we consider important. It has been proven that when there is a sharp variation it will bring about conflict in the brotherhood that destroys. Scripture does enjoin a church to be unified. In order for a church to be a brotherhood there has to be agreement before there can be heart-felt fellowship of the spirit. Since we are human we must deal with our humanness on the practical level, too.

I suspect if a couple were to attend a church where the sisters are veiled they would soon leave because they would not feel comfortable or will join the group in its application.

In the end let me say: wearing a veiling is not a sure ticket to heaven, nor is it anything magical apart from a walk with the LORD. I do not know what benefit it is to a person otherwise -suspect it is useless. Nor, does it prevent one from being



tempted to sin.

Does this make sense?

Sandra

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2015/7/15 11:30**

Quote: Some will say it is a culture issue, it is NOT a culture issue; it is God's word. How easy it is to ignore things that may be "uncomfortable" and brush it off as a "cultural issue". Nice try! This is a New Testament issue.

The new testament - tells you what it is 1 Cor 11:2 Now I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you.

No head-covering for a man and wearing a head-covering for a women while they pray and prophecy is a tradition.

When I am work while wearing a safety hat; I will pray with it on, I don't see how that is dishonouring God.

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/15 14:10**

Thank you for the explanations about the specific interpretations of the "angels" part of this passage. I've always found that part confusing when those who embrace this tradition explained it, but this gives me a clearer understanding of how many have interpreted it in this context.

As for the "judging" aspect that many have touched on: I asked some questions about this previously that I haven't seen anyone address.

Earlier, I wrote:

Quote:  
-----  
"I would never think of judging a sister who does or does not practice head coverings (in any of the various ways that it is practiced). If she is convinced of this and follows the Lord as she is convinced, then she should not be commended for following what she believes to be from the Lord.

At the same time, I would wonder how a local church, fellowship or group that embraces such a tradition would respond to a believing couple that did not embrace this practice. Would they be welcomed into full fellowship (like those who do practice it)? Would they be judged unworthy to engage in ministry or leadership roles within that local fellowship of believers? Would such a woman (or her husband) be rejected from teaching younger believers?"  
-----

For those who embrace this practice and fellowship among other believers (or congregations) that do...

What would be the attitude of the local church or fellowship leadership toward those who do not embrace head coverings? Would they be welcomed into full fellowship (including ministry)? Would they be welcomed to attend meetings but be shunned from active ministry or leadership in the local church?

If a believing husband and wife who do not embrace this practice began to fellowship with a local congregation or group, would they be permitted the same ministry and leadership opportunities in the local church as those who do embrace the head covering?

Thank you in advance.

**Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2015/7/15 14:59**

Hi Chris,

Brother you raise an interesting point with this question and as I considered it this question came as to expound on your initial query; would the Apostle Paul allow or restrict the fellowship/ministry of this same couple based on the scripture presented here in the 1st letter to Corinth?

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/15 15:32**

Hey Iceman-

Paul told Timothy to drink wine for his stomach ailment. Should all Christians today with a stomach ailment drink wine? If not why not?

The early church liquidated their assets and pooled them for the good of all. Should we do that today? If not why not?

**Re: , on: 2015/7/15 16:47**

TMK

Most Italian pentecostals in and from Italy drink wine to this day . They consider it a-okay although not in excess.

Yes the pooling of assets is very good, Please let me administer these funds.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/15 17:41**

I posted earlier in this thread:

The question came up about 1. Cor 11:10 For this reason the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

Eve was tempted by Satan the Archangel and was lured into disobedience to the one and only command they had to obey in those days. Please take note that Eve did not receive the command by God directly as Adam did, but she received it from Adam who got it from God. Eve had not been yet been created when the man Adam received the command.

By covering her head she expresses that she chooses submission and obedience to her husband and subsequently to Christ. In effect she proclaims to the angelic world:

"My great-grandmother Eve did not behold the command that Adam passed on to her and she left the authority she was under - but now I and my sisters in Christ express that we are subject to our husbands who is appointed head over us in the governance of God. We chose to keep Gods commands down to small details of which head covering is a visible symbol.

The angelic world witness now the weak point where Satan managed to launch his epic attack on mankind has now been fixed and fortified by obedience.

Watchman Nee gives us wonderful insight into this reality:

<http://www3.telus.net/trbrooks/neeonheadcovering.htm>

How to Cover the Head

â€œFor 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 veiledâ€ (1 Cor. 11:6). In other words, God tells the sisters to be thorough.

No woman can keep her hair and not have her head covered. If she is not covered, she should have her hair either shorn or shaven. If she feels shameful to have her hair shorn or shaven, then she should be covered. Everything must be done thoroughly, not in half measure.

“For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man” (v. 7). Since man represents the image and glory of God, he should not cover his head. But woman is the glory of man, so she should cover her head. If a woman does not cover her head, she cannot demonstrate that man is the head. “For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: for neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man” (vv. 8-9). These two verses make it very clear that the matter before us is concerned with government. “For the man is not of the woman” — this is God’s doing. In God’s creation man did not come by woman, but woman from the rib taken out of man. Hence, the head was Adam, not Eve. Furthermore, “neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.” Just by God’s ordering in creation, woman should be in submission to man.

“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 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.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/15 18:26**

I apologize for getting the thread off track per its original intent. I did not initially mean to get drawn into a discussion.

This is one of those topics where my mind will never be changed, nor will the minds of those who feel differently be changed. It falls into the same type of category as calvinism, views of hell, eschatology and age of the earth.

I would hope both sides can respect the other sides' view without feelings that the other side is silly or rebellious. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/15 20:15**

No matter what side we are on, let our behaviour and character display Whose authority we are under.

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/15 22:40**

Quote:

-----sree wrote:

Sister Lisa, when did I ever say that those who do not cover their head do not submit to their husbands?

Brother, you are putting words in my mouth, I didn't say you said that.

The only reason Iâ€™m posting in this thread is for other women to know that in order to submit to their husband, they donâ€™t need to wear anything on the outside. â€œ... True circumcision is not something visible in the flesh (or on the head). On the contrary, a person is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is of the heartâ€™ by the Spirit, not the letter. That manâ€™s praise is not from men but from God. (Romans 2:28b-29)

God bless,  
Lisa

**Re: - posted by dfella (), on: 2015/7/15 23:03**

Carmine:

Can you please send me an email, my email is in my profile.

Thanks

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/16 0:49**

Quote:

-----  
The only reason Iâ€™m posting in this thread is for other women to know that in order to submit to their husband, they donâ€™t need to wear anything on the outside.

-----  
Sister, I agree with you that you can be a spiritually strong women who can easily submit to husband. But that might not be the case with many. There are many women who might be struggling with this submission, who might not be strong believer like you. They need God's grace in this matter. We cannot earn God's grace by our actions but by our disobedience we can prevent his grace from reaching us. So a women who needs grace in this area of submission will be preventing God's grace from reaching her due to her disobedience to head covering.

I know many sisters who are very Godly and also wear ornaments. But once I heard a sister's testimony. She was longing for the Baptism of Holy Spirit but every time she asked for it, she heard a voice say 'remove your ornaments'. She kept resisting to that voice. Finally one day she removed her ornaments and said Lord now I obey your voice and immediately the spirit filled her. This is her true testimony.

Now a sister who is wearing ornaments and also spiritually strong can easily deceive this young sister saying, you do not need to remove your ornaments to receive the baptism of Holy Spirit. Now this way the sister could be easily deceived.

So you too could result in deceiving many young sisters who want to wholeheartedly obey God's word to receive grace in the area of submission to wife. Why do you want to do this? Why do you want to gain curse by making a little one stumble?

My humble advice for you is to keep your testimony to your self. This thread is for the weak sisters who need help in the

area of submission. You are spiritually strong enough to avoid such threads.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/16 0:56**

Quote:

-----  
This is one of those topics where my mind will never be changed, nor will the minds of those who feel differently be changed.  
-----

Brother if your mind will never change in this case no matter how much your understanding is proved wrong using God's word (as proven in this thread), then why do you want to come to this thread? Greg has put it clearly in the opening subject that this thread is for those who have genuine questions on this subject and wants to know the answer to make up their mind. This thread is not for those who already made up their mind and just asking question to prove others wrong or to show off their intelligence.

Why is it difficult for you to obey to this simple statement made by the moderator? Submission to human authority placed on top of us is a very good sign of our spiritual submission to an unseen God. If a man does not submit to human authorities on top of him then how can he submit to divine authority? I am sorry if I have hurt you but honestly it baffles me how someone takes such serious things so lightly.

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2015/7/16 6:40**

Quote:

-----sree wrote:

There are many women who might be struggling with this submission, who might not be strong believer like you. They need God's grace in this matter.  
-----

Are you kidding me? Unbelievable. This is a terrible argument full of so many illogical holes.

Ok, so let's start with these questions and please respond with honest answer::

- 1) Are there ANY women (in your church) who do not wear head coverings? How many?
- 2) What is the time frame before a new woman has to start wearing head coverings?
- 3) Is that part of the rules in your church that all women wear head coverings (if they are going to stay)?
- 4) Do you allow any woman who is strong in the Lord in submission to stay in your church without a head covering?
- 5) Are they known as women strong in submission or are they treated as those who won't submit to authority (Jezebel's)?
- 6) Do you consider all women in your church (I'm thinking that all of them wear head coverings), do you consider them all weak in submission?
- 7) And finally, do you actually use this argument with women in your church?!? "You are so strong in submission, you need to wear a head covering as an example for the weaker women."

Honestly, I'm thinking I'm not the one who is deceived.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/16 7:46**

Lisa, none of your question is anything related to what I have written. Why should my Church come into this picture? You clearly do not understand what I have written. I accept that you can be a woman who is 100% good in submission, a perfect Christian wife. But not everyone are like that. When Jesus said that he has come for the sick, not the healthy one, what did he mean? If Jesus lacked logic then my post as well lacks logic. If you understood the meaning of that verse you would have understood what I posted before.

I posted before that I struggle to love my wife like how Christ Loves the Church. I accept this because I know the standard of Christ's love for Church is extremely high. It is humanly impossible to love my wife to that standard. I definitely need divine help to achieve that standard.

This is my honest answer, if there was a command that Men should shave only one half of their head as a symbol of love to their wife to angels then I will shave the half of my head without asking question. Even if I look ridiculous, even if I was the only man on earth who comes to Church like that. I know I am weak in this, I will obey so that I will not prevent his grace from reaching me in all important thing of loving my wife.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/16 8:00**

Quote: "Why is it difficult for you to obey to this simple statement made by the moderator?"

Well, I did apologize.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/16 8:07**

Quote:

Quote: "Why is it difficult for you to obey to this simple statement made by the moderator?"

Well, I did apologize.

I did not just refer to your last post in which you put an apology. I am referring to your participation in this thread itself. If you did not have a genuine question, if you clearly believe that nothing can change your understanding, then why did you post your questions and understandings? This thread is for those who have genuine questions to get them clarified.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/16 10:46**

To: dfella

Hello David

There is no email in your profile that I can see.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/16 10:49**

For those interested the ebook:

Head Coverings by K.P Yohannan

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=25173>

can also be purchased for \$2.55 each here:

<http://christianlearning.org/head-coverings.html>

I really found this the most practical, simple, grace-filled explanation of headcoverings I have read.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/7/16 12:24**

Quote: "I did not just refer to your last post in which you put an apology. I am referring to your participation in this thread itself. If you did not have a genuine question, if you clearly believe that nothing can change your understanding, then why did you post your questions and understandings? This thread is for those who have genuine questions to get them clarified."

That is what I was apologizing for. My participation. You don't have to accept it I suppose.

**Re: - posted by Solomon101, on: 2015/7/16 14:58**

I did want to inject a few thoughts and questions to this topic.

If my wife is submissive to me in the Biblical (not dictatorial) sense then her head dress would seem to be irrelevant. Conversely, if my wife is destroying the unity of our family and walking in rebellion then that must be seen as wrong though she might be swimming in head dresses.

Isn't the issue whether she is actually walking in love, harmony, and unity with me rather than if she has a patch of cloth on her head.

What of the woman wearing a head dress that is subversive in her home and destroying it? She is in error regardless of the fact that she is sporting head gear.

The other thought that seems to keep coming up is in the regard to angels. Does anyone actually think that angels are too unable to recognize if a person is walking in love and submission??? Does anyone actually believe they need to see a piece of cloth on a persons head as a "sign" so that they won't be confused? Does anyone think the angels don't have the ability to understand this issue without seeing a piece of cloth on a persons head to point them in the right direction?!?!? What of the lady who is totally rebellious but wears a head dress. Would the angels then be walking in deception ... if they are getting their decision from the head gear they obviously would be.

That's just silly isn't it?

If a lady wishes to wear a head dress and sees it as a sign of submission then so be it. However, to wear the head dress is in and of itself no sign of submission whatsoever! It's her words, intents, and actions that matter!

If she gets her thoughts and intents correctly aligned then she is walking in submission regardless of the lack of headpieces.

It seems eerily near to Jesus warning of getting the outside of the cup clean but being unconcerned with the inside.

In my humble opinion keeping the focus on the persons attitudes, words, and actions reveals the true heart and fruit. Keeping the focus on an outward piece of clothing simply invites Phariseeism. The one wearing the cloth is judged as spiritual regardless of their true heart. In exactly the same way the one not wearing the cloth is judged as rebellious even though they may be the most loving and submissive person in the room.

It's quiet easy to be seen as spiritual when all I have to do is meet some dress code.

The church never, ever, ever does well when it makes judgements based on outward appearances.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2015/7/16 18:20**

Hello,

I posted some questions earlier about the wearing of head coverings. Most of my questions were answered, but there were a few that were not.

During this discourse, there were words about "judging" those who do or do not practice this tradition. My question was specifically about congregations, fellowships or local churches that embrace it. Since I assume that several people here attend congregations where it is either encouraged or widely embraced, I was hoping that someone with firsthand knowledge could answer.

How are believers who do not embrace this practice treated among believers who do?

Are believers who do not practice this welcomed into full fellowship (like those who do practice it)?

Are those believers who do not embrace this practice considered unworthy to engage in ministry or leadership roles within that local fellowship of believers?

Would such a woman (or her husband) be rejected from teaching younger believers?"

Would they be welcomed to attend meetings but be forbidden from active ministry, teaching or leadership in the local church?

Thank you for helping me understand the views and practices of this particular tradition. This greatly assists my understanding of how those who embrace this practice view those who do not or whether it is essential for actively participating in the local congregation.

**Re: - posted by 4wiseinheart, on: 2015/7/16 20:42**

As food for thought and not a source of contention but if she is "walking in love, harmony, and unity with you" then she will want to follow the ordinance laid out in the Word of God.

Just as there are two other outward expressions (taking of the Lord's supper and water baptism) this does have a "sign of authority." Man is to give glory to God and women are the glory of men. No man shall glory in the presence of the Lord. Man's glory should be veiled or covered. Let her be veiled.

Of course, she does not have to do it. Neither does she nor you have to have any outward signs of faith. These are your choices. You have to do what is right before the Lord.

With Love in Christ.

**Re: - posted by 4wiseinheart, on: 2015/7/16 20:45**

Brother,

I have a book as well by Brother North titled "A Sign of Authority." If you are interested in obtaining a good explanation of the head covering, please let me know.

With Love in Christ.



Re: - posted by dfella (), on: 2015/7/16 21:54

Hey Chris:

I would like to answer your questions regarding head coverings and my experience since 1997 with churches that practice this.

How are believers who do not embrace this practice treated among believers who do?

"Are believers who do not practice this welcomed into full fellowship (like those who do practice it)?"

Since 1997 I have been involved with 3 fellowships that practice head coverings. 2 were home churches (1 of which was charismatic the other not) and 1 church (my current church) which is not charismatic. The answer to this question is yes, women are accepted into full fellowship if they choose not to wear head coverings. I have noticed over time that those who come, eventually start wearing head coverings. As I said in another thread, this is not commanded or demanded. I believe the women who fellowship together on occasion may discuss the topic and the women are coming to their own conclusion.

"Are those believers who do not embrace this practice considered unworthy to engage in ministry or leadership roles within that local fellowship of believers?"

No, they are absolutely not considered unworthy to engage in ministry. But as I said above, the women, of their own free will, eventually begin to wear head coverings, not by constraint but of their own free will.

"Would such a woman (or her husband) be rejected from teaching younger believers?"

Absolutely not.

"Would they be welcomed to attend meetings but be forbidden from active ministry, teaching or leadership in the local church?"

Again, with my experience for the last 18 years, the answer is again no, they are not and have not been forbidden to participate in ministry.

Others may answer differently, I can only share my own firsthand experience.

A question that was asked in the other thread was "Would a sister who wears a head covering be willing to fellowship with a woman who does not?"

My thought and observation is that it is not a question about whether a woman who wears a head covering is willing to fellowship with one who does not but actually the other way around.

Are women who disagree with this practice willing to fellowship with women who wear head coverings?

Based on the way some women attack, judge, and condemn the practice I find them more judgemental toward those who do. Over 18 years I have seen the topic hotly debated and for the most part it is not the women who wear the head coverings that defend themselves but rather the men.

Then the men are looked down upon because they are accused of being sexist or controlling, it is a no win situation.

It is one thing to debate (which I do not, nor will not participate in) and it is another thing to reason with those who are willing and care only about getting to the truth of a matter.

I said earlier that I know women who love the Lord with all their heart, they bear fruit in their lives, and some women wear head coverings and others do not. I do not lose sleep over the topic.

Where I believe women trip themselves up is when one condemns the other for wearing or not wearing head coverings. In all honesty however I have NEVER seen a woman who wears a head covering condemn a woman who does not.

BUT, I have seen plenty of women who do not wear head coverings attack and condemn those who do.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2015/7/17 0:22**

Hi dfella,

Thank you for your answers. They are very educational and helpful for understanding the perspective of those who embrace this tradition in regard to those who do not.

Over the years, I have visited many different fellowships from different backgrounds and unique sets of beliefs. I've been to churches that taught the head covering (but they were a bit more strict with the teaching and those who can participate in church functions). I've also been to meetings where men and women were separated from one another (e.g., men on one side/women on the other, women meeting in a different room, etc...). I've seen church rules about hair, dress, etc... Of course, I have also been to more "loose" churches in terms of such matters too, as well as "mainstream" congregations.

Often, I have found that congregations will welcome believers who feel differently about some matter. They will be invited to fellowship and even participate in certain aspects of ministry. However, over time, if they don't comply (or "submit") to the teaching of a specific "doctrine" held by the leaders of the congregation (or the institution itself), they will eventually feel some pressure (everything from a sort of "spiritual peer pressure" to verbal reprimands). Some churches might even give others the "boot" if they don't comply.

For instance, my cousin was a part of a local church that held to KJV-only, OSAS, post-trib second coming, tithing, and a list of other "doctrinal" issues that were actively embraced and taught by the church. This was the only congregation that he attended after giving his life to Christ. He eventually became the Sunday School teacher. When the pastor was absent, my cousin was the person who would be called upon to preach. My cousin was quite the local evangelist -- and many of his converts ended up as a part of that local church. However, my cousin differed from the fellowship on one non-essential issue. It came to light during a Bible study Q&A session. When he shared what he believed, the pastor told him to sit down. After the meeting, the pastor met with my cousin and gave him an ultimatum -- "comply or fly." Until that happened, he was not allowed to hold any "position" of authority.

A similar situation happened with my brother-in-law and his family. They were welcomed with open arms at a small local church and their passion for the Lord was recognized from the pulpit. They were encouraged to even become involved in teaching the youth. That is, this was until they still didn't comply with a particular doctrinal issue that the congregation adhered to. Once it became clear that they weren't likely to ever adopt that particular position, they were eventually "voted out" of their teaching position. The pastor mentioned something about the lack of "growth" that was "apparent" because they didn't adopt that belief.

As such, I think that you can understand my concern with this type of perspective.

I've always felt that there are some issues that should not be "positions" taken by churches (institutionally speaking). I am speaking of non-essential issues that are not exceptionally clear among all believers. Most denominations have a list of "we believe" statements that the church adheres to. I think that I understand the need for such things in terms of legality for institutional churches. However, I have always wondered why we don't rely upon the Holy Spirit to lead and guide the congregation into all truth. Do pastors, leaders, teachers or institutions need to take a stand on things like tithing (yes, no, gross, net, etc...), OSAS, acceptable Bible version(s), music, tongues, head coverings, etc... to the point that they are mandated or greatly impressed rather than mentioned as a potential truth from God's Word?

In other words, I would have no problem with allowing a congregation to make up their mind on issues that are non-essential or not universally clear from the Word of God. While there will always be those that claim that something IS clear from God's Word or "essential," it doesn't mean that it is clear for all or even most who truly know the Lord. I think that the pastor and teachers can teach on controversial subjects without necessarily mandating a position or proclaiming a "doctrinal truth" out of them if they aren't essential. A pastor or teacher can share his belief on the matter while mentioning alternate perspectives that other believers have.

For instance, I still lean toward the belief that the Lord may gather His Bride before the wrath of God is poured out upon it

he Earth (call it "rapture" if you like). I would NEVER proclaim it as an indisputable truth. I would simply say this is what I believe with the reasons why...and then share other views and the Scriptural reasoning for those beliefs. The same can be said for everything from tithing to music to, yes, head coverings. Such matters don't have to be discussed on a weekly or monthly basis or become a part of a "first things first" Sunday School class for new believers. They can be touched upon (periodically even) and then the church can turn its attention upon much more important matters. The burden is then upon the believer to seek the Lord wholeheartedly in order to find out where the Lord is leading them (or not) in regard to such issues.

My wife and I do not embrace the man-made head covering as it is taught in this thread. That is not to say that we haven't studied and prayed about it. We have studied this issue in depth many times (often because we visited churches that embraced or taught it...or because of what we have read here at SermonIndex many times). Still, after much heartfelt and honest prayer and study, we just haven't been convinced of any sort of mandatory need for her to wear a piece of cloth upon her head as a sign to a fallen world (that would likely be confused by it in the first place), other believers or angels about her role. Of course, my wife is a very godly woman. I am so blessed to have found a wife like this -- a truly virtuous woman who is submissive in a godly way and a wonderful help-meet. Her submission and godliness is apparent to anyone who meets or knows her -- even without a kerchief atop her hair.

I hope that this helps explain a little more where I am coming from. I would never want to judge a person by their outer appearance. I think that sister ginnyrose once said that a woman isn't necessarily submissive just because she wears one of those head coverings. I guess that the same can be said of all believers from all backgrounds. A Christian t-shirt or a fish on the bumper doesn't mean that Christ is in the heart. In fact, I learned recently -- first hand -- that not all married couples wear wedding rings after meeting a man from a different nation and culture that didn't wear one and the idea of such a symbol was quite foreign to him.

I think that Greg has done a good job in the way that he gently brings up the idea of head coverings without impressing upon people a need to accept it. I think that he has stood out of the way and allowed the Holy Spirit to have His work in this matter. Of course, that doesn't mean that I embrace it. However, I appreciate the gentleness of spirit and manner in which Greg allows for God to have His work in each of us as we pray and study.

Thanks again. It is very helpful and this thread (and each participating in it) is very educational -- even if we might not all agree on this.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/17 3:35**

Chris and others who are concerned about Judgmental aspect of head covering. If Head Covering can lead to Judgmentalism then even 'breaking of Bread' and 'water baptism' can lead to judgmental-ism. To be consistent you need to advise Christians from practicing these external commands as well, because they lead to judgmental-ism.

For example many Christians when they enquire about my Church, the first thing that they ask is, 'How Often do you break bread?'. They think that a Church is more spiritual if it breaks bread often. Is this not judgmental? So can we stop breaking bread? William Booth stopped breaking of Bread in his salvation army because the grape juice they tasted reminded some of vine that they were once addicted. But we all know that Salvation Army of that time was a clear movement of God. Who can question that?

You guys keep pointing about judgmental aspects in home fellowships. I too agree and I have faced such judgments myself. But that is part and parcel of God's Church. Even the Church with Jesus as the teacher had Judas who was judging the women who anointed Jesus with Perfume. So if you keep running away from Churches due to judgmental-ism then you will be running away from Jesus. The only important thing in a Church is the presence of Jesus in the midst when you gather. If that is not there then even acceptance of your jeans and uncovered head is of no use!

The reason why many of the believers are running away from home fellowship and are happy with mega Churches where they can always be nobody without worrying about other believers is, they are not willing to face the cost of fellowship. In Noah's Ark there were animals packed to one another. They would have brushed each other badly. But their only mode of survival is to be in the Ark. Same way if we kept worrying about people judging us in a fellowship then we will never be part of a Church that Jesus is building. Before you are asking for a Church, count the cost that you have to pay to be part of a Church.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

**Head covering question - posted by vasilef (), on: 2015/7/17 8:30**

Head covering Question: (for those that don't consider head covering a cultural, first century Corinthian rule... I don't believe any passage of the Bible is just for 1st century church)

1. How should a woman cover her head? (if the 1 Corinthian 11 passage is not talking about physical covering)
2. How man should not have his head covered? (spiritually or metaphorical speaking)

So these are questions for those that do not believe in physical head covering.

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/20 3:01**

Greg - just to clarify your position: do you believe that headcoverings should be worn by women only in church assembly contexts, or at all times?

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/20 11:00**

Quote:  
-----Greg - just to clarify your position: do you believe that headcoverings should be worn by women only in church assembly contexts, or at all times?  
-----

Sisters, are free to wear a headcovering more then just at the times of Church if they want to. If they pray for a meal at home it would be good if they covered probably. But the Scripture says specifically during the Christian meeting when they are praying, etc.

So to me that is the requirement and specifically the reason is spiritual as I share here: [https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id=55015&forum=34](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=55015&forum=34)

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/20 11:20**

If women are required to cover their head at all times, then (going by the same 1 Corinthians chapter) men too would be obliged to have their heads uncovered at all times - "No hats, caps and safety helmets!"

But 1 Cor 11 specifically addresses the context of church meetings. So that's something which we don't have to worry about :)

**Re: , on: 2015/7/20 12:06**

The bible states that when 2 or 3 are gathered together in Jesus name there he is in the midst of them. So whenever my wife and I are in the same location: le home, church building etc Jesus is with us as well. We are therefore a church.

Does that mean that wives should always wear a head covering when they are together with their husbands wherever they are or does it just mean when they are in a specific location?

**Re: - posted by yuehan, on: 2015/7/20 13:04**

Quote:  
-----Does that mean that wives should always wear a head covering when they are together with their husbands wherever they are or does it just mean when they are in a specific location?  
-----

Well, if they had to - then by the same token, whenever two or three Christian tradesmen gather together, they would have to take off their safety helmets.

**Revivals And Church History :: Head Coverings For Women In The Church?**

Let us not propagate such man-made rules.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/20 16:41**

Quote:

-----by Sree on 2015/7/17 3:35:02

The only important thing in a Church is the presence of Jesus in the midst when you gather.  
-----

Amen!

Quote:

-----The reason why many of the believers are running away from home fellowship and are happy with mega Churches where they can always be nobody without worrying about other believers is, they are not willing to face the cost of fellowship. In Noah's Ark there were animals packed to one another. They would have brushed each other badly. But their only mode of survival is to be in the Ark. Same way if we kept worrying about people judging us in a fellowship then we will never be part of a Church that Jesus is building. Before you are asking for a Church, count the cost that you have to pay to be part of a Church.  
-----

I am in a home fellowship with no head coverings. One sister wears one but maybe that is because she has short hair. No one ever talks about it. We have Indians (India) too, and they don't wear head coverings, but maybe that is because they have long hair like the rest of the sisters. I have been in this fellowship for going on 7 years now and I have never witnessed any strife or judgmentalism. Everyone loves the Lord and each other. It is very refreshing and a place of peace and support. Just how I envisioned the church to be when they are really holding fast to the Head.

**Re: - posted by staff, on: 2015/7/20 19:19**

Hi All

This came to me last night while in the car.

Jesus said in heaven their is "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven

My conclusion that this issue will is not any long term pattern that will be present in heaven and is not in Gods Plan for the future.

I think this teaching is just going to confuse non christians and has no grace in it.It will not bring about revival which is a stated aim of this website and widespread use of a headcovering is just not going to happen whether Greg who we all have great time,love and respect for likes it or not,

If you are going to be honest with those you are going to witness too tell them about headcovering and see how far you get.

Yours Staff

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/7/21 1:27**

Quote:

-----  
Staff wrote:-

I think this teaching is just going to confuse non christians and has no grace in it.  
-----

So what Apostle Paul wrote in 1Corinthians 11 does not have any grace in it? I always thought grace is the most misunderstood topic among Christians. Many confuse mercy with Grace.

Quote:  
-----  
It will not bring about revival which is a stated aim of this website and widespread use of a headcovering is just not going to happen whether Greg who we all have great time, love and respect for likes it or not,  
-----

Revivals always happen by simple obedience to God's commands. Without obedience there is no revival. If emphasizing obedience to God's command of Head Covering does not lead to revival then what else can?

Why can widespread use of Headcovering not possible by few Godly sisters obeying this command of God? If few feminist theologies can change a Church tradition that was followed for 1900 years then why not few God fearing and obeying sisters change the Christendom. I have personally seen sisters cover their head after seeing my wife cover her head in a meeting where she was initially the only one covering her head. They did it after my wife explained the spirit behind the command. There are still sisters who are willing to obey when they are given the truth in right spirit.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/21 10:09**

staff

Good response! I think you have covered the topic quite well.

**Re: Head Coverings For Women In The Church? - posted by ahoglund, on: 2015/7/21 12:31**

I respect your conviction and position on this matter, but also have to disagree on all points.

Sometimes it is hard, as we read/study the bible, to distinguish eternal biblical truths from cultural paradigms. I believe it should always be our goal to extract the spiritual truth out of the text, taking into consideration the culture in which the text was written to do so.

The crux of the issue that Paul is addressing regarding head coverings is in v.10:  
"It is for this reason that a woman ought to have authority over her own head, because of the angels."

This verse clarifies the previous statement that appeals back to creation. It isn't that since the beginning God intended for women to cover their heads, but that they are intended to "have authority over her head".

Therefore, head coverings for women is not longer an issue for the church since head coverings has no cultural meaning anymore. 2000 years ago it did, as it was a symbol of woman's expression marriage. Lets not superimpose a 2000 year old cultural practice into the modern day.

To further note, just because something has been practiced throughout Christendom doesn't always make it right.

Here is an excerpt which gives further insight, written by Pastor William Carrol:

HEAD COVERINGS SEEN IN CULTURAL CONTEXT  
(1 CORINTHIANS 11:1-15)

The issue of head coverings for women is no longer a point of contention or controversy for most Christian denominations. However, the issue of mutual respect between husbands and wives remains. And it's this deeper and essential truth that is at the heart of the head covering issue. In that culture, a head covering would have been a sign of the distinctions between male and female. Thus, the lack of a head covering would have been a confusing statement. While it may have signaled liberty for the woman, it would have shamed her husband; and in an honor/shame culture, that would have been a poor testimony to the liberty found in Christ Jesus. As the covering of the head lost its significance in society, the issue of whether or not women should wear covers became less significant. However, the issue of mutual respect remains in full effect in every culture at all times.

So, in order to interpret the Bible accurately, we must consider the cultural context in which it was written. And in order to apply it correctly, we must consider the changes in culture. However, we must persist in addressing the culture with the eternal, essential, objective and absolute truth of Scripture."

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/21 18:17**

I doubt whether anyone of you who opposes Paul's teaching about head covering has actually taken the pains to listen to the teachings Greg posted in the beginning.

There is a pastor who did not believe in headcovering for today who did word for word study through the book of Corinthians. He was very honest and did an extremely scholarly and detailed study on the text and came to the conclusion that it indeed must be for today. As it was not generally practised in his church, he carefully and lovingly explains this to his congregation fully aware that this is a very loaded subject in our day and age.

Have you ever wondered why this topic always receives so many posts here? It is not just about a piece of cloth, but it reveals a much deeper issue: Are we men willing to submit to the headship of Christ and acknowledge our role as the head of the wife and are our women willing to submit to her husband as her head in God's economy.

It is easy to pay lip service and say I can serve God just as well without a head covering, what's the fuzz about it? The putting on of a head covering actually reveals the true state of one's heart. All scholars up to the 20th century agree that it was a command for today. Only with the rise of feminism did this teaching fall into disrespect.

**Re: , on: 2015/7/21 22:39**

A couple of scriptures that I have always seen and known about stood out to me this time because of the context of head coverings. I never really saw this connection before.

Eph 5:22 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord.

Eph 5:23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.

Eph 5:24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.

Eph 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

Col 3:18 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.

Col 3:19 Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.

What we have in Ephesians and in Colossians is the ordinance for wives to, "submit yourselves unto your own husbands". Identical statements in both books but conspicuously missing to the church in Ephesus and Colossae is any connection between wives submitting themselves to their husbands and the sign of submission (that we have been hearing about), namely head coverings.

Now, in 1 Cor 11, there is no reference to the word, "submit", but in this thread there are a lot of posts making the connection of submission and head covering. If that is the case, why didn't the apostle Paul connect head coverings with submission in Eph 5 and Col 3?

I don't believe there is a connection and the sign of submission should be manifested in a person's behavior and character just as a sign of loving his wife, should be manifested in a man's character and behavior.

The conclusion I have come to FOR ME and MY family, is the following:

- 1) Some people see head covering as a physical cloth over short hair if a married woman desires to pray or prophesy in a congregation (no mention of single women). And, there is no mention of submission to their husband.
- 2) Other people see the covering as long hair for a women's hair is her covering. 1Cor 11:15 "...for her hair is given her for a covering."
- 3) And there are people that believe a married woman should be covered regardless of the length of her hair when she prays or prophecies in a congregation, only.
- 4) I believe there are others who believe a woman should be covered at all waking moments because we are to "pray without ceasing", and she may pray spontaneously.

With all of these in mind, I don't see submission as part of the text and the true evidence of submission, which comes from

m the heart is manifested in the character and behavior of a person.

And finally, because there are several understandings related to what being "covered" is I think it is only Christlike if we extend to each other their own liberty in Christ to follow their consciences as whatever is not of faith is sin and we don't want anyone doing something because of others' expectations.

I think the biggest thing for me is that Paul and Peter and James combined, talked about submission about 7 or so times and never connected it to the head covering. And then of course the head covering is only referred to in 1 chapter in Corinthians and listening to and reading the posts from the Body, one meaning is clear cut in many minds, while also another altogether different meaning is clear cut in other minds.

What are we to do, to "Endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace", (Eph 4:3) except to walk in love with one another.

I am completely at peace with my decision and respect other's decisions to walk with the Lord as they see fit.

Rom 14:17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Rom 14:18 For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men.

Rom 14:19 Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

**Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2015/7/22 17:15**

If I take Julius21's conclusion Paul could have said, I give you the ordinance of head covering but in order to avoid church splits and contention, let everyone do as he or she deems right.

As reasonable as this sounds, however, Paul says in

1 Cor 11:16 But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

Paul in fact DID take action against a dithering application of the apostolic standard for head covering that he and his fellow workers once established.

This suggests that Paul and the other apostles managed to set an universal standard for all the churches of God. I do not think that he used force or compulsion but simply instructing ordinances that were taught by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It is the same Spirit that brought unity as mentioned in

Eph 4:3-4 ...Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. 4 There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling...

The problem lies not in holding up the apostolic standard, but how to deal with those opposing it in a spirit of truth, meekness and humility without kettou-ing to compromise.

Paul addressed some very thorny issues throughout the 2 Corinthian letters without bowing to pressure and without being unreasonably harsh or disproportionate in correction.

These letters are true masterpieces and outstanding examples of how to deal with contentious issues. In the end they were leading to correction in a godly fashion in the presence of false apostles who were working hard to undo what God did there.

Anybody who like Paul stays on course with biblical teaching is predestined for opposition and contempt by religious folk and even persecution and sufferings of various kinds.

2 Corinthians 11:26-28 (KJV)

26 In journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren;

27 In weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.

28 Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.

No wonder why men of God who teach these ordinances are in a diminishing minority because most of us shun adversity and suffering in our Laodicean generation. Not for long, God will turn the tables and a remnant will go through suffering



and persecution like our 1st century brethren did.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/7/22 18:50**

Quote:  
-----Now, in 1 Cor 11, there is no reference to the word, "submit", but in this thread there are a lot of posts making the connection of submission and head covering. If that is the case, why didn't the apostle Paul connect head coverings with submission in Eph 5 and Col 3?  
-----

Brother, you are right the word submit is not there, I would say that the headship order displayed in 1 Corinthians 11 infers submission of all christ, men and women.

I believe the more important aspect Paul shares is on God's Order and submitting to that for sisters, I wrote about this here:

Head Covering A Symbol To The Unseen Realm  
[https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id=55015&forum=34](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=55015&forum=34)

**Re: , on: 2015/7/22 20:53**

Quote:  
-----by narrowpath on 2015/7/22 17:15:08

If I take Julius21 conclusion Paul could have said, I give you the ordinance of head covering but in order to avoid church splits and contention, let everyone do as he or she deems right.  
-----

I did not say that. I only extrapolated from the thread the different viewpoints held by various individuals.

If it was cultural (Paul never spoke to any other church about this), then Paul's comment about "we have no custom, neither do the churches of God", makes spiritual sense to me. I have no idea what "because of the angels", refers to and I don't think anyone else does, either. The long hair makes more sense to me, "because of the angels", than a piece of cloth. But, that's just me. I don't teach on head coverings one way or the other.

Brother, enjoy what the Lord is leading you to do.