

Articles and Sermons :: The Effects of the Headcovering on Divorce by Myron Horst

The Effects of the Headcovering on Divorce by Myron Horst - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/10/13 8:13

Is there a correlation between Christian women wearing a headcovering as is instructed in 1 Corinthians 11 and the divorce rate among Christians? Most churches today teach that the woman does not need to cover her head and that the teaching in 1 Corinthians 11 does not apply to today. Is it true that the headcovering teaching is not important, has no value for today, and is to be "spiritualized" and reinterpreted? Or is the Church reaping the consequence of ignoring the headcovering command in the high rate of divorce and the destruction of families among Christians?

I grew up in a Mennonite church that practiced the headcovering. As the years have passed, many Mennonite churches dropped the headcovering. I have observed that among those churches that viewed the headcovering as no longer necessary or important and discontinued wearing the headcovering, the divorce rate among church members has significantly increased. At the same time the Mennonite churches that continued to require the wearing of the headcovering continued to have a very, very low divorce rate. The Amish, whose ladies also wear a head covering, have almost a zero divorce rate.

A hundred years ago, almost all denominations required a woman to wear a headcovering, at least to church. All of those denominations have experienced a significant increase in the divorce rate since they took the view that the headcovering is not important.

Compromise in beliefs in one area leads to compromise in other areas of Scriptural commands as well. When a Christian or a church explains away the need to follow the Bible in regards to the headcovering it becomes much easier to explain away the Scripture applying to divorce and remarriage. After all, the church is following the world in not wearing a headcovering and they are also following the world in saying that divorce and remarriage is permissible.

The divorce rate has increased so much in the church that today it is more likely for a person who attends a church to divorce and remarry than for a person who never goes to church and does not profess to be a Christian!

Why the woman's headcovering affects the divorce rate and why the headcovering is so important for today. The woman's headcovering has a much greater significance and importance than I realized. When I awoke early this morning, while I was still laying in bed, God gave me some new insights that showed me why the headcovering is so important for the church today.

In Malachi 2 God tells us the reason why He designed marriage and made a husband and wife one. It was because God wants their children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, great-great-grandchildren, and all the rest of their descendants to be Godly men and women after His heart. God is interested in our salvation, but He also is very much interested in the salvation of all the descendants of every Christian in the world. God wants ALL of our descendants to serve Him. When divorce occurs in a marriage, it often destroys the children spiritually. The chain of a Godly heritage is broken and the next generations are not taught to serve the Lord. Here is what God says:

Malachi 2:13-17 "And this have ye done again, covering the altar of the LORD with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth it with good will at your hand. 14 Yet ye say, Wherefore? Because the LORD hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. 15 And did not he make one? Yet had he the residue of the spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed. Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. 16 For the LORD, the God of Israel, saith that he hateth putting away: for one covereth violence with his garment, saith the LORD of hosts: therefore take heed to your spirit, that ye deal not treacherously. 17 Ye have wearied the LORD with your words. Yet ye say, Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the LORD, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?"

God desires for a husband and wife to produce children who will grow up to Godly men and women who will also produce children who will grow up to Godly men and women for generations to come. In order for a father and mother to produce Godly descendants for many generations, the father and mother have to be one, not divorced. In order for a father and mother to be one, there can't be two heads; they have to be a united unit. Because of Adam and Eve's sin, the

the tendency of women is to contend with men. Because of that bent in a woman's sin nature, God commands six times in the New Testament that women submit to their husbands.

Ephesians 5:22-24 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. 23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the savior of the body. 24 Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.

Ephesians 5:33 Nevertheless let every one of you in particular so love his wife even as himself; and the wife see that she reverence her husband.

Colossians 3:18 Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord.

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

Titus 2:4-5 That they may teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children, 5 To be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed.

1 Peter 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;

A woman's covered head is a reminder to her that God wants her to submit to her husband's leadership and not boss and nag him. She has to submit to her husband's leadership if they are to be one in their marriage. That doesn't mean that she has no input or say, she needs to. But there can be only one head of the home and God says in 1 Corinthians 11 that it is to be the husband.

1 Corinthians 11:3-5 But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. 4 Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. 5 But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven.

It is important for a wife to submit to her husband if they want to have Godly descendants for many generations. The wife models submission to their children. More is caught than taught verbally. Submission is an important lesson for every person to learn because each Godly Christian must submit to Christ's leadership and keep His commands. Disobedience to what God commands is sin and bars a person from entering heaven. God tells us "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." (1 Samuel 15:23) Christ is the head of man, and men must submit to Christ's leadership.

The importance of a woman wearing a headcovering and submitting to her husband's leadership and its affect on the divorce rate is greater than what you might think. Most people assume that generally husbands are the ones who instigated a divorce, but that is not correct. David Bercot in his book *The Kingdom that Turned the World Upside Down* on page 51, states that in research he has found, in the United States, 67% to 75% (varying by state) of all divorces are filed by women. In England, 70% of all divorces are filed by wives. But the percentage of divorces initiated by women is even worse than that when it comes to couples who own houses and have minor children. As an attorney examining land titles and reading the legal filings on several thousand divorce cases, Bercot's observation is that over 90% of those cases were initiated by the wives!

In the research paper "These Boots are Made for Walking: Why Most Divorce Filers Are Women," Margaret Brinig, Professor at University of Iowa, says that children are the most important asset in a marriage, and the partner who expects to get custody of the children is by far the most likely to file for divorce. Women are much more willing to file for divorce because they rarely fear losing custody of the children.

God knew all of this when He commanded women to submit to their husbands, to view their husband as their leader. In many marriages if the wife had submitted to her husband's leadership it would have prevented a divorce. God knew that Christian women needed a daily reminder to submit to their husband and not reject his leadership nor to divorce him.

You will note that God does not specify the style of headcovering that a woman must wear. The style is not what is important. Instead God puts the emphasis in 1 Corinthians 11 on the head being covered with something other than the woman's long hair. One mistake that the Mennonite church and the Amish have made with the headcovering is to specify a particular style of covering as the only valid one for the ladies to wear in their local church. The differences in headcoverings, the size, the shape, and the style be it ever so small between different Mennonite churches are used by Mennonites to evaluate the spiritual condition of those in a particular church. The people are then labeled as more liberal or conservative. This is wrong. It is not the style of headcovering that is important but that the headcovering be worn.

I believe that the reason God did not specify a particular headcovering is so that it could change with changes in society, not that a past culture be frozen in time like the Amish are doing. Women should feel attractive in wearing their headcovering, not like they are out of date. At the same time the headcovering needs to follow God's other instructions on dress that it not be elaborate. I believe that it is appropriate for a woman to wear a number of different styles, colors, etc. of headcoverings just like she wears different styles and colors of dresses or skirts and blouses. It is the covered head that is most important and the daily reminder to the lady that God wants her to submit to her husband.

The Christian woman's headcovering has a significant affect on the divorce rate. It drops the divorce rate very significantly. That is not to say that every marriage where the wife wears a headcovering will be permanent and not end in divorce, nor that every wife will always be submissive to her husband. Nor does it address the problems on the husband's side in the marriage. And we are not attempting to address all the causes of divorce, just the influence of the headcovering on the divorce rate. God gave the command for a Christian woman to cover her head for a reason. He knew she needed a daily reminder to submit to her husband's leadership and never seek a divorce.

God's desire is that each married couple be one so that they can establish the foundation for many Godly generations and that all their descendants will be men and women after God's heart. Hundreds of thousands of Christians have attempted to lay the foundations of many godly generations without following all of God's commands, including the headcovering. The experiment is over. Let's not continue that path any longer. We see the results and the consequences in large numbers of broken Christian homes, wayward children, lost grandchildren, and many apostate churches that are going through the religious motions of church worship each Sunday.

It is not enough to observe the headcovering and divorce situation and analyze things, and curse the darkness into which many have fallen. We must act and make the necessary changes. There is hope because we see the mistakes and know what to change. We do not know how soon Christ will return. If He doesn't return for another 200 years, each Christian family will have hundreds of descendants between now and then. Each father and mother is responsible to God to produce Godly offspring. What we need to do is lay and repair the foundation so that there will be many Godly generations.

A Christian woman wearing a headcovering, and using it as a reminder to submit to her husband's leadership, has many benefits. One is that she will be more likely to remain happily married the rest of her life. Her submission will make her more attractive to her husband and less likely for him to be attracted to other women. 1 Peter 3:3-5 "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."

Another benefit is that she has a greater chance of raising her children to be men and women after God's heart. Another benefit is that she shows her children by her example how to submit themselves to God's authority. And she has a greater chance of raising the foundation for many Godly generations and providing those descendants with a wonderful Godly heritage.

from: <http://www.biblicalresearchreports.com/the-effects-of-the-headcovering-on-divorce/>

Re: The Effects of _____ on Divorce by Myron Horst - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/13 8:52

Great article!

...except for the title.

It ought to be, "The Effects of Feminism on Divorce."

And each time headcovering is alluded to as the culprit, it should be replaced by the word feminism.

There are a number of countries whose divorce rate is low that have no clue about the headcovering.

Again, the culprit is the sin of feminism. All these other things are merely the symptoms of this disorder.

Re: , on: 2017/10/13 10:30

Yes and Muslim women are covered completely from head to toe. They certainly do not divorce their husbands. To do so they would be killed. Of course their husbands treat them like dirt. A Muslim who owns a horse regards his horse of greater value than his wife.

Brothers I think you're missing the point. The issue is not whether a woman is covered on her head that is leading her to divorce. The issue is her heart. Being that SI has a strong Calvinistic emphasis we should realize that the issue is the depravity of one's heart. The depravity of one's heart is found in man or woman. Consequently the depravity of one's heart will drive one to the divorce their spouse.

It is irrelevant whether one's head is covered or not as to whether they divorce their spouse. It's about as irrelevant as they having a wedding ring on one's finger or a wedding license. These are merely external representations of what should be an internal reality in the heart of an individual who marries in Christ. If a brother or a sister has decided that God has joined them to their mate. And if this commitment is in their heart. It matters very little as to whether the spouse is covered or not. If the heart is redeemed by Christ and joined to their helpmate. Then divorce is unthinkable. This is the heart of the Gospel. This is the transformation that takes place in one's heart after they have come to Christ.

Religion in its outward trappings does not bring about the holiness of one's heart. That is only done by the redeeming work of Christ in the work of the Holy Spirit. This is why Frank's article is right on when he poses the question is one a captive of the Holy Spirit or are they a captive of the organization. To put it another way are they a captive of religion.

God grant that we be captives of the Lord Jesus Christ. May we be bound to Him and not to the religion of man.

Posted by Blaine Scogin

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/10/13 17:21

Oh, please do not use the C-word (Calvinism) lest we get locked again.

I agree with the article, and I believe it is not the authors opinion that a piece of cloth can cure divorce.

Covering your head is a very small thing but it reveals a great deal of your hearts attitude. We husbands should feel honored when our wives voluntarily expresses their submission to us and God's order and that she has the moral strength to stand firm on the truth while others may scorn because they feel convicted.

About half the of the women in our fellowship cover their heads, some don't. I know I have to teach about at some point of time, but I also know I have to lay the right foundations before I can venture into this topic. Is anyone here who has advocated and introduced this successfully to a fellowship where it previously has not been practiced?

Re: The Effects of the Headcovering on Divorce by Myron Horst, on: 2017/10/13 18:27

The head covering is a very personal matter for me and in the past I was a member of an Anabaptist group. I have witnessed so-called sisters cover and profess to know Christ and then divorce. Now, interesting enough I do not know if Anabaptist sisters still cover after divorce and even after they remarry. Of course remarriage is rare among the Anabaptist, other than in very 'special' circumstances, e.g., the Holdeman Mennonites.

I also have met Hutterite brethren who came out of a commune/colony in Canada and experienced the New Birth through listening to old Charity Christian Fellowship tapes that were smuggled into the community. They stated that the bondage of Christian legalism, in their opinion, was far worse than bondage to heroine, drugs, sexual immorality, stealing, etc., because those who are NOT truly right with God can hide behind their religion, head covering, outward profession, etc.; however, in their heart they are sinning against a holy God. Of course we have examples in scriptures regarding the Pharisees and Sadducees: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within are full of dead people's bones and all uncleanness."

If the head covering is worn and embraced by a husband, wife and family then it MUST be led by the Holy Spirit and the Head of the husband and wife: i.e., Christ. However, should we abuse our liberty in Christ to wear the head covering to the point of causing our brothers and sisters in Christ to stumble? "But take care that this liberty of yours does not somehow become a stumbling block to the weak" (1 Cor. 8:9) (*please note, I am not purposely trying to take this verse out of context, I am open to correction from the Lord concerning my point).

I need God to break my wife and me until there is nothing left but Christ in us. We only have to answer to one person: Christ. May God truly bring us to the end of ourselves, so that His perfect will is done in us as it is in heaven.

"May the Lamb that was slain receive the reward of His suffering!" (Moravian bond-slaves of Jesus Christ the Lord).

Re: , on: 2017/10/13 18:29

I agree dear brother Blaine. And, I love my "Calvinistic" brothers, even though some might not like me too much. :)

Re: , on: 2017/10/13 21:06

Ken writes.....

"They stated that the bondage of Christian legalism, in their opinion, was far worse than bondage to heroine, drugs, sexual immorality, stealing, etc., because those who are NOT truly right with God can hide behind their religion, head covering, outward profession, etc.; however, in their heart they are sinning against a holy God. Of course we have examples in scriptures regarding the Pharisees and Sadducees: "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within are full of dead people's bones and all uncleanness."

Amen.....bro Frank

Re: The Effects of the Headcovering on Divorce by Myron Horst - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/10/14 14:15

Quote:

-----Why the woman's headcovering affects the divorce rate and why the headcovering is so important for today.

There are successful marriages that are not Christians but they are good people who make their marriages work no matter what.

There are successful marriages within Christianity but do not wear head coverings.

This guy is just preaching to his own choir, underpinning the belief system of it. That is just my opinion because in TN, I've met the most unkind women (toward me) that have head coverings. They judge me in jeans and no head covering with that "look" but we don't meet that often because we travel in different circles.

If and when there is another si conference, I hope to go but I also hope that the head covering people don't sit on one side of the church and the non on the other side.

Will there be any women there with pants on? That's a good question!! :) OR will there be rules about that?

God bless, just thinking out loud, bro greg,
Lisa

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/10/14 14:31

The problem is not with headcovering but legalism will find its expression through that what is outwardly recommendable without having the inward reality.

That will lead those who see their questionable testimony to reject their outward expressions. These people then discred it old hymns, King James bible, head covering, modest dress and the like. I sometimes come across people who grew up in fellowships where legalism was rampant. They think they have to counter it with tolerance and liberty or even license. They recoil at anything to do with these outward signs. This is very sad.

Headcovering in it self does not have to defend itself, it will never be a stumbling block in itself. Legalism is the stumbling block.

Legalism draws a caricature of godly things and drives immature people to counter it with license.

Matthew 23:23 Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

Jesus did not find fault with fasting twice a week or tithing spices, contrariwise he said: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2017/10/14 17:50

Wow! To think that head-coverings is still a relevant issue. It is! But not as an item in itself. Let me explain:

Recently I gathered up a few old fashion hats, pretty lace gloves, and costume jewelry from the attic of an elderly woman. I had my granddaughters put them on so I could take a picture of them posing like ladies of the past. They posed all right, but like the flattery sexy fashion models of today - not at all like the delicate "proper" ladies of the past. I encouraged the girls to tie their hair back in a bun, cover their shoulders, and sit up straight with their hands on their lap - to look authentic. They balked, and commented on how restrictive it must have been in the past.

In other words, this is far more than anything about outer attire, or what parts of the body needs more covering. It's about habits of presenting oneself which is deeply culturally conditioned.

I've been "round the mountain" with the attempts at making rules for women (which always feels demeaning) - and have concluded that the best way to train up young folk is model and teach the law of love: To consider other people's interests, respect one another, etc. When they respect others, they will gain habits of graciousness. That will affect their choices for attire, speech - with sensitivity to the social, religious, or domestic setting they find themselves in.

It starts with the experience of God's sacrificial love in their own lives - to gain self-respect. You can't respect others until you know your value as a human being made in God's image, whom Christ died for. Just think how important that is in preserving a marriage!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2017/10/14 17:57

Quote:

----- Legalism draws a caricature of godly things and drives immature people to counter it with license.

Well put!!

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2017/10/14 22:26

Savannah said:

...except for the title.

It ought to be, "The Effects of Feminism on Divorce."

And each time headcovering is alluded to as the culprit, it should be replaced by the word feminism.

There are a number of countries whose divorce rate is low that have no clue about the headcovering.

Again, the culprit is the sin of feminism. All these other things are merely the symptoms of this disorder.

I would go farther. Missing headcoverings on women in our culture results in a high divorce rate might possibly be one of the most creative oversimplifications one could make on the subject of divorce.

Savannah was right on the money, but this oversimplification in the O.P misses the real culprit which is feminism and godless rebellion towards male authority built into the female Psyche from the outset of their childhood.

Add to this the feminization of the male and the cultural approval of male-browbeating from females turns all upside down in a short time. Women are God designed to link with Males for family and childbirth, but all it is short-circuited when the feminist whores her way through life, pretending to put men in their place while the philandering man puts her in his bed to exploit her feminism by getting what he wants sexually and she gets to say triumphantly "I did it my way".

All of this nonsense is carried straight into the Church and delivered straight to the pastors and elders where the more rash forms of feminism are put to silence and the silent subtle forms are left to stand uncontested.

There is a lot to be said on this subject but headcoverings is probably the silliest way to approach repentance toward male leadership I've seen.

Is there no one that can muster the courage to deal with feminism and cowardly male leadership in the home?

Let me give you a Marvin-litmus test...take this recipe to your church and dip it in the Pastors "idea box" Suggest that he deal with women in rebellion to their husbands, male authority and failing to submit to authority. Then offer a series of meetings designed to address the area of feminism and its failure to keep the family safe from the harmful effects of disharmony and strife and replace it with a godly order.

Put this up right next to the same short series for men on avoiding and overcoming pornography.

If the females cannot overcome feminism, there is no sense in asking the males to turn from pornography for if the female can keep her sin, the male can keep his.

Does this sound godly? No not in a million years, but and I say a big but...this is exactly the sort of compromise and deal-making that is going on behind closed doors in the congregation. Have a look at the prevalence of dealing with males on pornography and look at the mere pittance of sermons or articles dealing with feminism, female subjection to males, godly order, patterning yourself after Sarah and other various texts in Titus 2.

I agree to in-spirit with the need for female subjection and submission to authority for a godly and orderly home, I do not agree that holiness buns will have the slightest effect in bringing an end to feminism. Holiness buns are something worn long after the issue of feminism has been put to death in the woman's heart just like pornography is long dead once submission to the Lord our bodies and repentance from coveting for male pleasure has occurred.

But again allow me to be the thorn in every churches shoe. The normative pastor will not address it for two reasons. 1. The pocketbook will be hit because when the woman writes the offering/tithe check she will vote against the leadership with her money. The Church budget will feel it and that all the way to the salary of the leaders. 2. An exodus of women pushing their husbands to get out from those mean, authoritarian, legalist, hostile, anti-women, anti-equality misogynists in charge over there. "how can you tolerate that talk about me like that"? she will say.

If the pastor succumbs to this, you can know for certain that no holiness bun will ever give the pastor the courage to confront this devil that roams freely in most big-church ministries and surely in every man-who-is-in-charge-by-permission-of-their-wife leading those churches.

So, if you want change I say deal with the real devil and leave the idea of resolving serious problems to those who will deal seriously with those problems.

Re: Declaration of Feminism - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/15 20:44

Here's the connection in their own words;

"The right to birth control, abortion and divorce should be recognized. (Humanist Manifesto II)

“The end of the institution of marriage is a necessary condition for the liberation of women. Therefore, it is important for us to encourage women to leave their husbands and not to live individually with men.” (Declaration of Feminism, c a. 1971)

Much more evidence could be brought forward, but maybe it would be best left at this and another thread begun on the F word.

And...thanks Marvin that you saw fit to "go farther".

Re: , on: 2017/10/15 23:36

Dear saints:

Feminism and not wearing the head covering might both be two of many outward symptoms of the man not being the head of the home, the spiritual examples God called/created him to be in Christ and not leading and providing an example to women to follow as he follows Christ.

The scriptures declare to the man:

"25 Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her, 26 that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, 27 so that he might present the church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish. 28 In the same way husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself. 29 For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ does the church, 30 because we are members of his body. 31 “Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and hold fast to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.” 32 This mystery is profound, and I am saying that it refers to Christ and the church. 33 However, let each one of you love his wife as himself, and let the wife see that she respects her husband" (Eph. 5).

Also:

"1 Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ.

2 Now I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I delivered them to you. 3 But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God" (1 Cor. 11).

"7 Likewise, husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way, showing honor to the woman as the weaker vessel, since they are heirs with you of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered" (1 Peter 3).

Is not the man the overseer of the home/family, the workplace and the local body of Christ?

"1 The saying is trustworthy: If anyone aspires to the office of overseer, he desires a noble task. 2 Therefore an overseer must be above reproach, the husband of one wife, sober-minded, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach, 3 not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. 4 He must manage his own household well, with all dignity keeping his children submissive, 5 for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how will he care for God's church? 6 He must not be a recent convert, or he may become puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil. 7 Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, so that he may not fall into disgrace, into a snare of the devil" (1 Tim. 3).

Does not the man of God need to have a pure heart to provide examples for the women and if he fails then what is the result?

"Tradition and Commandment

1 Then some Pharisees and scribes came to Jesus from Jerusalem and said, 2 "Why do Your disciples break the tradition of the elders? For they do not wash their hands when they eat bread." 3 And He answered and said to them, "Why do you yourselves transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition? 4 "For God said, 'HONOR YOUR FATHER AND MOTHER,' and, 'HE WHO SPEAKS EVIL OF FATHER OR MOTHER IS TO BE PUT TO DEATH.' 5 "But you say, 'Whoever says to his father or mother, "Whatever I have that would help you has been given to God," 6 he is not to honor his father or his mother.' And by this you invalidated the word of God for the sake of your tradition. 7 "You hypocrites, rightly did Isaiah prophesy of you:

"THIS PEOPLE HONORS ME WITH THEIR LIPS,
BUT THEIR HEART IS FAR AWAY FROM ME.

"BUT IN VAIN DO THEY WORSHIP ME,
TEACHING AS DOCTRINES THE PRECEPTS OF MEN."

10 After Jesus called the crowd to Him, He said to them, "Hear and understand. 11 "It is not what enters into the mouth that defiles the man, but what proceeds out of the mouth, this defiles the man."

12 Then the disciples came and said to Him, "Do You know that the Pharisees were offended when they heard this statement?" 13 But He answered and said, "Every plant which My heavenly Father did not plant shall be uprooted. 14 "Let them alone; they are blind guides of the blind. And if a blind man guides a blind man, both will fall into a pit." 15 "Every plant which My heavenly Father did not plant shall be uprooted. 14 "Let them alone; they are blind guides of the blind. And if a blind man guides a blind man, both will fall into a pit."

The Heart of Man

15 Peter said to Him, "Explain the parable to us." 16 Jesus said, "Are you still lacking in understanding also? 17 "Do you not understand that everything that goes into the mouth passes into the stomach, and is eliminated? 18 "But the things that proceed out of the mouth come from the heart, and those defile the man. 19 "For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, slanders. 20 "These are the things which defile the man; but to eat with unwashed hands does not defile the man" (Matt. 15).

Could God's Righteous Judgment be allowing feminism because of the failure of men to walk with the Father and follow Christ and His commandments?

"1 Therefore you have no excuse, O man, every one of you who judges. For in passing judgment on another you condemn yourself, because you, the judge, practice the very same things. 2 We know that the judgment of God rightly falls on those who practice such things. 3 Do you suppose, O man, you who judge those who practice such things and yet do not condemn yourself, that you will escape the judgment of God? 4 Or do you presume on the riches of his kindness and forbearance and patience, not knowing that God's kindness is meant to lead you to repentance? 5 But because of your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath when God's righteous judgment will be revealed" (Rom. 2).

Yes Father, I have failed to be an example to women in following Christ, in being holy in my whole manner of life and I have caused them to stumble. God have mercy on me a sinner, I repent, forgive me, break me, transform me into the image of your Son and let your will be done in me as it is done in heaven.

KM

Re: The Effects of the Headcovering on Divorce by Myron Horst - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/10/16 1:42

Looking at the scriptures where Jesus speaks of divorce I have to ask: is divorce a sin or is having sexual relations with someone after a divorce (which is adultery because you have already joined yourself to a woman/man and a court order ed paper does not annul that spiritual principal) actually the sin?

Im ready for the hate but go please look at the scriptures and see what they say, if i'm wrong please show me where

Re: , on: 2017/10/16 6:31

Tyler writes...

â€¢â€¢â€¢

Im ready for the hate but go

â€¢â€¢â€¢

Is it possible the hate being described here is a hatred of women. One wonders when I look at the spirit of this thread.

Blaine

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2017/10/16 7:05

Quote:
-----Looking at the scriptures where Jesus speaks of divorce I have to ask: is divorce a sin or is having sexual relations with someone af
ter a divorce (which is adultery because you have already joined yourself to a woman/man and a court ordered paper does not annul that spiritual prin
cipal) actually the sin?

Brother,

This is actually correct and is what the Scriptures speak of and the Early Church believed. Only during the reformation th
ere were a "few" exceptions and after that in the modern times there has been a losing of this doctrine and full allowance
under the premise of "grace."

I personally believe God knows every situation but the general rule is that it is sin an disobeying God's will. Once people
come to terms with this and repent they must ask the Lord what to do if "restitution" a leaving of the party is required. G
od will make this clear.

Just imagine 100 years ago remarried was almost unheard of in the Church and divorce much less seldomn then today.
And homosexuals hid and if they flaunted in public or caught in the act they were arrested. How times have changed.

Quote:
-----Is it possible the hate being described here is a hatred of women. One wonders when I look at the spirit of this thread.

Blaine, that seems like an outlandish comment, how do you justify that?

Re: feminism has crept in unawares - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/16 7:31

"Blaine, that seems like an outlandish comment, how do you justify that?"

You've just been introduced to the spirit of feminism!

Blaine, as Eve in the garden was, is under the spell. That is the only explanation of such an outlandish comment. Now, what is even worse, he will add more sin as he in his stupor attempts to justify himself and defend his comment.

When it is as clear as day to all other readers of this thread that there's absolutely no "hatred of women...in the spirit of this thread."

I knew this spirit would not be able to be silent, because this F spirit roams about seeking to devour.

Many have succumbed to this seductive spirit already.

As Ahab's wife Jezebel, many have joined themselves to the worship of the goddess Ashtoreth.

Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/10/16 9:30

Blaine that's not what I meant by hate. What I mentioned about the scriptures and divorce isn't commonly taught and thus isn't always well accepted. That's all brother.

Greg, I had no idea that was the standard practice until the "reformation". Thanks for sharing that!

Re: , on: 2017/10/16 10:16

â€¢â€¢â€¢

Blaine, that seems like an outlandish comment, how do you justify that?

â€¢â€¢â€¢

Is my comment any more outlandish than to suggest a woman wearing the head covering is less likely to divorce her husband. Muslims can make the same claim about their wives. Their wives are covered head to foot. Yet for a Muslim woman to divorce her husband she would be put to death. But yet a man is free in Islam to divorce any one of his four wives.

What is coming forth in this thread is the spirit of religion and all of its ugly forms. There is no gospel centrality or cross of Christ being displayed here.

The Lord Jesus Christ has a higher view of women than some of our evangelical brethren. But then Jesus never subscribed to a religious system.

Blaine

Re: - posted by Martyr (), on: 2017/10/16 11:44

Re: - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/16 13:21

Please note who is named in this article as the culprits who "...fought for divorce reform in which couples that wanted to divorce, could do so in the absence of any grounds for divorce."

History of Divorce in America Overview

Historically, divorces were only granted in very special circumstances and in early American history, couples found it very difficult to be granted a divorce. In fact, there were existed strict rules and regulations in place that often forbid spouses from filing for divorce. When couples were allowed a divorce, court orders were often ignored, and many women were left destitute by divorce due to their inability to collect marital property or spousal support. Generally, divorce was only granted on the grounds of extreme cases of spousal cruelty and even then, proof was required to back up any allegations. Couples had to explicitly prove that one spouse had been guilty of an extreme violation of the marital contract.

The proof required was also very definitive and it was often impossible for spouses to prove accusations, in the absence of committing perjury. One spouse had to be found guilty of violations such as abuse, infidelity or extreme cruelty. However, many couples hoping to reach a divorce settlement found that neither spouse was in fact guilty of such actions nor either could not be granted a divorce or had to commit perjury in order to get divorced.

Many judges, lawmakers, and feminist groups, fought for divorce reform in which couples that wanted to divorce, could do so in the absence of any grounds for divorce. Many people believed that spouses were entitled to divorce, simply because they wanted to do so. Eventually, couples were able to be granted a divorce in the absence of accusations and blame. No fault divorces allowed couples to divorce simply because they found that they could not be happy if they were forced to remain married. In early America, the divorce rate was less than 5%.

NOTE ABOVE: 'FEMINIST GROUPS'

Again, the proof is in history records as well. While some would cry misogyny, misogyny, the facts point to misandry, misandry!

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/10/16 15:36

Quote:
-----by Greg
Just imagine 100 years ago remarried was almost unheard of in the Church and divorce much less seldom then today. And homosexuals hid and if they flaunted in public or caught in the act they were arrested. How times have changed.

It's so easy to lump all women together down through the ages but 100 years ago (and earlier), divorce was unheard of because women were the "property" of men and everything that had been bequeathed to them became their husbands. If they did leave their husband, they had to literally leave everything, land, money and children. So yes, it was unheard of inside or outside of the church.

I'm sure men (own through the ages) that actually loved their wives as Christ loved the Church KEPT their wives as they do today.

God loves women just as much as He loves men. There is so much that goes into this conversation that is not feminism, if anyone is willing to have that conversation.

God bless,
Lisa

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2017/10/16 15:57

by Lysa on 2017/10/16 12:36:52

Quote:
-----by Greg
Just imagine 100 years ago remarried was almost unheard of in the Church and divorce much less seldom then today. And homosexuals hid and if they flaunted in public or caught in the act they were arrested. How times have changed.

It's so easy to lump all women together down through the ages but 100 years ago (and earlier), divorce was unheard of because women were the "property" of men and everything that had been bequeathed to them became their husbands. If they did leave their husband, they had to literally leave everything, land, money and children. So yes, it was unheard in side or outside of the church.

I'm sure men (own through the ages) that actually loved their wives as Christ loved the Church KEPT their wives as they do today.

God loves women just as much as He loves men. There is so much that goes into this conversation that is not feminism, if anyone is willing to have that conversation.

God bless,
Lisa

Greetings Lisa

You are right in saying there is much more to this conversation that is not feminism. I would be willing to have that conversation with you but honestly I feel almost like we would be labeled as a feminist by some just for not agreeing with them .

God Bless
maryjane

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2017/10/16 19:06

Hi Mary Jane and Lisa:

Please consider a few things.

1. If what I have said causes you to take issue with me, please feel free to express that and not feel there's an attack or a "labeling" coming your way.
2. In my dealings with any "ism" that doctrinally and in practice subverts clear scripture teaching I hit it pretty hard and so me might feel in attacking that "ism" they are under attack themselves. My post was not to imply all Christian women are feminists or that feminism can be attached to any Christian women who is confident, assertive or intelligent enough to have an opinion and stick to it.
3. Feminism as I addressed it is a subvert-er of home and Jesus Church as a foreign ideology to Christian doctrine.
4. As Bro Blaine mentioned he felt that the thread was proceeding in an ugly religious way, devoid of gospel centeredness. If you perceive what I am saying as lacking gospel-centeredness please offer correction and I will gladly review my wording; for my intent is always gospel-centeredness and in a spirit of grace and love toward my brothers and sister in Christ.

Over the years of posting on websites like this one, dealing with feminism or womens issues can turn women sour toward the discussion when men are harsh against "women" who practice it. Those women get defensive and/or become offended or insulted (sometimes warranted). This issue and a mans proper love and respect for his wife and his Christ-like manner that should be expressed toward her dove-tail together, one cannot be discussed without the other.

It is obvious that feminism attacked can appear to be 'women bashing' because feminism is a woman's ideology designed for usage by women. Feminism held by men is an ideology that suits the mans particular political perspective or fits his

own sexual-based liberties knowing that garnering favor with the feminist gains him ground to get what he wants. Feminism and Male pragmatism are bed-partners in our society.

I pray that my sisters in Christ who endorse this kind of thinking put it away as they would any other kind of foreign thinking which is contrary to scripture.

But...this is where the rub lies. What constitutes feminism in a Christian woman and what constitutes her God-given gifts, perspectives and directions that put her exactly in the will of God and diametrically opposed to male-tradition or male-stupidity (in all its forms) so the woman can and should make her case and know God has ordained it?

This has not at all been explored and if you want to start a new thread on it...since I've probably gone to far and derailed this head-covering thread into a completely different issue. I would be happy to respond and listen to what you have to say.

Re: signs - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/16 20:50

Signs are very helpful, I think all would agree.

The sign on the side of the the road reads, "Men at Work".

The spirit of feminism cannot read such signs without wanting to change them. As I drove through the 'work zone' I noticed several women getting their hands dirty along with the men there.

What's wrong with this picture?

It's no different in this thread.

But the feminist spirit sees nothing wrong with this picture, and takes even more offense to the comparison I am making.

But that woman who is precious in His sight, is of a meek and quiet spirit, and has no spirit in her to enter into the ring. She's too busy going about her God-given responsibilities as a woman, and setting an example for the younger women as well.

But this present world is so anarchical that the speech in this thread is viewed as hate speech. It's so far gone, it's like the couple I saw walking down the street the other day holding hands. The guy had beautiful long silky hair, was wearing tight pants, and had glamorous earrings dangling from his ears. The girl had a crew cut, ripped jeans along with some rugged boots, and tattoos all over her muscular arms which were exposed because of the muscle shirt she was wearing.

I'm not exaggerating! Nor am I exaggerating regarding this F spirit which is rampant in the world, and even in the church world.

Thanks for not taking offense ladies!

Ladies against feminism (a website), who are truly ladies worthy of respect, know real men when they encounter them, and certainly will not be of the wicked Jezebel spirit and be angry and try to muzzle and emasculate or manipulate the men of God who are called to be just that, men of God.

And for the ones who will write me off as a male chauvinist or a misogynist, please watch this trailer and get yourself a DVD copy of it if you can. Because this documentary does a very good job at showing what true manliness is, the manliness I am promoting as I decry feminism in this thread.

<https://youtu.be/g5FULJ57PeU>

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/10/17 3:16

Quote:

-----by maryjane

Greetings Lisa

You are right in saying there is much more to this conversation that is not feminism. I would be willing to have that conversation with you but honestly I feel almost like we would be labeled as a feminist by some just for not agreeing with them.

You have been proved to be honestly right!! :) :) :)

God bless,
Lisa

Re: The Effects of the Headcovering on Divorce by Myron Horst - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/24 0:25

Myron Horst is right: divorce becomes commonplace when people regard the application of I Corinthians 11 as irrelevant

My heritage is Anabaptist and currently we are part of the Biblical Mennonite Alliance. My husband and I were both brought up being taught one should obey scripture and accept it as the authentic Word of God. However, in time we have kin folks who have decided otherwise and their lives today are a mess - every time, no exceptions. Not only that, even if they are "decent" (and there are a few) many family lines are coming to an end - children don't marry, have no children or if they do they are caught up in the cycle of rebellious youth with unwed singles having babies. Little spirituality. Every once in a while you hear of a person who is hearing the voice of the Holy Spirit and is making an attempt to live for the LORD but it is rare.

I will suggest that wearing a head covering is an act of obedience that may make little sense to many but I suspect God uses it to test people's level of obedience, just like he did when he told Adam and Eve to not eat from the tree. Disobedience came with an awful price and this is the point Horst is making.

Thanks for sharing this article, Greg.

Sandra

Re: Ginnyrose - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/24 4:00

Sandra,

Are you saying that Christian women who do not wear head coverings have sinned like Adam and Eve?

I absolutely respect the practice in your denomination of women wearing head coverings.

I am NOT against it. But I do not practise it myself.

This fact remains:

There ARE many godly Christian women who do not wear head coverings who are hungry for Christ, who are pressing on to gain Christ, and, whose marriages have *** NOT *** failed.

This is indisputedly the higher obedience:

Ps. 51:6 -- Behold, You desire truth in the innermost being, And in the hidden part You will make me know wisdom.

This is also the Word of God:

John 4:23-24 -- But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for such people the Father seeks to be His worshipers. God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.

This is the truth of our sanctification:

1 Cor. 1:30-31 -- But by His doing you are in Christ Jesus, who became to us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption, so that, just as it is written, "LET HIM WHO BOASTS, BOAST IN THE LORD."

And Paul also said this:

Col. 2:9-17 -- "For in Him all the fullness of Deity dwells in bodily form, and in Him you have been made complete, and He is the head over all rule and authority; and in Him you were also circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, in the removal of the body of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with Him in baptism, in which you were also raised up with Him through faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead. When you were dead in your transgressions and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He made you alive together with Him, having forgiven us all our transgressions, having canceled out the certificate of debt consisting of decrees against us, which was hostile to us; and He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross. When He had disarmed the rulers and authorities, He made a public display of them, having triumphed over them through Him. Therefore no one is to act as your judge in regard to food or drink or in respect to a festival or a new moon or a Sabbath day-- things which are a mere shadow of what is to come; but the substance belongs to Christ."

Col. 3:10 -- "put on the new self who is being renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created him-- a renewal in which Christ is all, and in all."

I genuinely respect all Christian women who choose to wear head coverings. It has its place and its significance.

But holy also are all Christian women who do not wear head coverings but are pressing on to put on Christ and are worshipping God in spirit and in truth. (Gal. 3:26-27, Col. 3:10-11; John 4:23-24).

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/24 13:52

BranchinVINE ,

QUOTE:

Are you saying that Christian women who do not wear head coverings have "sinned" like Adam and Eve?"

To answer your question: "I do not know."

But how do you know it isn't?

Will unveiled females get to heaven? I do not know. However, if I were to cut my hair and go without it would be sin because Bro. James informs us in 4:17 "that if know to do good and doeth it not to him it is sin." So is wearing the head covering a good thing or not? And why so?

My opinion is that there are deeper issues at stake apart from the literal wearing of a head covering that needs to be addressed. I know that wearing one will not guarantee one's entrance into heaven.

Still, why the opposition to it? No one has ever answered this question to my satisfaction. Got some mocking, hostility but no good answer in my opinion.

Sandra

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/24 15:47

BranchinVINE,

In regard to the OP where Mr. Horst declares that abandoning the wearing of the head covering will lead to acceptance of divorce and remarriage...let me share something based on observation.

I am 70 years old, was raised in a large Mennonite community, specifically, Elkhart Co., IN - home to thousands of Mennonites of all flavors and Goshen College.

If one lives long enough you accumulate a lot of memories, OK?

I want to use Goshen College as a reference point for what follows.

Back in the 1950s the coeds at GC wore coverings, abbreviated, perhaps, but they were worn. Not long after they were discarded because they considered it nonessential. In the meantime, GC got very much involved in social programs where they eventually abandoned Biblical non-resistance and embraced pacifism instead. They have also gotten involved in the political process holding political offices in the area.

Goshen College has become the bastion of liberalism in the Mennonite Church - whatever is considered liberal by anyone will find support for it there. Unrepentant homosexuals and lesbians are not only welcomed and appreciated they are promoted to church leadership.

Conservative people in the area consider GC a serious thorn in the flesh....it is so serious some Mennonite Churches have removed the name Mennonite off their church signs. GC is viewed with sadness and disdain by serious Believers in the community.

It can be argued successfully that its decline began when the educators took a low view of the absolute authority of the Word - in fact, it was because of this issue it was closed down at one point in time, back in the 1920s, I think. In time this philosophy prevailed upon the campus and consequently the student body. The abandonment of the head covering seems to put it on fast track to embrace other perversions. It is hard for me to comprehend the slide into apostasy at Goshen because I well recall the ladies there wearing a head covering.

Today the devil is working hard to discourage Mennonite/Anabaptist women from wearing a head covering. Some of the reasons are:

1. Do not want to look different from the rest of society - am too embarrassed.
2. There are a lot of wonderful "christian" ladies out there with a wonderful testimony and they do not wear a headcovering so why do I have to?
3. Men are ashamed to be seen with a woman properly veiled.

In face of this, there are many who are very active in missions and the LORD has been using them mightily, or so it seems. Now the philosophy of experience superseeds the validity, authority of the WORD.

This is the process of decline that has happened and is happening in the Mennonite church.

I must say this, too. The seminary at Elkhart and Goshen had produced some great Mennonite theologians, like J.C. Wenger - whose writings are still held in high regard - and others. Mennonites as a group have been at the forefront in rendering humanitarian aid to the oppressed people, beginning with Russian Mennonites who were fleeing communism back in the 1920-30s. In the meantime, we had wonderful revivals in our communities, some that would rival Billy Graham in fervor and intensity. Parochial schools were started as well as other Bible Schools. We were taught well, God bless those men who had a passion for the LORD. I am a product of this level of education and I am extremely grateful for it. However, what is happening now is that in dealing with sin - particularly immorality - people are resorting to 'counseling'. Evangelistic meetings are giving way to a prosperity gospel and it is separating the sheep from the goats. And the women are once again wearing an abbreviated style of head coverings to abandoning them altogether. Divorced and remarried persons are welcomed; and I expect in time unrepentant perverts will be welcomed too. This decline is awakening concerned people where they are abandoning the liberal voices that are promoting apostasy within their ranks.

This is what happens to a culture that was given to serve the LORD but listened to the challenging voice of the devil. The cycle of revival and apostasy is similar to what happened to God's people in the OT era.

Sad. Many grieve over what has become of the Mennonite church at large.

Sandra

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/24 15:50

But Sandra you seem to be saying that not wearing a head covering causes divorce, as if it is some sort of a magic charm.

Unless I am misunderstanding.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/24 19:01

Todd,

In our church history it has happened that its (divorce) frequency increases when the wearing of head coverings is abandoned. The head covering is NOT a good luck charm that will ward off divorce. There is a mindset that is operative in this obedience that has far reaching repercussions. We women wear it out of obedience to the Lord, recognizing Him as the head of Believers. Doing so will empower us in ways we are at times left guessing but the blessings is that we do benefit from the ministry of angels of the which we do not fully understand. And also, we recognize we are to submit to our husband which is a dirty word as far as feminists are concerned. And it may well be this is the answer for your question.

I Corinthians 11 also teaches us a veiled woman will have power on her head....now this is a different matter, or is it? What power do we have? One of them just may well be to have the ability to have stable marriages...

Are all females who wear a head covering automatically submissive? No. We have to deal with self-will and bring it under the LORDship of Jesus-it is not automatic but something that we need to work on all the time. It does not preclude one from walking with the LORD.

The blessings are great. For one it gives us many opportunities to witness for our LORD because strangers will ask us about it. Sometimes strangers will come up with a prayer request for something that troubles them. Why do they think our prayers are more effective than theirs?

I stick out like a sore thumb in a crowd, but I do not care....If done for the LORD Jesus why should I be embarrassed? He was hung on a cross (naked?) for my sins and that is far worse than what he asks me to do.

Sandra

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/24 19:10

Are you saying that if a non covering believer starts covering that spiritual "empowerment" is imparted to her?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2017/10/24 19:27

Sandra: Well said, thanks for the Mennonite info.

I would love to see women wear head coverings and this would be taught world-wide. But as I said in an earlier post (a rant so I probably came off wrong) that feminism kills anything like this and it's my opinion that if head coverings were to be the norm, feminism would have to die in the hearts of women.

It is no surprise to me to see those women who are most in rebellion to marriage and godly order have butch-cut hair. Just an observation nothing more.

I appreciate your candor and a wonderful explanation.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/24 22:04

What does I Corinthians 11 teach?

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

V. 10:Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels. NASB

It has been my observation that when females get a hold of this truth, fear is displaced with TRUST in an Almighty God who cares for her well-being. I am convinced too many females who cover have no clue about this reality. My opinion.

What do these verses teach you?

Sandra

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/25 7:23

//What do these verses teach you?//

That Paul wanted the Corinthian women to abide by the customs of respectable women in their day and culture, which were generally in line with the principle of patriarchy. He does not give details about the custom, since these were well-known to his readers. This lack of detail makes it difficult, if not impossible, for us modern Christians to know exactly how we might duplicate the Greek practice. We have discussed this topic here before, but my opinion is that such imitation is not required today. In view of the corrupt and immodest styles of our own culture, with reference to headcoverings, it might be advisable for Christians to agree among themselves to honor their own "countercultural" standards of dress, possibly including some form of veiling of women. Except as such standards were essential to modesty, however, this would have to be regarded as voluntary and could not be pressed on the basis of Paul's teaching in I Corinthians 11.

Re: Ginnyrose - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/25 7:52

Reply tomorrow.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/25 8:15

Marvin,

The wearing of a head covering used to be done by Christian women everywhere. It has been only in the recent 60 years that it has been abandoned by Protestants and Evangelicals. If you look at pictures of church gatherings before then you will see females wearing hats in the church house. Back in the 1800s females began embellishing their hats much to the chagrin of some preachers. If you ever take a tour of Williamsburg, VA, a restored colonial town, take a note how the actors dress - they wear period costumes and the ladies wear pretty caps! The difference lies in the fact that Mennonites/Amish maintained it longer than other church groups. The reason for this is because historically Anabaptists were persecuted by the popular church so they banded together for mutual support with the result of being counter-cultural longer than other groups who worked to be acceptable to mainstream society.

Some will suggest that the rise of feminism gave way to frequent divorces and there is no doubt a correlation. The tragedy is that it is not all women's fault, either. There was a lot of abuse directed towards females by ungodly men and thus feminism went off the rails. In essence, when men and women want and work to have their own way at the expense of the other and their family you will have unresolved conflicts that make divorce an easy way out. Self-centeredness is being taught, parents promote it and they end up in utter chaos. A servant mindset is scorned and rejected because it does not promote self.

Sandra

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/25 9:22

I think this whole thing is classic example of the "post hoc ergo propter hoc" logical fallacy.

Per Wikipedia the form of the post hoc fallacy is expressed as follows:

A occurred, then B occurred.

Therefore, A caused B.

When B is undesirable, this pattern is often combined with the formal fallacy of denying the antecedent, assuming the logical inverse holds: Avoiding A will prevent B.

In the case at hand:

Women stopped wearing head coverings. Divorces increased.

Therefore not wearing headcoverings causes divorce.

Wearing head coverings will decrease divorces.

The fallacy lies in a conclusion based solely on the order of events, rather than taking into account other factors potentially responsible for the result that might rule out the connection.

A simple example:

The rooster crows immediately before sunrise; therefore the rooster causes the sun to rise.

Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2017/10/25 10:18

Brother Todd,

I totally get what you're saying and concur with your point, though couldn't it be that it's the result of and not the cause?

If I'm understanding sister Sandra correctly, the disuse of headcoverings is reflective of a heart disposition whereby when cultural compromise entered in from an ungodly source (the world) then the loss of a godly feminism was observed to progressively consume the symbols of said godliness. So due to the misuse of their authority, men unwittingly introduced a contextual framework that according to the prevailing cultural movement of the day actually affected the cultural revolt and opened the door of the church to the ungodly influence. This, as has been noted, was not limited to but included the disuse of headcoverings along with the adoptions of several other aspects of women's liberation. I maintain that it was a most precious opportunity for the church to shine brightly and we (men) failed miserably to see it and conformed not to Christ but to the world. In doing so we have ushered in a period of cultural reformation into the church the effects of which have yet to cease.

At the end of the day it's a matter of being satisfied with and in Christ.... if one is satisfied then whether male or female we aren't looking for attention thru objectification which is what I observe to prevail today both within and without the church. The truth is we should be and look different from the world because we have the peace that comes from knowing Him and that will naturally be reflected in all aspects of our lives, yes even down to something as innocuous as headcoverings though if this is not the result of a satisfied heart then it is an external observance that is nothing more than an attempt to gain godliness thru the flesh.

Post script-

Sister Sandra, though I've said it before I'd like to say again- I am in debt to the grace God has given you as yet again you are exemplary of a faithfulness rarely seen and not only are you easy to love, the wisdom of your experience and witness is a blessing to me :)

Re: , on: 2017/10/25 10:25

Brethren I certainly see that the head covering is Biblical as taught by 1st Corinthians 11. But then so is baptism. I only wish to point out that the head covering, baptism, and even the Lord's supper or simply symbolic obedience of what should have taken place in our hearts. Our hearts must be changed by the Lord Jesus Christ Uniden word reality. Does the external Obedience of the head covering or baptism or the Lord's Supper become much more meaningful.

If our hearts have not been changed internally by the Holy Spirit. Then the outward obedience is merely nothing more than a just religious external reflecting no internal reality of the heart. That internal reality being Jesus dwelling in our hearts.

Hope this makes sense.

Bro Blaine

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2017/10/25 10:36

Greetings

I will admit this thread has been a difficult one for me as I have felt as though the original post was placing the blame of divorces on women because they do not cover their heads. At first I felt offended but then as I prayed on it more I realized I had no reason to be. It was only because of self that I was choosing to allow myself to become offended and I repented of that heart. I did post before to this thread but did so in fear. Fear of being seen as a feminist and said so in my post. As I read some of the other posts I was surprised at the emotion I felt was behind them. Again I have been praying about this and realize perhaps it was possible I was assigning an emotions to others post because of how I was feeling, emotions that might not have ever been there. Again I am reminded how easily I can be offended if my focus is on self and not JESUS!

After much prayer and consideration I would like to respectfully share my heart on this. My trouble with this article is the emphasis on externals and not ones daily walk with CHRIST. If the heart is not willing to submit to JESUS as LORD in all things then it matters little if one covers their head or not. At the root cause of marriages coming to an end is individuals living for "self" and not for CHRIST and thereby sinning. Self, self promotion, self love and self living is at the root of why you see so many divorces today. This attitude that I matter more than my husband and what I want is more important all comes down to sin in ones heart and self. If it were as simple as covering our heads than you would see no divorce among women who practice head covering and that is not the case. (Nor do I believe anyone was suggesting that just to be clear :)

I do think the topic of feminism and the attitudes of modern feminism do feed into self for both men and women. The desire to rule one's own life and not live daily unto CHRIST is evident in those deceived by much of today's world thinking and teachings.

Honestly as I have said before I have no issue with those who choose to follow what GOD is showing them in this area of cover their heads. I believe if they feel compelled by FATHER to do so then they must. I am thankful for what GOD has given me in this and walk with HIM in that. I do think this article for those new to CHRIST and who are young in the LORD might be taken as condemnation or blame for the high divorce rate and that does give me pause...I wonder at how helpful it is to some?

God bless
mj

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/25 10:41

//If our hearts have not been changed internally by the Holy Spirit. Then the outward obedience is merely nothing more than just religious external reflecting no internal reality of the heart.//

Women who have been equally internally changed by the HS are at odds over this issue. The problem begins when one camp says they are more obedient or spiritual than the other.

Fletcher- I do see your argument but the title of the thread is "The Effects of the Head Covering on Divorce."

If the embracing of feminist ideas caused the disuse of head coverings then it was just the embracing of feminist ideas that increases divorce, not disuse of a head covering. The disuse of the head covering, as I understand Sandra's argument, was a symptom of feminism, not a cause of feminism.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/10/25 10:59

1st Cor. 11 is not speaking of a cloth/hat on the physical head.

It is speaking of men not allowing their conscience to be subjected (covered) by another man or a man made hierarchical system. (which is the theme of 1 Cor.)

And at the same time it is describing the hierarchical system of the family unit in which the woman is to submit (covered) by the husband.

The Woman was created for the man and for that cause the woman ought to have power/authority of an husband over her.

As far as trying to link not using the head covering to feminism, is to ignore the pagan and wiccan use of woman head coverings

add : "not using"

Re: , on: 2017/10/25 11:39

Well said MJ,

Here is my thoughts on this and it ties into a larger subject. The subject of religion and control. In the last 2000 years, almost all of our troubles arise when one group says that you must believe as I do, to the point of we will kill you if you do not, or at least banish you or shun you. To me, this is the essence of religion.

Scripture tells us that we can go and sit down and eat meat. Now in those days because of all of the pagan sacrifices, most meat served publicly was the left-overs from a multitude of sacrifices to pagan gods. Now, what is our advice from Scripture? Eat it for we know that there are no such things as other gods, there is only one true God. But if the host arises and announces that this meat is meat dedicated to a god, then simply leave for conscience sake. There is so much freedom in that and wisdom.

True religious freedom lies in allowing saints to find their path and their walk in the Lord. So, head covering. I actually think it is a beautiful thing. To see a woman slip a veil over her head and then rise and pray or prophesy is a holy thing to observe. Why is that so? Well, to move firmly into the politically incorrect camp, men and women are different. A woman's hair is very important to her. I don't think there is anything wrong with that at all. We are wired differently, that is why men have no desire to wear make-up. But, a woman is a beautiful creature/creation and a great part of that beauty, that part that attracts looks, is indeed her hair. Some women simply walk in a room and all eyes turn to her because of her beauty, even the Scriptures acknowledge this. Now, if a woman is to stand up in the congregation and pray or prophesy, then to cover her head is an act of humility and a desire that all eyes would be on the Lord and not her, which is why dressing modestly is also a beautiful thing. I don't think it is anymore complicated than that.

But as in all things religious, the problem starts when we compel people to do as we do to the point where they are not accepted when they do not. For instance, the Catholics should have just let the reformers go, the reformers should have just left the Anabaptists alone and so on and so forth, real, true genuine freedom of religion where one is either convinced or not by the wisdom of our words and the condition of our heart and love that pours forth from us. Biblical shepherds lead by going out in front and the sheep follow. Jesus led by going on before us and bidding us to follow. Why not us?.....bro Frank

1 Cor 11 - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/10/25 13:41

vs 3 : "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God."

Verse 3 : The heads are clearly defined.

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

Who is every mans head ? : "the Head of every man is Christ"

What is the covering ? : "It is our conscience being under the subjection of other men"

It is a dishonor to our Head if we allow other men to have rule of our conscience. So much so that we are not even to be called or call others master or rabbi

Matthew 23:8

5 But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven.

On other hand the Woman is to be under subjection (covered) by there husbands 1 peter 3:5

It is a dishonor for the woman to pray and prophesy without being under subjection of her husband 1 Tim 2:11

For to do so is to be as a woman whom is shaven (not married)

6 For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.

If a woman will not be under subjection (covered) by her husband than let her be without a husband (shorn) But if it is a shame for a woman to be without a husband (shorn or shaven) let her be under subjection (covered) by her husband

7 For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man.

Man ought not have other men be a master over there conscience so much so that Jesus said that we are not to even be called nor call other men Rabbi

8 For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.

self explanatory

9 Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.

self explanatory

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

(For this cause) that woman was created for the man: woman ought to have power/authority of an husband over them.

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

self explanatory

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

self explanatory

13 Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?

The common practice :

Woman are under subjection of there fathers untill that authority is given to a husband in marriage.

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

It is almost universal among all cultures that men have shorter hair to that of woman.

The headship order can be observed by that very fact

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

Woman is the glory of man vs 7 and it is a glory for the woman to be given a husband for he to be under subjection of.

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

For those who are contentious and try to dictate a legal rule for others based on what Paul just described as a natural law of woman naturally having long hair and men having short hair which is a picture of the headship order Paul says : we have no such custom, neither the churches of God.

Paul simply used a natural phenomena to show the headship order with.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/25 18:28

Papa wrote:

"As far as trying to link not using the head covering to feminism, is to ignore the pagan and wiccan use of woman head coverings."

Papa, there are people who are very much aware of this practice - of females veiling when attending a Wiccan ritual/service. And do you know what color they wear? Black. It is for this reason our church sisters wear white. There is too much scripture that connects 'darkness' with the realms of satan and this is why we choose to wear white because we do not want to be associated with the realms of darkness.

We must remember that satan is a master counterfeiter. He works to counterfeit God's work, commands in order to deceive people and we all admit he has done an excellent job of it. The fact he has his females wear a veil should be teaching us something: there must be some important significance in God's eyes to have his daughters veiled that he works to have his women wear a veil as well.

Sandra

Re: , on: 2017/10/25 19:02

Frank wrote...

"True religious freedom lies in allowing saints to find their path and their walk in the Lord."

"But as in all things religious, the problem starts when we compel people to do as we do to the point where they are not accepted when they do not."

So agree my brother. And this requires maturity on our part. Paul gives some excellent guidelines on Romans 14 on the i

ssue of Christian Liberty. I think we could also apply this to the head covering. Or for those that I have been fellowshiping with such as those who hold to Saturday as a Sabbath. I believe the key verse is Romans 14:5 in which Paul says Let each person be fully convinced in his own mind. But in our practice of accepting those who have different convictions than we do. We are to extend grace and accept them and not do anything to cause them to stumble.

As you said brother this is true religious freedom. All of us will stand or fall before Christ. I am learning in fellowshiping with the Seventh Day Adventist. I'm looking to see do they have Jesus in their heart. If they have Jesus by His Spirit dwelling in their hearts. Then I can certainly fellowship with them.

Some have already accepted me as a brother in Christ. The issue of whether I'm SDA or not does not come up. Although in a Bible study a lady did ask me if I was Adventist. I simply replied to her that I was a follower of Jesus. She committed me by saying you certainly know your Bible. You sound like a Seventh Day Adventist. I took that as a compliment.

Brother appreciate your thoughts. I am certainly trying to take them too heart. I have been in far too many arguments even recently on this forum. I'm trying to convince people of the rightness of my calls. Now the Holy Spirit in His gentle way of showing me don't argue. But fellowship with brothers and sisters who have the common ground of Jesus Himself living in their hearts.

Good thoughts my brother.

Bro Blaine

Re: , on: 2017/10/25 19:13

It could be that those who believe the sisters wear the head covering or those who believe that Saturday is the Sabbath. These could very well be our cell mates in a FEMA death camp. If they have Jesus in their hearts and are willing to suffer for Him. That there are far more greater things to consider such as laying down our lives for the Lord Jesus Christ.

Over 2 years ago ago 21 young men out of a Coptic Church background were marched to their death on the shores of Libya. The Coptic church is known for its smells and bells. The Coptic church is known for its liturgy. In a sense it is almost like the Roman Catholic Church. But on that day these 21 young men were not dying for the Coptic faith. These 21 young men died with one name on their lips. And that was the name of Jesus Christ.

Persecution has a way of burning off the dross of our theological pet peeves such as the head covering or the Saturday Sabbath or fill in the blank. If we are in prison for the Lord Jesus Christ. I think such things as Calvinism or the Hebrew Roots movement will be irrelevant. What will be most relevant is that we are in prison for One and One alone. And the One will be the Lord Jesus Christ.

At such. Let us keep the simplicity and purity of Devotion to the Lord Jesus but not to our theological pet peeves.

Brothers and sisters I am speaking only to myself.

Again simply my thoughts.

Bro Blaine

Re: 1 Cor. 11 - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/25 20:40

ANOTHER EXPLANATION

Extract from Zodhiates and Baker's NASB Key Word Study Bible:

Paul is writing here to the Corinthian Christians who, living in Greece, customarily complied with Greek traditions: men had their heads uncovered and the women covered theirs, which, however, was contrary to the Jewish tradition. Even to this day, Jewish men cover their heads at worship, but not the women. The question which faced the Corinthians was what to do with the existing custom of their day. Paul's advice was to examine the symbolism of the custom. If it has nothing in it that is contrary to God's Word or order of creation, accept it. Do not allow contentions to arise regarding customs which symbolize something that is proper (vv. 13,16). In this case, the Greeks believed that by not covering t

their heads, the men declared their independence as contrasted to the slaves who cover themselves. The women covered themselves, symbolizing the protectiveness that they enjoyed from their husbands. Paul intimated that there is nothing wrong in this, for in creation God created man, and from man there came the woman. That is good as far as it goes, but remember that man also, in spite of the fact that he prays without a covering, still has a Head and that is Christ (V. 3). In v. 11, however, he equated both man and woman in the Lord as it is also stressed in Gal. 3:28 and 1 Pet. 3:7. In spite of this equality in Christ, still in creation and in the present order of things, the husband is the head of the family. God made him physically stronger than woman to protect the woman. He ought to recognise his position as protector and show it overtly, and she ought to recognise her protector and abide under his care. God is responsible for the difference in the make-up of male and female (1 Cor. 4:7) and no man should at any time endeavour in any way to diminish the difference between the two either in physical or emotional constitution, appearance or function of life. Since this custom of head coverings showed beautifully that which is true in creation and also in the order of things, why should the Corinthian Christians living in Greece reject the Greek custom and assume the Jewish one? The decision was left entirely to the Corinthians as we see in v. 13 which should have been far better translated "Decide in regard to it your own selves." • Therefore these are personal decisions which must be exercised in following a custom as long as the symbol is good and there is no contrary teaching involved in the symbolism.

MY THOUGHTS:

In 2 Cor. 3, Paul moved past customs to TRUTH.

2 Cor. 3:3 -- "written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.

2 Cor. 3:5-6 -- Not that we are adequate in ourselves to consider anything as coming from ourselves, but our adequacy is from God, who also made us adequate as servants of a new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.

2 Cor. 3:16-18 -- but whenever a person turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away. Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory, just as from the Lord, the Spirit.

John 6:63 -- It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing.

Add:

John 4:23-24 -- But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for such people the Father seeks to be His worshipers. God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.

Re: Sandra - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/25 23:31

God's Word is clear to me.

The consequence of Adam's sin is this:
Gen. 2:17 -- "you will surely die.

The criterion for life or death is NOT the wearing or not wearing of head coverings BUT THIS:

John 14:6 -- Jesus said to him, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no one comes to the Father but through Me."

1 John 5:11-12 -- And the testimony is this, that God has given us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He who has the

Son has the life; he who does not have the Son of God does not have the life.

Christ must dwell in our hearts THROUGH FAITH (Eph. 3:17). Unless we have Christ in us, we will surely die. This is the eternal truth of Adam's sin.

We are sanctified NOT by the wearing of head coverings BUT by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Acts 26:18 -- to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the dominion of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who have been ***** sanctified by faith in Me *****.

IT is NOT the wearing of head coverings BUT the precious blood of our Lord Jesus that cleanses us from any and every sin.

It is NOT by the wearing of head coverings BUT by the CROSS of our Lord Jesus that sinful flesh is crucified (Gal. 2:20, 5:24).

IT is NOT by the wearing of head coverings BUT by the CROSS of our Lord Jesus that the world is crucified to me (Gal. 6:14).

1 Pet. 2:24 -- and He Himself bore our sins in His body on the cross, so that we might die to sin and live to righteousness; for by His wounds you were healed.

Rom. 6: 2-7 -- How shall we who died to sin still live in it? Or do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death? Therefore we have been buried with Him through baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with Him in the likeness of His death, certainly we shall also be in the likeness of His resurrection, knowing this, that our old self was crucified with Him, in order that our body of sin might be done away with, so that we would no longer be slaves to sin; for he who has died is freed from sin.

!!!! Heb. 10:14 -- For by one offering He has perfected for all time those who are sanctified. !!!!

It is finished! Jesus said (John 19:20).

Nothing can be added to this finished work of our Lord Jesus to make us more righteous and sin-free.

Eph. 2:8-9 -- For by grace you have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not as a result of works, so that no one may boast.

We are God's workmanship (Eph. 2:10).

1 Thess. 5:23-24 -- Now ***** may the God of peace Himself ***** sanctify you entirely; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved complete, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is He who calls you, ***** and He also will bring it to pass *****.

Into Your hands, Lord Jesus, I commit my spirit.

2 Tim. 1:12 -- for I know whom I have believed and I am convinced that He is able to guard what I have entrusted to Him until that day.

Jude 24-25 --Now to Him who is able to keep you from stumbling, and to make you stand in the presence of His glory blameless with great joy, to the only God our Savior, through Jesus Christ our Lord, be glory, majesty, dominion and authority, before all time and now and forever. Amen.

Add:

WE PREACH JESUS CHRIST AND HIM CRUCIFIED (1 COR. 2:2).

Re: Sandra - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/26 0:57

Thank you for sharing your experiences and observations re: the Mennonites.

I attend a Baptist church assembly near my home. I do not see women wearing head coverings. Good pastor. Biblical teaching. Within this assembly are definitely true and beloved children of God.

The Bible says:

Acts 4:12 -- "And there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other name under heaven that has been given among men by which we must be saved."

NOT Mennonite. NOT Anabaptist. NOT Baptist. NOT anyone else.

No other name.

The Lord Jesus ONLY.

The Mennonites, the Anabaptists, the Baptists and everyone else may fail.

BUT,

Matt. 16:18 -- and upon this rock I will build My church; ***** and the gates of Hades will not overpower it *****.

This rock is CHRIST. This is where we must be found. IN CHRIST.

Prov. 18:10 "The

name of the LORD is a strong tower;

The righteous runs into it and is safe.

Heb. 12:1-2 -- "let us also lay aside every encumbrance and the sin which so easily entangles us, and let us run with endurance the race that is set before us, fixing our eyes on Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith"

Re: Sandra - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/26 1:12

You wrote:

"There are a lot of wonderful "christian" ladies out there with a wonderful testimony and they do not wear a headcovering....."

There ARE a lot of wonderful CHRISTIAN ladies out there, beloved of God and faithful to God, who DO NOT wear head

coverings and HAVE wonderful testimonies.

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/10/26 10:24

"We are sanctified NOT by the wearing of head coverings BUT by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ."

Nobody here believes that we are saved by headcovering.

This is flawed logic. This passage about headcovering means what it says and it is there for a reason. It is better to try to understand why it is there than trying to explain it away.

Re: narrowpath - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/26 20:23

Head covering is a peripheral matter, not the central and crucial thing in our salvation.

You are free to have a different view.

As I said in an earlier post, I do not wear a head covering myself but I respect all Christian women who choose to wear it .

It is CHRIST who must have preeminence in all things in our hearts and our lives (Col. 1:18).

It is CHRIST who must be ALL in us (Col. 3:11).

Heb. 12:1-2 -- â€œlet us run with endurance the race that is set before us, fixing our eyes on Jesus, the author and perfecter of faithâ€œ..

Ps. 42:1 â€œ

As the deer pants for the water brooks,

So my soul pants for You, O God.

My soul thirsts for God, for the living God.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H8kgIggW4uc>

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/10/27 6:37

Quote:

-----by BranchinVINE

Head covering is a peripheral matter, not the central and crucial thing in our salvation.

You are free to have a different view.

As I said in an earlier post, I do not wear a head covering myself but I respect all Christian women who choose to wear it.

I say this tongue-in-cheek but it's kind a hard to have a different view when you post five posts opposing it on the same p

age! :):) but we still do!!

Ginny has been wearing head coverings for almost 60 years, her mind is not going to be changed nor will your posts make her a believer (if she read them all), of not wearing them.

She's still a believer and so is Greg and his wife and anyone else, so in the midst of debating head coverings/divorce we must take this into consideration and not try to post them into submission.

Here's an example that may or may not be relevant but I believe in the baptism of the Holy Spirit and all the gifts (who he does not know that?! haha), anyway sometimes when that topic comes up I'm so passionate about it that I have been accused of worshiping tongues, even though I do not but in my passion for that part of my life I came across that way.

The head covering folks are the same way, I know they don't worship the head covering but some of them through the years have come off that way due to their passion for it.

We all have to find a way to live together, Jesus said, "All men will know that you are my disciples by the LOVE that flows from the head coverings breast to the speaking in tongues breast to the Sabbath is on Saturday breast!" I ad-libbed there but I believe I made my point. :)

God bless us all!
Lisa

Re: , on: 2017/10/27 7:19

Bro Frank wrote...

"True religious freedom lies in allowing saints to find their path and their walk in the Lord."

Our sister Lysa writes...

"We all have to find a way to live together, Jesus said, "All men will know that you are my disciples by the LOVE that flows from the head coverings breast to the speaking in tongues breast to the Sabbath is on Saturday breast!" I ad-libbed there but I believe I made my point. :)"

To put it another way. Live and Let Live. There will be those out of conviction who will wear the head covering. And those out of conviction who will not wear their head covering. Let each one fully be convinced in his own mind before the Lord. And move on in our walk with Christ.

I believe brother Frank and our sister Lysa has brought a good word on this subject.

Bro Blaine

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/27 7:56

Perhaps articles pushing head coverings should not be posted? It always leads to the same discussion.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/10/27 9:28

Some people try to everything so complex, or that it's about these rules and regulations, but it's not, it's about relationship with Jesus Christ.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/10/27 10:07

I have a simple question for the men. Do you uphold the following verse which is stated along side all the others on head covering??

1 Corinthians 11:7

"For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man."

If you teach a woman must cover her head at all times, do you NEVER cover your head? If not why not?

If you teach it is just when praying or prophesying, do you insist men ALWAYS have their head uncovered even when outside praying?

Are men rebellious to God if they wear a hat and spiritual harlots??

Why is this part of 1 Cor 11 never emphasized?

Is this selective interpretation? Or could it be that men realise that maybe it is not just simply teaching a new outward dress code for them, but somehow cannot see that it is not for the women either??

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/27 11:15

In spite of all the explanations of man on this issue, 1 Corinthians 11 still remains. Last I looked it is still in my paper Bible and those posted online. I still consider the WORD as being the final authority on this issue.

Sandra

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/10/27 11:41

If one wants to cover their head, and one doesn't, it's not some sort of unforgivable sin. God sent his son here to die for ALL our sins, because he knew we could not walk perfect by the word of God. No one on this forum is perfect, nor will they ever be, so unless you are perfect, please don't judge me. You can throw out all 31,102 verses, but again, until you're perfect don't cast them at me. Everyday, all I see here is threads looking to condemn someone of something, until you have paid the price that Jesus did, don't keep starting threads that condemn, like some sort of Sunday morning armchair preacher. Were all just dirty rags, not one perfect, not ONE, how can anyone here set back and condemn? who made you Jesus Jr!

This is what the word says about sin....

Matthew 12:31-32 says, "And so I tell you, every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy against the Spirit will not be forgiven. Anyone who speaks a word against the Son of Man will be forgiven, but anyone who speaks against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this age or in the age to come."

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/28 3:29

Thank you, Lisa.

This is a Discussion Forum.

I was simply responding to posts and giving and explaining my own position.

Blessings.

Add:

It seemed to me that the head covering folks were bashing the non-head covering folks.

Re: Myron Horst - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/28 10:47

Jer. 2:13 -

For My people have committed two evils:

They have forsaken Me,

The fountain of living waters,

To hew for themselves cisterns,

Broken cisterns

That can hold no water.

It is not head coverings we must bring back but Christ.

Christ has been dethroned.

We must bring back the King.

2 Sam. 19:11-12 -- "Speak to the elders of Judah, saying, 'Why are you the last to bring the king back to his house?' Why then should you be the last to bring back the king?"

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2017/10/28 12:39

In this entire discussion the hermeneutics employed by the distractors is troubling, at best.

As expounded here Bible interpretation is subject to what I want to believe, not that Scripture informs me what I need to do, believe. When Scripture is viewed through these lenses one will go off the rails quickly into relativism. Then when does a promoted teaching fall into the category of false doctrine?

I consider it very odd that the subject of the head covering evokes such serious opposition...apparently it must be more meaningful to the LORD given the opposition. No other doctrine besides headship evokes such a response, e.g. baptism, communion, feet washing (ouch?), meeting with the believers on a regular basis, loving one's neighbor. Why?

Can one explain to me the reason for the opposition to this doctrine of a woman veiling and the man's unveiling as a symbol of Christ headship order? I so believe Jesus is the head of the church, or all creation, for that matter and I so want to honor Him! My hope of eternal life rests with HIM - how can I do less - in face of all he has done for me?

Sandra

Re: , on: 2017/10/28 13:25

Sandra writes...

"No other doctrine besides headship evokes such a response, e.g. baptism, communion, feet washing (ouch?), meeting with the believers on a regular basis, loving one's neighbor. Why?"

Sister I say this facetiously. We haven't had a good King James argument in a while. That generally evokes some controversy on this forum.

But Sandra I would simply urge you to just go on and please Jesus as I know you do from the convictions of your heart. And the head covering is such a controversial issue I don't know why it evokes such opposition. In past discussions I argued against it until the Lord showed me that 1 Corinthians 11 is biblical. But there will be those who are in opposition of it.

Though I believe 1st Corinthians 11 does argue for the sisters to be covered in the assembly. I know there are many assemblies and godly women who don't wear the head covering. Thus I'm taking a middle-of-the-road approach and saying that in all things let there be liberty and love one another.

I'm having to learn this in a church I'm visiting with a friend of mine. I do believe there are Christ-centered brothers and sisters in this assembly. They would affirm that one is saved only by the atoning work in the blood of Jesus. They would affirm that faith in Christ is that which saves. They would affirm that the scriptures are the authority and rule for our life. They would also argue that Saturday is the Sabbath in which we worship. On that last point I try to give them grace and extend them liberty and love. I choose to affirm with them that on which our faith rests. And that is the Lord Jesus Christ.

My sister I hope this makes sense. I appreciate the wisdom in the charity you bring in your posts. The Lord Jesus bless you richly.

Your brother Blaine.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/28 16:25

//Can one explain to me the reason for the opposition to this doctrine of a woman veiling//

There would be no opposition if proponents did not try to proselytize non-proponents, as if they are disobeying a major Christian doctrine based on a very nebulous passage of scripture from a letter written to a specific culture at a specific time with a specific issue that Paul wanted to address. It is absolutely not clear what the passage means exactly or what Paul meant by a veil or what is meant by "because of the angels." There is no instruction whatsoever how this practice should be implemented today. There is no clarity as to what the covering or veil meant or looked like. It was not unclear to those in that church at that time because they knew exactly what Paul meant.

To make a doctrine for today out of such vague statements is fraught with difficulty. If God meant this to apply to all cultures in all ages He would have provided much more explicit instruction in more than this one little passage from a letter to a specific church.

Re: 3:16 - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/28 17:50

"Can one explain to me the reason for the opposition to this doctrine of a woman veiling"

Every one is familiar with John 3:16, but not as familiar with Genesis 3:16.

Therein lies the answer to the mystery of your inquiry!

You see, there's more to the picture than meets the eye...this opposition will never die.

You see, even the F word began in Genesis!

Re: Sanda - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/28 19:19

I have already said that I do not oppose women wearing head coverings.

But for myself, I do not wear a head covering. I stand on these words of our Lord Jesus:

John 4:23-24 -- But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for such people the Father seeks to be His worshipers. God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/28 19:22

"There would be no opposition if proponents did not try to proselytize non-proponents....."

Agree.

Re: - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/28 19:59

"There would be no opposition if proponents did not try to proselytize non-proponents....."

This statement merely skirts the issue!

For one, it makes it neither true or false, and it thrusts it aside as one would the differences we have insofar as the preference of one color over another in our choice of shoes.

That statement, if applied to modesty or worldliness (and other issues as well) would not fair well, even with those who would agree with such a statement. Such a mentality has paved the way for the present reality and condition of the young in the article from the podcast that Greg posted on millennials a few hours ago on this forum.

May we truly worship God in spirit and in truth, but not do so at the cost of turning a deaf ear or a blind eye to pleasing our Husband, whatever that may wind up looking like.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/28 20:13

As if a hankie on the top of the head is a modesty issue.

Re: missed it - posted by savannah, on: 2017/10/28 20:26

You missed it Todd. I am certain that some of the others got it. I'll let them chime in. Maybe they can speak your language better than I.

But thanks for responding, because it sure does reveal what is truly in your heart.

Men ought always to pray, and not faint.

May we all pray one for another, that we enter not into temptation.

Re: - posted by TakeUptheCross, on: 2017/10/29 7:59

Quote:

"There would be no opposition if proponents did not try to proselytize non-proponents....."

There would be no opposition to anything, if you don't claim a certain thing to be the truth. If we say that "everything is relative" - there will be no opposition whatsoever. But as someone said "Truth is exclusive by its very nature."

So, 1 Cor 11 is in the Bible and in the text we can see that Paul addresses an issue that is not only relevant for the Corinthian church. His reference to nature reminds us that there is something common to men and women all over the world regardless of culture.

We know that Genesis 3:16 remains as well as Genesis 3:18. Does it mean that the woman is inferior? By no means! But it does mean that there is God-given order, where the woman has her place and the man his.

Though I have been taught to cover my head since childhood, I understood its meaning only recently (perhaps 2 years ago) - while I was praying. It is strange but I felt kind of contempt, or feeling of hate in the air while I was about to cover my head. And then it kind of dawned on me that some women hate it because it is a declaration of: "I accept God's order! I accept the position God has put me in as a woman."

So, dear Jade, I would urge not to fight against those who cover their hair, not to fight against the text. I do not judge those who do not cover, but I am convinced it is the will of God, and would be glad to teach my girls to do the same one day.

As it was already stated, I do not believe that the head covering in itself makes me more holy or is somehow my salvation. But it is the will of God, therefore I do it.

Just in case, you are interested:

"Answer concerning the sisters covering her head" -

<http://www.ministrysamples.org/excerpts/ANSWER-CONCERNING-THE-SISTERS-COVERING-THEIR-HEADS.HTML>

"Head covering" - more extensive explanation (on the website ministrybooks.org)

"Head covering for women" - <http://www.cfcindia.com/article/headcovering-for-women>

I do not advertise anyone's ministry, I just think that it is helpful resource.

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

Re: - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/10/29 10:17

It is not a matter of freedom of choice, but a matter of rightly dividing the truth. Only one can be right and the other wrong. It sounds wise to leave everyone to decide for themselves, and there comes a point where one needs to rest their case.

I agree it is not a core truth of the bible but rather a peripheral matter. Nevertheless, I think Christ is worth obeying not only in fundamental matters but also in small things. Why does headcovering cause such a vehement reaction in some people? Though it is a small thing but it reveals the heart.

As Esther quoted it,

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

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2017/10/29 11:04

Dear Esther,

I repeat:

I have already said that I do not oppose women wearing head coverings.

But for myself, I do not wear a head covering. I stand on these words of our Lord Jesus:

John 4:23-24 -- But an hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for such people the Father seeks to be His worshipers. God is spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.

This is my last word on this matter.

In accordance with the principle in Rom. 14:15, we should not destroy with our own view of I Cor. 11 "him for whom Christ died".

Also, re: Gen. 3:16, this is a curse of sin and Christ has freed us from sin and all its curses. The command now is for a man to love his wife as Christ loves His church.

This is also my last word on this matter. Will not debate.

God bless you.

Love & Blessings.

Re: - posted by noone (), on: 2017/10/29 12:04

Not sure if this has been mentioned on this thread already...I haven't read every post. Has anyone studied Dr. Michael S Heiser's interpretation of this subject? A Very interesting read for sure.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/10/29 13:13

The fact is, even the pro-head covering folk don't agree. Some insist women should cover their heads all the time, others that it is just in the church gathering, and others only when praying or speaking.

So if this passage in 1 Corinthians is so obviously clear as some say, why the difference of understanding??

So which of these is right?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/10/29 13:15

//Not sure if this has been mentioned on this thread already...I haven't read every post. Has anyone studied Dr. Michael S Heiser's interpretation of this subject? A Very interesting read for sure. //

<http://www.nakedbiblepodcast.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Transcript-86-Head-Covering-1Corinthians11.pdf>

To summarize greatly, in that day the preeminent Greek physicians believed that a woman's hair was part of her genitalia (and this was a common understanding among Greek citizens). Hair was not considered genitalia in men. Look it up- it's true. Paul was aware of this understanding. So he was basically telling the women to cover their genitalia when praying etc. Men should not cover because they would be identifying as female if they did. Makes perfect sense.

Of course we know better, or should know better, today.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2017/10/29 14:55

And all I want to do in this life is, do my best to be in the Lord's will for my life everyday. Try to grow closer to him everyday, and tell everyone I can about Jesus Christ, O and see my family that's gone ahead of me in Heaven. I hope I make it to Heaven with all these rules and regulations going on, I don't know, but I'm going to keep praying. :-)

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/10/29 15:24

Quote:

-----by MrBillPro

I hope I make it to Heaven with all these rules and regulations going on, I don't know, but I'm going to keep praying. :-)

Oh, no doubt you will brother, since the majority of these rules and regulations have nothing whatsoever to do with men!!
lolol

Hopefully, I'll see you there!

Lisa