

SermonIndex Announcements :: The Head Covering Movement**The Head Covering Movement - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/14 17:46**

Head coverings are not a popular doctrine. In fact, that's quite the understatement. So why would I start a movement based upon it? Do I enjoy controversy? Absolutely not. Looking to be divisive? The opposite. Then what would possess me to do such a thing? The short answer is, because it's in the Bible. See, if "all Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness" (2 Tim 3:16 NASB) then all Scripture deserves fair treatment. On top of that, this particular topic is not just mentioned in the Bible, but it's defended. It's not just one or two obscure verses but it occupies 15 consecutive verses. We can debate what Paul meant and we can debate how it applies in the 21st century, but the one thing we can't do is ignore this topic.

Daniel Wallace is one of the leading textual critics and the founder of the "Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts". To say this brother knows the Greek text well would be quite the understatement. He said this about the "actual head covering" view (the position I'm advocating) which I think many can relate to:

The argument that a real head covering is in view and that such is applicable today is, in some respects, the easiest view to defend exegetically and the hardest to swallow practically. Since it is never safe to abandon one's conscience regarding the truth of Scripture, I held to this view up until recently. Quite frankly, I did not like it (it is very unpopular today). But I could not, in good conscience, disregard it. *

That's an incredibly honest statement. Because a head covering is a visual symbol, it's impossible to hide or delay in stating your views. It's the first doctrine that people know you believe if you meet someone at church, even before you shake their hands. They may be feeling judged just by you wearing one (because they're not) and you may be thinking that they must be thinking that you're stuck in the 50's. To top it off, your pastors or those closest to you may be concerned that you're embracing legalism. These are real struggles that people face when even contemplating the "actual head covering" view. So suffice it to say, when Dr. Wallace noted that it's "unpopular today" he has an accurate perception of how well it's received. When you wear a head covering it forces everyone in your church to deal with the text and some just aren't ready to.

Daniel Wallace again says:

The real danger, as I see it, is that many Christians simply ignore what this text says because any form of obedience to it is inconvenient. *

Now this is not to say that the only reason that people don't embrace head coverings is fear. Some are persuaded by other interpretations and if convinced by Scripture, would change their minds. I hope that is you and you share my desire to rightly understand everything the Bible says and submit to that. But I'm worried that many read over 1 Corinthians 11, thinking "that can't mean what I think it says. No one I know wears one and we can't all be wrong." Then scurry off to chapter 12, making a mental note to look into it later (which if we're honest rarely happens). If I described your response, now is that time. We're going to go deep into the text and wrestle through it together as a community. Don't worry though, this blog isn't written to scholars, I wrote it for the average Christian, the layman and laywoman, for you. In the next four posts I'll be making a positive case for the wearing of an artificial head covering for women while in church. Likewise, I'll argue that men are commanded to keep a bare head in the same context. I'll do this by pointing to our reasons that Paul himself gives in 1 Corinthians 11. When I explain those reasons, I won't be giving as much attention to competing views as this will largely be a positive case. After that I'll make a case for why head coverings only need to be practiced when the local church is gathered together. Finally, we'll give attention to your questions and the popular objections.

The Heart of the Matter

Before this post comes to an end I want to bring up a word of caution: make sure your heart is prepared. I figure most people reading this blog either disagree with or don't know what to make of head coverings, so your guard is probably up. I know, I do it too and it's not a bad thing really. We're always in a battle against false teaching and false teachers, so it's good to be skeptical and keep a guard up, filtering everything through the Word of God. Just make sure you won't accept any old argument against head coverings because you don't want it to be true. What will my husband or wife thi

nk? What will those in my church think? How will I find a spouse if he/she knows I believe this? The fear of man can be overwhelming, but we must fear God and His commands above men. We must bind ourselves to the text of Scripture and obey no matter how uncomfortable the outcome may be. So if your heart is not ready, make sure you stop and seek the Lord in prayer before moving on. Then when you're ready give 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 a good read. Please read through this text slowly and become intimately familiar with it. This is the only chapter in the Bible that commands and explains the practice of head coverings, so you must know it well to be a good Berean (Acts 17:11).

You can learn more about this movement to de-mystify the doctrine and practice of headcovering by sisters in the Lord: <http://www.headcoveringmovement.com>

Re: The Head Covering Movement - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/14 21:55

The best and only valuable VISUAL symbol is the fruit of the Spirit both for men and women. Because this is REAL. You can't tell by headcoverings (or any type of clothing for that matter) if one has the fruit of the Spirit or not.

There are women who wear headcoverings when the saints gather who also (away from the congregation) "wear the pants". So, what does the headcovering accomplish except make people believe something that is not true.

Excerpt from "The Issue of Headcoverings" by Eric Svendsen of New Testament Restoration Foundation

"But here Paul is thinking about a specific kind of covering. Up until this verse Paul has consistently used the word katakaluptos ("covering") to insist that a woman be covered while praying or prophesying. Paul agrees with the contentious group that a woman does need a covering. What he disagrees with is their application. The contentious group insisted that the covering be a garment (a veil or shawl), whereas Paul is arguing that, in the case of the church ("In the Lord, however," v 11), the covering is the woman's own hair. Long hair, Paul argues, is the glory of a woman (v 15). he further argues this point in the very next phrase: "For, long hair is given to her as a covering." The word "as" here is anti, and means literally "instead of." The word for "covering" in this verse is not the same as has been used by Paul up to this point. Everywhere else in this passage Paul has used katakaluptos, which is a very generic term for "covering." Here Paul uses the word peribolaios, which means literally "that which is wrapped around."

In other words, Paul is saying that, yes, women do need coverings (katakaluptos) on their heads when praying or prophesying. But, "in the Lord" that covering is not a peribolaios (cloth wrapped around the head) but rather the woman's own long hair. In fact, "in the Lord" (i.e., in the church), long hair is given to a woman "instead of" (not "as") "that which is wrapped around the head." Women in the church have a ready-made covering and are therefore not necessarily in violation of the principles expressed in vv 3-10. Overall then, 1 Co 11:2-16 is a very liberating passage. In it, women are freed from the bondage of wearing religious head garb."

Read the full article here:

http://www.ntfr.org/articles/article_detail.php?PRKey=36

Re: The Head Covering Movement - posted by derektina, on: 2013/6/15 1:08

Greg,

I am thrilled about this post! My husband and I both agreed on the issue of head coverings 7 years ago while attending a Bhakt Singh assembly in Sydney, Australia and I have been wearing one ever since.

The spiritual blessing is unspeakable. Personally, I become highly aware of its purpose the moment I cover my head in corporate worship.

It's a little late but when I get an opportunity I'd love to share what the teaching was that correlated the 1 Cor 11 passage to the OT passage in Gen 28. Both making important points about angels who are in God's house....

I am greatly encouraged and once again thankful for this ministry for so many reasons!

With my love brother, your sister in Christ,

Cristina Antunes

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/15 2:33

I am glad you are blessed. I genuinely mean that. And yet there are women that are equally blessed without the scarf on their head. The important thing is that nothing should detract from Christ and it should be used to divide or exclude either those who wear one or those who don't. It should not be an essential for fellowship. I have never heard of a "head covering" movement and I think if that is what the movement is based on then by definition it will be sectarian, exclusive and divisive because it implies that one must agree with the movement and get on board with the head covering. This will take the focus off of Christ, once again focusing on something that is not related to salvation or fellowship.

In my fellowship, there are those who wear one and those who don't and I don't witness any exclusion of brethren or sense of one group over the other as being more obedient. There is genuine love between the saints, which tells me it is a non-essential for church-life and focusing on Christ.

So, if you build a movement or church on the requirement to wear a scarf or doily or whatever you want to call it on your head, you run the real risk of excluding some dear saints and only weakening the church.

Re: The Head Covering Movement, on: 2013/6/15 9:39

Brother Greg, to say I am confused as to the onus and aim of this post is to put it mildly.

I came onto the website this morning to download more brother Len's exhortations, as my dear older brother ALWAYS blesses me, teaches me via the Leading of the God the Holy Ghost.....BUT, I saw the headline of the post and my heart sank....I did not know you were the author, which begs the question, "is this now "doctrine" of the Gospel Fellowships?"...

which further begs the question, since when did something EXTERNAL, become a "doctrine"?....if we wish to go BACK, into Scripture and look for NEGLECTED Ordinances. why not go to John 13?

to quote, and may God add His Blessing to this Precious Portion of Holy Scripture:

"Now before the Feast of the Passover, when Jesus knew that his hour had come to depart out of this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end. During supper, when the devil had already put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him, Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God and was going back to God, rose from supper. He laid aside his outer garments, and taking a towel, tied it around his waist. Then he poured water into a basin and began to wash the disciples' feet and to wipe them with the towel that was wrapped around him. He came to Simon Peter, who said to him, "Lord, do you wash my feet?" Jesus answered him, "What I am doing you do not understand now, but afterward you will understand." Peter said to him, "You shall never wash my feet." Jesus answered him, "If I do not wash you, you have no share with me." Simon Peter said to him, "Lord, not my feet only but also my hands and my head!" Jesus said to him, "The one who has bathed does not need to wash, except for his feet, but is completely clean. And you are clean, but not every one of you." For he knew who was to betray him; that was why he said, "Not all of you are clean."

When he had washed their feet and put on his outer garments and resumed his place, he said to them, "Do you understand what I have done to you? You call me Teacher and Lord, and you are right, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that you also should do just as I have done to you."

John 13:1-15

lets look at that last verse again:

"For I have given you an example, that you also should do just as I have done to you."

That's RED LETTER, coming from our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ...hence a "foot washing" movement demonstrating Jesus Love, and Servanthood to the saints, would that not be of invaluable knitting us together as the Body of Christ?would that not be of Divine profit in underlining humility one to another?

I don't understand, with a world on fire, how such external displays, qualify as "doctrine". and I did read this dear mans website, and was taken aback in the first sentences by such as this:

Quote:

-----Hello everyone and welcome to the Head Covering Movement.

My name is Jeremy and IÂ'm the founder

"and I'm the founder"?

my question is this, is this now part of the Gospel Fellowships?

I have MANY more questions, but I wont belabor you. I could even bring up the importance of the Jerusalem Council For ur very simple edicts, to help Early Church Gentile followers of Jesus, who were being confused by those who maintaine d all the external requirements of Moses and the Law, must be maintained to follow Messiah.

this whole thread greatly concerns me as it relates to Gospel fellowships, and whether such a formation is to be IN-clusi ve, or EX-clusive.

In Jesus' love, neil

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/15 14:09

Those are great observations, Hezwelling (Neil).

If there is to be a "movement" to "join", let us move closer to the Lord and join the movement of the Holy Spirit where Jes us is the Founder and those that are joined to Him walk in love amongst the brethren.

Re: - posted by followthelamb, on: 2013/6/15 14:33

Dear brothers and sisters in Christ,

I felt led to log on briefly to help clear up some confusion about this post:

- 1.) Greg is not the author of this article (though it may have appeared that way by accident)
- 2.) the movement is not affiliated in any way with gospel fellowships, it was simply food for thought as with many other ar ticles shared

Thank you so much and may the Name of Jesus Christ be glorified in each of us this day and always increasingly.

In His love,
Your sister

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/15 15:20

Saints,

Just again to clarify what was shared. It is a blog website that is not run by myself but brother Jeremy who runs www.gospelebooks.net Which is a great website for kindle ebooks.

I am more partial to encourage the "re-thinking" of this practice in the church and therefore am not ashamed to encourage the consideration of it. As towards Gospel Fellowships this is not an issue of fellowship either way sisters interpret the passage.

There is a footnote in the Principles volume to encourage this practice but it is not a major issue or nor theme to dis-fellowship or fellowship around.

brother Niel quoted Ravenhill and their movement had sisters to be covered I believe as did most holiness pentecostal groups and most other denominations in the early 1900's and before.

Again it is not an issue to dis-fellowship or approve. I believe the wording "movement" simply is a movement to discuss and re-think the interpretation of it in the Church.

Watchman Nee considered it important for spiritual reasons therefore his entire little flock church in China practiced this for sisters to wear coverings in meetings.

Thank you saints for the humble heart to learn of the Lord, re-think things and if disagreed then that is fine. But we should not discourage other sisters who feel it was shown by the Holy Spirit for them to do it.

So neither compulsion or requirement is the case but all are left to the Spirit's leading and Scriptures for themselves.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/15 15:30

what are the spiritual advantages of making godly, spirit filled sisters wear one? Serious question.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/15 15:35

Quote:

-----what are the spiritual advantages of making godly, spirit filled sisters wear one? Serious question.

Brother, I am going to respond in short to this post but it is not my objective to defend this practice or promote it overtly. I would say personally it is not "making" anyone wear headcoverings. It is in scripture and if true then a practice the Lord gave for the Church.

So we would have to say it is God making or desiring sisters to do this.

God never will force, we must come to these things by His grace and with a willing heart.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/6/15 20:00

It is all about submission.

Women are called to submit.

Men are called to submit.

Sometimes God asks us to do things that seem weird: like forbidding Adam and Eve from eating from the one tree in the garden. Why single out ONE tree? God had his reasons and to violate it was costly for these people. Whether it makes s

ense of not is not the issue. Submission is.

And the benefits? Read the WORD...there are practical benefits but one would be amiss to wear it for those reasons. God loves it when we serve Him with joy and delight. When this is done there are blessings.

God bless.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/15 21:39

Ginny,

Just the way you responded is another reason the head covering seems unattractive and does not achieve the objective so many speak about.

When you flatly say, "It's about submission, women are called to submit, men are called to submit", you make God sound like Allah and the headcovering sounds like the Christian Burkha.

And, the very fact that you tie it to submission, tells me that you cannot help but judge those who don't wear it as being unsubmitive. No matter how much you deny that, the very fact that you believe wearing a head covering proves that a woman is submissive, then conversely, is an indication to you (and others I am sure) that those who do not wear them are rebellious. how could you not think that? Either you think others are rebellious who refuse to wear one after they have received the "teaching" or you think others are just ignorant and must not have had the "teaching", yet.

There are blessings when one is yielded to the Lord in their heart, dear sister. And when one is yielded and submissive in their heart to the Lord it is manifested in many different fruits of the Spirit.

I remain unconvinced, as I have not heard any compelling evidence that God is commanding women to wear a head covering.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/15 21:46

I think I will defer to the book that Greg markets:

What the PRINCIPLES FOR THE GATHERING OF BELIEVERS UNDER THE HEADSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST says:

page 282

"Who do you talk about the most? Jesus Christ? Or your Bible

translation? Jesus Christ? Or your particular doctrine, theology, eschatology...? Jesus Christ? Or your ministry? Jesus Christ or your gifts? Jesus Christ or your head-covering? Jesus Christ or your children, your family...? Jesus Christ or your denomination? It can be a number of things, brothers and sisters, and they're not all bad.

Everything should pale in comparison with our love for Him. Love for Christ; the pursuit of Christ. I tell you, this Remnant that God is raising up that is scattered all over the earth shares one thing in common: to you who believe, He is precious! Christ is precious!

Hallelujah"

And that book only refers to it as a discipline or godly tradition not a command. A discipline such as Bible reading.

In the Chapter on Assemblies:

"ONE OF the hidden jewels of the Church is godly DISCIPLINE. there has been a great lack of teaching and encouragement in modern evangelicalism towards the godly disciplines of: Fasting, waiting on God, early rising, head coverings, prevailing prayer, systematic Bible reading, Bible memorization, kneeling in prayer, and many other godly TRADITIONS in Church history."

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2013/6/15 22:00

Allaboard,

I just had to reply to your excellent postings! I believe you have displayed a right spirit in your comments.

It would be wonderful if Greg and some other sisters could really comprehend the spirit of what you have stated in your posts but I'm afraid it will fall on deaf ears.

Jesus said "he that hath ears to hear let him hear" but sometimes we let the letter of the word bind us instead of the Spirit setting us free.

The letter kills but the Spirit ministers life!

Blessings...from brother rbanks

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/6/15 22:23

Allaboard,

It is not my idea that one submits to authority. If I had my own way I would be my own boss and do things MY way! Having acted like that too many times has proven to me that I am not a good god! AND...I have never seen anyone else with an independent mindset function well as a god, either.

Allaboard, all of life consists of submitting to authority. The ones that refuse to do so are dysfunctional at all levels, some ending up in the slammer. When we follow the LORD Jesus, are filled with his Spirit, we are submitting to authority and many times He asks us to do things we do not like.

Sure, I wear a head covering..but I must say it is God who judges people. I know what the WORD says and if I be judged for doing so, so be it. God has been good to me. I know because his Spirit abides within me. I have a lot to learn still, but my desire is to be obedient in all things. He died a horrible death on the cross to redeem me so how can I complain about wearing something so simple as a head covering? It is painless, does not inconvenience me at all. And the angels take note of it as well. God is good. Since this is the case how else can I show my love for him then by being obedient? Jesus says if you love me, keep my commandments.

Allaboard, this is my conviction and I am sorry you do not share it as well. No amount of debate can deter me from it. Unless I feel so compelled, I will not say any more on this subject.

ginnyrose

Re: An Observation of the Hesrt, on: 2013/6/15 23:09

It seems the head covering is the female version of male circumcision. How many Jews were circumcised outwardly yet failed to keep the law. Paul reminds us that the one who is uncircumcised yet keeps the law in his heart is approved by God.

So if the sister wears a head covering as a sign of outward submission but in her heart is not submitting to God is she approved by God? It seems the sister who is not wearing the head covering but submitting to God is the one God approves.

I believe I read it is man that looks at the outward appearance but God looks at the heart. God is more concerned about what is in the heart of a sister than what is on her head. I read in 1 Peter 3 that a sister's adorning is not to be external but internal. The internal adorning that comes out of a heart governed by the Holy Spirit. Peter speaks of a gentle and quiet spirit that is precious in God's sight.

In the New Testament believers are exhorted to clothe themselves with Christ. In doing so the fruit of the Spirit will flow out of their hearts as rivers of living water. That fruit of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self control. These virtues of the heart are far more precious to God in a sister than whether their head is covered.

or not.

In my walk with God the sisters I have met that have shown the beautiful fruit of the Spirit did not have a cloth on their head. But they had the covering of Jesus himself. That covering of being clothed in Christ himself.

As usual, my thoughts.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/16 1:53

If one is submitting to authority but not wearing a head covering, are they in rebellion?

If one is not submitting to authority but wearing a head covering are they in submission?

Yes, Bearmaster, your thoughts are closer to the character and nature of God. The covering of Christ trumps any article of clothing.

But would it not make our Christian life easy if all we had to do to prove we were not rebellious was to wear a small article of clothing on our head instead of yielding to inward circumcision?

It seems to me that one could also become quite proud of their outward "status symbol". Almost to shame other women for or not being as "spiritual".

Re: The Head Covering Movement, on: 2013/6/16 4:30

Head covering or uncovering is scriptural and there is no argument with that, it is men and women. It is outward and it is visible, which is its meaning and purpose. It is for the angels and not principally for the man.

If you ever get the responsibility of employing a man and you find one who calls you "master" you can be certain that it will be his countenance and not the words which will decide who you employ. When you walk down the queue to select your labourers it will not be the ones who have removed their hats when you pass by which you will employ, but the one who removed his hat, calls you master and shows a good spirit to serve you according to day's wage.

If Satan is looking for his labourers who will he choose? The one who wears the hat or the one who removes it? He will choose both because he is looking for hypocrisy at work and if he sees it he will seek to have its benefit. On the other hand if he sees a sincere heart and a covering he will flee.

Re: , on: 2013/6/16 7:27

AA writes.....

"And, the very fact that you tie it to submission, tells me that you cannot help but judge those who don't wear it as being unsubmitive. No matter how much you deny that, the very fact that you believe wearing a head covering proves that a woman is submissive, then conversely, is an indication to you (and others I am sure) that those who do not wear them are rebellious. How could you not think that? Either you think others are rebellious who refuse to wear one after they have received the "teaching" or you think others are just ignorant and must not have had the "teaching", yet."

Brother, you have captured the very essence of it. Sometimes we have glimpses of that truth coming out, but most times it is hidden. On this very forum, someone of the head covering persuasion suggested that they did not know if Corrie Ten Boom was saved because she did not cover her head.

Andrew, are you suggesting that if a man ever wears a hat, he is in rebellion? For those of the head covering persuasion do not simply cover their heads when praying or prophesying, they cover their heads all the time in public. So, conversely, following that logic, men would not be allowed to cover their heads in public, as a sign of their own submission.....
bro Frank

Re: , on: 2013/6/16 7:46

Quote:

-----Andrew, are you suggesting that if a man ever wears a hat, he is in rebellion?.....bro Frank

No

Re: , on: 2013/6/16 8:08

Quote:

-----"And, the very fact that you tie it to submission, tells me that you cannot help but judge those who don't wear it as being unsubmitive. No matter how much you deny that, the very fact that you believe wearing a head covering proves that a women is submissive, then conversely, is an indication to you (and others I am sure) that those who do not wear them are rebellious. how could you not think that? Either you think others are rebellious who refuse to wear one after they have receive the "teaching" or you think others are just ignorant and must not have had the "teaching", yet." all aboard

Whatever benefit there may be to a sister wearing a head covering when the church assembles together is no doubt something for the sister to decide herself. If she sees benefit in it then it is for her a benefit. As for the hypocrisy of anyone making assumptions as to another sister who sees no benefit thereby "proving" her rebellion is of course legalistic. As to who has the power to comprehend why a sister does or does not wear a covering on her head, or as to why any one does or does not see it as error is hidden unless it is openly stated. My wife Helen does not wear a head covering in the church. Yet she has never stood against me before our children, nor whispered in private nor gossiped in public against me. Yet I believe in head covering in the church for those sisters who are minded to speak openly in the church by way of prayer of prophecy.

Most people do not believe me when I bear witness of my wife's good attitude. They imagine I am joking in some way. However it is the plain truth. Apart from that no man should instruct another mans wife or his children in contradiction to the head of the household.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/6/16 8:22

If God has given Head covering and submission to wife as a commandment to man then I will cover my head and submit to the decisions of my wife, no matter what the world follows. I will do it because I want to please God.

Head covering is a new covenant command unlike other external commands of old covenant. There are very few new covenant commands that are external. One such command is water baptism. Most of the Churches practices it as a sign for born again life. They do not discourage people saying born again is an internal thing and you do not need an external sign. But when it comes to head covering we see people discouraging others from following God's command.

My second point is in regards to submission. Bible says husbands should love their wives like how Christ loves the Church. Anyone who understands the depth of Christ's love for the Church will acknowledge that it is humanly impossible to love their wife with such a love. I acknowledge the same and I need God's grace to produce divine love in me. Same way any women who understands the depth of submission like how Jesus submitted to his heavenly father will acknowledge that it is humanly impossible for them to submit the same way to their husbands, hence they will seek God's grace in this area. Now if there is any commandment that is given as a sign for husbands to love their wife then I will immediately follow it because I do not want God's grace to be hindered because of my rebellion to his command. Same way if any woman truly acknowledges that she needs God's grace to submit everyday to her husband then she will cover her head so that God's grace will not be hindered in this area.

Re: Sred, on: 2013/6/16 9:33

Brother, very respectfully and in his Spirit, I invite you and others to address the issue of foot washing. I have opened up a thread on that very topic under "And what of John 13:1-20". Not to take away from this thread. But if we are going to speak of New Covenant commands then maybe we need to take a look at the example of the Son of God himself.

It seems to me that Jesus is teaching something that applies to both brother and sister. A practice that takes far more courage for one to practice because it takes a crucified life to wash one's feet.

My question to the sisters who wear the head covering. And this asked out of Spirit-filled respect. You have the courage to wear the head covering, but do you have the courage to wash someone's smelly feet?

In the New Testament two women washed the feet of Jesus and with tears and perfume no less. One was the woman who led a sinful life and came and repented. She washed the feet of Jesus with her tears and perfume. The account is found in Luke 7:36-42.

The other account is Mary, the sister of Martha, pouring perfume and anointing Jesus' feet. This account is found in John 12:1-8.

So as to not hijack this thread I invite you to respond on the thread I have opened up on "And what about John 13:1-20".

Submitted in the Spirit.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/16 10:06

Quote:

-----Apart from that no man should instruct another man's wife or his children in contradiction to the head of the household.

Completely agree.

Quote:

-----Head covering or uncovering is scriptural and there is no argument with that, it is men and women. It is outward and it is visible, which is its meaning and purpose. It is for the angels and not principally for the man.

Do not agree. There is a difference of opinion ("argument") otherwise this thread would not exist. It exists because some think it is scriptural and some think it was cultural (per Corinth).

Personal observation: I was at a well-known speaker's conference (he is from India) and I noticed that the women that wore head coverings did not associate with those who did not. Maybe it was also because they did not like the fact that some of the women without head coverings wore slack/pants. Do women feel slighted? Is this sectarian and speak of an air of superiority? We would have to ask the "inferior" women how they felt about that.

Ignoring other saints' over traditions/disciplines SHOULD concern us far more than whether everyone is complying with traditions/disciplines or not.

I believe some deep repentance is in order and all saints who name the name of Jesus should be welcome in our hearts and not just with words. I see too much of this in real-life gatherings. It is sickening and grievous.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/16 11:40

Quote:
----- Greg - I am more partial to encourage the "re-thinking" of this practice in the church and therefore am not ashamed to encourage the consideration of it.

I did want to thank Greg for giving us permission to "re-think" this issue. Especially since past threads have not ended so well. We certainly have been rethinking this issue but it seems that the result is the same as past threads in which there is a camp that believes it is a commandment from the Lord and a camp that believes it is cultural. If propagated as a commandment, it seems to create sectarianism in the Body.

So, what is the way forward if we are to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace? (Eph 4:3)

Greg, since you started this thread, do you have any comments?

Re: The heart of the passage. 2 Cor, on: 2013/6/16 12:15

1 Cor. 11:4-5

Every man who PRAYS OR PROPHESES with his head covered dishonors his head but every wife who PRAYS OR PROPHESES with her head uncovered dishonors her head.

j

Re: - posted by lovejt (), on: 2013/6/16 12:36

Dear Bear...i agree with the footwashing. I take the 'Ought' to wash one another's feet as a command as well as the head covering for services. As everyone has well put, its all about the inner reality then just the physical manifestation. If we don't have that, we're still in the OT as far as life. But, we do see the Outer in the New Covenant in the Wine/Bread, Foot washing, Headcoverings, What is the benefit? I believe it is also a witness to unbelievers since they are overtly external as well as regular reminders to us to humble and submit ourselves to each other. If God were to say men wear yellow dotted ties, we should do it even if we don't see the benefit of it. I don't think its a 1st Century only/Custom of the area thing. As an observation, i have never met a married sister who wears a covering and has divorced in my small world. I'm single and notice these kind of things. (Off-course i'm sure there are those who have divorced and maybe their marriages have arguments continually. The cloth does not make a Spirit-filled marriage as well as the many Godly marriages where women do not wear the cloth at services)

Re: The heart of the passage., on: 2013/6/16 12:43

1 Cor. 11:4-5

Every man who PRAYS OR PROPHESES with his head covered dishonors his head but every wife who PRAYS OR PROPHESES with her head uncovered dishonors her head.

1 Cor.11:13

Judge for yourselves; is it proper for a wife to PRAY to God with her head uncovered.

Acts 2:18

even on my MALE SERVANTS AND FEMALE SERVANTS

In those days I will pour out my Spirit and THEY SHALL PROPHESEY.

...Caps are for emphasis only....Cannot underline.

Brothers and sisters if we are going to rethink this issue. Then I respectfully suggest we do it in the context of the passage under discussion. The issue is not the external covering. The issue of this passage is the praying and prophesying of saints in the church meeting. Particularly of Christians sisters. This is the heart of the matter.

I ask the sisters, respectfully, who wear the head covering, do you pray or prophesy in your church meetings? I mean do you pray or prophesy in the public church meeting. I ask you brothers, respectfully, who advocate the head covering, do you pray or prophesy in the church meeting? Presumably with your head uncovered.

My brother or sister who advocate the head covering, if you cannot answer yes to the above questions then I gently say you are pursuing dead religion. For this is merely not submission. But the body praying and prophesying in the Holy Spirit.

As one brother said to me. I am more interested in what the sister is doing under the covering. What is she praying or prophesying?

Bearmaster.

Re: The Head Covering Movement, on: 2013/6/16 14:07

Quote:
-----Do not agree. There is a difference of opinion ("argument") otherwise this thread would not exist. It exists because some think it is scriptural and some think it was cultural (per Corinth). all aboard

By saying that head covering is scriptural I am simply agreeing with the OP. Especially the point made about exegesis. In this instance the exegetical formula is grammatical and syntactical and not cultural.

Quote:
-----Daniel Wallace is one of the leading textual critics and the founder of the "Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts". To say this brother knows the Greek text well would be quite the understatement. He said this about the "actual head covering" view (the position I am advocating) which I think many can relate to:

The argument that a real head covering is in view and that such is applicable today is, in some respects, the easiest view to defend exegetically and the hardest to swallow practically.

I think this element of the OP is intended to put to bed any notion that the passage of scripture from Corinthians has a grammatical or syntactical opt out clause and therefore the possibility of claiming that it doesn't carry an apostolic meaning. If it were simply a symbolic expression used by Paul to instruct this particular church then of course some would say that at this teaching was weighed in that balance and may not have meaning for every other church. This is in a sense what has happened and still happens. Hence the claim that what Paul taught the Corinthians in this instance is just for the Corinthians. To put it into context it would be the same as saying that the gifts of the Holy Spirit were just for the Corinthian believers. Likewise it would be conversely the same as saying that there were believers in every church who were fleshy because the Corinthian believers were given an explanation as to why some of them were dying prematurely. In short the deaths at Corinth are local, and needed an explanation. If they were not local at that time in the authority of Paul's apostleship of many churches, then he could have made reference to the other churches who had the same problem. He didn't and so exegetically the issue of the Corinthian believers fleshy lives was a basis for an explanation of their problem, and not a basis for saying all the churches were fleshy. Whereas the head covering issue was not intended to be a local explanation. Hence the phrase "we have no other tradition". i.e. the same thing is done everywhere.

In this light I agree with the OP. What else I may think is irrelevant.

Re: , on: 2013/6/16 14:57

Then Andrew if you are going to agree with the OP you will have to agree that the issue is the praying and prophesying of the Christian sisters in Corinth.

If we are going to carry this command today to have women where a head covering in the church meeting then the women and the men will have to be allowed to pray and prophesy. And this may be in the language of tongues.

This is the issue I am raising and I do it respectfully. If one is going to insist that the head covering be binding as a New Covenant command. Then one is going to have to allow for the New Covenant gift of prophecy to be exercised.

You cannot separate the head covering issue from what Paul is addressing in the passage. Mainly the way in which men and women were to prophesy in the Corinthian church.

But if this command is to be binding today. Then one must allow for the gift of prophecy.

Bearmaster.

Re: My Questkon Again, on: 2013/6/16 15:03

Respectfully I ask of those sisters who wear the head covering. Do you pray or prophesy publicly in the church meetings?

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/16 15:15

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

should a man never wear a Hat ?

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/16 15:15

Quote:
-----If God has given Head covering and submission to wife as a commandment to man then I will cover my head and submit to the decisions of my wife, no matter what the world follows. I will do it because I want to please God.

Head covering is a new covenant command unlike other external commands of old covenant. There are very few new covenant commands that are external. One such command is water baptism. Most of the Churches practices it as a sign for born again life. They do not discourage people saying born again is an internal thing and you do not need an external sign. But when it comes to head covering we see people discouraging others from following God's command.

I believe this is well said, there are few New Covenant practices. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are emphasized the most. And then Headcoverings is given one chapter.

Other ones such as Foot washing, Holy Kiss, Baptism for the dead are 1-2 verses are not really as important or they would be commanded or emphasized more. Also there is no specific spiritual allegory behind the practice as shown in scriptures for Foot Washing etc. But for headcovering as others have alluded to, submission and spiritual headship is a major spiritual teaching behind it.

Almost every denomination or group before the 1950's roughly had this practice of headcovering. It was a given.

I personally think it is healthy to teach it as in scriptures and allow the saints to follow the leading of the Spirit in its practice. I see no fruit in especially brothers speaking against it except that in some circles it is a religious rite and a source of pride and contention. This is in very few groups. I would say most evangelical sisters I have met who covered were doing it out of a love relationship to Jesus Christ. This is the case of my wife that with also the fear of the Lord she desires to follow everything the Lord has commanded and desires for her.

SermonIndex Announcements :: The Head Covering Movement

Quote:
-----My brother or sister who advocate the head covering, if you cannot answer yes to the above questions then I gently say you are pursuing dead religion. For this is merely not submission. But the body praying and prophesying in the Holy Spirit.

Brother, I do not believe it is fair for you to say to sisters it is all dead religion. It is also about submission and in even some cases MODEST DRESS. In the past a covering for the head is considered a way of being modest also for woman. Such should not be looked down upon.

The underlying assumption is that those who cover heads will not speak in meetings or be "silent" as the Apostle Paul commanded sisters in one case in the Epistles. But rather woman who cover their head in the right way are recognizing God's economy, His ways in the Church and in the world. She is submitting to God's order and respecting the unseen world under God's and Christ's rulership. Such a sister can prophesy and speak God's word BOLDLY as under the leading of the Spirit and respecting the authority of men in the home and brothers in the Church. Ultimately the MAN Jesus Christ who is over the Church as Head.

They can prophesy and should but only under submission just as Christ did not share a word except from the Father and the Holy Spirit submitted to Christ to speak only of Him.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/16 15:27

What should a woman choose to do if her Husband request that she not wear a head dress ?

I know of personal accounts of which this is true, Should she or should she not continue to wear a head dress ?

Re: The Head Covering Movement, on: 2013/6/16 15:29

Quote:
-----Then Andrew if you are going to agree with the OP you will have to agree that the issue is the praying and prophesying of the Christian sisters in Corinth.

If we are going to carry this command today to have women wear a head covering in the church meeting then the women and the men will have to be allowed to pray and prophesy. And this may be in the language of tongues.

This is the issue I am raising and I do it respectfully. If one is going to insist that the head covering be binding as a New Covenant command. Then one is going to have to allow for the New Covenant gift of prophesy to be exercised.

You cannot separate the head covering issue from what Paul is addressing in the passage. Mainly the way in which men and women were to prophesy in the Corinthian church.

But if this command is to be binding today. Then one must allow for the gift of prophesy. Blaine

Not sure why you feel the need to draw me on that one Blaine but I am happy to be drawn. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are for all members from the least to the great and both male and female. Amen.

It was whilst observing an elderly sister in the 1980's that I both learned the real meaning of head covering as well as the reality of sisters ministering in the gifts of the Holy Spirit. When this sister prayed she always discreetly drew her shawl over her head. Then similarly when she prophesied and so on. It was a good living example. I have also seen veiled sisters with more hair than you could shake a stick at prophesying unto destruction with a spirit of malice and judgmentalism. Both good lessons. One to glorifying the Lord the other to a grieving of the Spirit.

Re: , on: 2013/6/16 15:39

Andrew only responding to your post. This done respectfully. I appreciate your position that all of the spiritual gifts are for the believers today. Also about the the example of the elder sister who prophesied with her shawl on. At least she was consistent with the passage under discussion.

Blaine

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/16 15:42

Can we consider the common headdress of what we see amongst the sisters today, which usually only covers the Bun of hair, while leaving the rest of the head exposed, is this in line with a Head Covering of what 1 Corinthians 11 is speaking about ?

Is 1 Corinthians 11 mandating sisters to not be seen in public without a headdress ?

Re: Vreg, on: 2013/6/16 15:53

Brother in reading your post you are saying women can prophesy and pray in church provided they are covered by an external cloth?

Bearmaster.

Re: Greg, on: 2013/6/16 16:58

Brother just to clarify. I have been respectful of the sisters who wear the head covering. I do not look down on them. I did say in a spirit of gentleness if prophesy or praying were not done while the sisters head were covered, that they would be pursuing dead religion. Perhaps I should say if not done with a fight heart attitude then a sister is pursuing dead religion.

But brother might I suggest, respectfully, that it could be the other way around. I have heard that some of those sisters who wear the head covering look down on those who do not. One brother posted that was his experience when he went to a Zac Poohnen conference.

Indeed to insist on this practice could lead to a spiritual elitism. It should be a matter of spiritual liberty as to what God may tell each sister. Personally I do not hold to this practice to be binding on churches today.

As usual these are my thoughts.

Bearmaster.

Re: , on: 2013/6/16 17:46

Pride is the operation of all men and women naturally speaking. Although some folks do seem to have an ability not to be overtly proud. This is true for believers and unbelievers. If we spent some time in a culture where women automatically wear head coverings the same reality can be found. In the Gujarati community where I once lived I was always blessed by the attitude of many women. I witnessed mothers with their families and saw their willingness to be a good example for their daughters and at the same time to honour their husbands. On the other hand some of the matrons of households behaved like devils and oppressed everyone under them. The same is true for every other culture I feel certain. Yet none of this can take away from or compare with the pleasantness and delight of a godly sister who covers her head and does so as a sign of obedience in essence unto the Lord. Even an unbelieving woman is more pleasing when she has no anger towards other men, but desires to please those she respects.

It is a natural phenomena and this is why I believe Paul expressed this issue in terms of a woman's hair. If cutting the hair off is not shameful to a woman, no amount of head covering will contribute to a good attitude. Things have become confused in many places and rebellion of both men and women has made for an impossible confusion. Yet even naturally speaking the hair has its own effect on those who see it. My daughter as a young girl had a full head of golden red hair. When we walked down the public streets the Gujaratis would often stop us and just look at her hair with wonder. How many mothers simply wanted to touch it and how many old men were openly blessed by the sight of it, is lost to count. Yet in that place there came a time when little girls were required to cover their beauty for the sake of modesty.

How much more then ought we who comprehend eternal life, to do that which is pleasing to Christ. If we can comprehend how to please other men, how much more ought we to comprehend how to please the Lord. Sadly this subject as with so many is cast onto the ground not only because of those sisters who reject it out of hand, but because of those men who fail to comprehend that nature itself teaches in visibility what God intends in visibility. It is not about the body but the one who created the body. The difficulty is intensified when we do that which we ought to do simply for the sake of appearance. Then it is further intensified when pastors and elders commend those sisters who do cover their heads in the local churches, failing to see which sisters are doing it for approval and in that motive some of them do take a dim view of those sisters who will not do it.

It seems to me to be ironic that Zac Poonen is mentioned in two threads. One in this thread because sisters in his fellowships allegedly shunned other sisters on this issue of head covering and in another thread because he was willing and able to clean up the excrement of a child with his own hands. Do we really want to comprehend reality or are we simply proud ourselves? What father would not want to preserve his daughter for her husband alone? What husband would not honour the father who laboured well in it? I believe there are those who for a similar motive encourage sisters to cover their heads in the churches, especially when they pray or prophecy in order to please our heavenly Father. There are also sisters who obey their consciences and in doing so honour the Father in heaven. It would be a brave man who discouraged a godly attitude.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/16 18:21

We had a wonderful house meeting today as the Lord moved in our presence and touched the hearts of many of the saints to testify of His goodness and pray openly. There are several things that take place in an "open" church meeting that are always a bit hard to convey to others. The old saying, "you just had to be there, to understand", is no less pertinent than in my post. We have been meeting together for years and I cannot tell you the last time I remember any strife or debate among our brethren. Head coverings or the lack thereof have never been spoken about, even once or been an issue in any sense of the word though some wear them and some don't. And the love for each other is unmistakable. I feel very refreshed in the Lord, today after our time together. The focus was completely on Jesus Christ (as it should be).

Psa_133:1 Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!

Amazing, how unimportant so many things become when you get into God's presence.

Now, what was this thread about? Oh, yes...this topic will continue to come up time after time which proves only one thing. Those who continue to bring it up are dissatisfied with the fact that the whole church is not conforming to their way of doing things and embracing this. Most major doctrines have 2 or more witnesses in scripture, yet this one does not.

After the book of John we see nothing of feet washing in the Early Church. That is why this is not a doctrine. They understood that Jesus was teaching that we should serve and minister to one another, especially when it is not desirable. And we don't see a second witness regarding head coverings.

Head coverings, mentioned only once in 1 chapter of Corinthians and we don't see this as a command or a practice that permeates the Church of Jesus Christ, today. Whenever, it is proposed (sometimes quite strongly), it never yields good fruit and of course, those who resist it are always viewed as rebellious.

But, what else do people have to do in a debate forum?

In reality and practicality, these types of discussions don't happen amongst brethren that are endeavoring to dwell together in unity and peace.

Rom 14:17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink (or head coverings); but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Rom 14:18 For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men.

So, if you are serving Christ in righteousness, peace and joy, you are acceptable to Christ and should be approved of men. Let us not then put a stumblingblock or occasion to fall in our brother's way.

Rom 14:19 Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

Re: The Doctrine of Headship - posted by Isleander (), on: 2013/6/17 11:20

Please see this link (and the link at the bottom of the page). Thanks, Alex.
<http://uk-christians.net/group/bible-teaching/page/headcovering>

Re: The Head Covering Movement - posted by narrowpath, on: 2013/6/17 12:27

We practise it, and we do not question others why they are not doing it. Most in our fellowship don't and I do not condemn anyone who does not. I have been in a church in Russia where they practise it. There was a lot of reverence for God in this place, very different from most places in the West I have been. The women had beautiful long hair, and the covering added spiritual beauty. They wore skirts and modest dresses. There were families with up to 12 children. They take their street shoes off when they enter the place of worship.

Yes, I also saw it practised in a church affiliated with Zac Poonen.

I started a post about headcovering some years back. It was a heated debate.

I agree there are godly women who do cover and godly women who do not, as well as ungodly women who cover, but this does not make me waver.

In all of these debates, be sure the L-word (legalist) comes out soon. I found it very revealing to see in what spirit some people argued.

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

My advice for those who cover, show a meek and gentle spirit towards those who disagree. Put your covering on your head and humility for the rest of your body. This is the best advertisement for this precious truth.

May Christ's peace rest upon us all.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/17 12:33

In referring to your link: <http://uk-christians.net/group/bible-teaching/page/headcovering>

I don't know how conducive to a good and fair discussion it is for the article to open up with denigrating Western Christians as being influenced by Feminism and that is why they don't subscribe to the headcovering. And, accusing them of being "brainwashed". It does give us a window into how you think, though. The conclusion is that those who wear headcoverings think that those who don't are worldly and still captivated by the spirit of feminism.

I don't need reams and reams to refute this.

The simple fact is baptism and the Lord's Supper which are ordinances of the Lord have several "witnesses" in Scripture and need no explanation outside of Scripture. Head covering is NOT an ordinance from the Lord.

Head coverings have no witnesses within Scripture, only occurring in ONE place and that is why people have to write reams and reams of articles attempting to convince people who have the Holy Spirit they MUST wear a head covering. If the people cannot be convinced, then they must be denigrated and shamed (even avoided) into finally acquiescing or leaving the fellowship, altogether. How abysmally carnal!!

Jesus Christ talked about remembering Him ("Do this in memory of me") and the Apostles/Church continued the "Lord's Supper". Jesus Christ instituted Baptism and the Apostles/Church continues it. Jesus Christ did not say anything at all about head coverings and in all of the NT, it occurs only in one place. No WITNESSES!

Much ado about nothing, but very divisive and it must grieve the Lord.

I appreciate your post, narrowpath.

Re: , on: 2013/6/17 12:59

One wonders about a female who may have been converted out of Islam. She is told she has freedom in Christ. She need not wear the burka or the hajeeb. Yet she goes into a fellowship that requires a head covering. One wonders?

I am speaking of a Moslem woman who may be converted in the west. In places like Egypt and Iran, those sisters who have come to Jesus wear the head covering for protection against Islamic persecution.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2013/6/17 13:22

I have to say I think some of the responses from some here have been kind of unfair toward sisters who wear the head covering. What is really interesting is that many of these posts come from men??? For those sisters who choose to follow their convictions and wear a head covering I think its awesome. The desire to follow JESUS and simply obey HIM in your heart is a true thing of beauty. These sisters are following the conviction of their hearts and seeking to live unto to JESUS I think that is wonderful, and I pray that they are continually blessed as they walk with HIM daily.

God bless
mj

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/6/17 14:01

Hi all aboard,

Probably you are not aware of the self-righteousness that comes through your post. "God, I thank you that I am not like these other people."

Quote:
-----Amazing, how unimportant so many things become when you get into God's presence.

Does that mean that anything that is not important to you should be unimportant to all? Who determines what is important?

Quote:
-----this topic will continue to come up time after time which proves only one thing.

In your mind or God's? So, it is not possible that some people are interested in discussing it?

Quote:
-----Most major doctrines have 2 or more witnesses in scripture, yet this one does not.

Are you saying that anything in Scripture that only has one witness should be discarded or is not from the Lord? Is it a doctrine that something must be mentioned twice? What if the Lord has a good reason for only putting it in his Word once?

Quote:
-----After the book of John we see nothing of feet washing in the Early Church.

Unfortunately, that statement is wrong. Paul mentions it to Timothy, and the early church writings contain references to it

. Of course, this is getting away from the primary topic of this thread.

Quote:
-----Head coverings, mentioned only once in 1 chapter of Corinthians and we don't see this as a command or a practice that permeates the Church of Jesus Christ, today.

We don't see a lot of things as a practice that Permeates the Church of Jesus Christ today, and for the most part that is because people are not following the Lord's will or plan, so of what use is the argument about whether we see something in the church today or not? What matters is whether it is in the Word or not.

Quote:
-----But, what else do people have to do in a debate forum?

This is actually not a debate forum. It is a revival forum. The original post was only putting forward something for people to consider, nothing more. If it does not bless or encourage you in the Lord, no one said you had to accept it or agree with it to be part of these forums. So I find that the one who wishes to debate is you.

Quote:
-----Rom 14:17 For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink (or head coverings); but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Why add to the Word of God and have Paul contradict himself?

Quote:
-----Head covering is NOT an ordinance from the Lord.

Why reject plain Scripture and depart from the apostles sent by Christ? Paul said, "Now I praise you, brothers, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." What follows? The head covering and the Lord's Supper.

Quote:
-----Jesus Christ did not say anything at all about head coverings and in all of the NT, it occurs only in one place. No WITNESSES!

Jesus didn't talk about many topics, such as homosexuality. Should we reject what the apostles say on that topic also? And I hope you are able to see that saying one witness is "no witnesses" makes everything you say lack credibility.

Quote:
-----Rom 14:19 Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

All Christians agree with that Scripture. But that does not mean that we limit ourselves to only discussing certain Scriptures. All Scripture is profitable.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/17 14:11

Quote:

-----by MaryJane on 2013/6/17 10:22:38

I have to say I think some of the responses from some here have been kind of unfair toward sisters who wear the head covering. What is really interesting is that many of these posts come from men??? For those sisters who choose to follow their convictions and wear a head covering I think it's awesome. The desire to follow JESUS and simply obey HIM in your heart is a true thing of beauty. These sisters are following the conviction of their hearts and seeking to live unto to JESUS I think that is wonderful, and I pray that they are continually blessed as they walk with HIM daily.

God bless
mj

I think that is a great way to end a troublesome thread (that I believe is ALWAYS divisive), by extending to those who don't wear headcoverings the same sentiments. Namely: Those who don't wear headcoverings are simply following their convictions, too and want to obey the Lord in their heart and be a testimony of beauty to Him.

Good word! What else needs to be said?

Endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

Usually the person that starts an OP is actively involved and when they are not, it makes me wonder why they started the thread.

Re: The Head Covering Movement - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/6/17 14:15

Quote:

-----Head coverings are not a popular doctrine. In fact, that's quite the understatement. So why would I start a movement based upon it? Do I enjoy controversy? Absolutely not. Looking to be divisive? The opposite. Then what would possess me to do such a thing? The short answer is , because it's in the Bible.

So that someone does not misunderstand where I am coming from, the only sure foundation is Christ. Head coverings are nothing to "start a movement based upon it". If head coverings become our focus, instead of Christ, we are building on wrong foundations that are guaranteed to fail.

However, don't let the pendulum swing the other way. That does not mean that head coverings are not in the Bible or that they should not be discussed. Of course they are in the Bible, and since they are, they are to be a part of the Christian life. Unless we are ready to throw out the Bible.

Greg said the following:

Quote:

-----Other ones such as Foot washing, Holy Kiss, Baptism for the dead are 1-2 verses are not really as important or they would be commanded or emphasized more. Also there is no specific spiritual allegory behind the practice as shown in scriptures for Foot Washing etc. But for head covering as other have alluded to, submission and spiritual headship is a major spiritual teaching behind it.

I agree that any passage that discusses both God and Christ is among the most important passages in the Bible. 1 Corinthians 11 begins this way, and so we recognize that something essential for all believers is in this section of Scripture. As for something only being mentioned in 1 or 2 Scriptures, I know that Jesus cited some pretty obscure verses from the Old Testament to make some major points. I don't believe something being mentioned less often than something else means that it is not important to the Lord or that we can push it aside or ignore it. I think Paul talks as much about "foolishness" in the two Corinthian letters than all the Scriptures together on the Lord's Supper. In the end, quality wins over quantity. What is the Lord trying to communicate? What is his message through the Word?

Re: , on: 2013/6/17 14:18

Koheleth no one is denying that head covering is not in the scriptures. But the question would be is the command still binding on the church today or was it a cultural issue particular to the Corinthians

All scripture is breathed out by God and profitable. However not all scripture is applicable. That would certainly convey O.T. law. There are ceremonial verses in the Old Covenant writings that are not binding on New Covenant believers.

There are web sites that will argue both sides of the passage under question. It may be for the Holy Spirit to lead and guide what each sister is to do in each situation.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by allaboard, on: 2013/6/17 14:24

What does the church do when some are convinced and some are not convinced on a matter?

They pray and wait on God and continue to love one another. There is really not a whole lot more you can do, especially after reading all various articles of why and why not.

All the church can do is pray and ask God. We cannot force one another into something that they have no conviction about.

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/6/17 14:35

Quote:
-----Koheleth no one is denying that head covering is not in the scriptures. But the question would be is the command still binding on the church today or was it a cultural issue particular to the Corinthians.

All scripture is breathed out by God and profitable. However not all scripture is applicable. That would certainly convey O.T. law. There are ceremonial verses in the Old Covenant writings that are not binding on New Covenant believers.

There are web sites that will argue both sides of the passage under question. It may be for the Holy Spirit to lead and guide what each sister is to do in each situation.

Great questions. Is there anything in the New Covenant that is cultural? I guess we could argue that baptism is cultural since the Jews and John the Baptist practiced it before Jesus. Since the entire New Covenant was birthed into Jewish and Roman culture, I guess those of us who live in English-speaking lands could argue it is all cultural. Please don't misunderstand. I am not at all trying to be sarcastic, but rather very serious. How do we decide which Scriptures are okay to throw out because they were only cultural? What about the idea that "holy men led by the Spirit spoke from God"?

And I agree that it may be for each sister to do as led by the Lord. This leading would absolutely have to do with her husband or father and with godly teachers in the church. "No Scripture is of any private interpretation."

Re: , on: 2013/6/17 14:38

What do Elisabeth Elliot, Corrie Ten Boom, and Nancy Leigh DeMoss have in common? To the best of my knowledge they did not wear a head covering. Yet they were mightily used by God. Does anybody dispute this?

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/17 14:46

Quote:
-----What do Elisabeth Elliot, Corrie Ten Boom, and Nancy Leigh DeMoss have in common? To the best of my knowledge they did not wear a head covering. Yet they were mightily used by God. Does anybody dispute this?

Brother, obviously no one considers having a head covering practice the greater spirituality where someone is more saved or more anointed with the Spirit. It is a simple act of obedience that declares a hidden spiritual truth. Not all sisters receive the revelation of it because it is not taught in mainstream Christendom and also that is not a very important command compared to many other repeated New Covenant principles and commands.

Thus it is important because it "is" in Scripture. Yet it is not a full requirement for a healthy church. All first century Christians gentile or Jewish wore head covering, that is just a fact. Along with over 1900 years of Christianity by in-large had this practice.

Another way to show how this is practical is by the question: Does Christianity change everything about us or just our hearts and we can still live 100% like the world in every way including our appearance etc? Obviously Scripture has much to share on how we can be different in almost every realm of life.

Again brethren for me this is not a point of division for any brethren. We MUST NOT divide over this but we should give freedom to those who feel led to practice this. And those that practice this should NOT ever demand it of others. That to me is a worthy conclusion and let each person be convinced in his own mind.

I am going to close and lock the thread at this point to just leave the discussions as-is and consider them profitable to encourage saints who have interest to seek the Lord personally on this matter.

It was a blessing that by in large there was a graceful tone to many posts and we can disagree with each other on this and still 100% be brethren who are united in the common faith and pursuing Christ as His Bride.

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/6/17 14:49

Quote:
-----What does the church do when some are convinced and some are not convinced on a matter?

They pray and wait on God and continue to love one another. There is really not a whole lot more you can do, especially after reading all various articles of why and why not.

All the church can do is pray and ask God. We cannot force one another into something that they have no conviction about.

Was this article ever about forcing anyone to do anything? Please be careful with where you allow your thoughts to take you.

In the Bible, they did not "pray and wait on God and continue to love one another" as good as that sounds. They had what is sometimes called the "Jerusalem Council" where all had a chance to share their view and then the ones on whom God's leading rested concluded the matter by giving their experience (Peter) and Scripture (James).

Even though this meeting resulted in bringing out God's will for all churches, following Christ has never been about being forced to do anything. Neither Christ nor his apostles nor any spirit-controlled believer since has ever forced another to do anything. The call in any and all areas of the Christian life is for "whoever will".