

**General Topics :: head covering a very different interpretation****head covering a very different interpretation - posted by joliboy11, on: 2014/9/30 0:38**

Hello,
Greetings from the Philippines,

I just met brothers and sisters who believe that head covering means having a long hair, but not just that, their interpretation on what Paul said on not shaving women's hair is "never cutting women's hair", is there a possibility that they are right?

is there any historical evidences supporting this view?

Re: head covering a very different interpretation - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/9/30 6:17

Wrong interpretation, case of having very poor logical thinking.

Paul clearly says this 1 Cor 11:6-For if a woman does not cover her head, let her also have her hair cut off; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her cover her head.

Here Paul is giving a women 2 options,
Option 1:- To cover her hair
Option 2:- Or to have her head shaved

So it is very clear that hair is not at all an option given by Paul. Either you cover it or shave it. How then long hair can be come her head covering?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2014/10/4 18:45

RE: ///Wrong interpretation, case of having very poor logical thinking///

Should a man ever wear a hat according to the logic by which you interpret 1 Cor 11 ?

Does 1 Cor 11 teach that a woman is to cover her hair or her head ?

The common Menno/Amish, 16-18 century hair dress that many are wearing today, and believe themselves to be fulfilling a legal approach to 1 Cor 11 does not even cover half the head.

Edit add :

RE: ///How then long hair can become her head covering? ///

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

but

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

Re: head covering a very different interpretation - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2014/10/6 19:32

Opps! double post. Dunno how it happened but it did.

Re: head covering a very different interpretation - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2014/10/6 19:32

joliboy,

Christian ladies used to wear a head covering up until the 1900 when they started to back off. In the 1800s they worked to modify its style and has been going on still among groups that adhere to this doctrine of the head covering being a fabric covering.

All I am saying is that historically this scripture was understood as meaning a fabric covering, not the hair itself being it.

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/10/7 1:43

Quote:

Should a man ever wear a hat according to the logic by which you interpret 1 Cor 11 ?

The logical statement is not mine but Apostle Paul's. I only interpreted what options are possible based on his logical statement. That statement is clearly mentioned only for women not for man so there is no question of applying it on man. Not sure how you came with this conclusion.

Quote:

RE: ///How then long hair can become her head covering? ///

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

The questions you have asked nor the scripture you post has anything to do with the logical interpretation that I have posted based on Paul's teachings. If at all you want to prove me wrong you should identify a 3rd possible logical interpretation of 1 Cor 11:6. Which you have not done, nor anyone who teaches anything contrary to scripture can.

Even in 1 Cor 11:15 (that you have posted) -Paul clearly states that long hair is women's glory. But Women's glory belong to man (1Cor11:7). Hence the entire point of women covering her Glory (hair) in Church. But Man is God's glory. Hence his head should be let uncovered.

Paul never says that Hair is a replacement of head covering. He says the opposite based on the logical conclusions that I have posted earlier.

Brother I do not force any women to cover her head other than my wife and daughter (but they do willfully). Nor do I look down on anyone. But it is better not to misguide someone with such false interpretation of scripture. The punishment for such people is very severe in bible. Hope you understand the seriousness. Better to be humble and say that I do not have an interpretation rather than spread a wrong understanding.

General Topics :: head covering a very different interpretation

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2014/10/7 10:35

PP wrote : ///Should a man ever wear a hat according to the logic by which you interpret 1 Cor 11 ?///

Sree responded :

Quote:

The logical statement is not mine but Apostle Paul's. I only interpreted what options are possible based on his logical statement. That statement is clearly mentioned only for women not for man so there is no question of applying it on man. Not sure how you came with this conclusion.

For your interpretation to be consistent:

We must acknowledge that the context is referring to Women covering their heads and men not covering their heads while praying and prophesying. (If indeed it is even speaking of covering with a cloth)

But yet, so many and I would assume those of your circle require or else teach that the Woman should always wear a hair dress because at any given moment they might be in prayer or perhaps that they should always be in communion.

The inconsistency that I feel with that interpretation is this: verse 4 says : "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head."

as well as verse 7 likewise says : "(((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."

That is why I asked you if a man should never wear a hat ?

For your interpretation to be consistent, it would seem that you would have to conclude : a man indeed ought not to ever wear a hat. I am not aware of any sect that teaches the such.

What about me ? I am light skinned and work in the blistering sun all day, Is Paul in verse 7 saying that I ought not cover myself from the blistering sun ? or is verse 4 saying that the entire day that I have my straw hat to protect myself from the blistering sun, that I am not even to inwardly pray and be in communion ?

Or how about the men in Alaska or Russia that must all day cover their heads from the blistering cold ?

Can you see the inconsistency of your interpretation ?

sree wrote :

Quote:

Paul never says that Hair is a replacement of head covering.

indeed he never said a replacement, What he did say was that : "her hair is given her for a covering"

That was in verse 15 of which Paul was contrasting verse 14 "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?"

The impression that These verses give is that hair is a covering.

Both Paul and Peter elsewhere teach that women ought not adorn themselves with braided/plaiting of the hair. If a head covering was a command then those areas of Scripture seem to be the place for a second witness of such a command, and the need to make a point about styling of the hair would seem to be without need to address.

Quote:

But it is better not to misguide someone with such false interpretation of scripture. The punishment for such people is very severe in bible. Hope you understand the seriousness. Better to be humble and say that I do not have an interpretation rather than spread a wrong understanding.

May God indeed reveal to me if my understanding is wrong, in which it may well be, as we all look through a glass darkly, but may I not blindly except certain interpretations of Scripture just because Zac Poonen or Brother Denny interprets them a certain way, though I respect both greatly.
and may I also not except certain interpretations just because Clement of Tertullian taught them a certain way.

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2014/10/8 2:42

First of all I apologize if my previous post sounded harsh. I had nothing against you in my spirit but felt that my words did not sound polite.

Quote:

But yet, so many and I would assume those of your circle require or else teach that the Woman should always wear a hair dress because at any given moment they might be in prayer or perhaps that they should always be in communion.

Your entire question about men should not wear hat according to my interpretation of Head covering is based on the above assumption of yours. This assumption is not true. 1 Cor 11 talks about head covering in a Church or a public meeting while praying or prophesying. I am sure Paul is not concerned about what women wear when alone or at home. So those who preach head covering all the time are speaking from their own understanding. Even Zac Poonen whom you have quoted does not support this neither does his wife cover her head all the time. Since your assumption is wrong your conclusion is also wrong.

See let me explain my logic to you again so that you will understand how to counter argue. My logic is simple in 1 Cor 11:6 Paul gives women only 2 choices, either to cover their head in Church or to come to church with their head shaved. There is no third choice as pointed out in this thread of having a long hair. So if you want to prove this interpretation of mine is wrong then you should find a way to say that 1 Cor 11:6 allowing women to have long hair as her covering. But frankly you have not done that. Instead you have been trying to post against my emphasis of women covering their head by comparing it with men. See the point of entire thread is this question "Is long hair for women a replacement of head covering?" the answer according to 1 Cor 11:6 is NO. There is no 3rd option given by Paul or scripture.

Quote:

indeed he never said a replacement, What he did say was that : "her hair is given her for a covering"

That was in verse 15 of which Paul was contrasting verse 14 "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?"

Brother "her hair is given her for a covering" is only a small part of Verse 15 which you have taken out of context. The bigger picture of verse 15 as I pointed in my previous post is "but if a woman has long hair, it is a glory to her? For her hair is given to her for a covering."

If you see in verse 14 and 15, Apostle is no longer emphasising the need for head covering. He is talking about why Women alone should cover their head but men should not. The natural difference for women and man is Men having long hair is a disgrace but for women long hair is a glorious COVERING. A beautiful covering. But that does not mean that hair itself is head covering. Such a glory (her hair) should be covered in Church because women's glory belongs to her husband. A man's glory is her woman which should be kept covered in Church according to 1 Cor 11:7.

Do you now see how your interpretation is wholly based on a portion of verse 15 taken totally out of context? Satan tried to deceive Jesus by such broken verses only. Jesus fought by balancing the scripture with scripture.

Quote:

Both Paul and Peter else where teach that women ought not adorn themselves with braided/plaiting of the hair. If a head covering was a command than those areas of Scripture seem to be the place for a second witness of such a command, and the need to make a point about styling of the hair would seem to be without need to address.

This is the only logical argument that you have placed so far. It is really a valid good argument. But it is again based on the assumption you have that Paul was emphasizing head covering all the time. If so then why did Paul specifically state "Cover your head while praying or prophesying"? So Paul only meant public or Church meeting in which a woman prays or Prophesy. Not all the time.

But when it comes to adorning themselves or their hair Paul wants women to keep it simple and not focus on such things all the time. So there is no contradiction here.

Quote:

May God indeed reveal to me if my understanding is wrong, in which it may well be, as we all look through a glass darkly, but may I not blindly except certain interpretations of Scripture just because Zac Poonen or Brother Denny interprets them a certain way, though I respect both greatly. and may I also not except certain interpretations just because Clement of Tertullian taught them a certain way.

God can teach a man or correct him even through a donkey. Brother Zac Poonen is a Godly man of this age whom I know both personally and as a Bible teacher. He has such a wonderful testimony for God which I have witnessed in numerous circumstances. It is a faith that comes not by observing one's Gift but by seeing one's life.

My understanding of Scripture though might be influenced by Zac, did not come completely from him. I used his teachings till God started speaking to me personally. I still hear him and willfully subject to him. I am not even sure whether he is in agreement with my interpretation of 1 Cor 11.

Brother my point is not that you should be corrected. I am sure no one in Christian forum will change their view even if they are proven wrong. There is always a layer of pride on all over Bible understanding. Which is very difficult to penetrate.

Like I said in my previous post it is a curse to teach something wrong. Since it is very evident that your point of understanding of Head Covering is entirely based on a broken part of verse 15 that is taken out of context, it is better for you not to teach others the same and thereby asking them to ignore one of God's command to women.

General Topics :: head covering a very different interpretation

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2014/10/8 10:19

Quote:
-----First of all I apologize if my previous post sounded harsh. I had nothing against you in my spirit but felt that my words did not sound polite.

Thank you brother.

Quote:
-----Brother my point is not that you should be corrected. I am sure no one in Christian forum will change their view even if they are proven wrong. There is always a layer of pride on all over Bible understanding. Which is very difficult to penetrate. Like I said in my previous post it is a curse to teach something wrong. Since it is very evident that your point of understanding of Head Covering is entirely based on a broken part of verse 15 that is taken out of context, it is better for you not to teach others the same and there by asking them to ignore one of God's command to women..

Brother this is a discussion forum not a teaching platform, where hopefully iron can sharpen iron.
I believe if you would look back at my post you will see that I was not presenting my perspective as teaching.

Something that I want to give more meditation on is verse 3 in which defines the head. verse 4 than says that every man praying or prophesying with his head covered (which according to the context of verse 3 would appear to be Christ) verse 5 than speaking of the woman says that every : Woman that prayeth or prophesying with her head uncovered (in context of verse 3 is her husband), dishonoureth her head (her head being man).

There is alot here to meditate on.

What does it mean to pray with Christ covered ?

What does it mean for the woman to pray with man uncovered ?

apologies - posted by proudpapa, on: 2014/10/9 10:54

PP wrote :
///But yet, so many and I would assume those of your circle require or else teach that the Woman should always wear a hair dress because at any given moment they might be in prayer or perhaps that they should always be in communion.///

Quote:
-----Your entire question about men should not wear hat according to my interpretation of Head covering is based on the above assumption of yours. This assumption is not true. 1 Cor 11 talks about head covering in a Church or a public meeting while praying or prophesying. I am sure Paul is not concerned about what women wear when alone or at home. So those who preach head covering all the time are speaking from their own understanding. Even Zac Poonen whom you have quoted does not support this neither does his wife cover her head all the time. Since your assumption is wrong your conclusion is also wrong.

Sree you are correct and I want to apologize for many mistakes in my previous post including the pride behind them.

1. I did wrongfully stereotype and wrongfully assume.

2. Even if I had correctly assumed (which I did not), I now feel it is wrong to use actual Saints names in any form of negative connotation, In the future when I disagree with a certain Saints positions I will try to remember to research there views on the subject and present those views and than explain where and why I disagree.

The main issues that I have with the headcovering movement was what I felt where there inconsistencies, I was amazed and convicted in light of my previous post that Brother Zac addressed all of these inconsistencies.

The first inconsistency is one that I felt but had not brought up Bro.Zac addresses it :

Excerpts from Zac Poonen on the headcovering :

"What does the Bible teach about head-covering for women in the church meetings?

This has become a controversial subject in churches in Western countries and among Westernized Christians in India. It would probably be true to say that 99% of sisters who cover their heads when praying and prophesying do not know why they do so; and 99% of brothers who keep their heads uncovered when praying and prophesying do not know why they do so."

One of my questions was : ///Should a man ever wear a hat according to the logic by which you interpret 1 Cor 11 ?///

Brother Zac addresses this :

"Some say that since we are commanded to pray at all times (Lk.18:1; 1 Thess.5:17), therefore a woman should cover her head all 24 hours of the day. Scripture must always be read in its context, if we are to understand it aright. The entire section (1 Cor.11:1-34) is dealing with the meetings of the church (Verses 16 and 18 make that clear). So it is obvious that the Holy Spirit was referring to church meetings when He gave this command. If we add to that, and insist that women should cover their heads at all times, then we will be adding to the Scriptures.

And further: If those who preach a 24-hour head covering are consistent, they must also teach that men (who should also be praying at all times) should never cover their heads at any time - and therefore should never wear a cap or a hat, at any time . whether it be hot, raining, or snowing. Such teachers must also then teach that women should keep their heads covered even when sleeping or showering/bathing (=24 hours). But they do not preach that . proving that they are inconsistent in their teaching. We can safely ignore such inconsistent teachers."

Another question I had was RE: /// Does 1 Cor 11 teach that a woman is to cover her hair or her head ?

The common Menno/Amish, 16-18 century hair dress that many are wearing today, and believe themselves to be fulfilling a legal approach to 1 Cor 11 does not even cover half the head.///

Brother Zac also addresses this issue :

"I have also observed that many sisters who practice a 24-hour head covering do not cover their entire heads. They cover only the back portion of their heads or just the small part of their hair that is tied up in a bun at the back of their heads . so that the glory of their hair is still visible. A small piece of cloth at the back of the head however is only an excuse for a head-covering . and not a head-covering at all, because the head and the glory of the hair are still not covered. Such " namesake head-coverings" are worn by legalists only to ease their conscience and to appear "holy" before others. But their teachers do not object to this, because they themselves are inconsistent in their teaching."

Brother Zac addresses all of my questions and more at : <http://www.cfcindia.com/web/mainpages/articles.php?display=article39>

Re: head covering a very different interpretation - posted by ZealForTruth, on: 2015/1/5 2:57

The best explanation I found on this subject is the following by brother Zac Poonen:

There are at least three reasons given in the New Testament why a woman should cover her head when she prays or prophesies in the meetings of the church:

First: The Bible says, "A man should NOT cover his head." and the reason given is: "because he is the image and glory of God". In contrast, we are told, "but the woman is the glory of man" (1 Cor.11:7). The glory of man must be covered in the church and since woman is the glory of man, she testifies to this fact by covering her head. This is the plain and simple meaning of this verse.

Second: The Bible says, "A woman's long hair is her glory" (1 Cor.11:15). The glory of the woman also must be covered in the church, just like the glory of man. And so she must cover her head which has the glory of her long hair. Almost all women are conscious that their long hair is a major part of what makes them look attractive and that is why even among those women who do put a covering on their heads, most of them cover only a part of their hair!! If a woman does not want to cover her head, then the only alternative that the New Testament offers is to remove that glory, by shaving her head completely: "If a woman does not cover her head, let her also have her hair cut off; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut off or her head shaved, let her cover her head" (1 Cor.11:6).

Third: The Bible says: "Man was not created for the woman's sake, but woman for the man's sake. Therefore the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels" (1 Cor.11:10). The head-covering symbolizes the fact that a woman accepts her God-appointed role as having been created "for man's sake" as his helper and therefore her willingness to be submissive to male authority - whether as a wife to her husband, or as a daughter to her father, or as a sister in the church to the church-elders. It is significant that the disappearance of the head-covering from women in Western churches (on a large scale) coincided with the time that the movement for "Women's Liberation" (a phrase used in a book in 1949) began to spread in Western countries about 60 years ago. The "angels" mentioned in this verse could refer either to the fallen angels or to the angels in heaven. So it could either be a reminder to women to bear in mind that the fallen angels fell because they were not submissive to authority. Or it could mean "A woman should wear a covering on her head as a sign that she is under man's authority - a fact for all the angels (in heaven) to notice and rejoice in" (as The Living Bible paraphrases that verse).

The full article can be found at: <http://www.cfcindia.com/web/mainpages/articles.php?display=article39>

One interesting point that he makes that I never thought about is, if the hair is really the covering that the woman needs, then according to the Bible, it means that every man should shave his head bald as he is not allowed to pray with his head covered. Now that sure puts things into perspective!

Re: apologies - posted by Sree (), on: 2015/1/5 5:20

Quote:

Sree you are correct and I want to apologize for many mistakes in my previous post including the pride behind them.

Brother that is totally fine. I was not at all offended by your post. I only felt the assumption behind your question incorrect and pointed it out. Forgive me if my post was rude. I always struggle to put my thoughts correctly in text! I also believe textual conversation is not the best to express our emotions.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2015/1/5 11:10

This is the best simple explanation scripturally we have found in this short PDF booklet, trust it helps the saints:

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

<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=25173&commentView=itemComments>

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2015/1/6 11:33

I am not aware of any other New Testament ordinance that has generated as much controversy, conflict as the application of the head covering as taught in 1Corinthians 11.

The issues raised are: size, is it necessary?, is it essential for salvation?, when worn, when and how often, style, color. As a person who believes in the literal application of this scripture I do have a few 'ideas' concerning this issue. You must remember that even though I was taught this from infancy, I had to come to the place where I had to choose to wear it or not wear it. I had to deal with all the questions that came because I did not want to wear it! I did not want to stick out like a sore thumb in public! Bottom line: I did not want to wear it. Period. I wanted to look pretty like the women of the world!

How did it happen where I came to the point of wearing it joyfully? This was and still is the work of the Holy Spirit, nothing more, nothing less. It is, was a process - one still ongoing, believe it or not. And why so? Because there are too many others who claim the name of Christ who do not make application. Yes, this is a stumbling block to many.

The Holy Spirit is ever so kind, I promise. He gave me a love for the WORD, I find in it a delight, a pleasure, a joy to study. In this quest to read, study the WORD I was led to study the book of Numbers! Really! Apart from the inspiring leading of the Holy Spirit I could see how this book could be boring. Really boring. But it was not. The Lord showed me a very profound lesson: in the giving of the ceremonial law God was very precise in how the rituals were to be done. Very exacting. No detail was missed...and if it was I assume God expected them to use common sense to fill in the gaps but I am not aware of this being the case - not ever having sacrificed an animal.

In studying the OT law I see where God was very precise, exacting in matters that meant a lot to Him. This exacting nature tells us a lot about God - consider nature and how well it functions, nothing haphazard there.

Fast forward to the New Testament and in particular 1Corinthians 11:1-16. All one reads here is about headship, the veiling and its reasons for wearing - for power, for the angels. There is no pattern given, no style decreed only that it is to be worn when praying or prophesying. This is all.

If style was important God would have given us a pattern - similar to the instructions he gave for the building of the tabernacle, etc. But He did give us the Holy Spirit who was promised to guide us into ALL truth. Now we have the basis for its application but what style?

Would you know that among people who wear it this is an ongoing point of discussion. If one is in a church where the veiling is required there will be carnal members who will crowd the boundaries set by their brotherhood, with little to no regard for what the Holy Spirit would want you to do so in many cases you may end up with a symbol of a symbol.

Many distractors will criticize that the head is not fully covered if the covering does not fully cover the hair. I am told this style was not practiced by the early Christian ladies but was introduced to religious culture by the Moslems. Nowhere does scripture say that hair cannot be exposed.

In my opinion and conviction, I am of the mind that a head covering should be of a style that ungodly folks will recognize it for what it is. If it is just a doily it looks as though they wish they did not have to wear a head covering - or even its symbol.

A few years ago our church decided to allow the flowing veil. At that point I did not feel led to change my head covering style. Later I saw one I liked but the Holy Spirit stopped me. He asked me some questions - forget all the ones he asked me, but I learned He did not want me to change. Now I am happy to stick out like a sore thumb and He has given me many opportunities to witness for him because of it. I have no complaints and only praise for Him who loved me and did so much for me. The sacrifice I pay to do this pales in comparison to what He did for me that I do not consider it much at all.

General Topics :: head covering a very different interpretation

. Just want to please Him. That is all.

Sandra