

Head-Coverings in Worship Part 6

by Milton Vincent

In this sermon, Milton Vincent argues that the covering Paul is advocating in 1 Corinthians 11 is a cloth covering, not hair bound up or long hair.

Duration: 1:36:53

Topics: "Head Coverings"

Description

In this sermon, the speaker expresses disappointment with a seven-page note that fails to fully explain verse 6 of a biblical text. He criticizes Gordon Clark's commentary for not addressing the part of the verse that discusses women cutting their hair short if they are not covered. The speaker then presents three different interpretations of the passage, with one suggesting that the covering advocated by Paul is hair arranged in an orderly fashion on top of the head. Despite struggling with his voice, the speaker proceeds to present overheads and encourages the congregation to engage with the challenging material. The sermon concludes with a prayer of gratitude for the clarity of the gospel.

Transcript

Good evening. How many of you did not bring your handout back tonight or you weren't here this morning and you need another one? Go ahead and raise your hand. Do we just have one guy doing this? Okay, let's see.

Anybody else? Vernon, you didn't bring yours back? You know, actually, I need one. Let's see. Yeah, can I have one? Vernon still needs one, Sebastian.

All right, well, go ahead and turn in your Bibles tonight to 1 Corinthians chapter 11. 1 Corinthians chapter 11 for our time of study in the Word tonight. And tonight will be a little more of the same of what we were doing this morning.

It's probably going to have somewhat of an academic feel to you. But I really think that if we accomplish what I want to accomplish tonight, next Sunday is not going to feel that way to you. So let's really just muscle our way through the material that we're trying to cover tonight.

And I think we'll be better off for the exercise from a variety of standpoints. But the title of the message tonight, I guess, is Head Coverings and Worship, Part 6. Head Coverings and Worship, Part 6. And as you look on page four of the handout, what we are doing throughout the length of today is we are asking and

trying to answer the question. What is the covering that Paul is advocating in 1 Corinthians chapter 11, verses 2 through 16? As you look at the text, 1 Corinthians chapter 11, Paul says in verse four, every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.

But every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head. Verse six, 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, then let her cover her head.

Verse seven, for a man ought not to have his head covered, Paul says. And then verse 10, therefore, the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head. And then verse 13, judge for yourselves, is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? Now, this may not seem like a big deal to you.

In fact, I think apart from this text, none of us would have thought, you know, the presence or absence of some type of material on our head really is of very little significance to God. And yet it's clear from this passage that it is very important, especially in the context of prayer and prophecy. And so it's very evident in this passage, and I think all of us would agree on this, that Paul is telling men you should not have something on your head when you pray and prophesy.

And he's telling women you need to have something on your head. Your head needs to be covered when you pray and when you prophesy. The question we're asking today is what is that covering that is obviously of such great importance to the Apostle Paul in this passage? Well, we began this morning to look at the different views of the matter.

There are actually three different ways that people answer this question. There is, first of all, the those who and you see this on page four, who would say that the covering that Paul is advocating in this passage is hair that is bound up and arranged in an orderly fashion on top of the head. In other words, having a feminine do with the hair, not just hanging down, but having it drawn up on top of the head.

I'm really struggling with my voice tonight for some reason. I can't take a deep breath. If I do, I feel like I'm going to cough.

So I'm taking smaller breaths, but then I don't have air to preach with. So anyway, I'll just not preach right now and just show you some overheads. How's that? Well, I get some air.

Let me. This is from a book on entitled Hairstyles. The first five thousand years, fashions and hairs and hair.

The first five thousand years put out by a guy named Richard Corson, just a secular historian. And every one of the images that I'm going to show you have been drawn from either written descriptions or from statuettes or from pictures that were drawn in the first century. And you might be interested in some of the hairstyles that were common in the first century.

Here's some of them. And some of these may look, you know, a little bit similar even to hairstyles today. And then some are quite different.

Every one of these images are from the first century. That's a pretty hefty do there. There's some more.

And then here's some pretty sophisticated ones as well from the first century. And you'll notice that, you know, on many of these hairdos, you see the hair drawn up. They're doing something with it.

And part of the reason for that is you may get the impression, well, that must have been what every woman did. Well, no. But if you're going to pose for a statue, you're going to do something with your hair.

Right. And so that's what these women did. But that may not have been necessarily how they always wore their hair.

Just like you wear your hair different to get a picture with Olin Mills, maybe a couple of months ago than you would normally. This is the way women wore their hair when they really got dressed up. And then here's some more styles all the way to the letter I. Those are first century hairstyles.

And then these later ones are from the second and the third century. Oh, thanks. So that's what some of the hairstyles were during this era, especially during the first century.

The century in which Paul is writing to the Corinthians. And by the way, we're going to come back to this a little bit later. But when you look at the hairstyles there, does that seem like the hairstyles that people would really give a lot of time to in a culture where 95 percent of all women wore full head coverings all the time? That's actually not the evidence that you get from history.

Actually, hair was a very big deal to both men and women. Slaves would cut their master's hair in the first century and beyond that. But the average person would go to a barbershop and get his hair cut.

And they also had women who would really dress up hair. And sometimes it would take hours just developing these towering and very fancy hairdos. And also I was fascinated to read in this book of how sophisticated the industry, the hair industry was, even during the first century.

I mean, they had developed dyes. Women would want to dye their hair blonde back in the first century so as to look like the German women. And they had different recipes for dyeing one's hair.

There were women who would sit out in the sun in order to lighten their hair to make it a little bit more blonde. There was a whole industry that developed around this. They even had curling irons back then, just kind of rods that they would heat up and then they would use to curl their hair.

And so this was something that women would spend a lot of time on. And it makes sense why Paul would tell Christian women in 1 Timothy 2, don't be braiding your hair with gold and pearl ornaments and so forth. And why Peter would tell Christian women in 1 Peter 3, essentially don't rely on braiding of the hair to be what makes you a beautiful woman, is the spirit of what he is saying there.

Those types of instructions make a lot of sense in a culture where it was not unusual for a woman to be out in public with her hair uncovered. Now, that is not to say I mean, I'll have to say that wearing a head covering was more normal then than it is in America right now. But having said that, it would be wrong for us to assume that it was an unusual thing for a pagan Roman woman to be out in public with her head uncovered.

But nonetheless, as you look at some of those styles, you can get an idea what some people may be saying when they say that what Paul is telling women to do is to bind their hair up in an orderly and a feminine fashion. So we looked at that particular view and then on page 5 near the bottom, we looked at a

second view that some people advocate and that is suggesting that the covering that Paul is telling women to wear is long hair. And the uncovered status of the man should be that he has short hair.

But Paul is teaching women that you need to have a covering of long hair at least when you pray and you prophesy. And then we looked on page 6 at Spiros Zodiotis, the scholar who takes an either or view and say that Paul's point is merely that women be covered with any kind of covering, whether that is a cloth covering or if a woman's hair is too short, she goes ahead and wears a cloth covering. But once her hair grows out, then her hair would be an adequate covering.

We then came this morning to a third view. And this is the view that I am suggesting to you guys this evening once again. And that is the view that when Paul is telling women they need to cover their heads and when he tells men they are not to cover their heads when they pray and prophesy, Paul is speaking of a cloth covering of one sort or another.

And according to this view, as I say on page 7, Paul is correcting women who were not wearing a cloth head covering and he was also correcting men who were wearing them, which Roman men would often do from the emperor on down when they worshipped certain Roman deities. And folks, as we begin to look at this particular view, just kind of going through the text, we got some distance, we got through verse 5. And let's just review a little bit, pick up our train of thought, and then press on. But as we look at the text of Scripture, folks, in verse 4, Paul says, Every man who has something on his head while praying or prophesying disgraces his head.

Who remembers what that Greek expression is in verse 4? Kata kephales. I saw some people mouthing it. So, kata kephales is the expression that Paul uses there.

The question is, what does that mean? Well, we saw this morning how the Greek writer Plutarch uses it to speak of a Roman who was walking around with a toga on his head. And we also saw in Esther chapter 6 and verse 12 in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. And by the way, I brought a copy of the Greek Septuagint.

And this was published in this century. This isn't like a 2,000-year-old copy of the Greek Old Testament. But essentially, this is what it looks like.

And it's the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament that was written prior to the birth of Jesus Christ. And it was the Bible in a lot of ways of the apostles. And when they would quote Scripture, they would often quote from the Greek Septuagint.

And in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, in Esther chapter 6, verse 12, we see this expression where we learn that Haman went home to his house. And he hurried to his home and he went home kata kephales. And we saw how that clearly has to mean that he had some kind of covering on his head.

Because the Hebrew expression that that translates literally says he went home with his head covered. And so, we came to the conclusion, just the natural understanding of verse 4, is that Paul is saying, every man who has something on his head, he's placed something on top of his head, it's hanging down from his head, while praying or prophesying disgraces his head. And then, in the natural flow of thought, we would then expect in verse 5, when Paul develops a contrast with regard to women, we would expect him to be speaking of a contrast that we would expect.

And that is, he says in verse 5, but every woman who has her head uncovered while praying or prophesying disgraces her head. That's the exact opposite of what he has said for men. And I showed you this morning how the Greek term that is used here is a katakalupto.

It's essentially the word katakalupto, which means to cover. And we looked at references where it clearly means that. And then the *an* placed in front of it to mean uncovered.

That's the literal etymology of the word as you break it down. It means to uncover something. Katakalupto is used in Isaiah 6-2 to speak of the angels covering their faces and covering their feet with their wings.

Genesis 38-15 of Tamar, covering her face, no doubt with a cloth veil. And also in Habakkuk 2-14, of the waters covering the sea. And there's also a number of other references in the Old Testament where katakalupto is used.

And the clear idea of the term is it means to cover. And so to *an* katakalupto is to uncover something. I want to point something out.

You'll notice I have Esther 6-12 and I've got an asterisk by it. You may look at that and go, wait a minute, Esther 6-12 doesn't have katakalupto. It has katakepheles.

Well, what I want to share with you tonight is that the truth is that in Esther 6-12, some or most of the Greek manuscripts have katakepheles. OK, but there are some Greek manuscripts of this very passage that have, guess what? Katakalupto. OK, what that indicates, folks, is this.

That in the Hebrew, it literally speaks of Haman as being with covered head. That's the Hebrew expression. And there were some manuscripts that say katakepheles as a translation of that idea.

And then other manuscripts say katakalupto as a translation of that very idea. Giving us at least some indication that there's a sense of equalness, equation between these two. Whatever katakepheles means, katakalupto would mean the same thing.

They use it in this passage to describe the same thing in Hebrew. And so then if katakepheles and katakalupto mean to cover one's head, then a katakalupto must have the idea of uncovering one's head, taking the cloth covering or whatever it is that's on the head off of the head so that now the head is in the state of being uncovered. Now, that is the normal sense of the term.

When you break just the word down into its parts, you see that the word means to uncover. If you're studying this passage, the thing to ask yourself is this. All right, I know the natural meaning, just the etymology of the word is it means to uncover.

But is there any reason that I can find from other passages why I can't take it that way? I mean, there are some expressions that we use in English that when you break the etymology of the word down, it doesn't really mean what we are trying to convey when we use that particular English word. So you at least want to ask the normal meaning of this seems to be to uncover, to unconceal. But are there any other places where this particular word is used in ancient Greek literature? And in those cases where it is used in those other references, do I see anything in those references that would tell me I cannot take it to mean this in 1 Corinthians chapter 11? And folks, if you read 64 commentaries, you will find different commentaries making use of historical information and others don't.

But from all that I've read, I've gathered four ancient references in ancient Greek literature where the word akata kalupto is used. And there's only four that I've been able to locate. There's only four that commentators even make reference to.

And I have those four here on page eight. And I don't want to get bogged down on this, but just very quickly look at this. The first example is from Philo, who was a first century Greek writer.

And he says this. It says here, number one, he was a first century writer. Use the word in the following statement.

And so we become enslaved and yield ourselves up to unconcealed impurity. And the idea there is impurity that is now revealed or unconcealed. And then number two, the Philo that I refer to here in the first item, he actually wrote a commentary on the Pentateuch, on the first five books of the Old Testament.

And so it's a very ancient first century commentary on the first five books of the Old Testament. And he and his commentary uses Paul's exact expression. He actually uses akata kalupto te kephale.

He uses the exact words collected together that Paul uses in 1 Corinthians chapter 11, verse five. And look at look at the quote here. The priest shall take away from her talking about the woman who's been accused of committing adultery.

She's not been found guilty yet, but she's been accused by her husband. The priest shall take away from her the what the headdress or the kerchief. He takes the thing that was on her head off of her head.

So he takes away from her the headdress on her head so that she may be judged with her head bare and deprived of the symbol of modesty. So in Philo's mind, this isn't scripture, but in his thinking, this covering that was on her hair was a symbol of modesty, which all those women are accustomed to wear who are completely blameless. And he says the woman with her head uncovered.

And that's the exact expression that we find in 1 Corinthians 11, 5 shall come forward. So the priest takes this covering off of her head. And now with that off of her head, he says the woman with her head uncovered now steps forward to go through the process of the judgment.

So there's clearly in this passage. I mean, that confirms our understanding, actually, of this term in 1 Corinthians chapter 11, because Philo speaks of it in the same way. The woman had something on her head.

It's taken off. And now her head is uncovered. Also, number three in the histories of Polybius.

And by the way, I've kind of gotten a little jaded as I've studied this passage, as I've read commentators. I don't trust anyone anymore. If they make reference to a historical resource, I have tried to go to that to see if it's really true.

And I'm amazed sometimes how much there's either typos or just plain wrong information. I was referred this week in one article I was reading to, I think it's 3 Maccabees 46. There is no such thing as 3 Maccabees 46.

So I went to UCR on Friday and tracked down the writings of Polybius. And I have that here for you just to make sure that what commentators are referring to is really true. And in the histories of Polybius and in volume 15, there's an excerpt which says, for they took Dana from the temple and dragged her unveiled

Akata Kalupto through the middle of the town and committed her to prison.

And that ended up just that action by itself ended up creating a riot. And then also, folks, there is one place where Akata Kalupto is used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament. And that is in Leviticus 13, 45.

You don't need to turn there because I quote it here in Leviticus 13, 45. It says, and the leper and whom the infection is, let his garments be torn and his head Akata Kalupto. OK, now in this passage, this is a little twist here in this passage.

The Hebrew word underneath Akata Kalupto is the word paruah, which speaks of something that is loosed or not restrained. Now, I'm trying to be honest with you guys, and I'm trying to tell you that literally that Hebrew word speaks of something that is loosed or not restrained. And this fact leads a few commentators to suggest that Paul must be thinking of loosened hair hanging down when he uses the word Akata Kalupto in 1 Corinthians 11, 5. They say, aha, see in Leviticus 13, it comes from it's a translation of the Hebrew word that speaks of being loosened or unbound.

And so that's what Paul means here in 1 Corinthians 11, 5. He's saying if there's a woman whose hair is unbound and hanging down free, that's where they get this from from this passage. However, look at the next paragraph. This is reading too much into the text.

All that Leviticus 13, 45 speaks about in both the Hebrew and the Greek text is the head being unbound. You don't find the Hebrew word for hair or the Greek word for hair even used in either the Hebrew Old Testament or the Greek translation of the Old Testament. It's simply the Hebrew and the Greek word for head and then this word that speaks of being unbound.

So literally it's speaking of the head being unbound and to my way of thinking and to other commentators way of thinking, this fits perfectly with the picture of a turban being unwrapped and taken off of the man's head. So actually this is not an argument for the hair unbound view. It's just a picture of the man's head is now being unbound.

That was on his head is unwrapped. And now, yeah, the net result of that is hair is now free. But the text only literally says that his head would be loosened or his head would be unbound.

And just for the fun of it, you can see the different ways that the translators handle this. The New American Standard Bible says the hair of his head shall be uncovered. And they translate that even the Hebrew word as uncovered.

The New King James and the King James say and his head bare. And that's essentially the same idea. In other words, the turban is not on his head anymore.

But the NIV, they're a little more interpretive as they usually are. And they say, let his hair be unkempt. Well, the interesting thing there is the word hair is not even in the Hebrew text.

But the NIV then gives a marginal reading where they give an alternative translation. And that alternative translation is uncover his head. And that's the more literal rendering.

But anyway, if you're going to take the view that Paul is speaking of the hair being unbound. This is essentially where you would go to get support for that view. But even the evidence for that doesn't seem real strong.

It's differently understood. And even when you look at the literal Greek and the literal Hebrew expression, the word hair is not even mentioned. It's just the word head and the head being unbound or loosened.

No doubt of the turban that was wrapped and placed on the man's head. So anyway, that's how the word *akata kalupto* is used. And the only other four references in ancient Greek literature where it is used, besides First Corinthians, chapter 11.

We'll go to letter D where the fourth consideration, as you're just considering what view to end up holding as to what Paul is advocating when he tells women they need to be covered. In verses six and seven, Paul uses the same word as he uses in verse five, only without the negative prefix. Ah, all right.

And we've already looked at what that word means. He says in verse six, for if a woman does not *katakalupto* 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 *katakalupto* her head.

For a man, verse seven, ought not to have his head *katakaluptoed*. OK, and we've seen what that word means. It just has the basic fundamental idea of covering something.

And so, as I say here underneath that passage throughout the Greek Septuagint, this word is used numerous times and it always speaks of the act of covering something. This word is used in Genesis 38 to speak of Tamar covering her face with a veil. There are no references that have been found in either the Greek Septuagint or in non-biblical sources where *katakalupto* is used to speak of the hair covering a person's head.

Now, in giving you that fact, I'm not saying, therefore, it can't mean that in 1 Corinthians 11. But I am saying that if you're going to say that that's what it means, it speaks of the hair covering the head, what you are essentially saying is that this is the only place, in all the places in the Greek Old Testament and other sources where this Greek word is used, this is the only place where this word is used to speak of hair actually covering the head and being spoken of as the covering. So, and that may be right, but you're just kind of going out on a limb and it's a limb that personally I'm not comfortable going out on for the reasons we've already looked at and for the reasons to come.

Now, look at the next consideration. And this is probably one of the most compelling problems that I have with the long hair equals the covering view. And that is this.

If one believes that Paul is, after all, only advocating long hair on women and he has been viewing long hair as the covering all along, then how would one make sense of verse 6? In verse 6, Paul literally says, For if a woman does not cover her head, let her also have her hair cut short or cut really short. The idea of the term that's translated cut short is to shear. When they would shear the sheep, they wouldn't totally remove every absolute hair follicle from the sheep, but they shaved the sheep pretty closely.

So, basically what Paul is saying is that if a woman does not cover her head, let her just cut her hair really close. That doesn't mean the same thing as balding her hair. He uses a different word for balding in this passage.

And there's a difference between the two. So, the idea is cutting her hair very, very short. Now, understanding that, look at what I say.

The long hair view would have Paul saying, If a woman will not cover her head with long hair, then let her also have her hair cut short. Or if a woman's going to have short hair, then let her also have her hair cut short. And my response to that is that that doesn't make any sense to me.

If Paul were here and he was saying, I'm telling women they need to wear a covering of long hair, and if a woman's not going to cover her head with long hair, then my sarcastic advice is, then let her also have her hair cut short. All of us would be like, Excuse me, Paul. She already has her hair cut short.

She doesn't have long hair. That's what you're criticizing here. And so, folks, if you're going to take the view that Paul is advocating long hair as the covering, you really have a thorny problem here with verse six.

And as I say here, there just doesn't seem to be any way that one can make sense of Paul's words in verse six without accepting the fact that Paul is speaking of a cloth head covering rather than the hair. I have tried to put myself in the position of an advocate for the long hair view, and I have tried to figure out a way to make verse six fit with this view without twisting the text beyond recognition. Yet, I cannot come up with any sensible way to do so.

I tried very hard to make it work, and I was never able to make sense of Paul's sarcastic advice here if you do take the long hair view. Now, just for your information, as I say at the bottom of page nine, the three commentators I have read who take the long hair equals the covering view don't have an explanation for verse six either. In fact, none of them even attempts to explain the part of verse six where Paul tells women who won't wear a head covering to cut their hair.

Instead of giving an explanation, look at what they do say at the top of page ten. Ilmar Dahan, who says in verse fifteen, Oh, the hair is the covering, so Paul is advocating long hair. He's telling women not to be cutting their hair short, and he draws that from verse fifteen.

But then look at this, top of page ten. Regarding Paul's advice in verse six, and also everything else through verse fourteen, Ilmar Dahan merely says, We refrain from general comment, since it is evident and clear that the primary meaning of the word covering here refers to the hair. So he says, I'm not even going to comment on this, because it's already clear from verse fifteen what the covering is.

Well, if I could speak to him, I would say, you owe us an explanation of verse six. Take your view and show us how you can reconcile that with what Paul says in verse six. But nonetheless, he doesn't offer that in his commentary.

And then also Alan Padgett, who takes the long hair view, and instead of interacting with Paul's advice in verse six and trying to explain that, and also instead of trying to interact with the rest of the text and explain how his viewpoint makes sense in light of everything else Paul says, all that Padgett does after he's done dealing with verse fifteen and saying the hair is the covering, he then says, to demonstrate that such a view as mine is the most likely one, would take us beyond the scope of this short note. His short note, by the way, was seven pages in length. But I just was left disappointed.

I was like, man, I want you to explain to me verse six and the rest of the text, how your view can make sense. Don't just spend time in verse fifteen and pretend that you're done. You've got a lot more work to do, especially in verse six.

Gordon Clark, in his commentary, he takes the long hair equals the covering view, and he makes no attempt to explain the part of verse six where Paul says, if a woman is not covered, then let her also have her hair cut short. He quotes the verse, but then skips over this part of the verse in his commentary on the passage. So once again, leaving me with a feeling of disappointment.

Now, maybe you know somebody who takes the long hair equals the covering view and you know of their explanation for verse six. If you know of that, please come to me and tell me. But at least the three commentators that I've read, they didn't offer that.

And in my own mind, as I tried to make myself an advocate for that view and to try to crunch verse six and to make it work, I couldn't arrive at that either. So anyway, moving past that, in summary, let's remind ourselves of the three statements which Paul makes in verses five and six. And notice in each statement, folks, how Paul connects the related but not identical issue of the cloth covering to the hair.

Okay? Statement number one, Paul essentially says, and I'm paraphrasing here, but I think you'll all agree I'm capturing the spirit of what he's saying. The woman who has no head covering is in the same category as a woman whose head is completely shaved. In other words, she's 100% uncovered.

By the way, let me just throw this in. I talked this morning about Zodiaky's view about the prostitutes, the temple priestesses and prostitutes of Aphrodite in the city of Corinth, that they must have worn very short hair or had a shaved head. And that's why Paul views this as such a shameful thing.

Actually, from the research that I have done, if I've learned anything about prostitutes, I've learned three things. And that is that in ancient Greece, there are actually images of prostitutes. And you know what they're wearing? They're wearing a headdress.

Even if they're wearing nothing else, they have a headdress. They have something on their head. They're by no means bald.

In addition to that, in the same resource that I got all of these images of the hair from, this author speaks about the fact that there was a time in early in the Roman Empire where in Rome they made prostitutes dye their hair a yellowish blonde so that people would know them for what they were. They didn't have them shave their heads, but they made them dye their hair a yellowish type of blonde color. But unfortunately, they started doing that, and guess what? Yellow hair became the fashion.

And we see similar types of things actually happening in our society today with regard to fashion. And also, this same author talks about how in early Roman history, to have a really elaborate, sophisticated hairdo on a woman was actually frowned upon because if you did that, they would associate you as being a prostitute or a foreigner. Now, there may be more information that's out there, but the only things I've learned about prostitutes in the Roman Empire were these things that I just shared with you.

I've not seen anything that even hints at the prospect that prostitutes in the city of Corinth, the temple priestesses of Aphrodite, shaved their heads or wore very short hair. The desire of these prostitutes was to look attractive, right? And so they had every reason to dress up their hair in order to attract the attention of men. But anyway, Paul then says, Statement one, the woman who has no head covering is in the same category as a woman whose head is completely shaved.

Statement number two, if a woman refuses to wear a head covering, Paul sarcastically says that she might as well get a really short haircut and remove the covering of hair which nature has given her. At

least that way she would be consistent. If you're going to be masculine and throw off the head covering when you pray and prophesy, Paul says, then to be consistent, go the full distance and get a man's haircut as well.

That's really the point that Paul's making, and that makes perfect sense, at least to me. And then the third statement that he makes, and we find this in verse 6, in the second half of the verse, Paul says, but since, as we all know, it is disgraceful for a woman to go to the logical extreme of removing her natural covering of hair, then let her not even begin to go down that road. Let her wear the cloth covering, which I am teaching in this passage.

Now, one thing is very clear to me in verses 5 and 6, and that is Paul speaks of a cloth head covering and the hair as being related issues, but they're not identical, and we know they're not identical because of what he says at the beginning of verse 6. If a woman does not cover her head, then let her also have her hair cut short. That statement right there tells me that Paul cannot be equating the two and viewing them as one and the same. But anyway, with the above thoughts in our minds, looking at these three statements and reviewing them, it should not come as any surprise when, in verse 15, Paul makes explicit what he's already implied, and that is the hair is a covering of sorts, which serves as a signal in the matter of the cloth covering, which Paul is teaching about in this passage.

Now, I want all of you to look at verse 15, where Paul speaks of the hair as being a covering. He says in verse 15, Now, you want to underline the word covering. And if you're reading your English translation and that's all you're reading, you may go, oh, okay, I've seen the word covering before in this passage, and so what Paul must be saying is that the hair is the covering.

The long hair is the covering that he has been advocating all along. But, folks, you don't want to jump to that conclusion. As I say at the bottom of page 10, the word for covering in verse 15 is a different Greek word than the words that Paul uses in verses 5, 6, 7, and 13.

The word in verse 15 is the Greek word *parabolion*, a word which Paul has not used in his earlier discussion of head coverings in verses 3 through 14. The word *parabolion* speaks of something literally that is wrapped around or thrown around. In fact, the verb form of this word was often used in the Greek translation of the Old Testament and even in the New Testament to speak of clothing oneself.

You throw clothes on. We even use that kind of expression today. It has the idea of clothing oneself.

Literally, the idea is casting something around. And so it's a very appropriate word. It can literally have the idea of wrapped around.

And as I say at the top of page 11, this is an appropriate word description of hairdos in Paul's day because as historical evidence indicates, women would customarily braid and weave and wrap their hair around their heads in various styles. The only other place where this exact Greek word is used in the New Testament is Hebrews 1.12, and that's not helpful at all. It's just used to speak of a garment, a mantle.

But go to item number two here on page 11. What I'm wanting to suggest to you guys is that whatever Paul means by covering in verse 15, his use of *parabolion* seems to indicate to me that he's trying to convey a different idea than covering in verses five through eight. Otherwise, to me, he would have used the same word.

And actually, the Greek word, the verbs that are found earlier are katakalupto. Those are verbs. The noun form of katakalupto would be kataluma or simply kaluma, as I say here on page 11.

Those are the noun forms of those exact verbs that are used in the earlier verses of 1 Corinthians 11.2-16. Paul is familiar with these words. In fact, he uses kaluma in 2 Corinthians 3.14 to speak of a literal veil that Moses had over him that Paul says covered his face. So, Paul was very familiar with the noun form of the words katakalupto.

However, Paul does not say that in verse 15. Paul does not say in verse 15, for her hair is given to her as a kaluma or a katakaluma. If he said that, that would be significant to me.

But instead, he uses a totally different Greek word. And so, to me, that tells me Paul is trying to convey a different idea by using that term, parabolion, than what he's trying to convey in the earlier verses when he uses a totally different word group, the katakalupto word group. So, you may be saying, okay, so Paul isn't saying... I'll go with you, at least for now, for the fun of it and say that Paul isn't saying that the woman's long hair is the covering that I've been advocating all along that a woman ought to wear.

If that's the case, then, Pastor Milton, what is Paul saying? Well, look at consideration number seven. Paul's real point in verse 15 is not to tell women that they already have a head covering and that they, therefore, do not need an external one. Rather, Paul has been trying to convince women of the need to wear a cloth head covering.

And he now uses the analogy of the hair once again. This shouldn't surprise us. He's already used the analogy of the hair in verses 5 and 6, right? We've already seen that and reviewed that.

So, he now uses the analogy of the hair once again to show the harmony of his teaching with that of nature's teaching. And his point is that nature has given women something like a covering in the form of longer hair, thereby giving women a signal in the matter in which Paul is instructing them. Women should take nature's hint and wear a head covering as Paul is instructing.

Because nature gives them one type of covering, the parabolion, a woman ought to wear the other type, the katakaluma, the type that Paul is advocating in 1 Corinthians 11 through 16. Now, I'm not quoted from any commentators in articulating that, but I do in the next paragraph give you the names of the commentators that basically give that essential explanation, and it's over 50 of them. And I'm not saying, therefore, it must be right.

I just want to be fair. I've given you the names of those who take the other view. Just know that 90% of commentators understand verse 15 in this way.

And by the way, look at the last name in this paragraph, the name Vincent. That's not me, okay? Don't think I'm trying to throw in a freebie there just to make the list look longer. That's Marvin Vincent, who did a word study book, which I would highly recommend.

But it's Vincent's word studies. But I want you to know that's not me. I'm not even worthy to be on this list.

But anyway, look at the last paragraph on page 11, and you're going to have to correct a typo here. In verse 15, Paul, now strike the word is, okay? In verse 15, Paul reverses the logic which he applied in verse 6. In verse 6, he said, if a woman refuses to wear a head covering, then the absence of her head covering ought to serve as a signal for her to go ahead and remove her hair too. Now, in verse 15, Paul

implies the reverse.

The presence of naturally longer hair on the woman ought to serve as a signal to go ahead and wear the cloth covering too. To me, there just seems to be a perfect sense of symmetry here as Paul uses the hair as a related issue, but certainly not an identical issue. So hopefully that's an adequate explanation of that.

If you have questions about that, you can inquire during the Q&A. But very quickly, look at the top of page 12. This is something else that I think is at least worth considering, folks, and that is consideration number eight.

The early church universally understood Paul to be speaking of a cloth covering placed over the hair, not the hair itself as the covering. Not one ancient Christian writer, and I want to add, not one ancient Christian writer that I have read or have heard talked about in any commentary takes the position that the covering that Paul was calling for in verses 4 through 13 was long hair. In fact, the universal practice and teaching of the church through the first several centuries was for women to wear an external head covering over her hair.

Now, understand the spirit of what I'm saying here. I understand that church history has limited value in interpreting Scripture. But is it possible that everyone in the early church through the first several centuries got it wrong? Everyone? Consider the following examples.

Number one, paintings on the walls of the catacombs. You guys know what those were? The underground tunnels and galleries where Christians were often forced to go to under the ground to hide from the persecution that was occurring overhead in the Roman Empire. At various seasons of persecution, they would bury the dead, Christians who passed away.

And there were times where they spent a lot of time hanging out in the catacombs. Well, during that time that they're hanging out, they had to do something with their time. So they had a lot of services and they worshipped and prayed together, did a lot of writing.

They also did a lot of drawing on the walls of the catacombs that are still in existence today. And it's of great interest to historians to look at those drawings on the walls of the catacombs. And as I say here, the paintings on the walls of the catacombs from the first through the third centuries reveal that the uniform dress of Christian women was to cover the head and hair, not the face with some type of cloth.

And by the way, I have two images from the catacomb walls that are from the third century. And let me show you these just for the fun of it. This is one, and it's hard to make out, but this is a veiled woman.

And notice you can actually see much of her hair, but she does have something over her hair. And this is an image that they've dated to about the third century, so the 200s A.D. And here's another image of a woman. It's actually very well preserved, and you can even see more of her hair.

But nonetheless, she does have something on her hair. That is essentially the kind of thing that you universally see in the depictions of Christian women on the walls of the catacombs. My question is, did all of them misunderstand Paul? Irenaeus, look at number two.

This is a guy who goes way back. I mean, he was born in 120 A.D. He was born around 60 years after 1 Corinthians was written. You guys know when World War II began? Imagine someone being born two or three years from now.

The relationship of that person to World War II would be the same as Irenaeus' closeness to the actual first century Christian era. And this guy did some writings, and Irenaeus himself speaks about 1 Corinthians 11.10, and he understood it to mean that a woman ought to have a veil upon her head. And then a third example, Clement of Alexandria, who was born in 153 A.D. and lived to 217 A.D., he did some writing as well, and he explains this very passage, 1 Corinthians 11.5, by speaking of a shawl that a woman may use to pray with, so that she may pray veiled, he says.

And then also, a fourth example, Tertullian, that I referred to about a month ago, he was writing around 210 A.D., and he indicates that the Corinthian church itself understood Paul to be speaking of an external cloth covering. He says, so too did the Corinthians themselves understand him. In fact, at this day, the Corinthians veil their virgins, what the apostles taught, their disciples approved.

And folks, in the same work, Tertullian actually discusses the size of the cloth that a woman should place upon her head, and he makes the point that size does matter when it comes to the cloth covering. He says, otherwise, you women, all you've got to do is just lay a thread on top of your head and say, I'm covered. That's all I need.

So he actually discusses the size of the cloth covering that a woman ought to wear. And folks, the question I would ask is this. Basically, if you take either the long hair view or the hair bound up on top of the head view, you are taking a different position than the entire early church and recorded church history took.

And my question is, do you really believe that all of them in recorded early church history got it wrong? Everyone? That just seems difficult for me to imagine. And I would feel uncomfortable distancing myself from this huge body of ancient tradition and saying that what the position I'm taking is a position that nobody took in the first few centuries of early church history. A ninth consideration, folks, and we're getting close to being done.

It seems to me now I may be wrong in this, but there's actually other writers that I've read who say the same thing, but I can't say this dogmatically. But it seems to me that the long hair view is a 20th century innovation. In fact, I would say I may be wrong in this, but I think it's a second half of the 20th century innovation.

And so is the bound up hair view. I have spent the last month reading any commentary I could get my hands on. And some of the commentators I have read lived in the second, third and fourth centuries, while others lived in the 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th centuries.

And I have not found any commentator prior to the 20th century who would understand Paul to be advocating long hair as the covering in verses 3-13. If you find one, please let me know and I'll stand corrected and I'll publicly state that and let you guys know that someone in our church has found a commentator prior to the 20th century who takes the long hair view. And I would not be embarrassed at that at all.

I would be happy to do that because you know what? This isn't me against any of you. We're all fellow pursuers of the truth. And if I need to be corrected and if there's something I'm missing, I want you guys to share that with me so that we can learn together.

You've heard enough from me and I want to hear from you if there's something that I can learn. And then a final consideration is this. And this is more responding to Zodiatis.

Some like Zodiatis might suggest that the text could be understood in an either-or fashion, suggesting that Paul was merely teaching the need for a covering, any kind of covering, whether that be long hair or an external cloth covering. However, consider the following three things. Number one, no one in the early church understood Paul to be teaching an either-or idea.

The early church and the church down through the centuries have interpreted 1 Corinthians 11, 2-16 to be advocating both and. Not either or, but both and. Both longer hair on women and an external covering.

Number two, the either-or view still makes verse six sound nonsensical. And here would be the idea. But if a woman will not cover her head with either long hair or a veil, then let her also have her hair cut short.

Maybe you don't, but I still have a problem with that. That still doesn't make a lot of sense to me, but maybe it does to you. And then number three, the either-or view finds much of its strength.

Not all of its strength. It doesn't rise or fall totally on this, but it does find much of its strength in a fabricated problem for which there is no historical evidence. And we talked about that this morning.

Zodiotis states his either-or view, and then he says it must be remembered. And then he gives us historical information that actually may have been true, but there's no evidence to support basically the picture that he draws of the problem of a priestess from the Temple of Aphrodite whose head is short or balded, and she gets saved, and now she needs to have her head covered, so she wears a veil until her hair grows out. That may have happened.

I'm not going to say it didn't happen. Someone may find evidence for that tomorrow or a year from now. Some archaeologists may discover that.

But all I am saying is that what we do know for sure is there's no evidence to support that claim that Zodiotes makes. So nonetheless, this is the best that I can do, and I hope it hasn't been overly tedious for you, but I do think that it merits some attention because here's the deal. If we move on to deal with our head coverings for today, it would be a very frustrating few weeks for those of you that are still thinking it may be the long hair or the either-or view or hair-bound-up view.

You'd be saying, well, I agree with what Milton's saying, but I disagree on what the covering is, and so I thought it would be valuable for us to spend the day dealing with this issue and then having a conversation about it. But anyway, let me open up the floor and see if anybody has any questions about anything we've covered today. Michelle? Yeah, see, I wouldn't be comfortable with that.

She's saying, if it was the Roman custom for men to cover their heads, is it possible that Paul was telling men not to wear head coverings so as to be different from the pagan Roman customs? If you say that, you're kind of doing the same thing that I have a problem with that a number of people do. What you're kind of saying is Paul, he doesn't come right out and say this, but that's the real motive behind his instruction. And my response to that would be, if Paul was trying to just make men different from the Roman custom, then he would also tell women not to wear head coverings either because in Roman society, women would also wear a head covering frequently when they were involved in a religious exercise.

So if his only motive was to be different from the world, he would have told men and women to not wear a head covering. Yes? Yeah. She's asking about why would Paul narrowly define it to prayer and prophecy? Just those two instances.

And is it possible that he specifies that because that's where the women were being disruptive? I think that's worth considering, although I'd be surprised he doesn't add speaking in tongues because it's very obvious later on that that was a significant area of disruption. So I don't know why he specifies those two things. It could be that, and we're going to get into this later, that's like page 25 in our materials, but it could be that there's something special about praying and about prophesying and therefore one's comportment and even one's attire as far as a head covering is significant in only those two instances.

But you could understand those two things as merely two representative examples of the whole category of public ministry. And prayer is vertical, prophecy is horizontal, and so Paul cites the two of them as a representative sampling of just public ministry. And we'll get into that later, but as to exactly, we're going to deal later with exactly what does he mean by prayer, exactly what does he mean by prophecy, how broadly can we define that and how broadly should we understand it even by way of application, and is he merely using those two things as a representative sampling of what is a larger category.

Is Paul saying that when you prophesy, ladies, you've got to make sure you've got a head covering, but if you speak in tongues, you don't have to wear a head covering. If you share a testimony, you don't have to wear a head covering, but if you're standing in front of the church and you're praying, then you need to put a head covering on. You know, those questions we'll try to sort through a little bit later, but that's a very good question.

Any other questions, Brian? Okay, Brian is suggesting that this is not important. Yes, and what we're trying to do is we're trying to be faithful to the word. And yes, Jesus Christ is the most important thing, Brian.

We would all agree on that. But Paul says if a man has something on his head while praying or prophesying, he's disgracing Jesus Christ. So Paul, he brings to bear the glory of God, the honor of Jesus Christ to this issue, and that's why he gives it the space that it merits.

We may look at that and go, what's the big deal about just a piece of cloth on someone's head or not? This doesn't seem that important. But Paul is the one who brings the glory of Jesus and the glory of God to bear on this issue. And he says if you do the wrong thing here, you dishonor Jesus, men.

If you put something on your head, and women, if you have something on your head, your behavior has some bearing upon God receiving all the glory that he ought to receive from your life. So all of us would agree that our most important passion in life is to honor Jesus Christ and to glorify God. Those are our highest callings.

Paul says the head covering issue has relationship with that calling. If we really want to glorify God and honor Jesus Christ, this is something we really want to study and try to figure out, because I don't want to dishonor Jesus, and I don't think any of us do. Yes, right, right.

Yeah, yeah, and we'll get to that. But I'll go ahead. I'll be fair and say just a little bit about that.

Yeah, we actually had some women who used some coffee filters a few weeks ago. But the significant thing to me is verse 10, where Paul says that she ought to have a symbol of authority upon her head. The primary significance to me is that there's something located on top of the woman's head to where her

entire being is positioned underneath that symbol.

That seems to be the significant thing to me. Some people try to make significance out of the kata, which means down, and they say, well, it must speak of something hanging down from the head. And they try to read that into the word.

And there may be validity to that, but I think that may be pressing it too much. The significant thing is that the woman's entire being is located underneath the symbol so that the symbol would be located on top of the head. Paul never uses the noun veil.

He never uses that word. He uses the verb to cover. So the significant thing is just that it's a covering.

And in verse 10, he tells us the location where that covering needs to be. But there are some who try to press that further and say that all of the hair needs to be covered. But as we saw in the catacomb images, you could see much of the woman's hair.

And so people handle that differently. But to me, I would view that as a huge shade of gray. But what is clear is that it's something on top of the head.

Yes. Well, Paul identifies that when he talks about the structure of relationships in God's economy. Christ is the God.

The Father is the head of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is the head of every man. The man is the head of the wife in the home.

And therefore, because the man is the head, it would not be befitting to him to be wearing a head covering. And it is very appropriate for a woman to wear a head covering. And Paul says, if a woman does not wear a head covering when ministering publicly through prayer or prophecy, she's dishonoring her husband.

He then starts going back to creation, talking about how Adam was created first. Eve was taken from Adam, created for Adam. And he then says, therefore, she ought to have a symbol, essentially, of her husband's authority on her head.

So that's the significance of it. Yeah. Yeah.

I think that's very significant and very true. You know, symbols mean a lot in our society today. And I've already talked to women who, you know, before they put their hat on to come to church, they ask themselves, now, am I submitting to my husband? Am I living a life? And in my heart, is this symbol really befitting to where my heart is? And it causes them to really examine their heart.

And I think there's a lot of beauty in that. I know someone from the church allowed us to use their vehicle for a year, and they had a fish symbol on the back of it. And I'll just, I mean, we're all family here.

Sometimes I don't, I'm not as respectful as I ought to be of, you know, the precise laws and so forth. But you know what? I drove differently when I was in that vehicle that had the fish symbol on it. That symbol affected the way that I drove, because I knew that I was reflecting on Jesus Christ.

And so symbols do have an enormous amount of value. That's why Jesus says you've got to do the Lord's Supper, eat the bread, drink the cup, and baptism. These are very important symbols that give evidence of

significant spiritual realities.

And in fact, I'll give you one other example. A lady who doesn't attend our church now, she was talking about, she emailed me about the head covering issue a couple months ago. And she was talking about how her and her husband started to get into a discussion and it started to get heated.

And she said, we always do this. And she says, I could see us starting to go in that direction. And she had studied this passage, but she didn't know what to do with it yet.

She was waiting until we covered it and then she was going to get the tapes. But she said, what I did when I saw us going down that road, I was, she was folding laundry. She picked up an orange T-shirt and put it on her head and continued the conversation.

She didn't flinch. Her husband did not flinch and say, what are you doing? They continued the conversation and the tone of it completely changed. And so what she said that meant so much to me, she said, because it was a symbol of the way my attitude needed to be.

And I knew that I needed to be consistent in my heart with what that symbol represented. And so anyway, next Sunday, we're going to have some orange T-shirts available. But anyway, I just symbols do have an enormous amount of value.

And when a woman is in the first century and I'll at least say the first century, because you may not agree that it's for today or not. But at the very least, everyone would have to agree that in the first century in the Corinthian church, when a woman was up front ministering and she had her head covered, she was making a significant statement for the rest of the body about her position and her heart with regard to her husband. Not only was she making a statement to them, she was making a statement to her own heart.

She was making a statement to her own husband. She was making a statement to Jesus Christ, to God the Father. She was also making a statement to the angelic beings who were observing of that symbol and the meaning of it.

So there's a lot of significance to it. Jim, right. Yeah.

He's asking, why do I frequently say when a woman or man ministers publicly through prayer or prophecy? I say that not because I'm totally convinced that that's all that's being spoken of. But I say that because that's the least that Paul is saying. When Paul says speaks of someone prophesying to me, that has to mean public ministry.

You don't do that in the privacy of your prayer closet. There's an audience when you prophesy. And who is the audience? Well, First Corinthians 14, 4 and 5, the one who prophesies edifies the church.

So the audience of the prophecy is believers who are hearing the prophecy and they're being edified by it. So when I see the word prophecy, I automatically think it's obviously public prophetic ministry. And to me, it doesn't seem like a huge leap, although some may think it is, to also think of prayer as being audible prayer where there is an audience who is hearing the prayer.

People may think, and I may end up being convinced, that it includes more than that. But at the very least, it includes public prayer and public prophecy in a gathering of believers. That's the very least.

But I'm not convinced yet that that's all it means. I'm still trying to figure that out. So I'm kind of defaulting when I say that to the least common denominator of what is evident in Scripture.

Yes. Yes. Yeah, First Corinthians 14, 4 and 5, he who prophesies, the one who prophesies edifies the church.

So that there's a... Yeah. Yeah, so it could be prophecy that occurs in a gathering of believers. And that's why I'm always careful to say I don't say church service, but in a gathering of believers.

And that could happen in an auditorium. And they didn't meet in auditoriums back then. The first church building that was ever built was like 250 A.D. But they met at home, so their gatherings were much more informal.

So it is an applicational question that we're going to try to sort through later of, you know, are we doing the right thing to only limit it to like a Sunday service? To me, it seems to include whenever believers are gathered together, however many there may be in whatever setting. Yeah. Yeah.

But there's reasons that some justifiably say that the feeling you get from the text, as Paul is speaking of, when the whole assembly is gathered together and it's a mixed gathering where men are present and they would see the presence of men in the gathering as being a significant factor. But we'll we'll try to sort through that. But what I'm going to try to do when we're all done is define what personally I feel like I can know for sure of what the passage says and how it applies today and to try to nail that down and define the limits of that.

And and that would be my own personal view. But then beyond that, there's just going to be a lot of latitude and people going different distances in the application of what the passage teaches. Yes.

Yeah. I don't think that necessarily follows. Yeah.

Yeah. Where does it put single women in leadership or where does it put them in the head covering issue? OK. Yeah.

I don't really see it having bearing on that a married woman and a single woman can be differently placed in leadership. I don't see it as having bearing upon that. Yeah.

And it's not so much merely a symbol of I'm under the authority of my husband. It's a symbol that says I have accepted and embraced the place that God has given to me and the structure of divine relationships. It's a symbol that says something about God and about your response to where God has placed you.

That's probably the better way of framing that and thinking of that. It's it shows submission to God and to his structure of things. Yeah.

We're going to deal with the issue of to me, the passage at the very least includes married women. Personally, I'm not yet convinced that it includes single women as well. But at a later point, a couple of weeks from now, I'll at least walk you through what different people say and give you guys things to think through as you're sorting through that.

We'll take just a few more minutes here. Michelle. Yeah.

Yeah. Those are those are good questions. And I don't know that I'm fully prepared to answer all those.

But hopefully I will. When we get to the issue of single. Single women.

That does the passage include single women with regard to the head covering issue? But I need to think about what you've asked, Mark. Is that a Jewish writer? Yeah. Yeah.

I've never heard that. That's just saying that seems like it's. Reading, reading a lot into the Genesis account.

Yes. And I think it's just that the covering is just it's a spiritual covering. You know, some of these views and I felt this way a little bit with the long hair bound up on the head view and something like it's just spirit.

I don't know. I don't know how to respond. You know, if we're reading a statement on the overhead that says the moon is white and I say, wow, that means the moon is white.

And you say, no, my interpretation of that is the moon is cheese. And I said, well, I disagree with that. And then you say, well, prove to me I'm wrong.

Oh, I wouldn't know what to say. Paul was a very eloquent man. You know, if he if he wanted to convey spiritual ideas, he could have done that.

It's to me that attitude that that some people have is in the same spirit of those who go to the Gospels and say, well, the resurrection, it was just a spiritual resurrection that occurred in the hearts of the disciples. And it doesn't give due credit to the writers of Scripture who were writing under the inspiration of the spirit of God. And some of their thoughts are incredibly sophisticated that we're still two thousand years from now trying to figure out what they meant by what they said and the full scope of it.

If Paul just wanted to convey spiritual ideas, he, you know, he would have done that. So that's just tough to know how to respond to to that kind of thinking. Yes.

Yeah, no, those are very good questions. I'll try to answer this without crying. And I'm being serious when I say that.

It's first of all, how important is it when I read an inspired writer of Scripture saying, man, if you do this, you disgrace Jesus Christ, who's your head and who brings the glory of God, which is my highest calling. As a Christian to bear, that's important to me. And I see Paul, in addition to that, giving this much ink to the issue, which is more ink that he gives in first Corinthians than he gives to baptism.

This is very important to Paul. And in addition to that, I can't speak for any other pastor. But this is what's put the fear of God in me in dealing with this issue, that I will stand before God and I'm going to give an account to how I fulfilled my calling, which is to preach the word.

And if I preach the word only in those parts that are befitting to our culture and that are easy and that make people's lives easier. And then I skip over the other parts because it's too much work or it's going to make people uncomfortable or people may get mad or people may leave the church or the church will stop growing. If I do that, I will stand before God and I'm going to give an account.

I'm going to give an account to God for how I've handled this first Corinthians passage. And there are already things that I wish that I could have done better. But that's why I take this very seriously.

I have to look at myself in the mirror and know that I am a preacher of God's word and I've done what God has called me to do. And there have been times over the last few weeks where I've woken up during the night and I'm saying, what have I done? I've talked to believers here. Sometimes they're crying and they're tormented by practical questions that they're trying to sort through.

And I know for some of you, it's there's a heaviness that's in your heart as you're trying to sort through this. And there are times where the weight of that hits me and I'm like, what have I done? And just and handing this load over to the church body. But I always come back to the fact that I got to look at myself in the mirror in the morning and I got to stand before God one day.

And I have to be able to say that I preach the word. I did God what you told me to do. And some of the passages required more work.

Some of it made people uncomfortable. And really proved to be a lot of weight on their souls. But I did what you told me to do.

I didn't write this passage. You did. And you didn't just write it.

But you said this has a lot to do with the glory of Jesus Christ, the honor of Jesus Christ and the glory of God. And I didn't skip over it. God, I want to be able to say that.

Yeah. Yeah. Well, we'll get to that later.

But I'll. Basically, it was the middle point of this century where head coverings fell out of vogue. I was reading a secular writer for The New York Times a couple of weeks ago who was right.

Wrote an article on a historical exhibit from a hat shop from Trenton, New Jersey. They made hats for women and, of course, went out of business. And but they had located as many of those hats as they could find.

And they had them on display. And the secular writer was talking about the exhibit and then also commented on what's happened in our society. And this writer said, and I can almost say this word for word.

She said, when the beehive hairdo and the feminist movement in the 60s made it more acceptable for women to leave their hats at home. The hat industry faded. So here's a secular writer who just makes an observation about what has happened in our culture.

And from the research I've done, and we'll get into some of this later, that fashion trend away from hats on women is not an innocent fashion trend. But there is something of the feminist sensibilities that have informed our fashion sensibilities today, especially among women. Now, I'm not saying that's the only reason, but I do think that we're naive if we just assume, well, it's just not the style now.

And we don't investigate, well, why is it not the style anymore? I think that question at least is worth asking. But it was at the midpoint of this past century, R.C. Sproul, who takes the view that I'm advocating, he mentions that when he was a kid, when he went to church, every woman had a head covering on, everyone. But he says, now when we go to church, there are only two women that have a head covering on, and that's my wife and my daughter-in-law.

So, I don't know, you've been around for a while. What's your observation? So you've seen that trend over... Moses? Yes. I totally agree.

And I'll tell you, no passage that I've ever preached on has caused me to ask more questions about myself as a man and as a husband than this passage. I'm already seeing differences that it's making, and the kind of man I am in the home with my wife and with my kids. It's been a very powerful passage in that way.

And others have shared the same thing. When you do focus on the symbol, and you're really working through all the issues with regard to that, it does bring up in your heart all of these things you're describing, and it's a very healthy thing. What I realize is for a lot of women, and I said this a couple weeks ago, submission is just something they do when push comes to shove, rather than it being a lifestyle.

And this whole issue brings that issue to the surface. But I also realize that for me, and for a lot of men, a lot of times we view leadership as just something we do when push comes to shove. And okay, I'm going to step up and be a leader here.

Instead of leadership being a lifestyle, I want to be a leader, shepherd to my family in an active, proactive way every day as a lifestyle. And this passage is really impacting me in that way. So I totally agree with everything you've said.

It's well worth saying. Let's see, one or two more questions, and then we're going to close it up. Herb? Right.

Well, who was the team? New York? Well, if it was the Yankees, that's okay. Was it the Yankees? Okay, that would be fine. But talk to Mike about that, because he hates the Yankees.

He would tell you not to wear that at any time. But, yeah, I don't know. I mean, when you're, you know, and even for women, if you're shopping and you're not wearing a head covering, and then you happen to start talking to someone and you're sharing Christ with them, you've got to grab something off of a shelf and put it on your head.

Those are things that I think are going to be in that huge shade of gray. But some would say what you're doing is not prophesying in that moment or praying. But certainly, Herb, if you were sharing the gospel with that person, and you said, would you like to pray? And he said, yes, I know what you'd do.

You'd take your hat off, right? You didn't that time? Okay, okay. Yeah, but but mostly if you stopped and thought about it, that's what you would do. And that's what most see most men in our society today still practice.

First Corinthians 11. We take our hats off when we pray. So say what? Yeah.

One more. Last one. The million dollar question.

Mike. Yeah. I'm still trying to check on the veracity of this.

But I was reading one guy who was talking about how in the eighth century, head coverings just amongst the common people wasn't the norm. But Christian women were committed to doing it. And they actually changed the culture.

It became the fashion norm for women to wear head coverings. And the Christian community was a significant influence in that trend in that particular area in the eighth century. And it raises the question that why is it that we're always so obsessed with conforming to whatever the fashion sensibilities of our world are? Why can't we start a trend? Now, I'm not under any illusion that it's going to be popular in our society today for women to wear head coverings, especially because of what it symbolizes.

But I think sometimes we're just too we're too worried, too weak and not courageous enough. And we just got to blend in rather than, you know what? I'm going to I'm going to be who God has called me to be. And I don't care what anyone else thinks.

I think our world, when they see a woman like that, like I was at UCR Friday and I saw a girl walking towards me who was in typical Islamic attire and she had a head covering on. And I wanted to stop her and ask her, why are you doing this? But when I see people like that, I don't look at them and go, man, they're a bunch of weirdos. I think here is someone who holds deeply held religious beliefs and you treat people like that with respect.

You actually treat people like that with greater respect than you do someone who doesn't have such symbolism. And I think sometimes we're just too shallow in our faith and too obsessed with just trying to blend in and not be different. Instead of saying, you know what? We're going to impact our culture rather than trying to blend in and be impacted by our culture.

Randy, you raised your hand and this is the last one. Right. Right.

Yeah. That's a good point, Randy. I guess the only thing I could say from a historical point of view and just the way the term was used is when when people.

True. All of those are verbs. And then in verse 15, we have a noun.

But in in the Greek language, the verb was all that was needed because the noun idea is embodied in the verb. And that's why in those historical examples of Katakalypto, the woman was unveiled and dragged through the streets. Those are our expressions that, yes, they're they're verbs, but they convey clearly enough what's happening.

That when a person on it's like to to veil someone. OK, that veil is a noun in our language. It's also a verb.

I veiled her. Well, in our English language, someone hearing me say I veiled her would not say now exactly what did you veil her with? I need to understand that to know whether or not you really veiled her. No, just the verb embodies the noun when they veiled the bride.

Well, no one really asked. Well, was it some kind of cloth covering that they veiled her with? It's just an assumed thing. And it would have been the same way, like with what Paul, the way he phrases it in First Corinthians chapter 11.

Right. Right. Right.

Yeah. Well, we can talk more of it. And there's probably others like that.

And just like way through the material and then see how the Lord is leading and what you become comfortable with. And that's part of why I wanted to put all this in writing, because we're not going to accomplish everything in everyone's hearts tonight. But that you could use this packet to just continue to

study this issue out and arrive at the conclusion the Lord would want you to.

But let's keep the conversation going. I've been so blessed by the conversation, the openness and the earnestness that that I've seen in this congregation. And I, I would just be so blessed if that if that continues.

And if you do disagree with something I've said tonight, I want to hear from you. I really do so that that I can learn, especially if there's something that I'm missing. OK, well, let's go ahead and close our service in prayer and dedicate ourselves to the Lord.

Why don't we stand together? Our Heavenly Father, we conclude our day of worship together by just giving thanks to you for your word. And there are some passages, Lord, that do prove to be pretty challenging to us and yet help us to rise to this occasion with open hearts, committed to doing your will and ready to receive whatever you have for us. Lord, as we move into the days of this week, you know, one of the things that's hit me as we've gone through this passage is I am so glad the gospel is just abundantly clear.

And it's so simple. We are sinners deserving of God's judgment. And yet, God, you sent your son into the world to die for us and thereby showing us unfathomable love.

And because you raised him from the dead, we have atonement for our sins and we can now walk in close and intimate relationship with you. And I pray, Lord, that you would help all of us during every day of this coming week to make you far and away the number one priority in our lives. And that you would help us to always make sure that we are relating to you on the basis of gospel truths.

And then out of the overflow of that, Lord, that we would seek to give your love and your grace to our brothers and sisters in the Lord, our husbands, our wives, our children and to a lost and a dying world that desperately needs to experience the grace of Jesus Christ. Do mighty things in us and through us throughout this week. Lord, we give ourselves to you in the name of Jesus and all God's people said, Amen.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/26/SID26620.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/milton-vincent/head-coverings-in-worship-part-6/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net