

(The Head Covering) 10 - Final Questions and Comments

by Tom Chaplin

The speaker argues that Christians are bound to obey God's moral law, which is found in both the Old and New Testaments, and that this law is distinct from ceremonial law.

Duration: 54:40

Scripture: Romans 2:17

Topics: "Head Covering"

Description

The video is a sermon on the topic of the head covering, specifically focusing on the length of sermons and the importance of summarizing the preaching of the word of God. The speaker begins by discussing the ideal length of a sermon and emphasizes the need for wisdom and guidance from God in delivering the message effectively. The sermon then shifts to the story of a king who wanted to display his beautiful wife's glory to a large audience, which caused problems. The speaker concludes by addressing various questions and concerns raised by the audience regarding the head covering issue.

Transcript

Well, we've come, it looks like, to our last lesson on the subject we're considering now. This is our 10th week, and of course, as I know you all are aware, the subject has been the head covering, the whole Bible approach, and we do plan to finish up this evening. And basically, tonight is kind of an odds and ends night for me.

I'm attempting to deal with some issues that I just didn't get to during the regular teaching lessons, and also to answer a few questions that have been posed to me, either from individuals that have been attending the study or those that have listened to the tapes but haven't been able to attend. And so, that's what we're going to do. I've got basically four different questions that I want to address this evening, and I've got them up here on the overhead.

Let's see if I can get that a little clearer. We want to first look at just this teaching on the Old Testament that we presented to you. Does it put a Christian back under the law? That question was raised, and I want to briefly address it today.

We also want to look at the second question, and in fact, Christians are to wear a head covering. Just how extensive is that head covering to be? Also, two questions that usually arise when you're considering this passage. The last two things we want to look at are, well, it does speak about hair, so when it says a woman's hair should be long, well, how long is long enough, and how short is short enough, is to look at the other side of the question concerning the man.

So, we'll look at those questions to finish out our study and then make a few concluding comments, and then we'll be done. But before we actually begin and look at that first question, let's once again have a word of prayer. Father, we thank you for this day.

We thank you, Lord, for giving us this time, these 10 weeks, to study your word, to look at this issue, and once again, as it has been our cry unto you all along, we would just ask for your wisdom in your mind. Lord, just show us what your word has to say, and keep us from the traditions of men or the eras of prejudice. Give us clear minds, clear views, on 1 Corinthians 11 and the other passages in the scriptures that deal with the issue of the head covering, and help us to know what your word really has to say to us, and make it relevant to us today.

Just lead us into your truth, and bless our time here with the presence of your Holy Spirit, for we ask it in Jesus' name and for his sake. Amen. Okay, the first thing we want to consider is this issue of the Old Testament, and frankly, we've been very superficial, I admit.

If you've done any study on this matter at all, the Christian in the Old Testament, the Christian in the law, you find out real quick that volumes have been written on this issue, thick volumes, and in fact, if we were to really do it justice, we'd probably have a year's study on it, perhaps, because to really do it justice, it would take a good bit of time, and all really I can do in this study is hit some of the high points, some of the most important principles that I believe apply to this whole subject of the head covering, but because I'm being so broad and not really going into detail, I realize that that leaves people with the possibility to draw some conclusions that would not be really what I believe or what I think the scriptures teach, and one question that always comes up when we start talking about Christians having to debate anything in the Old Testament is, well, isn't that legalism? Because the Bible talks about how we've been freed from the law, we're not under law anymore, we're under grace, and does that mean then, therefore, that the Old Testament law has nothing to say to us today? Well, again, I can't spend weeks on this subject, so I'm just going to give you some of the key thoughts, key beliefs that I have on this subject, talk a little bit about them, and hopefully it'll clarify some issues if there was any question, maybe I'll raise more issues than I clarify, I don't know, I hope not, but let me just say a little bit on that so you'll fully understand what I believe if I haven't made that clear. The first point that I would share with you is this, and when I think of legalism, the primary thing I think of and the primary thing I think that Scripture is concerned with is this issue of how is a person actually saved? And the central era of a New Testament legalist, the Pharisees, the Judaizers, was that they taught that to be saved you had to keep the law of Moses, and by that they meant every aspect, every jot and tittle, right down to circumcision. To be saved you had to obey commandments, and those commandments were the whole aspect of Old Testament law.

Well, let me say right off the bat that I have never believed that, and nor have I ever taught it. I believe with all my heart that salvation is by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. I'm not standing up here trusting in any system of law keeping to save my soul, and I believe that anybody here is doing that, that they have not understood the Scriptures and they have missed the great truths of salvation as they are presented in the gospel.

That man is not saved by his own efforts, he's saved by Christ Jesus and his efforts in fulfilling every detail of the law and in going to Calvary and laying down his life and shedding his blood that we who cannot keep the law might be justified and saved from our sins of breaking that law. And I believe with all my heart that salvation is only by faith and trust in the Lord Jesus Christ. That and that alone will save a man.

So please, when I give anybody the impression that I thought anything else, may this lay that to rest. You do not know the Lord, you are not a Christian unless your hope is only in the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ and you put your faith and trust in him as your Lord and Savior. No system of law keeping will get you into heaven or make you righteous before a holy God.

Now this whole truth of salvation by grace, by the way, is the whole subject matter of my next series. So hopefully we'll look at this a little bit in that series, or quite a bit, and a lot of I believe on this matter will become even plainer, I think, as we go through that subject. But anyway, that's the first and foremost thing I would have you to understand about where I am in relation to my teaching on obedience to law.

The second thing I want you to understand is that I do not believe that Christians are obligated to keep the Old Testament ceremonial law. It says in Colossians 2, 16, Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink on the respective and holy day of the new moon of the Sabbath days. There are many laws in the Old Testament which are ceremonial in nature, but they're part of that system of which the people of God were under before Christ came.

They had to obey those things. Since Christ has come, he has fulfilled those types and shadows, and they no longer speak to us in terms of requirements on how we live our life. We do not keep or have to keep the ceremonial law.

But I think if you look in these passages such as Colossians, which are pointed to to teach that we don't have to keep the law, and you look at the specific things that they say, the examples they give out of the law that we don't have to keep, you'll see that they're all ceremonial in nature. It says you don't have to keep days, months, seasons, and years, such things. It never says you don't have to not obey your parents.

In fact, in another passage of scripture where it said children obey your parents in the Lord for this is right, for this is the first commandment with a promise. So you'll never find an Old Testament moral law which the apostles of New Testament prophets tell us we don't have to keep. But when you come to issues like days, and months, and seasons, and years, these typological things were said to not have to obey them.

They don't bind us today. The third thing I do believe, however, is this, that Christians are bound to obey God's moral law no matter where it is found. And unlike some today, I would say that God's moral law for Christians is found not only in the New Testament, but it's found in the Old Testament too.

And we've looked at several scriptures. It says in 2 Timothy 3, 16 and 17, all scripture is given by God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God might be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Now the scriptures that he was referring to there had to be the Old Testament.

Because Paul in context said that Timothy had known these scriptures from his youth. Well, in Timothy's youth, the only scriptures he had were the Old Testament scriptures. And Paul said all these things were given that we might be made perfect.

And he's referring to the Old Testament. And we could look at some other scriptures than we did earlier. So I think when you consider the way the Apostle used the Old Testament scriptures and the very doctrinal statements such as what he says in 2 Timothy 3, 16 and 17, I think unless Paul again is schizophrenic and he doesn't know what he believes, and he believes one thing in one book of the Bible and he believes another thing in the other book of the Bible, we've got to put these things together and see them as being harmonious.

Paul's not contradicting himself in Colossians and Timothy. And the way I put them together so they don't contradict is I understand that Paul recognizes that the moral principles of God never change. And that law is for us today.

Ceremonial law, that has changed down through history depending on what place in God's plan of redemption you happen to live. For instance, Abraham could offer a sacrifice wherever he wanted. But once they built the temple, there was only one place you could offer a sacrifice and that was at Jerusalem in the temple.

So you see, ceremonial law has undergone change depending on when you happen to live. But moral law has never changed. And wherever moral law is found older than you, it's still for us because God doesn't change.

He's the same yesterday, today, and forever. So I do believe that God's moral law, wherever it is found, binds us today. And unless you want to contradict scripture and make it fight against itself, I don't see how you're going to come to any other conclusion because that statement is accurate.

Now the one scripture or statement that probably most would have problems with is the last one. Let me read it. We see clearly from the New Testament that God's moral law is found not only in the New Testament or even in the Ten Commandments.

Because a lot of Christians would say, yes, we believe we obey the New Testament law, but we also keep the Ten Commandments. And they wouldn't have a lot of problems with that. But I would have to say even more than that and say that the moral law of God is found not only in the Ten Commandments, but also even in the case laws of the Old Testament.

And to the extent that the case laws of the Old Testament are concerned with moral law, they are still binding today. And the case that we dealt with earlier was the case in 1 Corinthians 9, verse 9, where Paul took the Old Testament case law, thou shalt not muzzle the ox, but tradeth out the corn. And he appealed to that case law of the Old Testament as the principle upon which he based his commandment to the churches to pay their pastors.

Now that wasn't one of the Ten Commandments, that was an Old Testament case law. And so again, I think if we're going to do justice to even how the apostles used scripture, that this statement is an accurate statement. And I'll point this out too.

A person is really faced with some difficult moral dilemmas if he adopts any other understanding of this issue. Let me give you a case in point. What if you were a pastor and somebody was to come to you and ask you this question, pastor can I marry my sister? Now what would you tell that individual? Well you'd probably say, no you can't marry your sister, that's perverse, that's incest.

Pastor, where in the Bible does it say that? What would you tell him? If you believe that the only law, or there was no law to govern Christian conduct, or if you believe that it's only the New Testament, how would you deal with him? You couldn't, because there's nothing in the New Testament that addresses in any depth the issue of a subject like incest. The closest you can get to it is in Corinthians where Paul talks about the man who had his father's wife. That's the only instance that you could say was incest that is dealt with in the New Testament.

The only place that you could help this man from and correct him would be to take him to Leviticus 18, where it clearly defines what constitutes incestuous relationships, improper marriage relationships. It's only to be found in the Old Testament. And that is not the Ten Commandments.

The Ten Commandments say thou shalt not commit adultery. It does not tell you what constitutes a lot of other sexual impropriety is, specifically. The only way you can get that is to go to the case laws.

So, just to help you understand where I'm coming from, I believe what I believe is biblical. Now, I realize that some questions arise. How do we know what is moral and what is ceremonial? And I'm going to tell you right off the bat, that is a difficult issue in some cases.

And again, we need a whole long series to deal with some of these issues that arise. And we can't do it here tonight. I can't do it.

But I'll say this, the Bible recognizes that that is a legitimate distinction. You can look for just a second in Romans chapter 2. Romans 2, beginning in verse 17. Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent being instructed out of the law.

And art confident that thou thyself art a God of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hath the form of knowledge, and of the truth in the law. Thou therefore which teacheth another, teachest thou not thyself. Thou that preachest, a man should not steal, dost thou steal.

Thou that sayest, a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery. Thou that abortest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege. Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonorest thou God.

For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you as it is written. For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law. But if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.

Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision. And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature if it fulfill the law, judge thee who by the letter in circumcision doth transgress the law. Now as you look at Paul's argument you see something very interesting.

He looks at circumcision as though it was separate from God's law. But that's not correct. Circumcision itself was a commandment of the law.

You see where I'm driving at that. He's saying that this moral, this ceremonial act of circumcision is in some sense distinct from all these moral commandments like not stealing, not killing and whatever. And

he says if the Gentiles will do those things, even though they're not circumcised, I'm going to say they're keeping the law.

Whereas even though you've got this ceremonial law, if you steal and kill, you're not keeping the law. Well he's making a distinction. He's saying that law keeping is distinct in some sense from being circumcised.

But wait a second, circumcision itself is part of the law. How could you keep the law and not be circumcised? Only if there's a distinction, that God is making a distinction between a ceremonial aspect of the law, which is not near as important as it is keeping the moral aspects of the law. There's the ceremonial law and the moral law.

Even though both are found in the law of Moses together. We're only bound to the moral law. Now that doesn't help us as far as fully understanding how to decide what is and isn't moral law versus ceremonial law.

But it shows that that is a legitimate distinction that God himself through Paul and the Holy Spirit makes. But if I was to just give a little general help in that direction, again I can't go into it in great detail, but the ceremonial law in the Old Testament is the law that is primarily concerned with the outworking of God's plan of redemption. In other words, this is the law regarding sacrifice and offering.

These holy days and feast days that were typical and pointed to the work of Christ on the cross, and the great acts of redemption that were yet to come like Pentecost, foretelling and pointing to that point of the Holy Spirit. The aspects of God's law that were redemptive in nature, that's the primary focus as we look for ceremonial law. Whereas the moral law is just the law of God that related to general conduct, how we would live each day.

And that to me is, again that's very broad and we'd have to look at everything real close, but those are, I believe, two general guidelines to help us make a distinction as we look at Old Testament scripture. But anyway, that in a very broad sense is where I'm coming from, in a very tertiary sense why I'm there. If this makes me a legalist, then that's what I am.

I don't think it does, because I certainly don't believe you're saved by keeping the law, nor do I believe that you have to, as a matter of obligation, keep the ceremonial law. All I believe is that as a Christian, we have to obey God's moral law wherever it's found, whether it's New Testament or Old Testament. And there is much instruction in the Old Testament that can be of benefit to us today.

That's what I believe. Any questions on that, Chris? In the Old Testament, there's a passage in the Old Testament that says, that in the name of heaven and earth, and in the aspect of God and the early universe, and in the coming of the end of the earth, that we will die through Christ to the law. In the sense that we die to the law.

In what sense have we died to the law? As I understand that verse I understand it to be referring to looking to the law for the sake of establishing my righteousness. In other words if I'm looking to a system of law to justify myself then I am alive for the law and the law is alive to me. The only problem is the law will slay me.

But now if I am tied, if I am related to Christ, if I am trusting in Christ and Him alone. Now the standard is still there but it but I'm in the sense I'm dead to it in that it does not any longer condemn me and it is no longer a principle by which I am seeking to establish my righteousness and in that sense because it I'm no

I could use some stronger words. On the other hand, if I look at a woman that has long, beautiful, long hair, it's very attractive, very appealing to me as a man. And I would note that women instinctively know this.

In fact, many, many women spend hours primping their hair. Many spend big money at beauty parlors month after month and year after year making their hair attractive. They perm it, they curl it, they tease it, and they do this maybe weekly, I don't know, but certainly on a regular basis throughout the year.

And I don't know, you know, I go up to Walmart and Sherman and they have a little hair studio there that does both men and women's hair. And I noticed that a man's hair costs like \$7. Women start it at \$20, \$20 to \$30.

I mean, that's where you start. And I don't think that's not even including the perm. You know, that's just to go in there and get something done to your hair.

And they do it. I mean, these shops could not stay in business if women were not going back regularly over and over again spending that type of money on their hair. Now, many women, and I'm just going to be perfectly blatantly honest here, and I don't mean to offend, but many women premeditatedly use their hair to draw the attention of men.

They're out to use all their charms to make an impression, and hair is one of their charms that they use to make that impression. It's one of their weapons in their arsenal. Now, frankly, other women, though, they're in innocence.

They adorn their hair in various styles and whatever. They don't really realize what they're doing, and they're not even thinking about what effect they might be having on, say, a man. They just do it because they want to look pretty.

But frankly, there are many women who premeditatedly dress provocatively, and that provocative dress includes not only what they wear or don't wear, it includes the way they fix their hair, and they're doing that to make a statement and to draw the attention of men. And we need to note that hair, long hair, is particularly attractive because God designed it to be that way. He said, It does not even nature itself teach you that if a woman has long hair, it's a glory.

I mean, how does nature teach us that? It's because what I'm just saying. I look at a woman with long hair, and it's appealing to me. It draws my attention.

It draws my notice. And there was a time when my wife, she didn't wear a head covering that covered all her hair. For a long time, she wore it down.

She wore a head covering, but her hair was hanging down loose and uncovered. And she can tell you, in one account, just a stranger walked up to her and commented on the beauty of her long hair. You know, just out of the blue, just some man walks up and starts commenting on my wife's hair.

And I know, when I was a child, I wasn't even a Christian at the time, when my mother cut off her hair, she'll tell you that it upset me. You know, I wasn't at all happy that she did that. Maybe that's just me, but since Paul says nature teaches this, I think it's more than me.

I think it's a characteristic of men. God has made us to appreciate long hair and to be drawn in our heart and in our minds to give attention to long hair when we see it. But now, what does the Bible say about this? Does the Bible teach us that women should be presenting themselves in public so as to draw the gaze of men based on the physical charms God has given them? Is that something that godly women should do? What do you think? Well, let's look once again at 1 Timothy 2, beginning in verse 8. I will, therefore, that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands without wrath and doubting, in like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel with shamefacedness and sobriety.

Now, notice the contrast, that shamefacedness is the exact opposite of dressing with broided hair. He says there's a dress with shamefacedness and sobriety not with broided hair or gold or pearl or costly array. So you see a direct, two things are put in opposition one to another, the shamefaced character appearance and this fancy hair appearance.

They're not compatible. But he goes on, they're not to wear gold and pearls and costly array. And it would seem to me as I consider that passage that what Paul is saying is that the proper attire for a woman is to be of such a nature that it's concealing of her beauty and not displaying it or drawing attention to it the attention of men.

She's to be shamefaced, not seeking the limelight, but rather being withdrawn because men are to be in the limelight. They're to be the ones praying with their hands uplifted. Women are to be meek and quiet and their dress is to reflect that spirit.

And so as I look at a passage like that, and we're not even in 1 Corinthians, it seems to me that it is not according to Biblical principle for women in particular to dress in such a way that they are using their physical charms to draw the attention of others, particularly of men. Yes, I think that's what it's saying. Well, you might raise an objection to that, namely this, well, you know, Tom, if I wear a head covering, as you seem to think I should, I'm going to be drawing all sorts of attention to myself.

So, you know, what am I accomplishing? And to be honest with you, most likely you're right. Any woman who wears a head covering, people are going to look at her. But I would note this, even if you didn't put on a head covering, you'd also draw attention to yourself if you were in Africa and you walked out among a bunch of natives there that wore no clothes at all, wouldn't you? But I know that none of us here would say that, well, I don't want to draw attention to myself, so I'm going to, for the sake of fitting in with the natives of Africa, I will not wear any clothes.

I mean, that's, you know, that's crazy. You have to consider what, you know, there's two different ways you can draw attention to yourself. One is okay, the other isn't.

If you're using your natural beauty and physical charms to draw improper attention to yourself, the eyes of men, that's not appropriate. But if, because you're a godly person and you're living a godly life and a godly character, with a godly character in an ungodly world that's so far gone that they've lost all standards of modesty and decency, and because you are determined to live that way, that makes you so different that there's no way people can escape your appearance. Well, God expects you to draw that type of attention to yourself because we're to be salt and light in this world.

And when our culture goes off the deep end in a certain direction, sometimes Christians will be starkly different from the world, not only in the way they dress, perhaps, but a godly man in business who will not be corrupted, who will deal honestly with integrity, he's going to stand out too. The fact of the matter is,

anybody that's going to live godly for Christ's sake will stand out in one way or the other. But that type of standing out is what God expects us to do.

If we have to. I'm not saying we go out of our way to make ourselves different, but if for the cause of righteousness' sake we must be different, God expects us to. But we should never be different for fleshly, lusty reasons.

Drawing attention to ourselves through fleshly, lusty means. That's never right for a Christian. And that's what Paul says you should never do as a woman, be drawing that type of attention to yourself.

Rather, he says, to be shamefaced. And if you do that and you draw attention to yourself, maybe you'll convict some sinner and he'll repent. And that's the type of attention we need.

Okay, well that's what Timothy says. We could also look at Peter, but they both are kind of in the same line. Does 1 Corinthians have anything to say about this as well? Let's look back in 1 Corinthians.

Now this passage speaks a lot about glory. And there are three glories spoken of in this passage. One is the glory of God.

One is the glory of man. And one is the glory of the woman. Now the glory of God, the image and glory of God is man himself in this passage.

Man's glory is what? It's the woman. Woman's glory is what? It's her hair. Verse 7 says, Verse 7 teaches us that the reason a man shouldn't have anything covering himself is because he is the glory of God.

And what this is saying is that it's proper, it's right for God's glory to be seen. We don't want to cover ourselves in the glory of God. We want to cover up God's glory.

And so man doesn't need to be covered because that's what he is. And now it goes on and my implication is telling us that the reason a woman needs to be covered is because she's a natural glory. She's the glory of the man.

And that's the reason she has to be covered. Because we don't want to see this human glory. That's got to be covered.

It's not appropriate in God's presence to display our glory. And you know, it's really grievous to me. There are men who actually want to have their wife's beauty, their wife's glory displayed.

It's interesting, we have an account of this even in the scriptures. You might look with me for a few moments in the book of Esther. There's a very interesting account in the first chapter.

In the first chapter you have the case where King Ahasuerus was given a banquet. And his wife's name was Vashti. And King Ahasuerus made a very interesting request.

Let me read, starting in chapter 1, verse 10. On the seventh day, when the heart of the king was married with wine, he commanded Mahuman, Vista, Harbona, Bigtha, Anabagtha, Zephyr, and Carcas, the seven chamberlains that served in the presence of King Ahasuerus the king, to bring Vashti, the queen before the king with the crown royal, to show the people and the princes her beauty, for she was fair to look upon. So here you have a case.

Here's this king, and he knows he's got a good thing. He's got a very pretty wife, and he wants everybody to see her. He wants her glory displayed, his glory, because she's his wife.

He wants that glory displayed to this great big audience. And it caused some problems. We won't go on, but if you read further in the passage, you'll see that it caused some problems for him and for her.

But anyway, there are men, and he's not an exceptional case, I don't think, by any means. There are actually men who really desire to have their wife's beauty displayed. Some men are really happy to have their wife even dressed in a modest way.

For the same reason that Ahasuerus wanted Vashti to appear in all her beauty, the same type of thinking. And I think, as I consider this, that this really must be a great grief to God. And it really is quite improper if we understand all the teaching that we've had on this whole subject of the head covering, and what we've covered on the subject of modesty.

Because we've learned that we are to promote God's glory and not our own. And what's the proper thing for my glory? Is it to be displayed before all men? Is it to be promoted? Well, according to everything we've learned, it's what? It's to be covered. And this is one of the basic themes underlying the biblical teaching of the head covering.

Isn't it? A woman's glory. My wife's my glory. But this passage says that a woman has glory too.

A woman's glory is her hair. Not just her hair, but her long hair. Long hair is a glory.

And I would like, you know, I would just suggest that the principle taught us in this passage is that natural glory is to be covered. And so if my glory is to be covered, which is my wife, then to me, I believe it reasonably follows that a woman's glory should also be covered, which is her hair. So how extensive should the covering be? Well, I believe it should cover a woman's hair.

And of course, again, I might point out, this is another argument, in my opinion, to why the head covering is more than just hair. And that Paul is here concerned with a cloth covering. Because it is only with a cloth covering that a woman's glory can be covered and taken out of view.

And this, by the way, you know, this goes along with the Old Testament evidence. It goes along with Isaiah 47, verses 1 through 3. And if you remember that passage, that passage indicated that it wasn't, in that case, the uncovering of the head that's specifically mentioned. It is the uncovering of the locks, which is said in Isaiah 47, verses 1 through 3, to be associated with shame and meekness.

So this is fully in line with the total biblical teaching on the subject, that a woman's hair should be covered, and not just what we consider just the top of the head tropper. Another reason I believe that is also from the use of the word in the Greek that is used to refer to the head covering, the word paribolion. And remember, we've talked about that word on several occasions.

And the point we made was that a paribolion was not just the head covering. You remember the picture of the Greek woman we put up here with the covering that went clear from the top of her head, clear down to her, I guess it was almost to her feet. Well, that was a paribolion.

And a paribolion did not just cover like a veil at just the top of the head, but a paribolion was a whole body wrap. And for a woman, yes, it wrapped her body, but it was also used to cover her head as well. But Paul

says that a woman's long hair was given to her to function as a paribolion.

Now you stop and think about it for a second. That kind of tells me the type of covering Paul is concerned about. It's a paribolion.

Is it possible, would it have been possible for a Greek woman to cover her head with a paribolion and not also cover her hair at the same time? Well, it wouldn't have been. If you wore a paribolion in Greek culture and you covered your head with it, you covered your hair too. There was just no way you could do the one without the other.

You couldn't have a partial covering with your hair hanging down behind you. Everything would have been covered up. And that seems to be the type of covering that Paul has in mind.

So when we consider the principle that our glory, our natural glory is to be covered, and we consider that the covering itself referred to as a paribolion, it seems to me that we're drawn inescapably to the conclusion that the covering not only needed to cover the head proper but also the hair as well. Again, though, you could have an objection. You might say, well, if you're a woman, you know, God's given me this long hair and it's said to be glorious.

But what good is it if nobody can see it? Why do I even have it? If it's always going to be covered up. Well, that's a good question, but again, I think we need to consider this. God has given to women charms, physical charms.

But who were they given to a woman for? Does God want a woman to just reveal her charms to anybody? I don't think any of us here would say that. I believe a woman's charms, her physical beauty and attractiveness are only for her husband. They aren't for any other man.

I think that before other men, they need to be covered. They need to be kept concealed. And I think one of the problems in our culture is that we have lost the sense that a woman's hair is also part of her beauty.

And it is also something that would draw the other men to her, just like the other beauty that God has given to her. Christian women would not think it appropriate to display the other beauty that God had given to them, to other men. They would be horrified at that thought.

They would say, no, this is for my husband. What I think we need to understand is that hair is also one of those beauties. In fact, it's the only thing that's said to be her glory.

It's the crowning beauty of a woman. And just like all her other beauties, I think we need to understand biblically that that also should be kept for her husband. It is for somebody.

It is to be seen. But it's not for men in general. It's for that one special person to a woman as her husband.

At least that's how I understand it. Carry the lie on. And you're right, she doesn't.

How can I justify all this line of argument when I don't seem to preach? And I'll frankly admit to you that we've adopted what we've adopted as a concession to our culture. I believe that we should be willing to be different, and even stick out, if it's necessary for righteousness' sake. I don't think we should try and intentionally make ourselves different just to be different, just so people will look at us.

As I've considered head covering in our society, it just seemed to me that if my wife would really wear a parable eye on, that it would be something that would draw a lot of attention that I don't think is necessary. We've tried to figure out a way to get the same effect of a parable eye on, and yet adopt a style that is more culturally acceptable, you know, based on the time and place where we live. Parable eye on, it functions not just as a ring, but as a full body covering.

Now, we need to think about that. You don't usually hear modesty preached in this passage, but it does teach us concerning modesty. And it goes right along with what we're taught in 1 Timothy about a woman being shamefaced, because realize in the head covering, nature gave a woman a full outer garment, a parable eye on.

Now what was that parable eye on, what did it do? Well, it was a concealing garment. It was wrapped around the woman, and it hid her form, and not only protected her from the weather, but it concealed her from view. And that goes right along with what Paul says in Timothy, where he says that a woman is to be shamefaced, and she's to be concealed, she's to be back in the background.

And nature gave to woman this long hair, which corresponds to the parable eye on that the Greeks wore. And giving the long hair, not just that the head needs to be covered, but the woman generally to conceal herself in the way that she dresses. That's what that long hair is pointing to.

So what we have tried to do, recognizing that fact, is even though we split the dress, so to speak, for the head, which doesn't go all the way down to the floor obviously, nevertheless, the dress that my wife wears, is she either wears a cape dress with a vest and a slip, she'll wear a blouse and a slip and a jumper, or she'll wear a dress that covers both front and back. And that functions in the same way as the parable eye on would, in that it adds an extra layer on top of her basic dress, which is put there to provide another layer of covering, such as had been provided if we were in Greek culture and wore a parable eye on. So we try and get the same effect, but we do it culturally palatable for the 20th century America, but I'm not being inconsistent.

It seems to me that even though we don't have the actual form of the dress, it seems to me to be sufficient. So my conclusion has been that the dress should cover the hair, not to wear the rest of our garments as ladies and very unrevealing, because the hair is not just a head covering, but a full body covering as well. I've got two more.

Clearly the passage speaks of, but it doesn't give a lot of practical definition as to what is long and what is short. And so many say this, and I say, well, what is long, what is short, don't know. Don't know, because I don't know and can't figure it out.

I'm just going to table this and not do anything with it.

Audio: <https://sermonindex1.b-cdn.net/20/SID20473.mp3>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/tom-chaplin/the-head-covering-10-final-questions-and-comments/>

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