

*The following is a series of articles that appeared in Truth Magazine  
in the 1950s and 1960s*

---

**Covered And Uncovered Heads In Worship (No. 1)**

Robert Rogers  
Booneville, Ind.

Please get your Bible and turn to First Corinthians, chapter eleven, and read carefully the first sixteen verses of this chapter. No doubt there is in the mind of some of my readers the idea that this passage is dealing with the customs of the ancient Greeks; therefore is not bound upon us today. It is said that for a woman to appear in a public place, in Corinth, with her face unveiled was to declare herself an harlot; therefore Paul instructed the Corinthian women to practice this veil custom lest they bring reproach upon the church. I have one question which I would like for someone who holds this "custom theory" to answer. If Paul meant "every time she appears in public," why did he say when "praying or prophesying"? The man who holds to the idea mentioned above must make this and many other alterations in the word of God. I have asked many, many times for someone to give me book, chapter and verse which indicates that this passage has anything to do with what was being done with harlots in Corinth, but I have not seen the verse.

A close examination of history will reveal that it was socially proper for a woman to keep her head covered while she traversed the but as far as the custom was concerned, once she was admitted into a private house it was in order for the head covering to be removed. A close examination of Romans 16:23 will reveal that the church met in Gaius' house. Gaius was a member of the church in Corinth. (I Cor. 1:14) The very time the custom permitted the women to uncover their heads, was the only time Paul commanded them to be covered.

In verse two Paul says, "Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to You." If the context of a passage proves anything at all, it proves here that the "ordinances" are those set forth in the following verses (2-16). They had not kept the Lord's supper as Paul had delivered it to them, but had turned it into a drunken feast. Paul specifically that he does not praise them for such conduct. (vs. 17) Besides that Paul says, "NOW I praise you . . ." So the "ordinances" referred to are things NOW under consideration. This is not just a matter of pleasing one's self but rather a matter of obeying God. It is obvious to me that the teaching of Paul in the verses under study has nothing to do with the customs of the ancient Greeks and any attempt to apply it to such constitutes a perversion of the text.

What is This Covering?

Is Paul talking about an artificial covering, or is it the hair? The evidence that this passage teaches the necessity of an artificial covering is indisputable. We shall now present four scriptural reasons for this. First. It is a covering that must not be worn by man. The same language used to forbid the covering for the man in verse four, is used to bind the covering for the woman in verse five. If verse four teaches that

man pulls it off, verse five teaches that woman puts it on. I doubt that you have ever seen a man in the assembly of the church with a hat, bonnet, cap, or an artificial covering of any kind on his head.

Second. There is some covering required while "praying or prophesying" **THAT IS NOT REQUIRED AT ALL TIMES**. It is something that women must put on her head while "praying or prophesying" that is subject to being removed at my other time. This could not possibly refer to the hair. The hair is on the head all the time.

Third. Verse six says, "If a woman be not covered, let her also be shorn, but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered." If a woman were not covered with hair she would already be shorn, and could not "also be shorn," as Paul says here. It would be ridiculous to say, If a woman be not-covered with hair, let her also have her hair cut off. You can't cut something off that is already gone. Verse fifteen says, "If a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given to her for a covering." Paul says that her hair is "a covering": he does not say that it is her only covering. Verse fifteen simply answers the question which is raised in verse six. Verse six says if woman will not cover her head, then she might as well cut her hair off too. But if it is a shame for her to have her hair cut off, let her realize that it is also, a shame for her not to cover her head while praying or prophesying. No one can deny that it is a shame for a woman to cut off what God gave her for her glory. It is a shame because it fashions her, to that extent, as a man, and such is contrary to nature. The idea in verse six is this: If a woman is not going to cover her head in worship, then she might as well not wear long hair. Away with the idea that Paul is teaching that the artificial covering is a substitute for the long hair. Paul says if she will not wear one she might as well not wear the other. Neither is sufficient without the other. Long hair is a glory unto woman; therefore it is a shame for her to be shorn or shaven, for that is to remove her God-given glory. Since it is a shame for her to, be shorn or shaven, Paul says, "Let her be covered." Fourth. The term "be covered" suggests action, not possession. For a woman to "be covered" necessitates her putting on the covering. This is clearly set forth in the Revised Standard version which reads, "veil herself."

Here are four reasons proving beyond question that this passage refers to an artificial covering, and teaches that this covering must be worn while "praying or prophesying." Next month we shall consider the question "Why Women Ought to Cover Their Heads While Praying or Prophesying." This will constitute a study of the basis of Paul's arguments.

Truth Magazine II:4, pp. 7, 9  
January 1958

---

### **Covered And Uncovered Heads In Worship (No. 2)**

Robert Rogers  
Boonville, Ind.

Last month we learned that Paul is referring to an artificial covering in 1 Cor. 11:1-16, and that this teaching was given by way of divine ordinance; that it was not just a matter of custom. This month we shall deal with the question: Why should women cover their heads in worship?

### The Symbolic Covering

Just what does the covering mean: what is the significance of the covering of the woman's head? Once this question is answered, the difficulty surrounding the subject begins to disappear. Let us go, to the word of God for our answer. In verse ten Paul says, "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels." There is a foot note on the word "power" in the margin of the King James version. It says, -That is, a covering, in sign that she is under the power of her husband." Now let us notice the American translation. "That is why she ought to wear upon her head something to symbolize her subjection . . ." Williams: "This is why woman ought to wear upon her head a symbol of man's authority." The Revised version says, "a sign of authority." The idea then is that since woman is commanded to be in subjection to man, she is to cover her head in worship as a sign or symbol of the fact that she acknowledges the authority of man over her. When she does not do this she dishonors her head who is man. (Vs. 3-5) Paul does not mean that the woman dishonors the head of her own body. Verse three says that "the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man." Therefore, for the man to have his head covered in worship is to dishonor Christ, but for the woman to worship with her head uncovered is to dishonor the man. She dishonors the man in that she fails to show her subjection to him as verse ten demands. Now for a man to cover his head in praying or prophesying is to dishonor Christ who is his heavenly head. The covering of the head in worship is a usage which symbolizes subjection to some earthly head, and in worship man has none. But woman is subject to an earthly head, man. Thus woman must approach God with covered head, and the man with his head uncovered.

### Headship

Now let us turn our attention to verse three. Here is the basis of everything taught in these verses. ". . . The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man . . ." Now let us ask, Why is man the head of woman? There are two reasons for this. (I Tim. 2:13-14) Woman is not to usurp authority over the man, but to be in subjection because "Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." God created man first. In Vs. 8-9 of our text Paul says, "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." From the creation God intended that man be the head of the woman, but when woman sinned God placed her in subjection to man the second time. (Gen. 3:16) God said to the woman, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Now I realize that Eve's sin is not specifically mentioned in these verses, (I Cor. 11 :1 - 16) But other passages of scripture, as we have pointed out, prove beyond doubt that the woman's transgression is inseparably connected with headship. Thus the apostle says in verse ten, For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority upon her head, because of the angels." Now what cause Paul? Because of a custom? No, because man is the head of woman. Because "Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Those who hold the idea that this is all custom must say, "No Paul, you are wrong. That is not the reason she ought to be covered. The reason is because someone will think she is an

harlot if she is not." Any such wresting of the scripture is sure to bring the displeasure of God. Now we know from verses fourteen and fifteen of this chapter that God gave woman long hair in the creation. So the idea is this: From the creation God intended that woman have a covering on her head as a symbol of her subjection to man. Her long hair was given her instead of an artificial covering. But when woman sinned God placed her in subjection to man the second time. Thus the artificial covering is a sign of authority, memorial of God's injunction to the woman after she sinned. If any man denies this he is forced to the conclusion that woman's sin has nothing to do with headship. If any man takes this position let him explain (I Tim. 2:12-14 and Gen. 3:16) Now with these things before you friend, just do as Paul says in verse thirteen: "Judge in yourselves; is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" I think that you can see that it is not.

Now we come to one of the most mistreated verses in all the Bible, verse sixteen. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." The idea of course is that the churches of God have no such custom as the woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, or the man praying or prophesying with his head covered. But some people have tried to turn this statement around, and make it say that the churches of God have no such custom as woman covering her head in worship. But Paul has already said back in verse ten that women ought to cover their heads in worship. To say that we have no such custom as her covering it, would be to say, that Christian women have no such custom as doing what they ought to. It seems to me that such a conclusion is too absurd to consider. Paul closed his discussion of the subject with a note of authority. He declared that the churches have no custom that violates the ordinance of God.

Truth Magazine II:5, pp. 4-5  
February 1958

---

### **Covered and Uncovered Heads**

Brodie Crouch  
Evanston, Ill.

Several articles and tracts which have recently appeared make it clear that a number of preachers feel that not enough women are wearing their hats to worship. Perhaps many, of both men and women, have lost sight of the spirit of dignity which should prevail when we draw near to God in worship, but it does appear to this writer that there is considerable basis for questioning whether I Cor. 11:1-16 teaches that women must wear hats or artificial coverings today when they pray or prophesy.

#### **I. The Viewpoint Which Attributes This To A Custom of Paul's Day Is To Be Considered.**

Though commentators are not infallible, it is known that many eminent men such as Clarke, Barnes, and McGarvey held the view that Paul was treating a situation which arose when certain women wanted to break away from an established custom of that day which attached a symbolism of subjection to one's husband to the wearing of a veil or headcovering. Objectors to this view attach

great significance to the claim that: (1) God would not bind a human custom on the church, and (2) Paul bases this argument on the fact that God created Adam before Eve, showing that this sign of subjection has been needed since the Garden of Eden.

Concerning these points, we may say that Paul did recognize customs when to disregard them was to bring reproach on the church, or to hinder it. Timothy was required to be circumcised, Acts 16:3, though at the time it was but a Jewish custom. Who among us today would contend that the church can refuse to abide within customs which are in themselves not wrong, and when to refuse to conform is to bring reproach upon the church? We might point out that the modern marriage "ceremony" is a legalized custom to which Christians must submit. If it be objected that this is a requirement of law, let us remember that it is the kind of law which was first custom, and then made a law. For Christians to ignore it in any country wherein to do so is to be considered not married would bring reproach on the church whether law required it or not.

On the basis of this point we may conclude that if the people of Paul's day considered the unveiled head of the woman during praying or prophesying to be a sign of independence from, or equal authority with her husband, the apostle may well have bound the custom on the church for just so long a period as the general acceptance of such a custom would have meant that to reject it would have brought reproach upon the church.

In the second place, no proof is given that the apostle means to imply that an artificial head covering became a symbol of subjection to mankind, or to God, back in the Garden of Eden. Certainly man was subject to God, and woman subject to man at that time. But to claim, without scriptural proof, that woman's sin required that she again be subjected to man, that now the natural covering is insufficient and an artificial covering becomes necessary, is equal to saying that when man did sin also, it would be necessary to remove his short hair as a sign of his second subjection to God.

Certainly that which the apostle taught must be observed. It should also be recognized that Paul does not confine this teaching nor the covering which it enjoins to public worship only. This writer has read one tract wherein the author quotes an authority who says we may "assume" this much, because Paul is dealing with the public assembly. But Paul's instruction concerns the appearance of the individual when praying or prophesying before God. Here we cannot assume. A Methodist might assume that baptism is referred to as "a burial" in Romans 6:4 because the practice of sprinkling was not yet widely recognized, but such assumption would be to misuse the scriptures. If Paul's charge concerning the covered heads requires an artificial covering while praying in this age of the world then it must be agreed that Paul makes no distinction between public worship, private worship in the home, or the woman who prays in the secrecy of her closet.

Nor can we conclude that the modern women's hats supply the required covering unless it can be established that the modern hat does what the original term employed by Paul would require. Even if it be granted that the passage in question is equally binding on all Christian women today, the advocates of the "wear a hat" custom have not removed their difficulties. They still must show

that the average modern hat provides the required covering, as we shall see. Most of those who insist that woman must wear an artificial covering, in addition to the natural covering of her hair recognize no middle ground between the "long hair" of verse 15 and the state of being "shorn" of verse 6. As one writer puts it: "Paul shows in verse 15 that it's a glory for a woman to have long hair. The opposite of long is short. The opposite of glory is shame." Another writes: "If a woman were not covered with hair she would already be shorn, and could not also be shorn,' as Paul says here."

If Paul's instruction truly comprehends but two possible degrees of hair covering, then the use of "also" would require an artificial covering. But if it can be shown that the language can refer to three degrees of natural covering, then the emphasis placed here by the advocates of the artificial covering falls, and the natural covering, may well be the covering Paul required. Let us consider the following points which are based upon some definitions of terms recognized by the weight of Greek scholarship which can be easily read by those of us who are not able to read the original.

## II. Considerable Evidence Indicates That a Woman's Hair May Be The Covering Given Her For This Purpose.

1. Many translations render the term *katakalyptestho* by the word "veil," rather than by the term "covered" found in the common version. The Emphatic Diaglott, Goodspeed, Conybeare and Howson, Revised Standard, American Standard, Catholic Confraternity, Weymouth, and New World translations all so render it.

The lexicons define the term variously, but despite their slightly varying terminology it is obvious that the term requires a complete covering. Liddell and Scott defines it: "To cover up; to veil oneself." Thayer, Abbott-Smith, and James Donnegan's classical lexicon all employ virtually the same words. The new Arndt and Gingrich lexicon says: "Of a young woman, covered or veiled to the forehead. 2. Middle, cover oneself with a veil." Both Robinson's lexicon and W.E. Vine's Expository Dictionary Of New Testament Words point out that the term signifies a covering which hangs down. Robinson says: "To cover with a veil which hangs down." Vine adds a note under the definition of the term, as follows: "In I Cor. 11:4 'having the head covered' is lit., 'having (something) down the head.'"

The term is then obviously one which conveyed the idea of complete coverage of the top of the head, most probably "to the forehead," and very probably the veiling of an even larger portion of the head. The term "veil" is used by all authorities in supplying full definition, though no one would contend that no garment other than a veil could supply this degree of covering.

2. The term *peribolaion*, I Cor. 11:15, is variously translated, and certainly in such a manner as to give credence to the belief that the hair is the covering already spoken of. It is variously translated as follows:

Englishmen's Interlinear: "Instead of a covering."

Diaglott: "instead of a veil."

Twentieth Century: "to serve as a covering."

King James Version: "for a covering."

A host of other translations employ virtually the same words found in the common version. The lexicons again throw light on the subject. Liddell and Scott, Donnegan, Abbott-Smith, Thayer, and Arndt and Gingrich all define it as all article of clothing which is "thrown around." It is termed variously a "mantle," "cloak," "covering," "vesture," or, "veil." Vine's Dictionary Of New Testament Words says: "Literally denotes something thrown around (peri, around, ballo, to throw); hence, a veil, covering, 1 Cor. 11:15 (marg.) or a mantle around the body, a vesture, Heb. 1:12." This then describes the kind of covering for which the woman's hair was given to her, since this was the term Paul employed. That this kind of covering does "hang down" is not to be questioned, and at least two authorities specify that the term found in I Cor. 11:6 requires that kind of covering.

Authorities abundantly testify also that the usage of "anti" with the term in 11:15 indicates "instead of" this kind of covering, as the term "anti" signifies in Luke 11:11 where the Lord employs it in asking what father would give his son a serpent "instead of" a fish. Woman's hair was given to her not only "as a covering," but "instead of" the kind of covering suggested by the term peribolaion found in 11:15, "instead of" a covering, mantle, veil, or vesture for the purpose. To say the least, one is being presumptive to say that there is "indisputable" proof in the passage in favor of an artificial covering. Among the worthy commentators who have not seen it as "indisputable" was David Lipscomb. He says: "The woman, when she comes before God in prayer, or in prophesying, must do it with her head covered either with long hair or with a veil or covering of some kind." Queries And Answers, p. 115.

There is Also Evidence To Indicate Paul Had Three, Not Two, Degrees Of Covering Under Consideration.

In efforts to justify the artificial covering as a necessity today, much emphasis is placed upon the words of Paul, "let her also be shorn," verse 6. It is pointed out that the use of the term "also" means either "long hair," v. 15, and the covering, v. 6, or else remove both. This conclusion is reached by assuming that any trimming of the hair will equal what Paul terms "shorn."

Bro. Lipscomb saw three styles for wearing the hair. He says: "There were three styles for wearing the hair: (1) to have the hair long; (2) to have the hair cropped, as is common with men; (3) to have it closely shorn, as with lewd women. Paul required that a woman should have her head covered with her long hair; or if her hair was not long, she must wear a veil or kerchief as a covering." Queries And Answers, p. 114.

Does the language of Paul permit this conclusion? Again we look to the authorities of the language Paul employed. Of keirastho, from keiro, the lexicons say:

1. Liddell and Scott: "To shear, cut the hair short; 2. to cut or hew off; 3. to ravage, waste a country.

2. Thayer: "To shear, a sheep, Mid., to get or let be shorn; absol. of shearing or cutting short the hair of the head."
3. Robinson: "To shear, to clip - a sheep; spec. the head, to cut off the hair."
4. Arndt and Gingrich: "To shear a sheep; Middle, cut one's hair, or have one's hair cut."
5. Abbott-Smitb: "To cut short the hair, shear a sheep; Mid., to have one's hair cut off, be shorn."
6. Vine: "Keiro is used (a) of shearing sheep, Acts 8:32, 'shearer,' lit. 'the (one) shearing; '(b) in the Middle Voice, to have one's hair cut off, be shorn, Acts 18:18; 1 Cor. 11:6."

It is thus seen that though the word apparently sometimes does signify an ordinary haircut, as in Acts 18:18, such a conclusion in this passage is by no means certain since commentators agree that we know not the nature of Paul's vow nor the details of it. And the evidence is weighty that the general use of the term is to completely cut away all the hair as one would shear a sheep. Yet the man wears his hair longer than this and is recognized as "uncovered" in the sense in which the apostle employs the term. Hence, Paul's meaning may very well be: if the woman have not the long hair given to her "instead of a covering," as is true today with many women with their masculine style haircuts, then let her "also be shorn" or wear an artificial covering that actually covers her head.

**Those Who Contend That An Artificial Covering Is a Must, Overlook The Fact That Consistency Requires They Go Farther Than The Average Modern Hat.**

That a modern hat covers a part of the head no one questions. That some of them do a fair job covering most of the top of it is also evident. But when the definition of "katakalyptestho," already cited, is considered it is obvious that a complete covering of the head is required, two authorities going so far as to say that a covering which "hangs down" is demanded by the term. Are we to simply conclude that because God is above us it is but necessary to have something over the top of the head? Certainly the average modern hat cannot be said to "cover up" nor "to veil" the head. Actually, in most cases where congregations insist upon the artificial covering, in any individual cases are seen in which the hair is covering as large or larger portion of the still uncovered head as is covered by the hat itself.

Woman's hair indeed provides a covering for her head, when it is left long as God intended, and is not cut in the shorter masculine style. Honesty compels one to admit that the average modern hat, aside from never having been popularly assigned the symbolism of subjection, comes but little nearer to the real meaning of "katakalyptestho" than Methodist sprinkling comes to "baptizo."

We may sum up by pointing out that there are two views of this passage, (1) that which considers it applicable to a custom of Paul's day, and (2) that of the natural hair providing the covering required, either of which is plausible and either of which adds up to the same ultimate conclusion; that an artificial covering is not required when engaging in worship today. The difficulty of deciding which of these two is spared us since in either case the result is the same.

The prevalent idea that woman was first given her hair as a covering to signify her subjection to man, and that when she sinned, Gen. 3:16, God gave her the artificial covering in subjecting her the second time overlooks the truth that the "sign of authority" required in 11:10 was predicated on the headship given to man at the time of creation, 11:9. At that time the hair was given to her "anti" (instead of) a covering, to accept the conclusions of two writers in defense of the artificial covering, and the usage of "anti" in Luke 11:11.

On the other hand, those who insist upon the artificial covering have failed to give scripture showing that God imposed an artificial head-covering later in the Garden of Eden. Furthermore, they weaken their position by the following inconsistencies:

1. They do not insist upon the kind of complete covering Paul spoke of. They substitute a modern custom of wearing a hat, which need not completely cover the head to be acceptable.
2. They do not require the artificial covering in private worship, or in family worship. Paul spoke of that which should characterize the Christian woman when she approached God in prayer, or in prophesying.

Truth Magazine II:7, pp. 22-24  
April 1958

---

### **"Covered and Uncovered Heads" Reviewed**

Foy W. Vinson  
Elgin, Ill.

This is the fourth article on the above topic which has recently made its appearance in TRUTH, and I am conscious of the fact that in writing this paper I am doing so at the risk of trying the patience of some readers; however, I believe that in the interest of truth some observations need to be made of the article which appeared in the April issue lest some receive the impression that it is unanswerable and thus constitutes the "end of the matter." We can only profit by a discussion of any Bible topic and I rejoice that we have mediums such as TRUTH MAGAZINE which allow such discussions among brethren.

In the article under consideration the writer states in his introduction that it appears to him that "there is considerable basis for questioning whether I Cor. 11:1-16 teaches that women must wear hats or artificial coverings today when they pray or prophesy." Then he proceeds to set forth his reasons for such doubts. He suggests two propositions or positions, either of which if established would prove that women today do not need an artificial covering in worship.

The Two Escapes

The first position or "escape" as I choose to call it (for it is an effort to escape the necessity of an artificial covering in worship) is "the viewpoint which attributes this to a custom of Paul's day." The idea behind this is that there is no basic principle involved. Paul is simply concerned about their following the established and accepted practice of the times otherwise there would be no point to his instruction. And when such a practice ceases to be in vogue, then his language becomes pointless and inapplicable.

The second "escape" is that "considerable evidence indicates that a woman's hair may be the covering given her for this purpose." So if one is not satisfied with the first explanation and feels that Paul's teaching is binding today, then this second position says to forget the first suggestion since Paul really didn't teach what was first suggested anyway. He just means that a woman ought to have long hair on her head, not an artificial covering. So that settles it. Here are two escapes. Take your choice. And it makes no difference which one you choose, for either will eliminate an artificial covering today. But someone inquires as to which position is the truth and the answer comes that it makes no difference. Hear our brother: "The difficulty of deciding which of these two (is true-I conclude he means-FWV) is spared us since in either case the result is the same." Paul said "prove all things; hold fast that which is good;" but our brother says we don't have to prove this. We can just remain in a state of indecision. But brethren (and especially sisters) if we cannot prove or know WHICH of these positions is the truth then we cannot prove or know that EITHER of them is the truth. Escapes such as these which hang in such indecision appear far too dangerous when they so blatantly fly in the face of the obvious and natural meaning of the text. As we examine more precisely these two positions I believe the cause of the uncertainty which envelops them will become apparent.

#### Only A Matter of Custom?

The writer states that those who object to the view that this was wholly a matter of custom claim that God would not bind a human custom on the church. Then he proceeds to show that where a failure on the part of the church to abide by a custom would bring reproach upon it, that under such circumstances the church would be instructed to conform to said custom. I think we would agree with this since Paul teaches us by example to "become all things to all men" as long as we can do so without violating God's will. However, the point is this: Would Paul seek to establish a human custom as he did establish the necessity of a woman wearing a covering in worship? Would he use the arguments which he did use if this were only a matter of human custom?

Paul's first argument is an appeal to a custom or a recognized evil. (vs. 5, 6.) The commonly recognized evil or shame was a shaven or shorn woman. Paul declares, however, that an uncovered woman in worship equals a shaven or shorn woman. It was admittedly wrong to be shaven or shorn, and yet since worship without a covering is just as shameful, women should wear a covering. This argument, however, implies that it was not considered shameful for a woman to worship without a covering! Otherwise the force of Paul's argument is removed. If the absence of the inquiry is seen to be one of magnitude. If the absence of the covering was a recognized shame and they were ignoring custom in regard to it, there was no reason to expect them to be moved by an appeal to just another

custom. His appeal to that which was generally considered shameful manifests his confidence in the brethren in Corinth that they would want to avoid any shameful conduct. The very fact that at least some women were leaving off the covering proves it wasn't so considered. Hence Paul is teaching that God considers an uncovered woman just as shameful as one who is shaven or shown.

The apostle's second argument in favor of the covering conclusively excludes the possibility of it being only a matter of custom (vs. 7-9). Here he teaches that a man should not be covered because he is the glory of God, but conversely a woman should be covered because she is the glory of the man. This argument is drawn from the relationship between God, man and the woman by reason of creation. This has nothing to do with human custom. Man had nothing to do with this relationship; it was wholly determined by God at creation. So Paul says: Don't cover God's glory, man; do cover man's glory, woman. Since man is still God's glory today and woman is still the glory of man, and further, since Paul instructed Christians to manifest this distinction in worship by the use of the covering, I ask by what authority do we discard this teaching today and lightly pass it by? Brethren, we should be exceedingly careful lest we be found wrestling God's holy word. By way of explanation it might be well to observe that Paul has nothing to say about an artificial covering becoming a "symbol of subjection to mankind back in the Garden of Eden." Needless conjecture about the woman's sin being involved or resulting in some sort of "second subjection" (whatever that may be) would best be eliminated. Paul is writing to Christians in the present dispensation instructing them as to what they should do now as a result of their relationships. Let us be content with the apostle's explanation of this in verses 7 to 9.

#### Is Woman's Hair the Covering?

Having shown that there is more than custom involved in this discussion, we now turn to a consideration of what constitutes the covering. Having learned that this teaching is applicable even now, the object of our present inquiry is seen to be one of magnitude. Our brother mentioned Clarke, Barnes and McGarvey in support of his contention on custom, but made no mention of them when arguing that the hair is the covering. The obvious reason for this is that all three strongly content that the covering is artificial. In fact, I do not recall having read a commentator who takes another position. Of course this doesn't prove anything one way or the other, but it was interesting to me how these "eminent men" were ignored when the kind of covering came to be considered.

The chief argument which is made in endeavoring to establish the hair as the covering is that Paul had three degrees of covering under consideration which are as follows: (1) long or uncut hair; (2) shorn hair (which he defines as a complete removal of the hair); and (3) a degree which falls between these two, where the hair has been cut but not entirely removed. In this way the expression in verse 6, "let her also be shorn," would not then necessitate the conclusion that Paul is referring to an artificial covering. In other words it has Paul saying the following: "if the woman be not covered (that is, if she does not have long hair-hair that has not been cut or trimmed at all), let her also be shorn (let her finish the job; let her cut it all off if she has cut any of it, because she has uncovered herself by having clipped or trimmed even a single strand of hair).

Now the veracity of the above conclusion hinges on the validity of his premise-i.e.- the three degrees which he mentioned above. Did the apostle have three degrees in mind? And if so, were these the three? I agree that three degrees are mentioned but I deny that they are the three which our brother describes. He pictures "long hair" and "shorn hair" as the two extremes, the former excluding the removal of any hair and the latter including the removal of all the hair. But here he contradicts Paul. The apostle has "long hair" (Vs. 15) and a "shaven" head (Vs. 5) at opposite ends, and "shorn" hair (Vs. 6) in between the two. These are the three degrees Paul mentioned, but the writer of the article under consideration forgot about a shaven woman. And there is a difference between shaven and shorn. The first is taken from the Greek "eurasthai" and means "to shave, to get oneself shaved." The second comes from "keirasthai" and means as even our brother defined it, "to cut the hair short, to cut one's hair, or have one's hair cut." Therefore when a woman is shorn she then has short hair, but before she is shorn she has long hair. So our brother's effort is for naught. Paul is saying that if a woman is not covered then she should also remove her long hair! He wasn't writing to women with short hair. They had long hair but they were still uncovered! Charles B. Williams in his book, "New Testament," page 379, says: "Only lewd women among the Greeks wore short hair or shaved their heads." Surely the Christian women at Corinth had not thus associated themselves with such by removing or cutting off their long hair.

I believe these comments should suffice to show all why these two escapes were stated and pictured in such an indecisive manner. Our brother in his article is found opposing himself. His first position was that the covering is artificial and that it was a matter of custom and his second position has him denying what he first was endeavoring to establish. I wonder too if he is willing to accept the consequences of his second position. From a practical viewpoint he in effect is contending that most every woman today must wear a covering, for his second position is that if a woman has cut her hair at all (which describes nearly all women today) then she must put on in artificial covering. So we find him running headlong into the very thing he was trying to escape.

There are a number of other matters which were mentioned in his article pertaining to the style of covering, public and/or private worship, etc. which space forbids me to comment upon. In this article I have simply tried to answer his two principal arguments on custom and the kind of covering. It is my prayer that we will carefully weigh these matters and be constrained to submit humbly and completely to the will of the Lord in this and in every other matter pertaining to our obedience to Him.

Truth Magazine II:10, 2-3, 20  
July 1958

---

### **Prophetesses And Covered Heads**

H. O. Hutto

Pleasant Grove, Alabama

In recent issues of Truth Magazine brother J. R. Pope has been discussing the questions of Bible Classes and Women Teachers. While not agreeing with everything that he has said nor with the use that he has made of every single scripture, I think that he has covered the subject rather effectively. I'm not sure, for example, that he has proved his point in limiting "women" in 1 Cor. 14:34-35 to the prophet's wives only. No doubt they are included, but that it refers to them only is quite another question. Then, too, several days ago a brother asked me to write an article and make some comments relative to bro. Pope's statements concerning 1 Cor. 11:1-16, and it is to that end that this is written.

When bro. Pope says, "the head covering of 1 Cor. 11...was a restriction upon the woman's exercise of her gift of prophecy... This restriction did not concern those women who did not prophesy, nor would it concern women after the gift of prophecy had been removed." I'm convinced that he says more than God has said. Some, though not all, of the reasons follow:

1. I Cor. 11:1-16 not only mentions "prophesying" but also mentions "praying". There is not even a hint that the instructions of 1 Cor. 11:1-16 was "restricted" to prophetesses. On the contrary, it concerned every woman praying". Surely all prayer was not "restricted" to prophetesses. Certainly there were women who were not prophetesses who could "pray". If they could "pray" then they must "cover their heads".

2. Furthermore, 1 Cor. 11:1-16 deals with men as well as women. If bro. Pope's contention is true, then men could have preached with their heads covered so long as their preaching was not prophesying! And if as bro. Pope says, this covering was a "restriction upon the woman's exercise of her gift of prophecy", then men could have prayed with their heads covered! Could men, even uninspired men, preach and pray with covered heads? Paul says in verse 7, "a man ought not to cover his head", and "every" man who does will "dishonor his head". Then, too, why would a man have to uncover his head to prophesy and yet not have to uncover his head to preach? If a man had to uncover his head to prophesy would he not also have to uncover his head to preach? Why would not the same principles, which caused a man to then uncover his head while prophesying, also cause him to uncover his head while simply preaching--or praying?

3. If the teaching of 1 Cor. 11: 1-16 affected only women and only a very few of them, why the appeal to what "nature" taught?

4. Bro. Pope says, "To correct the erroneous views of men concerning the woman (that she is virtually worthless in the kingdom), God allowed certain women to do exactly what the men did concerning prophecy." I challenge that statement and call upon bro. Pope to prove that that was the reason God had prophetesses. I could just as well claim that God allowed certain women to prophesy so that women could receive some private instruction from an inspired sister in a class type arrangement wherein they would be allowed to ask questions.

That Bible Classes and Women Teachers (with some qualifications) are authorized, Bro. Pope and I both agree; that God had some women who could prophesy, bro. Pope and I both agree; and that these were to do so with heads covered, bro. Pope and I both agree. But that this covering does not "concern women after the gift of prophecy had been removed" bro. Pope did not prove by the scriptures; therefore, we differ.

We conclude that as long as man is "the image and glory of God" he "ought not" to cover his head while praying or prophesying, and as woman is the "glory of the man" it is uncomely for her to pray to God uncovered.

Truth Magazine VII: 12, pp. 1b  
September 1963

---

### The Veil: Law or Custom?

W. E. Warnock

Akron, Ohio

(The following explanatory notes are not written with the view of trying to prohibit women from wearing an artificial "covering" in worship. W o m e n wearing a "covering" or not wearing one is a matter of indifference with me. My purpose in dealing with these passages is to show that wearing a "covering" is not obligatory, and, therefore, no person has a right to bind such practice upon Christian women. In the words of Paul, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind" (Rom. 14:5).

Verse 1. Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ." This verse would be better fitted at the close of chapter 10. The American Standard Version puts it there.

Verse 2. "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." The Greek word for "ordinances" is "paradoseis" and means, "What is delivered, the substance of the teaching . . . of the particular injunctions of Paul's instruction" (Thayer). This verse does not mean that everything stated in the letter is law. Else, I Cor. 7:6-9, 26-28 is still in force and the holy kiss of I Cor. 16:20 would have to be practiced. Hence, everything in I Cor. 11:1-16 is not necessarily binding today.

Verse 3. "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." This is the order God has decreed for all time. Any practice that reverses this order is wrong. Apparently some of the Corinthians were guilty of such reversions by failing to comply with their customary practices that denoted or manifested the proper order. If they were not guilty of such, the apostle was at least writing to prevent them from becoming guilty.

Verse 4. "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered (veiled), dishonoureth his head." It was the customary practice for a Jew to cover his head with the Tallith when he entered the assembly for worship. The covering was placed like a veil over his head or like a scarf over his shoulders. (Conybeare & Howson) The fourcornered Tallith was a badge of an Israelite. On I Cor. 11:4, 7, Conybeare & Howson say, "It is quite possible that the Tallith, though generally worn in the congregation, might be removed by anyone who rose to speak or who prayed aloud." Whether this be so or not, one thing is quite clear: Paul says that the man was not permitted to have a covering (a veil hanging down from his head, Thayer) while praying or prophesying. The veiled man would appear as one subordinate to man and not as one having authority over the woman. He would therefore dishonor his head and also would not manifest himself as the image and glory of God (v. 7).

Verse 5. "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered (unveiled) dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven." We know from Acts 2:17-18; Acts 21:9 that there were women prophetesses in the early church. We also know from this present verse that women prayed. Since praying is mentioned along with prophesying, a miraculous gift, we confidently assert that praying in these passages was miraculous too. I Cor. 14:14-16 leaves no doubt that praying was done at times under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, Paul is showing how both sexes are to manifest their proper relationship in the exercise of these supernatural functions. When the women prayed or prophesied, they had to be covered (veiled, according to Thayer). When the men did these things, they had to be uncovered or unveiled. As these women did the same acts that the men performed in verse 4, they had to put on a veil which was a sign or symbol of their subordination to man (v. 10). The veil removed brought disgrace because it put her on the plane with man and by so doing she arrogated to herself an honor that is not hers. Let us keep in mind just here that what Paul says in regard to the women being veiled is not applicable when the whole church comes together. The women could neither lead in prayer nor (prophesy as they were to keep silent in the assemblies (I Cor. 14:34). The veils were only to be worn when praying or prophesying. Those who use this passage to try to bind on women the wearing of an artificial covering when the whole church meets are being most presumptuous. The apostle says nothing about being veiled in public worship, but rather when praying or prophesying. It is mere assumption to say that I Cor. 11:1-16 is referring to the public assembly of the church. Paul's dealings with the public assembly begins in I Cor. 11:17. I Cor. 14:34 shows that I Cor. 11:1-16 could not be a public assembly or else there is a contradiction. Praying and prophesying were to be exercised as opportunities afforded themselves. However, the public assemblies of the church were not the opportune places.

Verse 6. "For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered (veiled)." Hair is given the woman for a covering (verse 15). This is the natural covering that all women are to have. The artificial covering (veil) was to be used only by those women that prayed or prophesied. Removing the veil would put her on the plane with man. So, she had just as well been shorn and be altogether like a man.

Verse 7. "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man." The veil was a sign of woman's subordination to man. Since man is to rule over the woman, and in this respect he is the image and glory of God, man ought not to have the veil on his head while praying or prophesying. Thayer says image "is applied to man, on account of his power of command." As to man's glory, Thayer states, "whose function of government reflects the majesty of the divine ruler." Woman is the glory of the man in that she was made for him, from him, to be a help to him.

Verse 8. "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man." Man was first, then the woman. Man has the priority as "Adam was first formed then Eve" (I Tim. 2:13)

Verse 9. "Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." Albert Barnes wrote, "The woman was made for the comfort and happiness of man. Not to be a slave, but a help-meet .... He is to be the head; the ruler; the presider in the family.... Her rank is therefore honorable, though it is subordinate."

Verse 10. "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels." Thayer says in regards to "power on her head" the following: "a sign of the husband's authority over his wife, i.e. the veil with which propriety required a woman to cover herself." Thayer calls the wearing of the veil an act of propriety. Propriety pertains to that which is suitable, fit, and customary. (Webster) Therefore, wearing the veil while praying or prophesying was nothing more than an act of propriety, which at the time, signified subordination. I think the subordination is to man in general and not to the husband in particular as Thayer states. Read verse three again. Thayer says, "because of the angels" means, "that she may show reverence for the angels, invisibly present in the religious assemblies of Christians, and not displease them." (Italics, Thayer) We might challenge Thayer's statement that angels were invisibly present in the religious assemblies, but the rest of his remarks are most plausible. We know that angels are interested in our doing right (Lk. 15:10). Hence, women were to manifest their proper place by wearing the veil when praying or prophesying to also please the angels.

Verse 11. "Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord." To prevent the man becoming filled with pride from the facts previously stated about his being the head, etc., Paul points out the dependence that man has on the woman and woman the man.

Verse 12. "For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God." Man is born of woman and is by the woman. The thought in verse 11 is continued.

Verse 13. "Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" "Decide yourselves" Paul writes or "From the standpoint of common sense," is it "comely" that a woman pray "uncovered" (unveiled, Thayer on "akatakalyptos")? "Prepo" is the Greek word for

"comely.", It means, "to be becoming, seemly, fit." (Thayer) Paul is simply saying that propriety should regulate the woman's wearing the veil when praying.

Verse 14. Doth not even nature teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?" "Phusis" is the Greek word translated "nature." It means, "the native sense of propriety." (Thayer)

Verse 15. "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." Hair is woman's natural covering. It is a distinguishing feature between her and man. Nature taught that long hair on man was a shame, but on the woman, her glory. There is nothing in this passage that prohibits a woman's cutting the hair. It simply states that her long (a relative term) hair is her glory and covering. Based on custom or "nature," the length of woman's hair will vary from time to time. Long hair now would have been considered short a century ago.

Verse 16. "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." The view occupied by some brethren is that if any is contentious about conforming to what Paul wrote in the preceding verses, he can just ignore the entire matter. But this position makes Paul invalidate in one verse all that he had said in the previous verses. This interpretation holds no merit whatsoever. The thought in the verse is that some might want to be quarrelsome and desire to change what Paul has taught. Hence, he lets them know that "we have no such custom, neither the churches of God." The apostle is saying in effect that "our custom or practice is: (1) Men are to pray and prophesy with unveiled heads; (2) Women are to veil themselves while praying or prophesying; (3) All women are to be veiled with long hair." In short, Paul is saying that the Corinthians must comply with the acts of propriety or custom.

#### Some Reflections

Today, since the veil no longer carries the connotation of subordination, the woman that prays or teaches is under no obligation to be veiled. A woman without the veil would no longer clash with the divine facts manifested in the custom. Too, women no longer pray or prophesy as they did in I Cor. 11.

If a Christian woman does not have to wear the veil today, hanging down from her head, but may substitute a hat, which in many cases, just covers a small portion of the top of the head' how small does a hat have to become before a woman would be "uncovered?"

What is the difference between substituting a hat for a veil and substituting sprinkling for baptism, that is, if being covered is a law of God?

If feet washing and the holy kiss were compulsory practices, and yet not laws, why could not the wearing of the veil be in the same category? As hospitality and affection are now shown without feet washing and the holy kiss, so is subordination now manifested without the woman being veiled.

Some say, "In order to be safe, the woman ought to wear hats to worship." No, if this reasoning is going to be used on "coverings," the women, in order to be safe, ought to wear veils to worship. Paul said "veils," not "hats." You are urged to read the American Standard Version on I Cor 11 in order to get the proper meaning of "covering."

Finally, let us notice once again that the public assembly of the church is not under consideration in I Cor. 11:1-16. Paul's instructions for the women to veil themselves when praying or prophesying would have been absurd if the public assembly is included, as three chapters later, he commands them to be silent. Why would Paul tell the women how to adorn themselves for prophesying in the public assembly, and then inform them that they can't prophesy after all?

TRUTH MAGAZINE X: 5, pp. 16-18 February 1966

---

#### A Review of "The Veil Law or Custom?"

Leo B. Plyler

West Chester, Ohio

In the February (66) issue of this magazine Bro. W. E. Warnock had an article titled "The Veil: Law or Custom." In love for truth and respect for brother Warnock I review what he has said. I Cor. 11:1-16 is from God and our attitude toward this teaching is our attitude toward the word of the Almighty.

In his explanatory notes, our brother says in regard to wearing a covering, "no person has a right to bind such practice upon Christian women." To this we say AMEN and by the same standard we want to emphasize that no person has any right to loose such practice (Mt. 16:19; 18:18). I am quite sure our brother teaches the latter part of the chapter that is that Christians are to obey the injunction of eating the Lord's Supper. Now is he binding that on Christians? When he teaches alien sinners does he "BIND" baptism on them?

Taking up the order of his article, under verse 2, the word "ordinance" is defined "what is delivered, the substance of the teaching . . . of the particular injunctions of Paul's instructions." Having given the correct meaning of the word, our brother immediately says, "This verse does not mean that everything stated in the letter is law. Hence everything in I Cor. 1: 1-16 is not necessarily binding today." Of course by the same rule one could say, that everything in I Cor. I 1: 17-34 is not necessarily binding. If he can prove that certain things in I Cor. 11 are not binding, let him do so. In view of such statements that "everything in I Cor. I 1: 1 - 16 is not necessarily binding," we ask: (1) is the subjection of women to man man to Christ and Christ to God "binding" today? (2) If the order of subjection is "binding" today, who loosed the badge, sign or symbol of subjection? (3) How can we be obedient if we refuse to regard the symbol, sign or badge of authority?

In regard to that very point of headship, our brother said, "This is the order God has decreed for all time. Any practice that reverses this order is wrong." Those are good statements. In view of such sound statements, it is difficult to see how anyone could cast away "that which God has decreed for all time."

In his comments on vs. 5, our brother concludes that this did not regulate "public worship" or the public assembly. "The apostle says nothing about being veiled in public worship, but rather when praying or prophesying." According to brother Warnock the following men were "most presumptuous."

James McKnight. "Next, he explained the foundation on which his ordinances relating to the public worship were built . . ." (p. 178). Again: "Farther, the different mental and bodily accomplishment of man and woman shew, that in the public assemblies for worship men ought not to be veiled, nor woman unveiled." (p. 178).

Albert Barnes: "The simple idea here is, that they spoke in the public assemblies" . . . "This is one reason why a man should not cover his head in public worship" (p 753 of the one volume edition.

Adam Clark: "Any person who engages in public acts in the worship of (,od." (p. 250).  
Again: "If she will not wear a veil in the public assemblies" . . . "He should not wear his cap or turban in the public congregation." (p. 251).

Matthew Henry: "The misconduct of their women in the public assembly" (p. 1817).

B. W. Johnson: "There should be no violation of decorum, such as a HAREHEADED woman in a public assembly would be " (p 107) Again: "That is, in the public assembly " (Vs. 13-10; p. 108).

Jamieson-Fasset and Brown: "The woman was made by God mediately through the man, who was as it were, a veil or medium placed between her and God, and therefore, should wear the veil or head-covering in public worship . . ." (comment on Vs. 8).

David Lipscomb: "The Purpose is to show how the woman should appear before God in the assembly . . . ' (p. 168).

We now cite the following translations:

Goodspeed: "I for my part recognize no other practice in worship than this...." (v. 16).

Amplified: "In church" (vs. 7) "In worship" (vs. 16).

We have cited these commentators and translators to show that they did consider this to regulate the public worship or public assembly. But our brother says: "I Cor. 14:34 shows that I Cor. 11:1-

16 could not be a public assembly or else there is a contradiction." There are others today who claim that there are contradictions in the Bible but it is proof that they do not understand the Bible. It may well be that I Cor. 14:34 simply shows that our brother misunderstands I Cor. 11:5. His application and supposed contradiction that would exist between the two passages reminds me of the two drunks who were trying to hang a picture. One took a nail but turned the head to the wall and seeing it would not drive said to the other, "this nail is made backward." But the other drunk said, "No crazy, it is made for the other wall." Human wisdom and desire to be, like the world will lead us to think and act the same way about God's word.

Commenting on vs. 6, it is stated, "The artificial covering (veil) was to be used only by those women that prayed or prophesied." We have already quoted a number of commentators who affirmed this was to regulate the public worship (which has not been shown to be otherwise) and as the law of subjection retains today, it follows that the sign is to be retained. Our brother from vs. 7 that the regulation does apply to man today properly observes it. He said, "Since man is to rule over the woman, and in this respect he is the image and glory of God, man ought not to have the veil on his head while praying or prophesying." Now this is exactly right and I fully agree with what he said. If our brother will accept what the book says about the woman as what it says about the man, he will teach that she "ought to have power on her head" just as he noted that the man "ought not to cover his head." Can't that be easily seen?

It is amazing how a person can cite facts such as the author did in commenting on vs. 10 and then turn around and cast them out the window. Notice this, "Thayer says in regards to 'power on her head' the following: 'a sign of the husband's authority over his wife, i.e. the veil with which propriety required a woman to cover herself.'" We ask WHY is the woman not to have power on her head today since she is still to be in subjection? According to the evolutionist, time has brought about changes and produced man. According to some religionists, time has brought about changes and produced "custom." That which denies the theory of both is their own doctrine. Why doesn't man evolve from the ape? Why doesn't custom change the law of subjection; The fact is that many have let custom change God's law of subjection so far as they are concerned and when they so teach and act, they contribute to disobedience by causing men and women to disrespect God's word.

Brethren, to take the position that custom changes God's law is deadly. It is God's law that said, "The head of the woman is the man," and that "a man indeed ought not to cover his head," and "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head . . ." (vs. 10). Custom did not give us either of the three and neither is custom to remove either. Will custom make it right and modest to wear shorts or wear nothing at all? Certainly not!

Our brother implies that a "hat" is a substitute and compares it to "sprinkling" as a substitute for baptism. Now if anyone can make a burial out of sprinkling it will not be a substitute. And I will not oppose that which is a burial, for that is what the Lord requires (Rom. 6:4). On the other hand if what the woman has on her head is a covering (whatever it may be "hat" or some other

covering), I have no more right to object to her being covered than I have to her being immersed that is what the Lord authorized. By our brother's own statements, he recognizes that a "hat" can be a covering. He asks. "How small does a hat have to become before a woman would be 'uncovered'?"

If our brother applied his rule to the size of the covering as he does to the length of the hair, he might satisfy himself he would at least be consistent. Hear him: "There is nothing in this passage that prohibits a woman's cutting the hair. It simply states that her long (a relative term) hair is her glory and covering." If the length of hair is relative why isn't the size of the covering (according to your rule) also relative? But let me state that I am not advocating short hair nor a small covering; rather I am showing that our brother makes an issue of the size of the covering but accepts short hair evidently. Incidentally, when custom has a woman cutting her hair like a man, will it be long hair? Will she be able to say, my "long hair is a glory" to me?

The author suggests, "feet washing and the holy kiss were compulsory practices, and yet not laws," and then he asks, "Why could not the wearing of the veil be in the same category? Brother Warnock, WHY COULDN'T BAPTISM BE IN THE SAME CATEGORY? And why couldn't EATING THE LORD'S SUPPER BE IN THE SAME CATEGORY? The Lord did not require feet to be washed when there was no need. As for the "kiss," God said make it holy. Furthermore, I deny that kissing was a "compulsory practice." There is no passage that enjoined kissing. The passage in Rom. 16:16 said, make it holy. "The disciples of Christ adopted (kissing) and practiced..." (James McKnight). "He did not ordain kissing as a mode of salutation. He found it, and cautioned that it should be pure and holy among Christians." Lipscomb). No, the Lord did not require them nor us to salute with a kiss, but if we do salute with a kiss the Lord requires that it be holy, not: like the kiss of Judas. The Lord does require us to worship and has told us how we are to appear in the public worship to show subjection. To remove the sign of authority and subjection would be equal to removing holiness from the kiss. (There is a Sectarian preacher here who has tried to remove the force of "The Churches of Christ salute you, with the "kiss" dodge, but his play does not affect the truth one whit either.)

Again we read, "Paul said 'veils,' not 'hats.'" Wait a minute now brother Warnock don't fudge on us! Why didn't you just define the Greek word "akatakaluptos" like you did "paradoseis" instead of saying "Paul said 'veils' not 'hats'?" It was brother Warnock who said "not hats." In desperation to make a "score" men will try to call the game themselves. Three times our brother cited a form of the word "veil" in parenthesis (veil, veiled, unveiled) citing Thayer as if this was all he said about it. We will now give the word from which "veil" is sometimes translated and we will not hold back part of it.

Akatakaluptos (katakalupto) "not covered, unveiled: I Cor. 11: 5,13" (Thayer, p. 21). Now brother Warnock, why did not you give all of it if you were going to give any of it? Do you recognize your position so weak that you purposefully hold back part of what Thayer says? Note again:

Katakalupto "To cover up. Katakaluptomai, to veil or cover one's self. I Cor. 11: 6; tan kefalan, one's head," (Thayer p. 331). Brother Warnock, though you see no need for a woman to cover her head in worship, must you cover part of the meaning of these words?

Brethren, did Paul say "veils" not "hats"? We can see that is brother Warnock's words. But to further his contention the author suggests the A. S. version for the readers to get the "proper meaning" of "covering." His statements show that he knew the word "cover" was part of the definition just as "veil." With just as much sense he could suggest the King James translation to get the proper meaning of the word "veil." As all can see, both "cover" and "veil" are given by Thayer. You knew that, didn't you brother Warnock? Why your big play? Does your position require it? Since our brother singled out one translation (A. S.) that used the word veil, we give the words in other translations.

King James: Covered, uncovered, cover.

New A. S. :Something on his head, uncovered, cover, covered.

The New English: Covered, bareheaded, veil, cover.

Goodspeed: Anything on his head, bareheaded, veil, with something to symbolize her subjection.

Amplified: Covered, bareheaded, covering, cover, wear anything.

Diaglott: Covered, uncovered, unveiled, veiled, cover.

Douay: Covered. uncovered, cover.

As in the case of the commentators, maybe the translators should have had brother Warnock to set them straight.

### Summary

Our brother began by showing that "ordinances" means, "what is delivered, the substance of teaching . . . of the particular injunctions of Paul's instruction." Very good! But then he glides and slides away until Paul's instruction and teaching becomes nothing more than custom.

Then he takes the position that wearing the covering did not apply to the "public worship" but to the miraculous age. According to this it was law that would have been done away when the miraculous age closed. But watch it! If this were true, why did our brother take up another argument, that of custom, and contend that women need not wear a covering because custom removed it? (Would not this mean that the man would be at liberty to wear a covering in worship today?) If he were correct in applying the covering to the miraculous age and that it passed with miraculous gifts, he is in error when he contends that custom did away with it. Hence, he denies what he says by his own argumentation. Either of his arguments invalidates the other.

When one teaches that it is not necessary for the woman to wear the sign of authority on her head (that woman need not be in subjection to man), he is ignoring the established order in the beginning, "that the woman is of man and for this cause ought to have a sign of authority on her head . . ." (I Cor. 11:8-10) Why does not custom or the miraculous age do away with God's law of marriage? God too established it in the beginning.

Maybe our brother will deal next with the man and tell us that either the miraculous age or custom will now allow him to wear a covering in worship and also to wear long hair. But now we must say away with such folly and follow Paul as he followed Christ.

Brethren, these are matters which test our obedience to God. Neither the passing of the miraculous age nor custom removes God's law. Smiting the rock may seem to have been a little thing (Num. 20:1-12) but it was disobedience. I realize that such position and teaching will not make me popular nor to have a flood of calls for meetings, nevertheless "we must obey God rather than men."

Finally, since it was not "becoming," "seemly" or "fit" for woman to appear in worship uncovered then, let us consider prayerfully if it would be now.

TRUTH MAGAZINE X: 10, pp. 8-11 July 1966

---

#### A Reply to Brother Plyler's Review

W. E. Warnock

Bowling Green, Kentucky

Must a woman have something on her head in the public assembly of the church? Brother Leo Plyler in the July (66) issue of this paper maintained that she does in his review of an article that I had written on this subject. My article appeared in the February (66) issue. There are four (4) things at least that brother Plyler completely and totally failed to show in his reply to my article. They are as-follows:

First, he failed to show that a public assembly of the whole church is in I Cor. 11: 1-16. I maintain that no public assembly of the church is indicated. His efforts to prove that a public assembly was involved consisted of seven commentaries and two translations. He quoted from McKnight, Barnes, Clarke, Matthew Henry, Johnson, Jamieson Fausset and Brown and David Lipscomb. Brother Plyler suggested that perhaps the commentators should have had me to help set them straight. However, it is interesting to notice that all of the commentaries, except the one by Lipscomb, state that the matter of an artificial covering was- simply a custom or an act of propriety. It looks like that they needed brother -Plyler to help them too.

David Lipscomb made this observation on verse 13 in "A Commentary on New Testament Epistles," page 168, "It is as wrong for a man to approach God with covered head in the closet as it is to do it in the public assembly. So also of women. God makes no difference as to how he shall be approached in public or in private." Was Brother Lipscomb presumptive in these remarks, brother Plyler?

The two translations, Goodspeed and Amplified, that brother Plyler used failed to substantiate a public assembly as the words, "in worship" and "in church" are parenthetical and not in the original whatsoever. What the translators thought is one thing, and what the apostle said is another.

Commentators are divided on I Cor. 11: 1-16 as to whether a public assembly is involved or not. I quote from the following sources:

Commentary on First Corinthians by F. W. Grosheide: "This lead us to the conclusion that Paul in ch. 11 speaks of a praying and a prophesying (of women) in public rather than in the meetings of the congregation. This interpretation has in its favor that it avoids a conflict with the absolute language of 14:34."

Commentary on First Corinthians by W. E. Vine: "The meaning of I Cor. 14:34 is quite unmistakable. Therefore this statement (I Cor. 11:5, W. W.) cannot refer to the gatherings of an assembly."

R. C. H. Lenski, commenting on verse 5, "Paul is said to contradict himself when he forbids the women to prophesy in 14:34-36. The matter becomes clear when we observe that from 11:17 onward until the end of chapter 14 Paul deals with the gatherings of the congregations for public worship and with regulations pertaining to public assemblies.- "The transition is decidedly marked: 'that ye come together, i. e., for public worship, v. 17; 'when ye come together in church (Ekklesia, no article), v. 18; and again: 'when ye assemble together,' i. e., for public worship, v. :20."

R. L. Whiteside in Reflections, page 111: "In I Cor. ' 11: 1- 15' where Paul speaks of veils and uncovered or bare heads, nothing is said about coming to a meeting. The young brother and a lot of older ones read that into the text. If he makes that Scripture apply to the public assembly, he will have to allow a woman to teach and pray in the public assembly, if she has on a veil." Brother Whiteside was replying to a question sent him concerning what a young preacher had taught. Pretty good answer, isn't it brother Plyler?

We can see, therefore, that neither commentaries nor parenthetical translations settle anything. The issue must be resolved by a fervent study of what the text says. The text says that a woman is to be veiled when praying or prophesying. The public assembly of the church is not in the text. Brother Plyler, if I Cor. 11: 1-16 is speaking of a public assembly, would you harmonize it with I Cor. 14:34? I would like to see how you do it.

Second, he failed to show that all women in I Cor. 11 are obligated to wear a veil. Paul said, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head . . ." Where do you get from this chapter brother Plyler that every woman was to

wear a veil? The passage says that those women who prayed or prophesied were to be veiled. You are not going to be permitted to assume anything.

Third, he failed to show that a hat is permissible in the place of a veil. Brother Plyler tried to find justification for a hat in Thayer and several translations. On "katakalupto" Thayer said, "to veil or cover one's self: I Cor. 11:6." Do you think a hat fits Thayer's definition? Goodspeed, one of the translations brother Plyler used, rendered verse 10 thusly, "That is why she ought to wear upon her head something to symbolize her subjection . . . . Are you sure that you want to accept Goodspeed on this verse, brother Plyler?" "Something" takes in a lot of territory. How about a feather, hair net, ribbon or bow? These are "something." They fit what Thayer said about as well as the hats women wear and call them "coverings."

On the word "kata" on page 329, Thayer stated, ". . . likewise in verbs naming that which is, covered, concealed, overwhelmed, etc., as katakalupto . . . ."

A. T. Robertson, commenting on katakalupto on page 160 in "Word Pictures in the New Testament," said, "Let her cover up herself with the veil (down, kata, the Greek says, the veil hanging down from the head)." Berry's Interlinear-Lexicon defines katakalupto, "to wear a veil."

The Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament by Edward Robinson states on katakalupto, "to cover with a veil which hangs down, and hence to veil; in N. T. only Pass. or Mid. to be veiled, to wear a veil, absol. I Cor. 11:6 . . . ."

Harper's Analytical Greek Lexicon says, "to veil; mid. to veil one's self, to be veiled or covered, I Cor. 11:6,7." Young's Analytical Concordance defines katakalupto, "to cover fully." Vine's Word Studies states, "to cover up . . . . to cover oneself."

R.L. Whiteside wrote as given in Reflections, page 111, "If one will consult the American Standard Version he will see that the head covering mentioned is either a veil or long hair. Nothing is said about a hat. A veil is not a hat, and a hat is not a veil. Is it not strange how some preachers read into a passage of Scripture things that are not there, and then severely criticize those who do not agree with their perversion? If a man says a woman must wear a hat in public, he says what Paul does not say."

Before someone accuses brother Whiteside of being worldly, a man-pleaser or "trying to get meetings," I quote from the preface of "Commentary on Romans" by R. L. Whiteside, penned by C. R. Nichol, Cled Wallace and Foy Wallace, Jr. "Brother Whiteside has been a close student of the Bible all of his life. His critical mind and power of reasoning have afforded him an insight into the teaching of the Bible as a whole that few men have. His

implicit faith in God has led him to seek to know only what the will of God is, that he might comply with it and teach it without faltering."

The preceding information should leave no doubt as to what the apostle Paul meant concerning the woman's covering' To say that the covering is still binding puts one who so advocates in the position of altering, substituting and perverting what the Bible says when he teaches that women are to come into the assembly with hats on their heads or something other than a veil. Paul said, "veil."

Too, I don't understand why bare-headed women aren't withdrawn from in the congregations that bind something artificial on the heads of women during the worship of the church. Brother Plyler said that such is the law of God. Brother Plyler, do you teach that women who come into the assembly bare-headed should be disfellowshipped? If not, why not?

Fourth, he failed to show a charitable attitude. He stated that my application of a couple of passages reminded him of a couple of drunks. I don't know which drunk was to have represented me. He accused me of fudging, being desperate and purposefully holding back part of what Thayer said. Here my motives were impugned. He continued by saying that I was making a big play, sliding and gliding, being foolish, and implied that I took such a position on I Cor. 11 in order to be popular and to get to hold more meetings. This kind of writing is in poor taste and is beneath the dignity of brethren in Christ.

I know preachers who hold brother Plyler's position, yet are well received among brethren everywhere. I would imagine that attitude and disposition make a big difference concerning "popularity" and affect the number of meetings a preacher conducts.

#### Conclusion

Brethren, I pray that our differences on "the covering" will not become intensified to the place where it hinders our brotherly relationship. May we have the same forbearance and generosity toward each other on this issue in the future as we have had in of Paul years that have passed.

Let us continue to study and discuss our differences in this matter, and at the same time, permit -each individual to follow his own conscience as he understands I Cor. 11.

TRUTH MAGAZINE, XI: 8, pp. 6-7  
May 1967

---