

### ANSWERS TO PAT DONAHUE'S QUESTIONS 1-5

- Q1. How many coverings are referred to in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16?
- A1. Two. One refers to man in verse 4 and one refers to woman in verses 5-7, 13, & 15.
- Q2. Beginning at the bottom of page 10 of your tract, "Woman's Glory," you said, "however, regardless if this has reference to 'worship only' or all times while praying or prophesying, we still must be conscious of the fact that a specific time is referred to. In short, if man is 'praying or prophesying' he cannot be covered, to violate this would be an act of dishonoring Christ; however, if he is not 'praying or prophesying' he can be covered, since he would be able to "uncover" himself before he enters into the specific acts of 'praying or prophesying' again." Unless I misunderstand, you are saying that the fact that a man is required to be uncovered when he is "praying or prophesying," proves that he can be covered when he is not praying or prophesying. If this is conclusive proof, and I wholeheartedly agree that it is, then why wouldn't the same reasoning prove that since a woman is to be covered when she prays or prophesies, then it would be right for her to be uncovered when she is not praying or prophesying?
- A2. As stated five lines down in the tract: "Because, (unlike man) she would not be able to 'cover' herself, that is, regain her 'long hair' before she 'prays or prophesies' again."
- Q3. Is there anything in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 that proves that either the "covering," or the "long hair" of verse 15 is the same as the covering of verse 5?
- A3. Yes, the context. In 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 practically every statement having reference to women and their being 'covered' or 'uncovered' infers "long hair" within the same statement.
- Q4. Some Greek dictionaries define the word translated "shorn" (and English dictionaries the word "shorn" itself) in 1 Corinthians 11:6 as simply "to shear, or cut" (New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon) without reference to length (how much is cut off). Do you think these definitions are fitting? If not, how can you be sure?
- A4. Yes

Q5. Do you feel that your case (for the long hair being the only covering taught necessary by 1 Corinthians 11:2-16) would be stronger if the same Greek word had been used in verse 15 as in verse 5,6,6,7, and 13?

A5 No, as stated in answer to your question #3, the context of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 proves that long hair is the covering; furthermore, it would be impossible for "the same Greek word" to have been used because in verse 15 the word "covering" is a noun and in the other verses they are either verbs or adjectives.

## MARK BAILEY'S FIRST AFFIRMATIVE

1. It is with pleasure that I enter into this discussion with Brother Donahue. I commend him on his willingness and eagerness to discuss this controversial subject. Even though brother Donahue and I have never met I believe him to be a honest and sincere student of the Bible. My prayer is that no personality conflicts will arise in this discussion and that we will treat each other as brethren in Christ. The proposition that I will be affirming and that Brother Donahue will attempt to deny is: "The Scriptures teach that long hair is the only covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying." I will begin by defining my proposition.

### 2.PROPOSITION DEFINED

By "**The Scriptures**" I mean the word of God.

By "**teach**" I mean to impart instruction or knowledge.

By "**that long hair**" I mean uncut hair.

By "**is the only**" I mean sole.

By "**covering**" I mean that which covers. That is, the uncut hair is the sole covering that Christian women must wear today.

By "**that Christian women must have**" I mean that Christian women are obligated to have upon her head as an ornament.

By "**while praying or prophesying**" I mean that during the time of either one of these acts (praying or prophesying) Christian women are obligated to have long uncut hair.

### CONTEXT EXPLAINED

3. The subject of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is not "long hair" nor artificial veils of any type. The actual subject concerns headship as Paul mentions in 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 written discussion is taking place due to controversy over **HOW** a Christian woman demonstrates that she is under subjection to man.

### WHY BE COVERED?

4. Before proving my proposition I would like to explain the reasons, given by inspiration, as to why a Christian woman must be covered while praying or prophesying. This is an essential point because some believe that Paul is speaking only about customs. However, notice that the reasons given by the

Apostle has absolutely nothing to do with the customs of the day. He gives three reasons:

1. "... the woman is the glory of the man." (verse 7)
2. "... the woman (is) of the man." (verse 8)
3. "... the woman (is created) for the man." (verse 9)

These three separate reason are given, but Paul ties these three reasons together in verse 10 by saying: "**For this cause** ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels." The question is: **For what cause?** Because of the order in which woman was created, because she was created both "of" and "for" the man. Notice, she is to be covered, as a sign of submission, because of creation and not because of custom. Man being created as the origin of the human race stands in the position of leadership, only under God and Christ. He is not to cover his head with anything because the covered head is "**a sign of subjection.**" It is a sign of the husband's authority over his wife (1 Corinthians 11:10). Furthermore, it should be understood that Paul's instructions for the woman to wear a "sign" as a sign of subordination to man and for a woman to submit herself to her husband is not a sign of spiritual weakness, it is recognizing the fact that has existed since the creation.

### ARGUMENT #1 "POWER" (THE SIGN OF SUBJECTION)

5. The scriptures teach that long hair (uncut hair) is a sign of subjection. In verse 10 Paul says, "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels." Two key words found here are "**ought**" and "**power.**" The word "ought" (*opheilo*) means "under obligation, bound by duty or necessity to do something"(Thayer 469). Whatever this "something" is women are "under obligation ... to do." It is not a matter of choice but a matter of necessity in order to please God. The "something" that she is under obligation to do is referred to by the term "**power**" (*exousia*). Thayer (page 225) says this "power" is "a sign of the husband's authority over his wife." Therefore, Christian women are "under obligation, bound by duty or necessity" to have this "power," that is, this "sign of the husband's authority" on her head. The question is: **WHAT IS THIS "POWER?"** Speaking of "power" Vincent (Vol.3, page 248) says it is "used here of the symbol of power, i.e., the covering upon the head as a sign of her husband's authority." This symbol and covering is **long hair**. In Revelation 9:8 John says, "And they had hair as the hair of woman,..." This clearly indicates that woman's hair is different from man's hair. Concerning this "hair," W.E. Vine (page 189) says, "The **long hair** of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their **subjection** to their Satanic master (compare 1 Corinthians 11:10, R.V.)." Here, the scholarly W.E. Vine tells us that "**long hair**"

is "indicative of their **subjection** to their... master. He then compares this "long hair" and "subjection" to the "power" the "sign of subjection" in 1 Corinthians 11:10. He has reference to the "**long hair**" or "the hair of woman," as referred to in Revelations 9:8 as being the "power," that is, the sign of subjection to their master (husband), that Christian women are obligated to have.

## ARGUMENT #2 HOW WOMEN BECOME UNCOVERED

6. In 1 Corinthians 11:5 Paul says, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven." The term covered or the negative "uncovered" (*akatakalupto*) found here is defined by Thayer (page 21) as "not covered, unveiled: 1 Corinthians 11:5,13)." The question is: **HOW** do women become "uncovered"? Notice that Paul says, that being "**uncovered**" is the same "**as if she were shaven.**" Before knowing how women are "uncovered" we must first know what she is covered with. This is decided by the context (see answer to Donahue's question #3). The context shows that the covering is long hair. We know this because every statement referring to women being covered or uncovered mentions "long hair" within the same statement. As just noticed, verse 5 says, "**uncovered**", then it says this is all one or the same as **if she were shaven.**" WHAT IS "SHAVEN?" **HAIR!** Again notice that verse 6 refers to "**not covered**" and "**covered**" then it says "**shorn,**" and "**shorn or shaven**" - WHAT IS "SHORN OR SHAVEN?" **HAIR!** Another example that conclusively states the truth concerning this is found in verses 13-15. In verse 13 Paul asks the question: "... is it comely that a woman pray unto God **uncovered?**" Then he answers his own question in verses 14&15 by referring to **HAIR**. He says (Verse 14), "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if man have **long hair**, it is a shame unto him, (verse 15) but if a woman have "... **LONG HAIR,**" it is a glory ... for "**HER HAIR IS GIVEN HER FOR A COVERING.**" Every statement found in 1 Corinthians 11 that says "covered" or "uncovered" mentions hair and then to simplify Paul states in verse 15: "Her hair is given her for a covering." HOW CAN IT BE DENIED? Long hair is the only covering mentioned, for women, in the context. Since "long hair" is the covering of this context - how is woman uncovered? She is uncovered simply by cutting her hair. Christian women are covered when they have long hair and is uncovered when she cuts her hair.
  
7. Since I have proven, by the context, of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16, that long hair is the covering for Christian women, I will now show, by examples, how Christians become uncovered? By doing this it will also further prove that "covered" and "uncovered" refers to hair. The idea of being "covered" or "uncovered" is not restricted only to the New Testament. We find several examples of this in the Old Testament as well. For example, in Leviticus 10:6: "Moses said unto Aaron,

and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, **Uncover not your heads, ...**" Also notice Leviticus 21:10: "He that is the high priest...shall **not uncover his head, ...**" In these two verses we have similar statements as found in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,13 referring to being "uncovered." The word "uncovered" in these Old Testament verses is defined by Gesenius Hebrew - Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, page 690 as "to make naked...**specially by shaving**, Leviticus 10:6; 21:10." It does not take a highly educated person to know that this "uncovered" by "shaving" does not refer to removing something artificial, but instead, it is referring to **hair** that has been cut. Hair that has not been cut, that is, "**long hair**" is woman's God given "glory" (1 Corinthians 11:15) - given for a covering. Her "**long hair**" is her covering or veil and thus it is an **ornament**. Thayer (page 354) referring to hair, says, "hair, head of hair: 1 Corinthians 11:15 ... it differs from *thrix* (the anatomical or physical term) by designating the hair as an **ornament** (the notion of length being only secondary and suggested)." In other words, long hair (uncut hair), regardless of the length, is an ornament given to woman by God for a covering (sometimes called a veil).

8. The words "uncovered," "not covered," and "covered," in reference to women, as found in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6, & 13 are translated from the Greek word "*katakalupto*" (or grammatical forms.) This Greek term *katakalupto* (covered) is a compound word made up of *kata* and *kalupto*. The prefix *kata* primarily means "down"; however, according to a study made at the South Africa Bible School "When prefixed to a verb, its usual meaning is 'completely'." In his Lexicon, W.J. Hickie tells us that *katakalupto* (covered) means: "To completely cover." Therefore, we should understand that God's desire for woman is that she honors man by wearing her sign of authority, that is, long (uncut) hair. When the hair is shortened even in the least measure the head is no longer "completely" covered. It's just as if I were to cover my house with roofing and then remove or cut away a small amount of the covering - during the first rain, I would quickly understand that my house is not properly or "completely covered." Likewise, when women remove or cut away part of their covering (long hair) they are not properly or completely covered, hence they are considered "uncovered."

### ARGUMENT 3 HAIR AND VEIL INTERCHANGEABLE

9. People sometimes becomes confused when studying this subject because many writers will use the term veiled and unveiled instead of "covered" and "uncovered." Due to this, people may have something artificial in mind. However, we should understand that the word "veil" does not necessitate something artificial. In reference to the word "nature" in verse 14, Dean Alford says: "... the mere fact of one sex being by nature **unveiled, i.e. having short hair**, - the other **veiled, i.e. having long hair**." As this scholarly man states "unveiled"

is "having short hair" and "veiled" refers, not to something artificial but, "having long hair." Another scholar that proves that the word "veil" refers to "hair in this context is W.E. Vine. On page 189, speaking of hair, he says, "The word (*kome*, hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the '**covering**' **provided in the long hair** of the woman **is as a veil**, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headship spoken of in verses 1- 10."

10. I would now like to offer several Biblical examples to prove that "hair" and "veil" are, at times, used interchangeably. The Hebrew word *tsammah* which is the Greek word *katakalumma* (this is a Greek noun form of the verb *katakalupto* in 1 Corinthians 11) is translated as "hair" and "veil" by the translators. Young's Analytical Concordance says that the Hebrew word *tsammah* (Greek *katakalumma*) is defined as "a lock of hair, veil," in Song of Solomon 4:1,3; 6:7; Isa. 47:2. Carefully notice the examples found here: In Isaiah 47:2 the King James Version translates "**uncover thy locks**" while the American Standard Version translates: "**remove thy veil**". The phrase "uncover thy locks" or "remove thy veil" is defined by Gesenius' (page 170 ) as: "to make naked; hence, to disclose, reveal, to uncover; to make bare, to uncover any one's ear by **taking away the hair**." Here we find that to "uncover thy locks" or to "remove thy veil" is done by "taking away the hair," that is, by cutting the hair.
11. This same word is also used several times in the Songs of Solomon. Carefully notice a comparison of each of these verses from the King James Version (KJV) and the American Standard Version (ASV).

#### **Song of Solomon 4:1**

"Thou hast doves' eyes within thy **locks**:" (KJV)  
"Thine eyes are as doves behind thy **veil**." (ASV)

#### **Song of Solomon 4:3**

"Thy temples are like a piece of a pomegranate within thy **locks**." (KJV)  
"Thy temples are like a piece of pomegranate behind thy **veil**." (ASV) The footnote says "or locks".

#### **Song of Solomon 6:7**

"As a piece of a pomegranate are thy temples within thy **locks**." (KJV)  
"Thy temples are like a piece of a pomegranate Behind thy **veil**." (ASV)

12. In the above examples we can see that in every case, the King James Version translates "locks", while the American Standard Version translates "veil". Neither

has mistranslated the word. The two words ("hair" and "veil") are simply used interchangeably since the hair is looked upon as a veil. Both the words "locks" and "veil" are defined by Gesenius (page 712) as: "a woman's vail." The significants of this is within the facts that the **HAIR** is looked upon as a **VEIL**. This is most likely the reason that Thayer (page 354) states that the **HAIR** is an ornament. It is an ornament when worn as God gave it.

13. The comparisons given above prove that the terms "hair" and "veil" are interchangeable. Furthermore, since these two terms are translated from grammatical forms of the same Greek word (*katakalypto*) as used in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,7, & 13 it is obvious that "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" (even when translated "veil," "unveiled," and "not veiled") as found in these verses also **refer to HAIR** just as the context shows.

#### **ARGUMENT #4 HER HAIR IS GIVEN FOR A COVERING.**

14. The proposition that I am affirming is: "The Scriptures teach that long hair is the only covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying." Before we can decide if **long hair** is the **only covering** we must first prove, by the Scriptures, that **long hair** is a covering. This proof is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15 where the apostle Paul says, "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for **her hair is given her for a covering.**" This point of the proposition is proven and cannot be denied. Now, let's consider the second point. Is the long hair the **only** covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying? In order to answer this question we must examine the context carefully to see if another covering is mentioned or even referred to that is binding on Christian women today. We have already discussed the terms "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" found in verses 2-14 dealing with Christian women. Within these verses we have noticed that the context refers to hair every time. Now, let's notice the "covering" found in 1 Corinthians 11:15. Paul says that "... **her hair is given her for a covering.**" The noun "covering," as found here, is translated from the Greek word *peribolaion*. As stated, in my answer to Brother Donahue's 5th question, the word "covering" (*peribolaion*) found here is a noun and the other references ("uncovered" and "not covered" and "covered") are either verbs or adjectives; therefore, the words are not the same. Will these verbs and this noun correspond with each other? **YES!** I am not a Greek scholar; therefore, I will go to the Greek scholars for proof of my answer. Concerning whether these verbs and noun can be used together, Leon Crouch, a Greek scholar, from Lubbock Christian College states:

15."They are certainly never used together in the New Testament. However, a study of the use of the words in

those sources indicates that **they could possibly be used together.**"

16. While it is correct to say the verbs and the noun cannot be found being used together in the New Testament, it is interesting to note that in the Greek Old Testament that forms of the two words (**katakalupto & periballo**) are used interchangeably. In Genesis 38:14 we find that Tamar "**covered** (*periebale*) her with a veil,..." Then in verse 15 Judah thought she was a harlot because "she had **covered** (*katekalupsato*) her face."
17. Also notice the same is true in Psalms 104:6 & 9. In verse 6 the Bible says "Thou **coveredst** (*peribolaion*) it with the deep as with a garment:..." However, speaking of the same thing verse 9 says: "Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to **cover** (*kalupsai*) the earth."
18. In both of these examples we find that grammatical forms of the Greek verb *katakalupto* and the noun *peribolaion* are used together.
19. Another excellent Greek scholar that proves that these verbs and this noun can be used together is Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer. In his commentary (page 256) on 1 Corinthians 11:15 he clearly states:

**"peribolaion**, something thrown round one, a covering in general, **has here a special reference to the veil (kaluptra, kalumma) spoken of in the context.**"
20. Since the Greek noun *peribolaion* (covering in verse 15) and the verbs *katakalupto* and *akatakalupto* (covered and uncovered) in verses 5,6,& 13 can be and are found to be used together in the Greek Old Testament this explains why the apostle Paul uses the terms as he did in the Greek New Testament (1 Corinthians 11:2-16). The point that must be understood is that Paul, just as the Old Testament writers, used the verbs and noun together and clearly stated: "**... HER HAIR IS GIVEN HER FOR A COVERING.**"

#### **ARGUMENT #5 LONG HAIR MEANS UN CUT HAIR**

21. "Long hair" (*Gr. komao*) is defined by Thayer (page 354) as "**to let the hair grow, have long hair.**" This is violated by doing anything (cutting, trimming, breaking, burning, etc.) to the hair to keep it from growing. The long hair is an ornament or covering only when it is left as nature gives it. When men **or** women do not let their hair grow, but instead shorten it - it is not long. I realize some people will say "When I trim the "dead ends" my hair will grow longer." The truth of

this statement is immaterial. It does not matter if it will grow longer once it is shortened. The fact that must be understood is that if a Christian woman's hair is shortened that they are not "letting the hair grow"; therefore, they have short hair and they no longer have their covering.

22. In 1 Corinthians 11:6 Paul says, "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." Notice the condition of the woman referred to in this verse. She no longer has her ornamental hair. Her hair is no longer as "nature" would have it. She is "not covered", that is, she is not "completely covered" (as is defined by W.J. Hickie) due to having removed a portion of her hair. She did not cut her hair enough to be shorn, she merely trimmed it. However, Paul continues to show the sinfulness of trimming the hair by saying in order to be consistent "let her also be shorn" that is, "have the hair cut close." (Vincent (Volume 3, page 247) In other words, if she is going to trim her hair, even a small amount -(for example: the bangs or the "split-ends) she may as well go further and be shorn or even a step further than that and be shaved. Here Paul is teaching matters of consistency. He is not commanding that they be shorn if the women trim their hair; however, he is saying that it is consistent to do so.
23. At the conclusion of verse 6 Paul relates to the known knowledge of the Corinthians by saying, "If it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered." They knew that it was sinful for women to be "shorn or shaven"; therefore, Paul says, since this is the case "let her be covered" - let her be completely covered. Paul is simply teaching that if they consider it permissible to cut their hair a small amount they may as well shave their heads. On the other hand, man is commanded (verse 14) not to have long hair (verse 14); in other words he is to cut his hair - he may also shave his head, if he desires. This is only consistency!
24. In defense of the proposition: "The Scriptures teach that long hair is the only covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying," I humbly submit these arguments and ask that you carefully consider each. May God bless Brother Donahue and me and every reader of this discussion in our search for the truth on this subject.

## ANSWERS TO MARK BAILEY'S QUESTIONS 1-5

- Q1. What will it take to convince you that long hair is the only covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying?
- A1 To convince me that the long hair is the only covering that a woman must have while praying or prophesying, you will have to prove to me that the long hair is the "covering" referred by 1 Cor. 11:5,6,7, and 13.
- Q2. If a Christian woman cuts, trims or shortens her hair in any way (even a very small amount) does she have "long hair" according to 1 Corinthians 11:15? IF yes, please give proof.
- A2 The New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon's (and some other dictionaries') definition of the Greek word translated "shorn" in 1 Cor 11:6 is simply "to shear, or cut" without reference to length (how much is cut off). I believe that this definition is appropriate, and therefore, since 1 Cor 11:6 implies that it is a shame for a woman to be shorn, then I believe that it is a shame for a woman to cut her hair at all (I certainly cannot prove that it is right for a woman to cut her hair at all).
- Q3. 1 Corinthians 11:15 states: "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." Does this verse teach that "long hair" is given for an artificial covering?
- A3 No, the long hair is a "natural" covering.
- Q4. With the exception of verse 15 that states "her hair is given her for a covering" are there any way to prove in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 what the covering (veil) is in verses 5,6, & 13? Please give proof.
- A4 The fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she prays or prophesies, implies (proves) that she doesn't have to be covered when she is not praying or prophesying. Since she cannot put the long hair on when she prays, and take the long hair off when she is not praying, the covering of vs. 5,6, and 13 cannot be the long hair. This proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that the covering referred to in vs. 5,6, and 13 must be an artificial covering that can be put on and taken off.
- Q5. In the Scriptures does the Greek term katakalupto (or any of its grammatical forms) which is translated "covered" in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6 & 13 ever refer to hair? Please list the verses.

A5 The Hebrew Old Testament certainly never uses any grammatical form of the Greek word "katakalypto" to refer to the hair (since this is a Greek word, not a Hebrew word), and the Greek New Testament doesn't either as far as I know.

## Pat Donahues First Negative

25. I thank Mark for being willing to enter into a discussion such as this, similar to the discussion held between Christians that is referred to in Acts 15:2. It will be Marks job, as well as mine, to prove (not just assert) what we are teaching by the scriptures (Acts 18:28). The readers (as well as the disputants) responsibility is to search the scriptures, as did the Bereans according to Acts 17:11, to see who is actually teaching what the Bible teaches.

### Marks Argument #1

26. Mark asserts, in giving his first argument in support of his proposition (in his Paragraph #5), that the symbol and covering (of I Cor 11:10) is long hair, and gives as proof W.E. Vines statement, the long hair of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Rev 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (cp. I Cor 11:10, R.V.). First of all, Mr. Vines comparison of Rev 9:8 to I Cor 11:10 is not necessarily that I Cor 11:10 is talking about the hair, but most likely he is comparing the two because he feels that both passages deal with subjection. Nobody can know why Mr. Vines feels that the verses compare, unless Mr. Vines tells us. Of course, it wouldnt matter anyway because Mr. Vines statement is only his opinion about the passage. There is a big difference between Mr. Vines scholarship (when he defines a word) and Mr. Vines commentary (speculation in this case) on a verse. Who can look at the phrase, And they had hair as the hair of women in Rev 9:8, and thereby conclude that the symbol of authority of I Cor 11:10 is the long hair?

### Marks Argument #2

27. I believe it would be fair to sum up Marks second argument by quoting the following two sentences from his Paragraph #6: The context shows that the covering is long hair. We know this because every statement referring to women being covered or uncovered mentions long hair within the same statement. Im not exactly sure which verses Mark is counting in making this last statement, so I wont contend that it isnt so as he states it, but I would like to point out that v.10, which both Mark and I agree is referring to the covering under consideration, does NOT mention the hair. In addition, v.7, which Mark says is also referring to the covering under consideration in his answer to my Question #1, and which uses the same basic Greek word for covered as vs. 5, 6, and 13 do, does NOT mention the hair. Note also that v.4, which is obviously talking about the same covering as v.7 is (both refer to the man being covered) does not mention the hair.

28. Even if Marks statement were true (Every statement found in I Corinthians 11 that says covered or uncovered mentions hair), it wouldnt prove anything. The fact that the terms fasting and prayer are mentioned in the same statement a number of times in the Bible (as in I Cor 7:5), doesnt prove that fasting and prayer are the same thing does it? At the most, it might give some indication that the two ideas are connected in some way. Likewise, all that is indicated by the fact that both the covering and the hair are referred to in vs. 5, 6, and 13, is that they are connected in some way. I believe that the covering referred to in vs. 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 13 is an artificial one (put-on-able and take-off-able), and I will prove this later. This artificial covering is mentioned together with the hair in vs. 5 and 6 in the connection that if a woman is going to be without one, she might as well be without the other; that to be without one is just as bad as being without the other; that it is just as shameful for a woman to be without the artificial covering as it is for a woman to be without the long hair (the natural covering). The connection between the two is further extended by vs. 13-15, where Paul teaches that nature teaches the woman to wear an artificial covering by giving her a natural covering, the long hair. Remember again, at this point I am not trying to prove the artificial covering, but I am only showing that the fact that the covering and the hair are mentioned close together doesnt prove that the two are the same. The passages only connect the two; and the wording will fit two different coverings, just as well as it will one. As a matter of fact, I will show in my next two paragraphs, based upon Marks and my agreement on the definition of the Greek word translated shorn, that the wording only fits two different coverings, and cannot be talking about just one.
29. Because of some other things that Mark says in his Paragraph #6, I think it would be appropriate at this time to talk about the difference between uncovered and shaven in v.5, and not covered and shorn in v.6. When v.5 says that for a woman, uncovered is even all one as if she were shaven, it is saying that one is just as bad as the other. This would not make any sense if the two (uncovered and shaven) are one and the same thing. The same point can be made from v.6a (For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn). The word also connecting the two (not covered and shorn), shows that the two are different. Now read Marks paragraph #6 again. It almost seems as if Mark is saying that uncovered is exactly the same (in reality) as shorn or shaven.
30. Furthermore, if the Greek word translated shorn in v.6 means simply to shear, or cut without reference to length (how much is cut off), then the long (uncut) hair cannot be the covering of v.6a (For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn). To repeat, the word also in the phrase shows that not covered and shorn are two different things. Now if shorn means cut without any reference to how much is cut off (like the shearing of sheet metal), and if not covered means to cut the hair (Marks position), then the verse would be saying, For if the woman cuts

her hair, let her also cut her hair. This is nonsensical. The hair only position would only make sense if shorn means to cut a lot, because the verse could be saying, if a woman cuts her hair a little, let her also cut her hair a lot. But Mark agreed that a fitting definition of shorn is to shear, or cut without reference to length (how much is cut off), and this definition rules out the possibility of only one covering being taught by v.6. I would also like to say that nobody can prove beyond a shadow of doubt that shorn means to cut a lot (with reference to length), and therefore since one could never be sure that there are not two coverings under consideration in v.6, they would have to practice both. Let me repeat, if the hair only view is correct, v.6 only makes sense if shorn means to cut a lot, and no one can prove for sure that that is the case.

31. Although Im not sure I agree with Marks reasoning in his Paragraph #7, I do agree with his basic conclusion, that is, that the long hair is a covering for the woman, and if she cuts off her hair she will be without that covering. I learn this from I Cor 11:15 without any problem. However, this does nothing for Marks proposition, because we already agree that the long hair is a covering for the woman; what he must prove is that the long hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 for the woman. That is where we disagree.
32. In Marks Paragraph #8, he is teaching that a woman should not cut her hair at all. Although this doesnt have anything to do with our difference on the coverings of I Cor 11, to save Mark further writing on this subject, let me say that I believe that it is wrong for a woman to cut her hair at all. Why do I believe this? Because I believe that a fitting definition of the word shorn would be to shear, or cut without reference to length (how much is cut off) (it cannot be proven for sure that it does have reference to how much is cut off). Therefore since it is a shame for a woman to be shorn (I Cor 11:6), it would be a shame for a woman to cut her hair at all.

### **Marks Argument #3**

33. Although Im not sure I agree with Marks reasoning in his Paragraphs #9 through #13, I do not think it necessary to comment upon them at this time. I do not plan to make the argument that since many translations (such as the American Standard) use the word English word veil in vs. 4, 5, 6, 7, and 13, but use the English word covering in v.15, that that proves that the covering (veil) of these verses is different than the covering of v.15.

### **Marks Argument #4**

34. Marks next proof (Paragraphs #14 through #20) is based upon v.15 saying that her hair is given her for a covering. Of course, Mark is supposed to be proving

that hair is the only covering taught necessary by the passage, and v.15 does not even intimate that. I already agree that the hair is a covering (this could be seen by my affirmative proposition) and that is all that is taught by v.15.

35. At this time I would like to point out that a different Greek word is used in vs. 5, 6, 7, and 13, than in v.15. Although I don't think that this proves that two different coverings are under consideration, I think it is significant, and does weaken Mark's case for the hair being the covering taught necessary by vs. 5 and 6. I asked Mark in my Question #5 if the fact that there are two different Greek words used weakened his case. He replied no, that it would be impossible for the same Greek word to have been used because in verse 15 the word covering is a noun and in the other verses they are either verbs or adjectives. I wonder why Mark made this statement when he knows that I was not referring to the fact that just the endings of the words were different (indicating the same basic word being used in different ways, e.g., noun, verb, etc.), but I meant that the basic Greek words used are different. The noun form of the word translated covering in v.15 is peribolaion. The verb form for this word is periballo. The noun form of the word translated covering in vs. 5, 6, and 13 is kalumma. The verb forms for this word are kalupto, katakalupto, akatakalupto, and ou katakalupto. So it would NOT have been impossible for the same basic Greek word to have been used in v.15 as in the other verses.
36. This significance of the fact that different basic Greek words are used, when Paul could have used the same basic Greek word, can be seen when compared with one of the answers that we normally give to one who is contending for Bales Doctrine. This doctrine says that the word bondage in I Cor 7:15 is referring to the marriage bond, and therefore a Christian is free to remarry (Not Under Bondage, that is, not under the marriage bond) if their unbelieving spouse deserts them (even when no fornication is involved). One of my first answers to this (and probably Mark does the same) is to point out that the Greek word translated bondage in I Cor 7:15 is not the same as the Greek word translated bound in I Cor 7:39 and Rom 7:2, which does refer to the marriage bond. The fact that two different Greek words are used is significant in this case. Although not proving conclusively that bondage in I Cor 7:15 does not refer to the marriage bond (because sometimes two different words do refer to the same idea or thing), the fact that two different words are used takes away from any proof that Mr. Bales has that bondage in I Cor 7:15 does refer to the marriage bond (simply because the English words look similar). The same applies to I Cor 11. The fact that two different basic Greek words are used in the passage, does not conclusively prove that two different coverings are in view; however, it certainly takes away from any proof that Mark has that the covering of v.15 is the same covering that is mentioned in the other verses (simply because the English words used are similar).

37. The bottom line on Marks argument is that v.15 teaches what I believe, that the long hair is a covering, and that is all that it teaches. There is no proof at all that the covering referred to in v.15 is the same covering as referred to in the other verses.

### **Marks Argument #5**

38. Mark, in Paragraphs #21 through #23, again teaches that it is wrong for a woman to cut her hair at all. Since I have already stated that I agree with this conclusion, I dont think I need to comment further on these paragraphs.

### **Marks Answers to My Questions**

39. What I was really wanting to know by my Question #1 was, is the peribolaion covering of v.15 the same covering as the katakalupto covering of vs. 5, 6, 7, and 13? From Marks speech, I gather that he believes that they are the same.
40. My Question #3 asks Mark for proof that the covering of v.15 is the same as the covering of v.5. In his answer to the question, and in his speech, he has not given proof that they are the same. The fact that the covering of v.5 is mentioned in the same statement as the hair wouldnt prove that they are the same would it? The fact that Mr. Vines speculates that the long hair of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (compare I Corinthians 11:10, R.V.) would not prove that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 would it? The fact (if it is true) that the English word veil could possibly refer to hair, doesnt prove that it always does, or that it does in this case does it? The fact that v.15 teaches that the hair is a covering, doesnt prove that hair is the only covering does it? The fact that woman are not to cut their hair at all doesnt prove that the long hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 does it? Simply put, there has been no proof given regarding what Mark and I differ on. Mark has basically discussed things we agree on, and also has tried to prove that the covering of vs. 5, 6, 7, and 13 could possibly refer to the long hair. Even if he did prove that these verses could refer to the long hair, that wouldnt be the same as proving that they do refer to the long hair, would it? One other important point: Mark is under obligation to prove the practice that he is contending for, that a woman does not have to wear an artificial covering when she prays or prophesies. We both agree that the practice that I am contending for, involving both the permanent and the temporary covering, is right, and a safe course to follow. The practice his view teaches is the one that is questionable. Therefore, for women of his persuasion (having only one covering) to leave off an artificial covering by faith (that is,

without doubt, Rom 14:23), their practice must be proven. This, Mark has not done.

41. My Question #2 for Mark is indicative of how I know, beyond a shadow of doubt, that two coverings are under consideration in I Cor 11, one temporary (when praying or prophesying), and one permanent, the long hair. The fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she is praying or prophesying, implies that she doesn't have to be covered when she is not praying or prophesying. This implies that the covering of v.5 is able to be put on and to be taken off, which does not fit the covering of v.15, that is, the hair, which is not put-on-able and take-off-able. As I pointed out in my question #2, Mark indicated in his tract that he agrees with this proof when it relates to the man. However, he does not accept the identical proof when it relates to the woman. Mark, the reasoning either proves the concept or it doesn't. If the fact that the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves through implication that he may be covered at other times, then it does the same for the woman, that is, the fact that the woman is told to be covered when she prays or prophesies, proves through implication that she may be uncovered at other times. Now if the proof is valid (and you recognized in your tract that it was), but the long hair is the covering of v.5, then there is a contradiction in the Bible, because what you also said in the tract (she would not be able to cover herself, that is, regain her long hair before she prays or prophesies again) is true. Mark you can't have it both ways. Does the fact that men and women are told to be uncovered and covered respectively, when they pray or prophesy, prove that they may be covered and uncovered, respectively, when they are not praying or prophesying, or does it not prove it?
42. Now if Mark backs down from his reasoning that a man can be covered when he is not praying or prophesying, based upon the fact that he is told to be uncovered only when he prays or prophesies, then he has another problem. Mark takes the position that the covering that the man is forbidden from wearing in v.4 would include anything, including an artificial covering. Notice that Mark indicated this on page 11 of his tract when he said in commenting on v.4 that, Most, if not all lexicographers will define covered in this verse as we have given. Therefore, Paul is simply teaching that man cannot have anything - any type of ornament - covering his head while praying or prophesying. On the other hand, man may, without sin, wear some ornaments on their heads if they are not praying or prophesying. For example, some jobs or sport activities may necessitate some fashion of a head covering and nothing is wrong with such since they are not praying or prophesying. Mark also indicated that he believes that the covering of v.4 could include an artificial covering, when in his answer to my Question #1, he taught that the covering of v.4 was different in some way than the covering mentioned in the rest of I Cor 11. Now if Mark changes and doesn't think that the

fact that the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves that he may be covered when he is not praying or prophesying, then the only other conclusion is that he must be uncovered at all times (just like Mark says that the woman of v.5 must be covered at all times). This would mean that it would be wrong for a man to wear any kind of covering (baseball hat, anything) at any time.

43. Of course the real point is that the fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she prays or prophesies, implies (proves) that she doesn't have to be covered when she is not praying or prophesying. Since she cannot put the long hair on when she prays, and take the long hair off when she is not praying, the covering of v.5 cannot be the long hair.

## ANSWERS TO PAT DONAHUE'S QUESTIONS 6-10

- Q6. Exactly how does Matthew 19:9 teach that a man may scripturally put away his wife for fornication, even though it only directly addresses the man who divorces his wife for a reason other than fornication? Similarly, exactly how does 1 John 1:9 teach that a Christian will NOT be forgiven of sins that he will not confess?
- A6. In Matthew 19:9 Jesus gives a parenthetical expression "except it be for fornication." In 1 John 1:9 John says, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins,..." Therefore, if we do not confess we do not have the promise that he will forgive us our sins.
- Q7. To ask my Question #2 another way, does the fact that men and women are told to be uncovered and covered respectively, when they pray or prophesy, prove that they may be covered and uncovered, respectively, when they are not praying or prophesying, or does it not prove it?
- A7. This question is simply repeating question #2 in different words; therefore, my answer is the same, in different words. As far as man is concern (even though my proposition says nothing about man nor his covering) if he is not praying or prophesying he may cover his head because it **is possible** for him to uncover it before praying and prophesying again. However, concerning woman: No, this does not prove that the woman may be uncovered when she is not praying or prophesying because it would be **impossible** for her to 'cover' herself, that is, regain her 'long hair' before she 'prays or prophesies' again. Pat, the implication that you are giving in this question is going to get you into trouble (See paragraph #64).
- Q8. Does 1 Corinthians 11:15 teach that the hair is the only covering necessary for a woman?
- A8. 1 Corinthians 11:15 teaches that hair is a covering necessary for woman. The teaching of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 teaches that the hair is the only covering necessary for woman since it does not name nor imply another covering.
- Q9. Do you still agree that a fitting definition of the Greek word translated "shorn" (and English dictionaries the word "shorn" itself) in 1 Corinthians 11:6 as simply "to shear, or cut" (New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon) without reference to length (how much is cut off). If so, how can 1 Corinthians 11:6a make sense if your view of the passage is correct, since a paraphrase of the phrase would become, "For if the woman cuts her hair, let her also cut her hair?"

- A9 I answered only the question that you asked concerning definitions! The definition of the Greek word translated "shorn" that you gave from the New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon was put in quotation marks as: "to shear, or cut." Your question was: "Do you think these definitions are fitting? If not, how can you be sure?" My answer was and still is "yes." My answer of YES applies only to your question concerning the **definitions** and not to your additional words concerning "without reference to length (how much is cut off)."
- Q10. To repeat my Question #5 more specifically, do you feel that your case (for the long hair being the only covering taught necessary by 1 Corinthians 11:2-16) would be stronger if the same basic Greek word had been used in verse 15 as in verses 5,6,7, and 13 (if the noun form of "katakalypto" had been used in verse 15, or the verb and adjective forms of "peribolaion" had been used in verses 5,6,7, and 13)?
- A10 The noun, verbs and adjectives that the apostle Paul uses are used correctly with each other and together they teach that long hair is the necessary covering of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16. Therefore, I do not believe that changing the wording of the Scriptures would have made any difference.

## MARK BAILEY'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

### ARGUMENT #1

#### "POWER" (THE SIGN OF SUBJECTION)

44. Brother Donahue asserts that my first argument was only an assertion, that is, "something said ... with no support or attempt at proof (Webster)"; however, I gave W.E. Vine as proof that long hair is a symbol of subjection. The scholarly W.E. Vine clearly says, "**the long hair** of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Rev 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their **subjection** to their Satanic master (cp 1 Cor 11:10, R.V.)." Readers, do not allow brother Donahue's smoke screen to confuse you. He says "Mr. Vines' comparison of Rev 9:8 to 1 Cor 11:10 is not necessarily that 1 Cor 11:10 is talking about the hair, ..." Brother Donahue, you should be ashamed for such a statement and apologize to our readers for challenging their intelligence! You know that Vine is talking about "hair" because these comments and definitions are under the word "**HAIR**."
45. Next, he attempts to nullify Vine's statement and says that "Mr. Vines' statement is only his opinion about the passage." That's right, it is his **scholarly opinion**. He continues and says that Vine's words were only "speculation in this case." Notice that he does not deny that Vine's says these things; however, he wants everyone to discard Vine as being "speculation," even though he gives no proof for such a charge. Also notice that Brother Donahue did not even attempt to give one Bible verse or a Greek scholar to disprove my Argument #1 showing that the long hair is a sign of subjection; therefore, this argument stands proven!

### ARGUMENT #2

#### HOW WOMEN BECOME UNCOVERED

46. Brother Donahue attempts to sum up my second argument by quoting two sentences from paragraph #6: "The context shows that the covering is long hair. We know this because every statement referring to women being covered or uncovered mentions 'long hair' within the same statement." He then **avoids** this argument by saying, "I'm not exactly sure which verses Mark is counting in making this last statement, so I won't contend that it isn't so as he states it,..." How can anyone not be sure of which verses I am speaking of when I named every verse that I included. **THE STRENGTH OF THIS ARGUMENT IS SEEN IN THE FACT THAT BROTHER DONAHUE IGNORED EVERY VERSE THAT I NAMED!** Instead of noticing the verses that I named dealing with "women," he wants to talk about verses 4 & 7 dealing with man. He also would like to talk about verse 10, but verse 10 does not say "covered" or "uncovered"; therefore, I did not name verse 10 within this argument. Remember, I said, "The context

shows that the covering is long hair. We know this because every statement referring to **women** being covered or uncovered mentions 'long hair'..." My proposition states "Christian women" and says nothing of man. Furthermore, this particular argument specified "**women**." Brother Donahue is as silent as a tomb concerning the verses, that I named, dealing with "women" being "covered" or "uncovered." He ignores this argument because he realizes that it does damage to his position and supports mine. Brother Donahue, I suggest that if you would respond to my arguments as given, instead of attempting to "sum up" a 816 word paragraph into two sentences that you would you be treating this debate with more justice. I respectfully ask you to respond to my argument and the verses that I named.

47. Again, I must caution the readers: Do not become confused over Brother Donahue's smoke screens! In paragraph 28, Brother Donahue makes a very weak and vain effort to discard my second argument by saying that this argument wouldn't prove anything. He then says, "The fact that the terms 'fasting and prayer' are mentioned in the same statement a number of times in the Bible (as in 1 Cor 7:5), doesn't prove that fasting and prayer are the same thing does it?" Brother Donahue, this is absurd! You must realize that there is a monstrous difference between the terms "fasting" and "prayer" than the words "covered, or uncovered" and "hair." The terms "covered" and "uncovered" are general verb terms indicating that something is covered. The noun that is used to cause the head to be "covered" is, by my position "hair" or by your position "something artificial." The same thing is not true concerning your parallel of "fasting" and "prayer" and I believe that you know this. For one thing both of these terms are nouns and neither one are general terms, but specific terms.
48. In paragraph 28 Brother Donahue said, "Likewise, all that is indicated by the fact that both the covering (I suppose you mean "covered" or "uncovered" as you have been speaking of) and the hair are referred to in vs 5,6, and 13, is that they are connected in some way." **AMEN!** They are connected in some way. Just I as stated in paragraph 6: "Every statement found in 1 Corinthians 11 (and I stated verses 5,6,& 13) that says 'covered' or 'uncovered' mentions hair and then to simplify Paul states in verse 15: 'Her hair is given her for a covering.' ... Long hair is the only (noun) covering mentioned, for women, in the context. Since 'long hair' is the covering of this context - how is woman uncovered? She is uncovered simply by cutting her hair. Christian women are covered when they have long hair and is uncovered when they cut their hair." Yes, the connection is easily seen! The noun is the "hair," which is always mentioned within the same context as the verbs ("covered" or "uncovered").
49. In paragraph 28, instead of responding to my argument, you decided to refer to your belief that the covering referred to in vs. 4,5,6,7,10, and 13 is an artificial one

and that you would prove this later. However, you spent almost a half of page of unsupported and unproven affirmative material concerning your view. When you decide to offer some source of proof for your statements, I will be glad to respond to it. You repeatedly spoke of an "artificial covering" and of a "natural covering." Brother Donahue, since you brought this up, I challenge you: Give us one verse, or one Greek text that says "artificial covering." Can you name even one??? We will end this discussion right here if you will give one verse or one Greek text that says "artificial covering." I have proved that the noun "hair" is found in every statement referring to women being "covered" or "uncovered"; however, you refused to respond to it. Now, if you will show where the Bible states: an "artificial covering" is found in every statement referring to women being "covered" or "uncovered" I will, do as you should, and give up this debate right here.

50. In paragraph 29 Brother Donahue shows that "uncovered" and "shaven" are not the same thing and then he shows that "not covered" and "shorn" are not the same thing. I don't know why he went to the trouble of saying these things, because, regardless of his accusation, I have never said that they were the same things. Certainly, if a woman shaves or shorns her head she is uncovered, but a woman does not have to shave or shorn her head to be uncovered; she may simply trim (not enough to be considered "shaven" nor "shorn") her hair a very small amount. Her hair may measure three feet long but has been trimmed. This would mean that she is uncovered according to verse 6. In such a case Paul is saying: "For if the woman be not covered (by trimming her hair a small amount) let her also be shorn (by cutting it close); but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn (by cutting it close) or shaven (by removing all the hair), let her be covered (have long hair).
51. Concerning my agreeing that a fitting definition of shorn is "to shear, or cut" without reference to length (how much is cut off)," I once again state: I agree with the actual quoted definition of "shorn" but not with the additional remarks by Brother Donahue. Brother Donahue asked if I thought the "**definitions** are fitting?" My answer was and still is "yes" because the definition, as he quoted and put in quotation marks, is "to shear, or cut" and I believe that. Brother Donahue would have you, our readers, to think that "no one can prove beyond a shadow of doubt that 'shorn' means to 'cut a lot' (with reference to length). No one that I know of ever claims that the word shorn means to "cut a lot"; however, what is claimed is that the word "shorn" means to cut short or cut close. The length that is actually cut is not under consideration because some women's hair never grows "a lot" to begin with. I know of ladies whose hair is extremely short in measurement but yet they have "long hair" because they have not cut it. They do not have enough to "cut a lot." As far as not being able to prove that the word

"shorn" means cutting close - notice the definitions of the following Greek Scholars:

## 52.DEFINITIONS OF "SHORN" FROM SCHOLARS

### Thayer (page 343)

"to get or let be shorn... absolute of shearing or **cutting short** the hair of the head, 1 Corinthians 11:6."

### Liddell and Scott (page 370)

"to clip, **cut short**, especially the hair"

### Abbott-Smith Manual Greek Lexicon (page 244)

"To **cut short** the hair, shear: a sheep, Acts 8;22. Middle voice to have one's hair cut off, be shorn: absolute, 1 Corinthians 11:6; Acts 18:18."

### Vincent's Word Studies of the New Testament (Vol. 3, page 247)

"To have the **hair cut close**..."

### Robertson's Word Pictures in the New Testament (Vol 4, page 160)

"Let her **cut her hair close**."

### Vine (Vol.4, p 18)

"In the Middle voice, to have one's hair cut off, be shorn. Acts 18:18; 1 Cor. 11:6."

### Robinson (page 395)

"Specially the head, to cut off the hair, Acts 18:18 having shorn his head, that is, having had it shorn. 1 Corinthians 11:6 twice."

### Harper's Analytical Greek Lexicon (page 227)

"to cut off the hair, shear, shave, Acts 8:32; 18:18; 1 Corinthians 11:6 twice."

### Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon (page 227)

"to cut off the hair, shear, shave, Acts 8:32; 18:18; 1 Corinthians 11:6 twice."

## John Dawson's Greek-English Lexicon

"To cut off, to shear, to shave."

## Green's Greek and English Lexicon (page 99)

"to cut off the hair, shear, shave, Acts 8:32; 18:18. 1 Corinthians 11:6, twice."

53. Notice that the first five Greek scholars prove that the word "shorn" means to **cut short** the hair and stronger wording is given by the last six Greek scholars by saying that the word "shorn" means "to cut off the hair." Other scholarly works proving that "shorn" means to "cut short" or to "cut off" or "cut close" are the following: The New American Standard Version, The Revised Standard Version, Goodspeed, Moffatt, The New English Bible, King James II, The Emphatic Diaglott, Coverdale Translation, Wuest' Translation of the Greek N.T. Furthermore, "The Expositor's Greek Testament (edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, Vol. 2 page 872) says that "let her be shorn" means "let her also **crop** (her head)." The word "crop" used here and in J.B. Phillip's translation means "a short hair cut ... having the hair cut so short that the ears show" (Webster). Your smoke screen, Brother Donahue, that "no one can prove for sure..." is absurd. Anyone, desiring to know the definition of the word "shorn" can understand, from these scholars that it refers to hair that is "cut short," "cut off," or "cut close." Brother Donahue, I challenge you to address these scholars. If the word "shorn" does not mean "to cut short" or "to cut off" or "to cut close" you prove these 22 scholars wrong.
54. In paragraph 7 I gave Biblical examples (Leviticus 10:6 and Leviticus 21:10) proving that the word "**uncover**" means "to make naked...**specially by shaving**." Therefore, "Uncover not your heads,..." refers to hair and not to something artificial. The same expression as "uncover not your heads" is found in 1 Corinthians 11:6 as "not covered" and verse 13 as "uncovered." The context of 1 Corinthians 11 repeatedly states "hair" and never states "artificial." Now what has Brother Donahue said about this argument? **NOT A WORD!!**, except for "this does nothing for Mark's proposition." Yes, it does!!! It proves, Scripturally speaking, that the words "uncover your head" refer to hair and means "to make naked...specially by shaving." Notice that he doesn't attempt to disprove this argument, he simply ignores it. Brother Donahue, you challenge me for this debate, you wanted to see my arguments but obviously you don't want to answer the arguments. I insist that you address this and all the other arguments as I have given. STOP AVOIDING THE FORCE OF THE ARGUMENT. Go back and answer paragraph #7.

55. Brother Donahue also decided that he would not respond to our differences in my paragraph #8. He says that he agrees that a woman cannot cut her hair at all. That's great! However, that is not all that I said, is it? In this paragraph I proved that the prefix of the words "uncovered," "not covered," and "covered," in reference to women, as found in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6, & 13 means, "completely." By this definition, in these verses the word "uncovered" and "not covered" refers to hair that is shortened; for when it is shortened it does not "completely" cover. It still covers, but not "completely." This teaches the same idea as paragraph 7 (which you did not answer - also see paragraph #54) that "uncover" refers to hair and means "to make naked...specially by shaving." Again, I insist that you respond to this argument.

### **ARGUMENT #3 HAIR AND VEIL INTERCHANGEABLE**

56. Brother Donahue very openly ignores my "Argument #3," showing that "hair" and "veil" are interchangeable. He simply says, "Although I'm not sure I agree with Mark's reasoning in his Paragraphs #9 through #13, I do not think it necessary to comment upon them at this time." **WHY NOT???** Commenting on my arguments is your responsibility in this debate. If I held your view, I would not want to "comment" on this argument either. I proved by the scholarly Dean Alford that in 1 Corinthians 11 that the word "unveiled" ("uncovered" in the K.J.V) means "having short hair" and being "veiled" ("covered" in the K.J.V) means "having long hair." Furthermore, if you would have addressed this argument, you would not have been able to honestly answer question #5 as you did. I asked, "In the Scriptures does the Greek term katakalupto (or any of its grammatical forms) which is translated "covered" in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6 & 13 ever refer to hair?" You conveniently, ignored the fact that there is a such thing as a Greek Old Testament (Septuagint). And it shows that grammatical forms of katakalupto ("covered") does refer to hair in Songs of Solomon 4:1; 4:3; and 6:7. Again, I insist - **GO BACK AND RESPOND TO THESE ARGUMENTS!!!**

### **ARGUMENT #4 HER HAIR IS GIVEN FOR A COVERING**

57. Brother Donahue also refuses to respond to my "Argument #4," which proves that hair is the **only** covering. Instead of answering my argument he decides to offer his affirmative material. He does not like my answer to his question #5 and says "I wonder why Mark made this statement..." He then says, "but I meant..." Brother Donahue, my responsibility is to respond to what you say. I am not going to get into a guessing game with you and try to figure out what you "meant" to say.

58. Furthermore, the fact that "a different Greek word is used in vs. 5,6,7,and 13, than in V.15" does not "weaken" my position. If you would have addressed my argument #4 you would have seen that I gave proof that the "different Greek word" (peribolaion) in verse 15 does correspond with the verb (katakalypto) "covered." I gave quotes from Greeks scholars to prove this and also Biblical examples. Again, I insist - **GO BACK AND RESPOND TO THIS ARGUMENT!!!**
59. Brother Donahue does not respond to my argument, but yet he writes a half-page paragraph (#36) debating James Bales on the marriage. For such I have no comment! **GO BACK AND RESPOND TO MY ARGUMENTS!!!**

#### **ARGUMENT #5 LONG HAIR MEANS UNCUT HAIR**

60. Brother Donahue openly refuses to respond to my "Argument #5," and says, "I don't think I need to comment further on these paragraphs." **WHY NOT???** YOU ARE SUPPOSE TO BE IN THE NEGATIVE - IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO COMMENT ON THESE PARAGRAPHS!!! **AGAIN, I MUST INSIST - GO BACK AND RESPOND TO THIS ARGUMENT!!!**

#### **DONAHUE'S RESPONSES TO BAILEY'S ANSWERS**

61. Concerning paragraph #39. The noun "peribolaion" (covering in verse 15) corresponds with the verbs and adjectives in the previous verses concerning women.
62. Concerning paragraph #40. The context of 1 Corinthians 11:2- 16 proves that "hair" is the only covering because there is no other covering mentioned. You then named over some of the arguments that I gave. **I still insist that you respond to these arguments.** Brother Donahue continues and says, "One other important point: Mark is under obligation to prove the practice that he is contending for, that a woman does not have to wear an artificial covering when she prays or prophesies." Brother Donahue, your problem is obviously that you do not realize what I am affirming. I am **NOT** affirming the negative statement that you named. The proposition that I agreed to affirm (and that you agreed to deny - but not doing so) reads: "The Scriptures teach that long hair is the only covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying." This proposition says **nothing** about an artificial covering; therefore, I am not under obligation to prove anything about one. Furthermore, my practice is not, as you claim, "questionable." My practice has been proven, even to the point that you refuse to comment on the arguments; therefore, it is not within the realm of being "questionable."

63. Concerning paragraph 41. I answered your question and explained the difference between the man and woman's covering. (See my answer to question #2) Your problem, Brother Donahue, is that you treated my answer as you have all of my argument, that is, you **ignored** what I had to say.
64. As I stated in my answer to question #7, you are getting yourself into trouble. In paragraph #41 you say, "The fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she is praying or prophesying, implies that she doesn't have to be covered when she is not praying or prophesying." **IS THAT SO?** Well, Brother Donahue, the proposition that you have already signed to affirm reads: "The Scriptures teach that a woman must wear an artificial covering (in addition to her long hair) while praying or prophesying." Notice, not only an artificial covering but also "long hair." WHEN??? **"WHILE PRAYING OR PROPHESYING."** Are you saying that a woman does not have to have this "long hair" when she is not praying or prophesying??? Do you honestly believe that a woman can cut her hair if she is not praying or prophesying??? To be consistent you must. **Don't overlook this question, as you have done my other arguments!!!**
65. Concerning paragraph #42 which has reference to man being covered. My proposition says, "Christian women," it does not say anything about the men. Brother Donahue is not able to answer the argument that I gave; therefore, he wants to go to my tract and refer to something that I have said that does not concern this proposition. However, I respond by referring you back to paragraph #64.
66. Concerning paragraph #43 which is redundant of #41 & #42. The fact of praying or prophesying does not prove that the covering is not long hair. Does it prove that a woman **MAY CUT HER HAIR** if she is not praying or prophesying, as your proposition states???
67. The proposition "The Scriptures teach that long hair is the only covering that Christian women must have while praying or prophesying" has been proven in my first and second affirmative. The very fact that Brother Donahue refuses to even comment on most of my arguments prove that they cannot be destroyed. Realizing that I only gave 5 arguments notice how he dealt with them:

"Argument #1"

He does not deny Vine's, he does not even attempt to give another scholar nor a Bible verse to disprove this argument, he simply says that this is Vine's "opinion" and "speculation." **The argument still stands!**

- "Argument #2"                      He avoids the argument by reducing the 816 words to form this argument to two sentences consisting of 29 words. He totally ignores the Biblical examples given to prove the argument. **The argument still stands!**
- "Argument #3"                      He ignores this argument by saying, "I do not think it necessary to comment upon them (paragraphs 9-13) at this time." **The argument still stands!**
- "Argument #4"                      He ignores this argument and gives affirmative material instead and then debates James Bales on the marriage. **The argument still stands!**
- "Argument #5"                      He totally ignores this argument. **The argument still stands!**

68.      Readers, don't blame Brother Donahue for his insufficiencies in answering these arguments. If they could be answered, he would have done so, but the fact is, as my brother is well aware of, the arguments cannot be answered. The only honorable thing that my brother can do is to acknowledge my position and give up his. If he refuses to acknowledge that I am right then I insist that he answers my arguments as I gave them and **STOP IGNORING THEM!**

## ANSWERS TO MARK BAILEY'S QUESTIONS 6-10

Q6. Mark 11:24 says, "... What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them,..." Does this mean that if you are **not** praying that you do not have to believe or do we have to "believe" at all times? Likewise, Verse 25 says: "And when ye stand praying, forgive, ..." Does this mean that if we are not standing while praying that we do not have to forgive or do we have to "forgive" at all times?

A6 My answer to both questions is the same, and so for succinctness, I will answer the question mostly as it relates to v. 25. The answer is no, but the wording would normally mean that a person only has to forgive when (at the time) he is praying. The reason we know to take the unusual meaning in this case is that other passages conclusively prove that we must forgive at other times than when we are praying (Lk. 17:3). Since we must take the normal meaning of words and phrases, unless forbidden by the context, or another statement elsewhere, this passage would teach that the only time that we had to forgive, would be when we are praying, except for the fact that other passages show otherwise. An example of this is Lev. 11:31. This verse would lead us to conclude that a Israelite would not be unclean if he touched one of these creeping things when they were alive unless some other verse said otherwise. Another example of this concept is located in Lev 16:17. This verse prohibits any man from being in the "tabernacle of the congregation" while the high priest was making atonement in the "holy place." Wouldn't it indicate to us that the same was not prohibited at other times (unless another verse told us otherwise)?

I would also say that the forgiving of another person in Mk 11:25 is something that is possible to "turn on" or "turn off" for, or at the occasion specified by the when clause (in this case, when praying). In Mk 11:24, the "believe that ye will receive" is possible (though not necessarily permissible) to turn on/off when you pray, or at other times. Another bible example of this principle can be found in Lev 26:17. A good everyday example of this type of command or regulation is when little Johnny is told to "be good at Granddaddy's house on Saturday." The child's mother is not saying that it is o.k. for Johnny to be bad at other times (other information tells Johnny that), but it can be learned from what the Mother says that it is possible to turn on/off this behavior while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday. On the other hand, it wouldn't make any sense for the Mother to tell Johnny to "grow taller when you are at Granddaddy's house on Saturday" (because the boy's height is permanent relative to the time that he would be visiting Granddaddy), and this is what would be parallel to telling a woman to have long hair when she prays or prophesies. The good behavior of Johnny at Granddaddy's on Saturday, and the forgiving in the case of Mk. 11:25 is

something that is possible to be done on a temporary basis. The covering of 1 Cor 11:15 is also something that can be done or not done on a temporary basis; it can be done while not praying or prophesying. The covering of 1 Cor 11:15 is different though. The long hair is either had, or not had, on a permanent basis, it can not just be turned on and off for occasions such as praying or prophesying.

Q7. May a woman cut her hair if she is not praying or prophesying?

A7 No, the long hair (covering) of 1 Cor 11:15 must be had at all times (it is permanent). In contrast to this, the modifying phrase, "prayeth or prophesieth" proves that the covering of 1 Cor 11:15 is temporary.

Q8. Do you believe the 22 scholars (sources) that I named in paragraphs 52 & 53 are wrong in their definition of the word "shorn" in 1 Corinthians 11:6 when they say that it means "to cut short" "to cut off" or "to cut close?"

A8 I am not sure who is right, the scholars you quoted or the ones that I quote in the article that accompanies these answers. Do you know for sure who is right about whether "shorn" means "to cut" (without reference to how much is cut off), or "to cut short (close)?"

Q9. Please give the page number and **actual definition** of the word "shorn" used in 1 Corinthians 11:6 as is given by the New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon. I am asking for the definition without any interpretation or explanation.

A9 The definition of the Greek word translated "shorn" in 1 Cor 11:6 as found on page 481 of Wigram-Green's "The New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon," without interpretation or explanation, is "to shear, cut."

Q10. 1 Corinthians 11:15 states: "... for her hair is given her for a covering." Please give the definition of this word "covering" by any Greek Lexicon and tell us how this noun differs from the covering referred to by the verbs and adjectives ("covered" and "uncovered") in verses 5,6, & 13. (Please give the page number(s) and the Lexicon(s) that you use.)

A10 My point has nothing to do with the definitions of the two words (if that is what you are asking), but my point is that the word translated "covering" in 1 Cor 11:15, is a different Greek word than the word translated "covered" in 1 cor 11:5,6,6,7, and 13. This can be seen by looking up the Strong's numbers for the words "covering" (4018), "covered" (2619), "cover" (2619), and "uncovered" (177). Now look under word #177 on page 25 of Wigram-Green's "The New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon," and see by the designation

"1/2619" that word #177 comes from word #2619. Word #2619 actually is #2596 and #2572 put together according to this same Lexicon, #2572 being the basic Greek word. So all these words used for the covering in vs. 5,6,6,7, and 13 are forms of the same basic Greek word #2572. The Greek word translated "covering" is v. 15, however, is a totally different Greek word (#4018) and is not a form of #2572, but is a form of #4016, which I think may be a form of #906.

## Pat Donahue's Second Negative

### Mark's Argument #1

69. Unless I misunderstand, Mark is saying in paragraphs #5,44-45 that the "symbol and covering (of I Cor 11:10, Pat) is long hair" (paragraph #5). His proof for this assertion is that W.E. Vine speculates, after giving his definition for "thrix," that "the long hair of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Rev. 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (cp. I Cor. 11:10, R.V.)" (I call this speculation because not one shred of evidence (much less proof) is given by Mr. Vine, nor by Mark, that Rev 9:8 has anything to do with subjection to a Satanic master). The fact that this comment is under the word "hair" does not necessarily indicate that Mr. Vine believes that I Cor 11:10 has the hair under consideration (as a matter of fact, my question #14 presents proof that Mr. Vine did not intend to indicate that I Cor 11:10 referred to the hair). As I said in my last negative, Mr. Vine could have been referring to the fact that he felt that both passages (Rev 9:8 and I Cor 11:10) deal with subjection, and not that both passages deal with the hair. However, even if Mr. Vine were saying that both passages refer to the hair, what would that prove? Nothing more than that Mr. Vine believed that I Cor 11:10 is talking about the hair. Remember, it is Mr. Vine's comment on this passage, not his definition of a word, that we are talking about.

70. Now, if the fact that a scholar agrees with Mark's position (in this case, Mr. Vine does not) proves that Mark's position is correct, then many contradictory conclusions are proven, because scholars can be found on not only both sides of this issue, but also on both sides of just about every issue. I now quote a comment concerning I Cor 11:15 from the Gospel Advocate Commentary on I Corinthians by David Lipscomb with additional notes, by J.W. Shepherd: "Since it is a glory for woman to wear a covering of hair which God gave her at creation instead of an artificial covering, she should wear also an artificial covering when she approaches God in prayer." Why do I quote this "scholarly opinion?" Not to prove my position. Not even to say that Mr. Lipscomb or Mr. Shepherd's position is in agreement with my position in all respects. I am only quoting this scholarship to show that any scholar's position/commentary on this issue proves nothing. If it does, then there is a contraction, because there are scholars on both sides of this issue. I might also ask Mark, does Mr. Vine's comments on other passages prove his position, since he is a "scholar?" What about in his Dictionary under his definition for the Greek word "apolouo" (translated "wash") where he comments that, "the command to Saul of Tarsus to wash away his sins indicates that by his public confession, he would testify to the removal of his sins, and to the complete change from his past life; this

'washing away' was not in itself the actual remission of his sins, which had taken place at his conversion." In conclusion, who can look at the phrase, And they had hair as the hair of women in Rev 9:8, and thereby conclude that the symbol of authority of I Cor 11:10 is the long hair?

### **Mark's Argument #2**

71. In paragraphs #46-49, Mark clarifies his second argument to basically be that "every verse in I Cor 11 that uses the actual word covered or uncovered, and is talking about the woman, mentions the hair in the same verse." This statement is true, but proves nothing. Mark arbitrarily rules out v.10 because it doesn't use the word covered even though both Mark and I agree that it "refers" to the same covering that the word covered in vs.5-6 refer to. Mark also arbitrarily rules out v.7 because it is talking about the man being covered, instead of the woman, even though the same Greek word is used for covering in v.7 as in vs.5,6, and 13, and the contrast between vs.5 and 6, and v.7 shows clearly that the same covering is being talked about in all three verses. Of course, v.7 and v.10 both refer to the covering and don't make reference to the hair.
72. Even if every verse in I Cor 11 that referred to the covering also referred to the hair, that would not indicate at all that the covering and the hair were the same thing. As I pointed out in my paragraph #28, the fact that the terms fasting and prayer are mentioned in the same statement a number of times in the Bible (as in I Cor 7:5), doesn't prove that fasting and prayer are the same thing does it? This is a parallel to Mark's reasoning, his denials notwithstanding. What difference would it make if "both of these terms are nouns and neither one are general terms, but specific terms" (the term prayer could be considered general since there are different types of prayer (I Tim 2:1))? The point is that just because two terms are used in close proximity to one another, that doesn't prove they refer to the same thing. The artificial covering is mentioned together with the hair in vs.5 and 6 in the sense that if a woman is going to be without one, she might as well be without the other; that to be without one is just as bad as being without the other; that it is just as shameful for a woman to be without the artificial covering as it is for a woman to be without the long hair (the natural covering). The connection between the two is further extended by vs.13-15, where Paul teaches that nature teaches the woman to wear an artificial covering by giving her a natural covering, the long hair.
73. Mark claims that the fact that the covering and the hair are mentioned close together proves that the two are the same, but then admits in paragraph #50 that the word "also" in v.6 shows that "not covered" and "shorn" are different. How they are different is a matter of dispute, but the fact that they are different nullifies any contention that their close proximity proves that they are the same.

74. Just to show how Mark's argument proves nothing, compare the following statement with my restatement of Mark's argument that I have placed within quotation marks in the first sentence of my paragraph #71: "every verse in I Cor 11 that uses the actual word covered or uncovered (general verbs?), and is talking about the man, mentions the head (specific noun?) in the same verse." According to Mark's logic, this would prove that the covering is the head.

75. In paragraphs #51-53, Mark quotes some scholars trying to show that the Greek word translated "shorn" in I Cor 11:6 means to "cut short," and does have reference to how much hair is cut off. When looking at these definitions, remember that the phrase "cut off" might not refer to cutting short, since a woman could "cut off" even just a little bit of her hair (I might ask the question, "how much was cut off"). Regardless, I will now give some definitions of the word that do not indicate that "shorn" necessarily means to cut "short," but only indicate that shorn means "to cut" without reference to how much is cut off:

Greek ("keiro")

New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon - to shear, cut

Strongs - to shear

United Bible Society Geek New Testament - cut one's hair, have one's hair cut

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich - shear a sheep (an example of its use, Pat), cut one's hair or have one's hair cut, have one's hair cut

English (appropriate because "keiro" is translated "shorn" by scholars)

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language - 1) to cut as with shears, 2) to clip (hair) from (the head), (wool) from (sheep), etc.; 1. a machine for cutting metal

Random House College Dictionary - 1) to cut (something), 2) to remove by or as by cutting or clipping, 3) to cut or clip the hair

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (Pocket) - to cut the hair or wool from; clip, trim

American Heritage Dictionary - to remove (fleece or hair) by cutting or clipping

76. I bring these definitions up simply to show that some dictionaries give the definition of "keiro" or "shorn" as "to cut," without reference to how much is cut off. Mark has given some dictionaries that give the definition as to cut "short." How can we be sure which dictionaries are right? I'll let Mark tell us how he knows his dictionaries are right, and the ones that I quoted are wrong. And if we cannot be sure, if "keiro" might mean to cut without reference to how much is cut, then

we could never be sure that the hair is the covering, because the word "also" in I Cor 11:6 shows that "not covered" and "shorn" are two different things. If "shorn" means to cut period without reference to how much is cut off, then since "not covered" is different than "shorn," then "not covered" could not have reference to the (cutting of the) hair, because the verse would be saying, "For if the woman cuts her hair, let her also cut her hair." This would be nonsensical.

77. In paragraph #54, Mark asserts that the reasoning that he gave in his paragraph #7, that "uncover" in Lev 10:6 and 21:10 means "to make naked ... specially by shaving," "proves, Scripturally speaking, that the words 'uncovered your head' refer to hair and means 'to make naked ... specially by shaving.'" The reason I did not spend more time on this argument in my last article is because I thought that Mark was only showing that "uncovered" could refer to the cutting of the hair (not that it always did) and I have no problem with that. I do have a problem with Mark's contention that it must refer to hair (and cannot refer to something artificial). To deal with his argument, first of all, the dictionary that Mark quotes mentions also (for the same Hebrew word) "from the idea of loosening, casting off, the garments" and gives also the reference Num 5:18. I would ask Mark, when Num 5:18 says that the priest shall "uncover the woman's head," is it talking about cutting her hair or removing a garment? If you agree it is talking about a garment then you absolutely have no point. Even if you don't agree that it refers to a garment, you have no point anyway for the following reasons: 1) this Hebrew word is obviously not the Greek word that is translated "uncovered" in I Cor 11:5, and therefore has no bearing on the issue at hand, and 2) other Hebrew words translated "uncover" in the Old Testament have reference to things other than hair, e.g., clothes in Lev 18:7.

78. In response to Mark's paragraph #55, the fact that the prefix "kata" intensifies the basic word and could give the idea of "completely" (cover) does not prove that the hair is what completely covers. It doesn't tell what the covering is, it just says that (whatever the covering is) it should cover completely, and I agree with that. I believe that the covering that the woman should have when she prays or prophesies should completely cover her head.

### **Mark's Argument #3**

79. In paragraph #9, Mark says "that the word 'veil' does not necessitate something artificial." At this time, unless someone changes my mind, I agree with this statement. But saying that the English word "veil" does not necessitate something artificial, and saying "that the word 'unveiled' ('uncovered') in the K.J.V.) means 'having short hair' and being 'veiled' ('covered' in the K.J.V.) means 'having long hair'" (Mark's paragraph #56) are two different things. I admit that the word veil could be used to refer to veiling with the hair, but the

word veil could also be used (and is used this way much more often, at the very least) to refer to veiling with a garment. Will Mark admit the same? The fact that a woman is to be veiled (or covered) does not prove what the veil (or covering) is. The issue is, what is the woman to be veiled (or covered) with?

#### **Mark's Argument #4**

80. In response to Mark's paragraphs #57-59, let me repeat that a different basic Greek word is used in vs.5,6,7, and 13, than in v.15. This is significant, and does weaken Marks case for the hair being the covering taught necessary by vs.5-6. Mark seemed to show that these two words were used interchangeably in a Greek translation of the Old Testament (Ps 104:6,9). I have no problem with this; I admit that they have similar meanings (although not exactly the same) and therefore could be used interchangeably without violence. My point is that they are two different Greek words. Because they are not the same word, the burden of proof is upon Mark to prove that they refer to the same thing. The fact that they are different is just as significant as the fact that two different Greek words are used in I Cor 7:15 ("bondage") and 39 ("bound"), as it relates to Bales doctrine.

#### **Mark's Argument #5**

81. In paragraphs #21-23, Mark teaches that "long hair means uncut hair." Since I agree with the conclusion of the paragraphs, that a woman should not cut her hair, there should not be any need for further comment. However, I will say the obvious: the fact that a woman should have long hair at all times doesn't have anything to do with whether or not a woman should wear an artificial covering when she prays or prophesies. The first fact has no bearing on the second question.

82. To comment on Mark's paragraphs #64-66, the reason that I added the parentheses around the clause "in addition to her long hair" in my affirmative proposition, and did not leave it as Mark originally wrote it, was precisely for the reason that I wanted to indicate in some way that the phrase "while praying or prophesying" did not modify the phrase "in addition to her long hair." I knew that it did not make any sense for the phrase "while praying or prophesying" to modify the phrase "in addition to her long hair," because the woman is to have long hair at all times, and could not have long hair only "while praying or prophesying" (and not have it at other times), as the language would imply, if it did modify the phrase, and does imply concerning the covering of vs.5-6.

#### **Mark's Answers to My Questions**

83. My Question #7 for Mark represents how I know that two coverings are under consideration in I Cor 11, one temporary (when praying or prophesying), and one permanent, the long hair. The fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she is praying or prophesying, implies that the covering of v.5 is able to be put on and to be taken off, which does not fit the covering of v.15, that is, the hair, which is not put-on-able and take-off-able. As I pointed out in my question #2, Mark indicated in his tract that he agrees with this proof when it is applied to the man. However, he does not accept the identically same proof when it is applied to the woman. Mark, the reasoning either proves the concept or it doesn't! If the fact that the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves through implication that he may be covered at other times, then it does the same for the woman, that is, the fact that the woman is told to be covered when she prays or prophesies, proves through implication that it is possible for her to be uncovered at other times. It proves it is possible "for her to 'cover' herself, that is, regain her ... (covering, Pat) before she 'prays or prophesies' again." The fact that Mark says it is impossible, only contradicts his own correct reasoning in his tract. Now, if the proof is valid (and he recognized in his tract that it was), but the long hair is the covering of v.5, then there is a contradiction in the Bible, because she would not be able to cover herself, that is, regain her long hair before she prays or prophesies again." Isn't it strange that Mark agrees with the validity of this proof until it is applied in a way that contradicts his beliefs? Mark you cant have it both ways. Does the fact that men and women are told to be uncovered and covered respectively, when they pray or prophesy, prove that they may be covered and uncovered, respectively, when they are not praying or prophesying, or does it not prove it?

84. Now if Mark backs down from his reasoning that a man can be covered when he is not praying or prophesying, based upon the fact that he is told to be uncovered only when he prays or prophesies, then he has another problem. Mark says that the covering that the man is forbidden from wearing in v.4 would include an artificial covering. Now if Mark changes and doesn't think that the fact the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves that he may be covered when he is not praying or prophesying, then the only other conclusion possible is that he must be uncovered at all times (just like Mark says that the woman must have the covering of v.5 at all times). This would mean that it would be wrong for a man to wear any kind of covering (baseball hat, anything) at any time.

85. The point is that the fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she prays or prophesies, implies (proves) that this covering is put-on-able and take-off-able. Since she cannot put the long hair on when she prays, and take the long hair off when she is not praying, the covering of v.5 cannot be the long hair.

## Summary of Mark's Arguments

86. Let me again sum up Mark's arguments for the hair being the only covering of the passage. The fact that the covering of v.5 is mentioned in the same statement as the hair wouldn't prove they are the same would it? The fact that Mr. Vine speculates that the long hair of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (compare I Corinthians 11:10, R.V.) would not prove that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 would it? The fact (if it is true) that the English word veil could possibly refer to hair, doesn't prove that it always does, or that it does in this case does it? The fact that v.15 teaches that the hair is a covering, doesn't prove that hair is the only covering does it (especially considering the fact that the word "covering" in v.15 is translated from a totally different Greek word than the word "covered" in v.6 is translated from)? The fact that women are not to cut their hair at all doesn't prove that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 does it? Simply put, there has been no proof given that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11:2-16. Let me repeat: Mark is under obligation to prove the practice that he is contending for, that a woman does not have to wear an artificial covering when she prays or prophesies. We both agree that the practice that I am contending for, involving both the permanent and the temporary covering, is right, and a safe course to follow. The practice his view teaches is the one that is in question. Therefore, for women of his persuasion (having only one covering) to leave off an artificial covering by faith (that is, without doubt, Rom 14:23), their practice must be proven. This, Mark has not done.

## ANSWERS TO PAT DONAHUE'S QUESTIONS 11-15

- Q11. Is the covering(s) of Genesis 38:14-15 an artificial covering or the hair? If you believe that it is an artificial covering:
- a) how did you know that it is an artificial covering?, and
  - b) would this passage be an example of a translation using the English word "veil" to refer to an artificial covering?

A11 The covering in Genesis 38:14-15 is an artificial covering and is an example of a translation proving such. I know that it is an artificial covering because of the context which states "she had covered her face" and the face is not covered with hair. I have never indicated that the word "veil" ("vail" in the KJV) never referred to an artificial covering. The context will always indicate what the covering is just as in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 the context refers to hair every time the words "covered," "uncovered" or "not covered" is found.

Pat, are you suggesting that this covering in Genesis 38:14-15 is the same covering in 1 Corinthians 11. This "vail" was used to cover the face and it was an indication of harlotry. Verse 15 says, "When Judah saw her, he thought her to be an harlot;..." WHY DID HE THINK HER TO BE A HARLOT? THE NEXT PHRASE SAYS "... because she had covered her face." Surly you are not saying this is the same vail of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16!

- Q12. Is the covering of 1 Corinthians 11:7 the same as the covering of verses 5-6? Is the covering of 1 Corinthians 11:7 the same as the covering of verse 4? Please give proof for your answers.

A12 The Greek word *katakalupto* (or its negative) is used in verses 5,6 and 7. No, the covering of 1 Corinthians 11:7 is not the same as the covering of verse 4. In verse 4 the Greek word *kata* is used which indicates "anything down from the head." My proof is Nestle Greek Text or any interlinear.

- Q13. Do you agree that the fact that different Greek words are used for "bondage" in 1 Corinthians 7:15 and "bound" in 1 Corinthians 7:39 is significant in determining if "Bales Doctrine is true or not?"

A13 No. Different words does not necessarily mean different meanings.

- Q14. I believe that the truth on any scriptural issue is not determined, or affected by what any non-inspired man (even a scholar) believes. Because you evidently feel otherwise, after reading the following quote from W.E. Vine's Commentary on 1 Corinthians (commenting on 1 Corinthians 11:10 on page 149): "The veiled

condition of the woman therefore sets forth the authority of Christ. She has a two-fold covering, the temporary one, the veil, put on for the immediate purpose, and another, the permanent one mentioned in verse 15," would you say that Mr. Vine taught here that the covering of 1 Corinthians 1:10 (I assume you mean 11:10) was the long hair, or an artificial veil? If you agree that Mr. Vine taught that the covering of 1 Corinthians 11:10 was an artificial veil, and since it seems that what you previously thought his position was, proved your position, is your position now proven wrong, now that you know correctly what his "scholarly opinion" was?

A14 My position is not proven wrong by Vine's commentary on 1 Corinthians. I did not quote from his commentary, but from his Expository Dictionary of New Testament words. A dictionary is much different than a commentary. In a dictionary a person must explain the meanings of **words**, but in a commentary he explains his views (right or wrong) on different subjects. Why not refer to what Vine had to say in his dictionary concerning this subject? On page 189, not only does he state "the long hair...is perhaps indicative of their subjection" and then compares this to 1 Corinthians 11:10, but he also defines "hair" (*Greek kome*) by saying: "The word is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the **long hair** of the woman is as a veil, **a sign of subjection** to authority, as indicated in the headships spoken of **in verses 1-10.**" Verse 15 is not even named; however, he clearly states that "**the long hair...is as a veil, a sign of subjection ... spoken of in verses 1-10.**" Vine's position is clear in his dictionary. In his commentary, he refers to "a two-fold" covering, but he does not indicate which is referred to by the term "power." **YOUR SMOKE-SCREEN IS NOT WORKING!**

Q15. Suppose a Father, talking to his daughter who has long hair, said to her, "be sure and have your head covered when you go outside." Would you think that the Father would be commanding his daughter to keep her long hair, or would he be commanding her to put on an artificial covering?

A15 It would depend upon the context. Most likely he would be referring to an artificial covering; however, if he said, "if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her **hair is given her for a covering**" (verse 15) therefore, be sure you keep your covering; he would be referring to long hair. **WOULDN'T HE???**

## MARK BAILEY'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE

### ARGUMENT #1

### "POWER" (THE SIGN OF SUBJECTION)

87. Brother Donahue continues to struggle with my argument #1 in which I proved by W.E. Vine's Dictionary of New Testament Words that the word "power" in 1 Corinthians 11:10 refers to long hair. Vine (page 189) says, "The **long hair** of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their **subjection** to their Satanic master (compare 1 Corinthians 11:10, R.V.)." Instead of attempting to prove Vine's statement incorrect, my brother runs from verse 10 to verse 15 and refers to statements found in Vine's and the Gospel Advocate commentary. Such actions are vain! **First:** These statements had nothing to do with Vine's statement concerning verse 10; therefore, your response does not disprove anything that Vine says. **Second:** Brother, you have things backwards - commentaries does not disprove dictionaries, but dictionaries often disprove commentary. For example, commentaries may teach that baptism can refer to sprinkling; however, a quick look in a Bible dictionary proves otherwise. Don't you realize that there is a big difference between a commentary and a dictionary? In a dictionary a scholar must explain the meanings of WORDS, not positions. However, in a commentary, even by the same person, the author will often give his personal view even though it contradicts the dictionaries. No one can deny that Mr Vine's dictionary proves that "long hair" is a sign of subjection to women. Readers, do not be overtaken by Brother Donahue's smoke screen. **NOTICE:** he did not answer this argument. He only made statement like: "The fact that this comment is under the word 'hair' does not necessarily indicate that Mr. vine believes that 1 Corinthians 11:10 has the hair under consideration." How absurd! Yes, Brother Donahue, in Vine's Dictionary under the word "**HAIR**" he has "**HAIR**" under consideration. If you need more proof- under the 2nd definition Vine says, "*KOME* ('hair' wmb) ... The word is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the **long hair** of the woman is a veil, a **sign of subjection** to authority, as indicated in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10." Brother Donahue does Vine have the "hair" under consideration in this statement in which he states again that "the long hair" ... "is a veil, a sign of subjection ... as indicated in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10? I quoted this statement in my first speech, but Brother Donahue's ignored the argument with a simple: "... I do not think it necessary to comment upon them (my paragraphs 9-13) at this time." In my second speech I urged: "... I insist - **GO BACK AND RESPOND TO THESE ARGUMENTS!!!!**"; however, in his second negative **HE IGNORES THE ARGUMENT AGAIN!!! WHY?** The answer is obvious - HE CAN'T! Therefore, argument #1 still stands.

**ARGUMENT #2**  
**HOW WOMAN BECOME UNCOVERED**

88. NOW WE ARE GETTING SOMEWHERE! Readers, notice that Brother Donahue admits (paragraph 71) that "every verse in 1 Corinthians 11 that uses the actual word covered or uncovered, and is talking about the woman, mentions the hair in the same verse." He says, "This statement is true, but proves nothing." Yes it does Brother Donahue, **IT PROVES THAT THE CONTEXT IS SPEAKING ABOUT HAIR.**
89. Concerning verse 10 in which Brother Donahue says that "Mark arbitrarily rules out..." Mark did not rule it out. My entire argument #1 deals with verse 10 and it proves that the word "power" in verse 10 refers to the hair as a sign of subjection. No, I did not rule verse 10 out, but when I talked about verse 10 Brother Donahue did not want any part of it; therefore, he ran to verse 15. However, now that I am dealing with verses 5,6,& 13 he does not want any part of these verses either; therefore, he runs to verse 10. **STAY WITH THE ARGUMENTS AND DEAL WITH THE VERSES WHICH I NAME.** Concerning man in verse 7 - my proposition does not include man and his being covered or not; therefore, I intentionally did not refer to man.
90. Readers, be careful not to be overcome with Brother Donahue's continual smoke screens. In paragraph 72 my brother, once again, vainly attempts to compare "fasting and prayer" to "hair" and the words "covered," "uncovered" and "not covered." He knows that such is absurd! (See my paragraph #47). The word "hair" is a noun covering used to answer the verbs "covered" and "uncovered." There is no way that your two nouns can compare to verbs and nouns corresponding with one another. Brother Donahue says, "that just because two terms are used in close proximity to one another, that doesn't prove they refer to the same thing." No one says otherwise; however, when verbs ("covered," "uncovered" etc) are used there must be a noun in the context to correspond. The context shows that the noun is "hair" throughout.
91. Now we have more smoke screens. In paragraph 49 I asked Brother Donahue: "Give us one verse, or one Greek text that says 'artificial covering.'" In paragraph 72 he says, "The artificial covering is mentioned together with the hair in verses 5 and 6 ... The connection between the two is further extended by verses 13-15, where Paul teaches that nature teaches the woman to wear an artificial covering by giving her a natural covering, the long hair." Brother Donahue knows better than this! Readers, look in your Bibles, see if 1 Corinthians 11:5,6 or 13-15 says "artificial covering." **IT DOES NOT!** Not only do they not say "artificial" covering there is not one word within these verses that is defined as such. In order to read "artificial covering" Brother Donahue has to supply the word

"**ARTIFICIAL**", because the Bible does not say such. Brother Donahue, our readers are intelligent people and they can see right through your supplied words. Notice that he had to add the word "artificial" here just as he had to add "without reference to length" to the definition of the word shorn in his 4th question to me to get it to mean what he wanted it to mean.

92. In paragraphs 73&74, Brother Donahue tries another angle by referring to words used close together and shows that they are different even though they are used close together. Again, this is absurd and does not nullify my argument. I never said that just because two words are use close together that they are the same. However, when you have an entire context, such as 1 Corinthians 11:5-15, with general verbs as "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" and then you have the Apostle Paul to say in verse 15 "her hair is given her for a covering." It does not take a Philadelphia lawyer to understand what the covering is. Now go back and notice that every passage referring to women and the words "covered," "uncovered" etc. always refers to hair - **YES, THE CONTEXT DOES PROVE SOMETHING!** It proves that the "hair" answers the general terms "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered." Then, tie this truth into the fact, as I have proven, that Brother Donahue ignores, that in the Greek Old Testament to "uncover the head" means to cut the hair (see paragraphs 7&54) then everyone can easily understand that Paul is teaching that long hair is the covering referred to in the context of 1 Corinthians 11 and that to cut the hair is to be "uncovered."

93. In paragraphs 75&76 Brother Donahue attempts to nullify 22 Bible scholars which I named in paragraphs 52&53 that clearly states that the word "shorn" means to cut close. He presents nothing but smoke screens because, not one of his scholars proves that shorn does not refer to "cut close." As a matter of fact, his scholars prove that "shorn" does mean to cut close. Notice: #1 The New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon and #2 Strong's and #3 Arndt and Gingrich all refers to "shearing." What does the English word shear mean? Brother Donahue gives the definition of "shear" from four English dictionaries (see paragraph 75) and each one says about the same: "to clip (hair) from..."; "to remove by or as by cutting or clipping; to cut the hair or wool from..." and "To remove (fleece or hair) by cutting or clipping. I have no problems with these definitions - some are more clear than other, but they say the same thing. **"TO REMOVE (FLEECE OR HAIR) BY CUTTING OR CLIPPING."** If removing does not refer to cutting close - nothing does. Brother Donahue, if you tell a man to remove a tree from your yard and he only trims the top edges a very small amount - **IS THE TREE REMOVED?** You know it is not! Now, the man may "remove" that tree by trimming a little at a time but it is not "sheared" until it is "removed" or cut close. Keep in mind, this is your definitions. Brother Donahue want to know: "How can we be sure which dictionaries are right..."

Brother, they are all saying the same thing. They either say, "shear," "remove," "to cut from...," "to cut off," many will even say "to cut close." However, readers, notice, not one says "to cut without reference to length." I am sure my brother looked high and low for such a definition, but it was all in vain! Again, I say Brother Donahue, Your smoke screen that "no one can prove for sure..." is absurd. The 22 Bible scholars which I quoted said that "shorn" in 1 Corinthians 11:6 means: "to cut short," "cut off," or "cut close." The definitions that you presented confirmed these definitions.

94. In paragraph 77 Brother Donahue admits that the word "'uncovered' could refer to the cutting of the hair..." He then attempts to nullify the definition found in Gesenius' Hebrew Chaldee Lexicon by saying this same dictionary "mentions also... 'from the idea of loosening, casting off, the garments". However, Brother Donahue fails to state that these words are in parenthesis showing that the original word is being explained. That is, the term come from the idea of loosening etc but here means "to make naked,... for example the head, Numbers 5:18 specially by shaving, Leviticus 10:6, 21:10." Brother Donahue's next fatal error for his position is in asking "when Numbers 5:18 says that the priest shall 'uncover the woman's head,' is it talking about cutting her hair or removing a garment?" **It refers to the hair**, brother Donahue. Wycliffe in his Commentary tells us that in Numbers 5:18 the phrase "uncover the woman's head" is from the word *para* meaning: "to unbind the hair, not uncover the head. As one under suspicion, she was deprived of this sign of dignity; her hair was unbound." If this is not enough Gesenius (page 690) says: "to make naked ..., for example the head, Numbers 5:18, specially by shaving, Leviticus 10:6; 21:10." Also notice the following translations:

King James Version: "Uncover the woman's head"

American Standard Version: "let the hair of the woman's head go loose"

New International Version: "he shall loosen her hair"

My brother's 2nd fatal error for his position is in saying, "this Hebrew word is obviously not the Greek word that is translated 'uncovered' in 1 Corinthians 11:5, and therefore has no bearing on the issue at hand." **WRONG AGAIN!** The Septuagint (Greek Old Testament) translates Numbers 5:18 with *apokalupto*, which is the same Greek root form (*kalupto*) we have in 1 Corinthians 11 for "uncover." Finally, your #2 objection that "other Hebrew words translated "uncover" in the Old Testament have reference to things other than hair, e.g. clothes in Lev. 18:7." Yes, the word "uncover" when it does not refer to the head does, sometime, refer to clothes. But we are not discussing uncovering the

body, we are discussing uncovering and covering the head, which in the Old Testament always refer to the hair.

95. Brother Donahue attempts to answer my paragraph 8 and 55 concerning the prefix "kata" meaning "completely" by saying this "doesn't tell what the covering is, it just says that (whatever the covering is) it should cover completely." This statement does not disprove anything. I have already proven that every time the words "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" are found in 1 Corinthians 11 that the same passage indicates "hair"; therefore, long hair is the complete covering (*katakalypto*) and cut hair is not complete.

### ARGUMENT #3 HAIR AND VEIL INTERCHANGEABLE

96. In paragraph 79 Brother Donahue mentions my argument #3 but does not attempt to prove it wrong. I proved by the scholarly Dean Alford that "in 1 Corinthians 11 that the word 'unveiled' ('uncovered' in the K.J.V.) means 'having short hair' and being 'veiled' ('covered' in the K.J.V.) means 'having long hair.'" What does Brother Donahue say about this? **NOT A WORD - HE IS AS SILENT AS A TOMB!** My brother, ignores this authority and simply ends his reply with: "The issue is, what is the woman to be veiled (or covered) with? Brother Donahue **HAIR** is what woman is to be covered with. That is why Alford says "uncovered" means "having short hair" and being "covered" means "having long hair." **STOP AVOIDING AND ANSWER THE ARGUMENT, BROTHER DONAHUE!**

### ARGUMENT #4 HER HAIR IS GIVEN FOR A COVERING

97. Again, Brother Donahue mentions my argument #4, but again he does not attempt to answer the argument. Instead, he want to play on the fact that there are two different Greek words. I say again, yes there are two Greek words because one is a noun and the others are verbs or adjectives. But the words (different words as they may be) are interchangeable with each other - as you now agree. Since the words will interchange there is no significant in there being two different words. I gave several sources of proof to show that the "different Greek word (*peribolaion*) in verse 15 does correspond with the verb (*katakalypto*) "covered." This does not mean two covering, but instead, it means that the noun is *peribolaion* "covering" (verse 15) and the verbs and adjective is (*a*)*katakalypto* "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" (verses 5,6,&13).
98. Concerning "Bales doctrine," again. I don't know anything about Bale's position and do not really care to know anything about it. One thing I do know is that Bales

position on the marriage has nothing to do with the discussion on 1 Corinthians 11. Readers, you should realize that when a person does not have the truth, as is true with Brother Donahue, that person must run from every argument given. Therefore, don't be surprised in Brother Donahue's actions in swapping back and forth between "hair" and "marriage."

### **ARGUMENT #5 LONG HAIR MEANS UNCUT HAIR**

99. Once again, Brother Donahue mentions my argument #5. But once again he does not even attempt to answer the argument. This argument proves that "Long hair means uncut hair," which also proves my proposition. I quoted Vincent to show that "shorn" means to "have the hair cut close." Therefore, Paul is teaching in verse 6 that if she is going to trim her hair, even a small amount, she may as well go further and be shorn or even a step further than that and be shaved. What does Brother Donahue say about this argument? **NOTHING! ONCE AGAIN, PLEASE GO BACK AND ANSWER ARGUMENT #5 AS I GAVE IT.**

### **DONAHUE'S RESPONSES TO BAILEY'S ANSWERS**

100. Paragraphs 82 & 83 refers to Brother Donahue's question #7 concerning "praying or prophesying." My brother thinks this proves two different coverings - one while praying or prophesying and another at other times. However, as I have shown, this proves too much because Brother Donahue's proposition which he is to affirm states: "The Scripture teach that a woman must wear an artificial covering (in addition to her long hair) while praying or prophesying." Notice, not only an artificial covering but also long hair. **WHEN???' WHILE PRAYING OR PROPHECYING.'** He tries to get out of this situation by saying that praying or prophesying does not modify "in addition to her long hair." **YES, IT DOES!** And you are right, according to your position, it does not make any sense. However, we both know that the words "praying or prophesying," in verse 5, does not mean that this is the only time for a woman to be covered. As an example: In the 2nd part of my question #6 to Brother Donahue, I stated: "Mark 11:25 says: "And when ye stand praying, forgive, ..." Does this mean that if we are not standing while praying that we do not have to forgive or do we have to "forgive" at all times? My brother attempts to skirt around the question and applies it only to "praying"; however, the point made and underlined was that the person is **STANDING praying**; therefore, I asked "Does this mean that if we are not standing while praying that we do not have to forgive or do we have to 'forgive' at all times?" He did not answer the question, but we know the answer. The fact that the Lord specified "stand(ing)" does not mean that we have to forgive **ONLY** if we are standing. Many

examples as this could be given. Praying or prophesying does not indicate two coverings any more than "stand(ing)" while praying refers to one type of forgiveness and if not standing it refers to another type. As, I have done many times in this discussion: **GO BACK AND ANSWER THIS QUESTION AND ARGUMENT!!!**

### **DONAHUE'S SUMMARY OF MARK'S ARGUMENT**

101. In paragraph 86 Brother Donahue gives a fairly good summary of many of my arguments in which he never answered. I like the way he gives it; therefore, let us review it again using some of his own words:

**"THE FACT** that Mr. Vine speculates that 'the long hair of the spirit-being described as locust in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (compare 1 Corinthians 11:10, R.V.)..."

**"THE FACT** (if it is true) that the English word 'veil' could possibly refer to hair..." It is true as you would know if you would have answered my argument #3.

**"THE FACT** that verse 15 teaches that the hair is a covering,..."

**"THE FACT** that women are not to cut their hair at all..."

102. I realize that I left off the ending comments of Brother Donahue's statement, but the **"FACT"** is that all these arguments which I gave are **"FACTS."** And I believe my good brother realizes it or he would have at least attempted to answer all the arguments which I gave. Does any one of the above "facts" mentioned by Brother Donahue prove my position? Maybe not; However, when you examine **ALL THE FACTS** my proposition is proven many times over.

103. Notice some more "fact" that Brother Donahue has become aware of:

**FACT #1:** Donahue stands against the scholarly W.E. Vines Dictionary. Vine teaches that the word "power" refers to the long hair of women.

**FACT #2:** Donahue stands against Vincent's. Vincent says the word "shorn" means "to have the hair cut close..."

- FACT #3:** Donahue stands against Thayer's Lexicon, Liddell and Scott Lexicon, Abbott-Smith Lexicon, Robertson's Word Pictures in the New Testament, Robinson Greek Lexicon, Harper's Lexicon, Bagster's Lexicon, John Dawson's Lexicon, Green's Lexicon which every one teaches that "shorn" in verse 6 refers to cutting the hair close.
- FACT #4:** Donahue has admitted that the context of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is hair (see paragraph #71).
- FACT #5:** Donahue admits that the word "uncovered" could refer to hair and means "to make naked... specially by shaving." (see paragraph 77).
- FACT #6:** Donahue admits that the word "uncovered" could refer to the cutting of the hair." (see paragraph 77).
- FACT #7:** Donahue has admitted that the word "veil" does not necessitate something artificial. (see paragraph 79).
- FACT #8:** Donahue has admitted that the word "veil" could be used to refer to veiling with the hair. (see paragraph 79).
- FACT #9:** Donahue has admitted that the words "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" (*(a)katakalypto*) in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,& 13 could be used interchangeably without violence with the "covering" (*peribolaion*) in verse 15. (See paragraph #80.)
- FACT #10:** Donahue has admitted that a Christian woman must have long uncut hair. (see paragraph 81)

#### 104.BAILEY'S FINAL SUMMARY OF HIS ARGUMENTS

- "Argument #1"            In two speech brother Donahue does not deny Vine's, nor does he attempt to give another scholar or a Bible verse to disprove this argument, he simply says that this is Vine's "opinion" and "speculation"; however, no proof is given. **The argument still stands!**
- "Argument #2"            In Brother Donahue's 1st negative he avoids the argument by reducing the 816 words to form this argument to two sentences consisting of 29 words.

In his speeches he totally ignores the 22 scholars which proves that "shorn" means to "cut close." Furthermore, he ignores Biblical examples given to prove the argument. **The argument still stands!**

"Argument #3"      He ignores this argument by saying, "I do not think it necessary to comment upon them (paragraphs 9-13) at this time." In his second speech he agrees that the word "veil" does not necessitate something artificial. **The argument still stands!**

"Argument #4"      In the 1st speech he ignores this argument and gives affirmative material instead and then debates James Bales on the marriage. In the 2nd speech he agrees that the verb *katakalupto* "covered" (verses 5,6,13) and the noun *peribolaion* (verse 15) are interchangeable. **The argument still stands!**

"Argument #5"      In his 1st speech he totally ignores this argument. In his second speech he agrees that long hair means uncut hair. **The argument still stands!**

105. Dear readers, I encourage you, to read this debate with an open mind and heart  
for                    the                    truth                    of                    God's                    word.

## ANSWERS TO MARK BAILEY'S QUESTIONS 11-15

- Q11. Please give the name, page number, and quote of any Greek Lexicon or Bible Dictionary that defines the word "shorn" (as used in 1 Corinthians 11:6) and that actually states that the term does not have reference to length.
- A11 I have none at this time, but I did give you four bible dictionaries and four English dictionaries that give a definition for the word that "does not have reference to length." None of these eight definitions for "shorn" indicate how much is cut, removed, or cut off. Mark, I could just as well ask you to give me one English dictionary that defines the word "slice," and "that actually states that the term does not have reference to length." Do you see the point? One of the definitions of the word "slice" as given by Random House is, "to cut through or cleave with or as with a knife." The fact that this definition does not tell how much is cut shows that the dictionary is definition does not tell how much is cut shows that the dictionary is defining it without reference to length, meaning that slice can be used to talk about slicing a lot off, or a little off!
- Q12. Since the word "covered" (*Gr. kata*) in 1 Corinthians 11:4 is a different word than "uncovered" (*Gr. akatakalupto*) in 1 Corinthians 11:5 and since both of these words are different from the word "covered" (*Gr. katakalupto*) in 1 Corinthians 11:6 and since all three of these words are different from the word "covering" (*Gr. peribolaion*) in 1 Corinthians 11:15 DOES THIS MEAN THAT 1 CORINTHIANS 11:4-15 IS DEMANDING 4 DIFFERENT COVERINGS? IF NOT, WHY NOT??? PLEASE EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THESE 4 WORDS.
- A12 There is no Greek word for "covered" in 1 Cor 11:4 (interlinears show that), the word "kata" simply means "down from, down" (Thayer), or "completely" (W.J. Hickie and Mark Bailey, paragraphs #8 and #55). "Kata" does not mean "covered," the English word "covered" is, in effect, supplied from the context (vs. 5-7) by the translators.
- Q12 The words "akatakalupto" and "katakalupto" are the same basic Greek word (as can be easily seen by looking at the spelling of the words), the "a" prefix on "akatakalupto" just negates the word like our prefix "un" which is added in from of the word "uncovered" and "covered" are different Greek words like the Greek word like the Greek word in v. 15 is different. Mark please explain why you are making this argument. I know that you know better.
- A12 Mark is actually the one with the problem on this point, he is inconsistent. Mark believes that there is a Greek word for "covered" in v. 4 and because it is different than the Greek word for "covered" in v.6, he believes it is a different covering.

But point out to him that the Greek word for "covering" in v. 15 is also a different than the Greek word in v.6, and he says that the fact isn't significant, they are still the same covering. Mark, please tell us why that the different Greek word in v.4 proves a different covering, but the different Greek word in v. 15 does not? The truth is that there are only two different basic Greek words translated into various forms of the word cover in 1 Cor 11:2-16: one of these words is used in vs. 5,6,6,7, and 13, and one is used in v. 15. Isn't it strange that Paul would suddenly switch the Greek word that he had been using all the way through, if he was still talking about the same covering in v. 15 as previously?

Q13. Do different Greek words (for example: *katakalupto* - covered in verse 6 and *peribolaion* - covering in verse 15) always necessitate different meanings?

A13 No, but the burden of proof would fall on the one who says that they refer to the same thing, to prove it, either by the context, or by some other statement in the Bible.

Q14. If different words are used interchangeable are the meanings the same? Please list some examples.

A14 No, not necessarily. For example, if I told my wife that my dog had knocked over the garbage can again, she might say, "that animal has got to go." The words "dog" and "animal" would be used interchangeable here, but they do not have the same meaning. My wife could call my dog an animal, because a dog is a type of animal. Sometimes ladies cover their heads with a napkin when "thanks" is offered at a restaurant. "Covering" and "napkin" could be used interchangeably in this circumstance, but that wouldn't mean that the two words have the same meaning. In 1 Cor 11, I do not believe that "katakalupto" and "peribolaion" are used interchangeably, but I do understand that the words have similar (but not the same) meanings. This is one reason why Paul could make the argument that he does in vs. 13-15: stated in my own words, "the fact that nature gives the woman a natural (permanent) covering argues for the fact that a woman ought to wear a artificial (temporary) covering when she prays or prophesies.

Q15. Please explain the exact difference between the Greek words *katakalupto* ("covered" in verse 6) and *peribolaion* ("covering" in verse 15). Please give your proof?

A15 They are different basic Greek words. This can be easily seen by looking at the transliterated versions of them as given in your question. "Katakalupto" is a form of the basic Greek word "kalupto," "peribolaion" obviously is not. The reader can see this from the spelling of the two words.

## Pat Donahue's Third Negative

### Mark's Argument #1

106. In paragraph #87, Mark again asserts that Mr. Vine's comments on Rev 9:8 prove his "hair only" position. Mark states that commentaries do not disprove dictionaries, but dictionaries sometimes disprove commentaries. Mark, did you miss the fact that I quoted from Mr. Vine's dictionary that says "the command to Saul of Tarsus to wash away his sins indicates that by his public confession, he would testify to the removal of his sins, and to the complete change from his past life; this 'washing away' was not in itself the actual remission of his sins, which had taken place at his conversion?" I asked then, did you believe this statement simply because it was in Mr. Vine's dictionary? Since you didn't answer in your last article, will you please answer now? Mr. Vine's basic definition for "thrix" is "denotes the hair." The rest of the section under this word are only his COMMENTS concerning verses where the word is used! Mark, can you see that when Mr. Thayer (in his dictionary) COMMENTS under "baptism" (#907) concerning I Cor 15:29, "on behalf of the dead, i.e. to promote their eternal salvation by undergoing baptism in their stead," that he is not defining the word "baptism," but is commenting on a passage where the word is used? Mr. Vine is doing the same thing in his section for the word "thrix." Obviously Mark does not have sufficient scriptural proof for his position, or he wouldn't have to resort to using the opinions (comments, speculations, theology) of men.

### Mark's Argument #2

107. In response to paragraph #88, I did admit that both I Cor 11:5 and 6 mention both the covering and the hair. But I just noticed a detail I didn't notice before. Mark's original statement (in paragraph #6) says that both verses mention both the covering and the LONG hair. This is not true. Neither verse mentions the long hair! v.5 mentions shaven hair, and v.6 mentions shorn (cut) and shaven hair. Both verses teach that the covering under consideration is different than shorn or shaven hair. Neither verse teaches that the covering is the same as long hair. Only Mark is saying that! But even if Mark's original contention were true, that both verses mention the covering and "long hair," it wouldn't prove that the covering is the long hair, anymore than the fact that a number of verses mention both "fasting" and "prayer" together, proves that fasting and prayer are the same thing.
108. Also in paragraph #88, Mark says he has proven "that the context is speaking about hair." Mark didn't need to prove that, v.15 tells us that the context is

speaking about the hair. Mark has also said that the context is speaking about an artificial veil (see paragraph #42 concerning Mark's view of v.4). Mark, what you need to prove is that the hair is the covering spoken of in vs.5-6.

109. In paragraph #90, Mark states "when verbs ('covered,' 'uncovered' etc.) are used there must be a noun in the context to correspond." I would like to know when Mark made up this rule of hermeneutics? Shall we call it "Mark's Law?" If this law is true (which it is not), I want to ask Mark, "what is the noun that corresponds to the English word covered in v.4? What about the English word "pray" in v.13, what is its corresponding noun?"
110. In paragraph #91, Mark makes a big deal about the word "artificial" not being in the text of I Cor 11:2-16. Of course, there are other ways of knowing that a covering referred to in the Bible is an artificial one besides the text having to actually use the word. If not, then how did Mark know that the covering of Gen 38:14-15 was an "artificial" one, even though the word "artificial" is not in that text?
111. In response to paragraph #92, it is Mark's argument that the hair is the covering because they "are used close together." I prove this by quoting his argument from paragraph #6: "The context shows that the covering is long hair. We know this because every statement referring to women being covered or uncovered mentions "long hair" within the same statement." Mark, I wonder if the Philadelphia lawyer you refer to would assume like you do, that the covering of v.15 is the same as the covering of vs.5-6, even though Paul did not say that it was the same, and even though Paul used a different BASIC Greek word in referring to these coverings.
112. In spite of his comments in paragraph #93, Mark knows that the word "remove" does not necessarily tell how much is removed. He agrees that the shearing of hair involves a removal of hair, but that it might only be 90% of a person's hair (definitely not all of it, shaving would be removing all of it). Likewise, cutting a little hair would be removing a little hair. When I first wrote my second article, I had too many words. You know what I did? I removed text. How much text did I remove, you ask? According to Mark's reasoning, if I said I removed text, then I must have removed it all! But we all read my 3500 word second negative article.
113. The same principle would apply to the phrase "cut off." To repeat what I said in my last article, the phrase "cut off" might not refer to cutting short, since a woman could "cut off" even just a little bit of her hair (I might ask this woman, "how much hair was cut off?"). Mark, what about the example given by Webster's Dictionary? Does the machine that "shears" sheet metal necessarily

cut the metal close; or would it be possible to "shear" only a little metal off a sheet? Yes you can shear something by only cutting a little bit off, by only removing a little bit. Mark knows this, but is willing to "bet" his own soul, and the souls of those he teaches, on his assumption that "shorn" has to mean, and always means, to cut a lot.

114. In paragraph #94, Mark seems to be trying to say that the Hebrew word (Strong's #6544) translated "uncover" in Num 5:18 has to refer to the hair. I don't know what this would prove, because this is not the Greek word translated "covered" in I Cor 11. I believe that the covering of Num 5:18 is an artificial one, and I can prove that the Hebrew word used in this verse does not have to refer to the hair, that is, unless Mark thinks that the word naked (also Strong's #6544), that is used twice in Ex 32:25, refers to the cutting of the hair.
115. Also in paragraph #94, Mark quotes me as saying "this Hebrew word is obviously not the Greek word that is translated 'uncovered' in I Cor 11:5, and therefore has no bearing on the issue at hand," and then says "WRONG AGAIN!" Mark, how could my statement be wrong? How could they be the same word (as you claimed) when one is a Hebrew word and one is a Greek word? Remember, the Septuagint is a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, not the Hebrew Old Testament itself!

### **Mark's Argument #3**

116. Mark again quotes scholars (paragraph #96) thinking they will prove his position. It is funny that Mark originally quoted Mr. Alford to prove "that the word "veil" does not necessitate something artificial" (paragraph #9), and then jumps to saying Mr. Alford's quote proves that the word veil does refer to the hair. These are different Mark. One is simply saying that the word "veil" could refer to hair, the other is saying that the word "veil" must refer to the hair (which would contradict Mark's own admission that the English word "veil" refers to an "artificial" covering in Gen 38:14-15). Which is right Mark? Of course, even if Mr. Alford were teaching Mark's position, it would prove about as much as Merrill F. Unger's statement that, "No, it is not possible for the Greek verbs of I Cor 11:5,6, and 13 to be correctly used with the Greek noun PERIBOLAION." Neither statement proves anything!

### **Mark's Argument #4**

117. Mark, I believe it is misleading to state as you did in paragraph #97 that, "there are two Greek words because one is a noun and the others are verbs or adjectives." This seems to imply that the two words are the same basic Greek word, only with different endings. I showed that this is not the case in my

paragraph #35. No, the words are not different "because one is a noun and the others are verbs or adjectives." They are different because they are forms of two totally different basic Greek words; the fact that one is a noun form and the others in verb or adjective form has nothing to do with it.

118. Since Mark is not familiar with "Bales' Doctrine" (paragraph #98), I'll give him two other examples. First, Mark, do you ever, when explaining why Gal 6:2 does not contradict Gal 6:5, point out that two different Greek words are translated "burden(s)" in these verses? Though the two Greek words are translated into the same English word, and though the two Greek words have similar meanings, it is significant, when explaining how the two verses do not contradict, that there are two different Greek words used. Mark, do you agree?
119. Secondly Mark, suppose you were in a debate with a Baptist and you pointed out from Acts 2:38 that baptism was "for (in order to) the remission of sins." If his response to this argument was to say that the phrase meant that baptism was "because of" the remission of sins, and gave I Cor 7:26 ("for the present distress") as an example of where the word "for" meant "because of," how would you answer? Wouldn't one of your responses be that the word translated "for" in I Cor 7:26 is a different Greek word than the word translated "for" in Acts 2:38? I know that would be one of my responses. In these two verses, two different Greek words are translated into the same English word, and carry similar (they both introduce the "reason" for the instruction), but not identical meanings. But the Baptist's argument is not valid, and one of the reasons that it is not valid is because two different Greek words are being used. Mark, do you agree? You see, the fact that there are two different Greek words is significant in both of these cases isn't it? It is likewise also significant in I Cor 11.

#### **Mark's Argument #5**

120. In reference to Mark's contention in paragraph #100 that praying or prophesying does modify "in addition to her long hair" in my affirmative proposition, I deny such. First of all, I believe that the use of parentheses are commonly used to "set off" an expression from the main thought of a sentence, and is a perfectly valid way to indicate that I did not want to indicate that the phrase "in addition to her long hair" was to be modified by the phrase "while praying or prophesying." But even if it is not a valid way, all that would prove is that I used incorrect grammar in forming my affirmative proposition. What matters is what I intended to convey, and in this case, the very reason I changed your wording of my affirmative proposition, and put "in addition to her long hair" in parentheses, was to indicate that the phrase was not modified by "while praying or prophesying."

121. In reference to Mark's point about standing praying in paragraph #100, I have already used more than a page to answer this, but I will repeat my answer briefly, noting particularly the word "stand." When Jesus said to forgive when standing praying, we would normally take that to mean that is the only time we must forgive, except for the fact that other verses tell us otherwise. In addition, the fact that Jesus said to forgive "when ye stand praying" shows that it is possible to either forgive or not forgive at the occasion of "when ye stand praying." The when clause in this case shows that forgiving is something you can (it is possible to) "turn on" or "turn off" for an occasion. For a more in-depth discussion of this point, I would ask the reader to refer back to my answer #6.

### **Mark's "Facts"**

122. The following are responses to Mark's facts as listed in his paragraph #103:
1. Mr. Vine never teaches "that the word 'power' in I Cor 11:10 refers to the long hair of women (but if he did, so what?). He simply asks the reader to compare I Cor 11:10 with Rev 9:8.
  2. Mark "stands against" the United Bible Society Greek New Testament, which defines "shorn" as "cut one's hair, have one's hair cut."
  3. Mark "stands against" the eight dictionaries I quoted in paragraph #75 that all define "shorn" without referring to how much hair is cut.
  4. Mark has admitted that the context of I Cor 11:2-16 is an artificial veil (see paragraph #42 concerning Mark's view of v.4).
  5. Mark admits that the word "covered" could refer to an artificial veil (see his answer to my question #11).
  6. Mark admits that the word "covered" in I Cor 11:4 could refer to an artificial veil (see paragraph #42).
  7. Mark has admitted that the word "veil" does not necessitate the hair (see his answer to my question #11)
  8. Pat has admitted that the word "veil" could be used to refer to veiling with the hair, but Mark has not proven that the word "veil" is used to refer to veiling with the hair in I Cor 11:5-6; that is what he must prove.

9. Pat has admitted that the words could be used interchangeably, but Mark has not proven that they are used interchangeably in I Cor 11; that is what he must prove.

### Mark's Answers to My Questions

123. Mark says that he knows that the covering of Gen 38:14-15 is an artificial one because "the face is not covered with hair." Mark, a lady's hair could cover her face could it not? My wife's certainly could. So by your reasoning, you shouldn't be able to tell what kind of covering Tamar had on. But you were able to. Could it be for the same reason that I could tell that her covering was an artificial one (not the hair)?, because it was something she did for an occasion (a certain time), something she could do and undo at certain times?
124. In response to Mark's question about whether or not this covering worn by Tamar is the same covering spoken of in I Cor 11: it could be (or may not be) that the coverings were similar in physical appearance, but the purposes for wearing them were vastly different. The covering in Gen 38 might have indicated that the wearer was sexually immoral, but the covering in I Cor 11 is indicative of the wearer's subjection to man.
125. Mark's response to my question #12 is that the covering of I Cor 11:7 is not the same as the covering of v.4. Isn't this absurd? I believe any unbiased reader can see that v.4 is telling the man not to be covered for one reason, and v.7 is just adding another reason to the same command.

The reason I asked this question is because the coverings of vs.4,5,6,&7 are obviously all the same. vs.4&7 tell the man not to be covered, v.4 tells when the covering is forbidden. vs.5&6 just turn it around and tell the woman to be covered, v.5 tells when the covering is required. There is obviously no difference in the coverings, Paul is just giving the different genders opposite instructions concerning the same covering, and concerning the same occasion of time. Now, Mark has said in his tract (see my paragraph #42) that the covering of v.4 would include an artificial covering, and since the covering of vs.5,6,&7 is the same covering as the covering of v.4, then it follows that the covering of vs.5,6,&7 would include an artificial covering. This contradicts Mark's whole point that the hair is the only covering talked about in the context. To be consistent, Mark would have to say, at the very least, that an artificial covering or long hair is required by the passage. Of course, I repudiate this logical conclusion of Mark's position.

126. In his response to my question #15, Mark again agrees with my number one proof of my position. Here Mark recognizes that when a person puts a when

clause (like "when praying or prophesying," or "when you go outside") on a command to be covered, the when clause tells you that the covering being referred to is put-on-able and take-off-able. Mark, if you would just apply the same reasoning that you did here (and in your tract concerning how you know that the man's covering of I Cor 11:4 is temporary, because he is told not to do it when he prays or prophesies) to I Cor 11:5-7, you would have the truth on the issue between us! Mark wonders if it would be different if the girl of my example had been told that "her hair is given her for a covering." No, it wouldn't be different, she had been told that! The girl I was referring to had long hair to begin with because of the Bible's teaching on the subject!

### Summary of Mark's Arguments

127. Let me again sum up Mark's arguments for the hair being the only covering of the passage. The fact that the covering of v.5 is mentioned in the same statement as the hair wouldn't prove they are the same would it? Not any more than the fact that the covering is mentioned in the same statement as the head in vs.4&7, proves that the covering is the head. The fact that Mr. Vine speculates that the long hair of the spirit-beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (compare I Corinthians 11:10, R.V.) would not prove that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 would it? I don't believe that Mr. Vine is teaching by his COMMENTS in his dictionary that the covering of I Cor 11:10 is the hair, but even if he was, what does one (uninspired) man's opinion prove? The fact that the English word veil could possibly refer to hair, doesn't prove that it always does, or that it does in this case does it? "Veil" can also refer to (and normally does) to an artificial veil, can it not? The fact that v.15 teaches that the hair is a covering, doesn't prove that hair is the only covering does it (especially considering the fact that the word "covering" in v.15 is translated from a totally different basic Greek word than the word "covered" in v.6 is translated from)?
- Remember the covering of v.15 is taught to be a permanent one, while the covering of vs.5-6 is taught to be a temporary one. The fact that women are not to cut their hair at all doesn't prove that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11 does it? Simply put, there has been no proof given that the hair is the only covering taught necessary by I Cor 11:2-16. Let me repeat: Mark is under obligation to prove the practice that he is contending for, that a woman does not have to wear an artificial covering when she prays or prophesies. We both agree that the practice that I am contending for, involving both the permanent and the temporary covering, is right, and a safe course to follow. The practice Mark's view teaches is the one that is in question. Therefore, for women of his persuasion (having only one covering) to leave off an artificial covering by faith (that is, without doubt, Rom 14:23), their practice must be proven. This, Mark has not done. He has not proven his proposition

by the scriptures!

## MARK BAILEY'S QUESTIONS TO PAT DONAHUE

### FIRST NEGATIVE

- Q16. Does Paul specifically state in 1 Corinthians 11 that he has reference to an "artificial covering" when he uses the verbs "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" in verses 5,6, & 13? If yes, please tell where and give his statement. If he has not specifically stated that he has reference to an artificial covering how do we determine that he does have reference to an artificial covering and not to "hair" as he does specifically state in verse 15?
- A16. Paul does not specifically use the word "artificial" in vs.5,6 or 13. Neither does he specifically state that the covering of v.15 is the same covering that vs.5 and 13 describe. We must determine what kind of covering is being talked about in vs.5,6, and 13 by other means. One such means is by noting that the covering of vs.5 and 13 is required when a woman is praying or prophesying, thereby implying that a temporary covering is under consideration.
- Q17. Does any Greek Lexicon actually use the word "artificial" in the definition of the words "covered," "uncovered," or "not covered" in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6, & 13? If yes, please name the lexicon and the page number.
- A17. I know of no Greek Lexicon that uses the word artificial in the definition of the Greek word translated "covered," "uncovered," or "not covered" in I Cor 11:5,6 and 13. There might be one, but I don't know about it at this time. Neither do I know of any lexicon that uses the word "hair" in the definition of this word either. If there is one ("artificial" or "hair"), I don't believe it would prove anything.
- Q18. In paragraph 52 & 53 of my 2nd affirmative I named 22 scholars which actually stated that the word "shorn" means "to cut short," "to cut off," or "to cut close" - Does any Greek Lexicon agree with you by defining the word "shorn" in 1 Corinthians 11:6 and then actually state (in the definition or in their comments) that "shorn" does not have reference to length? Please give definition and comment and name the Lexicon and page number.
- A18. The Greek and English Dictionaries that I have quoted do not state that "shorn" does not have reference to length. However, they agree with me because they do not state that "shorn" does have reference to length.

Q19. In 1 Corinthians 11:13 Paul asks "Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" Does Paul answer this question within verses 14 & 15? If yes, please tell us his exact answer.

A19. Yes, Paul does answer the question in vs.14-15. His exact answer is stated in the actual verses of 14 and 15. My synopsis of Paul's answer would be that "the fact that the woman is given a natural, permanent covering argues for the requirement given the woman to have an artificial, temporary covering when she is praying or prophesying."

Q20. In 1 Corinthians 11:6 Paul commanded, "let her be covered." If a woman covered ("*katakalupto*" - the verb in verse 6) herself with a "*peribolaion*" (the noun "covering in verse 15) would she be obeying Paul's command in verse 6? If no, please define by any Greek Lexicon the word "*peribolaion*" and explain why this "covering" would not suffice being "covered" (*katakalupto*) as Paul commanded in verse 6. (Give name and page number of the Greek Lexicon).

A20. As far as I know, the word "*peribolaion*" could possibly describe something that would suffice for the covering required by v.6. However, in this context, "*peribolaion*" does not refer to something that suffices as the covering of v.6. In this context, "*peribolaion*" is used to refer to a particular covering, the hair, which is a permanent, natural covering, but the covering of vs.5 and 6 is referring to a temporary, artificial covering.

**Pat Donahue First Affirmative**  
**My Proposition**

128. The proposition I am affirming is, "The Scriptures teach that a woman must wear an artificial covering (in addition to her long hair) while praying or prophesying." The proposition is self-explanatory, but I would like to comment on the part of the proposition that is in parentheses, since a question has come up about it in Mark's affirmative. If the paranthetical construction does not make it clear, let me make it perfectly clear now, the phrase "while praying or prophesying" does NOT modify the phrase "in addition to her long hair;" "while praying or prophesying" only modifies "wear an artificial covering." I intended to show this from the very beginning by placing "in addition to her long hair" within parentheses to set it off from the main idea expressed by the sentence.
129. Let me say now that I do not plan to try to prove my proposition by just quoting the opinion of men who agree with me on the issue, instead I plan to prove the proposition by the scriptures (Acts 9:22, 18:28).

**The Proof**

130. The phrase "prayeth or prophesieth" in I Cor 11:5 proves that two coverings are under consideration in I Cor 11, one temporary (when praying or prophesying), and one permanent, the long hair of v.15. The fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she is praying or prophesying, implies that this covering can be worn on a temporary basis, which does not fit the covering of v.15, the hair, which is permanent. It implies that the covering of v.5 can be worn for an occasion, and taken off after the occasion is passed, which does not fit the covering of v.15, the hair, which cannot be put on for occasions, and taken off later. This implies that the covering of v.5 can be put on, and can be taken off, which does not fit the hair covering of v.15, which is not put-on-able and take-off-able.
131. To show that Mark agrees with this exact line of argumentation, let me quote again from his tract, "Woman's Glory." On pages 10-11, we read, "This statement [referring to v.4] plainly teaches that man dishonors his head (Christ) when he prays or prophesies with his (physical) head covered. Paul mentions a specific time that is not appropriate for man to cover himself and for a woman to uncover herself - that is, while 'praying or prophesying'. ... However, regardless if this has reference to worship only or all times while praying or prophesying, we still must be conscious of the fact that a specific time is referred to. In short, if man is praying or prophesying he cannot be covered, to violate this would be an act of dishonoring Christ; however, if he is not praying

or prophesying he can be covered, since he would be able to 'uncover' himself before he enters into the specific acts of praying or prophesying again." In this paragraph, Mark is saying that the fact that a man is required to be uncovered when he is praying or prophesying, proves that it is not required for him to be covered when he is not praying or prophesying. If this is conclusive proof, and I wholeheartedly agree with Mark that it is, then why wouldnt the same reasoning prove that since a woman is to be covered when she prays or prophesies, then it would be right for her to be uncovered when she is not praying or prophesying?

132. So Mark indicates in his tract that he agrees with this proof when it relates to the man. However, he does not accept the identical proof when it relates to the woman. Mark, the reasoning either proves the concept or it doesnt. If the fact that the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves through implication that he may be covered at other times, then it does the same for the woman; that is, the fact that the woman is told to be covered when she prays or prophesies, proves through implication that she may be uncovered at other times. Now if the proof is valid for the man, it is valid for the woman also. Mark you cant have it both ways. Does the fact that men and women are told to be uncovered and covered respectively, when they pray or prophesy, prove that they may be covered and uncovered, respectively, when they are not praying or prophesying, or does it not prove it?
133. Now if Mark backs down from his reasoning that a man can be covered when he is not praying or prophesying (based upon the fact that he is told to be uncovered only when he prays or prophesies), then he has another problem. Mark takes the position that the covering that the man is forbidden from wearing in v.4 would include anything, including an artificial covering. Notice that Mark indicated this on page 11 of his tract when he said in commenting on v.4 that, Most, if not all lexicographers will define covered in this verse as we have given. Therefore, Paul is simply teaching that man cannot have anything - any type of ornament - covering his head while praying or prophesying. On the other hand, man may, without sin, wear some ornaments on their heads if they are not praying or prophesying. For example, some jobs or sport activities may necessitate some fashion of a head covering and nothing is wrong with such since they are not praying or prophesying. Now if Mark changes and doesnt think that the fact that the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves that he may be covered when he is not praying or prophesying, then the only other conclusion left is that he must be uncovered at all times (just like Mark says that the woman of v.5 must be covered at all times). This would mean that it would be wrong for a man to wear any kind of covering (baseball hat, "anything"), at any time.

134. In his response to my question #15, Mark again agrees with this number one proof of my position. Here Mark admits that when a Father commands his daughter to "be sure and have your head covered when you go outside," that normally an artificial covering would be under consideration. So Mark recognizes that when a person puts a "when" clause (like "when praying or prophesying," or "when you go outside") on a command to be covered, the when clause tells you that the covering being referred to is put-on-able and take-off-able. Mark, if you would just apply that same reasoning to I Cor 11:5-7, you would have the truth on the issue between us!
135. Mark also can tell that the covering of Gen 38:14-15 is an artificial one (see his answer to my question #11), I believe, for the same reason that I can tell that her covering was an artificial one (not the hair), because it was something she did for an occasion (a certain time), something she could do and undo at certain times.
136. Of course the real point is that the fact that the woman is told to have her head covered when she prays or prophesies, implies (proves) that the covering under consideration is a temporary one, it can be put on for the occasion of praying or prophesying, and taken off afterwards. Since she cannot put the long hair on when she prays, and take the long hair off when she is not praying, the covering of v.5 cannot be the long hair.

### **The Definition of "Shorn"**

137. When I Cor 11:6a says "For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn." The word also connecting the two phrases, "not covered and shorn," shows that the two are different. Now, if the Greek word translated shorn in v.6 means simply to shear, or cut without reference to length (how much is cut off), then the long (uncut) hair cannot be the covering of v.6a. To repeat, the word also in the phrase shows that not covered and shorn are two different things. Now if shorn means cut without any reference to how much is cut off (like the shearing of sheet metal), and if not covered means to cut the hair (Mark's position), then the verse would be saying, "For if the woman cuts her hair, let her also cut her hair." This is nonsensical. The hair only position would only make sense if shorn means to cut a lot, because the verse could be saying, "if a woman cuts her hair a little, let her also cut her hair a lot." But Mark agreed that a fitting definition of shorn is "to shear, or cut" and this definition (since it has no reference to length) rules out the possibility of only one covering being taught by v.6. I am not saying that there are no dictionaries that define "shorn" to mean "cut short," but I am saying that nobody can prove conclusively that shorn means to cut a lot (with reference to length), and therefore since one could never be sure that there are not two coverings under consideration in v.6,

they would have to practice both. Let me repeat, if the hair only view is correct, v.6 only makes sense if shorn means to cut a lot, and no one can prove conclusively that that is the case.

138. I will now give some definitions of the word that do not indicate that "shorn" necessarily means to cut "short," but only indicate that shorn means "to cut" without reference to how much is cut off:

Greek ("keiro")

New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon - to shear, cut

Strongs - to shear

United Bible Society Greek New Testament - cut one's hair, have one's hair cut

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich - shear a sheep [an example of its use], cut one's hair or have one's hair cut, have one's hair cut

Greek-English Dictionary by Prof. K. Feyerabend, Ph.D. - to cut off, clip, shear

Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament by F. Wilbur Gingrich - have one's hair cut

English (appropriate because "keiro" is translated "shorn" by scholars)

Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language - 1) to cut as with shears, 2) to clip (hair) from (the head), (wool) from (sheep), etc.; 1. a machine for cutting metal

Random House College Dictionary - 1) to cut (something), 2) to remove by or as by cutting or clipping, 3) to cut or clip the hair

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (Pocket) - to cut the hair or wool from; clip, trim

American Heritage Dictionary - to remove (fleece or hair) by cutting or clipping

Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary - to cut the hair, fleece, etc.

Webster's New Universal Dictionary of the English Language -

1. to cut with shears or a similar sharp-edged instrument

2. to remove (the hair, wool, etc.) by cutting or clipping; as, to shear a fleece

3. to cut or clip the hair, wool, etc. from

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary - to cut with shears or scissors: ... to cut ... shortened (shears - An instrument consisting of two blades with bevel edges used for cutting cloth or other substances by interception between two blades)

139. I bring these definitions up simply to show that some dictionaries give the definition of "keiro" or "shorn" as "to cut," without reference to how much is cut off. Mark has given some dictionaries that give the definition as to cut "short." How can we be sure which dictionaries are right? And if we cannot be sure, if

"keiro" might mean "to cut" without reference to how much is cut, then we could never be sure that the hair is the covering, because the word "also" in I Cor 11:6 shows that "not covered" and "shorn" are two different things.

### **Different Greek Words**

140. At this time I would like to point out that a different Greek word is used in verses 5, 6, 7, and 13, than in v.15. Although I don't think that this proves that two different coverings are under consideration, I think it is significant, and does weaken Mark's case for the hair being the covering taught necessary by verses 5 and 6. Let me make the following perfectly clear: these words are not simply different because they have different endings. They are not simply different forms of the same basic (root) Greek word. They are different basic Greek words altogether. The noun form of the word translated covering in v.15 is peribolaion. The verb form for this word is periballo. The noun form of the word translated covering in verses 5, 6, and 13 is kalumma. The verb forms for this word are kalupto, katakalupto, akatakalupto, and ou katakalupto. So it would NOT have been impossible for the same basic Greek word to have been used in v.15 as in the other verses. Now, Paul used one word in verses 5, 6, 7, and 13, and then suddenly switched to a different one in v.15. I ask Mark, WHY, if they refer to the same covering?
141. The significance of the fact that different basic Greek words are used, when Paul could have used the same basic Greek word, can be seen when compared with one of the answers that we normally give to a person who is contending for Bales Doctrine. This doctrine says that the word bondage in I Cor 7:15 is referring to the marriage bond, and therefore a Christian is free to remarry (Not Under Bondage, that is, not under the marriage bond) if their spouse deserts them (even when no fornication is involved). One of my first answers to this doctrine is to point out that the Greek word translated bondage in I Cor 7:15 is not the same as the Greek word translated bound in I Cor 7:39 and Rom 7:2, which does refer to the marriage bond. The fact that two different Greek words are used, is significant in this case. Although not proving conclusively that bondage in I Cor 7:15 does not refer to the marriage bond (because sometimes two different words do refer to the same idea or thing), the fact that two different words are used takes away from any proof that Mr. Bales has that bondage in I Cor 7:15 does refer to the marriage bond (simply because the English words look similar). The same applies to I Cor 11. The fact that two different basic Greek words are used in the passage, does not conclusively prove that two different coverings are in view; however, it certainly takes away from any proof that Mark has that the covering of v.15 is the same covering that

is mentioned in the other verses (simply because the English words used are similar).

142. We also understand this principle when we are explaining why Gal 6:2 doesn't contradict Gal 6:5. Two different Greek words are translated "burden(s)" in these verses. Though the two Greek words are translated into the same English word, and though the two Greek words have similar meanings, it is significant, when explaining how the two verses do not contradict, that there are two different Greek words used. Mark, do you agree?
143. Another example is the significance of the fact that the word "for" in Acts 2:38 ("for the remission of sins") and the word "for" in I Cor 7:26 ("for the present distress") are translated from two different Greek words. In I Cor 7:26, the word "for" carries with it the idea of "because of," but if a Baptist tried to argue it was the same in Acts 2:38 (simply because it was translated into the same English word), I would point out to him that two different Greek words were used. In these two verses, two different Greek words are translated into the same English word, and carry similar (they both introduce the "reason" for the instruction), but not identical meanings. But the Baptist's argument is not valid, and one of the reasons that it is not valid is because two different Greek words are being used.
144. You see, the fact that there are two different Greek words is significant in both of these cases isn't it? It is likewise also significant in I Cor 11.

### **Mark's Position Demands An Artificial Covering**

145. Earlier in this article, I pointed out that Mark takes the position that the covering that the man is forbidden from wearing in v.4 would include anything, including an artificial covering. Now, since Mark believes that v.4 includes an artificial covering, then I can show that Mark's position demands an artificial covering, if I can show that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of verses 5, 6 and 7. This is not hard to do. I believe any unbiased reader can see that v.4 is telling the man not to be covered for one reason, and v.7 is just adding another reason to the same command. Verses 4 and 7 tell the man not to be covered, v.4 tells when the covering is forbidden. Verses 5 and 6 just turn it around and tell the woman to be covered, v.5 tells when the covering is required. There is obviously no difference in the coverings, Paul is just giving the different genders opposite instructions concerning the same covering, and concerning the same occasion of time. As a matter of fact, there is no Greek word for covering in v.4, it is in effect supplied by the translators from verses 5, 6 and 7 ("kalumma or its equiv., is suggested to the reader by the context in I Cor 11:4," Thayer, pg.322, Strongs #2571), so it would have to be the

same covering as mentioned in verses 5, 6, and 7. Now, since Mark has said in his tract that the covering of v.4 would include an artificial covering, and since the covering of verses 5, 6, and 7 is the same covering as the covering of v.4, then it follows that the covering of verses 5, 6, and 7 would include an artificial covering. This contradicts Mark's whole point that the hair is the only covering talked about in the context. To be consistent, Mark would have to say, at the very least, that an artificial covering OR long hair is required by the passage. Of course, I repudiate this logical conclusion of Mark's position.

146. In summary, I have given proof that the covering of v.5 cannot be the covering of v.15, because the covering of v.5 is temporary (while praying or prophesying), but the covering of v.15 is permanent. I have shown that because the word "shorn" is defined by some as "to shear, or cut" without reference to how much is cut off, then there is no way to be sure that the word "also" in v.6 does not rule out Mark's view (the word "also" shows that "not covered" is different than "shorn" in v.6, so if "shorn" means simply "to cut," then "not covered" could not refer to cutting the long hair). I have shown that the Greek word translated "covered" in verses 5, 6, 7, and 13 comes from a totally different Greek root word than the Greek word translated "covering" in v.15 comes from. Why would Paul use one word all the way through, and then switch when he refers to the long hair in v.15? Could it be because v.15 has a different covering in view? And lastly, I have proven that the covering of verses 5, 6, 7, and 13 includes an artificial covering by using Mark's own admission. He admits an artificial covering is in v.4, and I proved that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of verses 5, 6, and 7.

147. Why reject the plain teaching of this passage? I believe anybody can see that a covering that is to be worn by a woman when she is praying or prophesying is a temporary (artificial) one, and not a permanent (natural) one as the long hair is. Every woman, therefore, should have (or use) both coverings required by the passage, the permanent (natural) long hair covering of v.15, and the temporary (artificial) covering of verses 5, 6, and 13 when she prays.

**PAT DONAHUE'S QUESTIONS FOR MARK BAILEY  
(BAILEY'S ANSWERS)**

**FIRST AFFIRMATIVE**

- Q16. One of the main tenets of James "Bales' Doctrine" is that I Cor 7:12-15 teaches that if a believing spouse is deserted by their unbelieving spouse, then the believing spouse may divorce that unbelieving spouse and remarry scripturally, even if the unbelieving spouse never commits fornication. Mr. Bales bases this conclusion on the fact that I Cor 7:15 says that the believing spouse "is not under bondage in such cases," and that the word "bondage" in I Cor 7:15 (according to him) is referring to the same marriage bond that is referred to in I Cor 7:39 and Rom 7:2. He reasons that since Rom 7:2-3 allows remarriage once the marriage bond is broken, then since I Cor 7:15 is showing that desertion breaks the marriage bond, then remarriage is allowed. Mark, do you agree with Mr. Bales' conclusion (that a Christian who is deserted by an unbelieving spouse may scripturally remarry) and reasoning (that "bondage" in I Cor 7:15 refers to the marriage bond of I Cor 7:39 and Rom 7:2)? If not, do you believe that the fact that "bondage" in I Cor 7:15 is translated from a different Greek word than the word "bound" is translated from in I Cor 7:39 and Rom 7:2, is significant in answering this false teaching?
- A16 NO (to both questions). Different words never necessitates different meanings. Different meanings (not different words) necessitates the difference in meaning.
- Q17. Please explain why if Mr. Vine's words under "hair" prove your position, then why do not Mr. Vine's words under "wash" ("in Acts 22:16, where the command to Saul of Tarsus to wash away his sins indicates that by his public confession, he would testify to the removal of his sins, and to the complete change from his past life; this 'washing away' was not in itself the actual remission of his sins, which had taken place at his conversion") prove the Baptist position that baptism only "ceremonially" washes away sins?
- A17. Because Mr. Vine is explaining the word "wash" (not baptized) under the word "wash." He is merely explaining the purpose of baptism is to remove sin or metaphorically to "wash away sins." However, Mr. Vine, under the word "**hair**" is explaining "**hair**," that is, "the long hair of the spirit- beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (compare 1 Corinthians 11:10, (R.V.))" To remove all doubt as to what he has reference to, Mr Vine (under #2) says, "The word *kome* (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair of the woman is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated

in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10." Notice that he once again refers to verse 10, as he did in the first quotation, and clearly states that **"the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair ... is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority."** Not only in verse 15 but in verses "1-10" as well.

Q18. Precisely, what does I Cor 11:6 teach?: (a) - that to be covered is the same as having long hair, or (b) - that uncovered is different than (but just as bad as) shorn or shaven? Does this verse, by itself, teach conclusively that long hair is the covering?

A18. 1 Corinthians 11:6 teaches: "For if the woman be not covered, (cut hair, but not necessarily close cut) let her also be shorn (hair cut close): but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn (hair cut close) or shaven (hair completely removed), let her be covered (have uncut hair)." Very simple isn't it? Yes, this verse, by itself, does teach conclusively that long hair is the covering. Notice how: "For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn (**What is shorn??? HAIR**): but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn (**What is shorn??? HAIR**) or shaven (**What is shaven??? HAIR**), let her be covered." Three times, in this one verse, "hair" is referred to; thus, the context of this verse is "hair." There is not even an indication to something artificial.

Q19. Is it significant (to the "purpose of baptism" issue) that the word "for" in I Cor 7:26 is translated from a different Greek word than the word "for" in Acts 2:38 is translated from? Please answer yes or no, then elaborate if you want to.

A19. No, the significance is in the meaning of the different words and not the fact that different words were used. To prove this fact I ask: If the two different words had the same definition would there be any significance to the different words?

Q20. Does the definition of shorn by the United Bible Society Greek New Testament ("cut one's hair, have one's hair cut") state or imply any amount that is cut off, any length that is cut to? Please answer yes or no, then elaborate if you want to.

A20 I do not know because I do not have a copy of the United Bible Society Greek New Testament. If the quotation you gave is the complete definition then the answer is no; however, without failure **every Greek New Testament, dictionary, lexicon or any other source that gives definitions**, always signifies hair cut short if they indicate the length that is cut. In other words, no source defines "shorn" as hair cut a small amount. If an indication is given it is **always** "hair cut short or close." I challenge you to present the definition otherwise!

## MARK BAILEY'S FIRST NEGATIVE

148. It is with pleasure that I present the denial of the proposition that Brother Donahue is attempting to affirm. I trust this discussion will continue with the good Christian attitude as it did in the first proposition.
149. In paragraph #128, brother Donahue, states his proposition: "The Scriptures teach that a woman must wear an artificial covering (in addition to her long hair) while praying or prophesying." He failed to define his proposition, but I must ask him to do so that we might have a clear understanding of what he is affirming. For example: "woman" - does this refer to Christian women only or to unbelievers also. When you bring a visiting unbaptized neighbor to worship or if you have a home-study with her do you ask her to wear an artificial veil during the praying or teaching? Does it refer to baby girls (maybe at their first service). "an artificial covering" - What does it consist of? "While praying or prophesying" - What does this mean? Is the artificial covering to be worn any time prayer is offered or only in worship? Is it to be worn when singing, listening to the preacher, while communion is observed (after prayer)? What is "prophesying" - is this the preaching service during worship or anytime a woman is in the presence where God's word is being explained. Please explain and be specific. I gladly except Brother Donahue's clarification of the parenthetical statement found in his proposition. We learned from the first proposition that he had to either change or clarify his position.
150. In paragraph #129 my brother says that he is going to prove his proposition "by the scriptures." By his own admission, this is not possible, because his proposition says, "a woman must wear an **artificial covering**"; however, in answer to my Question #16 Brother Donahue clearly states: "Paul does not specifically use the word 'artificial' in verses 5,6, or 13." Not only does 1 Corinthians 11 not state anything about an artificial covering, but in answer to my question #17 brother Donahue clearly states, "I know of no Greek Lexicon that uses the word artificial in the definition of the Greek word translated 'covered,' 'uncovered,' or 'not covered' in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,and 13." Since 1 Corinthians 11 does not state "artificial covering" and since the Greek Lexicons do not define any words in 1 Corinthian 11 as something "artificial" then Brother Donahue's proposition is already proven false. He cannot prove by the Scriptures, what the Scriptures do not say.
160. In paragraph #130 Brother Donahue refers to the restricted time of "praying or prophesying" and asserts that since Paul gives this particular time that this indicates that she does not have to be covered when not praying or prophesying. Please answer for us: Is it necessary for a woman to wear an

artificial covering if she is not praying or prophesying - for example, during worship while she is singing or while the collection is being taken care of? Furthermore, when does a woman "pray" or "prophesy" in your assemblies? Brother Donahue states, with no proof, that "praying or prophesying" "implies that the covering of verse 5 can be worn for an occasion, and taken off after the occasion is passed,..." Such is absurd! Notice the following chart #1 where specifics are named but not restricted to:

### CHART #1

Mark 11:24 "Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." **Here we are told to believe when you "pray." Is this teaching that you only have to "believe" while you are praying and that if you are not in the process of praying that you do not have to believe? Or must you believe AT ALL TIMES that you will receive the things prayed for?**

Mark 11:25 "And when ye stand praying, forgive..." **Here we are told to forgive when we "stand praying." Is this verse teaching that you only have to "forgive" when you are praying while STANDING or must you forgive AT ALL TIMES?**

1 Corinthians 14:35 "And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home:..." **Here the "home" is specifically named. Does this mean that the woman cannot ask her husband a Biblical question in the car, or in a friends home?**

1 Timothy 5:4 "But if any widow have children or nephews, let them learn first to shew piety at home, ..." **Here the "home" is specifically named. Does this mean that the children or nephews does not have to "shew piety" if not at home?**

Praying or prophesying is used in the same way that things in these verses are used. The objects are not necessarily restricted to the specific time or place named. Now, if it is impossible to do these things at other times or places the case would be different.

**NOTHING IN THIS PARAGRAPH PROVES AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.**

161. In paragraphs #131-133 Brother Donahue quotes from my tract "Woman's Glory" where I said that Paul "mentions a specific time that is not appropriate for man to cover himself ... while praying or prophesying. ... however, if he is not 'praying or prophesying' he can be covered, since he would be able to 'uncover' himself before he enters into the specific acts of 'praying or prophesying' again." My brother agrees with this. I am glad. But then he asks: "why wouldn't the same reasoning prove that since a woman is to be covered when she prays or prophesies, then it would be right for her to be uncovered when she is not praying or prophesying? Brother, continue reading because 5 lines further I explained why the same reasoning does not apply to woman, that is, "Because, (unlike man) she would not be able to 'cover' herself, that is, regain her 'long hair' before she 'prays or prophesies' again." **NOTHING IN THESE PARAGRAPHS PROVES AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.**
162. Since Brother Donahue brought up "man" let me ask: Is it acceptable for a man to wear a covering to worship while singing or during communion if he is not praying or prophesying? In other words, if he will remove his covering while praying or prophesying can he put it back on during any other activity in your worship service?
163. In paragraph #134 Brother Donahue refers to my answer to his question #15; however, he is attempting to make me say what I never said. He failed to state that I said, "It would depend upon the context. Most likely he would be referring to an artificial covering; however, if he said, "if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her **hair is given her for a covering**" (verse 15) therefore, be sure you keep your covering; he would be referring to long hair. **WOULDN'T HE???**" Why did you do this. Don't try to mislead our readers! The context of the scenario you stated in question #15 would more than likely indicate an artificial covering; However, why did you not take this opportunity to answer the question I asked at the end of my answer. Will you answer it now??? **NOTHING IN THIS PARAGRAPH PROVES AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.**
164. In paragraph 135 Brother Donahue refers to his question #11 and states that Mark "can tell that the covering of Genesis 38:14-15 is an artificial one." Yes, I can, but how? As I said, "... because of the context which states "she had covered her face" and the face is not covered with hair." Again, I ask you Brother Donahue, why didn't you take this opportunity to answer the question I asked in response to your question #11? I said, "Pat are you suggesting that this covering in Genesis 38:14-15 is the same covering in 1 Corinthians 11? This 'vail' was used to cover the face and it was an indication of harlotry. Verse 15 says, 'When Judah saw her, he thought her to be an harlot;...!' **WHY DID HE**

**THINK HER TO BE A HARLOT? THE NEXT PHRASE SAYS** "... because she had covered her face." Surly you are not saying this is the same veil of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16! Why want you answer my questions? Will you answer it now??? **NOTHING IN THIS PARAGRAPH PROVES AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.**

165. Paragraph 136 restates Brother Donahue's assertion that praying or prophesying implies an artificial covering. However, as proven. **NOTHING IN THIS PARAGRAPH PROVES AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.**

### **THE DEFINITION OF "SHORN"**

166. Since Brother Donahue's first "proof" concerning praying or prophesying did not prove an artificial covering let's notice (in paragraph 137-139) his second "proof" concerning the words "also" and "shorn." My brother states that the word "also" in 1 Corinthians 11:6a connects the words "not covered" and "shorn" and shows that the two are different. I agree with this logic. They both refer to hair; however "not covered," or "uncovered" as I have proven by the context of 1 Corinthians 11 (see my answer to Donahue's Question #18) and other Bible passages refer to cut hair and the word "shorn" refers to hair cut close. In paragraph #7 I gave Leviticus 10:6 and 21:10 as examples of where the word "uncover," without question, refers to hair. Leviticus 10:6: "Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, **Uncover not your heads, ....**" Also notice Leviticus 21:10: "He that is the high priest...shall **not uncover his head, ...**" In these two verses we have similar statements as found in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,13 referring to being "uncovered." The word "uncovered" in these Old Testament verses is defined by Gesenius Hebrew - Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, page 690 as "to make naked...**specially by shaving**, Leviticus 10:6; 21:10." The Septuagint (Greek Old Testament) shows that the Hebrew word for "uncover" comes from the same Greek word as is found in 1 Corinthians 11:6. This is proof that in all these places (Leviticus 10:6; 21:10; 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,13) the word "uncover" refers to hair and not something artificial.

167. Now let's consider Brother Donahue's statement concerning the word "shorn." He say "Now, if the Greek word translated 'shorn' in verse 6 means simply "'to shear, or cut' without reference to length (how much is cut off)," then the long (uncut) hair cannot be the covering of verse 6:a." The **key word** to take note of here is **"IF,"** Brother Donahue says, "if the Greek word translated 'shorn' in verse 6 means and then he gives the definition. However, notice in answer to my question 18, my brother says, "The Greek and English Dictionaries that I have quoted **do not** state that 'shorn' does not have reference to length." In

paragraph 137 Brother Donahue puts quotations around the so-called meaning of the word shorn. He says "'to shear, or cut' without reference to length (how much is cut off)". I cautioned my brother in the first proposition to not be so misleading. He knows that no one gives this definition for shorn, but yet, he uses quotation marks to imply that he is quoting someone else. **Shame on you!** Whenever the scholars define the word "shorn" and refers to the length they always indicate "cut short," "cut off," or "cut close" (see paragraphs 52 & 53 for 22 scholars which gives these definitions). This is conclusive proof that "shorn" means to "cut short," "cut off," or "cut close." The problem is being willing to accept the proof.

- 168 Now let's look at Donahue's chart on the Greek word ("keiro") or "shorn" where he gives six definitions of this word and explains that shorn means to cut "without reference to how much is cut off." These sources do not prove what my brother is wanting. For example, he names the New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon, Strongs, Arndt and Gingrich Lexicon, and Feyerabend and they all state that the word "shorn" means "to shear." What does the word "shear" mean. Webster defines it as "To **remove** (fleece or hair) by cutting or clipping. ... To **strip, divest, or deprive of**." It is easy to understand from words such as "remove," "strip," "divest," and "deprive of" that cutting very close is under consideration. Who would deny it? Brother Donahue also gives the definition from the Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament by Gingrich as "have one's hair cut." Brother, don't you realize that this Lexicon does not even claim to be a thorough Lexicon. This is the reason that it is referred to as a "Shorter Lexicon." If you really want to know Mr Gingrich complete definition refer to 4th source which you named (Arndt and Gingrich's Lexicon) for there he explains that the definition has reference to "shear." Gingrich even gives an example of "shearing a sheep." Brother Donahue, when a sheep is sheared is the fleece cut short or is it barely trimmed? Please answer.
169. In the second chart Brother Donahue gives English dictionaries to define the word shorn. However, understand, that we are dealing with the word as used in 1 Corinthians 11 which comes from the Greek language and not the English language; therefore, these English dictionaries proves nothing for him. Even if they could be used for proof, they would still not help because Webster (4 of the 7 sources) refers "shorn" to "**shearing**" as to a sheep (see paragraph 168)." He also refers to Funk & Wagnalls which states "to cut the hair, fleece, etc." Notice the shorn hair is equal to the shorn fleece of a sheep. Another source he named is Random House college Dictionary and American Heritage which both defines "shorn" as "**to remove** by or as by cutting or clipping." Now think about these definitions: #1)"SHEARING" which means to "**strip, divest, or deprive of**." #2)"TO REMOVE." What is so difficult about these meanings. **NOTICE THAT NOTHING IN PARAGRAPHS 137-139 CONCERNING "SHORN"**

## AND "ALSO" PROVES AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.

### DIFFERENT GREEK WORDS

170. In paragraph 140, Brother Donahue bring up, again, the fact that there are two different Greek words used in reference to the covering in 1 Corinthians 11. Verses 5,6,& 13 uses *katakalupto* or the negative *akatakalupto* which are verbs and adjectives while verse 15 uses the noun *peribolaion*. I really do not understand why my brother makes this argument because he even states: "I don't think that this proves that two different coverings are under consideration,..." The reason that he knows this argument doesn't prove his proposition is because, as he has already admitted (paragraph 80) that the two words "could be used interchangeably without violence." Brother Donahue asked, **WHY** did Paul suddenly switch to a different word in verse 15. The answer, Pat, is as you have stated, is because they are interchangeable, "without violence"; Therefore, why not! They are also used interchangeably in the Septuagint (Greek Old Testament):

#### **Psalms 104:6,9**

"Thou **coveredst** (*peribolaion*) it with the deep as with a garment: ... Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to **cover** (*kalupsai*) the earth."

#### **Genesis 38:14&15**

Tamar "**covered**" (*periebale*) her with a veil... Judah thought she was a harlot because "she had **covered** (*katekalupsato*) her face."

## THEREFORE, ABSOLUTELY NOTHING IN PARAGRAPH 140 CONCERNING THE DIFFERENT GREEK WORDS PROVE AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.

171. In paragraphs 141-144 Brother Donahue attempts to compare the words "bondage," "burden," and "for" to the words "covered," "uncovered," "not covered," and "covering" in 1 Corinthians 11:15. His argument is based on the idea that two different Greek words are used in all of these examples. However, his examples will not work because the two different Greek words in 1 Corinthians 11:2-15 are and have been used interchangeably in the Scriptures (See paragraph #170) and according to Brother Donahue they are interchangeable, "without violence." Pat, is the same true with the two different Greek words translated "bondage" and "bound" in 1 Corinthians 7:15&39? Are they interchangeable "without violence? Are the two words translated "burden" in Galatians 6:2&5 used interchangeable "without violence"? Are the different

words translated "for" used interchangeable "without violence?" **ABSOLUTELY NOT! THEREFORE, THE COMPARISON DOES NOT STAND. NOTHING IN PARAGRAPHS 141-144 CONCERNING THE DIFFERENT GREEK WORDS PROVE AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11, even Brother Donahue honestly states, "...sometimes two different words do refer to the same idea or thing." (Paragraph 141).**

### MARK'S POSITION DEMANDS AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING

172. In paragraph 145 Brother Donahue attempts to compare the word "covered" in verse 4 to the words "uncovered," "not covered, and "covered" in verses 5&6. He states that "there is obviously no difference in the coverings." He continues by saying, "...there is no Greek word for covering in verse 4,..." Pat, if there is no Greek word how can you say there is no difference in the coverings? You quoted Thayer on page 322 dealing with the word "*kalumma*," which by the way is not found in 1 Corinthians 11. All that a unbiased person has to do to find out about the words "having his head covered" in verse 4 is to go to any interlinear and where they read: Every man praying or prophesying **"having anything"** down over his head shames the head of him. Thus man's covering is "anything" but woman's covering is her long hair. 1 Corinthians 11:15 "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." **NOTHING IN PARAGRAPH 145 CONCERNING MAN'S COVERING IN VERSE 4 PROVE AN ARTIFICIAL COVERING FOR THE WOMEN IN 1 CORINTHIANS 11.**
173. In paragraph 146 Brother Donahue summaries his first affirmative. Generally, in a debate, the first affirmative states the best arguments. If this is the case in this debate Brother Donahue has already defeated himself. He mentioned the two difference Greek words used in 1 Corinthians 11. I referred to this fact as my affirmative material and proved **by the Scriptures** that in the Greek Old Testament they were used interchangeably. Pat agreed and stated that such could be done "without violence." Furthermore, in answer to question #20 concerning these two words, Pat says, "As far as I know, the word '*peribolaion*' could possibly describe something that would suffice for the covering required by verse 6." He further states that in this context it does not suffice but the previous sentence he said "the word '*peribolaion*' could possibly describe something that would suffice..." This defeats everything he has to say concerning the two different words. He further says, "I have proven that the covering of verses 5,6,7, and 13 includes an artificial covering..." **NO HE DID NOT!** Instead he says, "Paul does not specifically use the word 'artificial' in verses 5,6,or 13. (his answer to question #16)." He also says (answer to #17) "I know of no Greek Lexicon that uses the word artificial in the definition of the Greek word translated 'covered,' 'uncovered,' or 'not covered' in 1 Corinthians

11:5,6 and 13." Since the Bible does not say "artificial" covering and no Greek Lexicon defines Bible words (in 1 Corinthians 11) as "artificial" we must conclude that an artificial covering is not taught. He also refers to "praying or prophesying" as being the restricted time for the covering to be worn. However, I proved by stating several Biblical examples that when the Scriptures name certain times, people and places they are not necessarily restricted to these times only. No one can deny such! Since he challenged me for this debate I expected more from him. We must be careful that we do not try to make the Bible agree to our particular views; instead, we should make our particular views upon the Biblical teaching. In paragraph 129 Brother Donahue stated: "I plan to prove the proposition by the scriptures (Acts 9:22, 18:28). However, I call your attention to the sources that he used. Very few were Scriptures.

174. In Pat's final paragraph he asks, "Why reject the plain teaching of this passage? Yes, brother, WHY???" Notice the plain teaching:

1. Every passage in 1 Corinthians 11 that uses the words "covered," "uncovered," or "not covered" also speaks of hair; therefore, the context is hair and not something artificial. Pat even states the word "artificial" is not found in 1 Corinthians 11 nor does any lexicon define any words in this context as artificial.
2. The two different Greek words for "covering" and "covered," "uncovered" and "not covered" are interchangeable. Proof of this is given in Genesis 38:14, Psalms 104:6&9 Pat agrees to this truth. Therefore, in 1 Corinthians 11:15 when Paul said, "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." This clearly proves that the **"LONG HAIR," not something artificial, is the covering of this context.**
3. In verse 10 we find that woman is to have "power" on her head as a sign of subjection. Vine tells us that long hair is this sign. "The word (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair of the woman is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10."
4. The Greek Old Testament (Leviticus 10:6; 21:10) proves that a person is "uncovered" by removing her hair. Gesenius Hebrew Lexicon (page 690) defines "uncover" as "to make naked...**specially by shaving.**" 1 Corinthians 11:5 says an uncovered woman "...is even all one as if she were shaven." **WHAT IS SHAVEN? HAIR!** Verse 6: "If a woman be not covered, let her be shorn." **WHAT IS SHORN? HAIR!** Verse 13: "Is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? **WHAT IS THIS COVERING?** Verses 14-15: "Doth not even

nature itself teach you, that, if a man have **long hair**, it is a shame unto him?  
But if a woman have **long hair**, it is a glory to her: **FOR HER HAIR IS GIVEN  
HER FOR A COVERING."**

## MARK BAILEY'S QUESTIONS TO PAT DONAHUE

- Q21. Please describe what the artificial covering of your proposition looks like. Since your proposition says "The Scriptures teach" please give Scripture to support your answer.
- A21 I am affirming that a woman should wear an artificial covering, I am not affirming what that covering should look like. However, I will state that the covering needs to completely cover the head, but need not necessarily cover any more than the head. It is something that can be worn temporarily like a piece of clothing (other things might qualify), and therefore is not the long hair. I will now answer other related questions. The woman under consideration is any woman, Christian or not. I am not sure at what age a young girl should start wearing the covering. A man can wear a covering during the assembly when he is not praying or prophesying, such as during the collection.
- Q22. Does "praying or prophesying" refer only to the acts of praying or prophesying or do they also refer to times such as singing in worship?
- A22 I believe that "praying or prophesying" refers only to the acts of praying or prophesying, and do not refer to the other acts of assembly worship (such as the collection). A woman might need to wear a covering when she sings (although I doubt it), because she does teach when she sings.
- Q23. Must a woman wear an artificial covering only while praying or prophesying at worship services or all times that she is engaged in praying or prophesying?
- A23 The woman needs to wear the covering whenever she prays or prophesies, even outside of the assembly. It is sin if she does not.
- Q24. Concerning woman, verse 13 asks, "is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" Paul's only answer to the question (concerning woman) is in verse 15 "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." Please explain where the artificial covering is referred to or hinted at in this question and answer.
- A24 The artificial covering is alluded to in v.13 when Paul uses the word "pray" to specify when the covering must be worn. This time specification ("pray") shows that the covering under consideration is a temporary one.

Q25. In Biblical days did Christian women wear an artificial covering while praying or prophesying and remove the artificial covering if she was not praying or prophesying? Please give proof.

A25 The women that were faithful to God in Biblical days wore an artificial covering when they prayed or prophesied, and removed this covering when they were not praying or prophesying if they so chose. The proof is I Cor 11:5 and 13.

## Pat Donahue's Second Affirmative

### More on Praying or Prophecy

175. In paragraph #150, Mark says it is impossible for me to prove that an "artificial" covering is under consideration in I Cor 11:5-6 because the word "artificial" is not specifically used in the passage, and because the word "covered" is not defined as something "artificial." Of course Mark is inconsistent with this remark, because he believes the covering of Gen 38:14-15 is an "artificial" one (see his answer #11), even though the word "artificial" is not in the text. Mark, do you know of any Hebrew Lexicons "that use the word artificial in the definition" of any of the words found in Gen 38:14-15? I wonder if Mark would apply his same reasoning to the idea of the Lord's Supper being found in Acts 20:7? In this verse, the term "Lord's Supper" is not mentioned by name, and a definition of the two words "break bread" would not necessitate the Lord's Supper. How does Mark know that Acts 20:7 is talking about the Lord's Supper? We'll let him tell us how he knows, but I know from other considerations, starting with the fact that the supper is referred to in I Cor 10:16 as the breaking of bread. When I use the word "artificial" in referring to the covering, I am contrasting the covering of vs.5-6 to the "natural" covering of the long hair in v.15 (v.14 uses the word "nature"). My proof for this "artificial" covering is not in the specific word being used, nor in the definition of "cover" (because both the artificial covering and the long hair cover), but my proof is in the temporalness of the covering of vs.5,6,&13, as opposed to the permanency of the long hair.
176. In Mark's paragraph #160, he makes a significant argument against my reasoning that the phrase "prayeth or prophesieth" in I Cor 11:5 shows an artificial covering is in view. I have already dealt with this (Mark's) line of reasoning in my answer #6, so I will be repeating myself some here.
177. Let me begin by saying that the phrase "at home" in I Tim 5:4 is not describing a "when" or a "where" for benevolence, but is specifying a "who" (a widowed mother or aunt). The word "first" in the verse actually proves that "piety" should be shown to other people, but given "second" priority, that is, after we have taken care of our own. In contrast, there is nothing in I Cor 11, or in any other passage in the Bible, that proves the covering of I Cor 11:5-6 must be worn other than when a woman is praying or prophesying.
178. A similar answer can be made to Mk 11:24 and 25. The wording of these verses would normally mean that we only have to "believe that ye receive them" when we "pray," and that we only have to "forgive" when we "stand praying". The

reason we know to take the unusual meaning in this case is because other passages conclusively prove that we must believe (that we will receive) and forgive at other times than when we are praying. Since we must take the normal meaning of words and phrases, unless forbidden by the context, or another statement elsewhere, these passages would teach that the only time we have to believe and forgive, would be when we are praying, except for the fact that other passages show otherwise. An example of this is Lev 1:31. This verse would lead us to conclude that a Israelite would not be unclean if he touched one of these creeping things when they were alive, unless some other verse said otherwise. Another example of this concept is located in Lev 16:17. This verse prohibits any man from being in the "tabernacle of the congregation" while the high priest was making atonement in the "holy place." Wouldn't it indicate to us that the same was not prohibited at other times (unless another verse told us otherwise)?

179. It is my belief that the word "home" in I Cor 14:35 does not refer to only the dwelling place, but actually stands for all other places other than in the assembly (as being typical of these locations). I believe Paul is just telling the woman not to ask questions in the assembly, but instead to ask outside of the assembly, and he specifies "home" only because it is an example of such a place (like we might say, "let them ask their husbands, outside the assembly, say at home"). However, if this "interpretation" is not correct, and Paul is specifying the home independent of other locations, then the same response would apply to this verse as I just made to Mk 11:24 and 25 in the previous paragraph.
180. Most importantly, I would say that in ALL three of these verses that have a "when clause" (Mark 11:24, 25, and I Cor 14:35) like I Cor 11:5-6,13, the "when clause" proves the action required is possible (though not necessarily permissible) to "turn on" for the time of the occasion specified by the "when clause," and "turn off" when the occasion has ended. In Mk 11:24, the "believe that ye will receive" is possible (though not necessarily permissible) to turn on/off when you pray, or at other times. The forgiving of another person in Mk 11:25 is something that is possible (though not necessarily permissible) to "turn on" (do) when praying, and "turn off" (not do) when not praying. The asking of questions by a woman in I Cor 14:35 is possible to do during the occasion specified by the "when clause" (in this case, at home), and then not do at another time, for example, in the assembly. Another Bible example of this principle can be found in Lev 26:17. A good everyday example of this type of command or regulation is when little Johnny is told to "be good at Granddaddy's house on Saturday." The child's mother is not saying that it is o.k. for Johnny to be bad at other times (other information tells Johnny that), but it can be learned from what the Mother says that it is possible to turn on/off this behavior while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday. On the other hand, it

wouldn't make any sense for the Mother to tell Johnny to "grow taller when you are at Granddaddy's house on Saturday" (because the boy's height is permanent relative to the time that he would be visiting Granddaddy), and this is what would be parallel to telling a woman to have long hair when she prays or prophesies. The good behavior of Johnny at Granddaddy's on Saturday, the believing in the case of Mk 11:24, the forgiving in the case of Mk 11:25, and the asking of a question in the case of I Cor 14:35, are all things that are possible to be done on a temporary basis. The covering of I Cor 11:5 is also something that can be done or not done on a temporary basis; it can be done while praying or prophesying, and it is possible to not be done when not praying or prophesying. The covering of I Cor 11:15 is different though. The long hair is either had, or not had, on a permanent basis, it can not just be turned on and off for occasions such as praying or prophesying. The conclusion is, therefore, that the covering that is to be worn while a woman "prayeth or prophesieth" is not, and cannot be, the permanent covering of long hair referred to in I Cor 11:15.

181. To clarify my argument again, I am not saying the phrase "prayeth or prophesieth" in I Cor 11:5 proves by itself that a woman doesn't have to be covered at other times. For example, if there were another passage in the Bible that taught that the woman should be covered while cooking, I wouldn't think there is a contradiction, I would simply think this covering must be worn when a woman prays, prophesies, or cooks. What I am saying is that the phrase "prayeth or prophesieth" shows that it is possible for the covering to be put on for the occasion of prayer, and taken off after the prayer. This is what does not fit the long hair, and therefore rules it out.
  
182. As I pointed out in my question #2, Mark indicated in his tract that he agrees with this proof when it is applied to the man. However, he does not accept the same proof when it is applied to the woman. Mark, the reasoning either proves the concept or it doesn't (it is impossible for the reasoning to prove one and not prove the other)! If the fact that the man is told to be uncovered when he prays or prophesies, proves through implication that he may be covered at other times, then it does the same for the woman; that is, the fact that the woman is told to be covered when she prays or prophesies, proves through implication that it is possible for her to be uncovered at other times. It proves it is possible "for her to 'cover' herself, that is, regain her ... (covering, Pat) before she 'prays or prophesies' again." Mark, the fact that the woman cannot "regain her 'long hair' before she 'prays or prophesies' again (Mark, in paragraph #161), does not show that the previous reasoning in your tract (that "praying or prophesying" shows temporalness) is invalid, it only shows that the long hair is not the covering!

183. In response to Mark's paragraph #163, let me say that the reason I did not mention that Mark had said in his answer to my question #15, "It would depend upon the context," is because I had given the context, and so I had assumed that Mark had made his answer ("Most likely he would be referring to an artificial covering") based upon that context given. To respond to Mark's question at the end of his response to my question #15: I am not sure how you are connecting your Father's statement with my Father's statement, but if it was done like I Cor 11 does it (the natural, permanent covering argues for the artificial, temporary), then I would say that an artificial covering is in view; why else would the Father have said, "have your head covered when you go outside?" Notice that the only thing in my question that could have given Mark the idea that the Father was commanding an artificial covering, is the phrase "when ... outside." The phrase "when ... outside," because it specifies a time for the daughter to be covered, indicates that the covering under consideration is a temporary one, and not the long hair.
184. In response to Mark's paragraph #164, please reread my paragraph #123. You can't tell that Tamar's covering of Gen 38:15 is an artificial one because it says she "covered her face," because a woman, who has very long, uncut hair, could cover her face with her hair, if she combed it forward. The only way to tell that an artificial covering is under consideration in Gen 38:14-15 is because she covered herself for an occasion, thereby implying it was a temporary covering. This same reasoning proves that the covering of I Cor 11:5 is a temporary covering also. Regarding Mark's assertion in this paragraph that I had not answered his question he asked in response to my question #11, I did answer the question; let the reader read my paragraph #124 again.

### **The Definition of "Shorn"**

185. Mark says in paragraph #167, "Whenever the scholars define the word 'shorn' and refer to the length they always indicate 'cut short,' 'cut off,' or 'cut close.'" Mark says in his answer #20 that "every Greek New Testament, dictionary, ... always signifies hair cut short if they indicate the length that is cut." In these statements, Mark is finally admitting (through implication) what I have been trying to get him to admit all along, that some scholars define the word "keiro" or "shorn," and do not tell the length that is cut. Mark, why did it take you so long to admit this obvious fact? I have never contended that "shorn" meant to "cut a small amount," I have been contending that some scholars define "shorn," and do not refer to the length. If these scholars (that I have quoted) are right in their definitions, then "shorn" (keiro) means to cut period, no length being specified. This means that when a woman cuts her hair, whether she cuts a little or a lot, she "shears" her hair. Mark asked me in paragraph #168, "when a sheep is sheared is the fleece cut short or is it barely trimmed?" The answer:

cut short. And my definition fits that example, because my definition for shorn can be used for any amount of cutting, a little or a lot. But Mark's definition for "shear" (cut close, a lot, or short) will not fit my illustrative use of the word, the "shearing" of sheet metal. What about it Mark, could the shearing of sheet metal involve only cutting a little metal off of a larger piece? Now if "shorn" simply means "to shear, cut" (New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon) without reference to length, then the long hair could not be the covering of I Cor 11:6, because the verse would be saying "if the woman cuts her hair, let her also cut her hair," which doesn't make any sense!

### **Different Greek Words Are Used**

186. Mark picks some words out of my definitions for "shorn" thinking they indicate "shear" means to cut short necessarily. Mark they don't. The words, "remove," "strip," "divest," "deprive of," do not indicate how much was removed, stripped, divested, or deprived of. For example, remove does not necessarily tell how much is removed. "Shear" obviously doesn't mean "remove all" in the passage, because the only way to remove all your hair is to shave it, and the text clearly shows that "shear" and "shaven" are two different things. For a fuller discussion of this point refer back to my paragraphs #111 and #112.
187. Mark answered (in paragraph #170) my question "why did Paul suddenly switch to a different word in v.15," with "because they are interchangeable, 'without violence.'" Mark this doesn't answer my question. This answers the question, "how could Paul have switched words if your view is true?" I agree that Paul could have; what I want to know is why did he! The bottom line is, two different Greek words are used." Why did Paul do that, if he was referring to the same covering?

### **Mark's Position Demands An Artificial Covering**

188. In paragraph #145, I proved there was no Greek word for "covered" in I Cor 11:4. Any unbiased reader can look at any interlinear and see there is no Greek word for covering in the verse. I gave further prove of this (that there is no Greek word for "covered" in I Cor 11:4) by quoting Thayer as saying on page 322, "kalumma or its equiv., is suggested to the reader by the context in I Cor 11:4." Thayer is saying there is no Greek word for "covered" in v.4, but that the translators got it from the context (vs.5-7). G.G.Findley suggested the same in the "Expositor's Greek Testament," when he said concerning v.4, "a veil: kalumma understood." Therefore, since the word was really supplied from the context, it could only refer to the same thing as the context (vs.5-7) refers to. Mark asked me "if there is no Greek word how can (I) say there is no difference in the coverings?" Mark, that is what I am saying, that "there is no difference in

the coverings," because "there is no Greek word." Of course I gave many others proofs that the coverings of v.4 and vs.5-7 were the same, but Mark failed to respond to them. The reader should go back to paragraph #145 to reread them. Now since I have proven that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of vs.5-7, and since Mark admits that the covering of v.4 includes an artificial covering, then I have proven by Mark's own admission that the covering of vs.5-7 includes an artificial covering.

#### Long Hair Does Not Cover The HEAD Anymore Than Short Hair Does

189. The long hair could not be the covering of I Cor 11:5 because this covering (of v.5) is supposed to cover the HEAD, and the long hair does not cover any more of the HEAD than a man's short hair does. An artificial veil is different, though. The woman's veil covers her head, but the absence of a veil leaves the man's head completely uncovered (artificial-wise, that is). The covering of v.15 is different. The long hair covering is not said to cover the HEAD specifically (as the covering of v.5), but is a covering in general. Long hair on a woman does cover more of her than short hair (meaning more than just the head is covered). To repeat, since long hair does not cover the HEAD anymore than short hair does, the long hair could not be the covering that is to cover the HEAD (the covering of v.5).

#### Mark's Final Four Points

190. Please reread Mark's four points in paragraph #174 before reading the following responses to them. 1) Of course, we have already shown this statement untrue. Both vs.4 and 7 use a form of the word "cover," but do not mention the hair. In addition, if Mark had answered my question #18, he would have answered this point. I Cor 11:16 precisely teaches that "uncovered is different than (but just as bad as) shorn or shaven." 2) The fact that two words may be used interchangeably, implies they might not be used interchangeably sometimes (Mark, would you agree?). So since, these words might not be being used interchangeably in I Cor 11, then there is no proof here. 3) Mr. Vine never "tells us that long hair is this sign" (of v.10). However, if he had, I'll let Mark take Mr. Vine, and instead I'll take Paul in I Cor 11:5. 4) The definition of one O.T. word "uncover" as "to make naked ... specially by shaving" implies that the cutting of the hair is not the only way to become uncovered (notice the word "specially").

#### Summary

191. In summary, I have given proof that the covering of v.5 cannot be the covering of v.15, because the covering of v.5 is temporary (while praying or

prophesying), but the covering of v.15 is permanent. I have shown that because the word "shorn" is defined by some as "to shear, or cut" without reference to how much is cut off, then there is no way to be sure the word "also" in v.6 does not rule out Mark's view. I have shown that the Greek word translated "covered" in vs.5,6,7,&13 comes from a totally different Greek root word than the Greek word translated "covering" in v.15 comes from. Why would Paul use one word all the way through, and then switch when he refers to the long hair in v.15? Could it be because v.15 has a different covering in view? I have proven that the covering of vs.5,6,7,&13 includes an artificial covering by using Mark's own admission. He admits an artificial covering is in v.4, and I proved that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of vs.5,6,&7. And lastly, I have proven that the covering of v.5 cannot be the long hair because the covering of v.5 is to cover the HEAD, and the long hair does not cover the HEAD any more than short hair does.

192. Why reject the plain teaching of this passage? I believe anybody can see that a covering that is to be worn by a woman when she is praying or prophesying is a temporary (artificial) one, and not a permanent (natural) one as the long hair is. Every woman, therefore, should have (or use) both coverings required by the passage, the permanent (natural) long hair covering of v.15, and the temporary (artificial) covering of vs.5,6,&13 when she prays.

PAT DONAHUE'S QUESTIONS FOR MARK BAILEY  
(BAILEY'S ANSWERS)

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE

- Q21. Would it be possible for the Greek words translated "burdens" (Strong's #922) in Gal 6:2 and "burden" (Strong's #5413) in Gal 6:5, to be used interchangeably, "without violence?" Please answer the question "yes" or "no," and then elaborate if you want. Please consider at least the following in formulating your answer: Wigram-Green's definition of Strong's #922 is "weight; fig in N.T., burden, load." Wigram-Green's definition of Strong's #5413 is "a load, a weighty burden." Aren't these definitions very similar? Also use your Greek concordance to look at their uses in the N.T.
- A21 No, if they are interchangeable these two verses would be contradicting each other just as you correctly explained in paragraph 142 and I responded in paragraph 171.
- Q22. Mark, you said in paragraph #167 that "Whenever the scholars define the word 'shorn' and refer to the length they always indicate 'cut short,' 'cut off,' or 'cut close.'" You also said in your answer #20, that "every Greek New Testament, dictionary, ... always signifies hair cut short if they indicate the length that is cut." In light of these two statements, are you admitting that some scholars define the word "keiro" or "shorn," and do not tell "the length that is cut?"
- A22 Such a question is misleading. The fact is: Some scholars (dictionaries, lexicons etc) give a general definition of words while others give a more complete definition. My statements simply proves that when the scholars give the complete definition they always indicate "cut short," "cut off," or "cut close" and when they give an abbreviated definition they may say "cut." No Greek lexicon nor Bible Dictionary defines the word "shorn" (as used in 1 Corinthians 11:6) and actually states that the term does not have reference to length. They know that length ("cut off," "cut short," "cut close") is involved. In my question #11 I asked for you to name lexicons and dictionaries that may differ with me about this fact and you answered by saying, "I have none at this time,..." Surly, if your view is correct you could find at least one dictionary or lexicon that would clearly define "shorn" as cut without reference to length. The fact that you cannot proves that your understanding of "shorn" is wrong.
- Q23. Could a woman, who has very long, uncut hair, cover her face with her hair, if she combed it forward, yes or no?

- A23. Yes, however, the length of the hair is immaterial. The important thing is that the hair is uncut and therefore it is a covering. It is a covering, not because it may or may not cover the face, but because it is uncut. If the hair is cut the person is uncovered (1 Corinthians 11:6).
- Q24. Please explain why Mr. Vines' comments about a word are true so long as you find the commentary under his definition for the word "hair," but are not true if found under his definition for the word "wash." Is it that Mr. Vines' comments after his definitions are valid proof only if you think that they agree with the position that you already take, and they are not valid proof if they do not agree with the position that you already take?
- A24. I have no idea what you are asking in the first part of this question. I don't believe the statement and therefore I don't understand your question. As to the 2nd part of the question, if I understand you correctly, my answer is NO. Concerning things in Vines' Dictionary being "valid proof" I ask you: Under the word "hair" Mr Vine says, "The word (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair of the woman is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10." Is Mr Vine correct or wrong in this statement?
- Q25. Please explain how the long hair of the woman covers the HEAD any more than the short hair of a man (remember that the covering of v.5 only specifies covering the HEAD, but the covering of v.15 does not; therefore the long hair of v.15 can cover more than short hair because the long hair can cover more than just the head, but short hair does not). Elaborate all you want to in your answer, but do not fail to simply answer the question that I have asked.
- A.25 According to Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 11 the covering is the "long hair" when the long hair is "complete" (see paragraph 8), that is, uncut. The length of the long hair is immaterial as long as it is uncut. Therefore, this uncut hair is the covering spoken of by Paul. On the other hand, "short hair" of man or woman is never identified as being a covering. The question is not, which covers "more" but which covers at all. Now, don't misapply what I am saying. I realize one string of hair 1 inch long could possible cover something smaller; however, this is not the covering that Paul refers to. He is referring to hair being a covering, in sign that she is under the power of her husband and the hair is such a covering only when it is uncut. If the hair is cut she is "uncovered" (See paragraph 6-8).

## MARK BAILEY'S SECOND NEGATIVE

193. In paragraph 175 Pat shows concern for his inability to prove that an "artificial" covering is under consideration. Certainly, he should be concerned because he is attempting to affirm and insist that women wear this artificial covering and he claims that she "sins if she does not" wear it. However, even though he has stated this and stated that he is going to prove this proposition "by the Scriptures" he cannot because he has admitted that Paul does not specifically use the word "artificial" in verses 5,6, or 13 and if that's not enough he has also stated that he knows of "... no Greek Lexicon that uses the word artificial in the definition of the Greek word translated 'covered,' 'uncovered,' or 'not covered' in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6, and 13." Now, if the Scriptures do not state his claim and if the Greek Lexicons do not support his doctrine - it is wrong! No one can prove by the Scriptures, what the Scriptures do not say. In paragraph 175 Pat concludes that the **"artificial covering" cannot be proven by the "specific word ("artificial"), nor in the definition of 'covered'..."**
194. Next Pat attempts to prove that I am inconsistent because I believe that the covering mentioned in Genesis 38:14-15 is not hair, but is something artificial. The reason I know that a veil (made of cloth) was used is because (verse 15) "When Judah saw her, he thought her to be an harlot; because she had covered her face." #1) The face that was covered - not the head, which proves that hair was not involved. #2) The actions of Tamar was consistent with the actions of a harlot. Long hair was never customary of harlots; therefore, hair was not involved. Next, Pat, in vain, runs to Acts 20:7 and speaks of the words "break bread." To prove that "break bread" refers to the communion. I, just as you did, would go to 1 Corinthians 10:16 and show that the term does in fact refer to the communion. However, Pat, you cannot do this with your view of the artificial covering. You cannot go to another passage to prove your proposition. In my affirmative, I proved that "hair" was under consideration. #1) I proved this by showing that the context of 1 Corinthians 11 speaks of hair every time that the word "covered," "uncovered," or "not covered" is used: Verse 5 says, "**uncovered**", then it says this is all one or the same as **if she were shaven.**" WHAT IS "SHAVEN?" **HAIR!** Again notice that verse 6 refers to "**not covered**" and "**covered**" then it says "**shorn**," and "**shorn or shaven**" - WHAT IS "SHORN OR SHAVEN?" **HAIR!** In verse 13 Paul asks the question: "... is it comely that a woman pray unto God **uncovered?**" Then he answers his own question in verses 14&15 by referring to **HAIR**. In verses 14&15 he says, "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have **long hair**, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman have **long hair**, it is a glory to her: for **her hair is given her for a covering.**" #2) I proved that hair was under consideration by going to other passages such as Leviticus 10:6; 21:10 showing that the word "uncovered," as

used in 1 Corinthians 11 is defined as "to make naked...**specially by shaving**" (Gesenius Hebrew - Chaldee Lexicon, page 690). Certainly this would refer to hair. #3) I proved that hair was under consideration by proving that the words translated "hair" and "veil" are interchangeable. Dean Alford says: "... the mere fact of one sex being by nature **unveiled, i.e. having short hair**, - the other **veiled, i.e. having long hair.**" Also W.E. Vine (page 189) teaches the same: "The word (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the '**covering**' **provided in the long hair** of the woman is **as a veil**, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headship spoken of in verses 1-10." #4) I proved that hair was under consideration by listing several verses (Solomon 4:1; 4:3; 6:7) where translations renders "hair" or "locks and others" "veil." Since these two words are translated from grammatical Greek form as the words "covered," in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,7,&13 this proves that the terms "hair" and "veil" are interchangeable. The difference between my view and the view that Pat is attempting to prove is that I was able to prove my proposition from the Scriptures and from Greek and Hebrew Lexicons and Bible Dictionaries. But on the other hand, Pat must say, The artificial covering cannot be proven by the "specific word, nor in the definition of 'covered.'"

195. Paragraphs 176-182 deals with my chart #1 in which I gave several verses that names specific times or places but are not restricted to them. In paragraph 177 Pat says, "there is nothing in 1 Corinthians 11, or in any other passage in the Bible, that proves the covering of 1 Corinthians 11:5-6 must be worn other than when a woman is praying or prophesying." Such a statement is absurd! 1 Corinthians 11:6 says, "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." Here Paul says that it is "a shame (sinful) for a woman to be shorn or shaven"; therefore, he says, because it is sinful to be shorn or shaven "**be covered.**" I have already proven that the word "covered" as found here refers to "**hair.**" Every time, concerning women, the term "covered" (or its forms) is found the context always mentions hair to clearly state what is being referred to (See paragraph 194 again). Therefore, this covering, the HAIR is to be worn at all times - WHY? Because it is "a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven."
196. In paragraph 178 Pat vainly attempts to nullify the example found in Mark 11:24 & 25. It is absurd to say that these verses "would normally mean that we only have to 'believe that ye receive them' when we 'pray,' and **that we only have to 'forgive'** when we 'stand praying'." It is not unusual to understand this correctly. However, Pat had to say this to be consistent with his view on this subject. This is a clear example of where a specific situation was named but not restricted to. The situation was NOT "praying or prophesying" but **STANDING**. In the same way that we do not have to forgive only when we "**stand**" praying; women also do have to be covered only when "**praying or**

**prophesying."** Other verses, such as verse 6 (see paragraph 195) proves that women must be covered with long hair at all times.

197. Notice in paragraph 179 that Pat refuses to accept that the word "home" in 1 Corinthians 14:35 actually means home, but instead he believes that it means "all other places other than in the assembly..." Pat the Bible says, "And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands **at home**..." Certainly the words "at home" is not the only place that a woman can ask her husband questions, but that is what the verse says. Likewise when 1 Corinthians 11:5 says "praying or prophesying" other times are also included. The instructions given are not restricted to the specific time or places named.
198. In paragraph 180 Pat asserts that in "all three of these verses that have a 'when clause' (Mark 11:24,25, and 1 Corinthians 14:35) like 1 Corinthians 11:5-6,13, the 'when clause' proves the action required is possible... to 'turn off' when the occasion has ended." How absurd can a person be? As Christians, we must be a forgiving people at **all times**. This is not something that you can "turn off" any time you desire. By this same logic, I could say, women must have long hair when praying or prophesying, but she can "turn off" by cutting her hair as long as she repent and gains forgiveness before entering the two acts again. Such is ridiculous and you must know it! **There is no "turn on" and "turn off" when considering God's instructions. SHAME ON YOU FOR OFFERING SUCH AN IDEA.**
199. In paragraph 181 Pat asserts the same theory as given and answered earlier.
200. Paragraph 182 refers to my tract concerning my statement dealing with man being able to be covered when he is not praying or prophesying. The reason of this is because it is not a "shame" or sinful for man to be uncovered; however, concerning woman it is a "shame" or sinful (1 Corinthians 11:6) for her to be uncovered, that is, have cut hair; therefore, the situation of the man and the woman differs. Furthermore, the words "having his head covered" in verse 4 is not the same as term nor definition as "let her be covered" in verse 6 concerning woman. Concerning man in verse 4 the words indicates "**anything** on the head."
201. In paragraph 162 I asked Pat if it was acceptable for a man to wear a covering to worship while singing or during communion if he is not praying or prophesying? He has refused to answer this question within his speech; However, in answer to my question #21 he says "A man can wear a covering during the assembly when he is not praying or prophesying, such as during the collection." Readers, notice the situation that Pat has gotten himself into. You people that know Pat: Has he ever told you brethren that it was acceptable for you to wear a hat to worship as long as you remove it when you are praying or

prophesying. Sisters: Do you remember Pat Donahue telling you that you can remove your artificial veil during communion, collection or other times when you are not praying or prophesying. I know of nothing more disrespectful than for a man to wear a hat inside the worship service regardless if he is praying or prophesying or not. Such a view as this proves how far a person has to go when he does not have the truth.

202. Paragraph 183 proves Pat's absurdity. In paragraph 163 I asked, if an individual said, "if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her **hair is given her for a covering** (verse 15) therefore, be sure you keep your covering; he would be referring to long hair. **WOULDN'T HE???**" Pat answers, "... I would say that an artificial covering is in view;..." Pat, you know better than this. There is nothing found in verse 15 that indicates something artificial; but contrary to this, Paul said, "**hair is given her for a covering.**" You can say artificial all you care to, but Paul will still have said, "**HAIR IS GIVEN HER FOR A COVERING.**"
203. In paragraph 184 the absurdity continues by Pat saying, "You can't tell that Tamar's covering of Genesis 38:15 is an artificial one because it says she 'covered her face,' because a woman, who has very long, uncut hair, could cover her face with her hair, if she combed it forward." There must be a line of human reasoning somewhere - no where does the Scriptures imply that a woman covered her face with her hair by combing it forward. Such responses as this are clear indications that you are forced to take views that are ridiculous. Now, concerning Pat having answered my question: "Are you suggesting that this covering in Genesis 38:14-15 is the same covering in 1 Corinthians 11?" I do not consider, "it could be (or may not be)..." as an answer. This is a run-around. Please answer it in detail in my separate written question.
204. In paragraph 185 Pat is attempting to mislead the readers by indicating that I have changed my view on the definition of the word "shorn." I have not, and he knows it. If I changed I would be in error. In my second affirmative I gave 22 scholars which proves that the word "shorn" means to cut short:

#### DEFINITIONS OF "SHORN" FROM SCHOLARS

##### Thayer (page 343)

"to get or let be shorn... absolute of shearing or **cutting short** the hair of the head, 1 Corinthians 11:6."

##### Liddell and Scott (page 370)

"to clip, **cut short**, especially the hair"

**Abbott-Smith Manual Greek Lexicon (page 244)**

"To **cut short** the hair, shear: a sheep, Acts 8:22. Middle voice to have one's hair cut off, be shorn: absolute, 1 Corinthians 11:6; Acts 18:18."

**Vincent's Word Studies of the New Testament (Vol. 3, page 247)**

"To have the **hair cut close**..."

**Robertson's Word Pictures in the New Testament (Vol 4, page 160)**

"Let her **cut her hair close**."

**Vine (Vol.4, p 18)**

"In the Middle voice, to have one's hair cut off, be shorn. Acts 18:18; 1 Cor. 11:6."

**Robinson (page 395)**

"Specially the head, to cut off the hair, Acts 18:18 having shorn his head, that is, having had it shorn. 1 Corinthians 11:6 twice."

**Harper's Analytical Greek Lexicon (page 227)**

"to cut off the hair, shear, shave, Acts 8:32; 18:18; 1 Corinthians 11:6 twice."

**Bagster's Analytical Greek Lexicon (page 227)**

"to cut off the hair, shear, shave, Acts 8:32; 18:18; 1 Corinthians 11:6 twice."

**John Dawson's Greek-English Lexicon**

"To cut off, to shear, to shave."

**Green's Greek and English Lexicon (page 99)**

"to cut off the hair, shear, shave, Acts 8:32; 18:18. 1 Corinthians 11:6, twice."

204. Other scholarly works proving that "shorn" means to "cut short" or to "cut off" or "cut close" are the following: The New American Standard Version, The Revised Standard Version, Goodspeed, Moffatt, The New English Bible, King

James II, The Emphatic Diaglott, Coverdale Translation, Wuest' Translation of the Greek N.T. Furthermore, "The Expositor's Greek Testament says that "let her be shorn" means "let her also **crop** (her head)." The word "crop" used here and in J.B. Phillip's translation means "a short hair cut ... having the hair cut so short that the ears show" (Webster). Anyone, desiring to know the definition of the word "shorn" can understand, from these scholars that it refers to hair that is "cut short," "cut off," or "cut close."

205. In paragraph 185 Pat admits that when a sheep is sheared that the fleece is "cut short." In the say way, when a person's hair is shorn it is cut short. Any unbiased person can understand this fact. Now, concerning the shearing of sheet metal. Pat can not find a dictionary to agree with him concerning the shearing of "hair"; therefore, he runs to Webster's New World Dictionary and locates a noun called "shears" which is defined as "a machine for cutting metal." This is not a verb as used in 1 Corinthians 11 nor as used concerning a sheep being sheared, which you have agreed means to "cut short." This machine used to cut sheet metal is a noun called "shears." **This smoke screen will not work.** See my answer to question 22 for more information dealing with the definitions of "shorn."
206. Next, Pat totally skips my next paragraph (166). He chooses not to respond to the fact that the word "uncovered," such as used by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 refers to hair. I proved this by noticing Old Testament passages (Leviticus 10:6 & 21:10) where the same word is found and is defined as "to make naked ... **specially by shaving.**" The word "uncovered" comes from the same Greek word as the word "uncovered" in 1 Corinthians 11:6; therefore, the word "uncovered" refers to hair and not something artificial.
207. In paragraph 186 Pat continues struggling with the definitions of the word shorn. He now says that the words "remove," "strip," "divest," and "deprive of," does not indicate "to cut short." Pat, not one of these definitions could possibly refer to anything other than "cutting short." The readers can easily see your dilemma.
208. In paragraph 187 Pat indicates that he is not pleased with my answer to his question concerning "why did Paul suddenly switch to a different word in v. 15." However, my answer is true and Pat agrees: "because the two words are interchangeable." Pat want to know - WHY did he use two words. Pat, you answered this question yourself by saying (paragraph 187) "I agree that Paul could have" used both words. Since he "could" he did. Since, as you have said (paragraph 80) that "the two words 'could be used interchangeably without violence'" Paul used both terms. Pat hops, skips, and jumps so that he would

not have to respond to my other Biblical examples of where these same two Greek terms are used. I will give them again - will you answer?

**Psalms 104:6,9**

"Thou **coveredst** (*peribolaion*) it with the deep as with a garment: ... Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to **cover** (*kalupsai*) the earth."

**Genesis 38:14&15**

Tamar "**covered**" (*periebale*) her with a vail... Judah thought she was a harlot because "she had **covered** (*katekalupsato*) her face."

209. Pat ignores my paragraph 171 concerning his examples of "bondage," "burden" and "for." He must realize that his examples are not interchangeable "without violence."
210. In paragraph 188 Pat restates his argument found in paragraph 145 concerning the word "covered" in 1 Corinthians 11:4. I refer the readers back to paragraph 172 where I answered this argument by showing that the interlinears indicate that "covered" refers to "**having anything**." What did Pat say about this? Nothing, he was as silent as a tomb. If the word "covered" in verse 4 is the same as the ones mentioned in verses 5-7 why didn't Paul use the same words in verses 5-7 or at least a word that is interchangeable?
211. In paragraph 188 Pat says, "Of course I gave many others proofs that the coverings of v.4 and vs. 5-7 were the same, but Mark failed to respond to them." Pat, I challenge you to prove this statement. I have not refused to respond to anything that you have said. You have one more speech, please list these proofs that you claim to have given that I have failed to respond to. If you can't find them - admit your error in making this false statement.
212. Pat avoids my paragraph 173 by not referring to it. He realizes that the truths presented there utterly destroys his position; therefore, he dodges it altogether. I encourage the readers to reread this paragraph. Notice the statements which I quoted from Pat that destroys his own position. By the way, in realizing that Pat has refused to respond to several complete paragraphs, don't think that it was due to not having enough space. He still had plenty of words left before reaching his limited words - he simply chose not to use them.
213. In paragraph 189 Pat asserts that the long hair does not cover any more of the HEAD than a man's short hair does. This is absurd! The Bible never teaches that short hair is a covering - only LONG HAIR. See my answer to Pat question 25 for more dealing with this.

214. In paragraph 190 Pat refers to my 4 points found in paragraph 174. #1 deals with "Every passage in 1 Corinthians 11 that uses the words 'covered,' 'uncovered,' or 'not covered' also speaks of hair." Furthermore, as Pat states the word "artificial" is not found in the context and no lexicon defines any words in the context as such. This proves that "hair" is under consideration. Pat attempts to refute this by referring to man's covering; however, both of our propositions deals with the women and not man; therefore, this proves nothing.
215. In paragraph 190 Pat also implies that I did not answer his question #18. Readers, look and see if I answered it.
216. Point #2 deals with the fact that the words "covering" and "covered," "uncovered" and "not covered" are interchangeable. If words are, in fact, interchangeable then either word could be used under the same context.
217. Point #3 deals with Vine's statement "The word (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair of the woman is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10." Now, Pat says, "Mr. Vine never tells us that long hair is this sign (of v.10)." Readers, reread Vine's statement. He says, "the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair ...is as **a veil, a SIGN...**" Pat says, even if Vine does say this, "I'll let Mark take Mr. Vine, and instead I'll take Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:5." Vine does not disagree with Paul, Pat does. Vine is teaching the same as Paul does in Verse 15 "... her hair is given her for a covering. "
218. Point #4 deals with the word "uncovered" being defined as "to make naked...**specially by shaving.**" 1 Corinthians 11:5&6 refers to something being "shaven" and "shorn." WHAT is it? **HAIR!** Pat says, "to make naked... specially by shaving' implies that the cutting of the hair is not the only way to become uncovered (notice the word 'specially')." That's right Pat. A person also becomes "uncovered" by trimming or being "shorn." The point that you do not want to admit, but that the readers can clearly see is that the words "specially by shaving" proves that **HAIR** is under consideration and not something artificial.
219. Paragraphs 191&192 summaries Pat weak arguments. Each one has being answered in detail. However, I feel it necessary to call attention to Pat's misleading and false tactics in saying that I have admitted "that the covering of vs. 5,6,7,&13 includes an artificial covering." I have not said nor implied this. Pat is doing the same as he has often done in this discussion and that is trying

to make others say what has never been said. When a person does not have the truth he must rely upon deception.

## MARK BAILEY'S QUESTIONS TO PAT DONAHUE

### SECOND NEGATIVE

- Q26. Under the word "hair" W.E. Vine (page 189) states: "The word (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the '**covering**' **provided in the long hair** of the woman is **as a veil**, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headship spoken of in verses 1-10." Please tells us: What is Vine indicating that the covering is in verses 1-10 - "hair" or an "artificial covering." Regardless if you believes Vine is right or wrong, please simply tell us what Vine is indicating.
- A26. Mr. Vines indicates by his comments under his definition for the word hair that the covering of I Cor 11:1-10 is a "veil." It is not the hair because he says the long hair of v.15 is AS the veil of vs.1-10. The word "AS" here carries with it the idea of "LIKE," conclusively proving that Mr. Vines thought the veil and long hair were two different things, because if one thing is AS or LIKE another, then it certainly is not the same thing. Notice that Mr. Vines did not say that the long hair was USED AS the veil of vs.1-10, he did say that the long hair IS AS the veil of vs.1-10. How is he saying that the long hair is AS or LIKE the veil of vs.1-10? In the sense that both show "a sign of subjection to authority." I agree with Mr. Vines that the veil of vs.1-10 is "a sign of subjection to authority." I am not so sure that the long hair serves this same purpose (it might though), because the text (vs.14-15) does not say such.
- Q27. Do we teach by our example and Christian living? If yes, can man be covered while doing this teaching and can woman be uncovered while doing this teaching with God's approval?
- A27. Yes. Yes, because by no stretch of the imagination does teaching by our daily example constitute "prophesying." Vines defines the noun form of "prophecy, prophesy, prophesying" as "signifies the speaking forth of the mind and counsel of God." Vines defines the verb form as "with the primary meaning of telling forth the Divine counsels."
- Q28. Do you believe that Paul is instructing women to wear the covering while praying or prophesying that was a sign of harlotry in Genesis 38:14-15?
- A28. This is like asking the question, "is my brother Ben's pet the same as mine?" The answer is "yes" in some respects (they are both dogs, and they are both German Shepherds at that), and "no" in other respects (they are different colors, and they are different individual dogs). The answer to Mark's question is "no,"

if he is asking if both coverings cover the face. The answer is "no," if he means do they both have the same purpose. The answer is "yes," if he is asking if both are artificial, meaning not the hair (and both Mark have and I already agreed to such). If Mark does not mean any of the above three questions by his question, then I have no idea what he is asking. I have already answered this same question, so I am a little confused. Is Mark trying to get me to say that they are the same, meaning in one respect, so that he can act like my answer was that they are the same in another respect, which I never intended? If so, that would not be honest, so we will assume that Mark is not trying to do that.

Many examples could be cited showing a difference between God's (and man's) law then, and God's law (man's) now. For example, the O.T. said that if a woman was divorced from her husband (for a reason other than fornication), and then she married someone else, that if she ever went back to her first husband, it would be an "abomination" (Deut 24:1-4). On the other hand, the N.T. teaches, that under the same circumstances, it would be right for her to go back to her first husband (I Cor 7:10-11, Mt 19:9, Rom 7:2-3). Another example is long hair on men. In the N.T., it is expressly forbidden (I Cor 11:14), but under the O.T., it obviously was not (Judges 13:5).

Q29. Is short cut hair considered to be a "covering" according to the teachings of 1 Corinthians 11?

A29. No, not according to the teachings of I Cor 11. But according to your teaching it would be, because it (short hair) does cover just as much of the HEAD (and that is what is to be covered in v.5) as the long hair does.

Q30. If an unbaptized woman desires to be baptized but clearly states that she **has not** nor **will not** wear an artificial covering while praying or prophesying should baptism be withheld from her? Out of curiosity: Do you take the same position concerning an unbaptized divorced woman desiring to be baptized. Should baptism be withheld from her if she has been divorced for reasons other than fornication?

A30. Yes, but normally this does not come up till later, like the accompanying teaching concerning long hair. I could ask Mark the similar question: "If an unbaptized woman desires to be baptized but clearly states that she has not nor will not wear her hair long, should baptism be withheld from her?"

A woman who has been divorced by her spouse for a reason other than fornication has not necessarily sinned, so I would not necessarily withhold baptism from her.

However, if a woman whom I am studying with, is divorced unscripturally, and remarried (adulterous), I would withhold baptism from her (and I usually

know if this is the case). You would probably do the same if your were studying with a person who was in a homosexual "marriage."

## Pat Donahue's Third Affirmative

### A Detailed Response to Mark's Second Negative

220. In my paragraph #175, I was responding to Mark's argument (made in paragraph #150) that it is impossible for Pat to prove that an "artificial" covering is under consideration in I Cor11:5-6 because the word "artificial" is not specifically used in the passage, and because the word "covered" is not defined as something "artificial." I showed this reasoning false in my last article, because Mark believes that Gen38:14-15 (and ICor11:4 also) is talking about an "artificial" covering, yet it does not use the word "artificial," and evidently Mark does not know of any Hebrew lexicons that use the word "artificial" in the definitions of any of the words in Gen38:14-15. I made the same point in my last article about the "Lord's Supper" in Acts20:7. The point is that we look at other considerations to show our understanding on these two passages. So the word "artificial" does not have to be in ICor11, or in Greek lexicons defining the words in ICor11, for us to know that an artificial covering is in view. I know from other considerations, one being that ICor11:5 says she is to do it when she prays or prophesies, and that does not make sense if the long hair is in view.
221. In paragraph #194, Mark repeats some of his "proofs" for his theory. Again he intimates that since the covering and the hair are mentioned in close proximity, that this somehow proves his position. I've already pointed out that "praying" and "fasting" are mentioned together many times, but that fact does not prove that they are the same thing. ICor11:5 teaches that "uncovered ... is even all one AS IF she were shaven," it does not teach that uncovered is equivalent to shaven. The words "as if" actually show that "uncovered" and "shaven" are referring to two different things. v.6 teaches that "not covered" is different than "shorn" when it separates the two by the word "also," "if the woman be not covered, let her ALSO be shorn." The argument of vs.13-15 is based upon consistency just like the arguments of vs.5-6. The argument is that a person ought to know that a woman should be covered (artificially) when she prays or prophesies, just like a person should know that a woman ought to be covered (naturally with the hair) all the time.
222. Mark's point on Lev10:6&21:10 proves nothing. We've already shown that this is a definition of a Hebrew word, whereas ICor11 was written in Greek. Besides Mark assumes his point anyway. There are many ways "to make naked" (the basic definition for the word) besides cutting the hair, one of which is to take a garment off. The word "specially" in the phrase "specially by shaving" found in Gesenius' application of his definition to (only)

Lev10:6&21:10 shows that there are other ways of making naked besides shaving. Mark's assumption (in paragraph #218) that it is referring to "trimming" is purely that, an assumption, and so really Mark is assuming his whole point on this definition, that it can only be talking about hair and not about garments also. And even if Mark proved his assumption, he still would have no point, because ICor11:15 already shows that hair can cover, and that is all that Lev10:6&21:10 would show anyway.

223. Regarding the rest of paragraph #194, I have never had a problem with saying that the words for covering in ICor11 could possibly be used interchangeably (it is obvious from ICor11 that the hair covers just as the veil does). What Mark should be proving is that the words are used interchangeably in ICor11. This he has not done. Of course this is certainly not the first time I have made this statement, but Mark continues to argue as if I've never made the statement.
224. Concerning Mark's paragraph #196, the way we know that we are to "believe that ye receive them" at times other than prayer, and that we are to forgive at other times than when we "stand praying" is because OTHER VERSES tell us so. Mark do you disagree? Yes, the Bible does teach that the long hair must be worn at all times (in fact, that is the nature of long hair), but there are no verses anywhere that tell us that a woman must be covered with the covering of ICor11:5 other than when she is praying or prophesying. Nothing in his paragraph #195 concerning the HAIR refutes this!
225. In paragraph #198, Mark misses my point. This point is critical to my first affirmative (praying or prophesying) argument. When I said that the "when clause" proves that the action required is possible to turn on and off, I did not necessarily mean permissible. These two words do not mean the same thing. For example, it is possible for me to sin, but it is certainly not permissible. Besides using the word "possible" (and not "permissible"), I also made this distinction perfectly clear by using the phrase "though not necessarily permissible" once in my answer #6, and three times in my paragraph #180. Mark, how did you fail to miss this critical point four times?
226. Next, Mark again makes points that contradict what he said in his tract. He indicated in his tract that the fact that the man was told to pray or prophesy uncovered proved that he could be covered at other times. Now if this reasoning is valid for the man, it is just as valid for the woman. It doesn't matter about anything that Mark asserts, if the reasoning actually proves the point, then any evidence pointing to the contrary must be false (because something truly proven can have no true evidence against it). I agree with the reasoning in Mark's tract. It does prove the point. That is why I used the same reasoning as the first proof of my proposition. The fact that the woman is told

in ICor11:5 to be covered when she prays or prophesies, shows the temporary nature of this covering, and proves this covering cannot be the (permanent) long hair!

227. Mark's questions for me (my answers to such being dealt with in Mark's paragraph #201) do not prove anything on this proposition, but are interesting nonetheless. After study, I have taught for at least the last seven years that the covering restrictions apply whenever a person is praying or prophesying, and only then. Mark may not like this, but this is exactly what the Bible says. I am willing to accept Gods' statement exactly as he put it.
228. Regarding Mark's paragraph #202, I thought the "he" that made the statement that Mark raised was the same "he" that I brought up that told his daughter to "be sure and have your head covered when you go outside." If the Father made both statements, and the connection between the two statements was done like it is done in ICor11 (the natural, permanent covering arguing for the artificial, temporary), then yes, I would say he is talking about the same covering Mark thought was under consideration based upon my first statement alone, that is, an artificial covering.
229. Concerning Mark's paragraph #203, Mark, you said that the fact that Tamar covered her face shows that an artificial covering is in view. But in your answer to my question #23, you admitted that a woman's long hair could cover her face. So since a "harlot" could cover her face (not all the time, but for an occasion), with her hair, then this can't be how you know that Tamar's covering was artificial. You know that it was artificial the same way I do, because she did it for an occasion. The fact that you won't just admit this, is what is "ridiculous" (your word).
230. Mark's two paragraphs #204 again ignore the fact that some dictionaries define the word "shorn" and do not give the idea of cutting short or close. I am willing to admit the obvious fact that some define it as cutting short or close, but Mark is not willing to admit the obvious fact that some define it without reference to length. Or is he willing to admit it? I thought he did last time, but he now seems to be backing up on his admission. Mark will you give us a straightforward answer on this? Mark's contention in his answer #22 is just an assertion that the definitions that I gave are "abbreviated" or incomplete. Of course, this is only an assertion given with no proof. Many examples can be given where the English word "shear" does not necessarily mean to cut short or close. Repeating one example, "Fred SHEARS (verb) sheet metal for a living." Mark knows that this does not imply that any certain amount is cut; only that metal is cut. Another example is, "George SHEARS bushes for a living." Is the bush completely cut down?, or are only the extremities trimmed?

231. Mark then gives some of additional authorities that are supposed to prove his point. Since I own hardly any of these books, I could not look many of them up, but I did look up the word "crop" in my English Dictionary. The definition that it gave that related to hair was "to clip the ears, hair, etc., of." And if you'll look at any definition of the word "clip," you'll see that the length clipped is not necessarily inferred by the word. The point is that if "shorn" simply means "to shear, cut" (New Englishman's Greek Concordance and Lexicon) without reference to length, then the long hair could not be the covering of ICor11:6, because the verse would be saying "if the woman cuts her hair, let her also cut her hair," which doesn't make any sense!
232. It is funny that Mark uses phrases like "Pat continues struggling" and "The readers can easily see your dilemma" (in paragraph #207) instead of answering my arguments on the point. Why do you continue to do this in many cases Mark? I made arguments in my paragraph #186, and more fully in my paragraphs #111 and #112, concerning this point, and Mark still has not responded to them; instead he just tells the reader how bad Pat is doing. Mark, responding to my arguments is the only way to convince the searching reader that I am wrong. Talking about how bad the other debater is doing is generally taken as a sign that the accuser is "struggling."
233. In paragraph #208, Mark again does not respond to what I said (in my paragraph #187), but just repeats what he said before. Now I have to repeat: "how could Paul have switched words" is not the same question as "why did Paul switch words." For example, the question "how could the man put out the fire?" might be answered "because he had a fire extinguisher." On the other hand, the question "why did the man put out the fire?" might be answered "because he wanted to save his house." These are two different questions with two different answers. The point is that Paul used one Greek word for the covering all the way through the section until he reached v.15, where he switched to a different Greek word. Why did he do this if he didn't mean to indicate that two different coverings were in view? I don't know how many times that I've asked this, and Mark still has not answered. Answer it this time Mark, the readers want to know!
234. As far as Ps104:6,9 and Gen38:14-15 are concerned, I have already admitted numerous times that the two words could possibly be used interchangeably (that is evident from the fact that both are translated to a form of the word "cover" in ICor11), now would Mark please prove that they are used interchangeably in ICor11. That is the issue!
235. In paragraph #209, Mark says that I ignored his paragraph #171 concerning my examples of "bondage," "burden," and "for." I did not ignore it, but chose for

lack of space to pursue only one of the examples ("burden") using my question #21. Instead of answering my question, "could the two words be used interchangeably?", he seemed to answer the question, "are the words used interchangeably in Gal 6?" Mark, I already knew that the words are not used interchangeably in Gal 6. That is my point, that it is possible to use the two words interchangeably, but that they are not used interchangeably in Gal 6, and that the fact that two different words are used in Gal 6 (though the words have similar meaning), helps us to harmonize the two verses. Mark, would you please answer the question now? Would it be possible to use these two Greek words interchangeably in other contexts?

236. Mark shows (his paragraph #210) that he either doesn't understand my argument in paragraphs #188 and #145, or he refuses to answer it. I have quoted two Greek scholars that say that there is no Greek word for "covered" in ICor11:4 (easily verified by a quick look at any interlinear), but that the English word is supplied from the context. That is how that I know that the covering of v.4 must be the same as the covering of vs.5-7, because the word "covered" of v.4 is only there because it is understood (and transferred) from vs.5-7. What is the purpose for this debate Mark, if you won't respond to my arguments?
237. Next, Mark asks me to tell what arguments I have used to show that the coverings of v.4 and vs.5-7 are the same, and that he has refused to respond to. I will do so gladly. Let the reader and Mark notice again the 4th,5th,6th, and 7th sentences of my paragraph #145. Now will Mark respond to these arguments?
238. I skipped Mark's paragraph #173, because I had already responded to each one of these arguments, but with no response from Mark afterwards. So why waste the space until he responds to what I said last? I have run out of space in every one of my articles. Mark said I had plenty of words left. He must have a different counter than mine, because by my word processor's count, I have used over 3495 (out of a possible 3500) words in every one of my articles thus far.
239. Mark claims in his paragraph #213 that my argument stated in #189 is "absurd." Instead of just saying this (which anybody can say about any argument, true or false), why didn't he answer the argument? Responding to my question #25, Mark said the question was not 'which covers 'more' but which covers at all.' Instead of telling me what the question should be, Mark should answer my question. Mark, the question is, "Please explain how the long hair of the woman covers the HEAD any more than the short hair of a man." If you don't think the long hair covers any more of the HEAD than the short hair, then just say so. But if you do think that it covers more, then explain HOW. I have never understood how these brethren could look at the word "long" in ICor11:15, and say that "The length of the long hair is immaterial." Now, similarly, Mark

seems to be looking at the word cover, saying that it is immaterial if the covering actually covers, just so long as it is a sign, being uncut. No, the hair needs to be long, and the covering should cover. Mark, I never said that the Bible teaches that short hair is a covering. But according to your position on v.5 it would be; and at that, just as much a covering as the long hair (because it covers just as much of the HEAD as the long hair). Mark, please answer my question #25 this time.

240. To repeat my argument: the long hair could not be the covering of ICor11:5 because this covering (of v.5) is supposed to cover the HEAD, and the long hair does not cover any more of the HEAD than a man's short hair does. A veil is different, though. The woman's veil covers her head, but the absence of a veil leaves the man's head completely uncovered (artificially). The covering of v.15 is different. The long hair is not said to cover the HEAD specifically (as the covering of v.5), but is a covering in general. To repeat, since long hair does not cover the HEAD anymore than short hair does, the long hair could not possibly be the covering that is to cover the HEAD (the covering of v.5).
241. Mark, my question #18 gave you a choice of (a) or (b). You should have answered either (a), or (b), or neither, and then elaborated if you needed to. As it is, I don't know your answer to the question. The strange thing is, I have made this same point over and over, and Mark still has not responded to it.
242. In paragraph #216, Mark just repeats his same argument, but again fails to respond to my answer to his argument. Will you do it in your next speech, Mark? Prove that the words are used interchangeably in ICor11, that is the issue (not whether they could be used interchangeably). Tell us why Paul switched Greek words for covering in ICor11 (not how that he could, I already agree that he could, and that proves nothing).
243. Mark accuses me of "misleading and false tactics in saying that I (Mark) have admitted 'that the covering of vs.5,6,7,&13 includes an artificial covering.'" Mark, where did I say such? What I said in paragraph #191 is that Mark "admits an artificial covering is in v.4, and I (Pat) proved that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of vs.5,6,&7." This is not anywhere close to what you said I said. The sad thing is that I have made this argument many times and Mark still has not replied to it. Will you answer it in your last speech Mark? Let me repeat it one more time. Mark has admitted that an artificial covering is in v.4, and I have proven that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of vs.5,6,&7 (see my paragraphs #145, #188, and #236), therefore the covering of vs.5,6,&7 must include an artificial covering!

### **A Summary of My Affirmation**

244. In summary, I have given proof that the covering of ICor11:5 cannot be the covering of v.15, because the covering of v.5 is temporary (while praying or prophesying), but the covering of v.15 is permanent. I have shown that because the word "shorn" is defined by some as "to shear, cut" without reference to how much is cut off, then there is no way to be sure that the word "also" in v.6 does not rule out Mark's view. I have shown that the Greek word translated "covered" in vs.5,6,7,&13 comes from a totally different Greek root word than the Greek word translated "covering" in v.15 comes from. Why would (not how could) Paul use one word all the way through, and then switch to another when he refers to the long hair in v.15? Might it be because v.15 has a different covering in view? I have proven that the covering of vs.5,6,7,&13 includes an artificial covering by using Mark's own admission. How?, because he admits an artificial covering is in v.4, and I have proven that the covering of v.4 is the same as the covering of vs.5,6,&7. And lastly, I have proven that the covering of v.5 cannot be the long hair because the covering of v.5 is to cover the HEAD, and the long hair does not cover the HEAD any more than short hair does.
245. Why reject the plain teaching of this passage? I believe anybody can see that a covering that is to be worn by a woman when she is praying or prophesying is a temporary (artificial) covering, and not a permanent (natural) covering as the long hair is. Every woman, therefore, should have (or use) both coverings required by the passage, the permanent (natural) long hair covering of v.15, and the temporary (artificial) covering of vs.5,6,&13 when she prays.

## Questions for Mark Bailey, #6, by Pat Donahue

Q26. Mark, you answered my question #11a that you knew that the covering of Gen 38:14-15 is an artificial covering, "because of the context which states 'she had covered her face' and the face is not covered with hair." My question is, would the fact that Tamar applied her covering for an occasion ("she put her widow's garments off from her, and covered her with a veil") also tell you that an artificial (not hair) covering was in view? When considering what your answer to the question will be, please remember that, in your own words, some responses "are clear indications that you are forced to take views that are ridiculous."

A26. NO, as I said in answering your question #11, the context determines whether the covering was artificial or not. "The context will always indicate what the covering is just as in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 the context refers to hair every time the words "covered," "uncovered" or "not covered" is found.

Q27. (a) Please answer the first sentence of my question #24 since you didn't last time. My question #24 is referring to the first three sentences of your answer to my question #17.

(b) What if I produced a Greek Lexicon that in its definition of the Greek word translated "covered" in I Cor 11:6, clearly indicated that a garment was involved in such covering. What would that prove? Please don't come back and only say something to the effect, "produce the Lexicon, and we will see." If you do that, you will not only have not answered my question, but you will also have missed the point of the question. I want to know what if I produced such a definition, what would it prove? Please answer this question Mark; what would it prove?

A27. (a) I answered your question #24 the best way I could since I did not understand it. I would have been glad to answer this question if you would have explained it. I am sorry, but I still have no idea what you are asking. You said, "My question #24 is referring to the first three sentences of your answer to my question #17"; therefore, I will restate my answer to your question #17:

"Because Mr. Vine is explaining the word "wash" (not baptized) under the word "wash." He is merely explaining the purpose of baptism is to remove sin or metaphorically to "wash away sins." However, Mr. Vine, under the word "hair" is explaining "hair," that is, "the long hair of the spirit- beings described as locusts in Revelation 9:8 is perhaps indicative of their subjection to their Satanic master (compare 1 Corinthians 11:10, (R.V.)" To remove all doubt as to what he

has reference to, Mr Vine (under #2) says, "The word *kome* (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair of the woman is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headships spoken of in verses 1-10." Notice that he once again refers to verse 10, as he did in the first quotation, and clearly states that **"the context shows that the 'covering' provided in the long hair ... is as a veil, a sign of subjection to authority."** Not only in verse 15 but in verses "1-10" as well."

I underlined the first three sentences since this is what you say you are having reference to. Now, I will state your question #24: "Please explain why Mr. Vines' comments about a word are true so long as you find the commentary under his definition for the word "hair," but are not true if found under his definition for the word "wash." (I answered this part of the question by telling you that "I don't believe the statement...") Is it that Mr. Vines' comments after his definitions are valid proof only if you think that they agree with the position that you already take, and they are not valid proof if they do not agree with the position that you already take?" (No, Vine's comments do not depend upon whether or not they agree or disagree with my position.)

(b) Pat, you have the right to ask any question that you would like; however, you do not have the right to dictate what my answer will or will not be. Therefore, you produce the Lexicon, and we will see. You know that this answer is only logical; otherwise, you would not have instructed me not to answer it as such. I perfectly understand this question, I have not missed the point; however, I will not give an answer in response to "what if" a Lexicon says. You produce the Lexicon and I will be glad to respond it, but not to your hypothetical definition. The fact is, the Lexicon does not exist and you know it. In my question #17 I asked, "Does any Greek Lexicon actually use the word 'artificial' in the definition of the words 'covered,' 'uncovered,' or 'not covered' in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6, & 13?" You answered, "I know of no Greek Lexicon ..."

Q28. Would it be possible for the Greek words translated "burdens" (Strong's #922) in Gal 6:2, and "burden" (Strong's #5413) in Gal 6:5 to be used interchangeably in a context other than Gal 6? This is, unfortunately, a repeat of my question #21, so refer back to that question for further information. Would it be possible, Mark?

A28. To my knowledge, the answer is No. These two words are not used interchangeably in the (Septuagint) Greek Old Testament. The Greek word *baros* (Strong's #922) is found in Judges 18:21 and the Greek word *phortion* (Strong's #5413) is found in Judges 9:48 & 49; 2 Samuel 19:35; Job 7:20; Psalms 37:5; Isaiah 46:1. Likewise, in the New Testament they are not used interchangeably. The Greek word *baros* (Strong's #922) is found in Matthew

20:12; Acts 15:28; 2 Corinthians 4:17; Galatians 6:2; 1 Thessalonians 2:6; and Revelations 2:24 and the Greek word *phortion* (Strong's #5413) is found in Matthew 11:30, 23:4; Luke 11:46; Acts 27:10; Galatians 6:5.

29. This is, unfortunately, a repeat of my question #18. Precisely, what does I Cor 11:6 teach?: (a) - that to be covered is the same as having long hair, or (b) - that uncovered is different than (but just as bad as shorn or shaven? Please answer this question (a), (b), or neither, before elaborating. It really teaches (b) doesn't it, Mark?

A29. Yes, it is unfortunate that you repeated question #18. I answered it in detail by saying: "1 Corinthians 11:6 teaches: "For if the woman be not covered, (cut hair, but not necessarily close cut) let her also be shorn (hair cut close): but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn (hair cut close) or shaven (hair completely removed), let her be covered (have uncut hair)." Very simple isn't it? Yes, this verse, by itself, does teach conclusively that long hair is the covering. Notice how: "For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn (**What is shorn??? HAIR**): but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn (**What is shorn??? HAIR**) or shaven (**What is shaven??? HAIR**), let her be covered." Three times, in this one verse, "hair" is referred to; thus, the context of this verse is "hair." There is not even an indication to something artificial." I answered this question, by elaborating, because you were after a "A" or a "B." I showed that "A" is correct, at least if you are thinking of it in the sense of: "let her be covered (have uncut hair)." And "B" is also correct, at least if you are thinking of it in the sense of: the word "uncovered (shorten hair of any length, regardless if it is shorn or shaven or trimmed just a small amount without being shorn.) is different than (but just as bad as) shorn or shaven." In other words, hair trimmed a small amount, but not to the point to be classified as "shorn" or "shaven" is "just as bad" as being shorn or shaven.

30. This question concerns a woman named Betty who prays, asking for blessings, in the morning, and prays again for blessings in the evening.

(a) Would it be possible (though not necessarily permissible) for Betty to "believe that ye receive them" (Mk 11:24), during her morning prayer, cease to believe that she would receive the blessings during the afternoon as she worked around the house, and believe again that she would receive the blessings during her evening prayer?

(b) Would it be possible (though not necessarily permissible) for Betty to "forgive if ye have ought against any" (Mk 11:25), during her morning prayer (while standing), cease to be forgiving during the afternoon as she worked

around the house, and forgive again during her evening prayer (while standing)?

(c) Would it be possible for Betty to be "covered" (I Cor 11:5-6) with an artificial veil, during her morning prayer, cease to be covered with this artificial veil during the afternoon as she worked around the house, and to be covered with this artificial veil again during her evening prayer?

(d) Would it be possible for Betty to be covered (I Cor 11:15) with her long hair, during her morning prayer, cease to be covered with her long hair during the afternoon as she worked around the house, and be covered with her long hair again during her evening prayer?

The answers to the above questions will be obvious to the reader, so keep that in mind when you answer them, Mark. Of course, this question not only points out the difference between your points on Mk 11:24 and 25 and my first affirmative argument, but also reasserts the validity of my first affirmative argument. Please answer this question forthrightly, Mark.

- A30.     (a)     YES  
          (b)     YES  
          (c)     NO, because "to be 'covered' (1 Corinthians 11:5-6) does not refer to an artificial veil.  
(d) YES, she may have long hair in the morning, sin by cutting her hair and therefore being uncovered during the afternoon, and then, maybe after being taught the truth, repent and have prayer for her sins before the evening prayer and therefore, her sins would be forgiven and then she is as if she had not committed the sin of cutting her hair; therefore, she would have long hair. This is not an indicating that such is permissible. Another example: Would it be possible to be free from the sin of murder in the morning - commit murder in the afternoon and be freed from the sin of murder in the evening?

## MARK BAILEY'S THIRD NEGATIVE

246. In paragraph 220 Pat attempts to get around the fact that the word "artificial" is not specifically used in the context of 1 Corinthians 11 and that no Lexicon defines the word "covered" as something "artificial." These two facts have proven his proposition to be false. He attempts to get the readers minds away from these two facts by saying, "So the word 'artificial' does not have to be in 1 Corinthians 11, or in Greek lexicons defining the words in 1 Corinthians 11, for us to know that an artificial covering is in view." Pat, your proposition states: "The **Scriptures teach** that a woman must wear an artificial covering...." The Scriptures cannot teach that something is "artificial" if it does not say or at least define something "artificial." **THEREFORE, YOUR PROPOSITION HAS BEEN PROVEN FALSE.** Pat attempts to avoid this conclusion by referring to man in 1 Corinthians 11:4 and saying Mark believes this verse refers to something artificial. Yes, I do and I have stated that the reason of this belief is based upon the fact that the words, "having his head covered" indicates "having **anything** down over his head" (The Interlinear Greek - English New Testament, The Nestle Greek Text with a Literal English Translation). The word "anything" would include "anything" that is called a covering - long hair or something artificial. Paul could have used this same language concerning woman in verses 5,6, 13 or 15 - **but he did not!!! WHAT PAUL COULD HAVE SAID TO PROVE YOUR PROPOSITION - HE DID NOT SAY!!!**
247. In paragraph 221, Pat, struggling for proof of his proposition makes an argument on the words "as if" in 1 Corinthians 11:5. This verse says "uncovered ... is even all one AS IF she were shaven." He then says, "it does not teach that uncovered is equivalent to shaven." I never said it did! As I have already proven "uncovered" means to cut the hair. Therefore, if the hair is cut (any length) it is "as if" she were shaven, that is, the same sin is involved. WHY? Because the hair is involved whether it is simply "cut" or "shaven." Nothing is given here to indicate something artificial.
248. Pat also attempts to weaken my arguments concerning the fact that the context of 1 Corinthians 11 teaches long hair by using the words "close proximity" instead of context. Calling it what you wish but the context still teaches "long hair" as the covering. Pat realizes that the best form of proof is to let the Bible prove itself by using the context. He attempted to do this by intermingling the teachings concerning man and woman in 1 Corinthians 11. In answer to question #12 Pat said, "There is no Greek word for "covered" in 1 Cor 11:4 ... the English word "covered" is, in effect, supplied **from the context** (vs. 5-7) by the translators." Again, in answer to question #13 Pat says things are proven "either **by the context**, or by some other statement in the Bible." Thank-you, Pat, for

your honesty in this matter; however, notice that in paragraph #71 to response to my statement:"every verse in I Cor 11 that uses the actual word covered or uncovered, and is talking about the woman, mentions the hair in the same verse." Pat says, "This statement is true." In other words the **context** of every verse saying "covered or uncovered" in reference to woman mentions hair in the same verse. This proves that the **context** is teaching that the covering is the long hair. After stressing that the **context** does teach long hair, Pat says (paragraph #108) "Mark says he has proven 'that the context is speaking about hair.' Mark didn't need to prove that, v.15 tells us that the **context** is speaking about the hair." Thank you, Pat.

249. Readers, notice the difference between my belief concerning long hair being the covering and Pat's belief concerning the artificial covering. Pat says, that the word artificial is not found in the context of 1 Corinthians 11 either in statement or in definition. However, he states that "Mark didn't need to prove that (context teaches long hair), verse 15 tells us that the **context** is speaking about the hair." In other words, Pat is truthfully saying Mark's position is found in the context of 1 Corinthians 11, but Pat's position cannot be found in the context nor even in the definitions of words found there.

250. In paragraph 222 Pat attempts to do away with my arguments based on Leviticus 10:6 & 21:10 by saying "...this is a definition of a Hebrew word, whereas 1 Corinthians 11 was written in Greek." Pat is intentionally ignoring this argument. Referring to the Hebrew word has nothing to do with anything because I referred to the "Septuagint" which is the Greek Old Testament. Pat the Septuagint is in Greek, not Hebrew - as if you didn't know. In the Greek Old Testament the Hebrew word for "uncovered" comes from the same Greek word as is found in 1 Corinthians 11:6. Remember I explained this in paragraph 166 by saying: "The word 'uncovered' in these Old Testament verses is defined by Gesenius Hebrew - Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, page 690 as 'to make naked...**specially by shaving**, Leviticus 10:6; 21:10.' **The Septuagint (Greek Old Testament)** shows that the Hebrew word for 'uncover' comes from the same Greek word as is found in 1 Corinthians 11:6. This is proof that in all these places (Leviticus 10:6; 21:10; 1 Corinthians 11:5,6,13) the word 'uncover' refers to hair and not something artificial." The reason Pat desires to do away with this argument is because he knows that the definition "specially by shaving" refers to hair and not something artificial.

251. Next, in reference to this same argument Pat says, "Mark's assumption that it is referring to 'trimming' is purely that, an assumption..." No, Pat, it is not an assumption. The words "**specially by shaving**" positively proves that hair is involved and the person becomes "uncovered" by shortening the hair regardless if it is by "shaving," or "trimming." Both ways are sinful. A person also becomes

"uncovered" by trimming or being "shorn." The point that you do not want to admit, but that the readers can clearly see is that the words "specially by shaving" proves that **HAIR** is under consideration and not something artificial.

252. In paragraph 223 Pat does not deny that "the words for covering in 1 Corinthians 11 could possibly be used interchangeably..." However, he attempts to weaken the strength of this fact by saying, "What Mark should be proving is that the words are used interchangeably in 1 Corinthians 11." Pat, the fact that they (katakalupto - "covered" in verse 6 and peribolaion - "covering" in verse 15) can be used together, and that the context teaches "hair" is proof that they are used interchangeably in 1 Corinthians. Furthermore, as I have given earlier in argument #4 - Scholars such as Meyer (page 256) says: "**peribolaion**, something thrown round one, a covering in general, **has here a special reference to the veil (kaluptra, kalumma) spoken of in the context.**" Pat, this is your proof once again.
253. Now, this is all that Pat had to say concerning paragraph 194. Readers, isn't it strange that he didn't refer to my quotation of Dean Alford where he said: "... the mere fact of one sex being by nature **unveiled, i.e. having short hair**, - the other **veiled, i.e. having long hair.**" The fact is I have given this quote in paragraphs 3, 56, and 96 but Pat chooses not to comment whether Alford is right or wrong. He simply ignores the truth that the words "uncovered" ("unveiled") refers to "short hair" and "covered" ("veiled") refers to "having long hair."
254. Pat also doesn't comment about my quote from Vine's statement on page 189: "The word (hair) is found in 1 Corinthians 11:15, where the context shows that the '**covering provided in the long hair** of the woman is **as a veil**, a sign of subjection to authority, as indicated in the headship spoken of in verses 1-10."
255. Pat also ignores my argument concerning the translations rendering the words "hair" or "locks" as "veil." (See paragraph 194).
256. Next, Pat jumps from my paragraph 194 to 196. He skips paragraph 195 dealing with chart #1 which gives verses to prove that just because a specific time or place is named that the teaching is not necessarily restricted to them. (Please reread paragraph 195).
257. In paragraph 224 Pat refers to paragraph 196 where I proved his absurdity in which he states that Mark 11:24 & 25 means "**that we only have to 'forgive' when we 'stand praying.**" Pat takes this view simply in order to be consistent with his view concerning the artificial veil. Both views are wrong and any honest reader can certainly understand Pat's dilemma.

258. Pat jumps again by ignoring paragraph 197 in which I gave 1 Corinthians 14:35 as an example of where a particular place ("home") is named where women can ask questions and learn; however, he knows that the "home" is not the only place that women can do this - thus his argument concerning the restricted time of "praying or prophesying" falls flat.
259. In paragraph 225 Pat says that I missed his point. No I did not! He says that he was talking about things "possible" but not "permissible." Strange, isn't it. Pat can not produce a Bible verse to prove something artificial, he can not produce a Lexicon to prove something artificial; therefore, he produces things that is not Biblically permissible.
260. In paragraph 226 Pat says that I contradict what I said in my tract. This is absolutely not true. (Readers, if you would like a free copy of my tract entitled "Woman's Glory" that Pat is quoting from write to "Contenting for the Faith," 1625 Trinity View, Irving, TX 75060. Reading this tract would prove Pat's statement incorrect.) He says this because he has ignored my statements concerning the fact that man can be covered (without sin being committed) when not praying or prophesying; however, woman cannot be uncovered (cut hair) (without sin being committed) at anytime.
261. In paragraph 227 Pat indicates that women do not have to be covered (with an artificial veil) unless they are actually praying or prophesying and "only then." Therefore, since the woman does not prophesy in the assembly she does not have to wear it when someone else is prophesying, she does not have to wear it during singing, when someone else is praying, during the communion (after the prayer), during the collection. **WHEN DOES SHE WEAR THIS VEIL???** Pat says "ONLY" when praying or prophesying. Dear sisters, Pat is teaching that if you are hurt seriously in an automobile accident **DON'T PRAY** if you don't have your artificial veil - for you sin if you do. **THE BIBLE DOES NOT TEACH SUCH A DOCTRINE.** Your long, uncut hair is your covering (just as 1 Corinthians 11:15 says). You would have this covering at all times; therefore, when you need to pray - simply start praying. By Pat's position, if someone ask you, "What must I do to be saved" you cannot answer this person unless you have your artificial covering - or you sin if you do. **THE BIBLE DOES NOT TEACH SUCH A DOCTRINE.** Your long, uncut hair is your covering; therefore when you are asked such an important question you may answer the question. In 1 Corinthians 11:15 Paul says, "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." **HOW MUCH PLAINER CAN IT BE?**
262. Paragraph 228 deals with Pat's absurdity. Nothing new was offered. Reread my paragraph 202.

263. In paragraph 229 Pat continues making arguments on things that he does not believe. For example, the indication that Tamar (Genesis 38:15) may have covered her face by combing her hair forward. Such is absurd and warrants no response for the readers can see how ridiculous it is.
264. In paragraph 230 Pat completely ignores more than a page of scholars concerning the word "shorn" meaning "to cut close." He says that he is "willing to admit the obvious fact that some define it as cutting short or close"; however, he does not attempt to prove them wrong. I have repeatedly stated that every dictionary that indicates a length always proves that shorn means "cut short." The only dictionaries that doesn't do this is one giving a abbreviated definition.
265. In paragraph 231 Pat mentions the fact that I gave additional authorities to prove that "shorn" means to cut close; however, he does not respond to them in order to prove them wrong. WHY? Because he can not. He dreams up "examples" concerning the word "shear." He speaks of several things being sheared, for example sheet metal and bushes. Why didn't you give an example concerning "hair." SIMPLY BECAUSE YOU CAN'T. You know that concerning "hair" or even "fleece" on a sheep that "shorn" means to "cut short." Pat totally ignores my statement concerning "shearing" sheet metal in paragraph 205. REREAD to see that Pat's smoke screen will not work.
266. Pat jumps again and ignores my paragraph 206. He then goes to paragraph 207; however, he doesn't even attempt to answer what I said. Instead, he says that I have "not responded" to his arguments in paragraphs 111, 112 and 186. First of all paragraph 111 and 112 were in the last speech of the first proposition. I had no opportunity to respond to these two paragraphs. My responsibility, in the negative, is to follow you - this I have done. Now, let's consider paragraph 186 - did I "respond" to this paragraph - YES, and it is a falsehood to say otherwise. I responded to this in paragraph 207.
267. In paragraph 233 Pat again accuses me of not responding to another argument found in paragraph 187. This is absolutely a false statement. I answered it in paragraph 208 and even gave examples to prove his statements wrong. Pat, why didn't you at least attempt to answer my response. You ask, WHY did Paul suddenly switch to a different word in verse 15? He did so because the words are interchangeable (as I have proven many times). If they are interchangeable, as you also have agree they are at times (see paragraph 234), Paul could use either word and therefore, he did.
268. In paragraph 234 Pat says, "Mark please prove that they (two words for covering in 1 Corinthians 11) are used interchangeably in 1 Corinthians 11."

The fact that we both agree that they can be used interchangeably, the fact that "hair" is under consideration in the context, the fact that W.E. Vine, Dean Alford and others that I have quoted states this is proof that they are interchangeably in 1 Corinthians 11.

269. In paragraph 235 Pat restates an argument which has been repeatedly answered - see paragraph 171.
270. In paragraph 236 Pat indicates that I may have refused to answer his argument in paragraphs 188 & 145. THIS IS FALSE. See my paragraph 210. Pat, you have not said one thing that I have not responded to, and you know it. Obviously, you have run out of arguments for your position and therefore, you are attempting to make the readers think that I did not answer you. THE READERS KNOW THAT I DID ANSWER.
271. In paragraph 237 Pat says that I have failed to respond to the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th sentences of paragraph 145. THIS IS FALSE - SEE PARAGRAPH 172 FOR MY ANSWER.
272. In paragraph 238 Pat, again says that I did not respond to things he said previously. THIS IS NOT TRUE! Furthermore, Pat, why did you not answer my paragraph 173. You have had several opportunities but REFUSED.
273. In paragraphs 239-240 Pat deals more concerning his argument that short hair covers as much as long hair. This is absurd. As I stated in paragraph 213: "The Bible never teaches that short hair is a covering - only **LONG HAIR**. Since short hair is not a covering it cannot cover in the way that 1 Corinthians 11 teaches. Long hair covers more than short hair because Paul says "But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering." (1 Corinthians 11:15). On the other hand "short hair" is never called a covering; therefore, it does not cover. See my answer to Pat's question #25.
274. In paragraph 241 Pat refers to his question #18 and claims that even though he has made this same point over and over that I have not answer it. THIS IS A FALSE STATEMENT. See my answer to question 18.
275. In paragraph 242 Pat falsifies again by saying that I "failed to respond" to his statements. This is a repeat of a previous paragraph. Paul did use two different words in 1 Corinthians 11 because they were interchangeable, just as you have admitted they are at times. Since I have proven, and you agreed, that they are interchangeable at times, you must prove that they are not in 1 Corinthians 11. YOU ARE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.

276. In paragraph 243 Pat refers to paragraph 219 in which I pointed out his "misleading and false tactics." I said this in reference to Pat's statement about me, supposedly, having admitted that the covering of verses 5,6,7,&13 includes an artificial covering. In paragraph 243 Pat says, "Mark, where did I say such?" Pat, in paragraph 191 you said, "I have proven that the covering of verses 5,6,7,&13 includes an artificial covering by using Mark's own admission." **THIS IS YOUR "MISLEADING AND FALSE TACTICS."** Once again, you accuse me of not answering your question - **THIS IS NOT TRUE.** Concerning you having proven that the covering of verse 4 is the same as the covering of verses 5,6,&7 is absolutely not true. You stated this; however, with no proof.
277. In paragraph 244 Pat gives a summary of his affirmation. His first argument concerns the idea that the "covering of verse 5 is temporary (while praying or prophesying), but the covering of verse 15 is permanent." **I have proven this to be wrong by showing several Biblical examples where a specific time or place (temporary) is named but yet the instructions were not limited to this place. (SEE PARAGRAPH 160 AND CHART #1.)**
278. Pat then refers to something that he is not "sure" of concerning the word "shorn" not referring to "how much is cut off." **I have repeatedly given 22+ scholars to prove that shorn means to "cut short," "cut close" or "cut off." (SEE PARAGRAPH 204.**
279. Pat's third argument concerning the idea that the word translated "covered" in verses 5,6,7,&13 comes from a different Greek word than the word translated "covering" in verse 15. **This was answered by proving, repeatedly, that the two terms are interchangeable. This Pat has agree to and has even stated: "I don't think that this (two different words) proves that two different coverings are under consideration,..." (SEE PARAGRAPH 170).**
280. Pat's fourth argument deals with the covering referred to in verses 5,6,7 & 13 includes an artificial covering and that it is the same as the covering of verse 4. **This was answered by referring to Pat's own statements in which he said, "Paul does not specifically use the word 'artificial' in verses 5,6, or 13." He also stated that he knows "of no Greek Lexicon that uses the word 'artificial.'" (SEE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS 16 & 17). Pat cannot proved the covering is artificial because he says 1 Corinthians 11 nor Lexicons states it.**
281. Pat's fifth and final argument is based on the idea that "the covering of verse 5 is to cover the HEAD, and the long hair does not cover the HEAD any more than short hair does. **This was answered by showing that "short hair" is not a covering; therefore, it does not cover. (SEE PARAGRAPH 213 AND MY ANSWER TO HIS QUESTION #25.)**

## CONCLUSION

282. Readers, you must now judge for yourself. I have just stated Pat's arguments and how I proved them wrong. However, the arguments I presented still stands. **Argument #1** proved, by W.E. Vine and Vincent and Revelation 9:8 that the word "power" refers to long hair. **Argument #2** proved that people become uncovered by cutting the hair "specially by shaving" and that the context of 1 Corinthians 11 teaches "HAIR" by referring to "hair" every time the word "covered," "uncovered," or "not covered" is found in reference to woman. **Argument #3** proved that the terms hair and veil are used interchangeable. **Argument #4** proved, from verse 15, that hair is given for a covering and that even though two different Greek terms are found for covering in 1 Corinthians 11 that they are interchangeable. **Argument #5** proved that long hair means uncut hair.
283. Most of these arguments, Brother Donahue has not even attempted to deny, but instead he admits:

### DONAHUE'S ADMISSIONS

- #1 The "artificial covering" cannot be proven by the "specific words ("artificial"), nor in the definition of 'covered'..." (Paragraph 175)
- #2 1 Corinthians 11:15 tells us that the **context** is speaking about the hair." (Paragraph 108)
- #3 The context of 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 is hair. (Paragraph 71)
- #4 The word "uncovered" could refer to hair and means "to make naked... specially by shaving." (Paragraph 77).
- #5 The word "uncovered" could refer to the cutting of the hair. (Paragraph 77).
- #6. The word "veil" does not necessitate something artificial. (Paragraph 79).
- #7. The word "veil" could be used to refer to veiling with the hair. (Paragraph 79).
- #8. The words "covered," "uncovered," and "not covered" ((a)katakalypto) in 1 Corinthians 11:5,6 &13 could be used interchangeably without violence with the "covering" (peribolaion) in verse 15. (Paragraph 80).
- #9. That a Christian woman must have long uncut hair. (Paragraph 81).

- #10. The *peribolaion* (covering in verse 15 which the hair is given for) could possibly describe something that would suffice for the covering required by verse 6.
284. The seriousness in understanding the truth on this subject is because Brother Donahue believe and says that preachers should **withhold baptism** from a woman who refuses to wear the artificial covering. (Answer to my question #30). THINK OF THE RESULTS OF SUCH A POSITION.