**IS THE HAIR THE ONLY COVERING?**

**BY DICK WARD**

Before getting to the subject at hand, I feel compelled to make a few remarks in my introduction that I believe pertinent to the over-all study being conducted. Let me first read a familiar passage from Luke’s writing in the book of Acts. Luke records a statement by the apostle Paul in his discussion with those elders of the church at Ephesus: “For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.” There are some people who feel that subjects like this (the covering of I Corinthians 11) ought not to be studied. Yet, if we fulfill the obligation set forth as a necessary inference in Acts 20:26-27, somewhere, sometime, we are going to have to spend time studying this part of God’s word. Therefore, it would be wrong for me or anyone else to say that you ought not to study this passage; that you ought not to preach or teach on it if you are in a position as a preacher or teacher. I should not do that; I should not try to prevent brethren from speaking on this subject. Also, with the same thoughts in view, I do not appreciate any man who would attempt to silence me on this subject or attempt to restrict my rights to present what I understand the Bible to teach in this passage or in any other passage.

 I recall a telephone conversation with a gospel preacher who called me prior to the first speech delivered in this series of studies on I Corinthians 11:1-16. In one breath he opposed the study and with the next breath he discussed an article he was “seriously” considering having published which (you guessed it) had to do with the subject matter of I Corinthians 11. When I asked him if the material he had prepared on the subject of the covering was written BEFORE or AFTER he had heard of the five-lesson series, he admitted that it had been written BEFORE he knew of the study of five lessons. So it could not have possibly been in his mind to write his article BECAUSE of the study at Pleasant Grove since he admitted he was not aware of these lessons. I suggested to this preacher that he had the right to publish what he believed on the subject found in I Corinthians 11:1-16. I encouraged him to have a series of lessons (where he preaches) on the subject, if the church there wanted such and if my schedule would allow, I would certainly try to attend. I feel now just like I felt then, if a congregation wants such a study, let them plan what they desire and with the same allowance let other churches plan their own work and study periods – autonomy, I believe it is called!

 One of the questions that I received from the audience after my speech posed the following, “why the need for five nights on this controversial subject but not on the deity, miracles, virgin birth or the resurrection of Christ?” The plain and simple answer is that the elders chose this particular time for the study (their right, you know) while other times have been given for these other subjects. If my memory serves me well, I have preached a series of lessons on each of these subjects with the exception of the virgin birth. But to get to the heart of the question, “why five nights?” Well, let me answer this part of the question with the following observation. I have never met a person who took issue with my position on I Corinthians 11 that argues that the covering is not necessary for the woman when she prays or when she prophesies because it was a CUTSTOM at Corinth for those who possessed SPIRITUAL GIFTS to have HAIR as the covering since the passage is FIGURATIVE. In other words those who do not believe that a man must be uncovered when he prays or prophesies and that a woman must be covered when she prays or prophesies are not in agreement. Oh yes, they agree the instructions of the apostle Paul in I Corinthians 11:1-16 are not binding today, but they do not reach this conclusion with the same reasoning. One group argues that the information found in this passage is not necessary today because Paul was only giving instructions regulating a practice in view of the custom of the hour. But another group voids Paul’s teaching as being binding today because it has to do with the regulation of spiritual gifts; since the days of miracles have ended, so the need for women to cover and men to uncover while praying or prophesying has ended. Again, we find still another group who do not accept the custom nor the spiritual gifts but rather, set forth that Paul is discussing the need for men to have short hair (thus, be uncovered) and women to have long hair (thus, be covered) and this MUST be followed today. No artificial covering is even mentioned in the passage, they contend. One other view of the passage is the figurative – the point advanced in this view is that the passage does not concern itself with the physical head of the man or the physical head of the woman – figurative language is the answer to Paul’s teaching in I Corinthians 11. To be more accurate, two of the four positions do argue that the passage is still applicable (hair is the covering & figurative language) while the other two (custom and spiritual gifts) contend that the instructions are not for us today. All four of the positions oppose a woman needing an artificial covering on her head when she prays or prophesies and all four positions oppose the need of a man to be without an artificial covering when he prophesies or prays. While there are many capable gospel preachers who do an able job in presenting their teaching on this passage, there are some brethren with whom I have discussed this passage who go from one position to another. When I say they go from one position to another, I mean when one objection is met they will jump to an entirely different position. A man cannot consistently argue that “custom” removes the force of I Corinthians 11:1-16 in the lives of Christians today and turn in the same discussion in an attempt to uphold the spiritual gifts arguments; or the hair is really the covering argument. So, the opponents of my teaching on I Corinthians 11:1-16 have a little homework to do among themselves. I believe any fair person can see why a “five-night” series on this subject!

 As we look back over the speeches already delivered we can see that men have spoken out on this subject on both sides. There has been the use of church bulletins (I have several in my possession) to express a preacher’s views on the covered and uncovered heads. Tracts have been written advancing teaching on the sixteen verses in the first part of I Corinthians 11. Articles in the journals published by brethren have given space to both sides of the question of the covering. In the previous speeches some of this published material has been quoted to show the arguments made by brethren who have given time and thought to Paul’s teaching as recorded in I Corinthians 11:1-16. From a personal standpoint, I have heard men who came to preach in meetings in this area and in other places present what they believe the Bible to teach on the subject. Although I have disagreed with some brethren on their teaching on this subject, I have not denied them the right to present their thoughts. Therefore, we take our right to speak out on this subject. The elders of this church have chosen this method to study this part of God’s word in hopes of gaining knowledge and truth on the subject. Is there any among us who would deny the elders this right in tending the flock among them? I think not!

 One other area that demands our attention before getting to the material I have prepared for consideration needs a moment of our time. This question is about FELLOWSHIP. Several of the questions that were handed to the different speakers indicate interest and concern in this area.. Let me say that I was raised in the Birmingham area and that most of my time in the kingdom of God has been spent in work with brethren in Jefferson county. I have preached for most all of the sound churches, by invitation, at some time or another and I have close friends in most all of these churches. I am glad these churches have held the lines of truth on the support of human organizations. I know of no one who has drawn lines of fellowship on the covering. I don’t know of a church that has refused to “keep company” with a brother who differs with them on this. I Corinthians 11 subject. I have never felt like brethren in this area were “avoiding me” nor “rejecting me in view of my teaching on the covering.” I cannot name a brother in Jefferson county who “refuses to eat with me because of my stand on the covering.” Really, I know of no one who has been treated that way in our area because of this subject.

 Some people insist on asking such questions like: “Well, brother Ward, don’t you believe that a woman ought to be covered and a man uncovered while they engage in the acts of praying or prophesying; and have you not taught that this is an ordinance of God?” Yes, I believe that and I teach that this is an ordinance of God. “Well, if a man or woman violates what you believe the passage teaches aren’t you willing to withdraw fellowship?” I would like to answer this question with a question (as Jesus often did): “If you teach that it is not a requirement today for a man to be uncovered and a woman to be covered when engaged in the act of praying or prophesying and you know of some person who not only practices the opposite of your view but also who is going about teaching the opposite of your view are YOU going to withdraw fellowship from them? Since they teach the OPPOSITE VIEW from your teaching would you not be forced to say they are teaching falsely?” The problem is not unique to just the one side of this Bible question of the covering. Both sides bear much the same responsibility to work for peace and not open division over a subject that involves individual action. I personally believe that such questions about fellowship when “pushed” cause a strain on attitudes and can be the very thing which genders strife. Such questions are not conducive to the kind of study we had purposed in Pleasant Grove. The differences on these matters of the covering have been successfully handled in the past and if brethren really want it, these matters will be properly handled in the future.

 During the question period following my lesson brother James Shear presented two questions seeking information about the practice of the Pleasant Grove church and her “fellowship” with preaching brethren. In one of the questions he asked about men being invited for meeting work. The church meeting in Pleasant Grove has had a long-standing practice of using different speakers in the fall meetings. With this practice I believe I can safely say that the Pleasant Grove church has had more preachers (different speakers) to present sermons than any other congregation in the area – in the last several years. The visiting preachers often do have assigned subjects to carry out a selected theme for a meeting. On other occasions, when no set theme has been selected, the men were asked to choose their own topics. Many of these invited preachers hold the opposite view of the covering question. In thinking back over my work with this church I can recall that the very ffirst meeting held after my move to Pleasant Grove had almost all of the speakers holding a different view on I Corinthians 11:1-16 from that held by the elders of this congregation. The speaker selected for the June meeting of the next year also holds a different position of the subject from that held by the elders. It might be interesting to some to look at the names of men who have had fellowship in preaching the gospel with this congregation since I have labored with them:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OCTOBER 1970Ed HarrellYater TantDavid HarkriderDavid FraiserDoug MatlockHarold ComerEd BragwellGene Plunkett | NOVEMBER 1971Jimmy ThomasGilbert AlexanderHiram HuttoIrvin LeeLeo PlylerA.C. MooreBob WaldronRex Hadley | NOVEMBER 1972Clark BuzbeeWillis LoganDarrel HymelBill NaveE. L. LovellW.N. ChriesmanHuston Gateley | November 1973James ShearAubrey BelueJackie RichardsonA.C. MooreWayne PayneBill HallBarney KeithDick Ward | November 1974Lowell BlasingameDavid ClaypoolFrank SmithChet EllisCurtis FlattAl WatkinsCharles Maples | November 1975Richard WeaverHuey HartsellHugh DavisErvin DriskillJohn GurtlerMike JohnsonGary HalcombL.A. Mott |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| JUNE 1971Harold Comer | June 1972Curtis Flatt | June 1973Lynn Headrick | June 1974Hiram Hutto | June 1975Sam Hastings | June 1976Lynn Headrick |

The second question brother Shear presented was one asking about Pleasant Grove’s support of men on a regular basis. Brother James Shear’s question was worded: “Will the church here at present support a man on a regular basis that does not believe the covering of I Cor. 11 is binding today?” In looking back over the financial reports for the Pleasant Grove church I found that the first man to be supported other than the local preacher was brother J.D. Mosley. After brother Mosley came the next three names of men receiving wages from this church while they labored in another field. The three names are as follows: LEE, McCAY and SHEAR. Although brother Shear has never believed the covering of I Corinthians 11 to be binding today, the congregation meeting here in Pleasant Grove had fellowship with James in his preaching work for several years. In the years I have preached for this congregation several me have been supported who differ with the elders on the covering question. I believe the practice of the past shows adequately the position of this church and I do not forsee any change in the future. Now really, whose business is it who the elders support or how they go about deciding who to support?

 I hope to present the material prepared for this study in such a way that it is palatable to all who are present; to present the study so all might see the arguments clearly and weigh them as to their strength or weakness in light of divine revelation. A lesson has already been presented that dealt with I Corinthians and spiritual givts. I am not talking about that question at this time. We had a lesson presented that looked at I Corinthians 11 and custom. I am not discussing that question at this time. I am going to look at some of the arguments advanced by those who believe and teach that there is only ONE covering considered in the first sixteen verses of I Corinthians 11. Does I Corinthians 11:1-16 teach that if a woman has her hair (long hair) when she prays or prophesies she obeys the instruction of Paul? Or, does the passage under consideration have TWO coverings – a natural covering and an artificial covering? I believe the passage teaches TWO coverings are being considered. In the case of the woman, Paul teaches her to have long hair as a covering (the natural covering which is permanent) but also, he teaches her to have an additional covering (the artificial covering which is temporary - something she puts on and takes off) to be worn at specified times. In the case of the man, Paul teaches him to be uncovered (without artificial covering) when he prays or prophesies and for the man to follow nature’s teaching and have short hair. Let us begin by asking the question, HOW MANY COVERINGS ARE IN THE PASSAGE?

 I want to suggest to you that I Corinthians 11: 15 indicates without any question that “the hair” is given her for a covering. The passage reads, “for her hair is given her for a covering.” Let me hasten to say I do not believe that the hair is the ONLY covering of the passage. It might do us some good to seek out the contextual use of this verse. What part does verse fifteen play in Paul’s presentation of this subject of the covered and uncovered heads? I believe in a close examination of the setting all of us should be able to see Paul’s point in this part of his discussion of the subject. Paul has already presented reasons for his contention that women are to be covered and the men to be uncovered (verses 1-12) and he is now simply appealing to the reader of the epistle with what might be called his “secondary arguments”. By way of illustrating his instruction that women ought to be covered and men ought to be uncovered Paul appeals to nature’s teaching. What does Paul say nature teaches? The apostle has written that nature teaches long hair for the male is a shame unto him and the inspired writer instructs us that nature teaches long hair for the female is a glory to her. What does nature teach? Nature is teaching the woman to grow a natural covering and nature is teaching the man not to grow a natural covering. Thus, nature’s teaching well illustrates the point that the apostle has argued in the preceding verses – when parying let the woman be covered and the man uncovered. So, this is my first argument to show that the hair is not the ONLY covering of the passage. The way Paul has used verses 14 and 15 by way of ILLUSTRATION; nature’s teaching of the natural covering (the hair) supports the propriety of the artificial covering of verses 5, 6, and 13. If the long hair is the ONLY covering then why does Paul (verses 4, 5, 6, 13) methodically point to a need for women to be covered when engaged in SPECIFIC acts of worship? We all know that long hair is not a temporary thing but rather it is permanent. When once established, long hair is with the woman continually in every activity she undertakes so there is no need for a specific act (praying) to be mentioned. A proper view of the context argues against only one covering in this passage !

 The next argument for your consideration will come through a study of the following chart [at end of Brother Ward’s sermon outline csw] that is entitled, DO THE NOUNS AND VERBS AGREE? Let me preface the comments I want to make in view of this chart by suggesting to you that you do not need to be a Greek scholar nor do you need to be able to read Greek to understand our arguments presented on the chart. Actually, you can take a Young’s Concordance and turn to page 209 under the word “covering” and notice the 13th entry. This reference shows us the word used in I Corinthians 11:15 and translated “covering”. Young’s Concordance indicates the Greek word which some will not be able to read but the TRNASLITERATED form of this word is also given (peribolation). With these English letters we are now able to “sound out” the Greek word for covering as is found in I Corinthians 11:15. Now look on this same page of Young’s Concordance but find the listings for the word “covered”. In the 6th entry under the word “covered” we have I Corinthians 11: 5, 6, and 13 listed. Take notice of the TRANSLITERATED form and you see the English letters spelling out a different word (katakalupto) than that which we found in I Corinthians 11:15. The point I am making is that without a working knowledge of the Greek language the transliterations show the words are DIFFERENT. As we study along with the information from the chart we now know that the word “covering” in verse 15 is a different word from those found in verses 5, 6, and 13. We hope to show by the use of the chart why we do not believe the covering of :15 is the SAME covering mentioned in verses 5, 6, and 13. We know already that the words are spelled differently and by the information from the chart we will be able to see that the words are not from the same “family” of words and thus do not properly go together.

 Another introductory point. Please check the complete definitions of the words we are presenting to see that we have not mis-represented the material. We have tries to take care so as to accurately present the reference material but we realize the possibility of mis-spelling, etc. I have tried not to “twist” any material to fit with my position on I Corinthians 11:1-16. We did not choose to give every word under each definition because of lack of space and time. We have searched through the reference material and sought to present those parts of the definition that pertain directly to our study.

 In turning our attention to the chart (DO THE NOUNS AND VERBS AGREE?) we have placed the noun translated “covering” in I Corinthians 11:15 next to the corresponding verb. Look also to the chart and see that the verb forms found in I Corinthians 11:5, 6, and 13 are not from periballo but rather from kalupto. It is significant that these words are different. Not onlydo we have a noun form in verse 15 while we have verb forms in verses 5, 6, and 13 but the chart shows that these words are from a different “family” of words altogether. Peribolaion corresponds to the verb periballo and kalumma corresponds to the various forms of kalupto. The formal definition given by W.E. Vine shows that PERIBOLAION literally means, “something thrown around”. Look at the chart and notice the parentheses under W.E. Vine’s definition. “(peri, around, ballo, to throw)”. This shows that the word for covering in I Corinthians 11:15 (peribolaion) comes from the compound verb periballo. The word is used only two times in the New Testament – here and in Hebrews 1:12. On the other hand, we learn from W.E. Vine’s definition on page 252 of his Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words that KALUPTO (the verb found in verses 5, 6, and 13) means “to cover; … to veil” and note the corresponding noun for this particular verb is not PARIBOLAION but rather KALUMMA, “a veil”. With that in mind look now at the chart under Thayer’s definition of KALUMMA and notice his comment when he says, “(kalumma or its equiv., is suggested to the reader by the context in I Corinthians 11:4…)”.

 We are now ready to draw several conclusions from the information found on the chart. First, we can clearly see that the word found in verse 15 is an entirely different word from the words of verses 5, 6, and 13. I want to emphasize that these words differ in that they are not from the same ROOT WORD and thus are from a different “family” of words. But look back to the bottom of the chart and notice the last quote we have listed. When Dr. Merrill F. Unger (author of Unger’s Bible Dictionary) was asked about this passage he had this to say, “No, it is not possible for the Greek verbs of I Corinthians 11:5, 6, and 13 to be correctly used with the Greek noun PERIBOLAION…” Now let me hasten to say that I personally do not know enough about the Greek language to tell you that Mr. Unger’s statement cannot be refuted. I will state that the person who argues that the hair or long hair of the woman is the “covering” that can be substituted in verses 5, 6, and 13 must refute Mr. Merrill F. Ungre’s statement. What we have demonstrated through this chart is that a different word is used and it is from a different “family” of words and some Greek scholars contend that one cannot correctly substitute or interchange these words. The person who contends that a woman’s hair or her long hair is the ONLY covering in the passage must explain why different words are used. Also, the individual who is contending for the hair or long hair must show that peribolaion can be correctly used with the verb forms of kalupto. If you believe that a woman’s hair is the covering or if you would rather have it stated that you believe the woman’s long hair is the covering of I Corinthians 11:5,6 and 13 you must not ignore this material concerning the word differences. You must answer the question, DO THE NOUNS AND VERBS AGREE? Surely we can see that they do not agree and that they argue for a different covering in verses 5, 6, and 13 from that covering (the hair) in verse 15! Yes, there are actually TWO coverings discussed in I Corinthians 11:1-16; the hair is certainly one of the coverings (:15) but not the ONLY covering. The passage also discusses a covering that is not PERMANENT like the hair but is a covering that can be PUT ON AND TAKEN OFF and thus is an ARTIFICIAL one. To please God, the woman is to have long hair (her permanent covering) ALL OF THE TIME and she is to have an artificial covering (her temporary covering) when she PRAYS OR PROPHESIES.

 If the hair or long hair is the covering, please explain the different words given in the text; please produce the information showing Mr. Unger’s statement that the words cannot be used interchangeably is false; please explain Mr. Thayer’s point of kalumma (not paribolaion) being inferred in the text. Until these points are answered successfully, it falls that our conclusions from the chart MUST BE TRUE. The hair is given the woman for a covering – the natural and permanent one – but an artificial covering which is worn when in the act of praying or in the act of prophesying is under consideration in verses 5, 6, and 13.

 Let us turn our attention to still another area of study on this hair question. Some people who contend that a woman does not need an artificial covering on her head today when she prays or prophesies advance the argument that the verse should be rendered as follows and should be understood that there is no veil needed:

 “… because her hair is given her instead of a veil.” – The N.T. in Modern English

 “… for her hair is given her instead of a covering.” – The Authentic Version, 1951

 “… Because the hair instead of a covering hath been given to her:” – Youngs Literal Translation

ETC… (see chart #2 at end of sermon)

 Our question for consideration, “Should we translate the word ANTI “instead of” and understand that the hair is given in place of an artificial covering?” Let us look at the chart for the formal definition of this Greek word and please take special note of its use in the New Testament.

 Our chart (Her Hair Is Given Her For – “Instead of” – A Covering) shows Mr. Thayer’s definition of ANTI as: “2. Indicating exchange, succession, FOR, INSTEAD OF, IN PLACE OF (something). A. Univer. INSTEAD OF… Lk 11:11; anti peribolaiou to serve as a covering, I Cor. 11:15…” In Mr. Thayer’s comments on this he has informed us that it means in I Corinthians 11:15, “to serve as a covering.” Thus, Mr. Thayer does not agree that the long hair takes the place of an artificial covering but rather he points out that the hair SERVES AS A COVERING. Now look to the chart again and we will examine another definition from a Greek Lexicon – Arndt and Gingrich, page 73: “2. In order to indicate that one thing is equiv. to another, FOR AS, IN PLACE OF… hair as a covering I Corinthians 11:15…” Once again, we must not overlook the fact of still another Lexicon avoiding the connotation that the hair is to take the place of an artificial covering. I ask yu now, are not these Modern Translations that give the word ANTI as “instead of” doing an injustice to the text and leading us in the wrong direction? Surely you can see that to be the case.

 If you will look back to the chart (#2) I want to notice with you the next reference we have listed and it is a comment found in the Expositor’s Greek New Testament. It reads, “And this ‘glory’ is grounded upon her humility: ‘because her hair to serve as a hood (anti peribolaiou) has been given her’ – not as a substitute for headdress (this would be to stultify Paul’s contention),…” Let me emphasize the latter part of this quote – NOT AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR HEADDRESS! This same point is brought out in the Word Studies of the New Testament by A.T. Robertson. As we call attention to the chart (#2), it reads: “It is not in the place of a veil, but answering to (anti, in the sense of anti in John 1:16), as a permanent endowment…” Think about these two comments along with the Lexicons. How can one argue that the hair is given in place of an artificial covering? The opposite teaching is shown in the definitions and in these Greek word studies than that which one advocates who says we ought to give up the King James, American Standard Translations and accept some of these modern renderings of verse 15.

 Before leaving this word study of ANTI, I have on the bottom of this chart (#2) several references containing this word and I want to see if one can insert this ‘INSTEAD OF’ definition into these passages without running into some problems. Take the first passage, Matthew 5:38, “an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” but we are going to make the insertion and let it read, “an eye INSTEAD OF an eye”. That does not make too much sense, does it? But continue on, “a tooth INSTEAD OF a tooth”; I do not understand that, do you? It just will not work in Matthew 5:38 is the point. The second scripture will do no better with this insertion of INSTEAD OF. Let us try it in Matthew 17:27. The setting of this passage is when Jesus was asking about a need to pay tribute. Jesus was willing to pay the tribute to prevent His offending those who would not understand so the Lord instructed Peter to go and catch a fish and this fish would have a piece of money in it to pay the tribute. But look at the last phrase of the verse, “give unto them for Me and thee”. Now let us insert the “INSTEAD OF”. And it will now read, “and give unto them INSTEAD OF me and thee”. The thought of this passage has changed with the insertion. Jesus was not saying that the coin was to be given INSTEAD OF Peter and himself – the body of Peter was not an acceptable exchange for the money that was due. One could not pay this tribute by substituting his own person in place of the required coin. The passage does not teach what the insertion of INSTEAD OF would force it to teach so we conclude that this is not an acceptable way of translating the word ANTI. We want to notice the next passage and that is found in Matthew 20:28. This passage reads: “to give His life a ransom for many”. When we remove the FOR and replace it with the “INSTEAD OF” we really degrade the teaching of the scripture. Jesus gave His life a ransom “for many” but the insertion makes the passage read, “to give His life a ransom INSTEAD OF many”. If INSTEAD OF is a lawful way of translating ANTI in this passage, we have the idea taught that it is possible for “many” to be a ransom. I am confident that everyone present realizes that Jesus is the only ransom and there is no number of people – many - that God will accept as a substitute INSTEAD OF or IN PLACE of the Lamb of God. Only one person has ever lived that is worthy to be a “ransom” and so we see how such and insertion abuses the word of God. I call your attention to the last scripture listed on the chart and this is the one that A.T. Robertson calls forth as an example of how the word ANTI is used in I Corinthians 11:15 (see chart #2 for Robertson’s comment on I Cor. 11:15). With the insertion in John 1:16 it reads, “all we received, and grace INSTEAD OF grace”. In this scripture we have the downfall of this INSERTION argument – it just will not fit and make any sense. We see from these several passages that the INSTEAD OF definition will not be acceptable because it changes the meaning of God’s word.

 In conclusion, let me say that if the word ANTI is to be translated “instead of” in I Corinthians 11:15 the responsibility for such falls heavily upon the individual who argues for such. Since the word ANTI does not bean “instead of” every place it is used in the New Testament then before we allow one to translate this word in a different way than the King James and American Standard rendering, let them show by the context that this is demanded. Thayer and Arndt and Gingrich say that the hair is a covering not “instead of a covering”; the two word studies argue from the Greek construction that the hair is not a substitute for the artificial covering nor has the long hair been given in place of the artificial covering; the many passages where ANTI is found and translated FOR when changed to make them read “INSTEAD OF” wrest the scriptures. I suggest to you that such an insertion in I Corinthians 11:15 will also distort this passage and will “stultify” Paul’s teaching in the earlier part of the chapter. Paul has given reasons for the woman (verses 1-14) to have an artificial covering on her head when she prays or prophesies but this change of ANTI to mean INSTEAD OF makes Paul appear foolish in giving these several reasons since the hair is all that one really needs. I hope you can see the fallacy in this argument which attempts to free the woman from the obligation to be covered while in these acts of worship.

 Now I want to turn our attention to some REASONABLE ARGUMENTS to show that two coverings are discussed in I Corinthians 11:1-16. As we consider these affirmative arguments I am confident it will become evident that Paul has under discussion in the passage more than simply the hair. The first point we need to examine is the question will the HAIR substitute agreeably in the text? If the HAIR is the ONLY covering in the passage, then we shoud be able to insert the word hair in the text and have it read correctly. So, let us look to the chart (#3 Reasonable Arguments) and do this insertion. After taking the expression from I Corinthians 11:15 (for her hair is given to her for a covering) and using it in verse 4 we have the following: “Every man praying or prophesying WITH HAIR ON HIS HEAD, dishonoureth his head.” If this is taken to the extreme, a man would have to remove all his hair before he could pray to God acceptably. And what sense can we make of verse 6 if we allow this insertion? “For if the woman BE NOT WITH HAIR let her also be shorn.” How could a woman have her hair cut off if she is already without hair? This certainly shows that HAIR is not the ONLY covering spoken of in these verses. Let me add just here the fact that we have already noticed the first chart (Do The Nouns and Verbs Agree?) which plainly shows the hair (peribolaion of verse 15) cannot be correctly used with the verbs (katakalupto) of verses 4, 5, 6, and 13. But for the sake of argument, one can still see the error of making the HAIR the covering of verses 4, 5, 6, and 13!

 Some people agree that the HAIR will not substitute in the verses but are quick to point out that they believe LONG HAIR will insert in the verses and make sense. Let me hasten to say that I believe Paul is teaching the female to have long hair all of the time and when she removes the long hair (cuts it off) she has brought shame to herself and to her head. I believe the apostle informs us that the male must have the short hair before he is pleasing to God and when a man lets his hair grow long he brings dishonor to himself and to Christ. I do not believe that verses 4 and 6 is the place Paul is teaching how hair brings shame. It is true that every man praying with LONG HAIR ON HIS HEAD dishonors his head. Yes, this is true but not because of I Corinthians 11:4 but rather because of I Corinthians 11:14. Let me illustrate this point by looking to an example of the mis-use of I Corinthians 9:14. This passage reads “…*they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.”* Sometimes this passage is mis-used by people who contend that the preachers need to live by the same message that they preach. Well, certainly preachers ought to practice what they preach but this passage is talking about preacher support and not the preacher’s manner of life! We might look to Romans and find in chapter 2:21, 22 the passage that is the proof-text for the need of people (preachers) to conform to their own teaching. Just as it is a mis-use of I Corinthians 9:14 to apply it in the manner above, so we ought to be able to see the mis-use of I Corinthians 11:4 when people attempt to make the LONG HAIR the covering of the passage.

 Before leaving this matter of trying to substitute LONG HAIR in the verses, I want to suggest to you that this cannot be the covering under consideration because such an insertion in verse 6 makes Paul’s comment without force or weight. When Paul says, “… *if the woman be not covered let her also be shorn.”* He is not actually demanding the unveiled woman to cut off her hair. Paul is pointing out her inconsistency in going only halfway – the uncovered head while praying or prophesying is logically followed by the shaven or shorn physical head because both are shameful and dishonorable. Paul is not encouraging women to do the dishonorable thing but rather he wants them to act in the opposite way – let her keep her long hair (do not cut it off) and let her be veiled when she prays or prophesies! What are the alternatives offered to women by the apostle? Paul offers two alternatives in this passage – to be shameful or to be honorable! Whether a woman is shameful or honorable depends upon her practice. I fa woman has long hair (verse 15) it is a glory to her and it brings honor to her (verse 14 – just the opposite of man). Paul demands the woman to be consistent and have a veiled or covered head when she prays or prophesies which also brings honor to her (verses 5, 6. And 13). Now let me show you from the context why LONG HAIR does not logically fit into verse 6. Keep in mind that with this position, COVERED equals LONG HAIR and UNCOVERED equals SHORT HAIR. Let me insert into these verses these “formulas” and see if the passage makes sense:

 :4 “*every man praying or prophesying, having LONG HAIR, dishonoreth his head”*

 :5 *“But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with SHORT HAIR dishonoreth her head: for that is even all one as if she were shaven*.”

:6 *“For if the woman has SHORT HAIR, let her also be shorn; but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her have LONG HAIR*.”

We learn from verse 5 that the uncovered head is equal to the shaven head in the sense of bringing the same degree of shame. Look to the last phrase of verse 5 with me: “…*for that is even all one as if she were shaven.”* Notice on the chart (Reasonable Arguments) under “Long Hair” and read with me from several translations of verse 5 and the last phrase:

 “…*for she is one and the same with her whose head is shaved.”*

 New American Standard Version

 “*…it is just as though her head were shaved.”*

 The New International Version, 1965.

 “…*for she is exactly the same as a woman who is shorn.”*

 New Testament in Modern Speech

If LONG HAIR is the covering of verses 4, 5, 6, and 13 then verse 5 states that SHORT HAIR (the uncovered head) is one and the same with the shaved head. From this viewpoint, the woman who does not have LONG HAIR is shameful; it does not matter if the hair is SHAVEN, SHORN, OR SHORT – it is SHAMEFUL! I am at a loss to make any sense out of verse 6 if this LONG HAIR is the ONLY covering in the passage. Look with me and see if verse 6 has any purpose if SHORT HAIR is the UNCOVERED HEAD.

 “*… if the woman has SHORT HAIR let her also be shorn…”* (verse 6)

If SHORT HAIR and SHORN HAIR are equally shameful (verse 5b) where is the force and what is the purpose? Can you really believe that Paul would say, “if the woman has SHORT HAIR let her ALSO be shorn”? There is no REASON or PURPOSE for Paul to instruct the woman with SHORT HAIR (uncovered?) to ALSO shave her head because by this position, ANY LENGTH of hair other than LONG is shameful – whether it be shaven, shorn, or this SHORT HAIR. The truth of the matter is that Paul has TWO coverings under consideration in I Corinthians 11:1-16. And Paul is telling women to use an artificial covering when they pray or prophesy or else be consistent and ALSO be shaven or shorn. The Greek grammar does not allow the substitution and it is evident her that the context argues against the HAIR or for that matter the LONG HAIR as being the COVERING of verses 4, 5, 6, and 13.

 We are affirming that the passage shows two coverings. I Corinthians 11:15 indicates that the hair of the woman is given her for a covering and we might add that the hair is permanent – having this covering at all times. On the other hand, I Corinthians 11:5, 6, and 13 teach a second covering that is temporary in the sense that Paul gives specific times for the wearing of it – the woman to be covered when praying or prophesying. Since this second covering is not worn all the time then it would naturally follow that this second covering is artificial.

I Cor 11:15 - HAIR - PERMANENT – at all times

I Cor 11:5, 6, 13 - ARTIFICIAL - TEMPORARY – at the times of praying or

 prophesying

**TWO COVERINGS CONSIDERED**

 Another argument that can be considered is the use of the word ALSO as it is found in verse 6 of I Corinthians 11. “*For if the woman be not covered LET HER ALSO be shorn:”* The word ALSO by its definition means:

 “In addition; as well; besides; too.” Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary

And while we are defining the word ALSO, let us look at the definition of the Greek word (kai) and consider the use of the word in I Corinthians 11:6. Look at this chart (The Word “Also”) and consider Thayer’s definition of kai. As we look to verse 6 and consider again the position that the HAIR is the covering, the passage would be saying, “for if the woman is (WITHOUT HAIR) let her ALSO be SHORN”. How can this be??? How do you go about shearing something without hair? Certainly we can allsee if the HAIR is the covering and the woman is UNCOVERED (without her hair) there is no way to shear off that which is not there in the first place! So we have learned from the adverb ALSO that this passage could not be talking about the HAIR as the COVERING to be put on by the woman when she prays or prophesies.

**THE WORD “ALSO”**

:6 “*For if the woman be not covered LET HER ALSO be shorn…”*

 ALSO (kai) “II. It marks something added to what already has been said, or that of which something already said holds good; accordingly it takes on the nature of an adverb, ALSO 1. Used simply, a. ALSO, LIKEWISE:… I Corinthians 11:6.”

“*If the woman is (WITHOUT HAIR) let her ALSO be SHORN.” How can this be???*

*“If the woman has SHORT HAIR let her ALSO be SHORN.” Why? What is the purpose?*

 One other point before going to our next chart’ let us answer the question about LONG HAIR being the covering of verses 5, 6, and 13. Since UNCOVERED would be synonymous with SHORT HAIR the verse would read: “*… if the woman has SHORT HAIR let her ALSO be SHORN.”*  But with the position before us (long hair is the covering) we would have to understand from verse 5 that the woman with SHORT HAIR (uncovered) has dishonored her head: FOR THAT IS EVEN ALL ONE AS IF SHE WERE SHAVEN (verse 5b)! Now since the short hair (uncovered of verse 5) is “even all one as if she were shaven” what purpose is the suggestion of going on and shearing the physical head? One might argue that the “shorn” hair is a greater degree of shame than the “short” hair. If that is true, the logical step would be to consider the “shaven” head as being a greater degree of shame than the “shorn” hair. But Paul has said that the UNCOVERED head of verse 5 is “even all one as if she were shaven.” Using this idea of degrees of shame, why would Paul tell the woman to SHEAR OFF something that is EQUAL TO IN SHAME the GREATEST DEGREE? – “short hair” is equal to “shaven”! I do hope I have made this point crystal clear. So the word ALSO argues in the setting against LONG HAIR as being the covering of these verses.

 Another reason that I reject the idea that the covering discussed in verses 4, 5, 6, and 13 is the HAIR or LONG HAIR is founded in Paul’s continuous mentioning of the need to wear this covering at a SPECIFIC TIME. Notice how EMPHATICALLY he expresses the time for wearing or not wearing the covering:

 :4 “*Every man PRAYING or PROPHESYING, having his head covered…”*

 :5 “*But every woman that PRAYETH or PROPHESIETH with her head uncovered…”*

:6 “*Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman PRAY unto God uncovered?”*

If the HAIR or LONG HAIR is the covering of these verses, there can be no point in Paul’s attaching special attention to the TIME of WEARING – “When praying or prophesying”. One should feel obligated to explain why Paul mentions the specific acts of worship as the time for the woman to be covered and the man to be uncovered. Look again to the text and yu can see that the inspired apostle gives emphasis to the time of her praying and the time of here prophesying as the TIME FOR THE COVERING. If it were the HAIR or LONG HAIR the woman would have that ALL OF THE TIME. Paul is not saying, “Have this covering ALL OF THE TIME.” He says to the woman, “be covered when you pray; be covered when you prophesy.” He tells the man, “Be uncovered when you pray; be uncovered when you prophesy.” Thus, the covering of the first part of I Corinthians 11 (4-6 and 13) is something that can be put on and taken off for these SPECIFIED TIMES of worship. Once a woman cuts off her HAIR or makes her LONG HAIR into SHORT HAIR by cutting it, she can try as she will but there is no way she can gain back that HAIR or LONG HAIR. By that, I men, the woman cannot grow it back in the same day. Someone pointed out to me that the ENCYCLOPEDIA states that a woman’s hair will grow at the rate of half an inch a month. If that is true, the average woman would have to wair quite some time before she would again have her head covered if LONG HAIR is the only covering in this passage. It is evident that Paul is giving instructions for something that the individual has control over. Since the human will has no control over the growing of hair we cannot help but deduct that the artificial covering is that covering to be put on or removed as the case may be.

I want to go to the next chart (The Human Will Involved) and read from the chart those two verses listed:

:4:6, 13 What REASON would apostle have for mentioning specific acts? “PRAYING OR PROPHESYING” “PRAY” WHEN to put it on/leave it off? ALL THE TIME – NO! but when the “praying” and when the “prophesying” is going on!!!

:7 “OUGHT” “for a man indeed ought not to cover his head”

:10 “OUGHT NOT” “for this cause ought the woman to have power on her head…”

:4 ”HAVING” “Every man praying or prophesying having his head covered…”

:10 “TO HAVE” “For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head…”

 TO HAVE (echo) “… b. in the sense of wearing (Lat. gestare);

 of garments, arms and the like… having a covering hanging down from

 the head, i.e. having the head covered… I Cor. 11:4 THAYER page 266

THE HUMAN WILL INVOLVED

 :7 “for a man indeed ought not to cover his head…”

 :10 “for this cause ought the woman to have power on her head…”

I want you to take special notice of the word “ought” in these verses. The word “ought” suggests something a person woes. The word “ought” suggests the human will is involved. The will of the man is involved, the will of the woman is involved

Back to the chart (The Human Will Involved) and look at the definitions of the word “have”. Mr. Thayer indicates the word “echo” is used in I Corinthians 11:4 as “in the sense of wearing (Latin gestare); pf garments, arms and the like… having a coverin g hanging down from the head, i.e. having the head covered…” Let me add to Mr. Thayer’s definition the information found in Arndt and Gingrich on page 332 of this lexicon” “b. of clothing, weapons, etc. have on, wear… while he wears (a covering) on his head I Corinthians 11:4.” Thus, we find in verses 4 and 10 the idea of the man being veiled (as the American Standard Version gives it). These definitions argue for an article of clothing, NOT THE HAIR!

Let me read to you again, verse 15: “… for her hair is given to her for a covering.” Please take note, the phrase does not say that the hair has been given the woman for “THE” covering, but rather the text reads, “A” covering! The absence of the definite article is what I want you to notice. Yes, the hair is “A” covering but Paul does not say that the hair is “THE” covering. The passage discussed TWO coverings not ONE! The covering of verses 5, 6, and 13 is something the woman can put on and take off, something that involves the human will of the person; an item of clothing that one wears.

Since we have been discussing the hair as being a covering but not the only covering of this passage, I want to spend a few moments discussing this natural and permanent covering for the woman. We have a chart (Hair Lengths in I Corinthians 11) that begins with verse 14: “if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?” The word (KOMAO) translated “long” in this verse is defined as: signifies to let the hair grow long, to wear long hair, a glory to a woman, a dishonor to a man (as taught by nature), I Corinthians 11:14, 15.” Leaving the definition given by W.E. Vine, look now to Thayer’s definition: “to let hair grow, to have long hair I Corinthians 11:14.” The next verse on this chart is the sixth verse of the chapter: “but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered”. The word shorn (KEIRO) means to have one’s hair cut off, be shorn, as the word is used in Acts 18:18 absolutely of shearing or cutting short the hair of the head, I Corinthians 11:6. Now the other word (XURAO) in the verse, shaven, means to get one’s self shaved. We can now look at several hair lengths that can be found in the text. We read of the LONG HAIR of verses 14 and 15; we notice the shorn hair (shearing

:14 “if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?”

KOMAO “signifies to let the hair grow long, to wear long hari, a glory to a woman, a dishonor to a man (as taught by nature). I Cor. 11:14, 15”

 Ex. Dict. of N.T. Words

 W.E. Vine Vo. II, p. 189

 “to let the hair grow, to have long hair I Cor. 11:14.”

 THAYER page 354

:6 “but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.”

KEIRO (shorn) “to have one’s hair cut off, be shorn, Acts 18:18; I Cor. 11:6

 Ex. Dict. of N.T. Words

 W.E. Vine Vo. IV, p. 18

 “to get or let be shorn Acts 18:18; absol. Of shearing or cutting short the hair

 of the head, I Cor. 11:6.”

 THAYER page 343

XURAO (shaven) “to get one’s self shaved”

 THAYER page 432

1. Long hair
2. Shorn hair
3. Shaved hair
4. Short hair

**HAIR LENGTHS IN I COR. 11**

or cutting short the hair) mentioned in verse 6, and we defined the shaven head of verse 6. I realize that shorn and shaven hair are certainly SHORT HAIR. But let me hasten to add that is unavoidable to conclude that if a head of hair is not shorn (cut close as in the shearing of sheep) nor shaven (the use of a razor is inferred) such a hair length still could be SHORT HAIR. Now, the point I am making is that a woman cannot successfully argue that since she has not shaved her head with a razor nor had her hair cropped close as is done when shearing that her hair length is automatically to be considered LONG! No, I believe we can find that there is SHORT HAIR that is not shaven or shorn. For the proof of this contention,, let us look to Acts 18:18 and read Luke’s account, “And Paul after this tarried there yet a while,… HAVING SHORN HIS HEAD in Cenchrea”. What did Paul do? He had SHORN (keiro) his head. Now Paul is the very one who gave the divine instructions that the LONG HAIR was a dishonor to the man and I do not believe Paul would dishonor his HEAD (Christ). Would Paul do anything under the law of Christ that would be a dishonor and a shame? Thus, we would not infer that Paul had LONG HAIR while under this “vow”. The conclusion drawn from Paul’s actions recorded in Acts 18:18 would suggest that the apostle had a hair length that could be SHORN or cut closer. Please do not misunderstand me, I am certainly not trying to defend the hair lengths of our young men today. I believe we will show very clearly our position toward the effeminate hair lengths of some of our preaching brethren and many of the younger Christians of today. I am showing from this passage that there is no justification in the women today trying to defend their SHORT HAIR styles by pleading that their hair is not SHAVEN OFF nor SHORN like the cropping of sheep! Since Paul was able to take the length of hair that he had at Cenchrea (I believe him to have had an acceptable length at this time) and SHEAR it to complete the “vow” I know that a woman can have a “shameful” length of hair even though it is not cut close as with the shearing tool or shaven as with some kind of razor. How would you answer if you were asked the following question: “If a woman’s hair was the same length as Paul’s hair length at the time BEFORE he sheared his head, would she have had long hair or short hair?

Let me make one more point on this matter of the length of the woman’s hair. It is ironic that Paul appeals to women to cover their heads with an artificial covering and he encourages them to do so by his use of nature’s teaching about the long hair. Today, I find in a few cases, that there are women who would never worship publicly with the uncovered head but who have their natural covering removed – the hair cropped off. Sisters, if you believe Paul requires of you to cover your head (by his inspired teaching in this chapter) then please give due consideration to the OTHER COVERING (the long hair) in this passage. LONG HAIR is YOUR GLORY, do not cut it off!

I want to continue this investigation of matters pertaining to the natural covering (the hair) with the intention of answering the question, “How long is long?” This question can be asked in two different ways. One way the question is presented shows an attitude of self-will. Some say, “Now just how long is long? Is the Bible such that it specifies in inches now long the hair has to be to classify as ‘long hair’?” You can find some of these same people contending that since the scriptures do not give the length in inches or centimeters the individual is free to decide for himself the length of his hair. You will even find a few preachers making this argument (be sure to notice his hair length or that of his teen-age children) and thus leave an impression with people that one cannot tell the difference in long and short hair. But you just ask some of these men if they can answer one question – “How long is long?” – when it pertains to the “length” of women’s dresses. I find no hesitation on their part in coming up with answers where the subject changes from the hair to the matter of proper dress. Lest I be misunderstood, I want to add that I realize it is often difficult to discern the true purpose behind questions that people ask; but some make their “fruit” so evident that one could not misunderstand their purpose. Others are sincere when they ask for an answer to the question, “How Long?”.

I Corinthians 11:14 and 15 teach that the hair, long hair on a man is a SHAME to him while the long hair on the woman is an honor to her. The Bible by these statements about hair lengths, gives every Christian the RESPONSIBILITY to be honorable and not shameful as pertaining to one’s hair.

God had the power to make every woman’s hair grow to the same length and He could have given His children an exact measurement in length if He had so desired. To some people that would have been an easy way out but since God did not specify it falls upon the individual to “discern” through principles given to us. I can se in this a TEST of man’s faith. Will man take the proper care and consideration about his hair as to its length? Will the woman take care to make sure she has her “glory”? God has not given His children the RESPONSIBILITY to have acceptable hair lengths and then leave ma in a position to be unable to “know” how long his hair should be. I know that such a position cannot be right. The truth of the matter is that man can tell how long his hair should be and the woman can know if her hair is long hair.

HOW LONG IS LONG?

SOME OBSERVATIONS

1. The Bible does not give hair lengths in inches or centimeters.
2. The Bible gives RESPONSIBILITY to the man to have short hair.
3. The Bible gives REPONSIBILITY to the woman to have long hair.
4. Which is it? If one cannot answer “How long is long?” – Gpd is giving man a responsibility that he CANNOT fulfill. Or, MAN is OBLIGATED to answer the question & CAN ANSWER the question.

THE AREA OF DISCERNMENT

1. The Stumbling block
2. The Appearance of Evil
3. The Abuse of “Liberty”
4. The Respect for Parents.

In looking to the chart (How Long is Long?) we begin by suggesting that the scriptural answer to this question must be found in our discernment. In reading the Bible we all know that there is not a specific measurement in inches or centimeters. Thus, this points us to the matter of DISCERNMENT. Not everything that is “good” is specified in just so many words nor will we find everything that is “evil” specified. So what can the Christian do? The Hebrew writer shows that many matters fall in the realm of DISCERNMENT: “… who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.” (Hebrews 5:14b). God has given His word which “completely” furnishes man with everything he needs to guide him in the right paths. Since this is true (2 Peter 1:3 and 2 Timothy 3:17), man has been provided the PRINCIPLES to enable him to discern the proper hair length he should maintain. We should not set out to find the passage that gives the length in some measurement (there is not such a text) but rather we should set out to find those scriptures which will aid us in discerning the answer to our question – “How long is long?”. The Christian can discern the proper hair length in such a way to satisfy God; to satisfy his brethren and to satisfy himself – through the principles revealed in the scripture.

In I Corinthians 8:9 the apostle Paul points out the danger of becoming a STUMBLING BLOCK to a weak brother. Paul in writing to the Christians in Rome, made that same point clear when he wrote “… that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother’s way.” (Romans 14:13). In this same chapter and in verse 21 Paul wrote, “It is good neither to eat flesh, or to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak,” In these scriptures, a divine principle is set forth, man must not cause his brother to stumble. In applying this principle to the hair, a brother would not want to have a hair length that would cause another brother to stumble. Let us say, for an example, that the preacher begins to let his hair grow out to the point that many brethren in the congregation where he is preaching start QUESTIONING its length. It might be that several of the younger Christians who try to imitate the preacher begin letting their hair grow longer and longer - even though they have some question about it being proper to do so. When the preacher has brethren coming to him about the length of his hair or making comment about its length, what should that gospel preacher do? Well, Paul has already told him what he ought to do; the inspired apostle points out that the godly man will not even use a “liberty” in such a way as to cause his brother to STUMBLE. We all must take special care that we do not allow “liberties” to turn in to sin (I Corinthians 8:12).

In I Thessalonians 5:22 we read, “Abstain from all appearance of evil.” (King James Version). We see from the more literal translation, “Avoid every kind of evil.” Many students of this passage point out to us that the “appearance” is not really under consideration but the actual sin itself. If that is true, we do see by way of an approved example in the life of the apostle Paul (2 Corinthians 8:18-21) that “appearance” is important. Paul kept himself free from suspicion by allowing each church to appoint its own messengers so he was “providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord but also in the sight of men.” The woman who is seeking to do the will of the Lord will not have SHORT HAIR nor will she try to get JUST AS CLOSE to the line as she can (cutting off some of her hair). She will “avoid the appearance” of that which is a shame. The man, on the other hand, will not allow his hair to get into a questionable length – he will refrain from he appearance of having LONG HAIR.

I want a word with the young people about this matter of hair. The Bible gives the young people the responsibility to obey parents. Paul in Ephesians 6:1 wrote, “Children, obey your parents in the Lord for this is right.” Now let us look at how this commandment to obey the parents will work in application to the hair. A father and mother who are trying to bring up their children in the proper way make a request of the son (let us say he is a Christian who is still living at home) to do something about his “long hair.” They require him to cut his hair short because in their judgment his hair is too long or at least is at a length that brings a question to their minds. Take notice that these godly parents have not requested the son to do anything that is a violation of the will of God. They have not told him to stop studying his Bible nor have they forbidden in any area t hat puts the son in conflict with the obligation to obey the Lord. Suppose for a moment that such a request was “poor” judgment on the part of the parents – that the son’s hair was really not too long. Do you know what the child must do? How would you advise this son to act? Look again to the passage in the book of Ephesians and you cannot help but see what the child MUST DO – “children, OBEY your parents”! Young people, lesten to Paul’s teaching and meet your OBLIGATIONS – “for this is right.”

*[INSERTED HERE ARE SEVERAL PICTURES AND A QUESTIONAIRE REGARDING THE PICTURES AS TO WHETHER THEY SHOW LONG, SHORT, OR QUESTIONABLE LENGTHS OF HAIR ON BOTH MEN AND WOMEN.]*

The last area of our study on this subject has to do with the ways to bring honor and the ways to bring shame. Why am I spending time presenting this material on I Corinthians 11:1-16? Why have the elders of this church planned this study? Why are so many people in attendance if it is incidental or unimportant? The reason that I am teaching on the subject and the reason that the study is being presented in because there are ways to bring honor and there are ways to bring shame that are directly related to this passage. Therefore, upon our head (in the order of subjection). And so, as we look to the chart (Ways to Bring Shame) I want to begin by reading the verses and stop along the way to define a few words in order to place clearly in our minds, exactly how this shame comes about. Verse 4 of I Corinthians 11 says, “Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, DISHONOURETH his head.” The next verse, “But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered DISHONOURETH her head.” The Greek word for dishonor is defined by Thayer on page 331 of his Lexicon as follows: “To dishonor, dis disgrace… I Cor. 11:4.” Thus, we learn that every man who prays or prophesies with the covered head disgraces or dishonors Christ (man’s HEAD). Every woman who prophesies or prays wit her head uncovered, she disgraces man, her head; she dishonors her head. And so here is a way to bring dishonor, disgrace, shame; such is related directly to the covering under consideration in the verse.

:4 “Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, DISHONOURETH his head”

:5 “But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered DISHONOURETH her head”

 KATAISCHUNO “to dishonor, disgrace… I Cor. 11:4” Thayer, page 331

:6 “… but if it be a SHAME for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered”

 AISCHROS “base, dishonorable: I Cor. 11:6” Thayer, page 17

:13 “… is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?”

 PREPO “2. To be becoming, seemly, fit… I Cor. 11:13” Thayer page 535

:14 “…If a man have long hair it is a SHAME unto him”

 ATIMIA “dishonor, ignominy, disgrace… I Cor 11:14” Thayer page 83

WAYS TO BRING SHAME

The next verse of this same chart is the sixth verse of I Corinthians 11:… ut if it be a SHAME for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.” Here we have a different word (aischros). If it be a shame for a woman to be shaven or shorn – and it is – then let her be covered! Here is the “let her be covered” in order that she will not be “base, dishonorable” as Thayer gives the meaning of the word. This verse teaches us that it is a shame for a woman to be “uncovered” just as it is a shame for her to be shaven or shorn. Now I ask you the question, is it a shame for a woman to be shaven today? Is it a dishonorable sight to see a woman today with her head cropped close like in the shearing of sheep? Why, certainly it is! You know it is! Verse 5 shows that it is the same thing as if she were shaven (to have the head uncovered).

Verse 13 asked a question that really answers itself. “… is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?” On page 535 of the work by Thayer, the definition is given: “to be becoming, seemly, fit…” The woman who prays to God uncovered is unbecoming, unseemly, unfit. If a woman prays to God without an artificial covering (the way the passage is arguing the point) it is out of character with godliness and with the woman professing godliness.

And now, the last verse on the chart, “… if a man have long hair, it is a SHAME unto him?” That is, it is a dishonor, a disgrace, ignominy (see Thayer’s definition on the chart).

Now look with me to the unavoidable conclusions that are based on the verses we have just reviewed. Here are ways to bring shame. A man who prays with his head covered; a man who prophesies with his head covered, either one of these brings dishonor, disgrace, and thus brings SHAME. Verse four of the chapter is where this is found. Also from verse fourteen of the chapter we learn that a man having long hair is a DISHONOR, SHAMEFUL and a DISGRACE. Can you not now see why we are discussing this subject? Can you now see why it is important?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| WAYS TO BRING SHAME | WAYS TO BRING HONOR |
| 1. A man praying with his head covered2. A man prophesying with his head covered3. A man with LONG hair4. A woman praying with her head UNCOVERED5. A woman prophesying with her head UNCOVERED6. A SHORN woman7. A SHAVEN woman8. A woman having SHORT HAIR | 1. A man praying with his head UNCOVERED2. A Man prophesying with his head UNCOVERED3. A man having SHORT HAIR4. A woman praying with her head COVERED5. A woman prophesying with her head COVERED6. A woman with LONG HAIR |

What about the woman? A woman who prays with her head uncovered, brings dishonor and disgrace to her head (man). If she prophesies with the uncovered head, the woman also brings dishonor to her head. It does not take BOTH of these acts (praying and prophesying) but just one: EITHER one will bring dishonor. Still another way to bring shame to the woman is through the wrong hair lengths. A woman with a shaven head is SHAMEFUL. It was true in the days of the apostle Paul lived on the earth and that certainly has not changed even today. Yes, today it is indeed shameful for a woman to have her head shaven. A woman having SHORN hair (cutting it close like the shearing of sheep) is DISGRACEFUL and DISHONORABLE. Actually it is inferred that any length of SHORT HAIR is shameful! So by these ways, a woman can bring dishonor upon herself and upon her head.

On the other side of the ledger, we can read of ways to bring HONOR. When a man prays uncovered that Christian brings honor to Christ – the opposite of DISHONOR. Let the man honor his spiritual head and this is done by being UNCOVERED when he prophesies. And what about man’s hair? Let him have his hair SHORT – not long – and he has the opposite of SHAME. So there are ways for the man to bring shame but on this chart (Ways to Bring Honor) We see ways to bring HONOR.

Just the opposite action is true for the woman. If the woman wants to follow the ways of HONOR, let her do just the opposite of the man and thus, COVR her head when she prays. She can bring honor by COVERING her head when she prophesies. Her hair is not to be SHORT like the man’s hair; her GLORY is found in having LONG HAIR – so says Paul in verse 15.

There are ways to bring honor and there are ways to bring shame. Paul tells us plainly how we can bring honor and what will please God. The apostle also shows how men and women can be shameful. These verses (I Corinthians 11:1-16) tell us how we can be vessels of HONOR or vessels of SHAME. The question for you and for me, Which way are we traveling?