



<https://freecommentaries.com/pdf/HeadcoveringWeb.pdf>

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE THE HEAD OF WOMAN IS THE MAN

Isn't it dangerous and unbiblical to divide the "the spiritual realm" from "the physical realm" by saying the authority of man over woman exists in the physical realm. Isn't the headcovering observance a physical display of a spiritual reality? I think it's more dangerous to think of man as having a spiritual headship over woman. A husband has authority to decide (in love and for the welfare of his wife) where they should live, but not what she must believe. In the spirit, and regarding spiritual things, "there is neither male nor female." So the headship is in the physical realm, but the obedience rendered because of headship is spiritual, because it is rendered as obedience to the commandment of God. Physical and spiritual salvation is a big topic I wrote a book about. We have to have some understanding of the difference between physical and spiritual to interpret scripture correctly. Matthew starts out "the book of the genealogy of Jesus Messiah," and genealogies only matter in the physical realm. In marriage, a man and woman become "one flesh," not "one spirit."

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE THE HEADCOVERING AS AN APOSTOLIC ORDINANCE

Are Headcoverings an apostolic ordinance? Where can we find the Lord delivering the ordinance of head coverings to the apostles or the church? An excerpt from my book: The words "ordinances" and "delivered" in verse 2 (KJV) are the noun and verb forms of the same Greek word, meaning to 'transmit', or 'deliver.' Verse 2 could be translated "you keep the deliveries as I delivered them to you;" or "you keep the transmittals as I transmitted them to you," or "you keep the ordinances as I ordained them to you." The verb form is also used regarding the Lord's Supper in verse 23. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered [ordained, transmitted] unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread" The verb form is also used regarding the gospel in chapter 15, "I declare unto you the gospel ... for I delivered [ordained, transmitted] unto you first of all that which I also received," 1 Cor. 15:1-3. The Headcovering, the Lord's Supper, and the gospel are all 'apostolic transmissions' that the apostles received directly from the Lord, and delivered directly to the churches; not cultural accommodations to first-century Corinth. Sometimes the Greek word translated "ordinances" is translated as "traditions," because things can be passed from men to men, as well as from God to men. Jesus rebuked the Pharisees that "laying aside the commandment of God, you hold the tradition [ordinances, transmissions] of men," Mark 7:8. But ordinances from God through the apostles to the church are authoritative. "Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions [ordinances, transmissions] which you have been taught, whether by [our spoken] word, or our epistle," 2 Thess. 2:15. Peter was right that Judas' replacement had to receive the ordinances to pass on to the church directly from Jesus, as the other apostles had, when Jesus "had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen ... being seen of them forty days [after his resurrection]," Acts 1:2-3. An apostle couldn't go around saying, "Peter says he saw the resurrected Jesus who commanded" But Peter was wrong that he and the other apostles had to choose Judas' replacement. Paul received the apostolic ordinances, like the Headcovering

and Lord's Supper, directly from the resurrected Lord, when "last of all, he was seen of me also, as one born out of due time," 1 Cor. 15:8, and when he "went into Arabia," Gal. 1:17, shortly after his conversion. Paul said, "the gospel which was preached of me is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Messiah," Gal. 1:12. Paul delivered the apostolic transmissions to the Corinthians when he founded the church as recorded in Acts 18, "After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth; ... and he continued there a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them," Acts 18:1,11. "For this cause have I sent unto you Timothy, ... who shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which are in Messiah, as I teach everywhere in every church," 1 Cor. 4:17.

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE THE HEAD OF MESSIAH IS GOD

Does the mention of "Messiah" rather than "Son" in 1 Cor. 11:3 indicate that headship doesn't exist within the godhead? Isn't it only when "the Word became flesh" that he became obedient to the Father? I think it's important and central to the message of this passage to realize the Son has been and always will be eternally in a position of submission to the Father, and not merely since the incarnation. It was the Son who became flesh per Rom. 1:3. If this subordination isn't eternal then superior/inferior hierarchical authority structures based on office rather than abilities are not inherently good, but only a temporary accommodation.

Doesn't every act of God include all three members of the Trinity? Yes, but they always do different parts of the same action (Rom. 1:1-4; Eph. 2:13-18; 2 Thess. 2:13-14; Titus 3:4-6, etc.). And they always and only act according to their respective eternal offices and roles. The Father gives, the Son receives, "so has he given to the Son to have life in himself," Jn.5:26. The Father teaches; the Son learns, "I do nothing of myself; but as my Father has taught me," Jn. 8:28. The Father sends; the Son goes, "he that sent me is with me," Jn. 8:28. The Father commands; the Son obeys, "I do always those things that please him," Jn. 8:29. Isn't that what 'headship' is, leading and submitting? Don't the terms God uses, 'Father' and 'Son,' rather than 'Brother and Brother' etc. inherently imply hierarchy and headship? Likewise, Eph. 5:21 says "Submitting yourselves one to another," but the following verses say the manner of mutual submission must be different for those in the office and role of wife vs. husband. It would be just as inappropriate for a husband to submit to his wife by submitting rather than by loving, as it would be for Jesus to submit to the church by submitting rather than by loving. "Wives, submit ... to your own husbands ... as to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Messiah (to emphasize the Son/Messiah - Male part of the God/Father - Son/Messiah/Jesus - Male - Female chain of command) is the head of the church." "Husbands, love your wives even as Messiah also loved the church." The Bible never says 'Husbands, submit to your wives' or 'Wives, love your husbands.' (Titus 2:4 says wives should "be affectionate to" their husbands; not to agape them.)

Wouldn't it be heresy to believe there is headship within the godhead? Heresy is something no born-again believer indwelt by the Holy Spirit can believe. Believing there's hierarchy within the godhead is biblical rather than heretical. We can't trust unsaved Roman Catholics at the various Church Councils to define sound doctrine or heresy, nor let their Greek philosophy about things like immutability influence our interpretation of scripture in any way. (What those creeds should really contain is a statement that "I believe in salvation by grace through faith, not works," and then at least if someone really believed it you would know you're dealing with a regenerate vs. an unregenerate person who believes a creed even the unregenerate can agree with.) You can't take a verse like Mal. 3:6, "For I am the Lord, I change not," and build a doctrine of immutability on it, because the context is about God keeping his promises to Abraham when "the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasant to the Lord, as in the days of old," Mal. 3:4. Likewise, Heb. 13:8, "Jesus Messiah, the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever," in context, refers to spiritual things like, "Let brotherly love continue," Heb. 13:1. Physically, Jesus changed. First he was a baby, then a man. Sometimes he was weary and thirsty and sat on a well, sometimes he wasn't and didn't. Before he had a mortal unglorified body that could die, but now he has an immortal glorified body that can't die.

Athanasius has shown us a way that is neither naive nor dismissive of the term hierarchy. Isn't the word hierarchy inappropriate when discussing the Son and the Father, except by analogy, vs. Christ and the Father. 1 Cor. 11 speaks of God and Messiah. No headship for the Father or the Son or Jesus in 1 Cor. 11a. But actually the terms Father and Son

inherently imply headship. If God wanted merely to show the emanation of the Son, and not the loving hierarchical authority (i.e. patriarchy) he shows of fathers over sons throughout scripture, he might better have used the terms Mother and Son. Athanasius isn't authoritative, and his arguments seem to be overwhelmingly logical vs. scriptural. The Bible was written entirely by Jews, not Greek philosophers. "Unto them were committed the oracles of God," Rm. 3:2. I don't find Paul warning us against "using creation [or incarnation] terminology for a timeless God," or saying we can only speak "analogously." The important thing in our discussion about the godhead is that Paul bases the meaning of headcovering on it. If there is not eternal authority and submission within the godhead then authority structures are not as 'good' as say love and truth. Just as egalitarians want to define "head" as "source" like of a river, so a segment of complementarians want to define headship as something less than the perfection that existed eternally within the godhead. And the loss isn't just in the area of human relations. If hierarchy is really an intrinsic and understandable part of the godhead, and not merely analogously, then we lose more complete understanding of who God is and what he is like if we banish it from the godhead.

Aren't Church Councils authoritative since they were considered orthodox by Augustine (a Catholic), Calvin, Luther and virtually every Protestant? You can't believe Roman Catholic or Greek Orthodox or Augustinian doctrine and also be a born-again saved Christian, because all three believe in salvation by (not merely evidenced by) works. <https://freecommentaries.com/pdf/Catholicism.pdf>. Church Councils aren't authoritative. The Talmud shows what the 'oral law' the Pharisees of Jesus day believed. Healing on the Sabbath was prohibited in it, and the scripturally stated reason they killed Jesus was that he rejected their oral law traditions, not because he offered a different kind of kingdom than they were expecting. Mt. 12:12-14, "It is lawful to do well on the sabbath days. Then said he to the man, Stretch forth your hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, like as the other. Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him." Jesus rebuked the Pharisees that "laying aside the commandment of God, you hold the tradition [ordinances, transmissions] of men," Mark 7:8. But ordinances from God through the apostles to the church, like in 1 Cor. 11:2, are authoritative. "Brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions [ordinances, transmissions] which you have been taught, whether by [our spoken] word, or our epistle," 2 Thess. 2:15. Some of the things in the Roman Catholic councils, like the Nicene Creed from the First Council of Nicaea (325), were mostly harmless (except that the RCC killed men over them), since even unregenerate smart men can contribute to discussions about things like homoousias and hypostases. But the Council of Nicaea's decision on the dating of Passover that divided the Jewish from the Gentile believers was tragic for the future of even born-again believers. And unregenerate men can't get issues like salvation by grace through faith right, like the Westminster Assembly (1643) did in the Westminster Confession. I'm pretty sure you reject the canons from the Roman Catholic Council of Trent (1545).

Who then, historically, are Christians? Who, if anyone, could be saved before the Reformation. The way of salvation didn't change from what John and Paul wrote just because the RCC became the government sponsored religion under Constantine (312) and it was no longer physically safe to believe in justification by faith. "He that believes on the Son has everlasting life," Jn. 3:36. "A man is justified by faith," Rm. 3:28. And the way of salvation didn't change again after Luther (1517) when some monarchs began to offer physical protection to some of those who believed in justification by faith. Luther didn't 'rediscover' justification by faith, he just made it physically safer to believe it and preach it. Waldensians (1173), Anabaptists, and other non-conformists and radical reformationists might be examples of groups that likely had high percentages of believers. Unfortunately, even though God preserves his word throughout all generations, he doesn't preserve history books. The Roman Catholic Church determined what non-scripture writings survived, so we don't have much history of their adversaries or their victims.

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE PRAYING TO THE FATHER, NOT TO YESHUA

Aren't there examples of people praying to Jesus in the Bible? Acts 7:59, 9:5, 10-17, Rom. 10:12-13; OT to the Angel of the Lord? Acts 7:59 says Stephen prayed to God the Father "calling upon God," and then spoke to Jesus, "saying, Lord Jesus ..." because he saw "the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Likewise, in Acts 9, Paul saw Yeshua who was so bright it blinded him, and he heard his voice, and spoke to, not prayed to, him. "And he said, 'Who

art thou, Lord?" Also, because Ananias saw and heard the Lord present in a vision, "he said [not prayed], 'Behold, I am here, Lord.'" Romans 10:13 doesn't clearly say, "Whoever will call upon Jesus will be saved," but "whoever will call upon the name of the Lord [i.e. God] will be saved." The Greek of verse 14 doesn't have the word "him" that the English KJV has twice. It says in more general terms, "How then shall they call on in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in of whom they have not heard?" We believe in God and Yeshua, but we call on God. I don't think preachers who give "pray along with me" kinds of invitations should say something like, "Dear Jesus, I believe you died for me, etc.," but rather something like, "Father, I believe your Son, Jesus, died for me, etc." Certainly "Lord" in "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" Rm. 10:13 in the original context refers to God. ASV Joel 2:32 "It shall come to pass, that whoever shall call on the name of Jehovah will be delivered." The Bible (without going on to look at the angel of the LORD) seems careful to say prayer is only offered to God the Father; and since the time of Messiah's sacrifice, in the name of, but not to, Jesus Messiah our mediator. You pray though, not to, a mediator.

Doesn't "Lord" sometimes refer to God the Father and sometimes to Jesus? Yes, but Jn. 16:23 clearly says we should pray to the Father in the name of Jesus. "Lord" can mean either, its hard for a reference to "Lord" can to provide clear indication of prayer to Jesus. Jn. 14:14, "If you shall ask [doesn't say 'ask me'] anything in my name, I will do it," must mean we pray to the Father, the Father wills Jesus to do it, and Jesus agrees and does it. It wouldn't make sense for us to pray, "Jesus, I ask you in Jesus' name." However, Jn. 14:14 in the versions based on the perverted Alexandrian family of manuscripts does say "If you shall ask me anything in my name, I will do it." The Received Text, found in 90% of NT manuscripts, a manuscript family we've had through all generations as far as we know, doesn't say "me," whereas the manuscripts that became available since 1850 don't, but we know these aren't the word of God since, "his truth endures to all generations." The doctrine of miraculous preservation is just as important as the doctrine of inspiration since what good would it be for God to give his word to men but then not preserve it. A friend commented: "It should be evident that the Holy Spirit breathed out the "Great Commission" in each of the four Gospels and Acts -- including Mark -- and that the last words of Mark's Gospel were not, "for they were afraid" in 16:8. The widely acclaimed modern critical text is fraught with problematic omissions and alterations. I recommend this resource on the topic: www.chapellibrary.org/read/ebtb."

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE WOMEN PROPHECYING IN 1 COR. 11a

Why is it ok to read the words of scripture in Lu. 1:42-55 of Elisabeth and Mary's prophesies in the Assembly but they themselves wouldn't have been permitted to say them in the Assemblies? I think it's similar to Deborah prophesying privately under the tree, but Barak being the one to publicly lead the armies to bring her prophesy to fruition.

Didn't Anna prophesy in the temple, and Phillip's daughters prophesy publicly? The Bible doesn't say that. "There was one Anna, a prophetess ... [who] departed not from the temple," Lu. 2. "Philip ... had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy," Acts 21.

Does "in private" vs. "in the Assembly" mean "alone." Mary and Elizabeth weren't alone when they prophesied. "Private" doesn't necessarily mean "alone." The out loud prophesy at Elizabeth's house was in private, even if, as I picture it, Zacharias was present too. Or like when "Aquila and Priscilla ... took [Apollos] to them, and expounded to him the way of God more perfectly," like in their home, not out loud in public for a whole crowd or assembly to hear. Stephen's daughters prophesied, probably at home, but when Paul and his travelling companions joined them Agabus had to come down to prophesy to them. Huldah the prophetess prophesied in the presence of several men who went to ask her advice, but they didn't bring her to the king to prophecy before his court. If a mixed group of people are having a 'private' conversation about doctrine in a public restaurant, the women contribute freely to the discussion, but when someone in the group then leads in a prayer of thanks for the food, it should be a man, since "I will therefore that men [not women] pray everywhere," 1 Tim. 2:8. To be consistent with the principles of male leadership and female quietness, and following the pattern of 1 Cor. 14:28, I don't think women prophesied in the assembly except silently speaking to themselves and to God since that would be very public rather than private, vs. Elizabeth with Mary and Zechariah, or Philip's daughters with their parents at home vs. when Agabus prophesied when there was a meeting at their home. And in the same way as women didn't lead in prayer in the assembly speaking out loud but only praying silently along with the rest of the congregation.

Doesn't v31 indicate "prophesying" is the opposite of silence, vs. "revelation", which is the content that shared or not? 1 Cor. 14:30-31, If any thing be revealed to another that sits by, let the first hold his peace. For you may all prophesy one by one. I don't think the passage is making a distinction between unspoken "revelation" vs. spoken "prophesy." When "there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God," the tongues-speaker still "speak[s] to himself and to God", the same words he would have spoken out loud had there been an interpreter, so it's still revelation, and it's still prophesy.

Is it possible that 1 Cor. 14:34-35, "let your women keep silence in the assemblies," might not mean women can't prophesy or teach in the Assemblies, because it obviously doesn't mean women have to be completely silent. Women sing with the congregation, and talk with their children and other people, and sneeze, and their shoes and breathing make a little sound. Peter also talks about woman's ministry of quietness in the home, "even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit," but women aren't completely quiet in the home. The 1 Cor. 11 passage is about leadership. Women aren't to lead. God - Messiah - Man - Woman. A woman can pray, but not lead in prayer; sing, but not lead the singing; prophesy, but not out loud; speak, but not as a speaker addressing the Assembly. The sisters may not do the kinds of speaking out loud described in 1 Cor. 14 in the Assembly: prophesying 14:1, tongues 14:2, addressing the congregation for "edification, and exhortation, and comfort" 14:3, interpreting tongues 14:5, speaking "by revelation, or by knowledge, ... or by doctrine" 14:6. Women can "pray with the spirit, and ... pray with the understanding; ... sing with the spirit, and ... sing with the understanding" provided they are praying or singing either silently or congregationally, not leading, not addressing the congregation. If the Assembly leaders appoint women wearing headcoverings to stand on the stage in front of the congregation and lead the vocals during singing, I think they're violating the principles taught via the headcovering as much as if they had the women teach the congregation while wearing headcoverings.

Wouldn't 14:28 "speak to himself, and to God" be referring to times of private prayer like Paul says he does in 14:18-19? "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than you all; yet in the church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." I'm not inclined to build a whole doctrine or scenario of brethren praying in tongues in the privacy of their prayer closets based merely on the phrase "yet in the church," 1 Cor. 14:19. What would be the purpose of Paul praying in Persian one day in the privacy of his room, and then in Ethiopian another day? But in the assembly such a miracle would provide confirmation of the new revelation and birth of the new entity of the church, Messiah's body. I don't think Paul is contrasting his speaking in tongues in his prayer closet at home vs. his speaking in tongues in the assembly, but rather saying he values his plain, non-miraculous teaching in the church more than all the miraculous tongues speaking he has done in the church. Are there other scriptural references to people praying in tongues in the privacy of their own prayer closets like modern day charismatics do?

Doesn't the universality of the promise of Joel, cited at Pentecost, that the Holy Spirit would be poured out on men and women mean women can prophesy in the Assembly? Joel's prophecy doesn't rule out gender appropriate ways of fulfillment. I don't think it proves anything either way as to inside or outside the assembly.

Didn't Paul only have only teaching and public speaking with authority in mind like in 1 Tim. 2:11-12 in the silence of 1 Cor. 14:34-35? MacArthur, Piper, and the others are correct that Biblical prophecy also means authority over men. It's the highest level of authority, even higher than mere teaching. 1 Tim. 2 prohibits both teaching and public prophesy by women. So Piper softens it to a different kind of prophecy. You can say, well the headcovering allows this exception to women not being allowed to have authority over men. But you can't biblically say that prophecy isn't authority.

What is the definition of silence for women in the Assembly? The sisters may not lead or address the Assembly (for Teaching, Prophesy [1st century], Tongues [1st century], Song Leading, Testimonies, Leading in Prayer, or anything else) but Silent (Prayer or Prophesy [1st century]) and Congregational (singing, reciting creeds, praying or singing in the Spirit where everyone miraculously says the same thing at the same time [1st century]) are ok.

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE THE HEADCOVERING BEING AN ASSEMBLY OBSERVANCE

Isn't your saying that the Headcovering observance is a memorial to the indirect creation of woman a case of going beyond what 1 Cor. 11a says? This is somewhat of a stretch, but I feel it's warranted and profitable based on, as I said, Paul's use of the Genesis account of woman, like, of, and for man; and the pattern of the Sabbath, the Passover, and the Lord's Supper all being based on historical events.

John McArthur: John [Piper] defined the gift of prophecy in episode 215 as, "something that God spontaneously brings to mind in the moment; and because we are fallible in the way we perceive it, and the way we think about it, and the way we speak it, it does not carry that same level of infallible, Scripture-level authority." As I pointed out before, that is a radical departure. ... The Bible has portrayed the gift of prophecy consistently, from Genesis to Revelation, as always verbal, propositional, infallible, and authoritative. But continuationists like John Piper and Wayne Grudem modify the definition of prophecy, evidently believing that the Holy Spirit gave the church a lesser gift consisting in spiritual impressions that are ambiguous and non-authoritative. John points to three passages in support of his view, ... [including] 1 Corinthians 11:4–5. ... I believe the simplest answer is that the prohibition for women to speak comes in a specific context, namely, "in the churches" (1 Cor. 14:34). "For, in the first place, when you come together as a church . . ." The first matter that Paul addresses as it regards the gathered assembly ... doesn't come until 11:18. Therefore, especially in light of 14:34–35, it's very likely that Paul's reference to praying and prophesying in 11:4-5 is not intended to be understood in the context of the corporate gathering. Women were able to exercise their authoritative, instructive gift of prophecy outside the assembled church. "In the first place" refers to the first thing Paul wants to say about the Lord's Supper church meeting topic, not the first thing he wants to say about church meeting topics. 1 Cor. 11a and 1 Cor. 11b are one unit tightly joined together by the parallel phrases "I praise you" and "I praise you not" in vs. 2 and 17.

What kind of divine or ceremonial significance does the head covering have in worship? Isn't headship a more universal idea, not just to be applied in worship? It shows the church's submission to the different creation roles of men and women, and God-ordained male authority, responsibility, and leadership, as 1 Cor. 11:3 says underlies the meaning of the observance: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Messiah; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Messiah is God." In contrast to the world's rebellion against God, authority, and submission. 2 Thess. 2:7 ASV, "For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work." Like the meaning of the Lord's Supper church meeting observance, including things like forgiveness of sins through Messiah, applies all the time; even so, the meaning of the Headcovering church meeting observance applies all the time. Out of all the different things God could have chosen for the church to have reminder observances about, why the Headcovering and Lord's Supper, the ministry of our Lord to provide our salvation, and the ministry of the church to be his submissive and obedient bride, his own body? Like Israel received the Sabbath and Passover observances at the time of Israel's creation at the Exodus, even so the church received the HC and LS at the time of its creation just after the Lord's death and resurrection at Pentecost. The church is to be preserving salt slowing down the decay of the world, and how central are changes in beliefs about hierarchical roles (God/Man, Husband/Wife, Parents/Children, Employers/Employees, Pastors/Brethren, Government/Citizens, etc.) to that decay! But conversation about the significance of the Headcovering observance could go on and on, like for the Lord's Supper.

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE BECAUSE OF THE ANGELS

Does 1 Cor. 11:10 refer to good angels or bad angels? Eph. 6:12 clearly refers to demonic powers. There are hierarchies of both good and bad angelic powers? Dan. 10:12-21, "Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words. But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me. ... And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come. But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth: and there is none that holds with me in these things, but Michael your prince." The Congregation and the sisters' submissive obedience to the observance of the headcovering is a glorious testimony to the good angels and a condemnation of the rebellious angels.

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE PROPER HAIR LENGTH

Since the headcovering of 1 Cor. 11a is a garment, not hair; and since it merely observes that inappropriate hair length is a "shame" rather than directly commanding any appropriate hair length, is it ok for men and women to have any hair length they want even if it's shameful? Appropriate hair length isn't merely an observation from nature. Even though 1 Cor 11a isn't about hair, anything it says about hair is still authoritative even though hair length is only brought in as a supporting argument. Proper hair length isn't an apostolic transmission/ordinance, 'paradisis,' from Yeshua to the Assembly, but it's still shameful for a man to have long hair per nature, per Paul, and per scripture. The Nazarite vow is an exception as to how men should trim their hair. The Bible teaches that shame is bad and ought to be avoided unless there's a good reason not to: "Yeshua, the author and finisher of our faith, who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame," Heb. 12:2. Bible teachers have the obligation to authoritatively, based on 1 Cor. 11a, teach that men -ought- to have short hair. Maybe a person might want to bear the shame, like to make a movie about Absalom, or for the sake of another person, like to reach out to the hippies, or to hide his identity when entering a closed country, or something. But the lack of an explicit command about something shameful doesn't mean there's no 'ought to' involved. The Bible isn't a science book, but anything it says about science is still authoritative. A thing doesn't have to be the main topic of a passage for us to learn anything about it. Yes, hair's not the covering, but the passage is still authoritative on the subsidiary issues also.

FACEBOOK QUESTIONS RE MISCELLANEOUS

Wouldn't your books be better if you had an editor? I think so. Do you know any I can afford?

What should the Headcovering Tradition be called? The Headship Tradition? The Uncovering and Covering Tradition? Or something else? I would call the observance The Headcovering, The Headcovering Observance, or The Headcovering Ordinance. 1) Tradition is often misunderstood by people to indicate something customary that gained general acceptance and thus became a tradition. But the Greek word "paradosis" means an apostolic transmission of a command from God, i.e. an ordinance. The Headcovering Tradition is still ok but then you have to do the extra work to explain it's an apostolic transmission from Messiah to the Congregation (Church) and not what Webster says our English word tradition means: "an inherited, established, or customary pattern of thought, action, or behavior (such as a religious practice or a social custom)". 2) It's good not to mention the men's requirement to be uncovered in the name of the observance, though that fact is critical to correct understanding, interpretation, and application. It's the men that must understand and lead the way, like for the Assembly to decide to do the observance, etc. After all, male leadership is what the observance is about, and I hold the men, not the women, guilty for the observance having been abandoned. But the men already get to teach, lead, speak, etc., so I like to describe this observance as the sisters' ministry. They're the ones that get to wear the headcoverings, which are the symbols of the observance. They're the ones that get to wear the headcoverings, which are the symbols of the observance, which proclaim to the Congregation, the world, and the angels that the Assembly is submissive and obedient to the Lord, in contrast to Satan and his angels and the world. I look at this observance as their participation in the ministry of the Assembly, that only the sisters can do, or it will remain undone. The observance focuses on the sisters, similar to how the Shabbat candles can only be lit by a woman in Jewish practice. The sisters manipulate and interact with the headcovering symbol, which is like the bread and wine symbols for the Lord's Supper. The men simply refrain from doing something, i.e. they wear nothing on their heads, thus their symbol is -nothing-. 3) Headship isn't a 'tradition,' meaning an apostolic "paradosis," since Headship has been around forever. It's the Headcovering that's a new apostolic command. Male headship and female submission are the underlying meaning of the Headship Observance, i.e. what the symbol represents. Male headship and female submission go all the way back to creation, but the Headcovering observance began with the birth of the Congregation at Pentecost. Before that time, God commanded the all-male ministers in the temple to cover their heads.

Can a Bible teacher be popular and also hold to the Headcovering? I've always planned to warn any pastor that would believe what I wrote about the headcovering he would lose his ministry as he knows it if he implements it in his church. He would lose half the congregation and not be able to pay for the big building or possibly not even his salary. Reportedly,

RC Sproul's wife wore a headcovering. Wikipedia says he left his pastor position at St. Andrews but doesn't say what church he attended after that. I don't know if he had the belief, courage, or influence to have his church implement the headcovering as a church meeting observance. As far as I know, he wrote only part of one chapter of one book (Knowing Scripture) and part of a 5 minute video https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=X1Zmjyvet_4 out of his more than 100 books and countless articles and broadcasts.

Shouldn't we avoid taking everything the Bible says literally since it also tells you to chop off your hand if it causes you to sin? The sermon on the mount is LITERAL that logically it would be a good deal -IF- plucking out our eye or cutting off our hand could keep us out of hell. "If your right eye offend you, pluck it out, and cast it from you, BECAUSE it's profitable for you that one of your members should perish, and not that your whole body should be cast into hell." But the point is that we shouldn't pluck out our eye, because it won't keep us out of hell. Yeshua wanted us to realize the problem isn't in our eye or hand, but in our heart. If we pluck out our right eye, we'll sin with our left. Then if we pluck that out, we'll sin with our imagination. Jesus taught this to make us realize we can't keep the Law well enough to merit eternal life, and therefore we need SALVATION through Yeshua for justification and the receipt of the Holy Spirit for sanctification. Mt. 11:28-29, "Come to me, all you that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and you will find rest to your souls."

PDF about the Timing of the Observance:

<https://freecommentaries.com/pdf/HeadcoveringTiming.pdf>