



Dear Brother Faull,

I have a question for you regarding the head coverings for women from the text in **1 Corinthians 11**.

I am one who presses to have a solid answer on any Scripture when I am confronted or questioned.

The passage of **1 Corinthians 11** concerning the wearing of the veil, and the issue of short hair and long hair, has been one that I have had a hard time to nail down.

MR. FAULL'S ANSWER:

My wife used to wear a covering at church because I felt that is what it taught. We caused trouble everywhere we went even though I did not push it because I was not sure I was right.

It made women angry with my wife because they felt condemned for not wearing the covering and accused her of thinking she was better than they were.

It made men jealous of me because my wife would wear it thus stating she was in subjection to me, and their wives would not wear a covering. It caused so much trouble, I was thinking, "Surely I am wrong", so I had her stop wearing it.

There are some things to keep in mind:

- Paul thanked them for keeping the ordinances or traditions as he delivered them.
- This was not Jewish tradition for Jewish men wore and still wear caps in worship assemblies.
- The covering is not her hair because two different words are translated, "covering": *katakalypto* verses 5, 6, 7, 13, *peribolaion* verse 15.
- "The angels" in that passage refers to remembering what happened when they did not keep their proper place. It is not that the angels might molest the women if they did not have on a veil.

- From what I read, it was not necessarily Greek custom. I suspect that it was Christian tradition and revelation by Paul amidst a Church that lived among those immoral and promiscuous women who cut off their hair to show themselves as prostitutes.
- His main message is, 'If you are not in subjection to your husband, you might as well cut off your hair (be immoral) because you are no better than a prostitute.' It is the same as if you were shorn, or a prostitute. That is still the key message of that passage.
- The nature he refers to is not animals for males are the most ornate, like the Lion. He means, "Isn't it just the nature of things that men have the short hair and long hair glorifies a woman?"
- Men who have long hair are shamed and women are glorified for their long hair. It is not that it could not be cut at all but that she is to look like a woman and he, the man. When hair is shorn or sheared, it is not just trimmed but almost made bald.
- Obviously, this is in the assembly that she is to have the covering. If she must always wear it then a man can never wear a hat.
- If the woman's hair is the veil that he speaks of, then it follows the man's covering would be his hair and he must be bald!!!
- The long hair of women and short hair of man is only an illustration that the nature of things is for the woman to be covered, and so it is the woman who should cover her head and not the man.
- The "no other custom" and "no such custom" thing is difficult and I cannot be dogmatic about it. This is why I would not try to reintroduce the custom.

It would be pure arrogance on my part to teach and test or judge women on whether they do this when I am not even sure that I am right. Others should not be judged on my suspicions of what a passage means.

Let me say this, "What if it had never been stopped? What if the covering still meant, 'I am in subjection to my husband'? What would my wife have felt like going to a

church with other women who had coverings and she had to walk in uncovered because she divorced me? How would she have felt? Would it make a woman stop and think?

On the other hand, traditions or ordinances teach. When the symbol disappears, the teaching disappears. When the woman takes off her wedding ring it is because the marriage vows carry no weight.

When the Lord's Supper is missing, it is because the teaching of His Blood for our salvation has lost its significance. If there is no symbol, there is no teaching.

What if we still did it? People would ask, "Why do your women wear coverings in the assembly?" Immediately Christian teaching would be given.

Women are to be in the divine order. God, Christ, man, and woman. Women are subject to their husbands. At the end of the second war, the covering or hats came off and hairstyles changed. With it, the teaching of subjection of the wives to the husband and the pushing of women's lib became popular.

I have asked the women in several assemblies if their husband asked them to wear a covering would they do it. I have not known over a couple who answered "yes".

I have seen women who did come to camp meetings with coverings on and they were whispered about, made uncomfortable, and they never returned. That is a shame as they were just following their conscience and not insisting that others wear them.

The thing to keep in mind is, wearing one does not make a woman submissive any more than wearing a wedding ring makes one faithful.

If I were you, I would tell people that the thrust of the passage is that God has a divine arrangement of God, Christ, man, woman. To get out of that order and demand no distinction, or deny this God-given arrangement is rebellion. Refusal to submit to one's husband is as bad as whoredom.

Since a covering in the assembly demonstrated one was in subjection, then if a man who is created in the image of God wears one would indicate that he was in subjection to someone else other than Christ.

I offer this to be helpful. The answers are my opinions and where I am today. I would be willing to be taught otherwise since I do not know it all.

One thing I know. Only by pride cometh contention (division). Pride could be the only basis I would try to demand my sisters-in-Christ do what I think, when I am not even sure I am right about the matter.