

Discussion on I Corinthians 11:2-16

Hiram Hutto and Paul Hutcheson

Mr. Hutcheson – First Affirmative

I must say I appreciate the opportunity, I'll not say that I'm glad, that's a different little expression. I appreciate the opportunity for discussing God's truth. We need more opportunities when we are willing to sit together and look at the truth of God and try to determine what He says for us. Frankly, I'm shaking in my boots...I'll just have to tell you that. 😊

As I think about trying to deliver God's word, and even when I try to speak from the pulpit it's very much the same way...when I think of delivering God's word, I think about the problems that come to one when he affirms very vehemently, and very effectively, a false doctrine, thereby leading people astray.....or on the other hand, is ineffective in expressing and teaching the true doctrine and thereby not teaching people that which is right...a great responsibility rests upon us. And I feel that very strongly tonight.

I'd like to issue a warning as we enter this....I certainly enjoy any time getting together with men of like precious faith who are willing to delve into our differences. It is my *conviction* that two honest men who study together God's word, I believe this, two honest men studying together God's word, both desiring earnestly to know what God says, are *not* going to differ too long. They are going to come together. Now I believe that with all my heart and therefore I think it's very, very worthwhile that we sit down, and with that idea in our heart, we want to know what God says, we want to be united with others on what God said, and we are willing to study and take what God says and I believe it's going to be effective. I believe the word of God teaches that. I'd like to issue a warning though, that we are dealing with a very unpopular subject, at least in our area and I think probably even in this area. A very unpopular subject, in that people don't really want to believe what a number of the things that both brother Hutto and I believe. Now the warning is this, whenever we are faced with a doctrine that is unpopular and is against the grain of the masses, we have to be especially careful because by the very nature of its unpopularity we have a bias against it. And so we must be extremely careful that we study things like that, and I think brother Hutto will certainly agree here, that we study things like that with a very open mind and try to overcome the natural bias against accepting doctrines, particularly when they are not very popular. There are doctrines that creep up from day to day and they creep up because people want to hear them. And there's no better example of that than the many doctrines that have crept up about marriage, because people want to hear it. And so let's be sure that we *want* to understand God's will. Don't listen to anything because I say it or because Brother Hutto says it...listen to it because you are absolutely convinced by your own study, and by our studying together, that God said it, and I believe we are certainly in agreement in this.

Now please take note in our discussion tonight, that the subject of our discussion is not whether this was a custom or not. That was handled in another discussion. And some

of you may disagree with us, or others, on this, and we would like the opportunity to speak to anyone else, and I'm sure brother Hutto or myself, on this subject, but that's not the subject tonight, whether this was a custom that we are dealing with or not. Or any of the other, whether it just held in that age and didn't hold in this age. Tonight we are discussing the point, what is the covering? I'd like to turn to the scriptures first and look at what Paul has to say in 1 Cor 11. I'd just like to go over it so we can keep it before us.

I'm reading from the ASV, which incidentally gives more credits to another position other than the position I take, so understand I'm using the version that normally a person wouldn't use with this.

I'd like for a moment to look at some of the references that deal with man and his head covered and the woman with her head uncovered. Quickly look at verse 4, "**A man praying or prophesying with his head covered dishonors his head**". Whether that's his own head, or Christ, really doesn't make a great deal of difference there ..it's dishonor. "**A woman praying or prophesying without her head covered**", verse 5, "**dishonors her head**"....whether that's her own head, or man, again it's a dishonor. "**The woman without a covering is the same thing as if she were shorn and that's a shame**" in verse 6. If she is not going to be shorn, or she's not willing to accept that if your head not be covered to be shorn, then she ought to be covered, this removes the shame....this removes the shame if she is covered. "**A man ought not have his head covered and if he does not he glorifies God,**" verse 7. In verse 10, a woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head; in fact, that just says she ought to have authority on her head, and everybody recognizes that means a sign of this authority we've been talking about. And the mention here is that this is good, even because of the angels. You don't have to know what that means to know that that is good, and it's meant to be good, and meant to be something of importance. In verse 13, "**a woman praying with her head uncovered is unseemly.**" In verse 14, "**a man having long hair dishonors himself.**" Verse 15, "**a woman have long hair it's a glory to her**", and so we see back and forth the expressions that deal with not only hair but the word *covering*, that say that we have either an honor or dishonor, depending on how this woman or man is arrayed.

Now, to get to more at the point of tonight, I want to deal with some statements that appear to me to be equivalent, and that's really where our discussion is going to be tonight. Notice, I want you to notice, the smooth change of terms in verse 13, 14 and 15. We're talking about this covering, and listen to what he says, "**Judge ye in yourselves, is it seemly that a woman pray to God unveiled or uncovered?**" Continuing now this same thought, "**Does not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair it's a dishonor to him. But if a woman have long hair it's a glory to her.**" And so he says a woman is praying unveiled, and then he says, why, looking at the other side, he changed from unveiled to uncovered, to long hair. Instead of saying, if a man be covered, he says a man have long hair. Instead of saying, if a woman is covered, it says, if a woman has long hair. And so as we see this smooth transition, these things seem to be meaning the same thing. Now, if we look at it, a man has long hair it's a dishonor to him, if a man has his head covered it's a dishonor to his

head, in verse 4. Verse 14, if a man have long hair it's a dishonor to him. In verse 4, if a man has his head covered, it's a dishonor to him. These terms seem to be equivalent, and we'll continue this line of thought. A man has long hair, is equivalent to, a man has his head covered. Watch that, and if you'll see that the force of the argument there is very difficult to overcome...if a man have long hair, it's equivalent to a man having his head covered. Alright, now looking at verse 13 and 15, a woman *unveiled* in verse 13, is the *opposite* of the woman which has long hair in verse 15. Okay here's the woman unveiled, a shame, whereas in 15, the same thought in verse 15 a woman has long hair, and it's not a shame, it's a glory. And so here, this is a shame and that's a glory, so a woman unveiled or uncovered is the opposite of the woman who has long hair, in this expression. That suggests that a woman unveiled, is equivalent to a woman with short hair, or one of the other things in context.

Now, in order to pursue this, (please chart 3), in order to pursue this, I'd like to look at the meaning of some words, and I'm sure these will come up from time to time. We have the word shave and the word shear, and I'm giving you Vine and also Arndt and Gingrich and Thayer on each one. I'm giving you all of Vine, and just an extraction from the others for of lack of space. We have the word for shave comes from the word razor in this language, in Greek, and it occurs in Acts 21:24 in the middle voice, in connection with a vow, and if you see verses 2 to 18 discusses how a man's head is sheared or shaved in a vow. Also in Acts 18:18, although the word in 18:18 is *this* word, and you notice he says in the terms of shave in Acts 18:18, see shear. Alright, he deals with that, and it says, this is also where we're studying, that's why we are looking at this right now, because this word is where we are studying. This word means to have one self shaved; to shear shave or anything equivalent to taking all of the hair off, completely removing the hair, and I find that this word is so easily understood that the dictionaries, for example, Colin Brown, Little, Kittle, don't even discuss it, there is not worth the discussion, its just too well known, there's nothing to it. Likewise, the word shear, is pretty much the same way, Vine discusses it. The word here, and I give you the transliterated Greek, is used of shearing sheep, and that's where, that's the mother of the word, that's where the word came from; deals with shearing sheep, and also the noun form, shearer, used in Acts 8:32, as the sheep before his shearer is dumb.... remember the eunuch quoting from Isaiah 53. It means to have one's hair cut off, to be shorn, as in Acts 18:18 and of course 1 Cor 11:6. I'll come back to this in a minute, but I want to look at Arndt and Gingrich, to cut one's hair to have one's hair cut, as the result of a vow, but notice the word comes from, to shear, to shear a sheep. Likewise, Thayer says, to shear a sheep, but in the middle voice, dealing with a person, to get or let be shorn, or shearing, or cutting short, the hair of the head. Now notice this is not just a *cutting* of the hair, not just ---here's long hair and somebody cuts an inch off and leaves a great deal, but it's shearing, as shearing a sheep. It's *shearing*, as they did in a vow. A man had his head shorn; in fact, these two words are so close together that sometimes they swap back and forth, as we'll see.

Now while we are here, (turn to Chart 2, Length of Hair), I want to look at this chart, and I hope you will remember I'm not an artist. I'm looking at four hair lengths; here is uncut or covered, or what God gave a person without any changes whatever; here is cut, and

I don't mean by this it has to be cut half way, I'm just saying, obviously cut; here is shorn, when it's shorn, we have like shearing a sheep, just a bristle left, its not much left; here is shaven. Even though these are close together they are, and very closely related, and yet they are not quite identical. Now the question, do all of these occur, and do we recognize that these are recognized in the scripture? And the answer is yes. If we go to Acts 18:18, Paul who would *never* have his head covered or have long hair, if we believe what he read in 1 Cor 11, had his hair shorn, which was an exception to him. Because there was a vow, he had his hair shorn; that means that his hair normally was not shorn. I don't believe you could escape that. His hair was not normally shorn, and we probably won't even have an argument over this. But his hair was not shorn; it neither was long, so there had to be an in between point, and again, I'm not suggesting by my pictures that it had to be so long. 😊 As I'm not suggesting that it had to be so short. And so we have uncut hair; we have Paul in Acts 18:18, having normally something *between* this and this, and which we'll say is cut hair; and then shorn or shaven. Now Paul said that in this condition his head was uncovered. Paul said in *this condition*, his head was uncovered. It's obviously uncovered, if we go further, and we'll see this come up in 1 Cor 11. Likewise if he had this kind of hair, that is united in our discussion with covering. He said why that's a man head is covered, that's a shame, he dishonors his head when he has long hair. And therefore, we have *clearly* identified the four levels, the last two being very similar. I want to again reiterate that if we look at the definition of shorn, that it cannot be expressed *here*, and it's made very clear by the fact that Paul was *here*, and *not here*, until he had his head shorn for that vow. Likewise, although a bit later in Acts 21:23, 24, they came to him and said, brother Paul there are a lot of people have thought that you don't keep the law. You take these men that have a vow on them, and you be with them and shave the head, and so he uses these, so these terms are close together. Both used in respect to a vow, and both used, and recognized in the OT meaning removing all the hair, whether you leave a stubble, 😊 or whether you have a nice razor and get everything. But these two, are definitely different than these two, and they are different from each other. And I want to reiterate, because this can't be missed. Paul's hair was not *uncut*, he called that equivalent to covered. He called that a shame. Neither was his hair shorn, because if it was already shorn, he could not have had it shorn, to have, to take this vow. And therefore, there exists and is definitely implied and recognized, a position in between, and I want to say again, Paul said or recognized, that if he had long hair, that that would be equivalent to covered, that would be a shame. Paul recognized that it was alright to be shorn and shaven; we find him doing that in the 18th chapter of Acts and the 21 chapter of Acts; but we recognize that as an exception, and so there's this in between position which is, his hair cut, and he is now recognizing that his head is not covered, though it not be shorn or shaven, it is uncovered. And so we have the long hair as God gave it; we have the hair that has been cut where Paul normally was; we have the cut off hair, that as you shear a sheep; and we have the totally cut hair. These two being very close together.

Now recognizing these four, I want to go back and look at this. We find again Paul saying here, recognizing long hair is equivalent to covering. Go back to verse 6, (One minute) okay, I'll just do on verse 6 and have to leave it. Verse 6 says, for if a woman is not covered, or s we have already noticed says veiled, and we can look at these words

in a few moments, but if the woman is not covered, let her also be shorn. This gives a lot of trouble to those of us, or people say it gives a lot of trouble to those of us, who believe that *hair* is the covering there. Now if you recognize *this*, if a woman is not covered, recognizing that he has identified *covering* with *long hair*, that means she's in here, and she might not recognize that *this* is as much a shame as *this*, and so he says if she starts tampering with that length of the hair, if she leaves the point that God calls covered, and she cuts her hair short, why, she might as well go ahead and shear it completely or shave it, and so remove the whole hair. And I believe that's what he is saying there, and I believe we can see.

Hiram Hutto – First Negative

Like brother Hutcheson, I'm glad to be able to participate in this discussion. And in some way, in the other discussions that we've had, I'm especially glad to do this with brother Hutcheson. I've heard about him for a long time. All that I've ever heard about him has been good and I expect it will continue that way. I have become acquainted with two of his daughters and think the world of them. And I'd like to commend the church here for having these studies. I don't know about other people, but they've helped me. The studies have gone very well, the atmosphere has been good, it's been on a friendly basis, and it has helped, I believe, clarify the thinking of some people, and I'm one of them, on a number of questions. And I hope that tonight will be the same way. It will help us clarify what this passage teaches, at least to some extent. I sympathize with what brother Hutcheson said about shaking, ☺ that's scriptural I believe, Paul was there with fear and much trembling, so we're on good ground. I know only too well how unpopular the subject is, and his warning to us is a good warning. But I would like to ask brother Hutcheson two questions....can a man with a flat top hair cut, we know what that is, in that condition, violate I Cor 11:4 and 7, by wearing a turban or fez or some hats, that cover his head; and does long hair in verse 15 permit a woman to either cut or trim her hair? (Let me have my chart No. 1.) He said some of this....I'm sure he'll agree with what we've got here.

The issue tonight is, what is the passage teaching about the covering? First of all it is *not* mere custom, that may be an interesting discussion, and it is, but that's not the discussion tonight. The discussion tonight does not concern itself with whether or not these people were inspired or uninspired; it does not discuss whether or not the assembly is included, that's not a part of it; nor does the discussion include or it is *not* rather, is long hair required for women? I believe the Bible teaches that, long hair is a glory to a woman, the Bible said, because it's a covering, so I believe strongly that long hair is required for women. In the same way the discussion is not over, is long hair forbidden to men? The Bible is clear on that. And the discussion is not over, is long hair a covering? The Bible says very plainly that it is. He and I agree that it applies today, whatever it teaches, it applies today. It includes all Christians today, it would include the assembly; it would require a covering for women today; it forbids the covering for men today. The issue is, is long hair the *only* covering of I Cor 11:4-10 and 14, or is a covering, in addition to long hair, required for women, and we say forbidden to men? In other words, that is what we are to be discussing tonight.

I would like to approach this first of all by just raising the question, what does the Bible mean when it talks about having his head covered? You remember on one occasion, some folks had plotted against King Ahasuerus. Mordecai heard about it, turned it in to the authorities who took proper action. And then they recorded what Mordecai had done in the records. One night the king couldn't sleep, so he had them bring the records, and they read the records to him. And he read about Mordecai, and he said what have we ever done to honor that fellow? And they said, well nothing. Well, he said we ought to do something, and about that time in come Haman, you remember Haman? His plotting to kill the Jews. Well he comes in, and the king said, what do you think we ought to do to honor somebody that the king would like to honor? Haman thought, who could that be but me? Let's have a big parade, and we'll get somebody to lead the parade and lead the horse. And the king said that's a good idea. I want to do that to Mordecai, and I want *you* to lead the horse. Haman knew the jig was up. And so it says in Esther 6:12, "Haman hastened to his house, mourning, and having his head covered. What did he do? I think we know what he did. I don't think any of us think, suddenly he grew himself some long hair. Haman hastened to his house, mourning, and having his head covered. When we read that, I don't think we have a bit of trouble or difficulty understanding what that says. And it's the same expression in I Cor 11:4, about a man. He's not to have his head covered; he's not to do what Haman did. Haman covered his head. And so we would know *from* that, what it means to have one's head covered.

Another thing that I would like to point out, as we discuss the matter of the covering, is that this particular subject or covering, is limited to a particular time. You notice in 1 Cor 11:4, and again in verse 5 and 6, (Put that chart up for us.), the text says, "**Every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonors his head, but every woman that prayeth or prophesyeth with her head uncovered dishonors her head, for that is even all one as if she were shaven.**" You notice it is limited to praying or prophesying. If long hair is the only covering, you don't need that in there. (Take that overlay off.) And what you would have would be, 'every man having his head covered, dishonors his head'. It doesn't matter whether he prays or whether he prophesies or anything. If he has it covered, it's a dishonor. And every woman with her head uncovered, dishonors her head. It doesn't matter when she does it. (Now put it back now Tommy, that overlay), and you can see that the Bible limits the time of the dishonor, or limits rather the time that he's not to have his head covered, till when praying or prophesying. The woman is limited the same way. She dishonors *her* head when she uncovers it while praying or prophesying. And so that in itself suggest to us, that it's something you may put on, a woman may put on when she prays, but she does not have to have it on when she's not praying. It is something a man is not to have on when he's praying or prophesying, but he may have it on at other times. And so the time factor here, *limits* us as to when this applies.

And to show a time factor, (let's have the next chart), here in I Cor 16, Paul said, 'as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, even so do you upon the first day of the week let

everyone of you lay by him in store'. He gives the time. (Now take that off Tommy.) And it says, as I gave order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye, let every one of you lay by him in store. You've done away with the time factor. And in Acts 20:7, 'And when the disciples came together to break bread', Paul you've done away with the time factor. 1 Cor 11:4-6, and the other passages, tell the *time* that this covering is to be on, just like this tells the *time* that they were to give, and the *time* when they came together to break bread. And if we were to do that to a lot of other scriptures, we would have all kinds of problems. He mentioned the marriage question. (Put that up Tommy if you would, please.) In Matt 5:32, "I say unto you, whosoever shall put away his wife saving for the cause of fornication, causes her to commit adultery." Now if we take that overlay off, what you have is, "I say unto you whosoever shall put away his wife causes her to commit adultery." Well you've taken away the condition of it, and the condition was the exception. And so we cannot just take these off. The point is that the time factor is crucial, because it is the time that the man is told when he prays or prophesies, don't cover your head. Doesn't say a thing about it any other time. And the woman, she's to cover her head when she prays or prophesies, nothing about any other time. Far as I know, there's not a verse in the Bible that says it's wrong for a man to have his head covered when he's plowing in the field; and there's not a thing in the world wrong with a woman having her head uncovered when she goes to the grocery store. I don't know of anything in the Bible that would say that that's wrong.

Now we want to look at one of the arguments that he made, and that was on the length of hair. (Tommy let me have Chart 1.) How many lengths of hair are there in the passage? Well it mentions specifically three...long, shorn, shaven. It is claimed that there are four...long, short, that's anything less than long which means uncut I take it, and it's more than shorn, is less than long, and it's more than shorn, and that's short, and then you have the shorn and the shaven. And it is said that since Paul had his head shorn, it was not shorn before that. I believe his statement was, that the hair of Paul *normally* was not *shorn*, I'm not sure that's true, that's an assumption. For example, I went to the barbershop today, and I got my hair shorn, right here. I could go back tomorrow and get some more shorn. Just because I go back tomorrow and get some more shorn, doesn't mean I didn't have it shorn today. I shaved this morning; I will probably shave in the morning. That doesn't mean in the morning that I didn't shave today. Just because the record says Paul got his head or his hair shorn does not mean that it had not been shorn before that. It might not have been shorn that close. And so actually you could have a hundred different lengths. You could have a hair on a woman all the way down to the floor. Let me say this: I saw a thing on TV, and somebody told me that it was Crystal Gail. She had hair all the way to the floor, just about. If that woman were to cut eight inches, let's say she cut it off to her knees, would she have short hair? Here's a woman with hair coming off of her head all the way to her knees, I wouldn't call that short hair. But it would be cut hair, but it wouldn't be short hair. You could have a hundred different lengths, you could have some to your knees, some to your thighs, some about the middle of your waist. All that would be cut, but it would be different lengths. On this maybe not just four, the text mentions three. It says long, shorn, shaven. And it would not have to be the idea, that Paul, because he got his head shorn, was not shorn before that. He could have got shorn a week ahead of time, but it

wouldn't have been long, wouldn't have called it short, but it could have been shorn, just like we have suggested.

Another reason that I would suggest that I do not believe that the long hair is the only covering, is because of a lot of translations of the Bible. (Put that up if you would please, Tommy.) Here are nine translations of I Cor 11, different verses in that. And these all say bareheaded. Everett Thomas Cramer's translation says 'every woman that prayeth or prophesyeth bareheaded', we know what that means, 'bareheaded, dishonors her head.' The Geneva translation of 1557, 'Every woman that prayeth or prophesyeth bareheaded, dishonors her head.' The Bishops Bible, from which we got a lot of the King James, 'every woman that prayeth or prophesyeth bareheaded, dishonors her head.' Tyndalls translation of 1534, 'every woman that prayeth or prophesyeth bareheaded, dishonoreth her head'. Miles Coverdale, 'Judge you in yourselves, whether it be comely that a woman pray before God bareheaded'. These are words that are said to be uncovered, in verse 5 and 13, 14, the word here is bareheaded. So a woman could be bareheaded, if she had hair all the way to the floor, and this says a woman that prays or prophesies bareheaded. She could have long, uncut hair and still be bareheaded, and these translations say that if she were, she dishonors her head. And so the New English Bible 'Judge for yourselves, is it fitting that a woman pray to God bareheaded?' Goodspeed says, 'any woman who offers prayer or explains the will of God bareheaded, disgraces her head.' Charles B. Williams, the Baptist, says 'any woman who prays or prophesies bareheaded, dishonor her head.' And so the Riverside translation, and others. All of which tell us, that it is possible to translate the word, there, that we have as uncovered, in the case of the woman, as bareheaded. And so I am convinced, that it is not talking about long hair as the covering, that is under consideration in verses 4,5,6, because these translations say bareheaded. And so if a woman may be bareheaded and still have long hair, she is violating what this passage says in those verses.

He mentioned that he used the AS translation that does have veil in verse 5, 'every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled,' verse 6 'unveiled', verse 7 'a man veiled', and it comes on 'veiled', 'veiled' verse 14 'veiled', and then it says, 'covering'. Why the different words, if it's the same thing? If the covering of verses 4,5,6 and so on, is talking about long hair, why the change in the words? Why go from covered, or veiled rather, to covering. Why go from one word to another word. (Let me have, Tommy, on that particular chart No E5). This is entitled, Word Changes. We take this up under, is a deserted believer free to remarry, and the answer is no. Some people argue yes, on the basis of 1 Cor 7:15, of the brother or sister is not under bondage. They mean they are free to marry, and the answer to that is no. The word bondage here is from the word dulo-o. In the NT it is used as a noun or a verb 133 times. Not once is it applied to marriage, unless it is in this verse. Daio, on the other hand, is bound and is applied to marriage, and is so applied twice, verse 27 and 39 in 1 Cor 7. But in verse 15 it is not daio that's used to talk about marriage, but dulo-o which was talking about bondage. Why change the words unless he shows *two* different bonds? One is of slavery, 1 Cor 7:15, and the other is marriage, 1 Cor 7:27 and 39, and that the bond so to speak of 7:15, is not the marriage bond. He changed the words, and

that change in words showed that he had two different bonds. So in 1 Cor 11, we have the word for covered in 5, 6, 7 and 13 as one word, and then we have a different word in verse 15, than the one we have in those others. Why change the words, unless he meant to show two different coverings? One, to be on when praying or prophesying, like 4, 5, 6, and 13 said, but no requirement to be on at other times; and another covering, the hair, in verse 11:15, to be on all the time. And so it's just like in the marriage question, he changes the words, and shows he has two different bonds under consideration. And so in 1 Cor 11, he changes the words to show he has two different coverings under consideration.

One of the coverings is to be on, it says, when they pray or prophesy, that is for the woman. It doesn't require that at other times. The one for the man, the covering, is not to be on when he prays or prophesies, and it goes on to show that it could be on at other times. We say again there is not a verse in the Bible, as far as I know, that requires a man to be uncovered when he's plowing in the field, or when he's playing ball or golf or something of that nature. And in the same way, as far as I know, there is nothing in the Bible that requires a woman to be covered as I Corinthians 11:5, 6, except when she prays or prophesies. The Bible names the time that this is to take place, and that would show that it was not necessary at other times. Therefore it is something you put on *then*, but you don't have to have it on at other times. You can put it on and you can take it off. We say it's put-on-able and it's take-off-able, and clearly, that is not talking about hair. You can't do your hair that way. You can't grow you some real quick and then, or cut it off, and grow you some more, not anymore than Haman grew him some long hair and went home covered. No, we know what Haman did when the Bible says he went home or went to his house, having his head covered. (If you would, let me have that chart of pictures please) He has these four lengths of hair, and here I am, right here. The point is I had my hair shorn today. I could go tomorrow and get it shorn again. I might be able to go a week from now and get it shorn again. And the point is, I normally have my hair shorn, even though I get it shorn occasionally, normally it's shorn. And therefore, when Paul had his head sheared, it would not mean that he had not done that before, or that he had hair long like this over here; it wouldn't mean that at all. I thank you for listening, and invite you to listen courteously to brother Hutcheson.

Paul Hutcheson – Second Affirmative

Testing one another's positions, putting them to the test and going there. I would like to deal for a moment, leave the questions till the last speech, and you'll have time to answer that later, because I want to answer a particular thing that I believe is the very tap root, (chart 7 please) the very tap root of the statement that there must be a second covering. And the question is, is God's revelation or what he says, does it say, and does it limit the time that this is to be done? And now I would like to look at what does the scriptures *specifically* say, and I want us to read it and see what it says, not what we think it says. It says, **“Every woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head.”** And we have united this with prayer, and what he's saying is, not covered; if she is not covered, she cannot pray as she ought, she's

dishonored in prayer, when she tries to pray. Now that's what it says. I would like to note that we use this kind of expression quite often, when we, a mother say's to her daughter, 'those clothes you have on, they are not modest, you couldn't pray in those clothes'. Now what she is saying *isn't*, 'why daughter, wear those clothes anytime you want to, but if you decide you are going to church, (and I'm going to use that because most people do), if you decide you are going to pray, you must run home and change'. That's not what she's saying. She's saying that here is a condition you must meet, before you can pray.

Now the question is, I think this is a human statement, the question is, does the Bible reason this way? Alright, look next, the answer is yes, it certainly does. If you start looking for these, I've picked out ones that deal with praying and sacrificing and worship. But in Proverbs 28:9, 'if a person will not hear the law then God won't hear his prayers. Even his prayers are an abomination. He who turns his ear from hearing the law, even his prayers are an abomination to God.' Now, you notice it's exactly the same form. The second one that we illustrated with, was quite different. It was not a proposition, Not A yields Not B, that was not the form of the proposition that was used to illustrate. The proposition that was used to illustrate was, A implies B. That is if you have A, you have B. Now *this* if used logically is the *inverse* of *this*. And the truthfulness of *this* does not insure the truthfulness of *this*, nor does the truthfulness of *this* insure the truthfulness of *this*. That's very clear, and what I'm going to go down, is look at other expressions of this form, the Not A equals Not B, and note that they do not carry the opposite meaning that A and B. In other words you are saying, 'not covered' means cannot pray, 'covered' means, I'm ready to pray. You see what I'm saying. The time that you put on the covering, is when you are ready to pray... covered to pray. Now the scripture, on the other hand says, if she's *not* covered she cannot pray. Notice again, he who turns his ear from the hearing of the law, even his prayer is an abomination. If you do not hear the law, you cannot pray. Question, does this mean that I want to pray today, so I sit down and read the scriptures. This is really too close to home, there are too many Christians who reason this way. I'm going to church today. I'll read the Bible lesson quickly before I go, and go to church, and I'll hear the law, and I'll be able to pray. That's not what this says. This does not allow that, even though he says, there's a connection between not hearing the law and not being able to pray. What he says here is, if you want to be able to pray, you must have a condition which is, you must be a person who hears the law.

TOWN

Next...in Matt 5:23, 24, if you are going to sacrifice, and I find myself before the altar, and I suddenly realize I'm not right with my brother, again, not right with my brother, it's a negative on this side, and I find out I cannot sacrifice. Christ says, leave your gift, you can't sacrifice, and you go home and you get right with your brother, and come back. Now does this say, the only time I have to be right with my brother, look at it, watch it, because this is what the scripture says, is the only time I have to be right with my brother, is when I'm going to sacrifice? Not by any means. It says, if I want to be able to sacrifice, I have to achieve a condition of being right with my brother. Next, in 1 Pet

3:7, here is a man who doesn't properly treat his wife. And guess what, his prayers are hindered. Alright, I pray in the morning, and so, since I have to be right with my wife when I pray, I'll run in and kiss her and say honey, I love you and then I'll go pray, and I'll treat her like I want to the rest of week, or the rest of the time till I pray again. Obviously, you *know* that's not the case, but it's the same form. Not covered, not pray. Here's the condition that must be present before this can occur, and so here is a condition that must be present, I must properly treat my wife before I can pray. That is a continuing, it must be a condition *all* the time. Notice every one of these, is of that nature.

Next, in Isaiah 1:11-17, here are those that are unrighteous and disobedient, and they cannot sacrifice, and we could go on. And there are many, many, the Bible is full of these, but notice the form is, Not A means Not B. This does *not* imply that A is equal to B, or A yields B. I will suggest that this just as strongly teaches, that here is a condition that she must not allow, because if she has that condition, she cannot not pray or prophesy. Consider it, I believe that is what that scripture says. These other scriptures say the same thing, and don't turn around and say, these are equivalent. They are not logically equivalent, and they are not logically equivalent in the scriptures. Somebody might say your logic is not what the scriptures use. I'm sorry, that's what the scriptures use. That's exactly what the scriptures use, and if you start opening, you can find the Bible full of these expressions. And I want to go again, it says, if you're not covered, you cannot pray. Does that mean you must cover yourself at prayer and that only, that is, when you cover yourself, it means you are going to pray. The answer is resoundant no. That scripture doesn't say it. Now if that's the case, it might be the case, if that's the case, it must be established elsewhere. I will suggest that it is not established elsewhere, (if I can find my notes here), because the very thing that we have to have to be able to worship at any time, is to keep these conditions that the Lord requires of us. And we must have them all the time. The relationships that he bases these conditions on are holding all the time. The arguments he makes, are arguments that are true 24 hours a day, every day of the week. Is it ever a time when the wife is not properly in subjection to her husband, or men in general. Is there any *time* when women can take authority over men in this religious realm? Of course you know the answer is no. And so, we realize that when you say, that this is restricted to praying or prophesying, that it's only done when you are praying or prophesying, we have actually made a mistake of logic, and have substituted *this* the inverse for the theorem. And you cannot do that, that's not true. It's not true in logic, and it's not true, as the Bible uses logic. Again I say, if it's *true*, that this is a covering that must be put on, and it's a put -on-able and take-off-able covering, then you are going to have to go somewhere else to show it, this does not show it. I can't stress that too *strongly*. We have violated the scriptures when we say that kind of logic holds, and so I want to see the other scripture that says, this is something you put on or take off.

I want to go back, (Please give me, expressions for covering, No 4) and look at the idea of, there are two words for covered, and therefore, there are two coverings. No 1, there are not *two* words for covering, there are *three* expressions for covering, and therefore there must be three coverings for this argument. That will not hold. There is the

expression in 4, something down over the head, and again we recognize he's talking about the man with his head covered. We see in 5 and 13, 6 and 6, twice in 6, and 7, the word *katakalupto* or *akatakalupto* used. And in these contexts, we find that this means covered, and the 'kata' means intensive, a full covering, it's not just covered, the word *kalupto* means covered, but *kata* is an intensifier. And so this means fully covered. Now also in verse 15, we have the *peribolaion*, (excuse my pronunciation), word, which means something thrown around, a vesture. Now quickly, this word is used only a few times, most of them right here in the scriptures, in fact, all of those right here in the scriptures, but the *kalupto* part is used in many places. This word does *not* refer specifically to a veil, this word is 'covered', and these are verbs, every one of them are used in a verb form. This is a noun, and so it's equivalent to a mother saying to her daughter, 'daughter, you don't go out in the sun with your head not covered. The sun is dangerous, you must cover your head. Put on the bonnet.' Notice, I said don't go out covered, I'm using a verb, and then I say, put on the bonnet I gave you for that purpose. I used the noun. This is the only noun. This word also occurs only here and in Hebrews, where it's used as a vesture, but the *balo* occurs many times, and in every case it refers to, except one, it refers to *clothing*. This is a more general term, saying 'covered'. You need to be covered.

How are you covered? Well, it's shown in two ways. First of all, in verse 15, the covering is specifically mentioned, noun, this is the covering, and in these verses, particularly as we go to 13 and 14 and 15, it is constantly moving from the word 'you must be covered', you must not do this with your hair. It's not just verse 15, the hair occurs all through here. And the constant simile is, 'covered' or 'cutting the hair off', *covered* or *cutting the hair off*. These are synonymous. Notice that this is not a word for 'covering', this is a verb, general verb 'covered'. Notice for example, in Mark 8:32, I believe it is, the ship was covered by the waves, its *kalupto*. Obviously that's not referring to a specific word for a veil. It is not that, and all of us will admit that. It's just the word for covered. Obviously, if I talk about a cover that a man wears over his head, it might be a veil, it also might be his hair. See, the word covering here does not identify what the agent is, but the rest of the scripture keeps referring to hair, not once, but all the way through, keeps referring to hair, identifying hair as this thing that he said is, that by which you are to be, verb, covered.

Well, what is that covering? Well, here it is, it is the clothing of the head. The word *peribolaion*, or *bolo* as I mentioned, is defined as vesture, cover, veil. It also, as I mentioned, as it's used as a verb, is used as clothing extensively. Only one place out of 23 it is used in the scriptures, is it used in any other context. Now No 1, there are not two words for covering, there are three. And so if every word for covering means there must be a different covering, you are going to have to come up with three coverings. But that of course is not valid. Note, though, that we have here, a participle, having something down over the head. What is it? I don't know at this point. Here we must have the head covered. I don't know what it is for a minute. Well begin to read, and constantly he keeps saying, here is the cover, the cover is the hair. You see my point? I believe that, I believe that's consistent with the scriptures, and I wish I had time to deal with this fourth length of hair. I believe that the chart will actually identify that Paul was

not constantly with shorn hair, but had his hair shorn for the specific, *exceptional* thing, that at *this* point he had a vow. I want to make that plain.

Hiram Hutto – Second Negative

I'm glad to be back before you for this second speech. I thought for a minute there I was debating Tom Warren. 😊 You all have to understand brother Hutcheson is a math teacher, and uses a lot of the mathematics language. But I would call your attention to one thing that he said. He said the scripture does *not* say, that if a woman is not going to pray, you don't have to be covered. Here's the question, does the scripture say a woman has to be covered if she's not praying or prophesying, and if so, where is the scripture? See he said, the scripture does *not* say, that if a woman is not going to pray she doesn't have to be covered. I say, does the scripture say a woman has to be covered, if she's not praying or prophesying, and if so where? If you require a woman to be covered when she's not praying or prophesying, you must show the scripture that says that. (Let's have my chart on I Cor 16, which is chart No. CB3.) Here the Bible says very plainly, **“As I gave order to the church at Galatia, that on the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store”**. It doesn't say you can't do it other days. Would it be alright then, just to take up a collection every day? No, what this passage does, is authorize a collection on that day. It doesn't authorize a collection on some other day. And in the covering, what that passage authorizes, is the woman to be covered *then*, and if she's to do that some other time, you'll have to find another scripture. There is no other scripture that authorizes a collection on any other day. That's why we are limited to that.

In the same way, on the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached to them. We could say the scripture does not say, that if you are, that it would be wrong to take it up on some other day. What that verse does, is authorize it on that day. And so when it says a person that prays or prophesies with his head covered, it tells when that takes place. And if it's going to apply some other time, you'll have to find the scripture that says so; in the same way, all of those things that he had up there. For example, the mother saying to the daughter, who had on immodest dress, 'you can't pray that way, you can't go to church that way.' Well, would that mean that the mother would be saying she couldn't wear it somewhere. I know a lot of women, who would tell their daughters, you cannot wear pants to church. They'd let them wear anywhere else. I know some women that would not think of having their daughters going to church or praying in an immodest shorts. They'll let them wear them other places. Just because he says you cannot pray there, doesn't mean that the woman is saying, and you cannot do it anywhere. No you'd have to find some other teaching about it, some other word from her. What you can find is what is specified. That's what it is on the first day of the week; that's what it is on the time factor about praying or prophesying.

Proverbs 28:9 says, “whoso doeth not hear the law, cannot pray”. Well there may be some other things that he cannot do either, but you have to find that somewhere else. What you can find *here* is, if you don't hear the law, and of course hear doesn't just

mean sit down and read, it means to obey; if you don't do what the law says, you can't pray. Can you do other things? Well, if you can or *can't*, you'll have to find something else that says so. All that that passage says is, *that*, in the same way all that the passage says, is when you pray or prophesy, a man must not be covered. Can he be covered other times? The Bible doesn't deal with that. There's not a passage, that I know of, that deals with it. And the same thing would apply to Matt 5, if you are not right with your brother, you can't sacrifice. Can you do other things? Well, you'd have to find some other scriptures that deal with that. And so this passage, I Corinthians 11, deals at least in verses 4,5, and 6 with praying or prophesying, and that's what we'll talk about, because that's what the passage talks about. And if you're going to say it applies somewhere else, you'll have to find a passage that says it applies somewhere else. We'll just stay with what the scripture says.

Also, let's see, on the different words, he said there are not two words for cover, but there are three. Well, I believe if you look at verse 4, where he has the man is to be covered, he takes up the same thought in verse 7, when he uses another word, that he shows he's talking about the same thing, because he uses the *katakalypto* in verse 7, just like he uses that word that does not have the *kalupto* on it in verse 4. And he said every one of these are verbs. Well they're not verbs; some of them are adjectives. For example, when he says in verse 6, it's a shame, let's see verse 5, every woman, if a woman is not covered, but if it is a shame; anyway it's an adjective in that verse. And down in verse 13, "Judge in yourselves, is it seemly that a woman pray to God uncovered or unveiled." It's an adjective. It's not a verb. It may be a verb in English, but it's an adjective. And he's really saying, is it comely that an unveiled woman pray? It's an adjective. And it's an adjective up there in the other. It's not all verbs is what we are saying. Some of it's adjectives which modify nouns, which tell the kind of woman, it's an unveiled woman. And so the idea that they're all verbs, that isn't quite right.

He mentioned having his head covered, in verse 4, "every man praying or prophesying having his head covered dishonors his head." Thayer says the word 'having' in that passage, refers to wearing garments. In other words, the garment must be on the man's head for it to be a dishonor. Arndt and Gingrich said it refers to garments. So what it's talking about in verse 4, when a man is having his head covered, it's covered with a garment. That's why we said turban, a fez, a hat, it's a garment. And the Bible said that a man who has his head covered with a garment, is what Thayer says the word means, what Arndt and Gingrich say the word means, and therefore he's talking about some kind of clothing. And that shows again that it is something you put on and you can take off. When he's praying, he cannot put on a garment on his head, whether it's a hat, or a fez, or a turban, he can't do that, because if he does, he dishonors his head, and so much for that.

The statement that Paul was not *normally* with shorn hair, how does he know that? Just because Paul had his head sheared over in Acts 18, doesn't mean it wasn't, well like mine. As I said, I could go tomorrow and I could get mine sheared. I could go Monday and I could get it sheared again. Just because I may have decided, "well let's see, I believe I'll take a vow, and as a part of that vow, I'll get my head sheared," it doesn't

mean it wasn't sheared two or three days earlier. It might mean the vow didn't start two or three days earlier, but it wouldn't mean the head had not been sheared two or three days earlier. And so the idea that because Paul got his head sheared, it showed that Paul did not *normally* have that, that wouldn't necessarily apply. It *might*, but it doesn't *necessarily* mean that. And it could just as well mean that normally, Paul could have had a hair cut just like mine.

(Let's see, the chart that takes up all of this in summary...Two Coverings Required No. 21) Let's simply go over some of the material we had...two coverings are required ...the meaning of having his head covered as we saw from Esther 6:12, is talking about, we know what Haman did. That's the normal idea that a person gets when they read that. And that's the normal idea that a person gets when he reads I Corinthians 11:4, when a man has his head covered. *Normally* we know what that is, just like it does in the case of Haman.

Not only, so we say again the covering of I Corinthians 11:4-10 and verse 13 is limited to the time when you're praying or prophesying. Now if we're going to apply that to some other time, we'll have to find a verse that says that. I don't know of a verse that says that a man cannot be covered at other times. And if you can find a verse that says that he cannot be at other times, then I'll believe that, and that's what I'll teach. But I don't know of a verse, and the same way with a woman. The Bible says that a woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered, and far as I know that's the *only* time that she's required to be covered. Just like the *only* time that we may take up a collection, is on the first day of the week. The only time that we eat the Lord's supper, is on the first day of the week. We cannot say, well that's all that passage said you could do, therefore you *might* do it other times, but you'll have to find a passage that says so. And that's the way it specifies the time that this is to take place. That is, when they pray or prophesy, it does not include another time. And I wouldn't know a verse that says that it includes some other time.

Then also we looked at the translations that say bareheaded. You know, we said that a woman could have hair all the way to the floor, and still be bareheaded, could have hair as long as Crystal Gail, they said that's who that woman was, and still be bareheaded. Therefore long hair wouldn't fit in that, because when it says if a woman prays to God bareheaded, it shows it's not talking about long hair. It's talking about some kind of clothing, or as Thayer said in reference to the man in verse 4, it's talking about garments, and so bareheaded.

We say again, why two different words for covering, if only one covering is what is being required? We noted the difference in the words in I Corinthians 7, and I believe made a valid argument. The very fact that Paul changed the words, showed he had a different kind of *bondage* in mind, and the fact that Paul changed the words here, showed he had a different *covering* in mind. One is to be on, whatever it is. Now he said it didn't specify, well I don't specify, I don't specify what the covering is. Sometimes people want to know, where did the Bible say a woman has got to wear a hat? I've never said a woman had to wear a hat. Sometimes people call folks like me *hatters*. I don't teach

a woman has got to wear a hat. But the Bible does say she's to be covered, and I don't specify what the covering is, because the Bible doesn't. But as Thayer shows in the case of the man, it's talking about clothing, and therefore what she is to cover her head with has to do with clothing. And when he uses two different words, why do that, if he's talking about the same.

Now if it had said down in verse 15, that her hair is given her for, and used that *same* word, then you might have a pretty good argument. But it doesn't use that same word. He uses a different word, which evidently *shows* that he's talking about a different kind of covering. And so he specifies the *time*, praying or prophesying, he changes the *words*, many of the translations say bareheaded, and we know what that means when it comes to Haman, in Esther 6:12. All of that shows that it is not talking about long hair. I still would like to know, and he's going to answer this next time, could a man with a turban on his head, or a fez, or a hat that covers his head, could he, or would he violate I Corinthians 11:4 and verse 7. Because he would have hair cut shorter than mine we'd say, but he's got his head covered up with a turban or fez or with a hat. Could that man pray acceptably, and if he could not, what scripture does he violate? Because he couldn't violate the hair part of it, he's got no long hair, therefore he doesn't have *that* covering, but he does have a *covering* on, and that would violate what it says in verse 4, and again down in verse 7. As we saw from Thayer, it has to do with wearing clothes or wearing garments or weapons or something of that nature, and he sites John the Baptist, and a passage like that.

Alright, let's see. (Let me see chart No 7.) If long hair is the only covering, uncut hair, here's some consequences. A man with short hair violates no scripture that I know of, if he prays with a turban or a veil on his head. And in the same way, a woman may have hair six feet long, but it had four inches cut off, she is not covered, even if she has on an opaque veil that covers her head, face, and everything from her shoulder up, because she doesn't have *long uncut* hair. That would mean that a woman could get her hair cut off about to the knees, and put on a veil that covered everything from here up, like you see on the television some of them wear, and she still would not be covered, if it's long, uncut hair. And I don't believe either one of those. I believe a man *violates* the scripture, if he prays with a turban or veil on his head, and a woman who has hair six feet long but had four inches cut off, I believe she is *covered*, if she has on an opaque veil, that covers her head face and every thing from her shoulders up. Here are some consequences I take it, from the question, is the *long* hair uncut hair, and is that the only covering. As far as I can tell I've taken up the arguments that *he* gave, and gave some others. Okay I'll stop with that.

Paul Hutcheson – Third Affirmative

You can tell I'm unaccustomed to this kind of discussion. Very first thing I want to do, is deal with the answer to this....this was not answered. Going back to, does the passage say somewhere else? That is not what this is saying What we're saying is, (put this chart back up please), the form here, is a form used throughout the scriptures. It is *not* the form that you find in talking about the laying by in store. The laying by in store is on

the first day of the week, you lay by in store. It's, don't lay by in store on the seventh day. He said A yields B, first day of the week, you lay by in store. No question about the *time there*, because it's not an inverse setup, it's a straight proposition. And that's very clear, and if you'll look at all those he put down there with that form, we're not dealing with that form. We're dealing with, if you *do not* have *this*, it's you *cannot* have *this*. And that as he said, this does not require, that this be tied with this. There is no requirement; in fact, the implication is otherwise. And he says, where in the world is the implication? Is it more than implication. Where does it say it? Well if you follow the logic here, a woman must be covered, and her *hair* is her covering, *there it is*. That's a 24 a day, seven day a week, 365 days a year. That's consistent. This other is *not* consistent. Because you have a proposition turned around, and you *cannot* do that. You *have* to have something else to show it. Now in dealing with this, the answer was here. Well he might need to do something else. We're not talking about something else. We're talking about this particular condition. We're not talking about *all* conditions he has to have. We're talking about this particular condition. He must meet the condition of hearing the law, before he can have his prayers answered. This *implies* that he must do this *all* the time, in able to be able to carry out his service to God in prayer. Likewise the others. So *please* do not *confuse* the issue, the issue is the form, and the form that he used, are not synonymous with it, the forms he used are A yields B, not Not A yields Not B. I want to say again, and very plainly, not only in our logic, but also in the scriptures, this form is used very heavily, and it *always* implies, excuse me, it implies, let me take the always out, cause that gets pretty strong sometimes, but it implies that this condition must exist before this. It doesn't say that this condition is turned on when this is. It doesn't say, this must be done, and then do this. Always do this and then you do this. That's what he's saying that this says. It doesn't say that. If a woman's head is covered, not covered she cannot pray or prophesy. Well, when does she have to put the cover on? The consistent position is, verse 15, that her head, her hair, is given her for a covering, and if we take that position, then it's taken care of.

I want to go back to the length argument. I have *no* problem with the length argument. You notice we said in the, (let's get the hair length right quickly,) in the hair length, we said uncut as God gave it. That's what we see in verse 15. And when I say, I'm dealing with covered, and it deals there, it's dealing with this. Paul had something shorter than that. Brother Hutto, ☺ your hair is not shorn. The word shear means shorn like a sheep. Your hair isn't taken off. The very fact that it is mentioned that Paul had a specific condition, that he just did because of a certain thing, suggests and implies, that that condition did not exist before that. If he was *always* shorn, then it wouldn't say, he had his head shorn because he had a vow. He's always shorn. But in that case, we find, that that was not the general condition. Paul does not *say* that man must shear his hair. That must be a general condition. That condition was a condition, as we see from the various lexicographers, is a condition that existed for *particularly* a vow being taken, and it's associated with shaven. And so there was a man, could not have long hair, what's long hair, what God *gave* the woman is called long hair, he couldn't have that, he had something in between these. I don't believe you can miss that.

Now the question, verse 4, there are three terms for covering. He is correct, that as these develop, that in verse 4 and verse 7, I believe he said, these two show they're talking about the same thing. I agree. I agree. But as we go down the line, it also in verse 15, verse 13 and 14 we're looking at the same thing. The context shows that the *hair* is what we're dealing with. Now I agree, I'm not arguing the three mean three coverings, it's the argument here, that two means two coverings. We have three verbs, or three terms, all of them being the same thing. Incidentally, in verse six it *is* a verb, in verse 13 it is an *adjective*. We just checked that out. Check that out, and see if I'm not right. In verse 13, it's still the verb form, it's the form covered.

Now I want to again look at, while the man has to have clothing on his head. I agree. Going to verse 15 again, we have the peribolaion word, and that word is translated (let me read quickly a few) In Matt 6:29, "was not arrayed like one of these." In verse 31, "where we shall be clothed." Verse 36, 25:36, "naked and you clothed me," and in several places, and this is fair, there's the *clothes*. God has *specified*. He said the *hair* is given to you for clothing for the head. Now I don't have to argue a turban or a woman's length of hair, I've got that covered. Consistency in the chapter makes that easy. Now I am going to wait until the question and answer period to answer, to talk about the turban. I don't believe it would be wise for a man, or right for a man to cover himself with *anything*, but the *question* here is not *that*. The question *here* is, what did God talk about in this case, when he said covering? God said if a man has *long* hair he can't properly pray, he dishonors his head, he dishonors God, and he's talking about a man covering his hair here, with the clothing of the hair. Go back to verse 15, peribolaion means clothing. And so we have the clothing of the hair. Likewise the woman, it doesn't matter whether she puts a turban on her hair, if she cuts her hair off. And I believe you agree with me on this brother Hutto. I believe you agree that she must have the long hair. And so we are really closer here than it looks. But if a woman have long hair, her hair is covered. The long hair, verse 15, is the clothing of her head.

Realize again those verses, katakalupto and kalupto, and those other words used again, from the form of a verb, her head is *covered*, that's still the verb form used as an adjective. We have the verbs in *general* referring to *cover*. Then we have, well what is the cover? A covering his head. I want to go over this again. The mother says, "don't go out without covering your head. You cover your head." This is the word, a general term for covering. The ship was covered with the waves. Katakalupto used in this Septuagint version. In Isaiah, the flying creatures with six wings, with twain wings now, they covered their face and with twain they covered their feet, the same word, katakalupto. Did they put a veil over their feet. No they covered their feet. The word means covered. It's not a specific term for a separate veil, or separate covering. And so when we come to say what is the covering? It's identified by saying, if you start removing the covering, cut it all off, verse 6. If you are going to be well pleasing to God, you have long hair, that's a glory to you, because God gave you that hair for the clothing of the head. (one minute, okay).

Covered with the garment, the garment of verse 15. I want to say, on the two words, meaning two different things. Yes, two words in some places mean two different things,

but two words in another place don't mean two different things. Acts 2:38 and Acts 3:19, here are those that said repent and be baptized, and then in Acts 3:19, turn again. Alright there's two plans of salvation because there's two terms. *That* won't work. The context must show whether the terms are synonymous, or the terms are not synonymous. Many times two terms means two things. I say a dog and a cat, and I'm talking about two things, but other times two different terms are synonymous to the same. And here again, is the woman, she has her head *covered*, it's covered. Well, what is it covered with? It's covered with the hair, it's covered with this peribolaion, the clothing of the head, the clothing that's to be on her head. And so the two word, simply doesn't hold. Again remember there are three words, and I agree, the first word means the same as the second, and likewise the third.

Hiram Hutto – Third Negative

Says that its not long uncut hair, in order to cover their head. Alright, I also would like to look at the chart on Matthew 5. What is he talking about in I Corinthians 11? He said when you pray or prophesy, women, cover your head. And then he comes on a little bit later and said, doesn't even nature teach you that if a man have long hair it's a shame to him, and if a woman have long hair it's a glory to her. Nature teaches the same thing revelation teaches. He illustrates what he's been saying in 4 and 5, with what nature says down in 13-15, just like he does in Matt 6. He says, if God feeds the birds he'll feed you. Yeah but I don't like worms. What do you mean? Why that's the kind of food God gives the birds, I don't like bugs. Shall I conclude because God feeds me and feeds the birds, we're going to get the same food? No, God clothes the lilies, he clothes us, does that mean we get the same clothes? No. And so does the fact that God feeds the birds and us, mean he does so with the exact same food? No. Does the fact that God clothes the lilies and us, mean he does so with the very same clothes? No. Even so, the fact that her hair is a covering, and a covering is required when praying or prophesying, does not mean it has reference to the exact same covering. Not any more than it would up there. All it means is, her hair is a covering. It doesn't mean that it's the one he's been talking about. Not anymore than it would in this right here. It simply shows, that you can talk about something and mean two different things. He feeds you and he'll, or he feeds the birds and he'll feed you. You don't get the same food, but you get fed from God. And so the woman has a covering that he mentioned in verses 14 and 15, but it doesn't argue that it's the same one that he'd been talking about up there, in the other verses.

If I were to say, I'm going to get my hair cut. Does that mean I've not had it cut. No it wouldn't mean that at all. But he says the fact that it said Paul got his head shorn, meant he did not normally do that. Well it wouldn't mean that at all. It might, but you'd have to have more information than that to reach that conclusion. Just like he *might* decide that if I had hair like that fellow, I said I'm going to get it cut, you might conclude I never had, but I might. Just a statement I'm going to get my hair cut, does not mean that it was not cut before that. And he said my head wasn't sheared, right around here. I'm going to go and see if they'll give me my money back.

In verse 5, it's an adjective. The uncovered head, the word uncovered there is an adjective, it's not a verb. Just like a little bit later in verse 13, I believe it is, he talks about an uncovered woman, you've got an uncovered head and an uncovered woman.

He talked in Isaiah 6, you've got the word for the six wings they covered their feet, and it's not the word for veil. Well I never have said it was. I haven't argued that it's a specific kind of covering that's mentioned there. I maintain that it is not a specific kind of covering. God didn't specify the covering when he said a man must not be covered. When he said having his head covered, those that ought to know, says it's talking about clothing. A man ought not wear clothing on his head when he prays.

How about at other times? Just like that woman told her daughter, when you go out, cover your head. What about when I'm in-doors? Well she didn't say. You'd have to get some more information before you could reach that conclusion. And that's the way it is here. If it is wrong for a woman to be, if it is said that it is wrong for a woman to be uncovered when she prays or prophesies, you'll have to learn somewhere else, if it is wrong for her to be uncovered at other times. You won't learn it from *that* passage. All that passage says is when she prays or prophesies. And that's all that we say about it.

We say again, (Chart No. G,) if long uncut hair is the only covering, a man with short hair violates no scripture, if he prays with a turban or a veil on his head. A man would be perfectly in harmony with the scripture if he would get up here and lead a prayer of this congregation with a turban or a veil covering up his head, everything from his shoulders up, *if* long hair is the only covering. And in the same way a woman, who had her hair six feet long, but she cut it off, instead of letting it grow as long as he said God would want it to grow, she's *not* covered, even if she has an opaque veil that covers everything from her head, face, and up. Now I don't believe that. I believe if a woman had hair along about here, though she had cut a foot of it off, and then she had on this veil that I've talked about, I believe she'd be covered, and be doing what I Corinthians 11, verses 5 and 6 says she ought to do: cover her head when she prays or prophesies. But I do not believe that the Bible shows that long cut hair is the only covering that's under consideration. If it were, those would be some consequences.

Would you be willing for a man to lead the prayer where you are, with hair maybe down to his shoulders, but he's cut it off from say down to his waist. I used to hear people say a man's hair won't grow as long as a woman's hair. I believe we learned better than that in the sixties and seventies. It'll grow long. And they could get six inches of it off, and it would still not be long hair in the sense he's using it, and therefore he'd not be covered and could lead the prayer scripturally. I don't believe the Bible teaches that.

There was another statement he made that I wanted to get to. He said a woman, the Bible says, a woman must be covered and her hair's the covering. Well he connected up some sentences that don't follow. The Bible says a woman must be covered. And then a little bit later in the illustration that we gave, he points out that her hair is given her for a covering, but he doesn't connect it up, in the way that he's tried to connect it up. It just doesn't connect up that way. And he uses two different words, and shows by

that, at least, that he has two different words under consideration, two different coverings under consideration. If he only had one, if it said for example, that a woman must not pray uncovered, and use word 'k', and then a little bit later said the woman's hair is her covering, and use that same 'k', he'd have an argument. But it doesn't say that. It says that a woman must not be uncovered, and uses the negative with the 'k'. A little bit later he said her hair is the covering, and uses another word, which shows that it's not the covering that he's been talking about in verses 4,5 and on down through there.

I still don't know whether or not he thinks it would be right, but I gathered that he thought it wouldn't be advisable, it wouldn't be wise, but he did *not* say he thought it would be *wrong* and *violate* the scripture, for a man to have short hair and with a turban on. Would it violate the scripture, if he cut his hair off to the shoulders, and led the prayer that way? Maybe the questions will come up on that later. I appreciate getting to be with you and participating in this.

Question and Answer Session

We'll now begin the question and answer period. The first question is for Mr. Hutcheson. And ya'll can both take time to think on these questions before you answer.

Can a woman trim her hair for the health of it, if so, at what point does it become cut? What passage regulates this?

Paul Hutcheson: This question comes up obviously quite often, and when I get to this point, I'm very uncomfortable because I'm beginning to *specify* in place of God. I like to stay clear of how *long* is long and give the Bible definition, what God gave her, and if she tampers with it, she might as well go ahead and shave it all off. I will, I'll rise to this, if my own daughters have said, and I believe them, that here is the hair that is splitting at the tips, and if it starts splitting it will continue to split, and therefore will lose this length, and I will cut it off right at the base of the splits to stop this hair from splitting. If that's true, that would be doing something for the hair that would *protect* it's length, rather than doing something for the hair to *reduce* it's length, and I see there's quite a difference in thought. You see my point. I'll let it go at that. Incidentally I would like to use this to say one thing, I didn't deal with the turban for one particular reason, and that is, it's not quite, it's a consequence of the doctrine, not quite the doctrine that we are dealing with tonight. And we just didn't have time to deal with that.

Hiram Hutto: Let me have the chart. I too believe the Bible says something about long hair. And it says if a man have long hair it's a shame, and if a woman have long hair it's her glory. Uses the *same* word. Whatever's long for the man is long for the woman. And if a man has it, it's a shame to him, but if a woman has it, it's a glory. All of which leads me to the conclusion, that in order for it to be what the Bible teaches, the hair length must identify whether it's a man or a woman. And if she trims it, how much can you trim. If you cut it, how much can you cut. I don't believe the Bible deals with that particular part of it. All it deals with is, is long hair for a man it will identify him just like

this chart does, and it shows that there ought to be a difference, a recognizable difference between men and women, and the length of hair ought to show that. If she can cut the hair, and it still be *long* enough to show the difference, I don't know a scripture she violated. In the same way she could trim it. And I would say this, if the hair *splits*, and it's *wrong* to cut your hair, let her split, because you'd be doing wrong if you did that, because God's idea is just let her grow.

Must a woman cover her head when she prays outside the assembly of the church?

Hiram Hutto: I could be facetious ☺ and say yes, with one covering, she'd have to do it with long hair, because she's always got to have that. I'd also say, because I really think the passage is talking about the kind of covering that I've been talking about, when it talks about praying. And I would say that if I were a woman, and it *bothered* me, I wouldn't cover my head ever when I pray. I *can* say as a man, I wouldn't cover my head anywhere when I pray. And I believe if I were a woman, I wouldn't care if I were in a restaurant, or where I was, if I were going to pray, I'd cover my head. It might not be required, but it certainly wouldn't be wrong. And so that's what I would do about that.

Paul Hutcheson: Just point out that we're talking about when a woman prays or prophesies in the 14th chapter of this same book, Paul identified that a woman could not prophesy. Now if she might pray, if we'll assume praying is praying with the leader, but prophesying she cannot do. Prophesying was done by one person at a time, and he identifies that a woman could not do it. So when we are talking about a woman praying or prophesying, this *cannot* be limited to the *assembly*, and so I really came to pretty much the same conclusion you did.☺

The question is dealing with verse 5. If the hair is the covering, would she not already be shaven? The verse states, head uncovered dishonors her head, equals shaven. The verse does not say shorn. The verse says "But every woman that prayeth or prophesy with her head uncovered dishonors her head for that is even all one as if she were shaven".

Paul Hutcheson: If there's a misplaced understanding of that when you say, that that means, this condition is identical to the other. Here she is with whatever *uncovered* is, and I will suggest it is short hair, and he says that is one and the same as if she were *shaven*, and you're saying that, okay.....*uncovered* is shaven, well you're identifying then, the hair with the covering. But what this is saying, very plainly is, if she does whatever is called uncovered, and I won't even argue that at this point, if she does whatever is called uncovered, she might as well shave her head. You all recognize how *shameful* it is for a woman to shave her head, and if she does *this*, which I'll suggest is cutting her hair, or *whatever* uncovered is, it is *equivalent* in *shame*, not equivalent in *fact*, but equivalent in *shame*, to having her hair shaven. And so whatever this is, you better not do it. But he didn't say, it's the same thing as hair shaven, you have the same problem with that, that I would have. But if whatever uncovered is, it's one and the same thing as if her hair is shaven. Now you're not saying, now you really don't believe that. This would be *equivalent* in *shame*, and therefore if it's a shame for this,

let her recognize that whatever we're talking about right here, is a shame. And of course we'd identify that with the hair, and the very fact this is identified, if you start tampering with it and you shorten it, look, you might as well cut it off. That before God is what you are equivalent to doing. Oh no, I would *never* do that, well then don't do this.

Hiram Hutto: It would seem to me when it says it's the same as *if* she were shaven, it means she's *not* shaven. And then when it says, if she's not covered let her *also* be shorn, that means she's not shorn. Here's a woman that's uncovered, who's unshaved, her head is, and unshorn, and as he said if you're going to do one, which I would take, if you're going to pray without the covering that is required when you pray or prophesy, if you're not going to wear that, you might as well get your head shaved, you might as well get your hair cut off, one of them is just as bad as the other. You wouldn't think of doing the last two, therefore, you ought not to think of doing the first one. We agree on the principle, but not on what the covering is. Because it says, "*as if*," which means she's not shaven and she's not shorn.

What verse in I Corinthians 11 is of the form not covered – not pray?

Hiram Hutto: I'm not sure I understand exactly what this means, just to be frank with you. Every woman that prays or prophesies *not* covered, dishonors her head. As to whether, I don't exactly understand what it means when you're saying not covered, not pray. Maybe he'll explain that a little bit clearer to me. All I know about it is, it specifies the *time* that her head *must* be covered – when she prays or prophesies. That tells the time that that's to happen. Otherwise if she's not going to, the condition under which she can pray acceptably, is for her head to be covered. As to whether or not it's required some other time, you'd have to learn that somewhere else. That would be about all I could say about that.

Paul Hutcheson: I'll try to explain a little more what it means here. It says if she's unveiled or uncovered and tries to pray, she dishonors her head and so she can't pray properly, and the same form as all these others. Oh you pray, but your prayer is an abomination, so unveiled uncovered. The question is, does this suggest that the veil is something to put on when you pray, and that's the thing that I said this does *not* suggest. It does suggest that at the time of prayer, the veil must be on, the covering must be on, there's no question there. But the question is, does it suggest, and the very tap root of this argument is, it suggests that this must be put-on-able and take -off-able, and this does *not* say that. This says *merely*, it must be on when she prays. It does *not* give the conditions when she's not praying. The context of the thing seems to me to be saying, if it's the long hair, it's on all the time, therefore it should be on when she prays.

If the hair is the covering, can a woman wear her hair on top of her head, is the whole head covered?

Paul Hutcheson: This is one of those questions that bites on both ends. You better watch out. ☺ If here's another covering, can it sit on top of the head, or it must be like

verse 4 suggests, something hanging down the head. No. This does not say, does not suggest, how the hair is to be worn. It suggests, in my understanding of the scripture, that the hair *is* to be worn. There's no suggestion about how it is to be worn, you see.

Hiram Hutto: I don't have anything to say about that.

If a woman needs a covering, artificial covering, are the ones worn today really covering anything? You can see through them. If they were an article of clothing, the woman wearing them would not be clothed, would not be covered.

Hiram Hutto: Well what I'd say about that, if some other *kind* of covering is required, than that which is normally worn today, then women would just have to get one. If the Bible teaches that it is an artificial covering, that is to be worn, whatever kind the Bible teaches, that's what she'll have to do. As to whether or not the coverings that women wear today do that, I would say some of them do and some of them don't. I used to see women that, if I'd get close enough to them, they wore what they called a "whimsy." If they were out in the audience, I couldn't tell you if my life depended on it, whether they had on a thing. And I'd say it doesn't look like they're covered to me. And so I'd say some of them could cover, but that doesn't mean everything does. Just like somebody sometimes asked a word about hats, well some hats do but some hats don't. If I were a woman, I'd wear something that covered. And there wouldn't be any question about it.

Are the three conditions, cut, shaven and shorn all appropriate for a man, primarily if a man simply cuts his hair to any length, is he acceptable in God's sight?

Paul Hutcheson: In this I think I'm very close to brother Hiram. That a man's hair must be very distinctly cut so as not to be thought to be long like a woman. And it may well be that some of our brethren now that are wearing it down to the collar, if the women, if that didn't look feminine from behind, might get by with it. But remember, we are looking at the man, and the man must distinctly be different. Brother Hutto made this point: be distinctly different than the woman. And if he had very long hair, like the hair over here, and he cuts off a little bit of it, maybe in one sense of the word you'd say it's short, but before the world, and before anyone who's seeing him, he can't tell that, he has to demonstrate that he is, not only do God's will, but demonstrate he's doing God's will before others, it's not just here, we're not an island to ourselves. We have to be able to defend ourself. But I want you really to get serious about this, because I look at Christians, I remember one specific family, many ways one of the finest families around, one of the best. And here's the young boy coming in, and here's the mother coming in, and the boy's hair was longer than the mother's. From behind he looked more like a girl than she did. And I think all of us, we're not going to argue about this, I believe we've got something wrong, when that's occurring.

Hiram Hutto: I'll agree with all that, but I don't see how you could consistently say, because we argued that Paul's hair was cut, but it wasn't shorn, and I don't know how we'd know what length Paul's hair was cut, if we just kinda say it wasn't all the way down to the floor. Consistency, it looks like to me, would say that if a man had hair

down on his shoulders, and he'd just got four inches cut off, and long hair must be uncut, he would have *unlong* hair and it would be scriptural. I don't believe it would be, because I don't believe the length, I don't mean long hair means uncut hair. And I showed you the charts with what I believe long hair is.

Please clarify the use of katakalupto or words from the same root word, as adjectives and as well as verbs. Do you understand the question?

Hiram Hutto: Parts of it I understand. The word simply means 'to cover'. Sometimes it's used interchangeably with the word kalupto. I think it's Ezekiel 38, one passage talks about the dust covering, and another passage talks about the dust covering, and the words are just used interchangeably. So that it just means to cover. It could well mean that the 'kata' on front of it intensifies it. That's usually the case with combined forms like that. And clarify the use, or words from the same root word. I don't know what you mean by that, like what word or words, like the word 'kaluptare' which means a headcovering. A woman has a headcovering, mitre, snood, we used to call it. So it's that word, it's the word for a headdress in that particular instance. As to what is meant by it being an adjective as well as a verb, it is a verb in several places here in I Corinthians 11. But in two places it's an adjective. The woman, it is said in verse 5, with an unveiled head, is just an adjective describing her head. And then down in verse 13, it is an unveiled woman. Still just an adjective, and I was simply saying that, to say that they are not all verbs. Some of them are adjectives. I don't know whether that deals with what you wanted me to deal with or not. But so much for that.

Paul Hutcheson: There is a noun form of kalupto and it is kaluma, and this word is used for covering, and when it's used for covering, it's typically translated veil. In II Corinthians 3, the veil on the face of Moses, both here and in the Septuagint, are *this* word. The kaluma is the veil or the covering, and that's the noun form. It's not used here, but that's the other form. The forms here are all derived from the verb.

If a woman has long hair, but is not sure what the verses are saying, what should she do?

Paul Hutcheson: I'm glad you asked that question. I want to be *very* strong here, if any one thinks, or even aren't sure they understand, but thinks that a veil *may* be, the argument of the scripture is, if you don't wear it, I mean a veil or separate covering, if you don't wear it then, it would be that whatsoever is not of faith is sin, that's this very thing. So I wanted to say this, but let me say it very strongly here. I hope that if somebody is convinced by one side or the other, they won't just go out and let that be it. I hope we'll go and study, and make sure that our faith is based on God's word, and act accordingly. And when in doubt, it would be the *worst* of sins to me, not the worst of sin, but a sin for me to tell a woman, look you take off that covering on your head, because I don't think you need it, but if she thinks she needs it, she'd better have it on.

Hiram Hutto: On the word kaluma, I noticed, I believe it's Arndt and Gingrich, who say kaluma or it's equivalent, is suggested to the reader by the context in I Corinthians 11:4,

and I believe Thayer, that may be Thayer, but either Thayer, Arndt and Gingrich both say the same thing, that or it's equivalent, which would get into, well what's an equivalent. Well it'd depend on what you're going to do with it. Which would mean that it wouldn't have to be a veil; a turban or something that does what a veil does, would work. Reason I came up here to do this was I didn't hear the question. But I wanted to say that about the kaluma. And I would agree with this, that if a woman has long hair but is not sure what should she do. I've had people to say, you know there are a lot of questions about that passage, so I'm just not going to do anything. You can't not do anything. You will either cover it, or you won't cover it. That's like saying, I don't know whether I'm supposed to be baptized or not, so I'm not going to do anything. No, you'll do one or the other, and you'll either cover your head or you won't. You can't just do nothing.

Are there any other passages in the Bible that use both parabolaion and katakalupto? If so are the terms distinguished or differentiated?

Hiram Hutto: I would have to say, no, there are not, because the only time we have katakalupto is in I Corinthians 11. Now we do have it in the Septuagint, but I would be a little reluctant to claim all of that as the Bible. Some of the passages where it is used, they are not used interchangeably. Sometimes, this may come up, I don't know, sometimes people will appeal to a couple of passages I can think of in the old Testament, where you have the Septuagint, and the same words may be used within a verse or two, but the context shows clearly they are not being used interchangeably. And so in answer to the question, is there any other passage in the Bible, I'd have to say no, because the only time katakalupto is used in the Bible, would be in a Greek New Testament, and the only place we would have that, would be in I Corinthians 11. But if the other terms come up, we could say something about that.

Paul Hutcheson: One problem that you have with these terms is their very paucity in the scriptures. If we go to kalupto, we have more, and considerably more. And if we go to ballo we have more, and considerably more. But when we go to peribolaion we have it two places, here and in Hebrews, where it's translated in Hebrew as vesture. And the word covering is not there. And we have katakalupto here alone, and no other place, as he said. So on that, there's not much you can do with other references, you have to deal within this point.