

I Corinthians 11:2-16 Requires An Artificial Covering

I Corinthians 11:2-16 is somewhat of a controversial text. I understand there to be two coverings (artificial and long hair) enjoined upon ladies by the passage. Others say long hair is the only covering under consideration. How can we tell for sure?

Verse 5 tells us that a woman should be covered when she prays. It is true that verse 15 tells us that the hair is given a woman “for a covering,” but are those coverings the same? Just on the surface from the English, that might appear to be so, but in the original language two different words are used. The word for the covering in verses 5, 6 (twice), 7, and 13 is a form of the Greek word “katakalypto,” while the Greek word translated “covering” in verse 15 is “peribolaion.” While this use of two different Greek words does not prove conclusively that two different coverings are in view, it does lessen the effect of the argument that there is only one covering since the same English word is used in many translations.

We use this same “two different words” logic when arguing with the Catholics about Peter being the first Pope. When the Catholics make the argument in Matthew 16:18 that the name “Peter” in the Greek means “rock” and Jesus said “upon this rock I will build my church,” therefore Jesus was going to build the church upon Peter, we counter that the word for “Peter” is “petros” (masculine) and the word translated “rock” is “petra” (feminine) and therefore Peter is not the rock that Jesus is talking about. If you agree with our argument on Matthew 16:18, please apply the same reasoning to the fact there are two completely different Greek words used for covering in I Corinthians 11.

I once used Greek concordances of both the new testament and the Septuagint old testament, and throwing out I Corinthians 11, counted 88 times that a form of the word “katakalypto” refers to a

covering of cloth or fabric, and not once, not once did it refer to a covering of hair. I think this is very significant, and should cause the long hair only advocates to rethink their position.

The point that proves conclusively that two coverings are required by I Corinthians 11 is what I call the “done for an occasion” argument. The covering of verse 5 is something that is worn for an occasion (it is temporary) while the covering of verse 15 is something that is worn permanently.

Esther 6:12 reads, “And Mordecai came again to the king’s gate. But Haman hastened to his house mourning, and having his head covered.” In a public debate on this issue in 1994, I asked my friend, brother, and opponent Jesse Jenkins, “Was Haman’s head covering in Esther 6:12 an artificial covering, or was it hair?” Mr. Jenkins answered, “artificial covering.” I then asked him, “Most importantly, how do you know which one it was?” He answered, “Because having his head covered is associated with mourning. Therefore, the indication is that the covering was something he put on for the occasion.” Let the reader note this is the very proof I use to prove the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is an artificial/temporary one. It is to cover for an occasion. This cannot be the same covering as we find in verse 15, as the covering in verse 15 is a permanent covering.

Notice the following chart illustrating this point ...

Praying or Prophesying
It Just Doesn't Make Any Sense

Do The Following Make Sense? Yes No

Ethel, be sure and wear a red dress, while at the Alabama football game.
Ethel, be sure and be skinny, while at the Alabama football game.
Bobby, be sure and eat dinner, while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday
Bobby, be sure and be (physically) tall, while at Granddaddy's house on Sa
Karen, be sure and be covered, with a hood, while outside riding your bike
Karen, be sure and have long hair, while outside riding your bike.
Lucy, be sure and be covered, with a veil, while praying.
Lucy, be sure and have long hair, while praying.

It doesn't make any sense to command a person to:

- be skinny while at the Alabama football game
- be tall while at Granddaddy's house
- have long hair while riding your bike
- have long hair while praying

A command to be covered with long hair for an occasion just doesn't make any sense, because you can't grow a covering of long hair for just an occasion. The long hair is not a temporary covering; it is a permanent covering.

This argument can be summed up simply by asking the following two questions:

1. Does I Corinthians 11:5 require the “katakalupto” covering while working in the vegetable garden?
2. Does I Corinthians 11:15 require the “peribolaion” covering (long hair) in the vegetable garden?

The obvious answers being “no” to #1 and “yes” to #2 show that two different coverings are in view.

The truth is that if long hair is the only covering required by I Corinthians 11, then the phrase “prayeth or prophesieth” in verses 4, 5, and 13 are meaningless. The long hair only position would be taught equally well by I Corinthians 11:2-16 if the phrases "praying or prophesying" (verse 4), "prayeth or prophesieth" (verse 5), and "pray unto God" (verse 13) were not there. That should tell you something. Why would God put those phrases in there if they add absolutely nothing to the meaning of the passage?

The opposing view is that the "covered" head of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is Long Hair on the head, and the "uncovered" head is Short Hair on the head. This is shown to be false by noticing that Short Hair covers the head just as well as Long Hair does. This is physically self evident. My Short Hair covers my head just as much as my wife's very Long Hair covers her head. (note: the I Corinthians 11:5 "katakalupto" covering is to cover the head) On the other hand, a veil covers the head, and the absence of a veil does not cover the head. Long Hair cannot be the covering, because Short Hair covers the head just as well as Long Hair does. The only alternative is that the covering of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is an artificial veil.

Another distinction between the two coverings is the difference between who each covering is to glorify. Verse 7 and 5 show the “katakalupto” covering is designed to bring glory (and not

dishonor) to the man. But the long hair covering of verse 15 is designed to give glory to the woman. This is just another indication that two different coverings are being referred to in the chapter.

One thing the reader ought to consider is that if long hair is the only covering required by God, then it would be okay for a man to pray with a hat on. Most men understand they should take their hats off when praying, and I suggest the practice goes back down through the years to a recognition of I Corinthians 11:2-16.

Let's close with a humorous but valid point. We know the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is artificial/temporary, because it is to cover for an occasion → when a woman prays or prophesies. It must be put-on-able and take-off-able relative to the timeframe specified that it should be worn. The hair does not meet that requirement. Leviticus 13:45 reads, "And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean." I suppose the long hair only advocates believe the leper was supposed to grow a mustache?

Resolved: "It is still binding for a woman to wear an artificial covering while praying."
Affirm: Pat Donahue
Deny: Myles Davis

Davis Rebuttal

In this speech I want to refute the arguments made by Pat in his speech.

The first thing that I want to present is the fact that Pat does not believe the proposition he signed. In his speech he said, "In a public debate on this issue in 1994, I asked my friend, brother, and opponent Jesse Jenkins" So Pat considers him a brother.

I asked Pat would a woman go to Hell if she prayed without a covering and Pat said "yes".

If this is true than Jesse is also a false teacher and so is Pat's wife (who believes as I do on this subject) because they teach a false doctrine. Please note the passage 2 John 19-11,

2Jn 1:9 Everyone who goes on ahead and does not abide in the teaching of Christ, does not have God. Whoever abides in the teaching has both the Father and the Son.

2Jn 1:10 If anyone comes to you and does not bring this teaching, do not receive him into your house or give him any greeting,

2Jn 1:11 for whoever greets him takes part in his wicked works.

So Pat is all Bark and no Bite. If he truly believed in this proposition, he would not have fellowship with them.

Pat might say well, consider it under Romans 14, but if he can do that then why can't I put Faith Only under it, or any other doctrine under it for that matter?

If Pat's reasoning is true on this then even atheists are saved.

Pat might also say well, if I can't then they cannot either, but they do not think that it is a sin they just see Pat as the weaker brother.(Rom 14:1)

Now to deal with Pat's speech. Let me first define some terms.

Pat has challenged me (over the phone) to find one translation that translates αντι, "instead of" in 1 Cor.11:15. He said he can give me about 40 that translate it, "for." Well, Pat I can give you about 40 translations that translate βαπτισθητω, "baptism" instead of "immersion" like it should be, and I can give you about 40 translations that translate εκκλησιων, "Church" instead of "assembly" does that make it right/

What do the Scholars say on the word anti in 1Cor.11:15?

Thayer's Greek lexicon: "for, instead of, in place of (something)"

Arndt & Gingrich Greek Lexicon: "for, as in place of"

Mounce's Expository Dictionary: "In place of"

Dana & Mantey Greek Grammar: "instead of" (1Cor.11:15 is listed as a reference)

So even the scholars who don't believe in my position (Thayer, Arndt, & Gingrich) don't deny that it can mean instead of.

Now let me define what it is that I believe. I agree 100% with Pat that there are two covering in this passage. I also believe (as Jesse Jenkins) that when the word “katakalypto” is used in this passages it is talking about hair, but I also believe that in verse 15 he is talking about an artificial covering when he uses the word “peribolaion”. I also believe that when he uses the word “anti” he means instead of. So what is Paul talking about in this passage? Well I believe (like Ron Halbrook) that he is talking about a custom they had in Corinthians, but that hair is given to the women instead of a covering.

Now let us look at the text itself, and I will put my exegeses of the passage in brackets.

1Co 11:3 But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a wife is her husband, and the head of Christ is God.

[It is very important to for us to see the contrast here. Christ over man then man over wife.]

1Co 11:4 Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, [Now here Paul is talking to the man and he uses the word “katakalypto” in this passage. Also verse 14 says “that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him,” so in verse 4 the covering dishonors a man and in verse 14 long hair dishonors him.] Question for Pat: Can you give me one scholar who says “katakalypto” means a artificial covering?]

1Co 11:5 but every wife who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head, since it is the same as if her head were shaven.

[Here Paul makes the dissection of the covering. Why would Paul say that not wearing an artificial covering is the same as shaving your head? Pat uses a lot of illustrations maybe he has one to answer this question.]

1Co 11:6 For if a wife will not cover her head, then she should cut her hair short. But since it is disgraceful for a wife to cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head. [The Greek for cutting her hair short in this passage means like sheering a sheep so what he is saying here is if you are uncovered you should just shear it, (Something like a army hair cut) and we can see that from the next part of the verse. To cut off her hair or shave her head, let her cover her head.] Question for Pat: what is the covering talked about in the second part of this passage?

1Co 11:7 For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but woman is the glory of man.

1Co 11:8 For man was not made from woman, but woman from man.

1Co 11:9 Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man.

1Co 11:10 That is why a wife ought to have a symbol of authority on her head, because of the angels.

1Co 11:11 Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman;

1Co 11:12 for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.

1Co 11:13 Judge for yourselves: is it proper for a wife to pray to God with her head uncovered?

1Co 11:14 Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him, [This passage ties it all together it is a disgrace for a man to wear long hair, but glory for a woman to.]

1Co 11:15 but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering. [Now here Paul uses the Greek word “peribolaion” for the covering in this passage which means: a covering thrown around, a wrapper (Thayer’s Greek Lexicon), and “katakalypto” means:

1)to cover up

2)to veil or cover one’s self. (Thayer’s Greek Lexicon).

So the covering in Verse 15 is talking about an artificial covering (according to the Greek word), but hair is given (anti) instead of a covering.

1Co 11:16 If anyone is inclined to be contentious, we have no such practice, nor do the churches of God. [Now this is the passage that tells why Paul brought this up because we have no such practice to where an artificial covering in the church only in the town.]

So from the exegesis above we can see that Paul was talking about hair being the covering not some artificial covering.

Pat asked in his speech, Esther 6:12 reads, “And Mordecai came again to the king’s gate. But Haman hastened to his house mourning, and having his head covered.” In a public debate on this issue in 1994, I asked my friend, brother, and opponent Jesse Jenkins, “Was Haman’s head covering in Esther 6:12 an artificial covering, or was it hair?” Mr. Jenkins answered, “artificial covering.” I then asked him, “Most importantly, how do you know which one it was?”

Well Pat the truth is the Hebrew word for cover in this passage means: to cover, overlay, wainscoted, covered with boards or paneling.

And in Lav.13:5 the Hebrew word for covering means: to cover, enwrap, wrap oneself, envelop oneself.

Thank you,

Myles Davis

I Corinthians 11:2-16 Requires An Artificial Covering Patrick Donahue's Second Affirmative

I so appreciate Myles Davis being willing to take part in this Bible study on the woman's head covering issue. However, Myles' article covers a lot of irrelevant matters instead of answering the arguments I set forth proving the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is artificial. For example, Myles brings up the fellowship issue. Myles is a personal friend of mine, and I happen to know he fellowships a number of people he disagrees with on many different Biblical issues (Philippians 3:15-16). So what does his inconsistency prove? Only that we should concentrate on the issue in this debate – should a woman wear an artificial covering when she prays today? I assure Myles that I “truly believe” that women must do so.

Myles begins his argumentation on that issue by showing the Greek word “anti” (translated “for” in I Corinthians 11:15) can mean “instead of.” I agree with that. But it can also mean “to serve as.” Notice the following definitions:

- Thayer - to serve as a covering
- Arndt and Gingrich - hair as a covering
- G.G. Findley ("Expositor's Greek New Testament") - her hair to serve as a hood
- A.T. Robertson ("Word Pictures in the New Testament") - for a covering

(Robertson's comments - It is not in the place of a veil, but answering to [anti, in the sense of anti in John 1:16], as a permanent endowment ...)

So if “anti” can mean either “instead of” or “to serve as,” how do we know which meaning it carries in I Corinthians 11:15? Put another way, how do we know if the “katakalypto” covering of verse 5 is an artificial covering or the long hair? The way we

know is the same way my opponent knows that Haman’s covering in Esther 6:12 was an artificial one – because it was used for an occasion.

In connection with Esther 6:12, my first article included a chart entitled “It Just Doesn’t Make Any Sense.” The point of that chart was that just like it wouldn’t make any sense to tell Ethel to be skinny at the Alabama football game, to tell Bobby to be tall while at his Granddaddy’s house on Saturday, or to tell Karen to have long hair while outside riding her bike, for the same reason, it also doesn’t make any sense to tell Lucy to have long hair while she is praying (I Corinthians 11:5). The reason none of these commands make sense is because none of the actions required can be done just for the occasion specified. It isn’t possible for a woman to turn on and off her long hair just for the occasion of praying, which is exactly what I Corinthians 11:5 implies about the covering in dispute in this debate. This argument conclusively proves the covering of verses 4-13 cannot be the long hair, yet Myles chose not to respond to it. Perhaps he will in his next article.

This argument can be summarized by two questions that Myles failed to answer in his article:

1. Does I Corinthians 11:5 require the “katakalupto” covering while working in the vegetable garden?
2. Does I Corinthians 11:15 require long hair in the vegetable garden?

The obvious answers being “no” to #1 and “yes” to #2 demonstrate that the “katakalupto” covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15.

Toward the middle of his article, Myles switches his position to the custom view. Myles, please tell us exactly what the custom in Corinth was, and give proof for your contention that Paul is only talking about a Corinthian custom. In verse 16, “such custom”

would naturally refer back to the last thing mentioned, i.e., the practice of the contentious man, not the practice Paul is advocating. So Paul is simply saying all the apostles and churches are united in their stand that the covering is required when women pray or prophesy.

Since Myles didn't respond to it, let me repeat my Septuagint argument on the word "katakalypto": In the New Testament and Greek Old Testament, a form of the word "katakalypto" refers to a covering of cloth or fabric 88 times, but not once does it refer to a covering of hair. Perhaps this is why Kenneth S. Wuest's "Expanded Translation Of The Greek New Testament" translates "katakalypto" as "shawl" in verses 5 and 6.

Again from my first article, if long hair is the only covering required by I Corinthians 11, then the phrase "prayeth or prophesieth" in verses 4, 5, and 13 are meaningless. The long hair only position would be taught equally well by I Corinthians 11:2-16 if the phrases "praying or prophesying" (verse 4), "prayeth or prophesieth" (verse 5), and "pray unto God" (verse 13) were not there. Please answer this time Myles: Why would God put those phrases in there if they add absolutely nothing to the meaning of the passage?

Another argument left unanswered: Myles' view says the "covered" head of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is Long Hair on the head, and the "uncovered" head is Short Hair on the head. This is shown to be false by noticing that Short Hair covers the head just as well as Long Hair does. This is physically self evident. My Short Hair covers my head just as much as my wife's very Long Hair covers her head. On the other hand, a veil covers the head, and the absence of a veil does not cover the head. Long Hair cannot be the covering, because Short Hair covers the head just as much as Long

Hair does. The correct alternative is that the covering of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is a veil.

Notice also the difference between who each covering is to glorify. Verses 7 and 5 show the “katakalypto” covering is designed to bring glory (and not dishonor) to the man. But the long hair of verse 15 is designed to give glory to the woman. This is just another indication the covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15. Maybe Myles will choose to respond to the argument next time.

Something that needs to be asked again, if long hair is the only covering required by God, then would it be okay for a man to pray with a hat on? Perhaps Myles will tell us next time if he prays with a hat on.

Later in his article, Myles asks, “Why would Paul say that not wearing an artificial covering is the same as shaving your head?” Actually what Paul says is that the uncovered head is “the same as if her head were shaven.” To exhort his listeners to be honest when filling out their taxes, a preacher might say cheating on your taxes is the same as if you robbed a bank. He would not be saying that cheating on your taxes and robbing a bank are the same thing; instead he would be saying they are two different things, but both are stealing. Likewise in I Corinthians 11:5, Paul is saying that being uncovered is different than shaven, but that both bring dishonor; both are wrong.

Myles’ only response to the argument I made based upon Esther 6:12 is to tell us what the Hebrew word for “covered” means. We both agree the word means to cover,” no problem. Now let’s hope next time Myles will respond to the argument I made. Do you agree with Jesse Jenkins and me that the way we can tell Haman’s covering was artificial (and not hair) is “Because having his head

covered is associated with mourning. Therefore, the indication is that the covering was something he put on for the occasion”?

Myles, please answer this yes or no next time. If your answer is yes, why are you not willing to use that exact same reasoning to understand that the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 must be artificial (and not hair) since it is to be “put on for the occasion”? Whether Myles will answer this time or not, I am confident the reader can easily see the conclusiveness of the Esther 6:12 argument, and the similar argument I made on Leviticus 13:45. Since the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is required for an occasion, it cannot be referring to a permanent covering of long hair. Therefore an artificial covering is also required.

Davis second Rebuttal

First I want to talk about some things Pat said in his last speech. Pat got all upset because I didn't follow the rules of debate and answer all his arguments.

Well, Pat, you didn't follow the rules yourself because the one in the affirmative has the obligation to define the proposition in his opening speech, which you failed to do. So what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Also, the rule is that the negative speaker can't bring anything up unless the affirmative has already said something about it.

Then Pat got mad and said I was the one bringing up all these side issues like the fellowship thing. Well, actually, I didn't bring that up, you did by calling Jessie Jenkins a brother. I was just responding to that.

What Pat's real position should be, "A wife when outside the assemble must have an artificial covering wile praying or teaching," Because:

1. The KJV mistranslated and better translations of verse 5 have wife in there.
2. Women are not to speak in worship so they can't pray or prophesy in church any way.

Now, let's look at some of Pats arguments.

Pat asked me, "something that needs to be asked again, if long hair is the only covering required by God, then would it be okay for a man to pray with a hat on? Perhaps Myles will tell us next time if he prays with a hat on."

Well Pat, if you have the truth on this, then the following can't happen:

1. A young boy at school can not pray while he has a book on his head when there is a tornado coming.
2. A girl can not pray to God while being raped if she has no hat on.

Now Pat has some good kids with whom I have had the pleasure to meet. I ask you Pat, if one of your children are in one of these positions, can they pray to God for help or will they have sinned and burn in hell if they do so? I truly believe God would not call this a sin , for this is not what Paul was talking about!

3. A soldier can't pray to God if he is shot bleeding to death and can't take his helmet off because he has no arms.

4. A women can't pray to God if she is drowning in a pool with no hat on.

5. A construction worker can't pray to God if he is trapped and can't take his helmet off.

The list goes on and on.

Pat, did you know there were men in the New Testament who prayed with a head covering?

1. Jesus, in Mark.15:17 the Bible says, " And they clothed him in a purple cloak, and twisting together a crown of thorns, they put it on him." In Mark 15:34 the Bible says, " And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, "Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani?" which means, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

According to Pat, Jesus had sinned and would be condemned to Hell unless he repented but, as we know that didn't happen, so what about Jesus Pat?

2. Cornelius, in Acts 10:1 the Bible says, "At Caesarea there was a man named Cornelius, a centurion of what was known as the Italian Cohort." In verse 2, "a devout man who feared God with all

his household, gave alms generously to the people, and prayed continually to God. " Because

he was a centurion soldier he had to wear a helmet and he prayed constantly, so was he sinning Pat?

Pat also got mad because I didn't answer his illustration so let me answer it now.

Praying or Prophesying

It Just Doesn't Make Any Sense

Do The Following Make Sense?

Yes No

Ethel, be sure to wear a red dress, while at the Alabama football game.
Ethel, be sure to be skinny, while at the Alabama football game.
Bobby, be sure to eat dinner, while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday
Bobby, be sure to be (physically) tall, while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday.
Karen, be sure to be covered, with a hood, while outside riding your bike.
Karen, be sure to have long hair, while outside riding your bike.
Lucy, be sure to be covered, with a veil, while praying.
Lucy, be sure to have long hair, while praying.

Now let us look at all of his illustrations.

1. Ethel, be sure to wear a red dress while at the Alabama football game. Yes, this can make sense.
2. Ethel, be sure to be skinny while at the Alabama football game. Yes, this can make sense too, because if she is skinny at the foot ball game she can get through the crowd easier!
3. Bobby, be sure to eat dinner while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday. Yes, this can make sense.
4. Bobby, be sure to be (physically) tall while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday. Yes, this could make

since because his grandfather might need a light bulb changed in his house and he can't reach it.

5. Karen, be sure to be covered with a hood while outside riding your bike. Yes, this can make sense.
6. Karen, be sure to have long hair while outside riding your bike. Yes, this can make sense because her head might get cold if she has short hair.
7. Lucy, be sure to be covered with a veil while praying. Yes, this can make sense.
8. Lucy, be sure to have long hair while praying. Yes, this can make sense.

All of these can make sense in their own context, but Pat just put them out there with out any context.

Now Pat tries to say if we put long hair here it would not make any sense, but having people dunked in water to be saved doesn't make any sense to me. So does this mean it is not part of Gods law? There are lots of things in the Bible that don't make sense but they are still part of the Bible.

All Pat has done with his illustration is show that a text without a context is a pretext!!!

Now, in the last part of my speech I want to deal with a very vital word in this debate and that is "anti" (verse 15).

Pat gave the following definitions as proof that "anti" doesn't mean "instead of" in verse 15, so I want to deal with them.

— Thayer - to serve as a covering

— Arndt and Gingrich - hair as a covering

— G.G. Findley ("Expositor's Greek New Testament") - her hair to serve as a hood

— A.T. Robertson ("Word Pictures in the New Testament") - for a covering

(Robertson's comments - It is not in the place of a veil, but answering to [anti, in the sense of anti in John 1:16], as a permanent endowment ...)

The quotes he got from Thayer and Arndt and Gingrich are just their comments not their definitions. As for A.T. Robertson in his Word Pictures he says it must mean in answering to and in his Greek Grammar he says it must be instead of so he is just as confused as Pat is on what the word means. I also find it interesting that Pat puts so much weight in what Robertson's Word Pictures. I wonder Pat do you agree with Robertson's on Acts 2:38? "My view is decidedly against the idea that Peter, Paul, or any one in the New Testament taught baptism as essential to the remission of sins or the means of securing such remission. So I understand Peter to be urging baptism on each of them who had already turned (repented) and for it to be done in the name of Jesus Christ on the basis of the forgiveness of sins which they had already received."

You need to watch out who you quote and what parts you quote, Pat.

Thank You, Myles Davis

I Corinthians 11:2-16 Requires An Artificial Covering Patrick Donahue's Third Affirmative

In his second negative article, my friend Myles Davis says I Corinthians 11:5 should have been translated “wife” instead of “woman,” claiming my position should be that only wives must be covered. I don't think Myles thought through his point very well, because if he is right, then Jesus is only the head of husbands not single men (verse 3), it is only a shame for a wife (not single women) to be shorn or shaven (verse 6), it is only a shame for a husband to have long hair but single men may have long hair (verse 14), and a man is born of his wife instead of his mother (verse 12). No, “man” and “woman” are good translations in I Corinthians 11:2-16, and so all women should be covered when they pray.

In connection with that, Myles said my position should be that woman only have to be covered outside the assembly, because they don't pray or prophesy in the assembly. But Myles knows, as do all the readers, that a woman does pray in the assembly silently – the words being selected for her prayer by the male leader. So a woman should be covered in the assembly or out, just whenever she prays.

I had asked Myles if he prayed with a hat on. Instead of answering the question, he brought up some hypothetical / emotional situations that he felt reflected on my position. This is identical to a Baptist trying to prove water baptism is not necessary to salvation by bringing up the case of the believer who dies on the way to the baptistery. Myles knows these type arguments are invalid when debating the Baptists. So we wonder why he makes similar arguments when debating the covering question? Is it because he doesn't have any scriptural arguments to sustain his position? Now let Myles go back and answer my original question

– does he pray with a hat on? I don't think he does, therefore admitting by his practice at least that I Corinthians 11:2-16 is still binding today.

Finally Myles makes an argument from the Bible when he brings up the fact that Jesus had a crown of thorns (covering) on when He prayed in Mark 15:17,34. There are a couple of problems with this argument. First I doubt the crown of thorns completely (“kata”) covered Jesus' head as the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is supposed to. But even if it did, this example was before the New Testament law went into effect. The covering requirements of I Corinthians 11:2-16 were not included in the law of Moses. Myles of course knows better than to use an Old Testament example as New Testament proof. He knows the Baptists make the same mistake when they bring up the “thief on the cross” to try to prove water baptism is not necessary to salvation today. Again we ask, why would Myles make an argument he believes is unsound when denominational preachers make it?

Then Myles brings up Cornelius as another example of a man who wore a covering when he prayed. Cornelius, not being a Christian at this point, would carry no more weight than Lydia carries in observing the Sabbath in Acts 16:13 when she wasn't a Christian. Also, it should be obvious to all that if we assume Cornelius had to wear a helmet because he was a centurion, then he probably took off his helmet to sleep or take a shower. So if Cornelius was trying to follow I Corinthians 11:4 at this time in his life, he would have naturally taken off his helmet to pray. Arguments from the silence of the scriptures never work Myles.

Myles replies to my “Doesn't Make Sense” argument by saying a lot of things in the Bible don't make sense (like getting dunked in water to be saved), but they are still part of the Bible. I agree with Myles 100% on this point. However we do use our sense when

trying to figure out what God's word actually says, but once we determine what it says, we must believe and obey it even if it doesn't make sense to us. See the difference? For example, Romans 6:3-5 is one passage we use to prove water baptism is "into Christ," therefore required for salvation. Some counter by claiming that Romans 6:3-5 is talking about Holy Spirit baptism. But we know Romans 6:3-5 is not talking about Holy Spirit baptism because it doesn't make sense that Holy Spirit baptism is a picture (likeness) of Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection. But it makes perfectly good sense that water baptism is a picture of Jesus' death, burial, and resurrection because water baptism is an immersion/burial down into and out of water. So we can rule out Romans 6:3-5 referring to Holy Spirit baptism because that wouldn't make sense within the text. But once we determine from this passage that water baptism is under consideration and is therefore necessary to salvation, we have to trust God enough to believe and practice that, even if that idea doesn't make perfectly good sense to us. It is the same with my argument on the covering here. It doesn't make sense to substitute hair for the covering in I Corinthians 11:5, because you can't put on and take off hair just for the occasion of praying. But knowing that, and the conclusion it demands that the covering required by the text is a veil, then it is not valid to say that we are not going to wear the veil because we don't agree with God on the requirement.

This argument was emphasized by two questions that Myles failed to answer in either of his articles:

1. Does I Corinthians 11:5 require the "katakalypto" covering while working in the vegetable garden?
2. Does I Corinthians 11:15 require long hair in the vegetable garden?

The obvious answers being "no" to #1 and "yes" to #2 demonstrate that the "katakalypto" covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15.

Myles refers to the definition of “anti” again, but since all I was doing was showing that “anti” can mean “to serve as,” (not that “to serve as” is anti’s only possible meaning), then my response is sustained by the Greek definitions and Bible examples that I gave.

Since Myles hasn’t respond to it yet, let me repeat my Septuagint argument on the word “katakalypto” for the third time: In the New Testament and Greek Old Testament, a form of the word “katakalypto” refers to a covering of cloth or fabric 88 times, but not once does it refer to a covering of hair. Isn’t that strong evidence that “katakalypto” is referring to an artificial covering in I Corinthians 11?

Again repeating for the third time without response yet, if long hair is the only covering required by I Corinthians 11, then the phrase “prayeth or prophesieth” in verses 4, 5, and 13 are meaningless. The long hair only position would be taught equally well by I Corinthians 11:2-16 if the phrases "praying or prophesying" (verse 4), "prayeth or prophesieth" (verse 5), and "pray unto God" (verse 13) were not even there. Please answer this time Myles: Why would God put those phrases in there if they add absolutely nothing to the meaning of the passage?

Another argument Myles left unanswered again: Myles’ view says the "covered" head of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is Long Hair on the head, and the "uncovered" head is Short Hair on the head. This is shown to be false by noticing that Short Hair covers the head just as well as Long Hair does. This is physically self evident. My Short Hair covers my head just as much as my wife's very Long Hair covers her head. On the other hand, a veil covers the head, and the absence of a veil does not cover the head. So Long Hair cannot be the covering, because Short Hair covers the head just as

much as Long Hair does. The correct alternative is that the covering of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is a veil.

For the third time notice also the difference between who each covering is to glorify. Verses 7 and 5 show the “katakalupto” covering is designed to bring glory (and not dishonor) to the man. But the long hair of verse 15 is designed to give glory to the woman. This is just another indication the covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15. Maybe Myles will choose to respond to this argument next time.

Again still unanswered, let me ask Myles for the third time: Do you agree with Jesse Jenkins and myself that the way we can tell Haman’s covering was artificial (and not hair) is “Because having his head covered is associated with mourning. Therefore, the indication is that the covering was something he put on for the occasion”? Myles, please answer this yes or no next time. If your answer is yes, why are you not willing to use that exact same reasoning to understand that the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 must be artificial (and not hair) since it is to be “put on for the occasion”? Whether Myles will answer this time or not, I am confident the reader can easily see the conclusiveness of the Esther 6:12 argument, and the similar argument I made on Leviticus 13:45. Since the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is required for an occasion, it cannot be referring to a permanent covering of long hair. Therefore an artificial covering is also required. Instead of just sneezing at I Corinthians 11:2-16, we should obey what it requires.

Davis' Third Rebuttal

I want use most of this speech to deal with some things Pat brought up in his last speech.

The first thing I want to do is answer Pat's Question to me: "Perhaps Myles will tell us next time if he prays with a hat on." The answer is I don't make a habit of it (that is do it every time I pray) but I am in the Stilwell High School marching band and before every game or competition we all get together and say the model prayer and both the girls and boys have their helmets on. Frankly, I have no problem with it at all.

Pat also said "Instead of answering the question, he brought up some hypothetical / emotional situations that he felt reflected on my position. This is identical to a Baptist trying to prove water baptism is not necessary to salvation by bringing up the case of the believer who dies on the way to the baptistery. Myles knows these type arguments are invalid when debating the Baptists. So we wonder why he makes similar arguments when debating the covering question?"

Well Pat the reason that the Baptist's "emotional arguments" don't work isn't because they appeal to the audience's emotions, but because they don't have the truth. Many people in the Bible used emotional arguments to prove a point. In fact, I challenge Pat to read the end of all four Gospels and how Christ died for you because that is an emotional argument given by the Holy Spirit himself given to convict the sinners!

Question for Pat: Since you say these types of arguments are invalid does that mean we can't teach the death of Christ because it rides on peoples emotions and therefore are invalid?

In reply to my argument on Jesus Pat said, “the covering law was not under the law of Moses.” Well Pat, if Jesus had the crown on his head while he was dying wouldn’t he still have it on when he died? Also does this mean that nothing in the Gospels are binding for us today?

This passage will be a noose around Pat’s neck for the rest of this debate.

1Tim. 2:8 - I desire then that in every place that men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling.

Question for Pat: Does this even mean in a construction site with a helmet on your head?

Pat also said,

Myles’ only response to the argument I made based upon Esther 6:12 is to tell us what the Hebrew word for “covered” means. We both agree the word means to cover,” no problem. Now let’s hope next time Myles will respond to the argument I made. Do you agree with Jesse Jenkins and me that the way we can tell Haman’s covering was artificial (and not hair) is “Because having his head covered is associated with mourning. Therefore, the indication is that the covering was something he put on for the occasion”? Myles, please answer this yes or no next time.

If Pat would read my rebuttals he would find in my first one I said I don’t agree with him because I used the Hebrew to find out what that word means just like in 1 Cor. 11!

Pat also said, “Myles replies to my “Doesn’t Make Sense” argument by saying a lot of things in the Bible don’t make sense

(like getting dunked in water to be saved), but they are still part of the Bible. I agree with Myles 100% on this point.“

But then he turns around and tries to dispute my “Doesn’t Make Sense” argument by saying, “a lot of things in the Bible don’t make sense (like getting dunked in water to be saved), but they are still part of the Bible. I agree with Myles 100% on this point.”

But then he tries to disprove it. He didn’t even look at all of my answer to his “Doesn’t make Sense” argument. He needs to deal with the fact that all of his examples can make sense in their own context. Frankly, Pat is the one who is taking everything out of context, not me.

Pat has also said in his speech “Myles refers to the definition of “anti” again, but since all I was doing was showing that “anti” can mean “to serve as,” (not that “to serve as” is anti’s only possible meaning), then my response is sustained by the Greek definitions and Bible examples that I gave.”

PAT YOU ARE THE ONE IN THE AFFIRMATIVE NOT ME!!!

I only have to prove that anti can mean anything else; you’re the one who signed your name in the affirmative in this debate which means you are the one who has to prove that “anti” must mean exactly and only how you are translating it.

Pat also said,

Another argument Myles left unanswered again: Myles’ view says the "covered" head of I Corinthians 11:5-6 is Long Hair on the head, and the "uncovered" head is Short Hair on the head. This is shown to be false by noticing that Short Hair covers the head just as well as Long Hair does. This is physically self evident. My

Short Hair covers my head just as much as my wife's very Long Hair covers her head.

Well it is obvious that Pat knows nothing about the Greek, as we have seen with his argument on the word “anti.” This is why it doesn't surprise me that Pat make such a weak and flimsy argument. Pat, don't you know that kata- means “down” and therefore katakalupto means “to cover down”? Obviously long hair does “cover down” better than short hair does.

The last thing I want to look at is Pat said,

Since Myles hasn't respond to it yet, let me repeat my Septuagint argument on the word “katakalupto” for the third time: In the New Testament and Greek Old Testament, a form of the word “katakalupto” refers to a covering of cloth or fabric 88 times, but not once does it refer to a covering of hair. Isn't that strong evidence that “katakalupto” is referring to an artificial covering in I Corinthians 11?

Well Pat I went and looked up peribolaion two times it is used neither refer to hair ether so how does God give a woman hair as an “artificial” covering?

Throughout this entire debate Pat has been just like a crayfish, for in his first speech he swam around the issue, and when I tried to catch him, he went and hid behind the rock of the rules of the debate. Then I picked up his little rock, in his third rebuttal he tried to pinch me! Unfortunately for Pat, in this speech I have caught him, and in the following speeches I will put him in a pot and boil him for a snack.

Thank you, Myles Davis

I Corinthians 11:2-16 Requires An Artificial Covering Patrick Donahue's Fourth Affirmative

In his third negative article, our brother Myles Davis returns to his emotional arguments by saying it is okay to use emotion if you have the truth. But Myles' arguments are parallel to the Baptists' arguments that are all emotion and human reasoning with no scripture. For example, what is the difference between Myles' argument asking about a dying soldier who can't pray with a helmet on and the Baptist argument asking about a dying soldier in the desert where there is no water for baptism available? There is absolutely no difference! Neither argument is based upon a Bible verse. Hypothetical situations never prove anything; the scriptures are our only authority (II Timothy 3:16-17).

Myles says Jesus would have had a crown (covering) on when he died, but it is a simple matter to point out that Jesus wouldn't have been praying when he was dead, and besides, the new covenant didn't go into effect until "after" Jesus was dead (Hebrews 9:17), most likely on the first day of Pentecost after Jesus' resurrection (Luke 24:47). Myles' reasoning here is incorrect for precisely the same reason the Baptists' reasoning is incorrect when they claim the thief on the cross proves one doesn't have to be baptized to be saved. Again we ask, why would Myles make an argument in this debate that he himself believes is unsound when denominational preachers make it?

Myles asks if I Timothy 2:8 teaches a man should pray even at a construction site with a helmet on. My answer is – he should pray at the construction site, after taking off his helmet. I Timothy 2:8 and I Corinthians 11:4 do not contradict each other; they both should be obeyed. Evidently Myles thinks you should ignore one to obey the other.

Myles claims he can tell from the Hebrew that Haman's covering in Esther 6:12 was artificial, but the Septuagint (Greek) word for "covered" here is the same basic word as the word for "covered" in I Corinthians 11:6. So according to Myles' reasoning on this, the same word should prove the woman's covering of I Corinthians 11:6 is artificial also. But I won't use Myles' admission to my advantage here. The definition of the original word doesn't tell us what kind of covering is in view in Esther 6:12. Either a veil or long hair would "cover" Haman's head. However the unbiased reader of even the English knows Haman's covering was artificial because it was put on for an "occasion," and this doesn't match up with long hair, which is either on or off permanently. It doesn't make sense to tell a woman to have long hair when she prays any more than it makes sense to conclude that Haman would have long hair when mourning. The reasoning is identical in both cases – therefore both coverings must be artificial.

This argument is underscored by two questions Myles has failed to answer in any of his articles thus far:

1. Does I Corinthians 11:5 require the "katakalypto" covering while working in the vegetable garden?
2. Does I Corinthians 11:15 require long hair in the vegetable garden?

The obvious answers being "no" to #1 and "yes" to #2 demonstrate that the "katakalypto" covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15.

Repeating for the fourth time without response, if long hair is the only covering required by I Corinthians 11, then the phrase "prayeth or prophesieth" in verses 4, 5, and 13 are meaningless. The long hair only position would be taught equally well by I Corinthians 11:2-16 even if the phrases "praying or prophesying" (verse 4), "prayeth or prophesieth" (verse 5), and "pray unto God" (verse 13) were not there. Please answer this time Myles: Why

would God include those phrases if don't contribute to the meaning of the passage?

For the fourth time notice also the difference between who each covering is to glorify. Verses 7 and 5 show the "katakalupto" covering is designed to bring glory (and not dishonor) to the man. But the long hair of verse 15 is designed to give glory to the woman. This difference indicates the covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15. Perhaps Myles will respond to this argument next time.

It is true all the negative has to do is show another reasonable possibility other than the affirmative's contention, but if the negative's possibility is dependent upon the word "anti" always meaning "instead of," then if "anti" has other meanings, the negative's "possibility" is ruled out from being possible. The woman's hair (which is permanent) is given "for" a peribolaion covering. The hair is not given for the katakalupto covering that is required by verse 5 while a woman is praying (temporary).

Myles says long hair covers "down" (kata) better than short hair does, but "kata" doesn't necessarily mean "down." "Katakalupto" is used in the Septuagint version of Numbers 22:5 to say that "people ... cover the face of the earth." Does that mean the people hung down from the earth? Besides, responding to my argument by saying "kata" means "down" ignores the fact the text says the covering is to cover the head. Hanging down from the head does not cover the head any more than not hanging down does. Notice what Thayer has to say about "kata" – "In composition kata denotes ... an abundance of that with which a thing is ... covered up." So the prefix "kata" serves to intensify the word "kalupto" and most likely carries the idea of "completely." The katakalupto covering should completely cover the woman's head, and my

wife's long hair does not do that any better than my short hair does. Therefore we conclude the katakalupto covering cannot be the hair.

Next Myles states he “looked up peribolaion two times” and neither time does it refer to hair. But you don't get the meaning of a word from just two occurrences. On the other hand, a form of “katakalupto” refers to a covering of cloth or fabric 88 times in the Greek Bible, but not once does it refer to a covering of hair. Isn't that strong indication the reader of the Bible in the Greek language would have thought artificial covering (not hair) when he read I Corinthians 11:5ff?

Leviticus 13:45 reads: “And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean.” I suppose Myles believes the leper was supposed to grow a mustache?

I Corinthians 11:2-16 requires two coverings for the woman – the katakalupto covering when praying or prophesying, and the peribolaion covering at all times. Why is that so hard?

Davis' forth rebuttal

The first thing I want to bring up in this speech is the fact that Pat gave illustration after illustration and has quoted everyone under the sun, but the one thing he hasn't done is dealt with 1 Cor. 11:1-16. I have read all four of his speeches and did not find a single time where he went to the passage and gave us his exegeses of this passage. Pat you are in the affirmative of this debate--the least you could have done is address the passage!

Then again, if Pat did go to the passage it would have destroyed all of his arguments.

In Pat's last speech of this debate he said, "But Myles' arguments are parallel to the Baptists' arguments that are all emotion and human reasoning with no scripture." Pat, in my first speech I gave my exegeses of this passage. You are the one not using the scriptures! This whole debate you have ignoring the Scripture I've presented instead of dealing with it.

There are some things I want to bring up that Pat never dealt with.

1. In my second speech I said, "Ethel, be sure and wear a red dress, while at the Alabama football game." Yes this can make sense.
2. "Ethel, be sure and be skinny, while at the Alabama football game." Yes this can make sense too because if she is skinny at the foot ball game she can get through the crowd easier!
3. "Bobby, be sure and eat dinner, while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday." Yes this can make sense.
4. "Bobby, be sure and be (physically) tall, while at Granddaddy's house on Saturday." Yes this could make sense because his grandfather might need a light bulb changed in his house and he can't reach it.

5. “Karen, be sure and be covered, with a hood, while outside riding your bike.” Yes this can make sense.
6. “Karen, be sure and have long hair, while outside riding your bike.” Yes this can make sense because her head might get cold if she has short hair.
7. “Lucy, be sure and be covered, with a veil, while praying.” Yes this can make sense.
8. “Lucy, be sure and have long hair, while praying.” Yes this can make sense.

All of these can make since in their own context but, Pat just put them out there without providing any such context.

I replied to Pat on his illustrations. I guess Pat must not have seen this in his speech because he never replied to it. I wonder why?

2. Also in my first speech I brought up the connection between verse 4 and verse 14 but Pat never said anything about it, so let’s look at it again. In verse 4 it says “Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head” and in verse 14 it says “Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair it is a disgrace for him.”

So if dishonors verse 4 = disgrace verse 14 than covered verse 4 = long hair verse 14. Pat never addressed that.

Next I want to look at some things Pat has brought up in this debate.

1. In Pat’s last speech he said that my emotional arguments are parallel to those who affirm faith only (the Baptists). Well Pat, mine may be parallel to those who affirm such a position but at least my arguments don’t rely on those who believe in faith only as their only authority on what a word means like you did with A.T.

Robertson on the Greek word anti which by the way you never did say whether or not you agreed with him on Acts 2:38.

2. One argument I have yet to answer that Pat continues to bring up is that in the Septuagint, the word Kataklypto is used several times to refer to an artificial covering, and is never used to refer to hair in the 88 times it appears. In answer, the word Kataklypto is the general term in the Greek for a covering just like the Hebrew word torah is the general word for law in the Hebrew language but just because it means artificial covering in one place doesn't mean it can't mean the general meaning covering just like torah doesn't always mean the Mosaic law it can mean just law in general.

3. Another argument Pat has said I have yet to answer is

“1. Does I Corinthians 11:5 require the “kataklypto” covering while working in the vegetable garden?

2. Does I Corinthians 11:15 require long hair in the vegetable garden?

The obvious answers being “no” to #1 and “yes” to #2 demonstrate that the “kataklypto” covering of verse 5 is not the long hair of verse 15.”

Well Pat I dealt with this when I dealt with you chart. #2 can make sense because it may be cold outside!

4. In reply to my argument on Jesus, Pat has said,

“Myles makes an argument from the Bible when he brings up the fact that Jesus had a crown of thorns (covering) on when He prayed in Mark 15:17, 34. There are a couple of problems with this argument. First I doubt the crown of thorns completely

("kata") covered Jesus' head as the covering of I Corinthians 11:5 is supposed to. But even if it did, this example was before the New Testament law went into effect. The covering requirements of I Corinthians 11:2-16 were not included in the law of Moses. Myles of course knows better than to use an Old Testament example as New Testament proof. He knows the Baptists make the same mistake when they bring up the "thief on the cross" to try to prove water baptism is not necessary to salvation today. Again we ask, why would Myles make an argument he believes is unsound when denominational preachers make it?"

Let me deal with this on part at a time.

1. Pat says that the crown wouldn't cover the head. Well Pat, it went all the way around Jesus' head so yes it did cover it.
2. Pat says this wouldn't be under the New Testament law.
Fine Pat, the according your theology on this than,
 - A. We can't apply any of Jesus' parables or teachings to our life today for these were under the Old Law
 - B. We can't use Matt. 19 to teach against divorce because it was in the Old Law
 - C. Your theology violates Col. 3:17 which states, "And whatever you do, in word or deed, do everything in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him."
3. Jesus is now our high priest, according to Heb. 6:20, and Exo. 29:6 says that the high priest wears a turban. That means that in order to fulfill the law, Christ is wearing a head covering as he intercedes (prays for) us right now. According to Pat, Christ would be sinning because he didn't obey Paul!

So what does this passage mean and what does it have to do with this issue? Well the phrase "in the name of the Lord Jesus" means by the authority that Christ gives you, and one way to find authority for something is by example--and who should be a better

example than Jesus Christ himself? The greatest problem with Pat's passion is it gives Paul more authority than Christ himself and the example he set for us.

5. Pat is also still off on this fellowship issue. Pat says if a women prays to God without an artificial covering on she will go to hell. If this is the truth then that would make this issue a salvtional issue. Now as for myself, I try to stay away from saying anyone is going to hell just because I disagree with them, because I don't know their walk with God or God's plan for that person, but when you do say this then those who teach against this are false teachers and you shouldn't have fellowship with such people. Now in Pat's second speech pat said "Myles is a personal friend of mine," and I happen to know he fellowships a number of people he disagrees with on many different Biblical issues (Philippians 3:15-16). So what does his inconsistency prove? It is true that I have friends that I disagree with, but the difference between Pat and I is I don't say those people are going to hell! I don't make these issues a test of ones salvation so I haven't violated 1 John 1:9 like Pat has. Will I debate the issues with them? Absolutely, but when the debate is over I can still call them my brother!

Again verse 4 and verse 14 shows what the Kataklypto is (long hair) and verse 15 ties this whole debate together "but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For her hair is given to her instead of a covering."

Also Pat never did answer my question, "since you say these types of arguments are invalid does that mean we can't teach the death of Christ because it rides on peoples emotions and therefore are invalid?"

The last thing I want to say in this debate is I hope everyone wither man or women follows I Timothy 2:8 "I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or

quarreling;” men wither it is with a hat on and women even if you don’t have a hat please pray everywhere!

Thank you,
Myles Davis