

# THE KIPA

by Avram Yehoshua

The [SeedofAbraham.net](http://SeedofAbraham.net)

The kipa (yarmulke in Yiddish) is one of Judaism's most sacred items. A man cannot go into a synagogue to worship God without one. Many believers, both Jewish and Gentile, wear the kipa to identify with the Jewish people. This is why I wore one for 14 years. It was more of a need on my part because I saw it as what religious Jews were supposed to look like, but the Holy Spirit led me to see its pagan origin and symbolism, and I removed it.

We are to be an example to our people in the Way that they should go (Jeremiah 15:19). There is no biblical basis for the wearing of the kipa. I have no problem with the woman's head covering for modesty and submission to authority, or a man wearing a hat, etc., but the kipa is different. It's not a hat and it is a religious symbol in and of itself. What it symbolizes is the sun, the sun god, and his followers. The sun god is none other than Satan himself.<sup>1</sup> We should have no place with that even if it means 'separating' from what our Jewish people think. For they are to follow us, not us them. We are to walk in God's Truth.

There is no place in Scripture to imply that the Jewish people had the kipa at the time of Moses or King David or Ezra or Yeshua (Jesus). It is certainly a Jewish tradition, but it has no biblical basis, and it is of pagan origin. If one says that the kipa is like the bonnet of the priest (KJV Exodus 39:28, etc.), or the hat that Yahveh gave to the priests, I would ask for a reference that describes the bonnet to be a kipa. For the burden of proof resides upon the one doing the tradition: why do you do what you do? What biblical basis do you have, and does it go against God's Word? For if there is no biblical basis then it's a tradition. It's very important to understand where the tradition comes from. If it is of pagan origin, we must have nothing to do with it.<sup>2</sup> If it is not, and it enhances Scriptures, then it's alright.

My question is, 'Does the kipa symbolize submission to the God of Israel or to the sun god, Satan?' If to the God of Israel then we must be able to substantiate the claim with Scripture. If a man wants to wear a turban, fine, but God never commanded it for anyone in Israel except Aaron the High Priest and his sons. Turbans today take on a form of identification, as to if one is a Moslem, and from what country, just by the color or the way it's wrapped, but just because they wear them, it doesn't mean that the turban itself is pagan. The turban does not contain within itself a religious symbolic meaning, but not so with the kipa.

## *The Kipa of the Sun God*

I am not suggesting that it is offensive to God to wear a hat or a turban for a man, or a head covering or hat for a woman. My concern is that the kipa is not a hat in the proper term of the word and it has religious symbolism. What does it, did it of ancient times, symbolize?

The roundness of it suggests the sun. There are places in Scripture where the Lord says not to shave our heads in the form of a circle (because this is originally what all the priests of Baal, Bacchus, Tamuz, Apollo, Jupiter and Dagon, etc. did), to signify their allegiance to the sun god. Wearing a kipa is a very small step removed from having the head shaved that way, and the symbolism remains the same.

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, 2nd American edition. (Neptune, New Jersey, U.S.A: Loizeaux Brothers, 1959: [written in 1862]), p. 277. The Catholic Church has clothed itself in Christian garb, but is actually the ancient Babylonian Mystery religion revived. Incredible insight on Hislop's part. Read the book for free at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Two-Babylons.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. 12:28-32.

The kipa also represents the circle or nimbus of light that encircles the Catholic pictures of ‘the Lord’ and ‘Mary’ and ‘Joseph,’ and all the other ‘saints.’ This circle of light that radiants from their head is supposed to suggest their deity or piety, but in actuality they were taken from the pictures and statues of the gods and goddess of Babylon.<sup>3</sup>

Pagan worship was rampant in the ancient world. From Ireland to Egypt, to Assyria and India, and even to China and Mexico, the idolatrous pagan traditions were similar if not the same. The names of the gods and goddesses changed with each country, but the rituals remained the same or similar. It all came from Bavel (Babylon). Hislop states:

‘The disk and particularly the circle were the well known symbols of the Sun-divinity, and figured largely in the symbolism of the East. With the circle or the disk, the head of the Sun divinity was encompassed. The same was the case in Pagan Rome.’<sup>4</sup> (The Roman Empire before the Catholic Church conquered it.)

Hislop goes on to say that the nimbus was the same for the Roman Madonna (Virgin Mary). The kipa is the physical representation of the nimbus, disk or circle. Lev. 19:27 reads: ‘You must not shave around the sides of your head, nor harm the edges of your beard.’<sup>5</sup> It is this rounded head that the ancient pagans, and many Catholic clerics to this day, wear as a symbol of identification with the god of the sun, whether they realize it or not. Where did the Pope and his Cardinals get their kipa from? Some say they took it from the Jews, but the Catholics actually had it long before the Jewish people had their kipa.

The dictionary states that a tonsure (the head shaved in the form of a circle), means ‘to shear.’ *Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary* states that the tonsure was the rite of initiation to the priesthood of Roman Catholicism:

‘The Roman Catholic and Eastern rite of admission to the clerical state, by the clipping or shaving of a portion of the head...the shaven crown or patch worn by monks and other clerics...a bald spot resembling a tonsure.’<sup>6</sup> ‘to shave the head’, especially to confer some kind of clerical authority.’

Alexander Hislop further elaborates about Roman Catholicism:

‘These celibate priests have all a certain mark set upon them at their ordination; and that is the clerical tonsure. The tonsure is the first part of the ceremony of ordination; and it is held to be a most important element in connection with the orders of the Romish clergy.’

“When, after long contendings, the Picts were at last brought to submit to the Bishop of Rome, the acceptance of this tonsure as the tonsure of St. Peter on the part of the clergy was the visible symbol of that submission. Naitan, the Pictish king, having assembled the nobles of his court and the pastors of his church, thus addressed them: ‘I recommend all the clergy of my kingdom to receive the tonsure.’”

---

<sup>3</sup> Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 87.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> NKJV. In commenting on this, the Artscroll Chumash says that if one were to do so it would make the top of the head (hair) look round; Rabbi Nosson Scherman and Rabbi Meir Zlotowitz, General Editors, *The Artscroll Siddur* (Brooklyn: Mesorah Publications, Ltd., January, 1987), p. 664.

<sup>6</sup> Henry Bosley Woolf, editor in chief, *Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary* (Springfield, MA, U.S.A: G. & C. Merriam Co., 1980), p. 1220.

“Then, without delay, as Bede informs us, this important revolution was accomplished by royal authority. He sent agents into every province, and caused all the ministers and monks to receive the circular tonsure, according to the Roman fashion, and thus to submit to Peter, ‘the most blessed Prince of the apostles.’”

“‘It was the mark,’ says Merle D’Aubigne, ‘that Popes stamped not on the forehead, but on the crown. A royal proclamation, and a few clips of the scissors, placed the Scotch, like a flock of sheep, beneath the crook of the shepherd of the Tiber.’”

“Now, as Rome set so much importance on this tonsure, let it be asked what was the meaning of it? It was the visible inauguration *of those who submitted to it as the priests of Bacchus*. This tonsure cannot have the slightest pretence to Christian authority. It was indeed the ‘tonsure of Peter,’ but not of the Peter of Galilee, but of the Chaldean ‘Peter’ of the (Babylonian) Mysteries. He was a tonsured priest, for so was the god whose Mysteries he revealed.”

‘*Centuries before the Christian era*, thus spoke Herodotus of the Babylonian tonsure:’

‘The Arabians acknowledge no other gods than Bacchus and Urania (i.e. the Queen of Heaven), and they say that their hair was cut in the same manner as Bacchus’s is cut; now, they cut it in a circular form, shaving it around the temples.’

‘What, then, could have led to this tonsure of Bacchus? Everything in his history was mystically or hieroglyphically represented, and that in such a way as none but the initiated could understand. One of the things that occupied the most important place in the Mysteries was the mutilation to which he was subjected when he was put to death.’

“In memory of that, he was lamented with bitter weeping every year, as ‘Rosh-Gheza,’ ‘the mutilated Prince.’ But ‘Rosh-Gheza’ also signified the ‘clipped or shaved head.’ Therefore he was himself represented either with the one or the other form of tonsure; and his priests, for the same reason, at their ordination had their heads either clipped or shaven.”

“Over all the world, where the traces of the Chaldean system are found, this tonsure or shaving of the head *is always found along with it*. The priests of Osiris, the Egyptian Bacchus, were always distinguished by the shaving of their heads. In Pagan Rome, in India, and even in China, the distinguishing mark of the Babylonian priesthood was the shaven head. Thus Gautama Buddha, who lived at least 540 years before Christ, when setting up the sect of Buddhism in India which spread to the remotest regions of the East, first shaved his own head, in obedience, as he pretended, to a Divine command, and then set to work to get others to imitate his example...One of the very titles by which he was called was that of the ‘Shaved-head....The shaved-head,’ says one of the Purans, ‘that he might perform the orders of Vishnu, formed a number of disciples, and of shaved-heads like himself.’”

“The high antiquity of this tonsure may be seen from the enactment in the Mosaic law against it. The Jewish priests were expressly forbidden to make any baldness upon their heads (Lev. 21:5), which sufficiently shows that, even so early as the time of Moses, the ‘shaved-head’ had been already introduced.”

‘In the Church of Rome the heads of the ordinary priests are only clipped, the heads of

the monks or regular clergy are shaven, but both alike, at their consecration, receive the *circular* tonsure, thereby identifying them, beyond all possibility of doubt, with Bacchus, ‘the mutilated Prince.’”

‘Now, if the priests of Rome take away the key of knowledge, and lock up the Bible from the people; if they are ordained to offer the Chaldean sacrifice in honour of the Pagan Queen of Heaven; if they are bound by the Chaldean law of celibacy, that plunges them in profligacy; if, in short, they are all marked at their consecration with the distinguishing mark of the priests of the Chaldean Bacchus, what right, what possible right can they have to be called ministers of Christ?’<sup>7</sup>

“In a footnote to ‘the mutilated Prince’ (above) Hislop writes:”

“It has been already shown (p. 18, note) that among the Chaldeans the one term ‘Zero’ signified at once ‘a circle’ and ‘the seed.’ ‘Suro...the seed,’ in India, as we have seen, was the sun-divinity incarnate. When that seed was represented in human form, to identify him with the sun, *he was represented with the circle*, the well-known emblem of the sun’s annual course, on some part of his person.’

“Thus our own god Thor was represented with a blazing circle on his breast. (WILSON’S *Parsi Religion*, p. 31.) In Persia and Assyria the circle was represented sometimes on the breast, sometimes round the waist, and sometimes in the hand of the sun-divinity. (BRYANT, vol. ii., *Plates*, pp. 216, 406, 409; and LAYARD’S *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 160.) In India it is represented at the tip of the finger. (MOOR’S *Pantheon*, Plate 13, ‘Vishnu.’) Hence the circle became the emblem of Tammuz born again, or ‘the seed.’ The circular tonsure of Bacchus was doubtless intended to point him out as ‘Zero,’ or ‘the seed,’ the grand deliverer. And the circle of light around the head of the so-called pictures of Christ was evidently just a different form of the very same thing, and borrowed from the very same source. ‘The ceremony of tonsure,’ says Maurice, referring to the practice of that ceremony in India, ‘was an old practice of the priests of Mithra, who in their tonsures imitated the solar disk. (*Antiquities*, vol. vii. p. 851. London, 1800.)”

‘As the sun-god was the great lamented god, and had his hair cut in a circular form, and the priests who lamented him had their hair cut in a similar manner, so in different countries those who lamented the dead and cut off their hair<sup>8</sup> in honour of them, cut it in a circular form.’

‘There were traces of that in Greece, as appears from the *Electra* of Sophocles (line 52, pp. 108, 109); and Herodotus particularly refers to it as practised among the Scythians when giving an account of a royal funeral among that people.’

“‘The body’, says he, ‘is enclosed in wax. They then place it on a carriage, and remove it to another district, where the persons who receive it, like the Royal Scythians, cut off a part of their ear, shave their heads in a circular form,’ &c. (*Hist.*, lib. iv. cap. 71, p. 279).”

‘Now, while the Pope, as the grand representative of the false Messiah, received the cir-

<sup>7</sup> Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, pp. 220-223.

<sup>8</sup> It seems to me that this would refer directly to the Commandment of Yahveh for all His people not to follow the pagan practice of the shaved or circular head for the dead, and also not to represent the circle on their head, the kipa.

cular tonsure himself, so all his priests to identify them with the same system are required to submit to the same circular tonsure, to mark them in their measure and their own sphere as representatives of that same false Messiah.<sup>9</sup>

The 'kippa' that the Pope and his Cardinals wear is a mirror reflection of the circular tonsure, a symbol of the solar disk, the sun. The Catholic Pope and his Cardinals had it long before the Jews, and the pagan priests and peoples before the Catholics. The Catholic Church is an extension of Babylon, dressed in 'Christian clothes,' but why must we Jews follow them? Some tribes in Africa and some South American Indians also shave their heads in the exact form of a kippa. Coincidence?

I won't be part of what I have come to see is a pagan symbol that has absolutely no biblical basis, but associates the wearer with the sun god, better known as Satan. Tamuz, his 'son,' is the anti-Christ. I am not talking about wearing a hat or head covering for a woman, or a hat for a man, but specifically the kippa. The kippa is not a hat or a bonnet or a cap. It is a religious symbol of the sun god, and we Jews, for whatever reason, may not have intentionally copied it, but it is not for any follower of Messiah Yeshua to wear.

Is the bonnet or cap that Yahveh gave to Aaron and his sons, equal to the kippa? Where is this described? Not pictured by an artist who was not there, as we sometimes see in illustrations in books that talk about biblical things, but some reference that tells us exactly how the bonnet was shaped. For I cannot see how the God of Israel would forbid His people, on the one hand, from shaving their heads or cutting their hair in a circle, and then order His priests to look like the pagan priests and people (mourning for the dead), around them.

Some physical identification marks of God's people are the full untrimmed beard (Lev. 19:27), and the *tzit-zit* (tassels of Num. 15:37-41). These signify who we are and whose we are, the God of Israel's.

In Revelation 17:5, etc., the Lord calls His people to come out of Babylon, the Harlot that made the nations drink of her abominations. Our Father Abraham was also called out of Babylon, and we are being called out of Christianity and Judaism, both of which have embraced Babylonian days and ways. We are not called out of Christianity to enter Judaism. For they are both perverse, even though we can glean much from both. We are not here to follow or create our own system, or to walk in man's, but to discover His System, His Way, and to walk in it. We must be able to lay down those things that He is calling us out of.

If you wear a kippa, I hope that you are able to begin to question *why* you wear it, and if it is sufficient for you to continue to wear it. Perhaps you will never take it off or perhaps this is the beginning of your process, or a confirmation in what the Lord has been leading you in. For the things that we are emotionally attached to take time for us to sort out. Yeshua gives us that time.

## ***The Bonnets of God***

In Exodus 39:28 it mentions the two types of head coverings for Aaron and his sons. One is the 'turban,' and one is called a 'bonnet' (KJV) or a 'cap' (NASB). It is also mentioned in Ezekiel 21:26 (Hebrew 21:31), and Ezekiel 44:18 (and other places). The words would both have better been translated as turban. The first part of Exodus 39:28 reads, 'and the turban, fine linen and the hats of the headbands.'<sup>10</sup> The

<sup>9</sup> Hislop, *The Two Babylons*, p. 222. This section is a footnote to 'the mutilated Prince.' It's note Y.

<sup>10</sup> John Kohlenberger III, Editor, *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament*, vol. 1, (Grand Rapids, MI U.S.A: Regency Reference Library, 1979), p. 262.

words translated as turban, are:

1. *Tzah'naf*: the verb for the turban, means, 'to wind or wrap around,'<sup>11</sup> to 'wrap, or wind up, together,'<sup>12</sup> 'to wrap, wind up together.'<sup>13</sup>
2. *Mitz'nehfet*: the noun for the turban, means, 'turban, espec...of the high priest,'<sup>14</sup> 'turban of high priest, turban of linen, sign of royalty,'<sup>15</sup> 'turban of the high priest.'<sup>16</sup>
3. *Tzah'neef*: another noun, means, 'turban,'<sup>17</sup> 'turban, royal turban,'<sup>18</sup> 'turban.'<sup>19</sup>
4. 'Turban; also a sign of royalty...It was the distinctive head gear of the high priest...The translation turban is supported by the derivation of the word from *sanap*' (sic: *sanaf*) meaning 'to wrap around.'<sup>20</sup>

Now we come to the word in question that some translate as bonnet or cap. If it was like a kipa then it would justify the wearing of a kipa for a Jew.

1. *Pah'are*: the verb for 'bonnet' means, 'to adorn, beautify, honour,'<sup>21</sup> 'beautify, glorify,'<sup>22</sup> 'glorify, beautify, adorn.'<sup>23</sup>
2. *Pih'air*: the noun means, 'ornamental head dress, turban,'<sup>24</sup> 'head dress, turban...Ezk 44:18...of priest,'<sup>25</sup> 'turban.'<sup>26</sup>
3. Turban. If the idea behind the verb is 'to clothe with beauty' it is only fitting that a derivative from the verb should refer to some kind of clothing. "The turban was not limited to a certain sex or worn on just one occasion, as the following shows. It could be worn by women (Is 3:20, KJV 'bonnets') or by men Ezk 24:17, 23, and Ezekiel himself, KJV 'tire'). It also was worn by the high priest or his sons and was made of linen (Ex 39:28; Ezk 44:18). It was worn by the bridegroom (Isa 61:10), perhaps here with the translation 'wreath;' cf. also 'garland' for ashes in Isa 61:3."<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Benjamin Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Grand Rapids, MI U.S.A: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979), p. 647.

<sup>12</sup> Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, Charles Briggs and Wilhelm Gesenius, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Lafayette, IN U.S.A: Association Publishers and Authors, Inc., 1978), p. 857.

<sup>13</sup> R. Harris, Editor; Gleason Archer, Jr. and Bruce Waltke, Associate Editors, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II (Chicago, IL U.S.A: Moody press, 1980), p. 1943.

<sup>14</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 647.

<sup>15</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 857.

<sup>16</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II, p. 1943.

<sup>17</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 647.

<sup>18</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 857.

<sup>19</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II, p. 1943.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 620.

<sup>22</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 802.

<sup>23</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 713.

<sup>24</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 620.

<sup>25</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 802.

<sup>26</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II, p. 713.

The word in question (bonnet), is a turban, not a kipa or a bonnet (as we would tend to think of a woman's bonnet). The last word from our sentence gives us an idea that it wasn't flat.

1. *Ga'vah*: the verb means, 'to be high,'<sup>28</sup> 'convex, projecting, high.'<sup>29</sup>
2. *Giv'ah*: a noun means, 'hill.'<sup>30</sup>
3. *Giv'ah*: another noun means, 'hill, height, elevation. lower than a mountain,'<sup>31</sup> 'hill.'<sup>32</sup>
4. *Ga'via*: a noun means, 'cup, goblet...the cup or bell of a flower, as an ornament of the sacred candlestick,'<sup>33</sup> 'cup, bowl,'<sup>34</sup> 'cup, bowl.'<sup>35</sup>
5. *Mig'vah'ah*: our noun means, 'only (found in) pl. Mig'vah'oat: mitres or bonnets of the common priests, probably of a conic form,'<sup>36</sup> 'head gear, turban, of common priest (conical? cf. Ex 28:40), Ex 28:40, Lv 8:13.'<sup>37</sup>
6. *Mig'vah'oat*: "turban, head gear, is used only four times: Ex 28:40; 29:9; Lev 8:13, convex in shape perhaps, translated by the RSV as 'cap.' It is worn by the ordinary priests and is to be differentiated from the turban worn by the high priest."<sup>38</sup>

There was a special turban for the High Priest, and also turbans for the Aaronic Priests, his sons. There was nothing that resembled a kipa. That's why I included the third word, which is in construct form, with our word in question, for it has the shape of a hill. Some other words that might prove helpful are:

1. conical: 'resembling a cone esp. in shape.'<sup>39</sup> It would tend to appear as 'hill' shaped.
2. convex: 'vaulted, concave...curved or rounded like the exterior of a sphere or circle...arched up: bulging out.'<sup>40</sup> This fits the description of a turban.
3. mitre : 'from Latin, head band, turban...Liturgical head dress worn by bishops and abbots.'<sup>41</sup>
4. bonnet: 'chiefly Scot...a man or boy's cap...a brimless Scotch cap of seamless woolen fabric' (perhaps a stocking cap?), 'a cloth or straw hat tied under the chin and worn by women and small children.'<sup>42</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Ibid. p. 714.

<sup>28</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 129.

<sup>29</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 148.

<sup>30</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 129.

<sup>31</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 148.

<sup>32</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II, p. 147.

<sup>33</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 129.

<sup>34</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 149.

<sup>35</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II, p. 147.

<sup>36</sup> Davidson, *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, p. 129.

<sup>37</sup> Brown, *The New Brown, Driver Briggs and Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*, p. 149.

<sup>38</sup> Harris, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, vol. II, p. 148.

<sup>39</sup> Woolf, *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary*, p. 236.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid. p. 246.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid. p. 731.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. p. 125.

Looking at how some Bibles translate the words gives us an overall picture. For Ezekiel 21:26 the words are:

1. King James Version .....diadem
2. New American Standard .....turban
3. New King James Version .....turban
4. New International Version .....turban
5. Kohlenberger Interlinear<sup>43</sup> .....turban
6. Koren Publishers<sup>44</sup> .....turban
7. Jewish Publication Society<sup>45</sup> .....mitre

Ezekiel 44:18 reads:

1. King James Version .....bonnets
2. New American Standard .....turbans
3. New King James Version .....turbans
4. New International Version .....turbans
5. Kohlenberger Interlinear .....turbans
6. Koren Publishers .....turbans
7. Jewish Publication Society .....tires

Exodus 39:28: This is where the two words are:

1. King James Version .....mitre, goodly bonnets
2. New American Standard .....turban, decorated caps
3. New King James Version .....turban, exquisite hats
4. New International Version .....turban, headbands
5. Kohlenberger Interlinear<sup>46</sup> .....turban, hats of the headbands
6. Koren Publishers<sup>47</sup> .....mitre, turbans
7. Jewish Publication Society<sup>48</sup> .....mitre, head-tires

Only Koren Publishers allows the reader to understand that both ‘hats’ are turbans. That is if you understand what a ‘mitre’ is. All the others opt for descriptions as such, but fail to properly translate the two

<sup>43</sup> Kohlenberger, *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament*, vol. 4, p. 355.

<sup>44</sup> *The Holy Scriptures, The Prophets* (Jerusalem, Israel: Koren Publishers Jerusalem, Ltd., 1989), p. 379. Ezekiel 21:26 is Ezekiel 21:31 in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>45</sup> *The Holy Scriptures*, vol. II (Philadelphia, PA U.S.A: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1982), p. 1329. Ezekiel 21:26 is Ezekiel 21:31 in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>46</sup> Kohlenberger, *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament*, vol. 1, p. 262.

<sup>47</sup> *The Holy Scriptures, Tora*, p. 112.

<sup>48</sup> *The Holy Scriptures*, vol. I, p. 225.



words. The ‘goodly bonnets’ remind me of the TV show, *Little House On The Prairie*, or the Easter parade, and the ‘decorated caps’ remind me of baseball caps. The ‘exquisite hats,’ perhaps a topper hat, and the ‘headbands’ of my jogging days. You can imagine what I think about the ‘head-tires.’ Remember the Michelin ‘Tire ‘Man’ that was made up of all tires?!

Perhaps if we had an Old English King James Version dictionary (and there are such creatures), bonnet would mean turban. Bonnet is very English and not Hebraic though. Maybe the translators tried to give a picture to the people of England in 1611 of something that they thought approximated the turban?

In speaking with Israelis about why they wear the kipa, two things come up. One means that the person who wears it is really a Jew (a religious Jew; for there are many Jewish Israelis that don’t wear the kipa). Many wear them all day while many others just wear them at the bet kenestet (synagogue).

The other reason is because the priests wore them or probably more accurately, that the priests had their heads covered. I don’t think that the Israelis imagine the priests actually wore the kipa, but we have seen that the Aaronic Priesthood was commanded to wear turbans. Nowhere are any of the common people commanded to have a head covering. Again, I am not against wearing something on one’s head., but the religious symbolism of the kipa has nothing to do with the turbans of the priests, and too much to do with the sun god.

The turbans for the priests were given to them to beautify them before God. The turban, as well as all the High Priest wore, pictured Yeshua as the King-Priest<sup>49</sup> who would come to serve. The kipa, on the other hand, is required by the Rabbis, for all the men ‘to stand before God.’ This is not something found in the Torah (Mosaic Law), but is an invention of man ‘to cover himself’ before God. As such it reminds me of what Adam and Eve did when they heard His Voice calling to them. They made for themselves fig leaves<sup>50</sup> in order to cover themselves and to stand before Him, but these were not to be their true covering. It was the blood (death), from the skin of an animal<sup>51</sup> that was to be their covering. This was what God did for them, in order for them to stand in His Presence.

Two thousand years ago, God sent Messiah Yeshua to die and give His Blood as the covering that would enable us to stand in His Presence. Sin will not be able to live in His Presence. Sacrifice has always been what God required in order for Man to enter His Presence, whether for sin, or service and worship. The Tent of Meeting, with its God ordained sacrifices, is typical of this,<sup>52</sup> but Jewish leadership rejected God’s sacrificial covering for His people. The kipa is the Jewish alternative to what it means ‘to be covered’ in order to come into God’s presence. The kipa has become a substitute for the sacrifices, or rather, the Blood of the Lamb.

If you choose to wear it to identify with the religious Jewish people, then you are placing yourself symbolically under the authority of the Pharisees, for rabbinic Judaism is a direct descendant of them. The kipa is the rabbinic religious symbol of what one needs in order to be covered before the Living God.

In Yeshua’s day, He did not associate with the Pharisees, nor obviously, was He a Pharisee, as some erro-

---

<sup>49</sup> Psalm 110:4: “Yahveh has sworn and will not change His mind, ‘You are a (High) Priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.’”

<sup>50</sup> Gen. 3:7: ‘Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves loin coverings.’

<sup>51</sup> Gen. 3:21: ‘Yahveh God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife, and clothed them.’ In order for them to have the skins, an animal would have had to have been slain by Yahveh. This would picture the Sacrifice of Yeshua so that Mankind would be truly covered in His Righteousness.

<sup>52</sup> Ex. 25:8f; Lev. 1-6; 16:1f.

neously teach, even though He could have been one.<sup>53</sup> Though some of what He taught seemed to line up with Pharisaic doctrine, He was not a Pharisee. We can plainly see this from the Council in Jerusalem in Acts 15:5.<sup>54</sup> For it specifically refers to some of the members as Pharisees who had come to believe in Yeshua, but if all who followed Him were to be Pharisees ‘like Him,’ then why wasn’t everyone in the Council and all the other Jews who believed in Him, Pharisees? To think that Yeshua was a Pharisee because some of *their* teaching seemed to line up with the Word of God, is to believe that the Mafia is the local police force because both have guns.

Now look at the Pope’s (and his Cardinals) ‘kippa’ and tell me what the essential difference is between them and the kippa of the Jewish people. For all intents and purposes there is none. The Pope had it many centuries before the Jewish people, and of course, it first came into use among the Babylonians as the circular tonsure.

We are to challenge the understanding of our Jewish people. The first and foremost challenge is our belief in Yeshua, while still retaining our true Jewishness; the keeping of Mosaic Law. This goes against what the Rabbis say about us; that we are no longer Jewish because we have converted to another religion, and what Christianity says about us; that we are not to keep Mosaic Law.

The Rabbis get what they say from the Roman Catholic Church. In ancient times they would initiate a Jew into their religious system, making him swear, upon penalty of the curse of Cain, etc., never to celebrate the Jewish (biblical) Holy Days nor have anything to do with the Jewish community. He was then made to eat pig, to formally sever his relationship with his Jewish people. This was ratified in Constantinople in 323 AD, but this was not the way the Jewish people came to their Messiah in the Book of Acts.<sup>55</sup>

As I have taken the kippa off I have experienced that it has become a tremendous witnessing tool. I didn’t take it off so I could use it as a witnessing tool, but in following my Lord Yeshua it has become such. Many Jewish people, who would never have given me a second thought with a kippa on, come over to me and engage me in conversation because I have a full untrimmed beard and wear the tzit’ziot, but not a kippa. In rabbinic law one cannot wear tzit’ziot without a kippa. It is forbidden. The beard makes me look like a rabbi and so it strikes them as very odd. It gives me a chance to explain that the kippa is of pagan origin and the Messiah has set me free from pagan traditions. Then I speak about Yeshua hand out various papers on Yeshua.

The kippa is the physical representation of the clerical tonsure that God commands against in both Leviticus 19:27 and 21:5. The tonsure is the mark for the priests of the sun god, the tonsure being circular, representing the sun. The kippa is just one step removed from an actual tonsure and it’s seen on the Roman Catholic clergy, from the Pope down. The kippa is the Jewish religious symbol of Orthodox Judaism, and the one who wears it places himself under that authority; an authority that is anti-Messiah Yeshua.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> For why Yeshua wasn’t a Pharisee, see *Yeshua the Pharisee?* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Yeshua-the-Pharisee.pdf>, and also, *Yeshua Shocks the Pharisees* at <http://seedofabraham.net/Yeshua-Shocks-the-Pharisees.pdf> and *Do As the Pharisees Say? Matthew 23:2-3* at <http://www.seedofabraham.net/Do-as-the-Pharisees-Say.pdf>.

<sup>54</sup> Acts 15:5: ‘But some of the sect of the Pharisees who had believed stood up, saying, “It is necessary to circumcise them and to direct them to observe the Law of Moses.”’

<sup>55</sup> That Mosaic Law was the way that all Christians walked out their faith in Messiah Yeshua is seen from Acts 15. See *The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21* at <http://seedofabraham.net/The-Lifting-of-the-Veil.pdf>.

<sup>56</sup> Revised on 26 May 2017.