

FBC - 11/4/84
Sun. P. M.
From Tape/mc

"THE ERA MOVEMENT IN CORINTH!"

1 Cor. 11: 2-16

If we were to suddenly lose all the women in this church, we would have to close down the church. The S. S. would be so crippled until we could not operate. Tonight, we're studying 1 Cor. 11: 2 through 16. I'll have to move quickly, I want us to close approximately 7:30.

I call this the ERA Movement in Corinth or the original ERA Movement. Nothing New under the sun. When you know the Bible and when you know History, you face nothing new. You know I've been amazed at the news commentators being all up in the air about Reagans Armageddon theology. He used the term 'Armageddon' - if they had known a little history - in 1912 Teddy Roosevelt stood at the Republic National Convention and said 'we stand at Armageddon and battle for the Lord. That was 1912. He was using Armageddon as a metaphor, a great crisis. And that's what Reagan was doing.

Armageddon is a prophetic battle that's going to occur and we're headed toward Armageddon but when we ~~know~~ history and when we know the Bible, we have the greatest source of information in the world. I urge you to know the Bible and I urge you to study history and to know history. It's the greatest teacher next to Scripture. Look at

V. 2 of 1 Cor. 11: (read) 'ordinances' there means 'traditions'. Paul is praising this local church, though there was a much, much out of order; he says 'you have kept the tradition in a big measure.' The word 'tradition' here means 'the discipline, the behavior of the church, the ordinances and the tradition means that which was passed down from Jesus Himself. So he's commending the church. But there was a problem about to develop in the church. Paul had taught that we're all free in Christ and sometimes, when this doctrine is taught, people, not understanding the order of God say 'oh, that means all of us are to be the same thing and do the same thing'.

I remember a statement that Mrs. Farraro has made this week. She says 'we women can do anything and be anything that any man can be'. Oh, no. She had not read her Bible. This is not the teaching of the Scrip. at all and so, there was a movement in Corinth saying 'away with the

veil; away with the covering on the head; away with the long hair - ~~wax~~ we're free, we'll do what we want to. Paul is giving them a word. Look at V 3: now here we have the Biblical chain of command. God, the Father is here; Christ is under Him. That does not mean that JC is not co-equal and co-eternal with God, the Father. But it does mean that He voluntarily placed Himself under the Father to become a man and a servant that He might save you and me.

So you have God, the Father and then you have God, the Son, in His Incarnation, voluntarily becoming a servant. Then you have man, under Christ and then you have the woman under man. And that's the order of God. So Paul's reminding of this profound Biblical Truth in V. 3.

V. 4 (read) 'praying' or prophesying. 'Dishonoureth' or brings shame upon his head. All right. What was the covering of the head? The covering of the head, if it were the hair or the veil, indicated the submission of the wife to her head, which was the husband. That's stated in V. 3. He says that a man praying in the church, or prophesying, having his head covered, wearing long hair or a veil, he brings shame upon himself. Upon his head. Why?

Because he is saying that I really am not the head of my home or I am really not the leader. I am taking a position that God has not given me. I am dishonouring my head who is JC. But look at

V. 5 (read) 'dishonoureth her head'. Who is her head? Her husband. Why does the woman dishonour her husband if her head is uncovered? Because she is saying 'I'm not under the authority of my husband'. The uncovered head in Corinth meant rebellion against authority. She'd cut her hair; she's just simply throwing off all restraints and not wearing the veil, which was to be worn as a symbol of her subjection under her husband.

Latter part of V. 5: he says if she has her head uncovered, she is the same as one who has shaved her head.

V. 6 (read) 'let her be also shorn (or let her have her hair cut). The covering of the woman indicated two things that she was under submission to her husband and also that she was a moral woman, not a street walker. In

V7 (read) now this is not teaching that a woman is of less value than a man or of less worth. This is going back to the original creation when God first made man. Gen. 1: 26 says He made him in His own image. Paul, going back to this priority of creation, says that the man was first given the image of God and the glory of God and that he is the image and glory of God and the woman is the glory of the man. She was made out of man and she gets her glory from man.

V. 8 (read) man did not originate from the woman. He's talking about the original creation. 'But the woman originated from the man'. He's really paraphrasing Gen. 2: 21 and that is certainly true in the original creation. The woman did not bear the first man; God created Adam and it was out of the side, really, the 'tsele' the Hebrew says, which means the side of Adam, not the rib. But really God took out of the side of Adam, Eve. And that's what V. 8 is saying. 'For the man did not originate out of the woman but the woman originated out of man!'

V. 9 (read) when you read the original account of the creation in Gen. 2: 18 and following, God looks upon man and saw that it was not good for him to be alone, so He made for him an 'ezerkezagimmetto' that is, He made one who would fulfill him and meet his needs. Paul is going back to the original creation here, showing that the primacy of man in headship goes back to this original creation.

V. 10(read) the word 'power' there is 'authority'. 'For this cause ought the woman to have the symbol of authority on her head because of the angels'. The woman ought to have the covering of hair and she ought to wear the veil because they are symbols of her being under the authority of her husband. But notice, he says 'because of the angels'. What in the world does this mean? The angels - this is a worship service they're attending. We know this because it speaks of prophesying and praying. Here's a worship service. Here the woman comes. She does

not come with her head shaved; she comes with the long hair; she comes with the veil. This is the ~~XXXX~~ symbol of her submission under the government of God. Doesn't mean that she is not just as valuable as the husband but it does mean that her function in the world is different. Her role is different. He says because of the angels. There are two kinds of angels: there's the fallen (evil) angels and it means that if the woman is not under subjection and she is not wearing the veil and ~~does not have~~ doesn't have the covering, that these mean angels looking at her might lust upon her and even try to seduce her.

But I think the primary meaning is the GOOD angels who minister to the people of God in worship. Heb. 1: 14 (read) when we meet in the Spirit of God, the angels are ministering. If they see a woman that's in rebellion, it offends them. Why? Because they know the order of God. A woman who's not under subjection and who is not under the authority of the Lord offends the very angels, who are ministering. The very angels of Heaven.

V. 11 (read) 'nevertheless' or however. Neither is the man independent of the woman; neither the woman without (or independent) of the man in the Lord. However he says in V. 11, the man is not independent of the woman and the woman is not independent of the man, in the Lord. In that original marriage, the Lord said to Adam and Eve 'the two shall become one flesh'. Oh, how interdependent we are upon one another. How dependent a husband is on the wife and how dependent the wife is on the husband until the Bible says 'we're one flesh'. Anybody knows this.

V. 12 (read) 'is of the man' or originates of the man -- ~~now the man is the head of the church as Christ is the head of the church~~
~~even so is the man also by the woman~~ 'even so is the man also by the woman'. Now he's saying historically and in the original creation 'woman originated from man' but no longer. God has changed it. Now the man, by birth, comes from woman and here is the honor of womanhood. God - GOD took the woman - the first woman out of the man but now everybody here came from a woman. Came by birth, out of the womb of a woman. A man who does not respect a woman is not worth the ground he walks on. He's a scoundrel! There is a uniqueness about womanhood that's not with anybody else on

earth. A man who will disrespect his mother; don't touch him to be your husband. A man who will not respect his sisters is nothing! A man who does not respect a woman is nothing! Women are on a pedestal above all humanity because it's through women that life is extended in the world. And the Bible honors women as no other segment of humanity. No other segment of humanity is honored like women. But it does not mean that women are to do the same things that men do and that they have the same role in God's government and in God's plan.

V. 13 (read) 'judge for yourselves'. I would translate it like this: you decide in ~~xxx~~ your own mind; you don't need an apostle or a theologian to know what I'm about to tell you. Is it proper (is it beautiful) for a woman to pray unto God uncovered? Is it beautiful for a woman to be out from under authority? I remember as a boy, I used to hear of women preachers. And I didn't know what the Bible said and I certainly didn't oppose women preachers, on the basis of the Bible because I didn't know any Bible.

But when I was a 15 year old boy, there was something that said to me 'there's something wrong. There's something wrong'. Is it proper, he says - how do you feel about it, he says - you don't need a theologian, just judge for yourself. Is it proper - but I would translate it 'is it a beautiful thing to see a woman praying to God uncovered'? Have you seen these women preachers on television? Do you like to see it? I don't. There's something that says to humanity 'there's something there'.

'It doesn't mean that the woman doesn't have a tremendous place but when she's taken the authority of the church, she has gone beyond what Scrip. says. And that's exactly what Paul is saying in V. 14

V. 14 (read) you remember the hippies? You remember the 60's and 70's - people were running around with their long hair? PTL! Our young people have learned better. They have cut their hair and now they're conservative and they're against abortion and they're for prayer in the public schools and they're far more conservative. That's the hope of America and it may be on

this basis, we're gonna have a revival! PTL! The most conversative in this country today are college students and young people. Man, they've got some sense in their heads now and I thank God and I'm looking forward to preaching to them. We've got them right in this church here. Their morals are higher than their own parents and have convictions and talk to me about their parents. Have a deeper loyalty to this church than their parents.

I don't know what in the world is gonna happen if this continues. This is the greatest sign in the world and when they go to the polls on Tuesday, they're gonna vote for people with Judao Xtn values. About 85% of them, the polls say. It's amazing!! Jerry Falwell told me the greatest hearing he had had within the last two years was on the campus of Yale University and Harvard. Man, in the sixties, they'd have killed him at Yale University. They'd have murdered him at Harvard University and in the 1960's and 70's, 90% of the young people would have voted for the humanist, my friends, in a national election. It's changed that much.

God has done this for some reason. Back in those days, long hair. We knew it was wrong. I knew it was wrong. I saw it in the church and I didn't get up here and preach about it because I wanted to win these people to Christ but when I'd see these people come in, I knew it was wrong. You say 'well, isn't it Biblical? Didn't the people in the Bible wear long hair?' NO, no. Those who took the Nazarite Vow, they didn't cut their ~~haxx~~ hair, like Samson, but that was an exception. In the main, the hair in Biblical times, was relatively short.

You say 'well, how about Geo. Washington and how about Thomas Jefferson'? Well, I'll tell you exactly about them: Renaissance Art showed men sporting long hair and then the enlightenment, which was really infidelity that came into France in the 18th Century - that's exactly where Jefferson and Washington got that from. They got it from the Renaissance and they got it from infidelic enlightenment. They did not get it from the Bible at all. They were greatly influenced, especially Jefferson, by the infidelity of the enlightenment that came out of France at the latter part of the 18th Century.

They were not Biblical at all. Nature tells us - my mother would not cut her hair because her mother told her that the hair was her glory. Now, I do not believe that a woman ought to wear hair down to the ground. But I tell you I think the hair of your ladies is beautiful and I don't think you ought to cut your hair like I do my hair. I do not believe that. Nature tells us not to do this.

V. 15(read)

But

¶ If a woman have a long hair, it's a glory to her. You know the hair can be pretty long indeed. I like to see it down the back sometimes. It's beautiful if it's down the back. If it's up here, it's beautiful. I tell you, a woman's hair is beautiful really. But you put that on a man, you know that's wrong. My goodness, if I let my hair grow like that, you'd run me out of town and I wouldn't blame you. That's just wrong. Paul says we don't have to be a theologian to know that. For her hair is given her as a covering.

Now if she has the hair for a covering, why does she need any other covering? Why would she need to wear a veil? To be sure that she was under submission of that authority. You say, 'well, guess we'll have to bring in some veils, if the women come here to worship. We've got to put on the veils'. The veils wouldn't mean anything to us today. But the principle is still with us and that is that God, the Father is here and God, the Son is here and man is under Him. Woman is under the man. Look at

V. 16 (read) 'conteneious' or quarrelsome; we have no such custom (or practice) neither the churches of God. Oh, how I love that verse of Scrip. You know what that says? That's saying 'now, some of you, you want to argue and you want to fuss in the churches but I'm just telling you that it's not the apostolic tradition for people to fuss in the local church'. I wish every Baptist on earth had to read this. When I hear of the awful fussing that goes on in Bapt. churches, let me tell you: a Bapt. church is not to quarrel and it's not to fuss! It's an abomination!

The apostolic order is to have no fussing and no arguing and no quarreling in the local church.

When you do it, you destroy the work of God! I've known several churches within the last two months which have been virtually destroyed because Baptist thought they had the right to get up and sometimes women, and talk and politic right in the church of God and Paul is saying 'you can do what you want to, but I want you to know that in the church of JC, it is not the custom to argue and to carry on the confusion in the church of God.

We have the order here in the FBC and that is to not have disputes and arguments in this church but to move it with harmony for God and not engage in that which brings ~~discord~~ discord to the family of God. You can't do the work of God in many churches - in most churches today - because some woman or some strong man or somebody is all time, arguing with the pastor. Arguing with someone, until you can't do the work of God. Many of our churches spend most of their time arguing, arguing, arguing about this. It's ungodly, it's unapostolic and Paul is saying here, in V. 16 -you may do it if you want to, but I want you to know this is not the apostolic custom. It simply is not and it's not been done in the churches of JC.

The church is a place of peace and not a place of argument and contention and carrying on, which so many of our local churches are engaged in tonight. This raises the question: what is the place of women? Paul says 'they're to be covered. They're to wear the veil. They're to have the hair'. If they don't do it, they disgrace their head, their husband. If the husband puts that on, he disgraces his head, Christ, because he's saying 'I'm not gonna be a leader'. And nothing is more disgusting than a husband who won't be a leader!

How about a man - you talk to him about Christ and he will say 'well, you know I'll have to ask my wife' or 'I go with my wife to such and such a church'. When you find that in a home, you find a tremendous tragedy and yet, I find it many, many times with a man wearing that covering and when his wife is the head and he's disgraced Christ. He's disgraced Christ. There are Scrip. that indicate that women spoke in the N. T. churches. We've already seen this in our lesson in 1 Cor. 11: 5 says that they were praying and prophesying, which we read tonight.

Acts 21: 8-9 (we don't have time to read it) but it says that the daughters of Phillip prophesied in the church. Titus 2: 4 says that the aged women are to teach the younger women, in the church it's talking about. There's no question that in the apostolic churches, women were teaching the Word of God. Instructing and serving in many, many places. This is history. There's never been a church where women did not have a valuable, vital place in it. You can't have a church that's worth anything without the service of women.

But then, there are Scrip. that indicate that women should not speak. Can you read that? I encountered a man recently; he says 'do you let women speak? Do you let women teach in your S. S.?' I said 'yes'. He said 'well, that's contrary to the Bible' and he really believed that. Because he didn't know what the Bible says. You know the saddest thing in the world is to find a Scrip. to back up a prejudice when it looks like the Scrip. really says that, when that's not the teaching of the Scrip.

1 Cor. 14: 34 says that the woman is not to speak in the church. She's to keep silence. The word 'silence' here is the word 'sigao' which means 'complete silence' and in that text, it means exactly what it says. Speaking about tongues. She's not to speak in tongues in the church. It's in the Bible. But then 1 Tim. 2: 12 says that the woman is to be silent. This is a very crucial text - let me read it to you. Now this is the Scrip. that the man quoted to me. He says 'you see here, the woman is not to teach but she's to keep her mouth shut'. But the word 'silence' here is entirely different word; it's the word 'hassakei' (?) which means 'to be quiet and of modest spirit, not assuming leadership over the man'. It does not mean she's not to open her mouth and that she's not to teach at all.

The word doesn't mean that in Greek. In 1 Cor. 14: 34 it DOES mean that. That she's simply not to speak tongues in the assembly. But here it is simply saying that when she does speak, she is to do it with a modest spirit and she is not to be above the pastor or above the men, but the same order that's in the home, it's to be maintained in the church and in our society.

CONCLUSION: Women were free to practice - I mean to participate in the activities of the early church, so long as the wives were in subjection to their husbands; modest in apparel and were not seeking authority over men in the church.

I tell you this leaves plenty of ministry for Xtn women. Let me say this again: women were free to participate in the activities of the early church so long as wives were in subjection to their husbands; modest in apparel and were not seeking authority over men in the church.

I want to thank the ladies of this church for the tremendous ministry that you're performing, for Jes. And we're gonna magnify this ministry more than we ever have. Ladies, without your prayers; without your teaching; without your support of the Vision, this church cannot go.

The ladies have recently begun a prayer ministry with the men. We as pastor, do not want to make the mistake that some of our churches are making, because women are not ordained pastors or deacons. Some of our churches are just putting them aside. That'd kill us in FBC. I want to encourage you, if you're a woman, to find out your gift and to use it in this Body. You have one of the most vital places of any group in the world. No one can perform the ministry that God has called our women to.

Homer Lindsey of Jacksonville, FLA has built one of the greatest churches on earth. He has built it with women on his staff. Is that Scriptural? Totally. In our church here, some of the great servants of Jes. are women, right on our staff. Johna Gaddis is a servant of Jes. Ann Curtis, my assistant in the Pastors Class, I don't have to say anymore, do I? About what a servant of Jes. we have. Is that Scriptural? Totally! They're not usurping any authority whatsoever. Women are called of God to serve in the church and let us not err on the other side.

The humanists would say 'women can do anything; they have the same role as men'. NO, but we can make an error just as great; we can leave the impression that women are second class. That women really don't have any place in the church. That's the mans outfit! It ain't so!

It belongs to the people of God and the women of FBC. Arise, women and come - come to the fore. Arise and take your responsibility. Some of you have not and I feel that you may have been intimidated - come to the fore! Come to the fore - God is calling women in FBC to take a stand like you've never done before and serve. Serve Jes. That's our privilege.

Tonight let's sing an invitation number. Let's stand.