

Wearing the Veil in Public Worship



W. E. Best

Distributed Freely by:

Spring Assembly of Christ

<http://springassemblyofchrist.org>

December 2015

WEARING THE VEIL IN PUBLIC WORSHIP

I Cor. 11:2-16

Preached by Pastor W. E. Best August 26, 1979 p.m.
To the Assembly of Park Place Grace Church

I Corinthians 11:2-16 sets forth a principle that if it were observed by all New Testament churches today would cause the membership of all churches to be decreased to a great extent. You may not think that is true but beloved it is. If I were to stand in First Baptist Church of Dallas, Texas and preach to them what I am going to preach to you tonight and next Lord's Day evening, I believe that 75% of the membership of First Baptist Church of Dallas would be found among the missing.

I am going to give to you seven different views of this chapter. I have read everything in my personal library on this chapter. I have been somewhat amazed at the different views that I have come across. It has been a long time since I have really studied this portion of Scripture. The last time I did, I did not go into some of the words as I have in recent days and because I failed to do that I have not seen some things that I should have seen a long time ago had I done it.

The seven views that I am going to present to you are as follows:

1. The covering or the veil (as is the meaning in the Greek text) was a custom for that day but it is not binding on the Church today. That is position number one. There are many who embrace that view. I repeat it – The covering or the veil was a custom for that day but it is not binding on the Church today. It isn't necessary for me to say any more about that theory.
2. States that the woman's hair is her covering and it is the only covering that is really given in this portion of Scripture.

I would like to read at this time a couple of short paragraphs from this book, "For a covering is literally instead of a veil. The fact that the women's hair is longer than the man's is her veil and is a substitute for a veil or hat. The women who were slaves in Corinth could come to church and pray even though they did not have a veil. The legalists in Corinth are commanded in this passage to refrain from bullying them and this liberates the ladies from wearing hats in church." That's one paragraph. Now I haven't misquoted him, I took the entire paragraph.

His comment on verse sixteen is as follows, "But if any man seem to be contentious we have no such custom neither the churches of God. No such custom as what? That you have to wear veils, only contentious people would contend that a woman must wear a veil in order to pray or worship publicly. The issue is not what they wear but the spirit-filled life. God is interested in mental attitude not hats."

There is one statement in this that I would like to mention again, "...only contentious people would contend that a woman must wear a veil in order to pray or worship publicly." Now keep that thought in mind.

3. The special covering for the woman was phased out with the phasing out of the extraordinary gift of prophesy given to women. Now this view was presented in the Banner of Truth Magazine back in October 1971. The man's name who presented this view is Gary North. He is a grace man. I'll give you some other quotations later by him but not at this point. I'm just presenting the views right now. He believed, and I will make this as simple as possible and as short, that the woman did have to wear a covering but she had to wear a covering to cover her natural covering which was her long hair while she was prophesying or praying publicly. He believed that God gave an extra ordinary gift to women in these times, that is, in the early days of the church, and with the phasing out of the extra ordinary gifts the phasing out of the covering phased out with the phasing out of the gifts.

Now that's another view. I have never read that one before. In fact I have never been subjected to that one. I can remember when I read it a number of years ago it didn't interest me, but since I was studying this subject again I remembered having read it, and so I started going through all of my Banner of Truth magazines and I came across it and I reread it. That's theory number three.

4. Women were to minister as well as men but not in the government of the church.

5. The covering is spiritual and not literal.

6. Paul disliked woman. Have you ever heard that one? There is not a woman connected with the Woman's Liberation Movement today who would not admit that. No woman who is affiliated with the Woman's Liberation Movement would stay in the church of which I am Pastor, she couldn't cut it. We would have to come to a parting of the way and I make that statement without any reservation.

7. The last theory is what I embrace with all my heart. A divine principle is given by Paul to all churches to be practiced for all time. That's what I believe this portion of Scripture teaches.

Now in introducing this passage, which it will take me at least half of the period tonight to do that, I want to begin by giving some very important observations. These are some that I have made as a result of having studied this passage as though I had never gone into it before.

Paul was not bowing to expediency. The Apostle Paul never did. He was not one to bow to expediency but he was inspired by God's Holy Spirit to give not only to the Church at Corinth and all the churches under his care but all churches for all time a principle to be exercised by each individual local assembly.

For one to dismiss the custom that is mentioned in verse sixteen as irrelevant to Believers today (and there are many who believe that) is to say that the Apostle Paul was not inspired by the Spirit of God and that he exaggerated his own importance by saying what he did. Now I would like for that one to soak in because I gave a lot of thought to that particular point. I would like to repeat it – for anyone to dismiss the custom that is mentioned in this portion of Scripture as irrelevant to Believers today is to say that the Apostle Paul was not inspired by God’s Holy Spirit and that he exaggerated his own personal importance. I don’t believe that for a moment, not even for a second.

Now for an important question, did Paul merely think there were basic differences between men and women? Did he merely think that there were basic differences between men and women? Another important question, are uninspired men today superior to the inspired Apostle? And yet many act as though they are superior to the inspired Apostle Paul. Beloved, I am uninspired in the sense of being inspired by the Spirit of God to give forth any Divine principle. I am at the mercy, I am obligated, it is my duty to embrace ALL the principles of Holy Scripture and teach them to God’s people if I’m going to be faithful in declaring the whole counsel of God. This is a part of God’s counsel. This portion of Scripture is just as important in the place for which it was intended as any other portion of Scripture is important in the place for which it is intended. Some passages are more important than others but they’re not more important in the particular area in which they were intended to be. Can we really criticize Paul? That is another question. Can we really criticize Paul? Are we to criticize him or are we to be in subjection to his writings? These are simple questions that convey the truth of this passage. I cannot criticize the Apostle Paul; I must submit to his inspired teaching according to Hebrews 13:17 – I am to obey him who has the rule over me.

Now these are some important observations as far as I am personally concerned. I would like to make a few more before we begin our study of this portion of Scripture. The motive for the covering is the “hidden man of the heart” (I Peter 3:1-4.) But the motive expressed by Peter must be manifested in the life of every Christian. Peter in I Peter 3:1-4 is not speaking of public worship; but Paul is speaking of public worship in I Cor. 11:2-16. If the covering is merely spiritual and not literal as some claim, then the relationship between husband and wife must be merely spiritual and not literal. If the woman wearing a covering was “phased out”, as one man said, “...with the phasing out of the extra ordinary gifts given to the early church”, then I would like to raise this question (he was referring to “prophesying”) was prayer phased out? Was prayer phased out? Look with me now if you please at verse five, “But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth...” Why did this man single out “prophesying” and then write an entire article based on that by saying that her ability to prophesy was an extra ordinary gift given to people in the early church but with the phasing out of that there is a phasing out of the covering? Nothing is said about prayer being phased out. Now I am not giving an interpretation of “praying and prophesying” at this point, but I am raising an important question.

Man is the image and glory of God in the realm of authority. Woman is not the image and glory of God in the realm of authority. The woman is to be in subjection to the man because she came *after* man, *from* man, and she was *for* man. Thus no woman is to be

assertive; she is to be in subjection. And I have my opinion of any assertive woman, she's not in her place as a woman, and since she's not in her place as a woman she is not only degrading herself but she is not showing the proper respect for the man. Woman is not designed to reflect the glory of God as a ruler. I like what one man said, "Beware of a woman who is authoritative and assertive. The woman is not constitutionally adapted to be the asserter, maintainer, and defender of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. God created the woman to play the role of submissiveness and not the role of assertiveness." I believe that, with all my heart I believe that.

"Long hair" is woman's personal glory, verse fifteen. But one is going to have to twist the Scriptures, if fact he's going to have to deny the Scriptures when he compares verse fifteen with verses five and six. There is a covering for the covering. Long hair is woman's natural covering; but in the act of worship as a symbol of her submissiveness to the man she is to wear a covering for the covering; and if she does not wear the covering for the covering let her be shorn or let her covering be cut off. Now no one can take those two passages and say that the long hair is the only covering that is mentioned in this chapter. There are two Greek words for "covering" in this portion of Scripture and the two Greek words are not the same. The one for "covering" in verse fifteen is not the same Greek word that is used in verses five and six as we will see when we start investigating this chapter.

When the Apostle Paul says, "Judge for yourselves..." to judge the preacher when he is preaching truth is in reality to judge God. They did not need Paul's direction to understand the principle that he was setting forth. He says, "...even nature itself teaches you..." subordination, "...even nature teaches you"... subordination. It may seem plausible not to burden the Church with this particular custom. That's the opinion of many today. People are saying, "The Church should be free", "should be free." Listen to a statement I came across and you'll see why that I love this statement, "Freedom at the expense of an inspired Apostolic custom or tradition frees the Church from all decency if carried to its ultimate conclusion." Do you know why the average church today does not have the decency it ought to have? It is because that church or those churches are not practicing this Divine principle. Listen to it again, "Freedom at the expense of an inspired apostolic custom or tradition frees the Church from all decency if carried to its proper and ultimate conclusion." Beloved this is a custom for the benefit of the local aspect of the church.

Now here is one that will put all of us in the dust at the feet of our Savior. A lower place is not of necessity an inferior place. I said a lower place is not of necessity an inferior place. Someone might say, "Well this puts a woman in a lower place than the man." Once again I must repeat a lower place is not of necessity an inferior place. I'd like to illustrate it. Where was the Lord Jesus Christ before the foundation of the world? He was at the right hand of God the Father. He was ever with the Father. There was nothing but eternal communion with the Father. Yet this Lord Jesus, who was rich for your sake and for my sake became poor in order that we might be made rich. So Christ came into a low place in order to serve. Did He complain about it? Not a word of complaint. And if there is any woman today who will complain about her place of being in subjection to the

man she needs to take another glimpse at the humiliation of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Abasement always precedes exaltation. Has woman been liberated from this Biblical principle? My answer is no, woman has not been liberated from this Biblical principle. What Paul is teaching in this portion of Scripture does not contradict Galatians 3:28 in Christ "...there is neither male nor female..." It is true that the Christian woman is on an equal with the Christian man in Jesus Christ; but there is a partnership between the man and the woman in which the man is the head and the woman is to play the role of being in subjection to the man. Authority has been given to the man not the woman. I think these are important things for us to consider. I hope we will give due consideration to them.

I have not had the problem that some men have. There was a period of adjustment when Juanita and I first got married. When we first got married we were both lost church members. Therefore, neither one really had the grace of God. Not too long after we were married the grace of God did something for both of us. I thought I loved her before the grace of God came into my heart and life but really I didn't know what love was until grace came into my soul. The same was true with her. Of course there was a period of adjustment. There is always a period of adjustment. I was mentioning this to one of the men the other night and he said, "You mean like the man when he takes the toothpaste and he squeezes the tube from the middle and the woman rolls it up from the end?" Well, there are adjustments to be made and we have to learn our peculiarities because we all have them. But I am thankful that I married a woman who was not assertive and she learned her place immediately. There are some women, and there are some men I must say, I am not going to let the men off the hook tonight either, there are some women who do anything in the world to get their way. They will use tears in order to get their way. I can remember when Juanita and I first got married; of course I lost half of my vocabulary when I was saved, but I can remember sometime when I would say something and she would become offended and she'd cry. Finally one day I said, "Now you're not really going to reach me with your tears." And I'm sure there were times when I wanted my way, I might not have cried in order to get my way, but she knew what I was doing in order to get my way.

Now I want to be helpful to men who might be having real problems with their wives and maybe with some wives and their problems with their husbands. But I want to tell you something, if I had a wife and when I got ready to go to church or to do what I knew was the right thing for me to do and my wife threw a fit when I started out to church or knew I was doing what I should do as a Christian, I would just have to say, "Honey, just go ahead and throw your fit, throw two while I am gone and when I get back if you want to throw another one, I'll help you throw the third one!" Now some of you might say that is hard. No, beloved, no person should ever compromise when it comes to doing the will of God. And if the woman throws a fit, let her throw two fits! And if a Christian man compromises with his wife there is no end to the compromising and vice-versa, when the woman knows she should do something and her husband rebels at it and she gives in to him and she compromises, there is no end to the compromising. I do not believe in ever taking the first step in compromising.

Now let's begin to look at the chapter. This is a great portion of Scripture. Beginning with verse two. I hope we've settled the points in our own minds that I have made that this is an inspired principle given to the people of God to be observed in the churches of Jesus Christ until the coming of Christ.

I Corinthians 11:2 – Paul said, “Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things...” Paul began as it was his custom if there was something for which he could praise the people of God to whom he was speaking or to whom he was writing he did that. I am not going to take the time tonight to go back to the first chapter of First Corinthians, but you can read it for yourself. He did commend the Corinthians for some things and those things are mentioned in the first chapter. “Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things...” or we could read it in this manner, “Now I praise you, brethren, *because* you remember me in all things...” “In all things” includes many things. Paul was an Apostle. He had given to them doctrine, he had not only given to them doctrine but he had given to them the practical things they needed to know in order to manifest the doctrine that they embrace. Therefore, I want you to remember me in all things, and evidently you do. You're familiar with the doctrinal teachings that I have given to you, you remember the practical things, you've been guarding them, and so I praise you for that. He says that you “keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you.” That you guard them, you keep them, you observe them, as I delivered them to you.

The word for “ordinance” in verse two comes from the Greek word *paradosis* and it means a precept handed down. So I know that you remember the precepts that I have handed down to you. Not only does the Greek word *paradosis* mean precept handed down but it also means a well known tradition delivered to you. There are traditions that are not to be embraced but there are also traditions that are to be embraced. The traditions that Paul mentions are traditions inspired by God to be given to the churches and therefore they are to be observed.

In the seventh chapter of the gospel according to Mark reference is made to human traditions. And our Lord had to say some things that weren't so kind as He spoke to the people in Mark chapter seven. I would like you to turn to that portion of Scripture. He makes reference to traditions but they're not inspired traditions they're human traditions. And I'm not for any man's tradition. I abhor any man's tradition. But traditions of men can be observed by religionists so long that they really think they're of God and people can go so far as to make void the Word of God through human traditions.

Let's read beginning with verse one of Mark chapter seven. You'll notice the persons to whom our Lord spoke, “Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (or you'll notice your marginal reference) that is to say, with unwashen, hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the *tradition* of the elders.” There's the word “tradition” but it is not used in a good sense. Take the word “doctrine” for instance is used in a good sense; but every time you find the plural word “doctrines” in Holy Scripture, the word is NEVER

used in a good sense. It is always used in an evil sense, “The doctrines and commandments of men” (Matthew 15). Verse four (Mark 7) He goes on to say, “And when they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables. Then the Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why walk not thy disciples according to the *tradition* of the elders, but eat bread with unwashen hands? He answered and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites (notice what He calls them), as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.” Verse seven, “Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” And if you’ll notice the thirteenth verse He talks about “Making void the Word of God through *human traditions*...” Now that is not the sense in which the word is used here in I Corinthians 11:2 “...keep the ordinances (keep the traditions)...” In other words, keep the well-known traditions, as I have delivered them to you. Was it a well-known tradition that the woman was to be in submission to the man? Was it a well-known tradition in all the churches of that time? That the men were to be the leaders? And the only place that the woman has is in the man? That was a well-known tradition.

Now the word “*tradition*” is used in a good sense not only here but it is used in a good sense in II Thess. 2:15 and the same Epistle chapter 3:6. You will find the same Greek word *paradosis*, a well-known tradition, a precept that has been handed down. So Paul had handed down this principle, this precept, this tradition to the churches of Jesus Christ.

I Corinthians 11:3 – After having said that in verse two which ought to be the first verse of this eleventh chapter, then he sets forth the principle itself in the next verse. Three things are found here. He says, “But I would have you to know...” or we could read it like this, I want you to understand, there is something that I want you to understand. Now what is it that Paul wanted the Corinthian Believers to understand? Here’s the principle – three parts:

1. “The head of every man is Christ”
2. “The head of every woman is the man”
3. “And the head of Christ is God”

I would like for us to take these one at a time. Here is the principle that is set forth at the very beginning of this subject that we’re discussing – “The head of every man is Christ.” Who is my head? My head is Christ and since the Lord Jesus Christ is my head I am to honor Him not by having my head covered but by having my head uncovered because I have been made in the image and glory of God.

First of all we need to give the meaning of the word “head”. The word “head” comes from the Greek word *kephalee*. And what does it mean? It means head, chief, top, cornerstone. *Kephalee* – the chief cornerstone in the temple that Paul describes is the head. So it denotes what? Authority. The word denotes authority. So Jesus Christ is my authority, He is my head. It is true that I have authority. He has given me some authority but I am under the superior authority of Jesus Christ. There are three things I would like to say in connection with that:

1. Christ is my head.

2. The Word of God is my guide.
3. And the appointment to the office of Elder is my authority.

I do not have to have any other. That is enough isn't it? Now there is a sermon within itself. There's an outline:

I. Christ is my head

II. He is my superior authority

III. I am under His authority

IV. He is my head

V. He is my chief

VI. The Word of God which He has given to me is my guide. I do not need any other guide. I do not want any other guide. I do not want the opinions of men. I do not want the traditions of men. I want the Word of God. It is sufficient. It is my guide.

VII. And my authority is delegated authority. My authority is my having been appointed to the office of Elder.

So Christ is my head, the Word of God is my guide, and my authority is my appointment to the office of Elder. It isn't always recognized, I make mistakes, I have made many, and I will make many in the future. I am just a sinner saved by grace. But I do recognize certain principles. In the recognition of these principles beloved I have all that is necessary to make me what I hope to be as a man of God in this life:

- I have the grace of God within
- The Lord Jesus is the Captain of my salvation
- He is leading me safely to glory
- He is my authority
- The Word of God which He has committed to my trust is my guide
- And my authority under His authority is my appointment to the office which I occupy. But I am not lifted up with pride because of it. It's a solemn responsibility.

So number one – Jesus Christ is the head of every man. The head of every man is Christ.

Now look at the second part of this principle – “The head of the woman is the man”. It still reads like that, Beloved, it will always read like that. This principle is just as binding as the first part of this principle given. In other words, the principle has three parts. I'll illustrate it another way in a moment. So man is the head of the woman – he is the head.

Now look at the last part of the principle – “The head of Christ is God.” This might throw you when you look at it the first time. How could Jesus Christ who is God, who is Divine, how could He have a head? How are you going to explain this? The Father is the head of Christ only in the sense of Christ as Mediator. He is the head of Christ in the sense of the Mediatorial work that Jesus Christ came into the world to accomplish. As the Mediator, as the God-Man, the Father is the head of Christ.

Now I would like to raise a question – Is there more than one head in the Divine Trinity? There's only one head in the Divine Trinity. The Father is the head in the Divine Trinity. He is the head of Christ and He is also the head of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, there is

only one head in the Trinity. There cannot be two heads in the Trinity. Just as there is only one head in the Godhead there is only one head in the home, just one head. There cannot be two heads. Any time the woman assumes the headship in the home, look out, there is going to be serious trouble. Now it isn't difficult for the Christian woman to be in subjection to the Christian man. And when the Christian man assumes his responsibility as the head of the home, it is easy for the woman to be in subjection to that kind of a husband.

I Corinthians 11:11 – Dropping down to verse eleven for a moment, when Paul says, “Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man...” he is talking about a partnership in marriage, partnership with marriage. But you'll notice the last phrase, set off with a comma “..., in the Lord.” “...in the Lord” denotes the true way of life, the true way of life.

There are so many homes breaking up today. And there are so many “Christian” homes breaking up today. I don't understand that. That does not make sense to me. I heard a program recently early in the morning, and they had this psychiatrist on and they were talking about so many divorces today and even so many “Christian” homes breaking up. I don't believe that. I walked out my front door day before yesterday and I looked to my left, and the second house to my left had a “For sale” sign in the yard. And I had the correct thought but I wanted to be sure, and so my neighbor walked out to go to work about that time, and I said, “We're losing a neighbor.” He came over and said, “Yes, they're getting a divorce.” Been there just a short time, they're getting a divorce. That's a common thing today. The real estate companies are buying up on it. And you know there are so many couples when they're having problems in the home they think that if we will just buy a new home, this will settle all the problems. Just get a new home and new furniture and all the difficulties will be solved – not so!, not so! The reason there are so many home breaking home up is because so many woman have gone to work and they are self-assertive, they are asserting themselves. And because of that, the homes are breaking up right and left. As there is only one head in the Godhead, there is only one head in the home.

When it comes to the local church, Jesus Christ is the head of the Church. But when it comes to the function of each local church there is authority that must be recognized. And if the man of God or the person who is occupying the pulpit:

- If his life is such
- If his teaching is such
- If his moral character is such
- That the people cannot follow his leadership
- The church ought to get rid of him and get one that the church can follow
- If the authority is not recognized according to Hebrews 13 there is going to be trouble, it is just that simple.

But the authority of the preacher is a delegated authority and he must never cease to understand that he is under a superior authority, the authority of Jesus Christ Himself.

I Corinthians 11:3 – Here’s the principle, look at it again, verse three, “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.” Is that a principle that is to be outlawed? Or relegated to the scrap heap? Or is it one that has become irrelevant to today’s society. People as a whole today, even church members, literally make fun of the principle that we are setting forth tonight.

I Corinthians 11:4 – Now we come to verse four. Paul begins now his explanation. Notice how he began in verse two by praising them. Then in verse three he sets forth the principle. And now the explanation begins in verse four. The explanation begins in this manner, “Every man praying or prophesying...” Prophesying in this verse does not mean necessarily predicting the future, but it means telling forth the message of God or to use a simple term “preaching.”

So here is the public servant. “Every man praying and prophesying...” and this refers to what is being done in public. A matter of worship is before us. “...having his head covered, dishonoureth his head.” There is no word in verse four for the word “covering.” I would like for you to remember that. Now there are two Greek words that are used: one of them is *kata* – That’s *k a t a*, and *kata* means what? It means down, it means over. And then you have the word for “head” *kephalee* – and what does it mean? It is “head.” So the man who has anything draped down over his head; but there is no Greek word for “covering” itself in this verse. So he says, “Every man praying or prophesying (and this has to do in public), having his head covered (or anything hanging down over his head), dishonoureth his head.”

Now I’ve studied this phrase as diligently as I know how. I’ve looked at the Greek text, I’ve investigated each one of these words, I’ve read commentaries. And men are divided on this that I am going to give you. Some say when it says he “...dishonoureth his head” it refers to his own head; whereas others say it refers to Jesus Christ who is his head. Now really it does not make any difference. I’ll tell you a way to simplify it. BOTH – He not only dishonours that which is on top of his shoulders but he’s dishonouring the Lord Jesus Christ whom he’s representing. So I don’t have to argue about it. I’ll let others argue about it. I’ll let those who want it to say it refers to Jesus Christ who is his head mentioned in the preceding verse and I’ll let those say it refers to his own head on the top of his shoulder. But I say, he dishonours his own head and it dishonours Jesus Christ whom he’s representing. I like one statement I read, “Whenever a person who is representing the Lord, since he’s been “made in the image and likeness of God” going back to Gen. 1:26, when he realizes he’s in the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ and he’s representing Jesus Christ, he wouldn’t walk into His presence with his hat on. He would walk into His presence and take his hat off. That’s a good way to illustrate it. He would take his hat off.

So when you look at this, what does it really mean? First of all, the man is to be uncovered do to the fact that he is representing the Lord Jesus Christ, and the authority that has been given to him, he’s exercising that authority in the public service. He’s praying and he’s prophesying. And if he goes into a service with something on his head,

then he's dishonouring his head. I have read some of the church fathers and I have found in the study of this, that going back to Tertullian and Chrysostom, they testified that this custom was practiced even in their time. In other words, the man was not about to go into a service with something on his head.

Now the Jews and some of the others, and if you have followed some of the traditional religions of our time, take the Pope for instance, he always has something on his head. Recently, when this young preacher came down to visit with me, and he said when he was in college, he didn't even take a course in Greek, but I tell you what, he didn't have to know anything about the Greek to understand this chapter. He had read it, and he had come to a proper conclusion on every point from verse two through verse sixteen. And when we were talking about the fourth verse, and the man dishonouring his head by having something on his head, he said, "I think it's right that the Pope always has something on his head." And I couldn't help but laugh. And you'll notice the Jews do the same. Recently we saw one of our Representatives having been sent by the President to Israel to try to bring about better relations, you know, between America and Israel, and between America and the Egyptians, and the Palestinians. And I saw in one news cast where he walked to the Wailing Wall. Did any of you see it? And he had that little cap on top of his head. So here is something the Jewish people do not understand.

I Corinthians 11:5 – Now let us go to the next verse, verse five. And notice the change, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth..." Now does that mean that the woman has the right to pray audibly and to prophesy audibly or to preach in a public service? No it does not. You say, "Well now how can you prove that?" Beloved, the Apostle Paul is talking about the act of worship in this chapter. If you want to know what he has to say about the woman and what her responsibility is, turn with me first of all to I Timothy chapter 2. Let's read it right out of the Scriptures. We're taking two passages now. I Timothy chapter two, we will begin reading with verse nine, "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; But (which becometh women professing godliness) with good works. Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection." Was Paul contradicting himself? No. He's talking about worship in First Corinthians eleven. Now he's dealing with the subject of learning, speaking, usurping the place of authority over the man. Let's read on, "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." He then gives the reason, which is in harmony with what we're talking about in First Corinthians Eleven, "For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

I Corinthians 14:34-36 – Turn if you will to the Fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians, let us read verses 34-36. Paul said, "Let your women keep silence in the churches:..." Several years ago I walked into a bookstore in the city of Houston to buy a book. While I was there, the woman who ran the bookstore was a member of First Baptist Church, Mrs. Showalter. Her husband had retired from the railroad and he was in the bookstore with her. A little bookstore on Bloggett Street. While I was there a woman came in. She had a box of books and she was advertising those books. The book had been written by Mrs.

W. R. White. And Mrs. W. R. White lectures from one Baptist Church to the next on the book of Revelation. This woman after having been introduced to me by Mrs. Showalter, said, "Bro. Best have you ever read this little book?" I said, "No, I haven't." "Have you heard about it?" I said, "No, I haven't." "Have you ever heard Mrs. White speak?" I said, "No Ma'm." But I said, "Before you go any further, I never will." I knew I would get her attention. Boy, you could see the blood flushing to her face. She got red in the face. She said, "What do you mean, you never will?" I said, "I don't believe in woman preachers." Well, she's not a preacher. I said, "Oh, yes, yes she is. Any time she stands in the pulpit giving lectures on Revelation or any portion of Scripture, she's preaching. And my Bible says that a woman is not to usurp authority over the man, but she is to be in subjection to the man." I said, "This is what the Bible says. How do you interpret that?" She wheeled around and she completely ignored me. I'm sure she said, "Trouble maker."

Now listen, let us read on, "Let your woman keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." Now is that true or false? Is that to be observed today or ignored? That's Bible. And it's going to be observed wherever I'm Pastor.

I Corinthians 11:5 - Alright back to verse five. Paul answered the question concerning public teaching in the place where it should have been answered. He is not dealing with that subject here in I Corinthians 11. He's talking about the act of worship. Now he says, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered..." Let's pause there with that phrase. I like what John Trapp said on this. With all of the information I have been able to gain I like this as well as any thing that I've read. It's in harmony with all of Scripture. He says, "But every woman that prayeth or prophesy, that is, that joins with the man who prays and preaches." In other words, woman, when they come to the worship service, when the preacher is preaching, when someone is praying, it is right for each Christian woman to pray with the man as he prays, not audibly, but to pray with him as he prays. And even as the man preaches, there's not a thing in the world wrong with you preaching as he preaches, but you do it silently. You're following him, that is, with the man who prays and preaches. So "every woman that prayeth or prophesy..." it doesn't mean that she is to pray audibly, or prophesy or preach audibly, but she prays and she prophesies or she preaches with the man of God as he prays and as he preaches. If she does this as an act of worship with her head uncovered and this is not talking about just her long hair. There's no way in the world that it can be interpreted in that manner. What does he say, "...she dishonours her head:" Now those who want to argue and say she's dishonouring the head on her shoulders and others who say she is dishonouring her husband, I would say she is dishonouring herself first of all and she is dishonoring her husband by not giving to him the honor that he is supposed to have. Then he says, "...for that is even all one as if she were shaven."

I Corinthians 11:6&7 – "For if the woman be not covered..." Now the word that is used in verse six and it is used twice, "be not covered" here and then "...let her be

covered.” And you will notice the word “cover” in reference to the man in verse seven. The same Greek word is used in all three places. Now I’d like for us to look at this word. We’re looking at a compound Greek word – **Katakalupto** is the word. And you’ll notice the word **kata**, and we’ve already given you the definition of **kata** – it means under, underneath, putting under. And when it is used with verbs it names that with which anything is covered or concealed. Now I’d like to give you the Greek verb. And the Greek verb which is **kalupto** – it means to cover, it means to cover up, to hid, or to veil. So it means a veil.

Did you know this Greek verb is used eight times in the New Testament? I’ll give you all the references and you can look them up when you have time. But I want to in explaining this verb relate three verses of Scripture. But the first time this particular Greek verb is used is in:

1. Matthew 8:24. And in Matthew 8:24 it is talking about the waves being boisterous and the waves covering the ship where our Blessed Lord was lying asleep. And the word “covered” is used, it is this word **kalupto**.
2. The next reference is Matthew 10:26
3. Again in Luke 8:16
4. Again in Luke 23:30
- 5&6 The word is translated “hid” twice in II Cor. 4:3 “But if our gospel be hid (concealed), it is hid (concealed) to them who are lost.” So the word **kalupto** is used twice.
7. And then it is used again in James 5:20 – and this is a verse I want to direct your attention. Remember James said if a brother be overtaken in a fault – well of course that person is to be restored. And when that person has been restored, what takes place, a multitude of sins have been hidden. Turn with me to James 5:19, 20 in order to get the connection, “Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converter the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death (physical death that is a result of a sin unto physical death which a Christian commits not eternal death), and shall hide a multitude of sins.” There is the verb **kalupto**, “hide a multitude of sins.”
8. The last place where this verb is found is in I Peter 4:8.

Now that is the word that is used – it is a compound word. Now look at it, “For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: (now this word that is used here for “covering” is not the same Greek word that is used in verse fifteen. We will not have time to get that far tonight) but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered.” There isn’t any way in the world that a person can take these two verses of Scripture and then go over to verse fifteen where it talks about the long hair being the woman’s “covering” and say that the “covering” of these, especially verse six, is the same as the word “covering” in verse fifteen. It just can’t be. Not even the same Greek word to begin with. And he’s talking about two different coverings.

So the woman’s natural “covering” which is her long hair is her glory. But I like to think about this – The woman is not to magnify her personal glory in the worship service; she’s to show her subjection to her husband who is made in the image and glory of Christ.

She's not to manifest her glory. There are so many illustrations in God's Word showing the woman's place. Do you remember when Mary took her long hair off her head and wiped the feet of the Lord Jesus? She was willing to cast her own personal glory at the feet of Jesus Christ. She didn't want to manifest her personal glory. So in the worship service the woman is to wear a veil over her natural covering to manifest her subjection to her husband in the act of worship.

I Corinthians 11:7 – We'll look at part of verse seven in closing, "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head (you see this is an answer to verse four), forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: and the woman is the glory of the man." And her glory is to be concealed since she is the glory of the man, in the act of worship recognizing her subjection to her husband.

This is a Divine principle. I'm obligated to teach this the same as any other portion of Scripture. We as Christians are obligated to observe it as much as any other portion of Scripture. Wouldn't it be wonderful if God's people as a whole were just willing to study all the counsel of God and then to do their best to put it all into practice in their lives? I do not look at my wife as being beneath my feet. She's my equal in the Lord; but I am her head and I have been given that responsibility by God. I want to do a good job of assuming that responsibility and she wants to do a good job by being in subjection to that authority.

WEARING THE VEIL IN PUBLIC WORSHIP (cont'd)

I COR. 11: 1-16

Preached by Pastor W. E. Best September 2, 1979 p.m.
To the Assembly of Park Place Grace Church

The man is to act like a man if he is to be respected and the woman is to act like a woman if she is to be respected. The man is to look like a man if he is to be respected and the woman is to look like a woman if she is to be respected.

I'm grateful for the grace of God that came into the life of both this preacher and his wife immediately after they were married. Now I am talking about the actuality of grace that we talked about this morning. We have had almost forty-one years of happy married life. A life that I trust has manifested to some degree the grace of God. It didn't take either one of us long to learn where his place was and that makes the difference. There have been many things that we've had to learn through the years and we haven't arrived as yet. I've had some of my own relatives and I've seen some of the relatives of my wife manifest jealousy for the way that we get along and I attribute it to the grace of the sovereign God and a little understanding in the beginning of our marriage of the will of God concerning husband and wife. Our son could not drive a wedge between us. Children are just naturally born psychologists and they'll try to pit one parent against another. But our son was never able to do that and he used to get disgusting at times because he could not do it. We had an understanding when I told him something Juanita would not tell- him something different. If she had told him something I didn't tell him anything different. We stood behind what each one had said.

Last Sunday evening we gave a number of introductory things to this passage and got as far as the I Corinthians 11:6 in our verse by verse interpretation of this portion of Scripture. Now I must tell you again tonight that even though we are making what could be called an in depth study of these verses that doesn't mean that we're giving all that could be given on these verses of Scripture. But we are trying to cover some of the major things at this time. It has been almost twenty years, in fact, I think a little better than twenty years, twenty years or about, well maybe a little more since I've made a study of this passage. Not until recently did I get into it again. I've been convinced for more than twenty years as to the woman's covering but I did not do an in depth study of some of the Greek words at that time. I just took what somebody else said. I could see the truth of the passage generally speaking and I didn't raise any questions. As a result of having made a deeper study of this passage I have a better understanding of some of things that I have already related generally to you and I will give more proof tonight of those things of which I have stated just briefly.

I would like to mention at the very beginning tonight the different views of this passage. I'll only name them and number them and that's all. Just state them as briefly as possible. But there are many different views of this portion of Scripture. I've heard

several of these views while a Baptist. I've read several of these views since leaving the Baptists.

1. The covering was a custom for that day but it is not binding on the Church today.

In other words, the covering for the woman is not relevant for the Church today. I'd like to expand on that a little bit. I believe that we have a principle given to us by an inspired Apostle, the Apostle Paul, and the principle which he gave is relevant for the Church in every age of the Church age. And I say that without any hesitation. And I'm willing to die by that statement. I believe we have a Divine principle given by the inspired Apostle.

When you hear someone say, "Now that custom is not relevant to the Church today." You should ask, "For what Assembly?" You must keep in mind there are different assemblies. There is the assembly of Satan and there is the Assembly of God. The principle about which I am speaking is not relevant for the synagogue of Satan that we studied about in Revelation 2 and 3; but this principle is relevant for each local church throughout each church age. I proved that last week by investigating the word *paradosis* that is found in I Corinthians 11: 2 when Paul said, "I praise you, brethren, that you remember me in all things, that you keep the *ordinances*..." The word *ordinance* comes from the Greek word *paradosis* – it means a precept that has been handed down, or a well-know tradition that has been given by an inspired Apostle. And I'm not going into a review of the word *tradition* again tonight.

So when you hear someone say it isn't relevant that reminds me of what I am constantly subjected to in this modern age in which we're living, many portions of God's Word are not relevant for modern man. I detest that statement with all the passion of my soul because it contrary to Scripture. Now, I will say this, it doesn't matter what Scripture it is, it is not relevant to monkeys and apes and that's what you need to tell people, so classify yourself. Every Divine principle is relevant for man in whatever age he is in. So it's not relevant to monkeys, apes, and baboons, and so forth, so people need to classify themselves. I'm giving it just as it is. So that's the first view.

2. The woman's long hair is her covering.

I'm not repeating some of the things we gave last week on that. But we know there are two coverings in this passage. One is the long hair which is a symbol of the modesty of woman; it is her personal glory (vs. 15). But then there is a covering for her covering during the time of worship for the simple reason that her personal glory is to be covered. And a covering is a symbol (I'm talking now about the covering for the covering) of her subjection to her husband or to the man.

3. The special covering for the woman was phased out.

And this has been given by a man who embraces the truths of grace but he's prejudiced on this point. And his name is Gary North. He wrote an article and I have it in my possession in the October 1971 issue of the Banner of Truth magazine published in

England. By the way, I heard some things about Gary North this past week that I did not know about. He says that this covering was phased out with the phasing out of the extraordinary gift that God gave in the early church.

Now the foolish thing about that statement is vs. 5 “But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth...” He used only one statement and that’s the statement of “prophesying”. So if he’s going to be consistent he’s going to have to say that “prayer” too has been phased out. So that’s a little bit foolish is it not? That’s view number three.

4. Women were to minister as well as men but not in the government of the church.

I read you some Scriptures tonight that refute that concept. Woman is to be silent, she is not to teach, she is not to usurp authority over the man.

5. The covering is spiritual and not literal.

I guess that would mean that the relationship between a man and his wife is spiritual and not literal. Isn’t that ridiculous?

6. Paul disliked women.

I read an article this last week by a man that I appreciate very much in his interpretation of this particular passage. He said there are a lot of people who downgrade the Apostle Paul. But he said, time will come when every woman will have to recognize and admit that Paul was the greatest liberator of woman of any man whoever lived. I agree.

Now I’m going to give the view that I heard this last week and then I’ll keep the one that I believe the passage teaches for the last.

7. Another one that I heard last week was that the man is the woman’s covering, that is, the authority of the man is the woman’s covering.

Now that too is a ridiculous interpretation. It is true that the man is the head of the woman but to say that the man is her covering is ridiculous. In other words, when you read I Corinthians 5 & 6 and if you accept the view that man is the covering, you’re going to see just how ridiculous it really is.

8. Now the eighth view which I believe with all of my heart and I’m ready to defend it anywhere anytime is this – A Divine principle is given for all churches for all time. A Divine principle is given for all churches for all time.

Two or three things I’d like to review and one in particular. A statement I came across that really said a lot in a few words. I give the quotation, “There’s much talk today about freedom in the church and freedom in the Christian life.” I believe in Christian freedom and in the very near future I’m going to bring a message on Christian freedom. But here’s the statement that I read that I like so much, “Freedom at the expense of an

inspired apostolic custom (in the light of this passage which we're studying) frees the church from all decency if carried to its logical conclusion."

What controls the woman today? What controls the average woman today? Is it the Word of God or is it the fashion of the day? Is it the Word of God or the fashion of the day? What really controls the average woman? You know the answer – It is not the Word of God it is the fashion of the day.

I know when we have visitors and visitors see the women of our church wearing veils they're going to raise questions. We have a family who is visiting our church and have been visiting now for, well several months of this year, and this morning the wife of the man asked my wife, "Where did you get your veil?" And he's already been considering the passage and they have not been subjected to this particular teaching before but they already see the truth of it. As I stated last week there're are many instances in the Old Testament when the Israelites did a certain thing, they knew the question would be raised, "Why are you doing this?" or "What meaneth this ordinance?" or "What meaneth these stones?" So when you're asked the question, "Why are you wearing a veil in the worship service?" It gives you a good opportunity to give a personal witness as to what the Scriptures teach on this vital subject of the woman and her place in worship.

I would like you to go back with me for a moment to I Corinthians chapter 7. I want you to see beginning with the vs.1 of chapter 7, and this takes in all the last part, in other words, chapter 7-16. Up to chapter 7 – Paul had been dealing with divisions in the church at Corinth; he had been dealing with immorality in chapter 5; he had been dealing with the subject of one brother taking another brother to law. Coming to chapter 7 and going through the last chapter we have the beginning of a new division and in this section what do we have? Some of the principle things that Paul is discussing – he discusses in chapter 7 the marriage issue (and we're not doing that tonight); in chapters 8 & 9 he discusses the subject of meats, eating meats offered to idols; in chapter 10 he warns the Corinthians against idolatry; and coming to chapter 11, which we're now studying, that is, the first part of the chapter, he discusses the subject of woman in worship.

I Corinthians 7:1 - Now let's read the first verse of chapter 7 so you can understand why I'm going back to this verse, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me..." "...concerning the things ye wrote unto me..." In other words, the Corinthians had written to the Apostle Paul asking questions about the very things discussed beginning with chapter 7 through the last chapter of 1 Corinthians. And the subject of woman and her part in worship is a question that was raised and Paul gives the answer in his letter here in the 11th chapter verses 2-16.

After having given to you the eight different views and the one which I believe the passage teaches I'd like to relate two other things before we go into the study and take up where we left off last Sunday evening. First of all there are preachers who laugh at this subject. When Bro. Robert Woods was working in the bookstore that was owned by Jay Greene several years ago, Robert and Johnnie came to Houston as Robert was the manager of the bookstore and when he saw it was going under and Jay Greene would go

bankrupt, and of course, after Robert told me about missing a paycheck, I said, “I think it’s about time to get out of it.” But to make a long story short, a certain preacher in our city had tried to get Robert and Johnnie to visit their church, or the church where he was pastor and they did. And they visited our church and they liked our church and kept coming. One day while this pastor was in the bookstore laughingly and jokingly, and I don’t know what else might have been behind it, I have my own idea, he wanted to know if Best had gotten a hat on Johnnie yet or a covering on Johnnie. Now that’s a ridiculous thing to say. That’s a lack of respect. And instead of winning Robert he disgusted Robert and he would have disgusted me. Now this same preacher, I saw him do this, I was attending a service at another church. After the service one night, of course my wife wore her covering, and after the service this preacher went by and he slapped the covering as he passed by. Well, that didn’t set too well with my wife and it surely didn’t set well with me. In fact, I had to bite my lip to keep from saying, “You’re acting what I thought you really are.” That’s what I almost said. Now that’s ridiculous, I don’t care who the person is.

Now let me tell you something to add to that. This last week I was talking with Steve Carpenter. Steve has not been out of Dallas Theological Seminary too long. While there of course, he was exposed to four years of Greek and he’d already had some in college before he went through Dallas Theological Seminary. And he said they would spend some time on difficult passages of Scripture, in other words, they’d spend maybe weeks on it. And he said this was one of the passages Bro. Best that we did an in depth study in the Greek. And I’d already gone through the chapter and taken the high points, and he said, “That is the exact conclusion to which we came. The teacher of the class and the students as well.” And he said, “After having come to the conclusion that this passage does teach that there are two coverings, the natural covering which is woman’s glory and the covering for the covering during the time of worship.” He said, “After the conclusion had been reached, then they started discussing, well now wait a minute, what are we going to do when we get out in the pastorate?” Isn’t that interesting? I want you to know I’ve witnessed the same thing. “What are we going to do when we get out of the pastorate? Woman in general will not accept this. Some would say we’re afraid there’ll be divisions in the church.” And so this went on and on, and he said it laughingly. And I asked him, “May I quote you?” He said, “You surely may, you surely may because it is a fact.”

Beloved I want you to know that when I’m convinced that something is Biblical I don’t count the cost, I never have and by the grace of God I never shall. If people want to make an issue of it, that’s their problem not mine. If it is Biblical it is my responsibility to give it. I like what Harry Ironside said in some comments on this passage. Harry Ironside was pastor of Moody Memorial Church for a great number of years. He had a Plymouth Brethren background. He was not by any stretch of one’s imagination a grace man but he did give a lot of good things. He said, “You know sometimes it takes something like this, it may not seem to be a real important issue but of course, it is important in the place where it was designed to be. It is not as important as other issues.”

This subject that I'm discussing with you tonight is not as important as what I discussed with you this morning or what I shall discuss with you next Sunday but it is important. It is a part of God's Word, it is a portion of God's counsel, and the man of God is obligated to preach the whole counsel of God. So I'd have to tell people since there are some eight different views, if you cannot embrace what is to me self-evident as being the Scriptural view then there are plenty of places people can go. And I'm not suggesting that; but it's my responsibility to give the whole counsel of God and I'm not going to count the cost. I'm going to have to stand before the Lord some day and give an account. And I tell you something, I don't have respect for any person who says he's a representative of God and he's afraid to preach any part of God's Word at any given point in time. I don't have any respect for him. The Word of God is the Word of God. So I thought that was rather amusing what Bro. Carpenter told me and yet how true it is. I know there is a division. I experienced a tremendous division. When we left the Southern Baptist Convention immediately the church divided in half. I turned right around and preached on the woman and her responsibility and her place and there was another division. That division divided in half. And beloved, when the whole counsel of God is proclaimed today it divides people who have no respect for the Word of God that they claim to have.

Now I'd like for us to look at another thing in the light of this passage. Did you know that many people read this passage and after reading it their mind runs immediately to Galatians 3:28. Turn with me to Galatians 3:28 and I'll just show you that there is no connection between the two passages. Galatians 3:28. I'd like to begin with verse 26 to get the connection "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Now there are people when they read this passage in I Corinthians go immediately and try to justify themselves by saying, "...in Christ there is neither male nor female..." we're all one in Christ. Beloved, Galatians 3:28 is not talking about the same thing that this passage is discussing. It is true that all Christian's males and females are equal in the grace of God; but that does not eliminate man's still being the head of the woman. I like a statement I read just tonight before the service in a book out of the library. I happened to see this book, I thought maybe it might have something on this particular subject, I had not read it, so I read it. He said, "'Some say Paul confessed the insufficiency of the proofs which he had just alleged by saying what he did in verse 16 "But if any seem to be contentious, we have no such custom." Isn't that hilarious? That's laughable. I repeat it again, "'Some say Paul confessed the insufficiency of the proofs which he had just alleged (that is in the context of the chapter) when he said, "But if any seem to be contentious, we have no such custom." In other words, according to that view Paul was saying now I don't want anybody to be offended. Isn't that stupid? In other words, I've given you the proof but now if anybody is going to be offended, just forget it! That's the furthestest thing from the mind of the inspired Apostle. And here is what he did say that I like. Now he didn't agree with the quotation that I gave but he gave that quotation. He made this statement, "The constitution of woman is the same as it was when Paul wrote and will continue till the renewing of all things." The constitution of woman is the same now as when Paul wrote this Epistle, as when he wrote I Timothy 2, as when he wrote I Corinthians 14, as when Peter wrote I Peter 3:1-7.

Now I must hasten to say this, especially for the benefit of young persons who have not entered into the marriage relationship yet. Any young woman who cannot willingly assume the name of the man had better not get married. She had better stay single. Now I do not believe that men are to be bully's neither do I believe that woman are to be brawlers. There isn't anything any more disgusting than a man who is a bully and always bullying over his wife.

Did you know that since I have been preaching when I would talk about the woman and her place and I can remember in several instances when I would preach, like from Ephesians 5 about the woman is to be in subjection to the man and the man is to love the woman as Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for it, and we'd have some womanly man as a member of the church, and so he'd muster up courage, and after he'd get home after hearing me on that subject, he'd say, "Now wife did you hear what the preacher said this morning? You're to be in subjection to me." Isn't that pathetic? Whereas if he'd gone home and assumed the position that he should've assumed in the spirit in which it should have been assumed it would be very easy for that wife to assume her place as a wife. So you can just see sometimes a person who has not assumed it and all of a sudden he hears the preacher, maybe his wife has not assumed her place, so now he's going to take advantage of the message that he's heard and he's going to try to force his wife to a decision. That's the wrong approach. So that's a man who is a bully. But what about a brawling woman? You know the Proverbs has some interesting statements about a brawling woman. Solomon said, and he should have known, he should have known, a thousand wives, he should've known. He said, "It is better to dwell in a little spot on the rooftop than to dwell with a brawling woman in a wide house." Both are disgusting. Both are disgusting. But that is not what Paul is talking about, not what he's talking about at all.

I Corinthians 11:2 – Now let's begin with verse 2. I'll review just two or three things. First of all the word for *ordinance* as I've already stated comes from the Greek word *paradosis* which means a precept handed down and it was handed down by the inspired Apostle. And so Paul said it is to be kept, it is to be guarded. So what is being taught in this portion of Scripture was not only for the Corinthian Church, it is for this church. It is for every church in every age.

I Corinthians 11:3 – And then the principle in verse 3. "...The head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." There is the principle.

I Corinthians 11:4 – Now for the explanation of the principle. Paul said, "The man who prays or prophesies (and he's talking about praying or prophesying in public), having his head *covered*, dishonours his head." He is not only dishonouring that on top of his shoulder but he is dishonouring Jesus Christ who is his head.

I Corinthians 11:5 – And then he says, "But every woman that prays or prophesies..." Now I was interested in discussing this with my friend (Bro. Steve Carpenter) since he had just gotten out and had so much Greek. I had already made a word study of this

verse. I wasn't in doubt about it but I wanted to see what he had to say. And I said, "Steve my concept of this is that the woman praying and prophesying has reference to her praying with the man who is praying as he prays and she is preaching in her own mind as he preaches." He said, "That is the exact conclusion to which we came in the class, not only by the professor but by all who were making an in depth study of this verse." That's the only thing that makes sense in the light of all that Paul has taught in other places and Paul doesn't contradict himself. So the woman does pray as the man is praying. I don't call on women to pray in this church, to pray out loud in public service. And I certainly don't call on them to give their testimonies and to preach. And regardless of what you might think about what I'm going to say, I never will call on a woman to give her testimony. I never will call on one to pray. And I don't have any respect for the institutions that do that because they're going contrary to Scripture. Now this is Bible – you either have to accept it or reject it. It cannot be refuted.

So the praying and the prophesying is what the woman does while the man is doing it as he does it. Let me illustrate that: As I'm preaching now every woman should be following me and you should be following me in the Scriptures and as you follow me you are preaching as I preach. I said you're preaching as I preach. Now I don't believe any of you preach as hard as my wife does. On Mondays I'm like a wrung out dishrag and so is she because she's nervous because she's feeling for me. And I'm sure that she has a feeling for me I'm sure you don't have, at least she should and I believe she does. But there is a sense in which you pray and you preach as the preacher prays and as he preaches. And that's the meaning of verse 5.

I Corinthians 11:6&7 – Now she does this not with her head *uncovered* but with her head *covered*. In other words, her natural covering which is her hair is covered with a covering because she is showing her subjection to her husband or to the man who is the head. Now the Greek word for covering here, which is used three times in verses 6&7, is the word ***Katakalupto***. It is a compound word – ***kata*** which means underneath, putting under. And then the suffix, the last part of this compound word is ***kalupto*** and I gave you the eight references where that word is found last week and I'll not repeat them now. But it means "a covering." So the covering is to be covered. And the artificial covering not the natural covering is a symbol of subjection to the man. So the word is ***Katakalupto*** and it's used three times in verses 6&7.

I Corinthians 11:7 – Now look at verse 7. "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God:..." that goes back to Gen. 1:26 God said, "Let us make man in our own image after our own likeness:" and man was given dominion, man was given authority according to the last verses of chapter 1. And so man "...is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man." And that is why I entitled the little booklet that we're going to have printed "Woman Man's Completion". And woman is man's completion. Man is incomplete without woman and the woman is incomplete without man. But woman is man's completion. So the woman is the glory of the man. So the man is to have his head uncovered out of respect for his head the Lord Jesus Christ but the woman is to have her head covered out of her respect

for her head who is the husband or man. So the man is uncovered and the woman is covered.

I Corinthians 11:8 – Now let’s look at verse 8 “For the man is not *of* the woman...” Notice the preposition *of* it is the Greek preposition *ek* – in other words, man did not come *from* woman originally, woman came *from* the man originally. This is what he is talking about. God took a rib from Adam and made He woman, when you go back to the Genesis account. So the man is not *of* the woman but the woman *of* the man in that God took a rib from man and made He woman. Then he says, “...but the woman *of* the man.”

There are three things that need to be considered:

1. Woman came *after* man
2. She was taken *from* man
3. She is meant to be *for* man

She is man’s completion. That doesn’t mean that woman has some inferior place, not at all. She has her rightful place and when she’s in her rightful place there isn’t anything more beautiful than the woman in her rightful place and the man in his rightful place. I realize we’re living in an age when society in general would laugh and scoff at what I am preaching. But I want you to know that I’m going to preach it, I’m going to stand for it regardless of what churches in general do, regardless of what society embraces. This is the teaching of God’s Holy Word and I believe it. I believe it with all of my heart.

I Corinthians 11:9 – “Neither was the man created *for* the woman; but the woman *for* the man.” See he is amplifying this truth.

I Corinthians 11:10 – Then he says in verse 10 “For this cause ought the woman to have *power*...” There’s a lot of controversy over the word *power* and the meaning of it. The word for *power* here is not the Greek word *dunamis* from which we get the word “dynamite”; but it is the word *exousia* which means authority. So you could translate the word *power* here *authority*.

Let’s read the verse 10 “For this cause ought the woman to have *authority* on her head...” Will you look at your marginal reference? The marginal reference in your new wide-margin Bible gives the best definition of this that I’ve read, and in all my studies, in all the Greek works that I’ve consulted, this is the best. And what does it say in your marginal reference? The word “*power*, that is, a covering ensign that she is under the *power* of her husband.” That’s what it says. I cannot improve on that. That is the meaning. So the woman is to carry the emblem or the sign on her head that she is under the *authority* or *power* of her husband.

Now the last part of verse 10 has been a most controversial phrase “...because of the *angels*.” What does that mean?

- Some have interpreted this as referring to the angels that are described by Isaiah in the 6th chapter of Isaiah’s prophecy. You remember those that had the six wings, with two they did fly, with two they covered their face, with two they

covered their feet, and so forth. Well that may be true and it may not be true, I'm not sure. That's one interpretation.

- Another interpretation is that it refers to the messengers of the church. Well we do know this that messengers are called angels, or the messenger is called "angel" in Rev. 2 & 3 – each letter was written to the "angel" of the church, or to the "messenger" of the church. *Angelos* is the Greek word for *angel*, *angeloi* for *angels* the plural. So here it would be *angeloi* the plural word. Now some say it means that.
- There are others who say it refers to the angels about which the writer of Hebrews talks in Hebrews 1:14 – the ministering angels sent to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation.
- There are others who say that it refers to guardian angels.
- Well one thing for sure beloved, and that is this, even the angels believe in being in subjection to authority. So however you want to interpret it, it doesn't change the principle in the least. Whether it means a literal angel, a messenger of the church, or whatever, the principle is the same.

So you can accept whatever interpretation that you think fits the context better. But I haven't really come to any definite conclusion and I don't know anyone who really has from the things that I've read. So it is a very difficult passage to really understand, that is, as to the meaning of the "angels" "...because of the angels." But one thing is clear and that is there is a principle involved and the principle is clear, they believe in subjection.

I Corinthians 11:11 – Now verse eleven "Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord." The statement "...in the Lord" refers to the one true way of life. And the only true way of life is to be in the way or to be "in the Lord." And the Lord's way is called "the way" in a number of places in Scripture.

We have in verse 11 partnership. And I count our marriage, my marriage, as a partnership. I'm a partner with my wife she's a partner with me but this is a partnership in which I am the head of my wife. And she recognizes that I am her head and she doesn't even believe that she is the neck that turns the head. You know once in awhile you hear a woman say, "Well I believe that man is to be the head but I'm the neck that turns the head." Well that's not saying very much is it? In fact, I think such a person needs some instruction that would make a statement like that. But don't forget the partnership that is involved here.

So woman is not man's reflection but she is his counterpart; not like to like. My wife is not like me and I'm thankful she isn't. I'm thankful she doesn't have a disposition like mine. Her having one disposition and me an entirely different disposition kind of balances the situation. So it's not like to like to like but like in difference.

Now let's go back and look at this text again, "Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man (partnership), in the Lord" but partnership with the recognition of authority. Woman is not man's reflection but she is his counterpart, she is his helpmeet; not like to like but like in difference in the Lord.

I Corinthians 11:12 – "But as the woman is *of*..." The preposition *of* here is that Greek preposition *ek* which means source. And you'll notice his argument here "For" he's giving proof this is why it's so. "For as the woman is *of* man..." she came *from* man, man did not come *from* woman originally; woman came *from* man originally.

Let me pause here a moment. This morning I intended to give another illustration when I was talking about those great principles that we were setting before you – which comes first you know, this is the common statement, which comes first faith or regeneration? Now really there shouldn't be any question which comes first faith or regeneration? Regeneration comes first. You've always heard this statement, which come first the chicken or the egg? That's never been any problem with me the chicken came first. God created the chicken that laid the egg; the egg didn't lay the chicken the chicken laid the egg.

So here we have man is first and woman came *from* the man. So that's the first preposition – *of* man; "even so is the man also *by*..." now this is an entirely different preposition. This preposition is *dia* *through*. Man, you and I have come *through* the woman. There is not a one of us who has not come *through* the womb of the woman and that's what that statement means. But notice the last phrase, "...but all things *of* God." So Paul reverts back and uses the preposition not *dia* but *ek* – God is the **source** of both the man and the woman. Man is first woman is second but God is the **source** of both man and the woman.

I Corinthians 11:13 – Then in verse 13 he says, "Judge in yourselves..." in other words you shouldn't have to depend on Paul's direction, just a little self-examination should teach you something. So he's talking about individual instinct here when he says, "Judge in yourselves: is it proper that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" It is not proper for her to do so. Individual instinct, you don't even need Paul's direction, you don't need my direction. Just think a little bit, is it proper for a woman to pray or to prophesy with her head uncovered? Is it proper for her to do so?

I Corinthians 11:14 – "Doth not even *nature*..." now I think we need to give the meaning of the word *nature*. The word *nature* comes from the Greek word *phusis* and the Greek word *phusis* means nature of things, order, mode of acting or feeling, habit or universal custom. "Doth not even *nature phusis* – doesn't the custom of things, doesn't the order of things teach you something, that, if a man have long hair..." when you see a man with long hair you see a womanly man. I never have liked it, I don't like it, I never will like it, and I have Biblical proof for not liking it.

I can remember when our son, he'd been away for some time, and we went to Dallas to see him and his hair was long. Of course he's not a Christian but I said, "My, that's not

becoming.” “Well Daddy Jesus had long hair.” He thought he really had an argument. I said, “Can you prove that?” “Well all the pictures show that he had.” I said, “Well who took the pictures? Who took the pictures?” Boy how ridiculous.

“...if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?” I don’t say that all men who have long hair are homosexuals. I tell you what I have my own idea about them. I don’t say they all are. But it’s unbecoming for a man to have long hair. I don’t care what the custom is today. You know what it is? It is rebellion against the authority of God that’s what it is. It’s rebellion against the teaching of Holy Scripture and it’s another way to manifest it. I told my own son that. He’s not a Christian yet, he might never be. But I tell you what, he knows what I believe and he has respect for his father and for what he believes. In fact he has enough respect for me that if you said something about me, and he’s big enough to do it, he weighs about 250 pounds and 6’2 ½”, you’d have a problem on your hand. Well I appreciate the fact that he has respect for me. You say well where in the world did he get his size? That’s a secret!

I Corinthians 11:15 – “But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.” Now here is a controversial subject. I’m not going to evade it. We’re going to take a little time and look at it.

The word for *covering* here is an entirely different Greek word from that used in verses 6&7 so keep that in mind. I want to give you two words that are used. I had already worked this out and after having done it I checked this with Steve last week and he said, “You’re exactly correct.” You have three words here in your KJV “...for a covering.” There are two words in the Greek text and the Greek words are *anti* which is a Greek preposition *anti*, and then the word for *covering* *peribolaïou* is used only twice in the New Testament. I’m going to give you both places where this word is found. So turn with me first of all to Hebrews 1:12. The word is used here in I Corinthians 11:15 and in Hebrews 1:12.

Let’s look at Hebrews 1:12 “And as a *vesture* shalt thou fold them up...” The words “a *vesture*” are the English words for the translation of the word that I’ve just given you. “And as a *vesture* shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.” This could be translated “a *mantle*”. “...a *vesture* (or a *mantle*) shalt thou fold them up...” Now I’d like to quote Nicoll in his Greek word studies, I like what he said very much and he’s given the best definition of any person that I’ve read on this statement in I Corinthians 11:15 her long hair is given her for a covering. This is not the only covering that she is to have. This is her natural covering *anti peribolaïou*.

Now the preposition *anti* is the preposition that has caused so much controversy. It means *instead of*, and you can understand that – like the *antichrist*, *anti*, it is the *anti*; but it not only used in that sense beloved, but it’s used in the sense *for* as it is in this verse. And I’m going to give you a quotation and then I’m going to give a proof text for what I’m saying in John 1:16 where the same Greek preposition *anti* is used and it is used in the sense of being *for* rather than *instead of*. So those who do not want to accept the

general teaching of I Corinthians 11 – that is there are two coverings – one the natural covering and the other the covering for the covering. They say that I Corinthians 11:15 is simply saying that it is her covering, her long hair is her covering and the only covering and they base it on the word *instead*.

Now here's what Nicoll said, "In I Corinthians it is not a substitute for head-dress [that is verse 15] is not a substitute for head-dress (this would be to stultify Paul's contention)..." That is it would render it absurd. And beloved, it would render it absurd in view of what he has taught throughout the chapter. He says, "but *in the nature of* a covering, thus *to match* the veil."

Now when we gave the word for *covering* in verses 6&7 which is the Greek word ***Katakalypto*** – it literally means *a veil*. And so personally I think the veil is the better covering to cover the covering and it is the meaning of the word, a veil. So Nicoll says in I Corinthians 11:15 "It is not a substitute for head-dress (this would be to stultify Paul's contention), but *in the nature of* a covering, thus *to match* the veil."

Now I had already checked some references where the Greek preposition ***anti*** is used and I had already come to this conclusion but I want to give you what Nicoll says in the light of John 1:16. So turn and we'll show how the Greek preposition ***anti*** is used in that portion of Scripture in the gospel of John 1:16 "And of his fullness have all we received, and grace ***anti*** grace." The word here for "for" is ***anti*** "grace *for* grace." Now what does it mean? It means one favor after another favor – grace for grace. So Christ is full of grace which we have received and grace for grace, one favor after another favor. So we have one covering after another covering. So there are two coverings in I Corinthians 11:15.

Now go back to I Corinthians 11:15 then we'll come to the closing verse which is that controversial verse; but it shouldn't be controversial at all. Paul concludes now his arguments...the tape abruptly ended at this point.