

This document may be copied and freely distributed. This document may not be sold. You may not change or alter any of the content without permission from the author, David Valderrama. You may email comments, corrections, suggestions, and any helpful information to: earlychristianlife@gmail.com

This book is not finished. Some parts may be incomplete. However, I believe there is enough information to stir your heart towards seeking the truth about modesty and to communicate our beliefs. I hope to add other chapters, complete these chapters, which would contain more Scripture, history, and reason.

Male Modesty?

Though truth may be difficult to recognize, and sometimes hard to find, these difficulties and rarities, however, do not mean that what you see around you is the truth.

One man stated, “Modesty is a controversial issue. No matter how the man of God approaches this subject, he will be judged a legalist or a libertarian by his audience. It’s inescapable. Speaking against current fashion and popular trends is always difficult and costly for the man of God. Still, God has called him to a course that divinely steers him toward a head-on collision with the thinking and ways of the world. Vincent Alsop once said that a man must have ‘a very hardy spirit, that shall dare to cross the stream or stem the current of a prevailing luxuriancy. So that, to have a finger in this ungrateful debate, must engage him in Ishmael’s fate—to have every man’s hand lifted up against him; seeing it is unavoidable, that his hand must be set almost against every man.’”

(Comments from women about male modesty is the last section)

Men have told women how to dress modestly without using a Scripture that specifically supports their definition and design, namely how the body is covered or exposed.

Yet, women have responded to the men who tell them this by saying that they need to be modest also, upholding a comparable standard to that which they require of women.

Neither the men nor the women have Scripture that specifically supports what they're defining.

What are your thoughts?

Is a double-standard of modesty acceptable to God? Is this hypocrisy? Do women lust? Are immodest men loving their sisters? Are they behaving themselves unseemly? Is the lowering of the standard for women in order to eliminate the hypocrisy of immodest men a sound

Biblical conclusion and a step towards the doctrine of godliness, or rather a failure to heed sound doctrine and the creation of a carnal resolution?

Below is a sermon that addresses these issues; it also covers foolish talking, joking, riches, covetousness, selling what you have and giving to the poor, and self-indulgence:

To listen to the sermon visit <http://www.earlychristianlife.com/> and select “press on to perfection, by David Valderrama”.

Below are some basic facts:

- 1) Women and men both lust. Both are stimulated by sight and touch. Some men and women are less stimulated by sight and touch than others. [Genesis 39, Proverbs 7, 1 Corinthians 7]
- 2) As women should not sit with their legs spread apart in front of men, neither should men before women. [Matthew 7:12, 1 Corinthians 13:4-5]
- 3) It is hypocrisy to define a standard of modesty for women without specific scriptural justification, while simultaneously not applying the same principles to yourself as a man in order to avoid such hypocrisy and immodesty.
- 4) There are plenty of Scriptures which provide a modest standard for those who truly desire to see them. [Genesis 3:21, Exodus 20:22-26, Exodus 28:42-43]
- 5) If we expect women to dress a certain way to prevent men from stumbling, then we as men must dress a similar way to prevent women from stumbling.
- 6) The attitude of “that’s a personal lusting problem you have” which women display when confronted about immodest clothing is an attitude that we as men we should avoid having ourselves. If that type of attitude offends us, then as men we should not respond with the same rude objection if confronted about our immodesty. (Matthew 7:12, 1 Cor. 13:4-8)
- 7) If men think of themselves as unattractive, old and ugly, and that no woman would lust after them, and therefore do not need to dress modestly, then they cannot be sincere while holding women to their standard of modesty who view themselves the same way.
- 8) Modesty applies to all men and women, regardless of how attractive or ugly they consider themselves to be.
- 9) Hypocrisy hardens the heart perhaps more than any other doctrine.
- 10) Our lack of temptation towards an immodestly dressed person doesn’t nullify the doctrine

of modesty.

- 11) Because you have never thought about modesty as a man, does not mean you do not need to be modest or that modesty is unimportant to God.
- 12) There is a stumbling block of hypocrisy, and a stumbling block of lust, common among the current practices of professing Christians concerning male and female modesty.
- 13) Modest apparel is more than preventing the opposite gender from stumbling sexually.
- 14) Men are partly responsible for much of the rebellion presently demonstrated by women in regards to modesty.
- 15) The lack of Scripture concerning male or female modesty does not grant to either gender a license of immodesty.
- 16) Because your ancestors have kept certain aspects of the faith contained in the Sermon on the Mount, and you have held on to these aspects, this does not mean you are complete and entire lacking nothing; you may add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge [2 Peter 1:5-8]; even if male modesty does not seem to appear as a central part of the faith of your ancestors does not mean it is unnecessary.
- 17) If you research how holy men of old were clothed (Yeshua, Simeon who prophesied concerning Yeshua, the apostles, Daniel and the other prophets, and many others, the early Christians, even secular movies and plays about these men), all wore modest clothing. Many men are depicted wearing multiple layers. It is that common and universally understood. If one insists they were dressed that way because of culture, I agree: Because it is the culture of men and women professing godliness, with good works, to wear modest clothing. Everything holy men and women of God do and do not do is with purpose. To imagine and carelessly assume or assert that such men and women took no thought about their clothing was to say there was no purpose behind their clothing.
- 18) If we men defend our immodest apparel with, "Those men of old times dressed that way because of their culture," remember that: women today say the same thing to you when telling them to wear dresses; and that you are a hypocrite if you insist on them wearing dresses while you wear western pants with your shirt tucked in.
- 19) Men MUST not hesitate to dress modestly because of the fear of men. Godly men do not forsake truth because they might be associated with Muslims, Hippies, or other men. It is better to be associated with Muslims, Hippies, or other modest men who look more Christlike

than to forsake Christ-likeness in order to please men.

20) The Pharisees told Jesus, "We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." The way men mock the virtue of male modesty is similar to how the Pharisees mocked Yeshua. The attitude of some is this, "God, what are you doing sending your Son to be born of a Virgin . . . don't you know Mary will look like a fornicator, Joseph will appear unrighteous for not putting her away, and Yeshua will be scorned [by the false accusation] for being born of fornication . . . couldn't you have redeemed humanity another way?" Regardless of what it looked like, this is what God chose and irrespective of what it looks like today, honest and sincere men will put away the existing hypocrisy and immodesty present in their lives and teach against it.

21) The early Christians not only had to forsake family and friends, risk tortures and death, but they had to bear the reproach of the false accusations of cannibalism, atheists, and incest. Yet, some professing Christians today won't do what is right in regards to modesty because of what other people think.

22) Those who insist that pants are for men presume that culture ceased evolving when men began wearing them. They say that women wore dresses for thousands of years because of modesty, but men wore robes and tunics not because of modesty, but because of culture. The idea that pants are for men, and dresses are for women, and that these designs are for the purpose of distinguishing between male and female, is preposterous. A primary ancient factor [besides color and material] among the history of Israel is that men wore beards, women did not. Moreover, a woman may go to her local mall and buy female pants, which, if a man wore, he would be considered effeminate. If such is the case, then pants are not for differentiating genders. If pants are worn, they must not be form fitting, and the "area" (from the naval to the knee) must be covered by more than just western pants.

23) Modesty is not a matter of conscience for a man and a matter of morality for a woman; modesty is a moral issue for both men and women.

24) You follow the Light of the World [John 8:12] when you follow the Word of God [John 1:1], not merely the letters that talk of Him.

25) You are not "right" if you need a Scripture to specifically tell you what is right, before you will do what is right. A sheep doesn't need a Scripture to hear Jesus' voice. A sheep recognizes truth, and chooses both to speak and to do what is true, even without a scriptural confirmation, as Jesus said, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me." For example: Scripture does not say, "Do not go to casinos and gamble." If you insist that

gambling at casinos is not prohibited by God because no Scripture specifically forbids it, as mentioned previously, “you are not right”.

26) If greed was not mentioned in the Bible would it still be considered a sin? Certainly! If your eye is single the Holy Spirit will help you find the truth. If your eye is evil, He may deceive you. You see this happening with Balaam, Ezekiel 14, and the Book of Isaiah; God deceives those whose eyes are not single.

27) If you are troubled by spiritual pride for wearing a long shirt or tunic, and are afraid of being called a "Pharisee" who, "loves to wear long robes," you must understand that Christians are not accustomed to repent of what is good in order to adopt that which is evil, and God is looking for men to be valiant for truth on the earth. You must conquer your pride with the assistance of God; you must through the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body and live.

Let's look at the Scripture which mentions those who love to wear long robes: “Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the markets, and the highest seats in the synagogues, and the chief rooms at feasts; which devour widows' houses, and for a shew make long prayers: the same shall receive greater damnation” (Luke 20:46-47). The character of these men is vain. They love the attention they get for appearing religious and holy. Not only do they wear long robes but they make long prayers and for what purpose? Show!

Laying the axe to the root of the tree for them would not be to start wearing short robes and offering short prayers. The root is not an external issue, but an internal issue. If they really saw themselves as they really were: vain, proud, covetous, arrogant, hypocritical, and self-centered, they would blush with shame at the thought of being proud. I think a mighty blow to such a root would be to confess such pride before those men whom they really desire to please and whose admiration they seek to retain. They could confess, “I have loved wearing long robes and have made long prayers for show.” That is laying the axe to the root of the tree.

The Greek word for long robes in the passage is $\sigma \tau \omicron \lambda \acute{\eta}$ stole². Let's see how this Greek word was used in the New Testament. In Mark chapter 16, some women who followed Jesus had bought sweet spices that they might go to anoint Him. When they entered into the sepulcher, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a *long white garment*. We may not know who this young man was, but he told the women He was raised from the dead, commanded them to tell Jesus' disciples, and that they would meet Jesus on the way. This young man was holy. Though he wore a long white robe, he was not troubled by it, nor did he wear it for the same reasons as the scribes whom Jesus rebuked. Also, in Revelation chapters 6

and 7 this is the garment worn by the redeemed.

28) 1 Corinthians 11:1-16 does not say that women need to be modest and the men do not. Neither do these Scriptures say that the glory of a man is his hair; they say that the glory of a woman is her hair. These verses are not referring to the necessity of male or female bodies needing to be covered; they are referring to the heads of both men and women. It is unsound to assume or assert that because women need to cover their glory (hair) as a part of female modesty, and because men are to uncover their heads when praying or prophesying, that the men therefore may undress or wear tight form-fitting clothing.

29) " A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous" (1 Timothy 3:2-3). The Greek word in this passage for good behavior is *κόσμιος* pronounced as *kos'-mee-os* meaning orderly and modest. In fact, this is the same word Paul used to instruct women in the previous chapter, "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in *modest* apparel." Leaders, be modest and free from hypocrisy knowing that you will receive a stricter judgment! (James 3:1). More is explained on this Scripture later.

30) Just because the New Testament doesn't record Jesus teaching about modest clothing does not mean it is not important to God. He also didn't teach about the head covering, order of the home, the wearing of jewelry, or homosexuality. If you take the line of reasoning that modesty is not important to Him because the Gospels never recorded it, then to be consistent you must agree that the head covering, order of the home, the wearing of jewelry, and homosexuality are not important to Him either. The Old Testament teaches about modesty and the Jews were familiar with those passages. Even Peter was ashamed to approach his Lord wearing only his undergarment. Why? Because he knew modesty was important to Jesus. Some may argue against this by stating that if the reason Jesus didn't teach modesty to the Jews was because they were already dressing modestly, then why didn't He preach this to the immodestly dressed Gentiles? It is true that the Gospels do not record Jesus telling the Gentiles to put on a modest garment, but neither do they record Him telling Gentiles to put away their swords, to sell their possessions and to give alms, or hardly anything. He said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matthew 15:24). He trained His disciples, and sent them saying, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Acts 1:8).

31) It true that Jesus taught His disciples saying, "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on.

Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" (Matthew 6:25). However, Jesus was not dismissing gluttony, lusts for dainties and various treats and drinks, and immodesty as sins that are so trivial we ought not to even take thought about committing these sins. Some actually use this Scripture to encourage others to not make such a big deal about dainties, self-indulgence, and immodesty. Jesus spoke those words because of the previous verse, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on" (Matthew 6:24-25).

32) If upon reading this document you decide to dress modestly and to take a serious stand against the hypocrisy and immodesty presently demonstrated by men, some may accuse you of taking such a serious stand because you are the one with the serious lusting problem, have been made to stumble, and therefore need others to take your stand seriously for your own sake. Who cares what other people think! Purge out the hypocrisy and immodesty anyways. Be faithful to God and seek not honor from men, but the honor that comes from God only (John 5:44).

33) As a teenager, do you remember being self-conscious of your pants perching up around the zipper because you didn't want others to have the impression that you were 'aroused'? Did you ever try to fix the problem? If so, why? What was there to be ashamed of if you were covered? Moreover, men have presented the idea that when women wear pants with their legs spread apart, it is not difficult to imagine being between their legs. However, when you wear pants, sit with your legs apart, and the pants give the impression of 'arousal', consider that it may not be difficult for women to have a similar trial. "Seriously?", one may retort. Indeed! Consider the words of the apostle, "We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves. Let every one of us please *his* neighbour for *his* good to edification. For even Christ pleased not himself" (Romans 15:1-3). Let us behave then in a manner worthy of the love of God, which is does not dismiss the weaknesses of others when choosing how to dress and to behave.

34) Some who object to the doctrine of modest apparel often base their objections on the fact that clothing is not an internal but an external subject. They say that God doesn't care about what is on the outside but what is on the inside. If this was true, God would have left Adam and Eve wearing loincloths of skin.

35) I have heard many irrational objections to this teaching of male modesty, one being an explanation of 1 Corinthians 7:1-2, which says, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote

unto me: *It is* good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless, *to avoid* fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.” This passage was explained to me that women are turned on by touch (as if men are only stimulated by sight), not by appearance, and that is why Paul said it is not good for a man to touch a woman. This man insisted that women who are stimulated to lust by sight are just perverted, and that it is now a sad world we live in if women are lusting after men. Apparently, he forgot about Potiphar’s wife who casted her eyes upon Joseph, the Proverbs 7 woman, the odious posters and magazines sold at adult stores and gas stations. His understanding of the 1 Cor. 7 passage is what was perverted. Men and women are both turned on by touch and sight; some men more than other men and some women more than other women.

36) An even worse objection to this teaching is calling a long tunic or shirt over baggy pants womanly. Some have mocked and derided such clothing saying that you shall not wear that which pertains unto a woman (Deuteronomy 22:5). These men have been so blinded by their culture and opinions that they do not consider the odious blasphemies which they utter against Christ, His apostles, the early Christians, the Patriarchs, and prophets. Moses was wearing a robe when He told Israel not to cross dress. Was he a hypocrite? I speak as a fool! Those who mock and deride the tunic or long shirt disallow all of the below Scriptures regarding God’s design for both Adam and Eve in Genesis, the commands in the Law of Moses to Israel and the priests saying, “That is the Old Testament.” Those who say such things are self-condemned. While they say it is Old Testament, they twist the Old Testament passage from Deut. 22:5 to support their own design of clothing.

37) I have heard men, impressed by what they understand to be discernment, who are wise in their own conceit, use the fact that in western culture the emblems on the men’s and women’s bathroom doors have a man wearing pants and a woman wearing a dress. They say this is used to distinguish between the sexes. Let’s go back to the Garden and look at God’s design: the emblems would appear the same, for God made them both tunics, coats, garments, robes, of skins. Even 500 years ago in western culture such examples as what they use would be nonsensical, because men were still wearing tunics, robes, etc. That was the design of God’s people for thousands of years.

38) It is a shameful hypocrisy for smooth shaved men to bring the railing accusation of effeminacy upon modestly dressed bearded men who wear manly tunics, long shirts, or robes. What resembles Jesus more, a smooth shaved face with a shirt tucked into jeans or a beard with a long tunic?

39) Pants do not contain the principles of modesty God established in the Garden of Eden.

Rather, they contain the principles of boxer briefs and long underwear.

40) It may be the opinion of some, that the Scriptures are silent concerning specific detailed commands and definitions regarding modest clothing; however, the Scriptures are not silent with examples and some specific details.

41) Some men object saying, "I feel that I am modest wearing pants with a tucked in shirt". However, women also feel they are modest wearing pants and shirts. Men who tell women they are immodest for dressing that way, while they themselves are wearing pants with a tucked in shirt, need to cut off the beam from their eyes before they cause a woman to stumble and trip over their hypocrisy.

42) Centuries ago Jewish men were accustomed to "gird up their loins" when working. Some have used this fact to justify their own immodesty. But why didn't these Jewish men wear garments that needed no girding up? Because either it was considered an indecency in their society or they felt it was inappropriate to dress that way outside of work.

I do not believe women should wear pants with a shirt tucked in because I do not believe that would be modest. I have no Scripture that specifically spells out my belief. Yet, I will tell women they need to be modest, and to not wear tight form-fitting clothing which clings close to their bodies revealing their figure or shape.

If we do not consider it modest for women to dress wearing pants with a shirt tucked in, because it reveals the form of their bottoms, and, if they were to sit with their legs opened or to bend over, we men would feel uncomfortable, or it would be unseemly, or ungodly "for women professing godliness with good works", then we MUST avoid it ourselves as men! Men have justified themselves by using the silence of the Scriptures. However, the Scriptures are clear and loud concerning pride, hypocrisy, laying stumbling blocks before others, and being holy in all manner of conversation as God is holy. The Scriptures are also full of examples of modest clothing and how God feels about nakedness.

On social media, one asked whether or not communion ought not to be administered to an immodest man, even as it should not be to an immodest woman, "Let us ask God for wisdom and avoid hypocrisy. If a woman should not be immodest, nor should a man. If a man rebukes women about modesty, he had better make sure he is not an immodest hypocrite." A woman responded to this saying, "Amen! So often I see plainly dressed women with head coverings and with them is their husband who looks just like the world wearing their name brands. Even worldly people know this is hypocrisy. I am beyond tired of this double standard among supposed Christians. It's like the men want the women to look the part but they don't want to

do it themselves. I think they must enjoy still turning heads.”

In Genesis chapter three there was no double standard in God's design of clothing for both Adam and Eve (Genesis 3:21).

Thus, Christian men wear long tunics, long untucked shirts with baggy pants, or articles of clothing which contain the principles previously mentioned.

The Struggle

One asked, "Do we struggle too much about clothing instead of placing our focus elsewhere?"

The struggle with clothing is with those who are immodestly clothed, and are unwilling to change. It is a very simple and easy thing to do. It is not nearly as difficult when compared to what we tell others to do when preaching: to separate from an adulterous marriage which many claim destroys families, leave the military, lose your life, love your enemies, sell what you have and give to the poor.

For example: I was preaching at a university in Arkansas, and I met a young lady who was excited about several things I was teaching. I noticed she was wearing a gold ring. I asked if she would take it off for a moment. She removed the ring with little effort and no difficulty. I asked if the ring was hard to remove. She told me it was not. I then read to her a passage from the New Testament, such as, “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” (1 Timothy 2:9). Even though the ring was easy to remove from her finger, she refused to stop wearing it. This command from Paul is easy to obey, yet many today refuse to stop wearing their jewelry. Likewise, modesty is easy for both men and women to obey yet many refuse to dress modestly. With little effort and no difficulty men and women could put on modest garments. Yet many, who refuse to put on modest garments, though it takes little effort and no difficulty, preach to others many things that require enormous amounts of effort, and create much difficulty. That is not right!

The aim of modest clothing is to: Cover the shame of your nakedness, and to do unto others as you would have them do unto you, specifically if you don't appreciate seeing the form of a woman's bottom and legs, as men you should cover those areas on your own body. The comments later in this blog post make it evident that some, if not all of these women would appreciate that.

Their reasons?

1) Many confessed to having struggles with lust: (a) when a man's legs are spread apart when

he sits (western pants, though baggy, would still be a distraction if the shirt is tucked in and the legs are spread apart), (b) when a man bends over and the form of his bottom seen because it is not covered; an untucked shirt, tunic, or some other design would be needed to cover it, the specific design is unimportant, (c) a man's tight shirts and pants, (d) a man who is shirtless.

2) Not only did many women confess to struggling with lust, but some are simply distracted, embarrassed, and uncomfortable by men's immodesty. Men pursuing holiness of mind feel the same way by women's immodesty. The Bible teaches that "Love doth not behave itself unseemly" "Love is not rude" "Love is not self-seeking" "Love is not puffed up" (1 Corinthians 13), and, "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Peter 1:15-16). A man or woman is puffed up when they disregard how their clothing or lack of clothing affects other people. They are puffed up if they dismiss the Biblical standard simply because there is no explicit commandment spelling out every article of clothing which is Biblically compatible. "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and *in* all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ" (Philippians 1:9-10). This prayer of Paul resonates with a modest heart.

3) Not only did many women confess their struggles with lust, while some were distracted, embarrassed, and uncomfortable, and others, in fact many, have voiced in those comments, on the streets, in my own family, namely, that it is hypocrisy to tell them they need to wear a dress or some other design to be modest when men cite no specific Scripture; while men (for the most part) dress however they want, and men have no better defense than women, that is, that there is no specific command in Scripture spelling out every specific detail of what modest apparel looks like. The modesty issue has been a one-sided, double standard doctrine of hypocrisy for many years. Though the customs of this world have changed, God has not and will not! If Jesus, when teaching on marriage, referred to the beginning of creation, why not follow His example and refer to the beginning of clothing, and stop pretending that there is no Biblical example which contains any definite principles of modesty which the church may use as a godly standard?

The Doctrine According to Godliness

"If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth" (1

Timothy 6:3-5). We have the words of our Lord Jesus Christ but where is the epistle of the doctrine according to godliness which Paul was referring to? Are we missing a book of the Bible? Paul brings some serious accusations against those who do not consent to the doctrine according to godliness but are these accusations unfounded? What source was Paul referring to when he wrote the above passage? To be sure, such a book was unknown to the early Christians and remains unknown to scholars today. This is because Paul was not referring to an epistle; he was admonishing people to consent to what was godlike, namely, to be imitators of God. A plain example of this is found in Ephesians 5:1, “Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children”.

Based on experience, we could safely assume that many people, if not most have some standard of modesty. For example, how many would serve communion to a man wearing only speedos or to a woman wearing only a bikini? If you would refuse to share communion with a man or woman wearing only a speedo and bikini, by what authority would you refuse? Where does it mention speedos or bikinis in the Scripture? Or where does Scripture tell us that we must refuse men and women wearing only those articles of clothing or those who are not dressed modestly, communion? Many agree that it is important to have a standard but who’s standard should we apply? If a man or a woman is not troubled in conscience concerning their clothing, would this alone provide us with a standard acceptable to God? Is it up to every man to decide for himself what clothing is modest and as long as he reckons something to be modest and abides by his own principles then does that make him modest? When Adam and Eve knew they were naked they covered themselves, but were their coverings sufficient? If modest clothing has any significance to God, if God cares about modesty and the Bible doesn’t specifically spell out what is too tight or too short, then as Christians, what may we glean from the Scriptures that could provide some assurance that how we are dressing is pleasing to God as any sincere Christian would desire to know? At what point does something become immodest? Does the Bible have any standard to offer us? These are reasonable questions which deserve reasonable answers. Consider the following:

When Adam and Eve sinned, the Scripture says, “And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they *were* naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons” (Genesis 3:7). The Hebrew word translated into English as “aprons” is חגור, which is pronounced as: chagôr, meaning: girdle, belt, or loincloth. Of the seven times this word is used it is only translated once as aprons. Instead of aprons, other translations use the words loincloths and girdles. A loincloth according to some definitions is a one piece garment, sometimes kept in place by using a belt, which covers the groin and occasionally the buttocks. What was God’s response to their aprons? “Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God

make coats of skins, and clothed them” (Genesis 3:21). Were the coats of skins only different from the aprons in that the aprons were made of fig leaves and the coats, of skins? The Hebrew word translated into English as “coats” is כְּתָנִית, which is pronounced as: *keth-o'-neth*, meaning: coat, garment, or robe according to Strong’s Hebrew dictionary. It comes from an unused root meaning to cover. Brown Driver Brigg’s defines this Hebrew word as: tunic, undergarment; a long shirt-like garment usually of linen; from an unused root meaning to cover. Now some encyclopedias describe the coats or tunics of skins as being a shirt like garment with sleeves that extended to the ankles but sometimes only to the knees; for example, the workman’s tunic was sometimes more abbreviated. Others describe the coats or tunics as some being sleeveless and others with sleeves extending below the knees and sometimes to the ankles. It is certain however, that simply because some workmen wore their kethoneths more abbreviated (to the knees) that this doesn’t mean that God’s design for Adam and Eve did not extend beyond the knees, especially when the prophet Isaiah called it nakedness for a female virgin’s leg, thigh, and hair to be exposed, and since Moses said for male priests to expose their thighs was an iniquity worthy of death. Rarely does a society, culture, or civilization become more modest with the passage of time. A brief look into western “Christianized” civilization will teach you that men went from wearing robes and tunics (1st century to 16th century, though more devout and conservative men still wore tunics and robes), to coats over breeches (late 16th to early 18th century), then to shorter and open coats over tighter breeches (mid 18th to early 19th century), to tucked in shirts with tight pants (19th to 21st century), to tank tops and shorts as casual wear (early to mid-20th century), to shirtless in shorts (early to mid-20th century. As a consequence of protesting, in 1936 it became legal for men to expose their paps in New York State. The first protests occurred on Coney Island in the early 1930’s, where men gathered to fight for the right to swim and sunbathe in shirtless swim trunks. In 1935, a group of male protesters got themselves arrested in Atlantic City for hitting the beach while baring their torsos. In 1936, these men legally gained the right to show their paps in public, laying the foundation for existing New York state laws that allow women to be topless wherever a man is legally allowed to be), to topless speedos (In 1935, the first bare-chested male swimsuits were worn in the United States), until ultimately walking around bare naked in legalized areas, particularly nude beaches (i.e. Florida 2015, Governor Rick Scott approved the bill passed by the state legislature making public nudity at state-owned beaches legal). (I have omitted my resources as I would not refer someone to the sites because of their immodesty. However, if you really desire to verify my statements it would not be very difficult to confirm them)

The powers of darkness could not easily introduce such a starkly contrasted concept such as nude beaches into a 16th century culture that still had some weighty measure of light in it.

However, little by little the world was enjoyed, defended, loved, and eventually granted to sit in the place of Jesus the Christ in the so called churches. The same spirit that makes light of modesty in the churches is the same spirit in the world that legalizes nude beaches.

I am convinced that the tunics of skins God made for Adam and Eve extended beyond the knees, and that with the passage of time it became more convenient for the workman to wear them more abbreviated which is the same line of reasoning secular men used when they forsook the doctrine according to godliness for worldly aims. Where do I derive my certainty that the tunics God made for Adam and Eve extended beyond the knees? The following Scriptures reveal why: Exodus 20:22-26, 28:42-43, Isaiah 47:1-4. For brevity's sake these Scriptures are explained a few pages later, instead of both then and now.

Knowing what the Hebrew word *keth-o'-neth* is makes us accountable for what we know about the word. This word was translated as coats centuries ago but in the 21st century when we think of the word coat, we typically think of what we wear during winter to stay warm, and such coats usually have nothing to do with covering the shame of our nakedness and we would not think of a western coat extending beyond the knees, except for perhaps a trench coat. That being said, it is important to know what words mean if we are going to understand what someone is saying to us. If we care about what someone is saying to us and we are unsure about a word or the meaning of their words, naturally we would ask them for explanations or clarifications because we sincerely want to understand them. If the principles of the *keth-o'-neth* were comparable to shorts and a tank top some would heartily approve of such clothing and consider the meaning of the Hebrew word to be of utmost significance. If the meaning of the word *keth-o'-neth* supported what they were doing they would whole-heartedly embrace its meaning. However, the principles in the *keth-o'-neth* conflict with the principles of shorts and a tank top, and do not support how many are dressing; therefore many could care less about its meaning and render it altogether insignificant.

If a Russian woman explained to you that traditionally Russian men wear a kosovorotka with pants you might ask her what is a kosovorotka? To which she would reply a shirt. Assuming you understood her, you might explain that American men dress the same way. But if you searched a little deeper you would learn that a kosovorotka is not a tight, short sleeved shirt tucked into pants, but that "It is a traditional Russian shirt, long sleeved and reaching down to the mid-thigh", and that "It was worn loose and was not tucked into the trousers, but instead belted either with a conventional belt, a rope, or a rope-like tie. The tails of the garment hung over the trousers" (Online Wikipedia Encyclopedia). If he who translated Genesis chapter 3 in the King James Version centuries ago would have translated the word kosovorotka they might have used the word shirt or coat. However, we would not know what a kosovorotka was until

we looked a little deeper into what that Russian word really is.

Again, if the KJV translator would have translated Kaftan into English he perhaps would have used the English word coat. Again, in the 21st century we would not understand what this “coat” would look like or the principles it contains from only reading the word coat. We would need to see what the original word for coat is and research what that word means. In this case, the original word would be kaftan, Persian in origin but partly influenced by French, “A kaftan is a variant of the robe or tunic, versions of which have been worn by several cultures around the world for thousands of years. The kaftan is often worn as a coat or overdress, usually reaching to the ankles, with long sleeves. It can be made of wool, cashmere, silk, or cotton, and may be worn with a sash. The caftan is of ancient Mesopotamian origin, and was worn by many middle-eastern ethnic groups. Through its dissemination and evolution, the kaftan has acquired different styles, purposes, and names depending on the culture. In many regions with a warm climate, the kaftan is worn as a light-weight, loose-fitting garment” (Online Wikipedia Encyclopedia).

We have learned that our 21st century understanding of the word coat would not be a correct translation for the Hebrew *keth-o'-neth*, the Russian kosovorotka, or the Persian kaftan. So what did the 16th century coat look like? According to various resources which one needs not to look hard to find you will learn that the 16th century coat extended to the knees, under which, breeches were worn. Though this would still be more modest than the American’s typical winter coat, this word still did not accurately represent the Hebrew *keth-o'-neth*, which extended below the knees.

All this is said to explain the seriousness of understanding different words.

CONCLUSION FROM the Genesis account of EDEN:

1) Based upon what the Hebrew word for coat means we can safely assume that God clothed both Adam and Eve from the neck to closer to the ankles.

2) Though historically, workmen may have worn their tunics more abbreviated for the purpose of work, this does not mean that this was God’s original design, and if men did gird up their loins to work women should not be watching. Furthermore, if men used to gird up their loins (the fact they needed to gird them up) means that they were wearing a garment extending beyond their knees and that perhaps it was unacceptable in the society in which they lived or at least the individual himself was uncomfortable bearing his lower legs in public apart from working.

3) God made tunics for both Adam and Eve. There was no double standard.

God did not do away with both Adam and Eve's loincloths of fig leaves, and then give to Eve a tunic of skin, and to Adam a loincloth of skin: He gave them both tunics of skins. Unless we are willing to assert that God's provision of tunics was arbitrary, then we must conclude that God does nothing without purpose, and that the principles of modesty contained in the tunics was a standard He established; hence, we have the doctrine according to godliness pertaining to modesty. For the same reasons God gave one to Eve He gave one to Adam.

If you have read this far you may be thinking, "Well, the design of clothing God made for Adam and Eve is thousands of years old, and after all, that design was part of the Old Testament so it is not relevant for us today". However, as men and women professing godliness with good works it seems most reasonable, seeing that we use both "clear" and "unclear" Scriptures to define sin, morality, good, evil and numerous other things, that instead of following the blind leaders of the blind, listening to church politicians, following solely our own inclinations, or looking to this present evil world for a godly example of modest clothing, we ought instead to look to Christ, His teachings, both Old and New Testaments from which we derive much of our faith, the apostles, and even consider how the second and third century Christians understood and applied modesty.

CONTINUING THE DOCTRINE ACCORDING TO GODLINESS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT: Some totally disregard the Old Testament and render it altogether useless, except for that which serves to establish their own ideas. The Old Testament speaks plainly about modesty and nakedness, and though its teachings pertaining to modesty do not conflict with the New Testament, but rather agrees, confirms, and further establishes it, they write it off as something old and ready to vanish away, as having been stripped of all authority. However, there are certain laws and principles contained in the Old Testament that are eternal, and as the pillar and ground of the truth (I speak of the church), we must rightly divide the Scriptures lest we become ashamed at the judgment bar of God. For the Scriptures which say, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that *is* thy neighbour's", "Thou shalt not commit adultery", "Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it *is* confusion", "Also thou shalt not approach unto a woman to uncover her nakedness, as long as she is put apart for her uncleanness", "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so *are* abomination unto the LORD thy God", these few laws from the OT are eternal and as Christians we must not violate them. Now many would readily agree that these laws are in fact eternal even though the last

three are not mentioned in the New Testament. That being said, the following Scriptures from the Book of Exodus present a clear revelation of how God thinks and feels about male immodesty, and as mentioned earlier, there is nothing in the New Testament that would conflict with these passages from Exodus. Therefore knowing how God thinks and feels, we as dear children ought to take these thoughts and feelings into account in how we clothe ourselves; and following the doctrine according to godliness become imitators of God.

Leaving the Genesis account, from the following Scriptures from the book of Exodus you will see God designing and instituting clothing adapted to the environment of specific situations for holy and moral reasons.

“And the LORD said unto Moses, Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel . . . Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon” (Exodus 20:22-26). Many professing Christ today have little to no conviction of exposing their legs and thighs. The thought of God caring at all about this seems absurd to them. They have been told that God doesn’t care about the way they dress, but that He only cares about the heart. The common Jewish man during the time of Moses was wearing a kethoneth/tunic so how would his nakedness be exposed? Well, if he were to climb up the stairs to where the altar of God was those below him might have seen underneath his kethoneth. What if today’s generation would have been there when the LORD spoke to Moses? What would their response be to Moses if he told them not to go up by steps to the LORD’s altar lest their nakedness be exposed? Would they contend with Moses? Would they say, “Naked? Only our legs and maybe our thighs would be exposed . . . that isn’t naked! Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?” However, was this law from Moses or from the LORD through Moses? What has changed? Has the New Testament redefined nakedness to mean only entirely naked? Apparently the children of Israel were wearing clothing. Would their clothes fall off from their bodies simply from going up those steps causing them to be naked? No, God considered what would have been revealed as nakedness. He expressly commanded them, “Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon.” Their nakedness was not discovered beforehand because they were clothed with tunics. However, by climbing up the stairs, once they ascended high enough their body underneath their tunics could become exposed and this alone God said was the reason why He didn’t want them going up by steps to His altar.

This passage provides one reason why the Israelites were not permitted to go up by steps to the altar of God: That their nakedness would not be exposed. The altar was higher than the eyes of men. If the children of Israel ascended up these steps wearing only a kethoneth/tunic and no breeches, one may see the skin, “And these *are* the garments which they shall make; a

breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a brodered coat, a mitre, and a girdle: and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, and his sons, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office" (Exodus 28:4). "And thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover their nakedness; from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach: And they shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the congregation, or when they come near unto the altar to minister in the holy *place*; that they bear not iniquity, and die: *it shall be* a statute for ever unto him and his seed after him" (Exodus 28:42-43). Notice that the breeches were to be worn by the priests when they went in unto the tabernacle of the congregation, or when they went near unto the altar to minister. These garments were not needed for ordinary persons whose work was on the ground.

(I am not done with this section, but desired to publish what I have so far until Lord willing I finish the book.)

This is an important aspect of God's "And the LORD said unto Moses, Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven. Ye shall not make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold . . . Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto mine altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon" (Exodus 20:22-26). The altar was higher than the eyes of men. If the people walked up the stairs to the altar then their nakedness would be discovered by those below: their thighs and groin might become exposed. God gave a specific command expressing His thoughts and feelings about it. He simply does not approve of it. This was not arbitrary but God plainly explained why He ordered breeches for the priests. God actually has reasons as to why He designed certain clothes.

"But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy" (1 Peter 1:15-16).

This is why God ordered breeches (pants) for the priests to wear underneath their robes. "And thou shalt make them linen breeches to cover their nakedness; from the loins even unto the thighs they shall reach: And they shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the congregation, or when they come near unto the altar to minister in the holy place; that they bear not iniquity, and die: it shall be a statute forever unto him and his seed after him" (Exodus 28:42-43). The LORD calls it iniquity. He previously commanded Israel not to go up the stairs to His altar that their nakedness be not discovered. However, He ordained the priests to go up these same steps to the same altar where their nakedness might be exposed, but not without wearing pants underneath their robes. He said, "They (the pants) shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons, when they come in unto the tabernacle of the

congregation, or when they come near unto the altar to minister in the holy place; that they bear not iniquity, and die" (Exodus 28:42-43).

God hates iniquity, and He plainly calls it iniquity to expose your loins and thighs as men. Men have taught women that to merely cover the skin is not a real covering. If the form is exposed then your loins and thighs are not covered. Hence, men have preached against women wearing pants because the form of their legs and bottoms are exposed. I agree with their application for women, but not with their personal practice, for they treat female modesty as a moral issue and male modesty as a matter of conscience, when apparently, God treated the principles of modesty as a moral issue for both men and women (Genesis 3:21).

Now some may contend that God accepts pants from this scripture, because as long as the flesh could not be seen, exposing its form did not matter. That is not true. Otherwise Israel could have worn pants and walked up the steps to the altar and been blameless. Also, the priests wore long robes over these pants. Typically, their loins and thighs could not be seen, but if someone happened to be directly underneath or a strong wind blew, the pants were instituted to avoid their flesh from being seen. It was a step further in modesty. This is why the sisters we fellowship with wear pants, bloomers, or some form of leggings underneath their dresses in similar situations and if they find themselves unprepared for a particular situation (as women seeking to be modest) they don't behave themselves unseemly, they take thought about possible wind gusts, when sitting down with their legs spread apart, or when bending over, etc. They do this because they are modest at heart.

Also, the modest at heart are not offended about modesty so that all they hear when it is preached is, "Line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little there a little; that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken" (Isaiah 28:9-14). However, the modest in heart even subject themselves to unnecessary regulations to avoid causing others to stumble (1 Corinthians 8:13). Therefore, if charity subjects itself to unnecessary things to avoid stumbling others, how much more does it keep the necessary commands and examples, modesty included.

One may say, "This research is interesting, and I do see some principles I can glean, but what should I follow as far as an example? These passages still provide no answer as to what is too tight and too short. Also, the encyclopedias seem to suggest conflicting explanations concerning the lengths of the coats or tunics."

The doctrine according to godliness in regards to modesty is following the order or principles of God. It is following the divine arrangement in regards to clothing.

To this the reply could be, “The doctrine according to godliness didn’t begin and end with what God provided for Adam and Eve in the beginning. It continued and developed all the way from Genesis through when God Himself was manifested in the flesh. The New Testament command to not look upon a woman with lust was given by Christ in the New Testament. With this teaching on adultery the standard of modesty ought to be taken more seriously.

Firstly, in answer to this, if we have decided that modesty is a moral issue for both male and female, then we need to recognize that we ourselves have a minimum requirement in regards to clothing from which lines of fellowship would be drawn. Secondly, it is not reason that we should lower the standard of modesty for women to accommodate the immodesty of men. Some who have been preaching that women need to wear dresses to be modest have gone backwards in their judgment after being confronted about their lack of modesty as men, and have said that a woman dressed wearing pants with tucked in shirts can be modest.

Thirdly, Jesus was clothed with a $\pi \omicron \delta \acute{\eta} \rho \eta \varsigma$ which being translated from Greek is pronounced *pod-ay'-race* (Revelation 1:13). This is a garment or dress reaching down to the ankles. Even if this garment was merely symbolic, if you understand the language of Scripture, you will know that this garment represented something holy and good. This foot length garment was given to Joshua the high priest (Zechariah 3:4), the man who had the writer’s inkhorn at his side (Ezekiel 9:2, 3, 11), and to the priests that ministered to the LORD in the priest’s office (Exodus 25:7, 28:4, 31, 29:5). The Greek word $\pi \omicron \delta \acute{\eta} \rho \eta \varsigma$ which is pronounced *pod-ay'-race*, was used once in the New Testament, and eight times in the Septuagint, which is the Greek translation of the Old Testament. The Septuagint was created in the 3rd century B.C. by seventy elders of the Jews (for more historical information research the Septuagint in Justin Martyr’s dialogue with Trypho and Irenaeus’ against heresies). To get a better understanding of the meaning of Greek words I look up how the New Testament Greek was used in the Old Testament writings. What is significant of the foot length garment which Jesus and the priests wore? 1Pe 2:9 But ye *are* a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. Rev 1:5 And from Jesus Christ, *who is* the faithful witness, *and* the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, Rev 1:6 And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him *be* glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

Some sincerely believe that Jesus would wear shorts if He was born into western culture. They imagine His character to be of such a nature so as to blend in with society. However, nothing regarding Jesus blended in with the Jewish culture He was born into. If you are one of those who sincerely believe He would wear long shorts consider that breeches were instituted for

the priests to wear underneath their robes. These breeches completely covered the thighs, yet nowhere in Scripture is Jesus recorded wearing breeches. Was this because He didn't want to create conflict with the Jews? Was it to please the religious elite? You would not get such an impression by reading the Gospels. Jesus clearly justified His disciples for plucking heads of grain on the Sabbath Day which was not lawful; He worked on the Sabbath, He didn't have His disciples wash their hands before eating, He went into the temple and drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables not fearing the repercussions He may incur from the Jews, He didn't go to the feast with his brothers, He did not fast as did the Pharisees and disciples of John fasted, therefore wearing shorts would have been no problem for Him. Jesus came to set men free from religious bondage. If modesty was an oppressive form of religious bondage, Jesus of all people would have worn shorts/breeches as a testimony against it. A good way for him to break the yoke of modesty from off of the neck of poor oppressed modest sinners would have been to wear shorts/breeches in public. All the other occasions I mentioned above were reasons why the Pharisees hated Jesus and sought to kill Him. Wearing shorts would merely have presented another reason which would mean little to Jesus.

Another thought to consider is that if God or any of His people would have been comfortable wearing breeches in public, reason dictates that they would have preferred to save money on fabric by simply using enough to make breeches.

Paul exhorted Titus, "But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine," and Timothy, "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but dotting about questions and strifes of words" (Titus 2:1, 1 Timothy 6:3). It is the doctrine according to godliness for both men and women to wear garments that do not break the principles of modesty which God established in the Garden of Eden. One may ask, "Does Scripture say that God was establishing His principles of modesty in the garden?" I would then ask, "Does God do anything without purpose? Is God vain?" Again, I speak foolishly. Some may irrationalize that we must follow the exact style and material of clothing if we are to truly be imitators of God. I disagree. Jesus did not wear a tunic of skin. The sound conclusion therefore regarding the doctrine according to godliness pertaining to modesty is that the principles in the clothing are what God was establishing, not the material or fabric. The principles covered the "area", that is, the thighs and loins of both men and women.

If we were to follow only the clear and direct commands from Scripture, our conclusion would be as some say, "wearing gold, pearls, and expensive clothing" is what matters. That does matter a lot. It is not however, the only application of what it means to be modest. Modesty is

a condition and attitude of the heart that works its way out practically in doing unto others as you would have them do unto you; by not being rude, puffed up, arrogant, unseemly, indecent, inconsiderate, or insincere in practical ways, dress and behavior being two of them. Those who only apply the direct and clear commands from Scripture, and neglect examples from Scripture, reject the counsel of God. "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps" (1 Peter 2:21). Having to study commands and examples places a necessary burden on souls, for all ought to, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth" (2 Timothy 2:15).

Modesty of heart destroys an ungodly double standard that turns people away from the truth.

Modesty of heart does not ignore the facts: 1) Women lust, as well as men; 2) women are embarrassed, distracted, and made uncomfortable by how men dress or don't dress; 3) women's hearts are hardened because of the hypocrisy of men.

As men professing godliness with good works, as the city set on a hill which cannot be hid, and as the light of the world we need to take responsibility and do something about modesty. Our silence, hypocrisy, negligence, indifference, and irresponsibility God will judge.

Paul said that the church is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Timothy 3:15), not the Bible. There was no Bible then, only letters, scattered throughout the world. It is the church's responsibility to judge and to do what is true. With God's grace and the guidance of the Holy Spirit we can both recognize and "speak the things that become sound doctrine" (Titus 2:1). If the Bible does not provide a clear revelation of the will of God, we need to seek God, and He will help us judge what is true, if we will indeed be the "pillar and ground of the truth".

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, AND SUCH LIKE: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (Galatians 5:19-21). Notice that Paul ended the specific works of the flesh with revellings, and then follows with, "and such like." These "such like things" he said are evident, and will keep you from inheriting the kingdom of God. It is the church's responsibility to judge these things and Paul expected Christians to be able to judge "matters pertaining to this life" (1 Corinthians 6:1-9). Some such like things not included in that list are: gambling, drugs, various sports and arts, hypocrisy, and immodest clothing. Many have made these and other "such like" judgments but are not willing to acknowledge them as such. However, to avoid hypocrisy, we must embrace all sound "such like" judgments and press on to perfection,

or relinquish all truth that is not specifically defined in Scripture. The former leads to “the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ”, the latter leads to lawlessness; while indifference on the matter is a gross hypocrisy.

I believe the reason why it is understood more clearly that men are visually stimulated, and struggle with lust, rather than women, is because the men have preached against women's immodest clothing, and have admitted their struggles openly. Women however, have not. Society has always attached a stigma of shame to women that is not parallel to men, such as: if a man cusses or smokes a cigarette it is one thing, but if a woman has a foul mouth or smokes, then she is uncomely, repulsive, and just outright wrong, as though what's being done is worse simply because it is a woman doing it.

Consequently, men have said that the reason why women lust is because things are perverted today and the world is just waxing worse and worse. That is foolish thinking. Remember Potiphar's wife who lusted after Joseph, the Proverbs 7 woman who caught a young man void of understanding to take her fill of love, and the apostle Paul's warning in 1 Corinthians 7 to avoid fornication for both men and women. To say that women struggle with lust today because this world is getting worse is the same as saying men are born perverts, so it isn't as bad if they lust, and if a man overcomes his lust problem then he is a really good man; but if a woman is lustful, she is ostracized as perverse and having something seriously wrong with her. Conversely, it is equally perverse and shameful for men and women to lust and dress immodest, if not more so for the men, because they are the heads of their women. Men are not blameless if they lust and/or dress immodestly, and to deride women who behave as they do is repulsive. Let us be honest with ourselves, women are attracted to men and men are attracted to women, it is that simple.

God designed clothing for both Adam and Eve not only to hinder lust but to set His people apart from the ever darkening world. When we dress like the world, unless the world is modest, we cannot possibly be a light to this world.

It is worth considering that perhaps the New Testament Scriptures directed women to modest clothing more than men, because women have commonly used their beauty to win men. Men however, did not primarily win women that way; it seems men won women by their knowledge and experience, namely, if they would be good providers and protectors, because historically women have been dependent on men for survival. Consequently, throughout history women have chosen to marry men who had these qualities, rather than good looks. In cultures where women have gained independence from men however, they became more selective and pursued attractive physical attributes.

Additionally, the New Testament epistles were primarily written with the intent of addressing issues of that time period. As time passes, however, different issues arise and requisite exhortation is needed. It is not that male modesty is a new principle that is the product of private revelation and interpretation, but rather it has always been a matter of morality and because of generational and present day negligence it has become a topic of much needed exhortation and discussion. This has happened with many principles which in time past did not require as much teaching. There are several main topics that are highly discussed among many conservative professing Christians, are considered fundamental and foundational, are held to dogmatically, and yet they are sparingly discussed in the New Testament when compared to other topics. To name a few: Marriage, the head covering, homosexuality, smoking, sports, etc. Some of which are not even issues of morality: Mode of baptism, mode of communion, church leadership structure. Sometimes dogmas have developed which have no scriptural foundation: Proving period before baptism, not using instruments in church, forbidding internet use, and others. We need to be honest and admit that we all have judgments which go beyond the specific letter of Scripture. Pretending that we do not will only cause little ones to stumble when they realize we do. In most conservative churches it is universally understood that a man cannot walk around in public with his shirt off only wearing a speedo and a woman cannot wear only a bikini. However, there is no specific Scripture that forbids these actions. Is it wrong then to reprove our brothers and sisters and admonish them that if they do not repent that they will be punished by God for their immodesty? God forbid that we would ever teach anything else. Yet, these same principles of immodest exposure of the body are the authority by which these articles of clothing are condemned. It does not matter if it is inexpensive and not flashy (i.e. color or jewels) to dress like that, the issue is that the body is exposed, despite the secret parts having fabric over them. Let us have a just weight and a just measure. If tight pants are forbidden for women then the same must apply for men. If it is ungodly to show shape and form, this applies to both genders. To forbid the public wearing of swimwear is an extra-biblical judgment just like forbidding western pants with a tucked in shirt. Judge for yourselves what is more godly and when judging this, consider how God clothed Adam and Eve.

You may ask, "By what authority have we preached against men wearing western pants with tucked in shirts?" To which I would reply, "By what authority have you decided it was unlawful, wrong, and immodest to wear speedos and bikinis in public? Which if you tell me, I will likewise tell you by what authority we preach these principles of modesty." He that has an ear let him hear.

The Language of Scripture

“I put on righteousness, and it clothed me: my judgment *was* as a robe and a diadem” (Job 29:14). Clothing here is represented in a good light. To get a better understanding of the language of Scripture, let’s look at the reverse of this passage, “I put on wickedness, and it unclothed me: my judgment was as nakedness and an indecency.” The words clothed, robe, and diadem in the context of this verse signify dignity, that is, “True honor; nobleness or elevation of mind, consisting in a high sense of propriety, truth and justice, with an abhorrence of mean and sinful actions” (Webster’s 1828 Dictionary).

“Come down, and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon, sit on the ground: *there is* no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans: for thou shalt no more be called tender and delicate. Take the millstones, and grind meal: uncover thy locks, make bare the leg, uncover the thigh, pass over the rivers. Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen” (Isaiah 47:1-3). In context, the prophet’s message was exposing the pride of Babylon, “*thou that art* given to pleasures, that dwellest carelessly, that sayest in thine heart, I *am*, and none else beside me” (Isaiah 47:8). Biblical language always connects nakedness with sinful and shameful behaviors and practices. It would not make this connection if nakedness was morally excellent. Thus it can be understood that if Scripture uses nakedness and the bearing of the leg as a shame to metaphorically describe sinful pride, then it is requisite that physical nakedness itself was regarded as shameful, even from the leg to the thigh. Otherwise, to make the comparison is illogical. Because the Scriptures do make this connection, let us connect ourselves therewith and learn the language of the Scriptures.

“I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth *herself* with her jewels” (Isaiah 61:10). Again, the words *garments* and *robe* are associated with *salvation* and *righteousness*, words that represent *dignity* and *virtue*. If then righteousness is like unto wearing a robe, while wickedness is like unto nakedness; it follows that the covering of a robe is righteous and the exposing of the body is wicked. Furthermore, if the wearing of garments is comparative to salvation, then the lack thereof (by choice) relates to death or a state of depravity.

Consider the following Scripture, “And when he [Jesus] went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in *any* house, but in the tombs” (Luke 8:27). This and other Scriptures sufficiently demonstrate that the Bible never speaks well of wearing no clothes, or of being immodestly clothed (Isaiah 47:1-3).

To prod the church onto perfection the apostles use this language, “And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and *in* all judgment; that ye may *approve things that are excellent*; that ye may be *sincere and without offence* till the day of Christ . . . And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, AND do *those things that are pleasing in his sight* . . . But speak thou *the things which become sound doctrine* . . . For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying *ungodliness and worldly lusts*, we should *live soberly, righteously, and godly*, in this present world . . . Who (Christ) gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from *all iniquity* . . . If ye then be risen with Christ, seek *those things which are above*, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on *things above*, not on *things on the earth* . . . That he [Jesus] might present it [the church] to himself a glorious church, not having *spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing*; but that it should be *holy and without blemish* . . . Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these*; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness . . . Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred . . . Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and *such like*: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told *you* in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God . . . For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which *be* the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk *is unskilful in the word of righteousness*: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, *even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised* to discern both good and evil.”

Be confident that any doctrine which hinders you from judging between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, light and darkness, good and evil, sincerity and hypocrisy, pride and humility, is most certainly a doctrine of devils intended to seduce men, keep them unskillful in the word of righteousness and consequently blind their minds, and lead them into an infernal abyss where they will find no place for the soles of their feet. Those who follow such men will continue this life groping in darkness, not knowing what causes them to stumble, and remaining in a lost state of confusion. Jesus asked, “Why not judge ye yourselves what is right?” (Luke 12:57). Jesus sought to call men out from the darkness and bring them into the light, but men must first judge, examine, prove for themselves what is right, and any man who hinders men from doing this is an enemy to what Jesus was compelling men to do. God is not the author of confusion, but of peace. We ought to love the judgments of the Lord for “When Your judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness” (Isaiah 26:9). Therefore, if the judgments of God are necessary to attain unto perfection, and it is the desire of Jesus and the apostles that we be found blameless when He returns, then who is it that would persuade us otherwise? The apostle Paul told the Galatians that they “ran well, who is it

that hindered you from obeying the truth? This persuasion cometh not from Him that calleth you” (Galatians 5:7-8). Those who would resist this are those who he describes in this manner “If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself” (1 Timothy 6:3-5). Conversely, John tells us that “But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things . . . but the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him” (1 John 2:20, 27). If then the Spirit teaches us all things, let it not be resisted because it lacks specific wording of Scripture though it agrees with “the doctrine according to godliness”. Anything that teaches us to be more like God is a wholesome word, and according to the apostle these wholesome instructions ought to be consented to.

The following is Biblical language God wants men to understand: *approve things that are excellent . . . be sincere and without offence . . . those things that are pleasing in his sight . . . the things which become sound doctrine . . . ungodliness and worldly lusts . . . live soberly, righteously, and godly . . . all iniquity . . . those things which are above . . . things on the earth . . . without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing . . . holy and without blemish . . . such like . . . unskilful in the word of righteousness*. What are all these things? These words are Biblical language. Those who have trained, developed, and exercised their judgment, reason, intellect, and understanding of the Bible are able to understand and speak such language. Other than the commandments of God, what are those things which John said are pleasing in God’s sight? What is a *spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing*? What is *holy and without blemish*? What are those *such like things* that the apostle said would keep the men who do them from inheriting the kingdom of God? If you don’t know, “Awake to righteousness, and sin not; for some have not the knowledge of God: I speak *this* to your shame” (1 Corinthians 15:34).

On the same line of thinking, consider these words from an early Christian writing: “Restrain yourself, therefore, from *all iniquity*, and do that which is good.” “What, sir,” say I, “are the evil deeds from which we must restrain ourselves?” “Hear,” says he: “from adultery and fornication, from unlawful revelling, from wicked luxury, from indulgence in many kinds of food and the extravagance of riches, and from boastfulness, and haughtiness, and insolence, and lies, and backbiting, and hypocrisy, from the remembrance of wrong, and from all slander. These are the deeds that are most wicked in the life of men. From all these deeds, therefore,

the servant of God must restrain himself. For he who does not restrain himself from these, cannot live to God. Listen, then, to the deeds that accompany these.” “Are there, sir,” said I, “any other evil deeds?” “There are,” says he; “and many of them, too, from which the servant of God must restrain himself—theft, lying, robbery, false witness, overreaching, wicked lust, deceit, vainglory, boastfulness, and *all other vices like to these*” (The Shepherd of Hermas Book 2, eighth commandment). Even after an extensive list of 23 specific vices which the servants of God must restrain from, the Christian man Hermas is still admonished that he must refrain from *all other vices like to these*. Despite having been commanded to restrain from *all iniquity*, he was still not given an all-inclusive list of every single vice. Is God then unjust to punish him if he commits or practices a vice that is not explicitly stated in the list? No. On the contrary, it seems that His judgment will include whether or not men made the requisite effort to discover what these other vices are. Apparently our Creator is not ignorant of what He made. “Well of course He is not” one could respond, “What is your point?” Well, namely that God knows the intellectual capacity that every man possesses, and the opportunity he had to search out and know the things that are pleasing in His sight. Truly, we have not because we ask not. Ask that you may receive. Or do we disparage the Scripture which says “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all *men* liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him” (James 1:5).

Why was this section relevant to the subject of male modesty? Because despite having examples, there are however, no specific detailed commands for the design of what is stated as modest apparel in the Scripture. We are to exercise sound judgment (what is modest?), speak the things that become sound doctrine (modesty), and judge for ourselves what is right (that is, what is in fact modest). We are to judge what is holy and godly apparel (modest clothing).

In conclusion, what God does, He does purposefully, including the first set of clothes that He made for Adam and Eve. This and many other things is why Paul instructed Timothy that “All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works” (2 Timothy 3:16, 17).

An early Christian writing

[Constitutions of the Holy Apostles: Book 1: Section 2: Commandments to men; second half of the third century approx. 250 A.D. “Date according to Professor Riddle”. SEC. II.—COMMANDMENTS TO MEN. CONCERNING THE ADORNMENT OF OURSELVES, AND THE SIN WHICH ARISES FROM THENCE.]

"Let the husband not be insolent nor arrogant towards his wife; but compassionate, bountiful, willing to please his own wife *alone*, and treat her honourably and obligingly, endeavouring to be agreeable to her; (III.) not adorning thyself in such a manner as may entice another woman to thee.

For if thou art overcome by her, and sinnest with her, eternal death will overtake thee from God; and thou wilt be punished with sensible and bitter torments. Or if thou dost not perpetrate such a wicked act, but shakest her off, and refusest her, in this case thou art not wholly innocent, even though thou art not guilty of the crime itself, but only in so far as through thy adorning thou didst entice the woman to desire thee.

For thou art the cause that the woman was so affected, and by her lusting after thee was guilty of adultery with thee: yet art thou not so guilty, because thou didst not send to her, who was ensnared by thee; nor didst thou desire her. Since, therefore, thou didst not deliver up thyself to her, thou shalt find mercy with the Lord thy God, who hath said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and, "Thou shalt not covet." For if such a woman, upon sight of thee, or unseasonable meeting with thee, was smitten in her mind, and sent to thee, but thou as a religious person didst refuse her, if she was wounded in her heart by thy beauty, and youth, and adorning, and fell in love with thee, thou wilt be found guilty of her transgressions, as having been the occasion of scandal to her, *and shalt inherit a woe*.

Wherefore pray thou to the Lord God that no mischief may befall thee upon this account: for thou art not to please men, so as to commit sin; but God, so as to attain holiness of life, and be partaker of everlasting rest.

That beauty which God and nature has bestowed on thee, do not further beautify; but modestly diminish it before men.

Thus, do not thou permit the hair of thy head to grow too long, but rather cut it short; lest by a nice combing thy hair, and wearing it long, and anointing thyself, thou draw upon thyself such ensnared or ensnaring women. Neither do thou wear over-fine garments to seduce any; neither do thou, with an evil subtilty, affect over-fine stockings or shoes for thy feet, but only such as suit the measures of decency and usefulness. Neither do thou put a gold ring upon thy fingers; for all these ornaments are the signs of lasciviousness, which if thou be solicitous about in an indecent manner, thou wilt not act as becomes a good man: for it is not lawful for thee, a believer and a man of God, to permit the hair of thy head to grow long, and to brush it up together, nor to suffer it to spread abroad, nor to puff it up, nor by nice combing and plating to make it curl and shine; since that is contrary to the law, which says thus, in its additional precepts: "You shall not make to yourselves curls and round rasures." Nor may men

destroy the hair of their beards, and unnaturally change the form of a man. For the law says: "Ye shall not mar your beards." For God the Creator has made this decent for women, but has determined that it is unsuitable for men.

But if thou do these things to please men, in contradiction to the law, thou wilt be abominable with God, who created thee after His own image. If, therefore, thou wilt be acceptable to God, abstain from all those things which He hates, and do none of those things that are displeasing to Him." **{END of Early Christian Writing}**

Men: part of being modest is not shaving off your beards or trimming them to look attractive or acceptable to the society in which you live (Isaiah 52-53). If your citizenship is in heaven, your faithfulness with the unrighteous mammon will demonstrate it. Besides, when the sheep are divided from the goats any expenditure upon razors, shaving cream, and after shave will be despised when you realize such a waste of resources could have ministered to the "least of these" (Matthew 25:45). Contemplate another exhortation from The Shepherd of Hermas, "Have a care, therefore: as one living in a foreign land, make no further preparations for thyself than such merely as may be sufficient; and be ready, when the master of this city shall come to cast thee out for disobeying his law, to leave his city, and to depart to thine own, and to obey thine own law without being exposed to annoyance, but in great joy. Have a care, then, ye who serve the Lord, and have Him in your heart, that ye work the works of God, remembering His commandments and promises which He promised, and believe that He will bring them to pass if His commandments be observed. Instead of lands, therefore, buy afflicted souls, according as each one is able, and visit widows and orphans, and do not overlook them; and spend your wealth and all your preparations, which ye received from the Lord, upon such lands and houses. For to this end did the Master make you rich, that you might perform these services unto Him; and it is much better to purchase such lands, and possessions, and houses, as you will find in your own city, when you come to reside in it. This is a noble and sacred expenditure, attended neither with sorrow nor fear, but with joy. Do not practice the expenditure of the heathen, for it is injurious to you who are the servants of God" (Book 3, similitude 1). It is not as important to know if God will punish you for not having a beard, as much as it is important to use your resources to do good. The question is not, "Can I be saved if I shave off my beard?" You ought to rather ask, "What good could I afford to do for a poor soul with money saved from not shaving my beard?" A Washington Post Headline once stated: Your beard is killing the shaving industry. It declared that over 2.3 BILLION dollars was lost that year by the shaving industry because men chose not to shave their beards for the month of November

(<http://www.thestate.com/news/nation-world/national/article13908752.html>). Based upon

this information alone, if men chose not to shave their beards at all, they could provide over 27 billion dollars annually to fund relief projects for those in need of safe drinking water, sufficient food and clothing, as well as disaster and health care assistance. Judge for yourselves what is the expenditure of the heathen in this situation.

Comments from Women

Below are many comments women have made about these things which reveal how women do struggle with lust, and the fact that they too, are visually stimulated. This truth is also known because the world creates posters of immodest men, bad magazines, and the fact that God made tunics for both Adam and Eve, not Eve only. Note: The women in these comments probably are not being told that they all need to wear long baggy dresses. If they were told that by men who wore baggy pants with loose shirts tucked in, they would probably be offended by such hypocrisy. If you are a man who wears baggy pants with a loose shirt tucked in, you may feel, after reading these comments, that, "I guess these women would be okay with the way I dress," which might be true, until you tell them they are immodest for dressing the same way and that they need to wear a long and baggy dress to be modest. The comments listed below I have copied and pasted from other male modesty blogposts I found on the internet. All of the comments are not from women.

The comments:

"I do not like the fact that guys act like girls are immune to lust. It is like sometimes guys expect girls to be perfect. While on the other hand they are wearing tight clothing. It bothers me that they could get away with something like that. To me, it is a sheer form of hypocrisy. Guys cannot tell girls they need to cover up and stop wearing tight clothes, while they are walking around shirtless or in tight clothes."

"This was an awesome article! I was/am a woman who struggles with lust. And the way guys dress or rather don't dress makes it hard. Thank you for being so honest, because women are afraid some times to say that they struggle with lust because people have made it into a man only struggle. In answer to your questions, I would say the things that guys wear that is the most distracting to me is the low-rise pants with no shirt, tight pants or shirts, and loose basketball shorts that can be revealing when you sit down."

"That's just incredible guys (girls!) - must be such a blessing for you not to have to worry about that temptation. :-) I've always wondered why so many women don't seem to 'get' the way guys struggle with seeing immodesty, as I had it really hard and could relate to every description guys wrote about how seeing a really attractive, scantily dressed girl made them

think and feel - I thought I was normal! And of course, was quite horrified to find that many people believe women don't have a struggle with inappropriate passion - finding that some don't is a relief, but I can honestly say that for me, having absolute passion for purity, the ages 16-18 was like fighting a life and death battle every day. It's gotten a lot easier, but it was so hard! Seeing the little shifts flowing through those who love God, the rediscovery of a Godly modesty (not wearing sexually attractive or revealing clothes, from a heart committed to honour God in purity, rather than the other extreme - to follow a external and hypocritical appearance) is such an encouragement to me. :-)"

"Thank you so much! While I do believe that guys have a much harder time with lust, I have been distracted by how men dress. So here are some things to think about, tight pants or shorts around the "area," is the biggest problem. no skinny jeans, don't sit with your legs spread apart Wearing tight shirts to show off your form going shirtless is distracting, and it's not fair, I hate it when guys are wearing practically nothing when I'm standing there in like 3 layers trying to stay modest even when it's like 90 degrees outside."

"I've been looking for an article that addresses the fact that guys can be immodest, too. I'm glad to know it exists."

"Thank you so much for posting this, this is such an overlooked issue. When real men care enough about themselves, God and their sisters in Christ enough to really think wisely with their clothing, it really shows Christ. The Psalms talk all the time about "praising God with all that I am". That means clothing, words, even hairstyle! When guys choose to show good, godly and Christian love to all those around them with their actions and clothing, it shows true manhood. Thanks guys!"

"Ok here we go, a list of things I find immodest in guys . . . skin tight shirts (you covered that, but it's worth mentioning) pants with the fabric tight across the butt and thighs-really low v-neck shirts (surprising, eh? But if you think about it, not really. A v-neck shirt reveals chest muscles and chest hair, and for some women, that can be really distracting)-anything that is tight across the crotch. (Yes, that can actually be REALLY AWKWARD when a guy wears tight clothing across the crotch, ESPECIALLY with spandex)"

"I just stumbled across this article. Fantastic! Something somewhat new to think about. Thanks, Brett!"

"Recently my family has had the guys wear t-shirts when swimming. I wondered about this, thinking it somewhat strange, something annoying that isn't needed. However, after reading some of the comments here I don't think I'll ever think this again! I'm so glad for honesty :)"

“This might have already been mentioned, but with regards who's to be blamed for lusting: I totally agree that the one doing the lusting is sinning. They cannot blame their sin on temptation. However, we should be careful not to become a stumbling block to others and certainly not an encouragement for them to sin. As an analogy, I believe that drinking alcohol in moderation is fine. Although I will be honest with others about this, I'm not going to offer a glass of wine to someone who has struggled with drinking problems. I've not had the slightest inclination to get drunk, but I certainly should not give a beer--not a sin in and of itself--to someone who struggles with alcohol. While there are definite, unchanging standards for modesty, but there are also actions we can take simply to be considerate to others.”

“Now, I'm not a guy, but I don't think so. Yes, you're right about overdressing/underdressing, but changing how revealingly you dress depending on the situation doesn't seem to make sense. It's more like a double-standard that most of society has accepted but never thought through. It looks to me like guys' minds don't change modes depending on where they are, they think the same way at the beach and at school. I realized that when I was looking at swimsuits and I got a one-piece. It had a flippy skirt and I wore shorts, but the top was more revealing than any I've worn before. I realized that no matter where I was, I would not feel comfortable talking to a guy friend while I was wearing the swimsuit . . . So my experience shows that I need to dress the same no matter where I am . . . Will guys comment please?”

“Well, I just found this thread and it is asking for a dude's opinion on modesty so here I go. I do not believe that bikinis are ever ok. They were created to be provocative in my opinion. A girl can do what a girl wants to do when she is around other girls, but a whole mess of issues come into play when dudes are around. Granted, dudes can be more modest about keeping their shirts on and whereing loose fitting clothing, but it seems to me that girls sometimes may feel an urge to be more provocative to attract attention. To me, even a form fitting one piece can act as a stumbling block, or even a plunging neckline. All I'm saying is to think smart about what you where. Honestly, it would be quite difficult for me to talk to a girl where a bikini without my mind going in the gutter, even though I do my best to treat all women with respect. Maybe I'm just an easier one to distract than most, but I am human and I'm being honest. I hope this will help anyone who may be doubting the morals of wearing a bikini. I'm just gonna say DONT DO IT PLEASE! For all our sakes.”

“As girls, lust can definitely be a struggle! I do think that it's more of a struggle for guys, but girls can definitely struggle. My biggest thing would probably be when you show off your torso; your abs, in other words. For example, don't go shirtless...it's inconsiderate of us ladies. Second, those Spandex shirts. If they are displaying your ab muscles, that's hard, too. But that's just me. I know other girls who have trouble when you show off your legs and butt.

Obviously, you can't hide your legs anymore than you already do, unless you're gay and are wearing bootyshorts, but that isn't really a problem for us ;) Some of my friends tend to like the arms. I'm totally not asking you to cover up your arms, that would be ridiculous (just as ridiculous as when you ask us to wear skirts all the time and cover our shoulders. lol) Also remember that it has more to do with the way you display yourself (the way you walk, talk, your attitude, etc.) than what you're wearing. I've been to the pool when some of my guy friends just had on their Hollister trunks. And they were attractive guys. But it wasn't a problem, because they weren't carrying themselves in a way that said, "Look at me." Also remember that when you tell us things like wearing skirts all the time, because pants show off our legs too much and it's tempting for you. Reverse that. My friend has trouble with checking out guys legs...BOYS, GO PUT YO SKIRTS ON! You'd think we were insane and completely ridiculous. And I happen to find muscular shoulders, arms, and backs attractive...You need to wear sleeves all the time. That's what you guys tell us. So, just keep that in mind before you tell us to do something. :) But again, I know your brains are wired differently, so :) But honestly, it's more in how you carry yourself. My friend wears Spandex shirts, and he's a muscular dude, but he carries himself in a humble, non-attention-calling way, and it's not a problem :) Thanks, guys!"

"YES YES YES YES and YES!!! I completely agree with this post because honestly I feel that most modesty conversations assume that women don't struggle with lust which is NOT true in the least! THANK YOU!!"

"I am not religious at all, and a feminist to boot, but still believe in the value of modesty. The religious-based discussions about female modesty make my blood boil. When did we get this ridiculous notion in our heads that femininity was about restraint, and masculinity was about lack of it?!? Why would the Herculean task of keeping men's heads pure fall solely on women?! Thank you for this. I hope this line of thinking becomes more common among Christian followers."

"OH yeah. Actually, it's not really a case of 'he's sexy'. The problem lies more in 'that is quite an attractive view (if it's pecs etc.) and I know what sort of girl I look like if I continue to look at that view.' If the image ain't there I can't look, can I?"

"And it's vaguely frustrating in summertime - guys can go around shirtless and I can't. You mentioned speedos: there the problem is 'where do I look to avoid being rude?"

"Yay! Someone has finally tackled the subject from the girl's point of view! When guys walk around bare-chested, it makes it difficult for girls to stay pure in their thoughts."

“I have often wondered about guys though, and whether them going shirtless is really such a big deal. It never bothered me really, but I knew friends who it did bother. Walking on the beach so much I passed a lot of guys in only their swim trunks, and one thing I noticed is that I always looked everywhere BUT at them until they had passed . . . Why was that? I wasn't really attracted to guys' bare chests, so what was the big deal? I think it embarrassed me! The fact that they were showing so much skin was embarrassing to me, and I didn't want to look at them for fear they might think I wasn't looking at THEM, but at their chests! The very fact that I felt the need to guard my eyes suggests something to me.”

“(man speaking) I find discussions on modesty like this to be both absolutely hilarious and slightly disturbing. It seems like every ultra-conservative guy or gal considers something "immodest" that the average person would think is completely silly. For example, someone in this thread said that a guy wearing pants should not sit with his legs open. You have got to be kidding me, right? Then there are other people who would have the whole world swim in baggy pants and long sleeve shirts, just so they don't have to be "tempted" by the natural beauty of the human body while at the beach! Modesty is pure silliness that has no basis in philosophy. I'm so glad I got out of this culture of shame.”

“I find it EXTREMELY distracting when guys wear cutoff shirts that show just about everything that a shirt should cover, also guys skinny jeans are a big no, there tight and attract attention to places that we Christian girls don't want to be attracted to. And of course being shirtless and wearing low cut shorts have the same effect.”

“I'm so glad that this topic was brought up. When I read this article, the first verse that came to my mind was 1 Corinthians 6:20 - "For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." KJV”

I believe that this verse tells us as Christian brothers and sisters to honor Christ with our bodies. Girls stumble just as much as guys, and I definitely battle in keeping my mind pure when it comes to seeing guys topless or wearing speedos at the beach or pool. (or anywhere for that matter). Seeing a guy topless or in speedos definitely makes my mind wander. (Just the same as seeing a girl in bikinis)”

“Men’s modesty is a HUGE issue because nearly most families DON'T teach it or encourage it. It's my personal belief, but if I were a man, I wouldn't be taking my shirt off in public, I would not be readjusting myself in public in front of people, i would try my best not to sit so wide legged that it takes up two seats, would not be showing my boxers above the rim of my pants, and would certainly not roam any room etc in just my underwear (as men love and feel obligated to do). Even when men do these things, most Christian women I know 'try' to

respect them and look away elsewhere, sometimes we mess up but we make the effort. Now tell me if a woman walked in a room with just her underwear most Christian men wouldn't just look at her eagerly? And the excuse from most men is 'Well, she's asking for it.' What about them? We could make the same excuse 10-fold! Fact of life: every issue that man has ever gone through, women have experienced as well. Lust is most assuredly one of them. Wake up world."

"I know I'm off-subject...I guess my point is that women like me have been raised in a sub-culture of homeschooling that says we are to blame for the sin that our brothers and fathers commit. And that is wrong. Do I believe in submission? Yes, but my only, and I mean ONLY head is Jesus until I get married (and even then, we're co-pilots). I don't go to God through any patriarch. Do I believe in modesty? Yes. Because it is trashy to flaunt our curves, glorious as they may be, in inappropriate ways and especially in church. I don't want to be ogled and objectified. But I'm not responsible when men lust. And I am responsible for my own sin when I think guys are super hot, which happens fairly frequently, because I am a hormonal and single young woman without any man in her life except church folks. Big deal. Thank God for grace. Free grace. FREE grace."

"This is an excellent article, thank you. I have always thought of modesty as a "girl" issue. But, to be completely honest I struggle with lust toward men all the time. I usually notice them for their face, but speedos are definitely something that draws inappropriate attention."

"Well, to tell you the truth, a man's muscles do not turn me on. My thought may be, "He's been working out, or he's in good shape," and that's as far as it goes. And as far as tight jeans, shorts or swimsuits: I don't desire to see a profile of "the family jewels," and I am embarrassed for him when he shows them."

"While I appreciate your desire to equate the modesty issue here, I honestly believe that men are more visual than women in general, and the weight of being modest lies more on the Christian female in response to her wanting to honor God in the way she dresses, by showing respect to herself, and to her weak brothers . . .

Response to the above comment . . . "Please do not make light of other women's struggles. Men already think we are not visual, when you say this kind of thing it reinforces that misconception. I am personally a very visual woman, I struggle even when a man wears a sleeveless shirt. So please be careful."

"This was articulate and excellently put; I know as a young woman who has chosen to live for Jesus and remain pure for the man I will marry someday, that men not being modest can be a

distraction.”

“First off, I really appreciate this article. This is the first one I've ever seen on the subject of male modesty. And as a 19 year old woman (and sister to 3 brothers) I think I can say with the rest of the Christian female population that guys aren't the only ones who struggle with lust.”

“I know its been said, but I'll say it again: women are attracted to men physically. I know I am. Here's just one example to help. If you have really nice muscles, don't show them off, (like for women, if she has nice legs she still needs to cover them and not show them off). Rather, show your strength by using your muscles to serve the weak. Your humility will bring glory to Christ rather than yourself. So show your strength by your service. Use your muscles not to be blessed but to bless! Like I said earlier, modesty is a heart issue. If your fight in this life is to love God and others more than yourself then you will care about your purity and the influence you have on your sisters in Christ. Please care for us just as we care for you in this area.”

"Anything that you wear [or don't] which draws attention away from your face is immodest."

“This is spot on. It's the one thing that has always bothered me about the modesty survey and the whole modesty doctrine. Women shoulder the blame for men's sin, and men are completely let off the hook. I grew up hearing that boys want sex and girls want love, and that boys are more visually stimulated than girls, but I have never once found that to be true. A lot of girls in the church, myself included, would feel alone when we find ourselves struggling with lust. If I see an attractive guy, especially one at the beach, that's where my eyes go. Period. Obviously, my lust is my responsibility, and I would never think of blaming the man in this case. Why, then, are men generally let off the hook? Thank you for finally waking up to this issue. This needs to be heard.”

“Wow, I just almost cried in the library . . . *ahem* Anyway. I think with guys, as with girls, modesty is mostly a heart issue. If you're wearing something to show off your body, it is more likely to be immodest. Also, common sense. If the clothing you're wearing would be a problem for you if it was on a girl, consider that on you it may be a problem for girls. Most of the time it is really awkward for me if guys walk around shirtless when they are not at the beach, its almost as if they are trying to show off. It also makes me uncomfortable when guys sit with their legs extremely wide open. Really distracting.”

“As a single girl in my mid-20s, yes, at times it is a tough battle to keep eyes and heart pure, and takes a lot of prayer and eyes-down-moments. There are only a couple of things really - things out of correct context like shirt unbuttoned too far, muscle shirts/close fitting collared shirts, and hanging out shirtless (in the water is okay - but not very sun-safe anyway!!) coupled

with the guy's attitude and stance.”

“The point of modesty is to dress not for yourself, but for Christ? Even if your intent is to dress confidently, that doesn't mean that it won't be perceived as immodest by girls who are visually stimulated, and who are caused to stumble in their walk with the Lord. For example, the boy I'm dating (and hope to marry) is very skinny, and I find him very attractive! I don't think it's fair for girls to have to worry about the length of their skirts, or the highness of their collars, in the name of modesty, when guys can just say "I find a shirt uncomfortable" and do whatever they want? God's law is God's law, and should apply to both guys and girls!”

“It just annoys me when girls have such high standards, yet guys get off scotch free on such issues. My college for instance: They want girls to be feminine and modest. "Leave the guys something to the imagination." yet girls don't have one??? It's like, come on, people!”

“All people are different, and we all react differently to situations. Saying that all girls will react such-and-such a way to something is a stereotype, and isn't necessarily true. So the best thing (in my opinion) is to look to God to honor Him in all decisions rather than trying to please all people. I am a girl. I am very visually and kinesthetically stimulated, and I have quite the imagination, so if I so much as try to control my brain myself rather than giving it to God, my mind will wander into unwanted territory. Thank you, for getting this conversation going.”

“Thanks for the article! I see this double standard a lot. I think guys are missing it by saying that it's immodest for a girl to wear her sports bra to work out and they go shirtless or with one of those shirts cut down the sides. I don't want to show my body like that until I get married. But I think it's harder for a guy to go to the pool and cover up. I was a swimmer for many years and I'm used to seeing guys in speedos and I can honestly say I had a difficult time sometimes. I was attracted to their abs and girls would giggle if they had cute butts or not. I'm not sure if wearing a shirt at the pool is the answer, but I can say that wearing it as much as possible would be helpful! . . .

Response to the above comment . . . why should a guy have to help you??- let him wear what is comfortable to him- if speedos ensure the highest speed and it his swimming is his calling then you are actually interfering with God by trying to deem some things as modest and not others. Also different things can cause lust- some girls are turned off by speedoes and attracted to suits- should men then be banned from suits?- good luck with that...I think this is an excellent point. Asking men and women to dress a certain way to help us with our own sin is even more sinful. Modest dress is a cultural thing, not a biblical one. Your attitude and your intentions are much more important than your dress.”

“First off, thank you for writing this article. Some of my hardest moments have been with Christian males, who don't seem bothered at all with how they are presenting themselves in front of girls...I understand that guys who work out are proud of the results, but if a female were to act the same way, she would be labelled immodest immediately. If more men would stop and ask themselves (and God) what message they are actually sending by acting/dressing in a certain manner, it would go a really long way. Honestly though, (and here I'm addressing the ladies who have been so witty and sarcastic and funny, but irreverent just the same). Please show a semblance of respect for some people who have serious struggles in this area. I think it is a lot a matter of respect, for guys and girls. Respecting the other and making it easy on them and also respecting their body by keeping our mind under control. It is definitely a heart issue and has to do with loving one another and desiring to serve God with our bodies and thoughts.”

“I absolutely agree here. Girls are definitely attracted to guys' bodies and it's frustrating that we always have to be conscious of modesty when guys don't seem to be held to the same standard.”

“Basically, the same principles of modesty that apply to girls should apply to guys as well. WHAT you wear is always important, but also HOW you wear it and your attitude about it. That makes a big difference. Please just try to treat us as you'd like us to treat you. Thank you for this post, it was really great!”

“A big hearty thank you for writing this! I've been waiting for someone to address this topic. I get pretty frustrated when guys expect the girls around them to dress modestly when they don't give a rip to how they are being a huge stumbling block themselves. Guys definitely need to be more sensitive and examine their motives.”

“Kudos for posting this article . . . I can't even begin to tell you what a relief it is to know that I am not the only person on earth who struggles with guys dressing immodestly. I know that it is hard for me to go to a concert where some guy is wearing skinny jeans, it is just hard.”

“I would bring up a double standard, and at the moment I can't remember if you addressed it or not--when it's assumed that men lust, and it's not addressed as embarrassing and disrespectful to the women, but when a woman admits her sinful desires for men, it is often looked on as inappropriate and perverted. Women have eyes, too, and they struggle with a lot of the same sin issues. Bringing women into the discussion makes us feel appreciated and respected, so thank you, Brett, for your humility and bravery in posting this article. I am also very pleased and surprised to find no negative or bitter-sounding comments on this post so

far!"

"Thanks so much for posting this! It's ironic. I was just talking to a girlfriend about modesty . . . And for me, it is embarrassing to admit that I'm very affected to how guys dress. I go to a Bible college and I feel that if I bring something up about male modesty, I'll be seen as a pervert of women. I'm sure that has a lot to do with my insecurities... but I do, at least in this environment, feel that pressure. Girls are seen as very innocent and pure, or not."

"Exactly! It is embarrassing and scary for me to admit my sin in this area--as a matter of fact, I've kept it as secret as I possibly could the entire four years I struggled intensely with this issue. It hurts me, then, when the lust of men is excused as either the woman is not dressed modestly enough, or as 'boys will be boys', quoting from Ann Voskamp's letter to her son. I would call that disrespectful toward women, and I feel hurt that my sins are magnified and theirs are made to look smaller--in God's eyes every sin is just as big as any other."

"I don't think it's ridiculous for guys to wear shirts over their suits. I would never swim topless (talk about immodesty!) or even in a bikini. And if a guy thinks his bare chest and stomach is less of a stumbling block than mine... well, he should spend some time looking through my eyes . . .

Response to the above comment . . . Yep! Awesome point! That's why (among other reasons), I always wear a shirt when I'm swimming in mixed company. It's showing the same respect that we ask to be shown to us."

"You put this so well! Thanks for your input. I know that many girls struggle with physical lust just as much (just differently) than guys. I have many friends who have tons of pics of celebs shirtless, or in really tight clothes."

"Guys who wear button down shirts too buttoned down. College guys seem to like to have that "white collar look" of a nice dress shirt unbutton just one botton shy of the normal "dress-casual open collar look". It feels a little flirtatious or at least temps ladies to look there. Also guys need to be aware of how they sit. There is a social acceptance to guys sitting with legs spread. No problem there, but when sitting right across from a lady...do us a favor guys...close the legs a little please. You don't have to sit like Pee-wee Herman but a little consideration would be helpful. Great article. It is about time I think we start balancing the conversation. Thanks!"

"Yes! Postures is important to us girls. As said, please close your legs if sitting across from a girl." **{End of Comments}**

These comments reveal how women do in fact lust because of tight jeans, sitting with legs spread apart, bending over in jeans. These are stumbling blocks because "the area" (as one lady posted), is not covered. They communicate that women are offended and disrespected by men's dress or lack of dress. They reveal a double standard.

"And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind. And some of the Pharisees which were with him heard these words, and said unto him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth" (John 9:39-41). If you endorse a hypocritical standard, and you see your immodesty as modest, and you justify yourself when confronted about these things, your sins of hypocrisy and immodesty will remain.

I hope those comments above, coupled together with Biblical examples, and the many Scriptures which call men to modesty of heart, will help men to understand their need to be modest. As sincere men of God we must take these things seriously.

"And do ye all things without murmurings and disputings: That you may be blameless and sincere children of God, without reproof, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation: among whom you shine as lights in the world" (Philippians 2:14-15). "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matthew 7:12). These scriptures cover "all of the above" concerning the issue of modesty.

As many as walk according to the truth in this document (God knows all of what is true), peace *be* on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.

Sincerely, David Valderrama

Matthew 24:18, Mark 13:16](Add to the scriptures section)

Dear Reader, please consider what you have read. You now only have two directions you can go: backwards or forwards.

I have other chapters I would like to add if I have time which will include more Scripture, History, and Reason, Lord willing.