

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Modesty for men! But how far?****Modesty for men! But how far? - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/24 20:38**

Hi brethren,

A thread on this subject may have already been discussed but nevertheless I would like to post this.

In some of the conservative movements the women are covered and modest. But the men are dressed in worldly appare I are indistinguishable from non-believers. This is wrong and hypocritical.

A few questions for all of us to dwell on...

1. How was our Lord Jesus clothed? In a pair of shorts and no shirt? Not at all. Just the thought sounds like a hippy Jesu s and blasphemous. Our Jesus, (Our example), was and is clothed like this: "And in the midst of the seven candle sticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle" (Rev . 1:13).

Christ is a man, think we would all agree on that, and His body is fully covered.

Garment: Poderes (4158); a garment reaching down to the feet, almost the same as stole (4749).

2. In the beginning of the church the followers of Christ were clothed far more than the modern watered down church. It a shame.

When Jesus was giving the New Covenant laws in Matthew 5 He spoke on clothing. "And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." (Matthew 5:40)

These early disciples that Jesus spoke these words to were wearing two garments at the same time.

Coat: Chiton (5509) tunic or shirt, Inner garment.

Cloak: Himation (2440) a loose upper garment.

The point is that God intends us men to be double layered.

3. One more argument for men being double layered is found in John 21:7. "Therefore the disciple whom Jesus loved sa ith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fishers coat unto him, (for he was nak ed,) and did cast himself into the sea."

Peter was not un clothed in the boat with the guys. No, he was considered naked by the Lord for he was only wearing hi s under garment. The Greek proves this fact...

Naked: Gumnos (1131) naked or striped of the upper garment (John 21:7; Acts 19:16).

What did he put on to cover up?

Coat: Ependutes (1903) an outer garment.

Therefore Peter knew that he was naked, but he still had his "Chiton" on. He was covered by our corrupt standards, but not before the living God. Hence he put on a second layer.

Please give input on this subject, (scripture to refute this claim), for I have not made a decision on this matter. I'm waiting for a word from God. Keep in mind I don't submit to this standard as of yet so I would really appreciate a counter argume nt with scripture not opinion please.

May God be glorified through His own, bro Doug

Re: Modesty for men! But how far? - posted by daniel- (), on: 2006/9/25 11:25

Hi,

what exactly do you mean with "double layered"?
How would you suggest clothing in practice referring to "double layered" ?
Do i have to wear 2 t-shirts?
I am not kidding, just curious about this.

greetz
daniel

Re: Modesty for men! But how far?, on: 2006/9/25 12:30

I would say that if I was running around in my underwear I would be naked without a doubt.
So it was his undies and he had to put his overgarment back on.

I believe that men need to be modest and discrete and unwordly in their attire.
The scriptural call is directed to women because men are primarily visual where as women are primarily emotional in appeal. Now of course a woman is also attracted to a man's physique as is a man to a woman's personality.

A good model for men to display modesty would be this. shirts that are moderate and do not overly accent the muscles.
Tank tops and sleeveless shirts would not be good.
Pants should not be tight nor overly loose, (big baggy pants that hang down, this is worldly).

To extremes would be Amish we know what that's like. or southern California beach christian ready for the surf dude in speedo shorts and long wavy ted nugent hair!

The model I laid out is a good general moderate approach to displaying a modest christian appearance.

I'm sure even then someone will cry legalism, but then they would say that about women trying to be modest as well. God bless, John

Re:, on: 2006/9/25 12:33

oh and one more thing. We do this to GLORIFY GOD.
Anytime we are obedient to him we glorify Him. Testifying that we are a peculiar people set apart for him.

Re: Modesty for men! But how far? - posted by Flash_red (), on: 2006/9/25 17:05

While talking about dressing modestly, it is important to remember two things:

- 1.) We have freedom in Christ from the Law, which included a form of a dress code (see Galatians)
- 2.) Our choices should reflect a genuine desire to glorify God, and not cause others to stumble all the while maintaining patience with those whose faith is weak (see Romans 14).

I see little reason to think that Christ ever desired for His followers to dress in the same manner that He did. He never mentions dress standards, instead focusing on acting as He acted and following His commands. Since none of His commands deal with clothes, it should be noted that each Christian should adhere to personal conviction from the Holy Spirit at all times remembering others and their struggles with the sin of lust.

Re: - posted by daniel- (), on: 2006/9/25 18:13

amen.

sometimes i get the impression that we set some "standards" we think reflect holiness but have nothing to do with holiness.

we are not to live under a set of regulations.

i am not implying that i can run around naked :)hope you get my point.

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2006/9/25 18:13

let's be careful not to use primarily narrative scriptures to form doctrines, especially when the narrative really has nothing to do with the doctrine we are trying to form. I'm sure what John saw Jesus wearing in his revelation has much more symbolic significance to Jesus being Messiah/King/Judge than give us an idea as to how we are supposed to dress. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus was addressing our actions toward God and others, not dress codes. In the passage from John, the motives for Peter putting on his coat are not discussed, and Jesus never chastises him for sinning in front of John.

Are we to dress in a way that is modest (not in any way "showing off" our bodies) and glorifying to God? Of course, always. Are we to watch out for our sisters when we dress? Absolutely. But let's be careful how we form such doctrines, and twist not the scriptures ;)

Re:, on: 2006/9/25 18:26

Good words BeYeDoers.

Let everything be established by two or three witness.

And they gave themselves to the apostles teaching

Paul who proclaims himself a teacher to the gentiles in book of Timothy then goes on to declare how women are to dress for modesty sake.

Peter echoes basically the same thing in his letter.

The call to modesty not only in dress but in inward parts is there. There for the purpose of glorifying God.

The call to modesty is not a call to "legalism" but rather to freedom. Freedom from the lust of the flesh, lust of the eye, and boastful pride of life. Paul taught this in all the churches.

The prescription I gave for modesty comes from years of having fellowshiped with both Assemblies of God, non denominational fellowships, Home fellowships Mennonite fellowships, and Baptist fellowships. For what it's worth.

God bless, john

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/25 22:36

Hi Flash,

You said,

Quote:
-----I see little reason to think that Christ ever desired for His followers to dress in the same manner that He did. He never mentions dress standards, instead focusing on acting as He acted and following His commands. Since none of His commands deal with clothes,

Sorry, but you are not correct. Paul spoke of a standard for modesty in 1 Timothy 2:9.

"In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel..."

Modest in this verse is, Kosmios (2887) Orderly, decent. That word alone shows that Christian clothing is to be clean and

king and orderly.

The word for apparel is, Katastole (2689) Loose outer garment. This garment was a double layered, (at the top), dress that covered the entire body down to the feet.

So there is a standard of dress for believers.

Another interesting fact is that when dress is mentioned in the Bible, a second layer is put on the top half of the human body. Hence the double coverage.

You also said,

Quote:

-----1.) We have freedom in Christ from the Law, which included a form of a dress code (see Galatians)

We do have freedom from Torah. But that does not mean that this principle is nothing. No, the problem for your argument is that you aren't looking for where God did command His followers to dress different from this world. As I said before can you find one scripture that clearly refutes this? Please do not use that liberal argument concerning the law being fulfilled. Do you not know that the law was replaced by an even higher standard?

In Christ, bro Doug

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/25 23:29

BeYeDoers said,

Quote:

-----I'm sure what John saw Jesus wearing in his revelation has much more symbolic significance to Jesus being Messiah/King/Judge than give us an idea as to how we are supposed to dress.

I'm very glad that you pointed this out. But let me ask you a question... How do you know that this is not to be taken literal for an application?

The very fact that Christ's clothing is so emphasized reveals the truth shown through His image to His followers. When Christ performed the first communion service His disciples knew that they were to continue in that "symbolic" rite. Would you not agree? Christ's actions are powerful and applicable. When the elders and chief priests struck Him did He resist them? No, our God practices what He preaches.

Again you have spoken truth.

Quote:

-----In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus was addressing our actions toward God and others, not dress codes.

Have you not heard that our actions speak louder than words? The clothing that a person wears is a clear witness to this fallen world. In America the people are so quick to throw off their clothes and glory in their flesh. In our every day life they could be no more better a witness "seen" than a Christian in modest plainer apparel. This is the reason why God even put this verse in Matthew 5. Jesus is speaking on retaliation but He speaks a few examples to His disciples.

1. "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Jesus warns us here of the coming persecutions.
2. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, (inner garment) let him have thy cloak (upper outer garment) also. Jesus expected His follower to be brought before courts. And He uses a common held practice, (modest dual covering), as an example of this.

The fact that a dual layered garment is mentioned in Matthew 5 shows that it was a common practice. Only in later times

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Modesty for men! But how far?

have people grown so immodest as to throw caution to the wind. Not to long back a man could be kicked off a public beach for not wearing a modest shirt.

I do not necessarily use this text to prove a commandment but rather to show a Godly higher standard.

Quote:
-----In the passage from John, the motives for Peter putting on his coat are not discussed, and Jesus never chastises him for sinning in front of John.

Nor did Jesus chasten Peter for denying Him. Does that mean that its ok to deny Christ at the drop of a hat? I think not. I could easily say that the reason for Jesus not rebuking Peter for shedding off his upper garment is because peter repented and put it back on. At that time some the disciples of Christ were somewhat in a state of disbelief and (if we should be double covered), disobedience, Mark 16:11, 15:13.

Quote:
-----Are we to dress in a way that is modest (not in any way "showing off" our bodies) and glorifying to God? Of course, always. Are we to watch out for our sisters when we dress? Absolutely. But let's be careful how we form such doctrines, and twist not the scriptures

I appreciate your warning and exhortation :-) But I must also say that this is not a "newly" formed doctrine since the early believers held to it.

May God be glorified through us, bro Doug

Re: - posted by Flash_red (), on: 2006/9/26 15:46

Quote:
-----Sorry, but you are not correct. Paul spoke of a standard for modesty in 1 Timothy 2:9.

Thanks bro Doug. I apologize for the lack of clarification. I meant a clear directive specifically for men from Christ himself. I understand the ideas of double layering, and I also apologize for the "liberal argument." Please remember that different translations have a different word in 1 Timothy 2:9 (Greek word "himation" meaning clothing, cloak, robe). Perhaps I could explain more of what I meant by that. Christ desires that we shun the fashion fads and immoral clothing of the world when He calls us to be set apart for Him. Nor should we, as believers, in any way adorn ourselves in a self-glorifying manner. The thing I fear is that strong, well-intentioned Christians would become a new form of hyperspiritual with regards to dress standards. Rather than bearing with patience the weaknesses of fellow believers and seeking peace and mutual edification, we would become the "Christian elitists" who scorn and mock those who dress immodestly. I know this may sound ridiculous or even stupid, but I have this silly fear. By completely abstaining from modern dress, would not people be drawing attention to themselves by how strange they look to the modern eye? Are we suppose to dress in the exact same manner as Jesus did? The line between modesty and immodesty is definite, and we should not dress like the world in every way yet some say (as one example) that any type of jeans is immodest on women!?! I need to be taught where these ideas come from so that I may pray about it and search the Scripture for Christ's desire for me. Thanks for the corrections!

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/26 21:01

No problem Flash,

You said,

Quote:
-----I need to be taught where these ideas come from so that I may pray about it and search the Scripture for Christ's desire for me.

This scripture can be located in Deuteronomy 22:5. "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto men, neither shall

hall a man put on a women's garment: for all that do so are abominable unto the Lord thy God."

A little digging into history shows that until not to long ago, (concerning jeans/pants) they were only worn by men. Through most of human history men and women have had differing apparel, not just styles. It wasn't until our parents/parents generation has this Biblically inspired division among men and women taken shape. It can be summed up to satan trying to undermine Gods divine authority and the authority given to govern man.

Talk to you in future posts, bro Doug

Re: Modesty for men! But how far? - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/9/27 0:27

Quote:

-----2. In the beginning of the church the followers of Christ were clothed far more than the modern watered down church.

Hi Doug, has it occurred to you that they were not likely dressed any different than anyone else in their day? No need to go into semantics here, but think your whole premise is flawed. You cannot start with an assumption derived from a couple of off hand mentions of clothing in scripture and then set that up as a straw-man to knock back down. (*"Please give input on this subject, (scripture to refute this claim)"*),

Quote:

-----The point is that God intends us men to be double layered.

That's quite an assumption.

Quote:

-----1. How was our Lord Jesus clothed? In a pair of shorts and no shirt? Not at all. Just the thought sounds like a hippy Jesus and blasphemous.

Considering that we don't wear tunics these day's how are you going to support the rest of your hypothetical? Besides, other than the particular constraints associated with my present employment, or in other words, submission to those above me, I would still have my long "hippy" hair, it just happens to work for the shape of my head and I prefer it to be quite honest. All that to say I think you are putting far too much emphasis on the wrong thing. If this is such a bother to you I can understand your convictions, but remember they are yours;

Col 2:16 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

Col 2:17 Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.

Col 2:18 Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind,

Col 2:19 And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

Col 2:20 Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,

Col 2:21 (Touch not; taste not; handle not;

Col 2:22 Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?

Col 2:23 Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.

1Pe 2:16 As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.

Didn't feel it necessary to speak of the semantics as the overt ought to be enough for each man bearing his own conscience. If you really wanted to get an understanding of the dress in the times of the Lord and the apostles I believe it is available with a bit of research. But as it stands here I think you are making some very poor comparisons.

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/27 16:07

Hi crsschk,

you said,

Quote:

-----has it occurred to you that they were not likely dressed any different than anyone else in their day?

That is a good question. Back when I still watched tv I remember seeing a special on the history channel about Roman culture. The historians that described the forms of dress spoke of the pagans walking about with little to no clothing on (not all). As for Jewish culture in that day, a harlot could be seen easily even though they were wearing the same or close apparel. They would slice a slit from the waist down the garment so that their legs could then be seen.

As it stands now, you have given me no counter argument except the same liberal one that I used all my life until God reached down and snatched away the desires to be worldly. What we do on the outside of our bodies is just as important as the inside.

You said,

Quote:

-----But as it stands here I think you are making some very poor comparisons.

No offense brother but you have given absolutely no counter argument to refute what little I do have. Can you give accurate scripture to refute this argument. I must say that the burden of proof rests on you. As I said before, only counter scripture that is applicable to this one subject. Have you any? I'm totally honest with you brother, I want more knowledge on this subject. I want an effective argument to demolish this argument so as to prove it right or wrong.

Quote:

-----why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,

The early disciples were subject to this, why not ourselves? I am more than happy to submit to God and His commands and the teachings of the apostles. (Including lifestyle)

As for hair, "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? (1 Cor. 11:14). Not trying to rag on you or anyone else but I am exhorting.

Quote:

-----Considering that we don't wear tunics these days how are you going to support the rest of your hypothetical?

The principal apply's today. The question is not about tunics, but rather how one would wear it. Understand me? The same is true for us 2000 years later. Why so much opposition to this if you have it all figured out? Please give clear concise evidence so as to prove this argument false.

Quote:

-----then set that up as a straw-man to knock back down.

Sure I can. I want advice in argument format.

In Christ Jesus, bro Doug

Re: - posted by elias, on: 2006/9/29 16:57

I've already told this to you Dougmore, so this is mostly for the benefit of the others.

It seems hard for me to believe that this would be something we are supposed to be doing since all there is in scripture to support it is an allusion in John 21:7. Also, nakedness is a sin; Whenever God spoke of nakedness in scripture or gave commands against it, he never mentioned this as falling within the category of nakedness. I believe that if God wants us to do something (or not to do something) he clearly lays it out in scripture. Especially if it is a sin, such as nakedness. I

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/29 21:35

elias,

Are you able to bring scripture to the table that clearly contradicts the practice of dual covering? We both would agree that God has given commands that deal with double covering, women's dress, and women's hair and covering. It is in the nature of God to have this for man. I understand that this is not a clear command and may for that matter not be one at all. But the early church did do this, and when we see other scriptures relating to dual covering, not to mention those that throw off a layer were considered naked. (In the eyes of man and God)

To conclude, this may be a Spirit led conviction and most of all we must not let it divide the body.

The fact that the disciples were double covered at that time reveals how far man has fallen from the fear of God and appearance in front of others.

In Christ, bro Doug

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/9/29 23:32

Joh 21:7 Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea.

His fisher's coat - His upper or outer garment or tunic, in distinction from the inner garment or tunic which was worn next the skin. In the case of Peter it may have been made of coarse materials such as fishermen commonly wore, or such as Peter usually wore when he was engaged in this employment. Such garments are common with men of this occupation. This outer garment he probably had laid aside.

He was naked - He was undressed, with nothing on but the undergarment or tunic. The word does not require us to suppose a greater degree of nakedness than this. See the Mar_14:51 note; also 1Sa_19:24 note.

Did cast himself into the sea - With characteristic ardor, desirous of meeting again his Lord, and showing his affection for him.

Albert Barnes

he girt his fisher's coat unto him. The Greek word ἵματιον, here used, is manifestly the ἵματιον of the Hebrews; and which, the Jewish writers say (b), was a strait garment, which a man put on next his flesh to dry up the sweat; and a very proper one for Peter, who had been toiling all night, and very fit for him to swim in; and, by what follows, appears to be put on him next his flesh:

for he was naked; for to suppose him entirely naked, whilst fishing, being only in company with men, and those parts of nature having a covering, which always require one, was not at all indecent and unbecoming:

and did cast himself into the sea; the Syriac adds, "that he might come to Christ"; and the Persic, "and he came to Christ"; showing his great love and eagerness to be with him; and, as fearless of danger, risks all to be with Christ; his love being such, that many waters could not quench, nor floods drown.

John Gill

Dress

1. Materials used. The earliest and simplest an apron of fig-leaves sewed together (Gen. 3:7); then skins of animals (3:21). Elijah's dress was probably the skin of a sheep (2 Ki. 1:8). The Hebrews were early acquainted with the art of weaving hair into cloth (Ex. 26:7; 35:6), which formed the sackcloth of mourners. This was the material of John the Baptist's robe (Mt. 3:4). Wool was also woven into garments (Lev. 13:47; Dt. 22:11; Ezek. 34:3; Job 31:20; Pr. 27:26). The Israelites probably learned the art of weaving linen when they were in Egypt (1 Chr. 4:21). Fine linen was used in the vestments of the high priest (Ex. 28:5), as well as by the rich (Gen. 41:42; Pr. 31:22; Lk. 16:19). The use of mixed material, as wool and flax, was forbidden (Lev. 19:19; Dt. 22:11).

2. Colour. The prevailing colour was the natural white of the material used, which was sometimes rendered purer by the fuller's art (Ps. 104:1; 2; Isa. 63:3; Mk. 9:3). The Hebrews were acquainted with the art of dyeing (Gen. 37:3; 23; Various modes of ornamentation were adopted in the process of weaving (Ex. 28:6; 26:1; 31; 35:25), and by needle-work (Judg. 5:30; Ps. 45:13). Dyed robes were imported from foreign countries, particularly from Phoenicia (Zeph. 1:8). Purple and scarlet robes were the marks of the wealthy (Lk. 16:19; 2 Sam. 1:24).

3. Form. The robes of men and women were not very much different in form from each other.

a. The "coat" (kethoneth), of wool, cotton, or linen, was worn by both sexes. It was a closely-fitting garment, resembling in use and form our shirt (Jn. 19:23). It was kept close to the body by a girdle (Jn. 21:7). A person wearing this "coat" alone was described as naked (1 Sam. 19:24; Isa. 20:2; 2 Ki. 6:30; Jn. 21:7); deprived of it he would be absolutely naked.

b. A linen cloth or wrapper (sadin) of fine linen, used somewhat as a night-shirt (Mk. 14:51). It is mentioned in Judg. 14:12; 13, and rendered there "sheets"

c. An upper tunic (meil), longer than the "coat" (1 Sam. 2:19; 24:4; 28:14). In 1 Sam. 28:14 it is the mantle in which Samuel was enveloped; in 1 Sam. 24:4 it is the "robe" under which Saul slept. The disciples were forbidden to wear two "coats" (Mt. 10:10; Lk. 9:3).

d. The usual outer garment consisted of a piece of woollen cloth like a Scotch plaid, either wrapped round the body or thrown over the shoulders like a shawl, with the ends hanging down in front, or it might be thrown over the head so as to conceal the face (2 Sam. 15:30; Esther 6:12). It was confined to the waist by a girdle, and the fold formed by the overlapping of the robe served as a pocket (2 Ki. 4:39; Ps. 79:12; Hag. 2:12; Pr. 17:23; 21:14).

4. Female dress. The "coat" was common to both sexes (Song 5:3). But peculiar to females were

1. the "veil" or "wimple," a kind of shawl (Ruth 3:15; rendered "mantle," R.V., Isa. 3:22);

2. the "mantle," also a species of shawl (Isa. 3:22);

3. a "veil," probably a light summer dress (Gen. 24:65);

4. a "stomacher," a holiday dress (Isa. 3:24). The outer garment terminated in an ample fringe or border, which concealed the feet (Isa. 47:2; Jer. 13:22).

5. The dress of the Persians is described in Dan. 3:21.

The reference to the art of sewing are few, inasmuch as the garments generally came forth from the loom ready for being worn, and all that was required in the making of clothes devolved on the women of a family (Pr. 31:22; Acts 9:39).

Extravagance in dress is referred to in Jer. 4:30; Ezek. 16:10; Zeph. 1:8; (R.V., "foreign apparel"); 1 Tim. 2:9; 1 Pet. 3:3. Rendering the robes was expressive of grief (Gen. 37:29; 34), fear (1 Ki. 21:27), indignation (2 Ki. 5:7), or despair (Judg. 11:35; Esther 4:1).

Shaking the garments, or shaking the dust from off them, was a sign of renunciation (Acts 18:6); wrapping them round the head, of awe (1 Ki. 19:13) or grief (2 Sam. 15:30); casting them off, of excitement (Acts 22:23); laying hold of them, of supplication (1 Sam. 15:27; 652

79;). In the case of travelling, the outer garments were girded up (﻿1 Ki. 18:46﻿). They were thrown aside also when they would impede action (﻿Mk. 10:50﻿; ﻿Jn. 13:4﻿; ﻿Acts 7:58 ﻿).

Easton.

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2006/9/30 1:46

I am posting a link to an article that is relevant to the present discussion.

http://www.sliceoflaodicea.com/archives/2006/09/when_jesus_come.php#comments

If we are truly saved, we should not look like a child of Satan. It is sad that for some, this has to be stated.

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/30 9:37

Hi crsschk,

I have read those commentators, and many others, before I posted this thread.

Quote:

-----4. Female dress. The "coat﻿â" was common to both sexes (﻿Song 5:3﻿).

This is my point...

The 1 Timothy passage concerning female dress commands that Christian women dress in two layers. So also it is/was common for men to do the same.

Thanks brother for the info, plan to print it out.

In Christ, bro Doug

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/30 9:45

Hi TrueWitness,

Thanks for the site. I read the article and agree with the author on the necessity of Christian dress being different than worldly dress.

I guess the true question for all of us is, How far are believers to go away from worldly dress? This is a gray area that brings out a lot of opinions and vary little scripture. I personally don't believe that believers should wear shorts and go without sleeves down to the elbow. We must be considerate to our sisters in Christ. We mustn't tempt them in this way. And the same for them to us. Our clothes must be different than the world so that they can be a witness and set us apart from the infidel.

In Christ, bro Doug

Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/9/30 10:33

Dougmore, Greetings,

The "dress code" in 1Tim mentions "decency, modesty, sensibleness, and inextravagance", and all this, truly can be subjective. Even 'liberal' can be subjective. What's liberal or modest to you may not be to me....Only the individual conscience towards God in Christ can guide us away from all this subjectivity.

An older man wearing shorts vs. a younger man wearing shorts, someone living by the equator wearing shorts vs someone wearing shorts in North Pole.....the list goes on.

I agree very much with all of your exhortations on this issue especially for my gender, except with the considerations of culture and weather, for it does cause me grief whenever I see ladies adorning themselves in contrary to the admonitions of ITim.

But, in a 3-digit temperature outdoor setting, I for one would not want to be sitting, next to anyone all covered up, doing that alone will cause me to feel physically uncomfortable, in hot weather, just looking at an over dressed person makes it all the hotter. Sensible?

Point being, there is no need to carry on and on and on about the dress codes, just like everything else in any believer's walk in the Lord, conviction comes by the Word and the Spirit, even so, at different times, and under different circumstances.

Would it sound right if I start a thread, " should Christians chew gum while assembling?" or " Should Christians wear red or blue..or wheat or white?" Is using fragrances or deodorants biblical"? (Oh yeah, I've even encountered a person who's against the use of deodorant !!)

We know this world and it's church buildings are waxing worse and worse, but as for individual Christians, all admonitions and guidelines pertaining to externality will only be complied when the person's internal condition is in alignment with the Word.

There once was a God-loving man that went to the church building we used to go, while everyone dressed pristinely and conservatively, this man, a minority man, dressed very sloppily and on Sunday nights, he would always come in casual long shorts with a big hawaiian shirt. The rest of the man there 'hate' him for this. But you know what, I happened to find him a genuine and passionate soul who loves the LORD a great deal through other observations. And no, it's not his shorts that had tempted me to support him, this was an elderly man, who might just happen to be poorer or poorly educated. We'd enjoy continue fellowship with this man if he hadn't finally left, far better than with those other layer-clothed, pious, "holy-looking" ones there. The ones with sort of " the form of godliness ",the properly dressed Pharisees.

To me, a layer-clothed man/woman manifests just that, a layered body, it indicates not the spirit and soul of the person. Nothing more! Carry this too far will easily induce self-pride. Any time we pass judgment on others' externality, aside from overt indecency and vulgarity, might bring judgment upon ourselves when we judge one-sidedly. Remember where Paul taught against judging others " food and drink "? (the external preferences of others).?

Re: Missing the point - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/9/30 12:26

I disagree with all of your deductions Doug. You have gone well past anything remotely scriptural with all this from the onset. You brought forth an argument based on a supposition then ask for a proving of it wrong by scripture. The evidence is yours to bear, not the other way around. You have a faulty understanding of terms, what is constituting 'nakedness' amongst others, attempt to take exhortations to woman and apply them to men, and fail to realize that you are bringing forth a leagлизм that *you* would bestow on everyone else. Hardly is it advice you are seeking, only support for a faulty argument and argument for arguments sake. If you truly want to carry this out to it's logical conclusions there are any number of laws that you can strain gnats at. This is beyond absurd and a practical pragmatism at best.

To over emphasize what constitutes modesty for men in this fashion is to miss the forest for the trees. Just as well, your penchant for tossing about labels, i.e. 'infidels' and other insinuations exposes a pride and haughtiness that no amount of clothing is going to disguise. Get your facts straight and pay a visit to Matthew 23 again.

Listen to what others are trying to say to you.

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/30 15:41

Brother Mike,

I want to make it clear to you and all other viewers that I DON't practice this dual covering. I know people that do and it seems that their argument is not able to hold up. This makes me some what glad you see, for I'm a framer and two layers would be extremely hot in the summer.

The thought of dual layering was vary convicting at first and all of the posts on this thread have given me much insight. I

have been searching the scriptures and found in John 13:4 a verse that can disprove double coverings for men.

In Christ, bro Doug

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/9/30 16:31

Quote:
-----I want to make it clear to you and all other viewers that I DON't practice this dual covering. I know people that do and it seems that their argument is not able to hold up.

Hold on a second, that is not what you have been saying whatsoever or otherwise you are now in a catch-22 of not practicing what you preach. On top of that you were forwarding the same argument that you now say can't be held up? Now you may have changed your mind as you have alluded, or you are equivocating.

Quote:
-----I personally don't believe that believers should wear shorts and go without sleeves down to the elbow. We must be considerate to our sisters in Christ. We mustn't tempt them in this way. And the same for them to us. Our clothes must be different than the world so that they can be a witness and set us apart from the infidel.

It's going to take a lot more than clothes and if that is your conviction that's fine, have a bit of trouble still where your heart is ...

But the LORD said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart.

1 Samuel 16:7

Romans 14

1 Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.

2 For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs.

3 Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him.

4 Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

5 One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

6 He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks.

7 For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself.

8 For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.

9 For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

10 But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.

ment seat of Christ.

11For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

12So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.

13Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or an occasion to fall in his brother's way.

14I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is nothing unclean of itself: but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

15But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.

16Let not then your good be evil spoken of:

17For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.

18For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God, and approved of men.

19Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

20For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.

21It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.

22Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.

23And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.

There is still the weightier matters brother.

Re: - posted by Dougmore, on: 2006/9/30 18:09

Mike,

Quote:
-----Hold on a second, that is not what you have been saying whatsoever or otherwise you are now in a catch-22 of not practicing what you preach.

Perhaps you didn't read my first post other wise you wouldn't be so quick to say this.

I said,

Quote:
-----"Please give input on this subject, (scripture to refute this claim), for I have not made a decision on this matter. I'm waiting for a word from God. Keep in mind I don't submit to this standard as of yet so I would really appreciate a counter argument with scripture not opinion please."

Why are you accusing me of not doing what I preach? Did I once on this entire thread tell one brother that he must do something (double covering) when I myself honestly said in my first post that "I" don't do this practice.

Quote:
----- have a bit of trouble still where your heart is ...

"Where is your heart?"

You seem very apt to accuse me of judging others and yourself when I have done no such thing. But who has really not been practicing what they preach? That's as far as I'm going there because this is getting ridiculous.

Let us stop the stupid word battle for we both sound like two five year olds filling the air with accusations.

And before you start throwing at me "judge not" you throw it at your own self and then if you will not be making a rash judgement, then throw it at me. What ever we intend to say to each other we need to examine that area in our own lives.

There is no problem here, we shouldn't try to make one.

bro Doug

Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/10/1 1:03

Doug,

Quote:
-----Let us stop the stupid word battle for we both sound like two five year olds filling the air with accusations

Philippians 2:3

Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem *other* better than themselves.

sorry to interrupt :)

Just because Crsschk, while doing his job in the Lord as a Moderator didn't agree with you, and tried to help you see certain things, there was no need to belittle yourself or him as the above.

I assure you, Crsschk is not the type of moderators that casually throw "rash judgments" on forum members, not during my time on SI anyways. I have always noticed his forbearance and compassion in his posts for others as a moderator.

mamaluk