

ARE OUR CLOTHES IMPORTANT?

GENESIS 3:6

6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

GENESIS 3:7

7 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 3:8

8 And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden.

GENESIS 3:9

9 And the LORD God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou?

GENESIS 3:10

10 And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.

GENESIS 3:6

6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

GENESIS 3:7

7 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.

APRONS: chagowr {khag-ore'} girdle, belt, loin-covering, belt, loin-cloth,

GENESIS 3:10

10 And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.

GENESIS 3:20

20 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.

GENESIS 3:21

21 Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God make *COATS of skins, and clothed them.

COATS: kthoneth {keth-o'-neth} tunic, under-garment, a long shirt-like garment usually of linen

Men are stimulated by sight. This is why Jesus told the men of His day, "whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Matthew 5:28).

Men are stimulated by sight. Men are always attracted to a lady, physically, before they are connected to her emotionally. In fact, they don't even want to pursue the possibility of an emotional relationship, if the physical attraction isn't there.

Women on the other hand are stimulated by touch. It could be a physical touch or an emotional touch. So all a man has to do is look at a woman, and he is stimulated. A woman has to be talked to, and she has to be touched. That touch can be emotional.

A man could talk to a woman in such a way that she is touched emotionally. Or it could be a physical touch. He could begin to pet her or stroke her in some way and that would begin to stimulate her. That is why pornography is sold mainly to men.

There is some pornography that is sold to women, but statistics tell us that the majority of the pornographic magazines that are published for women are actually purchased by a man, because women aren't really stimulated by sight.

That is why you can go to the mall and see some of the ugliest guys with some of the most attractive women, because they know how to touch.

DEUTERONOMY 22:5

5 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.

The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man,. It being very unseemly and impudent, and contrary to the modesty of her sex; or there shall not be upon her any "instrument of a man", any utensil of his which he makes use of in his trade and business;

as if she was employed in it, when her business was not to do the work of men, but to take care of her house and family; and so this law may be opposed to the customs of the Egyptians, as is thought, from whom the Israelites were lately come; whose women, as Herodotus relates, used to trade and merchandise abroad, while the men kept at home.

neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; which would betray effeminacy and softness unbecoming men, and would lead the way to many impurities, by giving an opportunity of mixing with women, and so to commit fornication and adultery with them;

to prevent which and to preserve chastity this law seems to be made; and since in nature a difference of sexes is made, it is proper and necessary that this should be known by difference of dress, or otherwise many evils might follow; and this precept is agreeably to the law and light of nature.

for all that do so are an abomination to the Lord thy God; which is a reason sufficient why such a practice should not be used.

"Whatever tends to eliminate the distinction between the sexes tends to licentiousness; and that one sex should assume the dress of the other has always been regarded as unnatural and indecent.

Transvestism has historically almost always been practiced by those who exemplified the characteristics of the opposite sex; and these were often homosexuals. To wear clothes of the opposite sex immediately labels one in his community. "

from Coffman's Bible Commentary,

This law may have gone beyond preserving decency and the clear distinction between sexes, to addressing idolatrous worship. Men wore the colored dress of women when they presented themselves before the Star of Venus, and women wore men's armor when presenting themselves before the Star of Mars.

Idols often had the features of one sex and the dress of the other, and their worshipers endeavored to be like them. Even apart from such idolatry it is wrong for men and women to try and erase the distinctions of their sex.

Imitating each other fosters softness and effeminacy in the man, and impudence and boldness in the woman. It opens the door to many evils which are an abomination to God and a disgrace to mankind.

Dake Annotated Reference Bible

Transvestism in the ancient Near East. Just as clothing served as a status marker in the ancient world, it also distinguished gender. In classical contexts, cross-dressing occurred in the theater, where women were not allowed to perform, and was also an aspect of homosexual practice.

Most instances in which cross-dressing or transvestism are mentioned in ancient Near Eastern texts are cultic in nature. Hittite texts use gender-related objects as well as clothing in a number of magical rites used to influence one's sexual status or diminish or alter the gender status of an adversary.

The objects of the female were mirror and distaff; those of the male, various weapons.

The adoption of clothing of the opposite sex was forbidden because it obscured the distinction of the sexes and thus violated an essential part of the created order of life (Gen 1:27). It also associated with or promoted homosexuality.

The same Hebrew word translated detests (toebah , lit. , "a detestable thing"; KJV, "an abomination") is used to describe God's view of homosexuality (Lev 18:22; 20:13).

Dominion of fashion: God thought womanly attire of enough importance to have it discussed in the Bible. Show me the fashion plates of any century from the time of the Deluge to this, and I will tell you the exact state of public morals.

Ever and anon we have imported from France, or perhaps invented on this side the sea, a style that proposes as far as possible to make women dress like men. The costumes of the countries are different, and in the same country may change, but there is a divinely ordered dissimilarity which must be forever observed.

Any divergence from this is administrative of vice and runs against the keen thrust of the text. It is made evident that Moses, the inspired writer, as vehemently as ourselves, reprehends the effeminate man and the masculine woman.

In the future life white robes always have been and always will be in the fashion. Wrong fashion is to be charged with many of the worst evils of society, and its path has often been strewn with the bodies of the slain. It has often set up a false standard by which people are to be judged.

Wrong fashion is incompatible with happiness. Those who depend for their comfort upon the admiration of others are subject to frequent disappointment. A wardrobe is the rock upon which many a soul has been riven.

The Biblical Illustrator

DEUTERONOMY 22:5

5 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.

That this law is still applicable to God's people appears to be certain, because of Paul's identification of a man's "long hair" as a shame (1 Cor 11:12-15).

I CORINTHIANS 11:11

11 Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord.

I CORINTHIANS 11:12

12 For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God.

I CORINTHIANS 11:13

13 Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?

I CORINTHIANS 11:14

14 Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?

It is a shame unto him; because it makes him appear like a woman. God has made the two sexes different, and placed them in different stations; and a proper regard to him and one another requires that this difference should be seen in their apparel and deportment.

FAMILY BIBLE NOTES

I CORINTHIANS 11:15

15 But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.

Nature demands that the sexes should wear different kinds of dress; nature demands that the female should be modest and retiring; nature demands that the toils of the chase, of the field, of war --the duties of office, of government, and of professional life, should be discharged by men.

The Nazarites let their hair grow, but it was as a token of humiliation

The familiar and now accepted word "unisex" first appeared in print in Life magazine (June 21, 1968) in an article describing unisex clothing as "good fashion as well as good fun. "

Moses was reminding the people that there is a distinction between the sexes, established by God from the very beginning, and that God wants us to maintain this distinction. By divine wisdom, man and woman were made for each other but were made to be different from each other.

Many nations in the ancient world approved and practiced homosexuality, even in their religion, but God prohibited it in Israel and made it a capital crime (Lev 18:22; 20:13). To blur their distinctives, so that men are no longer distinguishable from women is to bring confusion to God's order for His world.

FROM A CATHOLIC ARTICLE

For nearly 6,000 years, women always wore long dresses, but only since the last 40 years, a dress is suddenly "impractical" to wear. Formerly, women performed a wide variety of jobs, including farming, in skirts. Nowadays, they can't so much as rake a few leaves in the garden without feeling the need to put on a pair of pants.

Women have never, in the entire history of civilization, in any era from earliest antiquity or in any part of the world until our times,

stalked about in trousers that outlined the lower half of their body and gave visual prominence to their hips and legs.

Why not? Because they had the good sense to realise their physical vulnerability as the 'weaker vessel' and male readiness to exploit it, and besides, they wanted to be cherished and respected for their personal qualities other than their physical endowments.

* In non-Christian countries such as India and parts of the Far East, where women wore trousers, they took care to cover them amply with a flowing robe or a long tunic that concealed the outline of their body below the waist.

* Among Eskimo women and those who inhabited the Polar region there was a tradition of wearing long dresses made of hide or an ensemble consisting of seal skin leggings worn under a poncho-style garment that descended well below the knees.

Whether they were the early Celts or Vikings or the women of the tribe of Attila the Hun who swept down from the Steppes of Central Asia, there is no recorded case of a fashion for women to wear trousers as an outer garment until the 20th century.

* There is no doubt that from Victorian times women wearing trousers were considered both immodest and unfeminine. The early feminists who wore trousers were often lampooned in the press in their attempt to adapt manliness. A common criticism was that trousers gave a woman "an extremely mannish look".

*Here is what G. K. Chesterton thought about women wearing trousers:

“And since we are talking here chiefly in types and symbols, perhaps as good an embodiment as any of the idea may be found in the mere fact of a woman wearing a skirt.

It is highly typical of the rabid plagiarism which now passes everywhere for emancipation, that a little while ago it was common for an “advanced” woman to claim the right to wear trousers; a right about as GROTESQUE as the right to wear a false nose. It is quite certain that the skirt means female dignity.
”

This commentary was written in 1910 when the custom was in its infancy; it may be a century old, but it is even more relevant in our times than it was in Chesterton’s.

* All dictionaries up to the early 20th century defined “trousers” as “a garment worn by males. ” This identification of trousers as a male garment did not change until the 60s after women began to liberate their legs publicly in the 50s, thus altering the public perception.

* In wartime, women workers in munitions factories wore dungarees under overalls.

It is evident that trousers were historically associated with men. There is thus no recorded history of women adopting the fashion of wearing trousers like their menfolk until the 20th century.

Because shorts and slacks break both the modesty and gender barriers, we have a superb medley of immodesty AND 'masculinity' all gift-wrapped nicely for today's modern career woman!

No such thing as modest trousers on women
If women are "dressing to kill" these days, there is no doubt that they have succeeded in killing the morals of men and endangering their souls by wearing provocative styles, particularly midriff-baring tops and how-low-can-you-go jeans.

Some women appear to have been melted down and poured into their garments. A good question to ask oneself by way of analogy is: "Which outlines the form of the hand more – a mitten or a glove?" and then apply the question to a skirt and a pair of trousers, both of which provide adequate coverage.

It is obvious that there can be varying degrees of immodesty depending on the cut of the trousers, but that there is no such thing as 'modest' trousers – they may look modest on the clothes rack, but they behave like any other trousers when you put them on.

The 'crux' of the matter, is that even if trouser legs are of generous width and not particularly clinging, the fitted area is

bound to offset the female form to a greater or lesser extent, and its very visibility is what causes an immodest impression to be fixed in the mind.

Any woman who does not agree should take a long, hard look in the mirror and try to see herself as others (especially men) see her! Perhaps then she will agree that trousers reveal much more than gender.

FROM A BAPTIST PREACHER

in the Bible days, women did not wear crotched garments. Pants have a crotch. Men in the Bible days wore crotch garments. Not only that, women in any society did not wear pants until close to the middle of this century. Pants are called britches in the Bible,

and britches were worn exclusively by men for the first 5,950 years of human existence (which means up until about fifty years ago). Even the garments worn by men and women in Bible days were different. The woman wore a long flowing robe, and men wore a shorter and tighter robe.

Underneath the woman's robe would be nothing. Underneath the man's robe would be a pair of short pants that would go down to the knees.

Whenever a man would have to do some type of labor, such as to team up an ox, pull a trailer or dig a hole, he would pull up his robe and tuck it in his pants that were under his skirt, and that was called in the Bible "girding up your loins. "

The pair of pants was not under the lady's robes. The pants, or britches, were worn only by the men. You will never read in the Bible where britches were worn by women, but will read where they were worn by men.

Another reason we know that pants are a man's apparel and not woman's is common sense. Do you realize that you can get off an airplane in any country in the world, and if they do not speak English and you do not know their language, you will know which bathroom you were supposed to go to.

Go in an airport terminal, go to the bathroom and you will see a picture on the bathroom door. It doesn't matter if you are in Russia, France, Portugal, the United States or Mexico, there will be a sign on the door it will have a picture on it. It will either have a picture of someone in slacks or someone in a skirt.

Now, if you are a lady, which of those two doors will you walk through? And if you are a man, which of those two doors will you walk through? I doubt that even the rankest feminist would walk into the bathroom that would have the picture of a person in pants. Common sense tells us that pants are a man's apparel.

It amazes me that a woman would be appalled of just the thought of a man wearing a dress, but yet, men and women think nothing of a woman wearing pants. There was a fashion designer a few years back who decided he was going to come out with a line of dresses for men.

The idea wasn't very popular, so he gets himself an appearance on the Phil Donahue show. Phil brought all these male models out, wearing the dresses designed just for men, they paraded

them around the stage on the show, and all the women thought this was vulgar.

And, when Phil went into the audience with a microphone, many of the women made statements that they thought it was preposterous that a man would want to wear a dress. "Don't these men know any better? Don't they have any self-respect? Don't they have any concept of manhood, that they would parade around in a dress?"

And Phil Donahue said something that showed that he had more spiritual discernment than most Baptists do. He said, "Well, they said the same thing fifty years ago, when women started wearing pants. "