

1.21.19 – Naked Verses part II

Intro: The purpose for this study is to dispute the claim by textile people that when God said “naked” in the Bible He didn’t really mean naked He meant that they had undergarments on. These folks do not take a literal interpretation of the Bible they take a very liberal interpretation of the Bible changing the meaning to what they want or need the Word of God to say to fit their pre-conceived ideas. After all, their pastor or professor or wife told them that’s what it means so that has to be what it means...I suggest we go to the Bible and look at what it literally means and then choose to accept that for our lives.

The following is a Word Study of Strong’s Concordance reference # H6174

This Hebrew word occurs 16 times in the Bible and is translated naked all 16 times in the KJV. The transliteration is *`arowm*. I am going to group some of the verses because the context is similar.

Job 1:21 And said, Naked H6174 came I out of my mother's womb, and naked H6174 shall I return thither: the LORD gave, and the LORD hath taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD.

Ecclesiastes 5:15 As he came forth of his mother's womb, naked H6174 shall he return to go as he came, and shall take nothing of his labour, which he may carry away in his hand.

Hosea 2:3 Lest I strip her naked, H6174 and set her as in the day that she was born, and make her as a wilderness, and set her like a dry land, and slay her with thirst.

These verses leave little doubt about the absence of undergarments which are often added in other verses that use the same Hebrew word. The verse in Hosea is describing a punishment, but the amount of clothing left on her is clear, she is totally naked.

Job 24:7 They cause the naked H6174 to lodge without clothing, that they have no covering in the cold.

Job 24:10 They cause him to go naked H6174 without clothing, and they take away the sheaf from the hungry;

Job 22:6 For thou hast taken a pledge from thy brother for nought, and stripped the naked H6174 of their clothing.

Mic 1:8 Therefore I will wail and howl, I will go stripped and naked: H6174 I will make a wailing like the dragons, and mourning as the owls.

In these verses, clothing is mentioned except in Mic 1:8 to help the textile people understand that there were no undergarments. Each verse has a phrase to indicate how naked the individual was, “*without clothing*” or “*no covering*” or “*stripped of their clothing*” should make it clear for the reader. They were not “nearly naked” as our detractors would like to believe. If that were the case then we could also change other clear verses to mean what we want them to...such as “almost all have sinned and come short of the glory of God” or “thou shalt not commit adultery unless you have a good reason to” and I could go on and on, but I’m sure you get the point. If we decide it’s ok to change the meaning of some verses to what you want them to say, then why not change the meaning of all verses to what you want them to say? Where does the slippery slope stop? The

truth is it doesn't stop and soon you end up with no Bible and therefore no objective standard for right and wrong.

Isa 20:2 At the same time spake the LORD by Isaiah the son of Amoz, saying, Go and loose the sackcloth from off thy loins, and put off thy shoe from thy foot. And he did so, walking naked H6174 and barefoot.

Isa 20:3 And the LORD said, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked H6174 and barefoot three years for a sign and wonder upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia;

Isa 20:4 So shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked H6174 and barefoot, even with their buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt.

These verses are avoided by textile people at all cost. If you demand that they comment, the response is almost always that Isaiah still had his undergarments on. The problem is that "loins" is defined as the waist and hip area and "sackcloth" was worn next to the skin. So, when Isaiah took the sackcloth from off his loins he would have had bare skin showing at his waist/hip area. As shown above, this Hebrew word is used as our birthday suit. Certainly, if God allowed Isaiah to wear undergarments, He would also have allowed him to wear shoes. It is a long walk from Egypt to Assyria. Wearing out a pair of sandals would beat having sore feet and being forced to march barefoot. Now, here's the key to this passage...God commanded Isaiah to go naked, so if nakedness is a sin then God commanded Isaiah to go into sin, which contradicts God's very nature and it would violate **James 1:13** making God and the Bible a liar.

1Sa 19:24 And he stripped off his clothes also, and prophesied before Samuel in like manner, and lay down naked H6174 all that day and all that night. Wherefore they say, Is Saul also among the prophets?

This verse is dealt with elsewhere, so I will simply point out that it is the same Hebrew word that is used in the other verses and it would be confusing to say that it means with undergarments in some verses and not in other verses. What standard would be used to say which applies to a certain verse and not to the others. You would then become the arbiter of truth, you would get to dictate which verses meant what to whom. You would basically take the place of God. Also, since it was of God's leading that Saul stripped himself as it was in Isaiah's case then wouldn't it be odd for it to have been one way with Isaiah and another way with Saul? Besides, according to Scripture...the rest of the prophets were naked as the day they were born, so for King Saul to have been in his undies would have just been weird and out of context.

Job 26:6 Hell is naked H6174 before him, and destruction hath no covering.

Here Job is describing God and uses nakedness to show how exposed hell is to God. There is no covering that can hide hell or anything else from God. Not only hell is naked before God, but the good and bad that we do everyday is just as plain to God. We are all naked, figuratively and literally before God at all times.

Isa 58:7 Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, H6174 that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?

Isaiah is addressing the hard heartedness of us all. Even something as plain as a totally naked person, based on the word usage in the other verses, will not move our hearts to help a fellow human being. We want to say, “I did not notice that he was naked.” This word is used so we can not say, “He has undergarments, let that be enough for him.”

Amos 2:16 And he that is courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked H6174 in that day, saith the LORD

Here the word is used to emphasize how complete the victory will be. The best soldiers escape without anything except their lives. Again, the uses of the word in other verses adds clarity to its use in this verse.

Gen 2:25 And they were both naked, H6174 the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

I hope that by now you can see that based on the word used here they only had their creation suits on. It is amusing to me that the textile people can not say they had undergarments on here. At the time of the fall, Adam started with leaves and sewing might have been a thin branch or stem that he wove in and out of holes he made in the overlap of the leaves. I am not familiar with fig leaves, but I can not think of a way to make a durable garment from them. The point is, that if they had undergarments in the Garden they certainly would have not needed to sew leaves together. They were truly naked without any clothes in the Garden...the Hebrew word here is the same Hebrew word in all the other verses mentioned in this article...meaning that if it means without any clothing here, it means without any clothing elsewhere as well. So,

since they know that Adam and Eve were actually fully naked, the textile solution to their problem with nakedness is to add a righteous glow to cover them. This solution is only needed if you have an incorrect view of the naked body. God stated that they were naked and unashamed and then He said that it was good! But, those who cannot accept God's perspective on nakedness will do almost anything to avoid admitting that nakedness is good. This textile viewpoint comes really close to adding to the scriptures. The lack of garments prior to the fall tells me that they were content being naked, since necessity is the mother of invention, they did not feel it necessary to create attire. They may have been working on rope for a hammock if there were trees large enough for one, since damp ground would not be much fun to sleep on. If that were the case, then maybe they had thread to sew the leaves together.

At this point it should be perfectly clear that the Hebrew word we have been discussing means completely naked like you were when you were born with no undergarments or righteous glow.

What conclusions can we draw? We have still found no verses in Scripture stating the sinful state of nakedness. We have still found no command to clothe. We have still found examples of nakedness being proper and even commanded by God.

We are not saying that you should always be naked...quite the contrary, as stated in the Scriptures above, clothing is good to protect from cold, to protect from the elements, to protect from the harsh environment, etc. What we are saying is that there is no harm in nakedness either. When you can be naked, be naked. When you need to be dressed, be dressed.