

12.23.19 - Verses with Naked and Shame

You will often find textile believers thinking if a verse contains the words "naked" and "shame" that it proves that nakedness is a shame according to the Bible. A quick search with both words will find four verses with naked and three verses with nakedness. We will deal with them one at a time. When you think we are trying to force the verses to not mean, nakedness is a shame, remember the need is to not have God as the author of confusion. We can't say God ordered Isaiah to be naked or caused King Saul to strip and also say nakedness is a shame/sin. Or if we say that nakedness is a shame/sin then God ordered Isaiah into sin. That way when I get caught in sin, God ordered it. I was just being obedient. Just about makes it possible to do anything you want and not be in "sin". All that a person would need to do in order to "justify" their wrongdoing is to simply keep a few verses handy to "prove" that God orders people into sin and that is all the Bible study you'd need. We, on the other hand want to be biblical correct and that without taking verses out of context in order to do it.

Exo 32:25 And when Moses saw that the people were naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame among their enemies:) The Hebrew word for "shame" in this verse is only used in this verse. The "Outline of Biblical Usage" on Blue Letter Bible (BLB) has these words: whisper, derision, whispering. Derision is "laughing stock". The Hebrew word for "naked" has "to let loose restraints" as a biblical usage according to BLB. The words "had made them" have no Strong's numbers, which means they are implied by the Hebrew word for "naked" or other words in the sentence. Considering Aaron's excuse to Moses for what was happening, **Exo 32:22 And Aaron said, Let not the anger of my lord wax hot: thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief.** "made" might be "allowed". Either way the person with the authority is held accountable. The verse seems to be about a disorderly and unguarded camp which could encourage their enemies to make a raid on them. We find hints about being prepared for battle and prepared for His return in other verses as well so we believe it fits here.

In other words, the shame would have been that God would have brought them out here into the wilderness and then they all got killed by their enemies because they weren't prepared for battle in case of an attack. That would have brought shame as it would have appeared that He then, wasn't able to care for or protect His people. God cared enough to be super specific in even the layout for the camp He certainly cared if they were prepared for their camp's defense. The key evidence for this being the case is indeed found in the very verse itself...it says "shame among their enemies".

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

This one is rather easy...we are talking about prisoners of war. Being a prisoner of war is a shame with or without clothing as it means you had been conquered. The shame is not about clothing, but conquest. The Hebrew word used here for "naked" is used for Adam and Eve before the fall, for King Saul while prophesying, for Job and Gomer at birth. It means with no clothing. Everything that had value would have been taken from any captured people. As we have covered in other articles...this would certainly have included clothing at this time in world history due to the difficulty and expense of making the clothing. "The captors will take everything" is a short paraphrase of the verse. We like the verse because it gives verification of the monetary value and expense of clothing. If it could be used as collateral on a loan as in Exodus 22:26-27, then it had to be valuable therefore something to be confiscated by a conqueror.

Mic 1:11 Pass ye away, thou inhabitant of Saphir, having thy shame naked: the inhabitant of Zaanan came not forth in the mourning of Bethel; he shall receive of you his standing. This one is not as clear, but I don't think it is about clothing since the verses near it are not. Idol worship seems to be the topic of the surrounding verses more than clothing. The Hebrew word for "shame" is also translated "confusion" in other verses. The word for "naked" is translated as "bare" in other

verses. The phrase could read as having your confusion exposed. I believe the names of the town are part of the message of the verse, somewhat like a song by Irving Gordon that I remember from grade school. Here are a few lyrics to make the point:

*Oh how did Wis-con-sin boy
She stole a New-brass-key
Too bad that Arkan saw, boy
And so did Tenne-see*

Amazing what you can find with Google. Saphir means "Fair", Zaanan means "pointed", and Bethazel means "house of narrowing". The Hebrew word for "standing" could be translated "lodging". I believe the town names are classes of people or personality types.

Either way, the verse states that the shame would be naked...it is our opinion that means that their shame would be exposed or visible to those around. We do not believe the verse is stating that naked is a shame, but rather that their shame is naked.

Rev 16:15 Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.

The verses before this verse are talking about getting ready for a great battle. The verse after this one names it the Battle of Armageddon. The context suggests that the garments being spoken of are referring to protection and preparedness for the battle. Just because it is a shame for a thief to steal your clothing, does not mean that being naked in a group of like-minded people is a shame. It is a shame to be caught off guard regardless of what you lose. I can see no reason to put a verse about nakedness, meaning without clothing in a group of like-minded people, in this line of events. It seems to be saying, be prepared for battle at any time. If you are not ready you will be shamed by the enemy and even killed. The saved people during this time of the end times would not have sores and would be easy to identify. Since saved people represented the God that was causing all their pain, they would enjoy catching them off guard. Hence the need to watch and be prepared for battle. From the spiritual side we also believe that this is a warning about being spiritually prepared and on guard for Christ's imminent

return. Are you ready, are you prepared for the day that the Lord calls us home, whether by death or by rapture the spiritual meaning of the passage is also clear...be ready at any moment for the Lord's return, He did warn us that He'd return when the world was thinking He wouldn't be coming. We should be ready! I can confidently proclaim that naked or clothed has nothing to do with your spiritual preparedness for His return.

Isa 47:3 Thy nakedness shall be uncovered, yea, thy shame shall be seen: I will take vengeance, and I will not meet thee as a man.

The Hebrew word for "nakedness" here is the same one that is used in Leviticus chapter 18. It is clear in Leviticus 18 that the phrase "to uncover their nakedness" is a code phrase for sex outside of marriage. We agree that sex outside of marriage is certainly a shame. The verses before this verse are referring to Babylon when she is punished for her cruelty to God's people and her idolatry which often included sex outside of marriage. The shame is not about being without clothing, but giving gifts which had all come from God, to God's enemies. It is also referring to the things that should be offered to God were being used for self or Satan worship. All of these things including the abuse of God's people, the sexual sin and the idolatry were being uncovered to the offending party's shame.

Nah 3:5 Behold, I am against thee, saith the LORD of hosts; and I will discover thy skirts upon thy face, and I will shew the nations thy nakedness, and the kingdoms thy shame. This verse is addressed to the city of Nineveh. The reforms that had been incorporated there after the repentance that had taken place in the days of Jonah were forgotten. God did not plan to send another Jonah this time. It is a quote of God's intentions. The nakedness referred to is forced and we agree that it is a shame when someone is forced into nakedness as was typically the case when someone was conquered. It has nothing to do with living in the naked and not ashamed condition that we were created to live in.

Rev 3:18 I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. This verse is addressed to the Laodiceans, a very proud and spiritually bankrupt church. They were using wealth as a sign of being right with God. God is saying that they are not wealthy in His kingdom. They are on the other extreme. Nakedness was, at the time of the writing, quite common among the very poor. The nakedness itself is not shameful, but the poverty was viewed as a shame in the eyes of the world, but not a sin in God's eyes. The Laodiceans were judging the approval of God based on material wealth. "Nakedness" is being used in this case to illustrate how poor the Laodiceans are in God's eyes. Because we can not serve two masters at once, they were displeasing God by seeking wealth i.e. serving mammon, instead of obeying the leading of the Holy Spirit. They were missing the relation with God by chasing riches. They were missing the true God by worshipping their beliefs.

Since we have spent most of this article debunking the non-existent link between naturism and shame, we'd like to turn the tables on the textile position briefly. It is a fact that clothing in Jesus' time was very expensive as compared to today. Evidenced by the inability to take a garment to the pawn shop and get a loan with it today as you could in Bible times. Since Jesus taught that "if" you have two outfits to sell one and buy a sword then we can safely conclude that most people had only one garment...some I'm sure had two and some I'm sure had none. With that in mind, consider this teaching of Jesus from the Sermon on the Mount: **Luk 6:29 And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloke forbid not to take thy coat also.** In Mathew it says: **Mat 5:40 And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.** I think we miss a lot of the meaning of the verse because clothing is so cheap now compared to then. Only the upper class of people had two garments and that was a status symbol. I am not sure why the order is not the same in both verses, but which one is

wanted first is not the point I want to make. If the man is wearing two garments and he parts with both, what is he left with? His birthday suit and no status!

Is Jesus saying to give all your clothing away and go into sin?

Absolutely not! He is certainly teaching to go beyond what is asked or demanded. He did not see nakedness as a sin or He would have used a different example to make the point. Your textile friends are not likely to agree with the person being naked. They will argue that the person still had some undergarments on, even though there is no evidence he would have. It is something like Jesus always looks like an Italian with long hair instead of a Jew with short hair in the paintings. They assume that people always dressed like we do now. They assume that clothing was always cheap and easily accessible like it is now. They assume incorrectly!

These verses might be good verses to test a person for their willingness to accept the truth about nakedness according to the Bible. If they agree that the person would be naked, then you could ask if Jesus suggested going into sin. You will know what they will accept by that point. If they take the position that the person still had undergarments, they are probably not open to any change from their textile beliefs. However, if they are willing to admit that Jesus may have just taught them to give away all of their clothing to the person doing the suing and leave naked then they just might be open to the rest of the Bible's teaching on the commonplace of nakedness, the lack of any condemnation from God about it and the desire of God from the very beginning that we live naked and not ashamed confidently displaying the image of God in us much to the chagrin of Satan.