

Outward Adornment

Erich Matthew Janzen

4101 Haralson Mill Rd. Conyers, GA 30012

770.860.0705 emjanzen@ministersnewcovenant.org

NOTE: The following article is a review of Chapter Seven of David K. Bernard's book titled "Practical Holiness: A Second Look"

I was recently introduced to a book by a minister in the United Pentecostal church entitled *Practical Holiness A Second Look*. The primary reason I was looking at the book was for the author's findings in chapter seven of his work which gave a detailed description of how Christian men and women (primarily women) should adorn themselves in outward appearance. This article will examine Bernard's findings and arguments which are in favor of the traditional Pentecostal stance taken on the subject.

First, let me point out that Bernard's book is one which is very well written, and one can definitely tell that he has taken time to study and put much effort into teaching the word of the Lord on the issue of outward holiness. There are many things in his book that I do agree with, and I do not want the reader of this particular article to think I'm merely trying to be disagreeable because of an ulterior reason or motive. I simply want to give a logical defense for what I believe is Biblical truth that stands against certain things Bernard has stated concerning outward adornment. It is my obligation as a Pastor and Teacher of the word of Yahweh to give a defense for the truth whether privately or publicly.

This book was published back in the year 1985 and I am writing this in 2005 (*revision 2008*), twenty years later. Mr. Bernard has obviously been around much longer than me, as I was not capable of even making a decision on the subject for myself in 1985 as a child. Therefore if anyone is wondering why in the world would somebody wait 20 years to write a chapter review, it is because (1) I have only been studying the Bible for about 11 years, and (2) I just heard of the book about two or three weeks ago as of today (9/30/2005). Let us now begin.

Clothing

At the very beginning of his comments, Mr. Bernard states, "God desires for His people to display the spirit of holiness in outward appearance^[1]." With this statement I have no qualms. The word holiness is defined by Noah Webster's 1828 Dictionary in part as, "Applied to human beings, holiness is purity of heart or dispositions; sanctified affections; piety; moral goodness, but not perfect." Taking this definition into consideration we could define *outward* holiness as showing forth purity, sanctity, piety, and morality by what we look like on the outside. The key to knowing how to look holy on the outside is to be found in the pages of Scripture. It is Yahweh who we should look to in order to know how to appear moral and pure in our outward adornment. We are not permitted to state that something is holiness when the Bible does not substantiate it with book, chapter, and verse. Many people in certain church organizations attempt to define holiness with their own personal definitions, instead of looking to please Yahweh, and seeking Him for the proper understanding and enlightenment on how we should appear holy in society, no matter what century or age we live in. Mr. Bernard, like so many other professing Bible believers, turns first to two New Testament passages and a passage in Deuteronomy for the answer to this as his primary launching pad for the teaching. I will instead look first to the book of Genesis.

In the book of Genesis we can establish a case for both man and woman having their nakedness covered by Yahweh himself. Genesis 3 describes the fall of man and woman into sin, and

immediately after this fall the feeling for a need to cover nakedness came to both parties (Genesis 3:6-7). How they covered their nakedness was apparently insufficient in the eyes of the Creator, seeing that the Bible says that He (Yahweh) made for the two of them coats of skin to cover their nakedness (Genesis 3:21). What is often overlooked here is that the verse says, He made *them* coats, and not, He made her a coat and him trousers and a tee shirt. A detailed study on the word coat, Hebrew *ketoneth*, will show forth that what is meant is that Yahweh clothed both male and female with tunics or robes which reached anywhere from the knee to the ankles. This study is detailed in a book I have written entitled *Modest Apparel: for Men and Women*^[2] if anyone wishes to delve further into the topic. The point is that here in the very first book of the Bible we find exactly what garments Yahweh himself wishes for fallen man and woman to be clothed in. While this is a very clear case for decency and modesty in outer appearance, there is not a case that anything akin to pants is even in view in the scantest form.

In spite of this, Mr. Bernard comments on a passage in a book of the Pentateuch when he writes, “When we take Peters advice and look at the holy women of the Old Testament, we find that women should not wear clothing pertaining to men, and vice versa (Deuteronomy 22:5).”^[3] Although Bernard does not immediately state it here, he considers the prohibition of Deuteronomy 22:5 to be speaking of the swapping of a dress or skirt for trousers by a woman, and obviously the opposite for the man. However, with the foundation of Genesis 3:21, and the rest of the Bible up to Deuteronomy, we do not see any instance of pants being in view here. There is absolutely zero evidence in Scripture that pants are the apparel assigned to men. Many people point out the wearing of breeches by the priest and that priests were men, but that argument is faulty on at least four accounts.

(1) Breeches were a specified *holy garment* of the *Levite priests*, not the common man (Leviticus 16:4; Exodus 28:42-43).

(2) They were worn *underneath a priests robe* (Exodus 28:43)

(3) They were to reach from *the loins to the thighs* (Exodus 28:42).

(4) The breeches were *not worn at all times*, but taken off the majority of the time (Leviticus 6:8-13; Ezekiel 44:17-19).

The primary function of the breeches, or linen undergarments (NLT; YLT^[4]) were for ministering before Yahweh in His presence, and possibly for covering the priests genital area securely in this ministration. Even at this rate, they were never seen in appearance by the eyes of other human beings, namely, the opposite sex of women. This shows that the breeches covered the nakedness of the priest in a special way before Almighty Yahweh. How a man should cover his nakedness *in general* is to be found in Genesis 3:21.

Mr. Bernard shows his view on Deuteronomy 22:5 elsewhere in the chapter when he writes, “Girls who wear pants all the time gradually become more and more masculine in their behavior.”^[5] And again, “As part of her revolt against the God-given distinction between male and female, she stopped wearing dresses and skirts altogether.”^[6] Anyone reading these statements can see that Bernard consider pants to be mans apparel, even though he does not give a Bible verse to substantiate his claim. He does at one point in his treatise make the following, surprising statement:

Men should not wear attire that is distinctively female, which for Western clothing means dresses and skirts. Women should not wear attire that is distinctively male, which for Western clothing means trousers, slacks, or pants. Different cultures have different types of clothing. If clothing is modest and if there is a clear differentiation between male and female, the precise style of clothing in a particular

culture is not important. Care should be taken to dress appropriately for the culture and occasion.^[7]

Mr. Bernard states much concerning culture and custom here concerning dress, but elsewhere in answering an objection concerning makeup on women he writes, “No matter how much society changes, we must seek to please God rather than man. Also, society’s acceptance does not change all the spiritual reasoning we have discussed.”^[8] Consistency demands that in both instances we look not to culture but to the Bible for our beliefs concerning both makeup and clothing. The Bible’s standard for clothing on both men and women are tunics or robes according to Genesis 3:21. Holy men and women will practice outward holiness by wearing a long loose garment at all times amidst any society or culture they find themselves in. Pants may still be worn, but only as an additional undergarment to the robe. The robe sufficiently covers the mid section of both male and female loosely, which can become quite apparent and sensual in pants and even in some types of skirts. Deuteronomy 22:5 therefore has nothing to do with pants, seeing that when the command was first given by Yahweh through Moses, both men and women wore robes on a regular, daily basis. In light of this, we must seek for a more Biblical understanding of the prohibition in the book of the law.

More than likely the Deuteronomy passage is prohibiting role changes and transvestites. Transvestism is defined by Webster’s Third New International Dictionary as, “...the practice of adopting the dress, the manner, and frequently the sexual role of the opposite sex.” A woman which purposely tries to fill a man’s role is idiomatically said to be putting on the apparel of a man and the same holds true for the opposite. Men should seek to be masculine, while women seek femininity. The Bible often uses idiomatic expressions which show forth other meanings. One such example is where we find Samson’s new wife telling some men at the end of their wedding feast the answer to a riddle of his. When the men came back and told Samson the answer, he knew it had to have been his wife that gave it away seeing she was the only one he had propounded the riddle to. His proclamation to the men was that they had “plowed with his heifer” (Judges 14:10-20). Obviously Samson did not literally mean they had taken his cow and plowed a field, he rather idiomatically meant that they coaxed his wife into telling them the answer.

There is also much to be gleaned in the Hebrew word *geber*, used in Deuteronomy 22:5, a point which Bernard mentions but disregards.^[9] The word *geber* is only used twice in the entire book of Deuteronomy, and these two uses are found in Deuteronomy 22:5. The English word man is found elsewhere in Deuteronomy some 60 times and in none of these instances is the word *geber* used, but rather *iysb* or *adam*. I believe this is significant seeing that a more common Hebrew word for man could have been chosen by Yahweh to be placed in Deuteronomy 22:5, but wasn’t. The word *geber* emphasizes a man’s strength or ability to fight. Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance defines the word as, “From H1396; properly a *valiant* man or *warrior*; generally a *person* simply.” and Brown-Drivers-Briggs Hebrew Chaldean Lexicon states, “...man, strong man, warrior (emphasizing strength or ability to fight).” It is also interesting to note that in the KJV *geber* is twice translated into English as the word *mighty* (Isaiah 22:17; Jeremiah 41:16). Bible commentator Adam Clarke gives a very short yet thorough understanding on the passage when he writes in his comments on Deuteronomy 22:5,

...keli geber, the instruments or arms of a man. As the word גבר geber is here used, which properly signifies a strong man or man of war, it is very probable that armor is here intended; especially as we know that in the worship of Venus, to which that of Astarte or Ashtaroth among the Canaanites bore a striking resemblance, the women were accustomed to appear in armor before her. It certainly cannot mean a simple change in dress, whereby the men might pass for women, and vice versa. This would have been impossible in those countries where the dress of the sexes had but little to distinguish it, and where every man wore a long beard. It is, however, a very good general precept understood literally, and applies particularly to those countries where the dress alone distinguishes between the male and the female. The close-shaved gentleman may at any time appear like a woman in the

female dress, and the woman appear as a man in the male's attire. Were this to be tolerated in society, it would produce the greatest confusion. Clodius, who dressed himself like a woman that he might mingle with the Roman ladies in the feast of the Bona Dea, was universally execrated.

Concerning outward clothing, our emphasis should rather be on decency and moderation rather than on pants for men, skirts for women. The latter position has been taken by many in the Pentecostal denominations of the world today and it has only led to becoming more and more immodest. Church-going women think that they are sufficiently dressed as long as they are not wearing pants. Very tight, stretchy material is worn by Christian women over their breast area, with a skirt below accenting their buttocks and hips as they walk amidst other people, namely men. This is the result of the false teaching of Deuteronomy 22:5. By reforming the teaching on modest apparel to the Scriptures we can once again gain modesty in the Christian arena, having both men and women wear tunics or robes, hanging from the shoulders, and only wear other articles of clothing as an undergarment for protection from earthly elements if needed. Differentiation between the sexes can still be readily obtained by masculine and feminine style, as well as beards on men (Leviticus 19:27; Revelation 9:7), and long hair on women (1 Corinthians 11:14-16; Revelation 9:8). Many people have pointed me to the pictures on the bathroom doors attempting to prove the universal sign of pants on men, skirts on women. My objection is always, "Where are these pictures found in the Bible?" If we look to the Bible and lived in a holy society we would find the pictures on bathroom doors depicting a face with a beard and another face with long hair, so as to not be confused on which door you would enter. One author, whose article I've studied, makes the comment that the modern day pictures would be confusing to men such as Apostle Paul, as he would walk towards the bathroom where the picture depicted the dress/robe as this is what he would be wearing!

Extreme caution should be taken by women especially in their choice of clothing as it pertains to length and looseness. The admonishment for women to dress in modest apparel in Scripture has the meaning of a long loose robe, as the Greek word *katastole* denotes (1 Timothy 2:9; *Vines Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words*). This looseness should cover the whole body. A woman can wear a robe down to her ankles, but have it tight, and the Bible is disobeyed. The same applies for a very short dress, but an extremely loose one; both length and looseness should be sought after seeing that a woman's breasts and legs are the most sensual part of her body. An article in McCall's magazine entitled *What Your Intimate Behavior Says About You* reads:

The female legs have also been the subject of considerable male interest as sexual signaling devices. The mere exposure of leg flesh has been sufficient to transmit sexual signals. Needless to say, the higher the exposure goes the more stimulating it becomes for the simple reason that it then approaches the primary genital zone.

Mr. Bernard's stance on modesty, although not complete, is to be commended. We need more Bible preachers today who are willing to proclaim the word of Yahweh without fear of man. Most denominations today okay everything from mid-length skirts to bikinis for women, and all the way to swimming trunks (with no shirt) for men. These items of clothing are not to be worn by Christian men and women, men and women who seek to reach out and take the garment Yahweh gave them in Genesis 3:21. Sad to say, most men and women today go on; either not listening to Yahweh or simply thinking it doesn't make a difference for some unknown reason. Both men and women should rather seek to cover their nakedness adequately, and this will consist of long, loose robes on both sexes, and in turn decrease the amount of spiritual adultery (Matthew 5:27-29) caused by the appearance of nakedness (2 Samuel 11:2-5).

Makeup

Almost two years ago (2003) I began to study the issue of whether or not a woman should adorn herself in such cosmetics as make-up, blush, eye shadow, lipstick, etc. As I am a student of the Bible, I wanted to look to the Bible for my answers instead of the whims of differing churches or even the culture and custom of the society in which I live. Mr. Bernard has devoted some space in his writing concerning this issue as well, as he writes, “Without exception, the Bible always associates the use of makeup with wicked women.”^[11]

The examples given by Bernard are found in the act of Queen Jezebel painting her face (2 Kings 9:30), the unfaithful Israelite nation painting the face and eyes (Jeremiah 4:30; Ezekiel 23:40), and a *possible* mention of make-up in association with a harlots eyelids (Proverbs 6:25). Each passage (specifically mentioning painting the face) given by Bernard does cast negativity on the idea of a woman using make-up as part of her adornment, but there is at least one passage that Bernard passes off in brief. Bernard briefly mentions the name of one of the daughters of Job, (Job 42:14) Keren-happuch which Strongs Exhaustive Concordance defines as, “horn of cosmetic...” and Gesenius’ Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon defines as, “horn of paint.” Brown-Drivers-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon gives, “horn of antimony” as the definition for the name, while Albert Barnes’ Notes on the Old Testament defines the name as, “horn of stibium”. Each definition given by the lexicographers has to do with the meaning of painting something for beauty in appearance. The Hebrew word *puk* makes up the last portion of the name of Job’s daughter and is found in Strongs Exhaustive Concordance under the number 6320 and defined as, “From an unused root meaning to *paint*; *dye* (specifically *stibium* for the eyes...” The word is used in Bible passages that mention painting stones, the face, and the eyes (Isaiah 54:11; 1 Chronicles 29:2; Jeremiah 4:30; 2 Kings 9:30).

Commentator Albert Barnes’ in his Notes on the Old Testament looks into the meaning of Job 42:14 when he writes,

“Properly, ‘horn of stibium.’ The ‘stibium’ (*puk*), was a paint or dye made originally, it is supposed, from sea-weed, and afterward from antimony, with which females tinged their eye-lashes; see the notes at Isa. 54:11. It was esteemed as an ornament of great beauty, chiefly because it served to make the eye appear larger. Large eyes are considered in the East as a mark of beauty, and the painting of black borders around them gives them an enlarged appearance. It is remarkable that this species of ornament was known so early as the time of Job, and this is one of the cases, constantly occurring in the East, showing that fashions there do not change. It is also remarkable that the fact of painting in this manner should have been considered so respectable as to be incorporated into the name of a daughter; and this shows that there was no attempt at ‘concealing’ the habit.”

Well known commentators Keil and Delitzsch comment on Job 42:14 by stating,

“The one was called (Arab. *jemame*, a dove) on account of her dove’s eyes; the other, cassia, because she seemed to be woven out of the odour of cinnamon; and the third, a horn of paint (lxx Hellenizing: *κρας μαλθεας*), which is not exactly beautiful in itself, but is the principal cosmetic of female beauty (vid., Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, transl.): the third was altogether the most beautiful, possessing a beauty heightened by artificial means. They were therefore like three graces. The writer here keeps to the outward appearance, not disowning his Old Testament standpoint.”

Bernard’s comments on Job 42:14 amount to him saying, “The name of one of Job’s daughters in Job 42:14 means, ‘horn of eye paint,’ but this no more endorses the wearing of makeup then the names Ruby and Jewel endorse the wearing of jewelry or the name Jade endorses the contents of a jade box.”^[12] I personally believe Mr. Bernard has overstepped boundaries in Biblical exegesis. Of

course, in today's society, many parents do not look into the meaning of their children's names before giving them a name at birth. Some parents could care less as long as the sound of the name agrees to their ears. This was not the case in Old Testament times; names had significance. Time and time again we find where children were given a name for the very purpose of expressing a happening in the life of the mother or father, or for expressing the parents feelings and emotions towards the occurrence (Genesis 4:25; 5:29; 16:11; 17:17-19; 27:36; 29:35; 1 Samuel 4:21). The same can logically be stated in Job's account. Had Job looked at makeup in an always negative fashion, he would not have placed upon his daughter such a name. The name of his daughter proclaimed beauty to her, and the odds are greatly in favor of this particular daughter of Job looking beautiful because of her beautiful eyes (Job 42:15). They evidently reminded him of a beautiful woman with makeup.

What about the negative mentioning of makeup in the Bible? Does this give way for us to conclude that all makeup is negative and sinful? I do not think this is the case. When we look to such passages as 2 Kings 9:30 we find that not only did Jezebel paint her eyes/face, but she also in the same context "tired" her head. The Hebrew word for "tired" here is *yatab*, and basically carries the meaning of making well or beautiful. Some people believe she placed a hat or scarf for adornment on her head, while others say she merely arranged her hair. Both are possibilities, but the point is that if makeup is always sinful because of its mention in association with Jezebel, then arranging the hair or putting on a hat would be as well, seeing it is mentioned in the same sentence.

The same can be said for the passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Jeremiah 4:30 mentions clothing thyself with crimson and wearing ornaments of gold in association of painting the eyes/face. Yet we find in other places of the Bible where the virtuous woman clothes herself in scarlet (Proverbs 31:21) or in Hebrew - *shaniy* - the same Hebrew word translated crimson in the Jeremiah passage. We also find numerous positive examples of women and men wearing jewelry in the Bible, a topic we will address shortly. The passage in Ezekiel 23:40 mentions washing thyself in association with painting the eyes/face, and adorning one's self with jewelry. Is it always a sin to wash thyself? Or was the woman washing herself for the very purpose of committing harlotry and adultery? True enough some women today do adorn themselves with ulterior motives, trying to allure men other than their husband, which leads to both spiritual and physical adultery, but to say that this means all women beautify themselves with this motive is ludicrous in my humble opinion.

Just because something is associated with a sinner does not automatically mean that the act is always sinful. The Bible tells us about a woman with long hair who had been involved in many sins (Luke 7:37-47). Does this mean all women with long hair are living in sin? Should all women cut off their hair so as not to associate with this negative example? The Bible also mentions a harlot using the smell of perfume and clothing her bed with fine linen (Proverbs 7:16-17). Does this mean we must forego the use of linen for our bed sheets and also make sure we do not put perfume on them as a fragrance? Yahweh's unfaithful, symbolic wife Israel played the harlot with her earrings and jewelry (Hosea 2:13), but should we then conclude that every woman wearing earrings is a harlot? These points need to be addressed by those seeking to preach against the use of makeup totally. Bernard makes an attempt to answer these objections by stating,

Many acceptable things can be done by an evil person or can become evil only because of an evil motive. However, makeup does not fall under this category. The other things mentioned all have valid purposes other than ornamentation or seduction, but makeup does not. The other things are all mentioned favorably in other passages of Scripture, but makeup is not.^[13]

Is Bernard's statement valid? Take for instance the mentioning of Jezebel tiring her head in association with painting her face. Is tiring the head valid? Was not Jezebel fixing her hair or prettying up for the very purpose of seduction? Are all women who pretty up wanting to seduce someone towards adultery? Furthermore, Job 42:14 **does** cast makeup in a positive light, even though Bernard does not hold to this view. There is no need for us to assume that makeup does not fall under the category of something *acceptable* being done by an *evil* person for *evil* reasons.

Arguments generally made against makeup consist of sermons against outward adorning, and spending money on things that are of no profit. Pastors usually say that such time and money could be spent on the gospel, and if you spend it on makeup you are wasting the Lord's valuable time. Using this reasoning we should evaluate everything in our possession. Do we really have to have this size house? What about the car or cars we own, are they necessary? And clothes, is it an absolute necessity to own that many clothes and pairs of shoes? Should we comb our hair this way or that way, or comb it at all for that matter; why not just get up in the morning and leave it lying how the Lord intended it to lay the previous night? Is wearing makeup any different than a man adorning a necktie? What purpose does a necktie serve except for outward adornment? Some organized religions such as the Amish and Mennonite do take these things to the extreme, and at least they are more consistent. They refuse chrome bumpers on their cars and colorful clothing based upon the belief that such brings un-needed attention to a person and is vain and worldly. While these groups are consistent, I believe it is wrong to conclude that Yahweh wishes for us to be without nice and even at times costly things in this world. Many of Yahweh's people in the Bible were rich in wealth (Genesis 13:2; 24:35; 1 Kings 3:12-15; Job 1:1-3; Psalms 112:1-3; Proverbs 10:22) having numerous possessions. The key was to not allow such possessions to overrule your love for Almighty Yahweh in using them for evil rather than good.

Holy women should seek to beautify themselves on the **inside**, seeing that favor is deceitful and beauty is vain (Proverbs 31:30), but this does not mean that a woman can not look acceptable and beautiful in a decent and modest manner amidst people. I cannot condemn the use of makeup on woman, provided it is done with the right intentions and taken care to be done in decency and moderation, much like other things in outward adornment.

Jewelry

Mr. Bernard also addresses the outward adornment of jewelry in the same chapter of his book. I have discussed the issue of jewelry at length in a work entitled *Is Wearing Jewelry Sin?*^[14], and I ask the reader of this article to contact me for a copy of this study for it answers many of the claims of Mr. Bernard with Scriptural facts. For now, I will briefly mention some of the "high points" in Bernard's writings.

Without a doubt, jewelry is mentioned time and time again in the Bible in a positive light. There are cases where people who kept all of Yahweh's commandments (Genesis 26:5) gave a perspective bride bracelets and an earring for the purpose of adornment (Genesis 24:47); the wearer here being Rebecca, after adorning the jewelry bowed down to worship Yahweh (Genesis 24:48). There is absolutely nothing in the context of this passage that even hints that these items were worldly, sinful, etc. They are rather mentioned in a positive light and this mentioning is an irrefutable text of Scripture that shows a woman is permitted to adorn herself with jewelry.

Other examples are the wearing of rings and gold chains (Genesis 41:39-42; Daniel 5:29; Luke 15:22; James 2:2-4), earrings (Job 42:11; Proverbs 25:12), bracelets and crowns (Ezekiel 16:8-14), and a host of other items of jewelry.

Bernard hones in on such negative examples as the family of Jacob burying their earrings under a tree at Shechem (Genesis 35:4) when he writes, "When Jacob went back to Bethel to renew his relationship with God, he disposed of all the idols and earrings belonging to his family..."^[15] While Bernard mentions the earrings here, he fails to mention that Jacob's family also rid themselves of their clothing (Genesis 35:2). The fact that they got rid of their garments would not mean that all clothing was sinful would it? Neither should we gather from the text that all earrings are sinful, especially when we find earrings placed in a positive light in other Scriptures. Bernard also mentions the removal of ornaments by the Israelites after the worship of the golden calf by saying, "As a sign of humility, repentance, and consecration, God ordered them to take off these badges of vanity, pride, and lust. They gave all their jewelry to God, to be melted down and used in construction of the Tabernacle..."^[16] Bernard goes on to say that the jewelry was obtained from the Egyptians and this was because, "...God meant for them to take the Egyptians gold and silver for use in His service, not for personal ornamentation."^[17] The passage that is either ignored or overlooked by Mr.

Bernard is the one in which Yahweh directly tells the Israelites to take the jewels of the spoils and *put them upon* their sons and daughters (Exodus 3:21-22).

Bernard focuses in on all the negative verses pertaining to jewelry, but in each case it can clearly be seen that the wearer was adorning themselves for an evil reason, and not for a good reason like Rebecca (Genesis 24), the daughters of Israel (2 Samuel 1:24), the lover of the Song of Solomon (Song of Solomon 1:9-11), or the bride of a groom (Isaiah 49:18; 61:10; Jeremiah 2:32; Revelation 21:2). Bernard mentions the judgment pronounced on the vain daughters of Israel, presumably to bring out that the Lord would take away their anklets, bracelets, charms, rings, nose jewels, and the like, but the fact remains that Yahweh would *also* take away the daughters veils, scarves, apparel, mantles, hair, purses, and linen (Isaiah 3:16-24). Bernard comments on this by saying,

Some of them, such as articles of clothing, can be used innocently, but in this case they too were worn with ostentation and pride. They come under the condemnation of this passage whenever they are worn with the wrong spirit or with great extravagance, expense and show.^[18]

Why can't Bernard see that his statement applies to jewelry as well? So long as jewelry is not worn with such haughty motives, it is acceptable.

Bernard also attempts to somewhat say that Esther was holy because she did not adorn herself with jewelry. He writes,

When a woman was brought before the Persian king, she was allowed access to anything she desired in order to beautify herself (Esther 2:13). This included jewelry and cosmetics, which ancient royal courts used. Esther, however, desired and requested nothing, but used only what the king's eunuch... selected (Esther 2:15). The Bible only records that she used oil of myrrh, perfume, and other preparations to purify... the skin (Esther 2:12).

The above statements are full of inserting things into this Biblical text that are simply not written. In Esther 2:12-15 there is no direct mention of jewelry, there is only a mention of sweet smelling perfumes for the purifying and beautifying of women. The purifications mentioned in verses 3, 9, and 12 depict what we would call luxurious bath soaps. True enough, Esther did only request what the king's chamberlain advised (Esther 2:15), but this in no way means that she did not receive jewelry and makeup. Furthermore, the Bible does not record, as Bernard claims, that Esther *only* used the oils to purify and beautify, it simply states she requested what Hegai advised her. We are *not* told what was advised to her in Esther 2:12, as Bernard claims, this passage only tells us what was there available for *all* the women to use in the twelve months of purifying before being chosen to go into king Ahasuerus.

Bernard realizes that holy saints in the Old Testament wore jewelry but he says we must keep in mind that,

From Old Testament to New Testament God has progressively revealed more and more of His perfect will for His people. Through the Holy Spirit we have power to live a holy life in a way the Old Testament saints did not.^[19]

What is shocking here is that Bernard has to believe Yahweh's morality changes. In other words he is saying Yahweh allowed sin in the Old Testament, but not in the New Testament, or either it wasn't a sin in the Old but only in the New. This is fallacious on the account that nowhere does the Bible suggest an elevation in morality in the area of wearing jewelry, and also, there does not exist some kind of dichotomy between the two covenants of Yahweh. The difference in the covenants are clearly laid out in the book of Hebrews (Hebrews 7; 8:7-12; 10:1-17) and the differences have nothing to do with the wearing of jewelry. Furthermore, after quoting the Apostle's Peter's words in

1 Peter 3:1-6 Bernard writes, “When we take Peter’s advice and look at the holy women of the Old Testament, we find the women should not wear clothing pertaining to men, and vice versa...”^[20] If we can look to the women of the Old Testament for examples in areas of clothing, why not take their example in the wearing of jewelry too? It is inconsistent to look in one area and not the other. Bernard also states, “When godly people used jewelry, there was usually important functional value other than adornment.”^[21] In contradiction to this we find passages that actually mention the use of jewelry for the very purpose of *adornment* on people that where not involved in sin (Genesis 24; Isaiah 61:10; Ezekiel 16:8-14).

In examining a rebuttal from people as me of 1 Timothy 2:9 concerning an idiomatic expression, Bernard claims, “This is a devious interpretation, for it adds words to the Bible, twisting them to mean the opposite of what they literally say.”^[22] The “devious” interpretation Bernard alludes to is one which states that Paul is admonishing women to adorn themselves not *only* with gold, pearls, or costly array, but *also/rather* with a meek and quiet spirit. Bernard says that the word *only* is not found in any major Bible translation of his day. Are Bernard’s claims accurate? He is technically correct seeing that there is no underlying Greek word for only in 1 Timothy 2:9, but what he fails to recognize is that this *has* to be the understanding of the passage because of the sum of the Lord’s word (Psalms 119:160, NASB). Taking the totality of the Bible we find jewelry to be an accepted practice, and therefore it is easily understood that Paul was admonishing women to not allow outward adornment to be their primary goal in life, much like Yeshua admonished men to not allow working for food or material things be their primary goal when He stated, “Labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life. (John 6:27)” While the word *only* is not in *any major Bible version today* (As in “Labor not *only* for the meat that perisheth...” the understanding is nevertheless there. Taking Bernard’s method of interpretation we would have to conclude that men could not work for food, seeing Yeshua plainly stated to labor *not* for the meat that perisheth. Such an interpretation flies in the face of the totality of Scripture; one such place shows that if a man does not work, he has no right to eat food (2 Thessalonians 3:10). Bernard tries to use passages like Romans 13:13-14 by quoting it thusly, “Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness *only*, not in chambering and wantonness *only*, not in strife and envying *only*, but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ.”^[23] The attempt is to say that if the *only* interpretation is correct, then we would be allowed to be drunk, riot, wanton, strive, and envy as long as we *also/rather* put on Yeshua. Such a comparison between this passage and the passage in Timothy is stretching it to say the least. The rest of the Bible *clearly* condemns drunkenness, chambering, and such like, so we know for sure that the word *only* should not be inserted into the text of Romans 13:13-14. Passages like John 6:27 and 1 Timothy 2:9 however, make no sense with the rest of the Bible if they are meant to be taken at face value. The reader is advised to go to other passages in Scripture which use this *only-also/rather* idiom, to prove that it was a well known understanding many times in Scripture (Genesis 32:28; Exodus 16:8; 1 Samuel 8:7, Mark 9:37; Luke 14:12-14; John 12:44; Acts 5:4).

In light of what we find Bernard claiming concerning 1 Timothy 2:9, this contrasts with his understanding of 1 Peter 3:3. An objection given *to* Bernard, and given *by* some brethren I know of is that 1 Peter 3:3 cannot be prohibiting gold or jewelry outright for that would mean it would prohibit the simple wearing of clothes as well, seeing they are mentioned in the same context. I actually agree with Bernard on this one when he writes, “The KJV says ‘putting on of apparel,’ but the NKJV corroborates the NIV by saying ‘putting on fine apparel.’ Interpreted this way, the passage parallels 1 Timothy 2:9 exactly.”^[24] Although the Greek text does not use the word for *fine* or *costly* in 1 Peter 3:3, I believe this is the understanding of the passage. The singular word for apparel is used, but obviously Peter was not admonishing women to not wear clothes, but rather to not focus primarily on wearing expensive clothing, i.e. do not let that be your primary goal in life, but rather seek to beautify the inward woman. I find it interesting that Bernard realizes that this is the understanding of Peter in spite of the absence of a Greek word for *fine* or *costly*, yet he cannot realize that Paul wrote with the understanding of the word *only* in 1 Timothy 2:9.

Conclusion

Mr. David K. Bernard has done a great job at accurately representing the position of the United Pentecostal churches international on the subject of outward adornment. His writings are not filled with words of hate or sarcasm, but they are rather very scholarly, heart felt writings; writings which are seeking to persuade (2 Corinthians 5:10-11) others to his beliefs. What we must realize is that a man of such caliber as Mr. Bernard does have the possibility of being sincerely incorrect in his position, and I feel I have adequately demonstrated the fallacies of certain of his teachings on the subject of outward adornment.

In conclusion, both men and women must seek to dress modestly in their clothing, not revealing the sexual/private areas of their body through short and/or tight clothing. If people make an effort to do this the amount of lust and sexual immorality will decrease. Both men and women should not seek primarily to beautify their outward man with items while neglecting the inward/spiritual man. Many women today violate the admonition of Paul and Peter in the books of 1 Timothy and 1 Peter. Women spend hours on end at hair salons, and putting on makeup and getting their jewelry just right, while never praying, fasting, reading their Bible, submitting to their husband, etc. Many church-going men do the same thing in always working for material wealth while never spending time reading, studying the Bible, praying, fasting, spending time with family, etc. While there is nothing wrong with a women beautifying herself in moderation, or a man working and/or beautifying himself in moderation, when the more spiritual weightier matters are neglected the former activities become sin as they are placed above our relationship with our heavenly Father and His Son. I feel that if Paul and Peter and Yeshua were teaching and writing today, they would give the same admonishment to the many men and women in the 21st century churches.

There is nothing wrong with women wearing jewelry, having earrings, or bracelets, etc. There is also no sin in a woman using makeup in moderation. I have observed many fundamental, independent Christian families who had a woman/wife which adorned herself modestly with these things while dressing appropriately and they looked perfectly acceptable to the standard of Yahweh's word. The key is for us to not drop down the standard for both men and women of long loose tunics or robes for the sake of modesty. If Christian men and women would take a stand for Yahweh's word in this area, there would be very few if any that would have a problem in areas of outward adornment. Just a simple seeking to look nice and decent is the most you would see from such people. People have asked me, "Matthew, how can you okay jewelry and makeup, but then teach only robes for men and women?" The question is asked because people do not understand in their finite capacity how both teachings are compatible. The answer is that I do not go to the Bible with a pre-conceived idea before I study. I lay everything aside and make an honest attempt to come away with Yahweh's will on any issue; then I teach what Yahweh's will is straight from the pages of Scripture. It's a lot easier that way, instead of trying to make something fit that really doesn't.

I pray Yahweh will give us such men and women in these latter days, to shine forth the true gospel and message of Yahweh through His Son Yeshua the Messiah. If anyone knows of a United Pentecostal preacher willing to discuss these topics openly or one-on-one please contact me, I would be more than happy to make his acquaintance.

Endnotes

[1] *Practical Holiness: A Second Look*, by David K. Bernard, Series in Pentecostal Theology, Volume 4, published by Word Aflame Press 8855 Dunn Road, Hazelwood, MO 63042, p. 155-156.

[2] *Modest Apparel: for Men and Women* can be acquired by writing to the address at the end of the article.

[3] Bernard, p.158

[4] *New Living Translation; Young's Literal Translation*

[5] Bernard, p. 166

[6] p.167

[7] p.173

[8] p.184

[9] p.181

[10] *New American Standard Bible; Revised Standard Version*

[11] Bernard, p.169.

[12] p.169-170

[13] p.184

[14] The article, *Is Wearing Jewelry Sin?* may be accessed by visiting the *ministersnewcovenant.org* article section.

[15] Bernard, p.170

[16] p.170

[17] p.171

[18] p.172

[19] p.184, 185

[20] p.158

[21] p.185

[22] p.186

[23] p.186

[24] p.187