INDEED, “WHAT DOES GOD’S WORD SAY ABOUT IT?”

MODESTY AND THE IRREVERNT BABBLE OF BRETT HOGLAND AND OTHERS

INTRODUCTION

1. (1Ti 6:20-21 ESV) 20 *O Timothy, guard the deposit entrusted to you. Avoid the irreverent babble and contradictions of what is falsely called "knowledge," 21 for by professing it some have swerved from the faith. Grace be with you*.
   1. Timothy to guard “the deposit.”
      1. The gospel.
         1. It is the “pattern of sound words” that he heard from Paul (2 tim. 1:13).
      2. God has placed the gospel in the man of God’s safekeeping.
      3. He is its trustee; the faith is his sacred trust.
   2. He is to guard it.
      1. “to protect it by taking careful measures” (BDAG).
      2. “to defend it (The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek).
      3. At all costs!
   3. The gospel has been entrusted to him.
      1. Not found by him. It did not originate with him.
      2. It is the property of the Almighty entrusted to a young man, who is to keep it intact, not altered in any way, and share with others.
   4. He is to avoid the “irreverent babble and contradictions of what falsely called ‘knowledge.”
      1. He is to turn away from these babblers as they have “turned away from the truth” (2 Tim. 4:4) and have “strayed after Satan” (1 Tim. 5:15).
      2. (Rom 16:17 KJV) 17 *Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them*.
      3. “Turn away, however, does not mean refrain from confrontation.”
         1. He must fight the good fight of faith. Must contend for the faith.
         2. In means to not embrace the false teaching or the false teacher.
      4. “irreverent babble”
         1. Irreverent (**βέβηλος): pertaining to being profane in the sense of worldly or godless[[1]](#footnote-1)**
         2. Used of Esau in Heb. 12:16; he was a profane man.
         3. “babble” (**κενο-φωνία**): lit: empty speech.
            1. **talk that has no value**
            2. **useless**
         4. irreverent babble is teaching that is useless, worldly, and godless because it contradicts the knowledge of God, true knowledge.
         5. Contradicts: **ἀντίθεσις**
            1. Irreverent babble is teaching that is the antithesis true knowledge, the knowledge of God.
   5. The people of God are to avoid/turn away from irreverent babble because it will cause those professing it to swerve from the faith.
2. This morning we’re going to examine an example of irreverent babbling, as we examine the vain babbling of Brett Hogland related to the concept of modesty, and specifically, the false and godless notion that we can’t be sure what constitutes nakedness.
3. It’s a sad day in the kingdom when a preacher in whom I have placed confidence to uphold the truth, from whom I have profited by sitting at his feet, through whom I have been encouraged in gospel meetings, compromises with the world and goes after the devil.
   1. And what adds to the sadness of the day is that he has led a young preacher and area brethren to embrace his nonsense.
4. For over “thirty some years,” Brett has taught that exposing the thigh is the shameful exposure of nakedness and hence sinful, based on:
   1. (Exo 28:42 ESV) 42 You shall make for them linen undergarments to cover their naked flesh. They shall reach from the hips to the thighs;
   2. (Isa 47:2-3 ESV) 2 Take the millstones and grind flour, put off your veil, strip off your robe, uncover your legs, pass through the rivers. 3 Your nakedness shall be uncovered, and your disgrace shall be seen. I will take vengeance, and I will spare no one.
   3. Brett preached the truth then, but he no longer does.
5. Now he asks, “Is the uncovering of what we call the thigh, uncovering nakedness?”
   1. And in two sermons recently preached, he goes to great lengths to prove that, no, uncovering the thigh is not uncovering nakedness, at least not conclusively so. The word of God is ambiguous about the subject, and we cannot know for sure, therefore we cannot draw a line.
6. Much of what he says is based on the Hebrew word translated “thigh” in Exodus 28:42.
7. “YAREK”
   1. (Exo 28:42 ESV) 42 *You shall make for them linen undergarments to cover their naked flesh. They shall reach from the hips to the thighs*;
      1. Make for them linen undergarments (leggings).
         1. Purpose: “to cover their naked flesh.”
            1. “cover” means to thoroughly cover.
            2. Hebrew verb stem “piel”

(see S. Wallace sermon series on modesty).

* + - * 1. Puts the verb on steroids. Without it the verb would simply mean cover. With it, the verb means to fully cover, completely conceal, thoroughly clothe.
      1. How: “They shall reach from the hips to the thighs.”
         1. 1 Cor. 11:22 (Yoda literal trans) “if anyone is hungry, at home he should eat.
         2. Yoda: “Self control, you must learn” (Wallace, S.)

Self control is fronted for emphasis.

* + - * 1. God: “From the loins to the thighs, they shall reach.”

The holy spirit is emphasizing what is to be covered.

“When God defines modesty, He doesn’t whisper it. He emphasizes it. we must also” (Wallace, S.)

“to the thighs” means “cover even the thighs.” The whole thigh. All of the thigh.

(See S. Cox quote from PPT presentation on Modesty. [Sermon: Thoughts on Modesty – Sound Teaching](https://soundteaching.org/2011/11/13/sermon-thoughts-on-modesty/))

* + 1. Hips (*māṯ·nǎ·yim):*
       1. Loins (BDB), hips and lions (HALOT), (DBL) adds “lions, i.e., the area of the genitals of a body.’ Heart, body (physical person in its entirety).
    2. Thighs (yarek):
       1. thigh, lion, side, base (BDB).
       2. the fleshy part of the **upper thigh**[[2]](#footnote-2)
       3. *the thigh (Gesenius).*
       4. **yârêk**, *yaw-rake´*; from an unused root mean. to *be soft*; the *thigh* (from its fleshy *softness*); by euphem. the *generative parts*; fig. a *shank, flank, side*:—× body, loins, shaft, side, thigh.[[3]](#footnote-3)
       5. יָרֵך (*yārēk*). ***Thigh, loin, side, base***[[4]](#footnote-4)
    3. So, the priest’s nakedness would be thoroughly covered by covering the hip area and the entirety of the thighs.
    4. That’s holy writ. That’s God’s will.
    5. Exposing nakedness includes exposing the thigh. It did then, it does now. It is shameful, it is sinful.
    6. And it’s not popular. Brethren often rebel against the stricture of modesty. They look for loopholes, ways around divine restrictions so they do not have to stand out from the world.
    7. But God has called us to be a holy people, a holy priesthood that is not conformed to the world but conformed the image of the Lord Jesus.
    8. Preachers and churches all over the country continue to throw in the towel on the issue of modesty. Brett Hogland is just one example among many.

1. BUT HOW DOES BRETT GET AROUND WHAT THIS PASSAGE CLEARLY TEACHES?
   1. Centers his argument on the Hebrew word translated “thigh” in Exodus 28:42 in the ESV (*Yarek*).
      1. Thighs (*Yarek):* ***n.f.*** *Nu 5:27* ***thigh, loin, side, base******(****NH id.; Aramaic יַרְכָּא; Zinj. ירך loin; Assyrian arku, arkâtu, back, rear, hereafter Dl 242; Arabic وَرِكٌ (warikun) hip****)****—abs. יָרֵךְ Ju 15:8 + 6 times; [[5]](#footnote-5)*
      2. The word has several meaning. True of many words in Hebrew, Greek and English.
      3. Context determines what definition is meant.
      4. The context of Ex. 28:42 demands “thigh”.
   2. Brett argues, since the word has several meanings, we can’t be sure how it’s used here; therefore, we can no longer say for sure that exposing the thigh is nakedness.
      1. “Now I wasn’t - probably clear enough as we went quickly through all of the definitions. But as you go back to those definitions, I want to point out – that most of the lexicons do offer thigh as one definition— but they all concur that it involves the hips, and it involves the- genitalia, the reproductive parts. And that- that that’s primarily the base is- is what it’s talking about. There are translations that say it’s the thigh. Here’s what I want for you to understand from that. As I said, I’ve learned that the Hebrew language does not have always the same specificity that the Greek language has. And when you’ve got a word that is that general. I’m not saying that the thigh might not be included, what I’m saying is we cannot know that for sure.”
      2. Is the word actually “that general”? is it ambiguous? Is it true, brethren, that God is unclear here?
         1. (2Ti 3:16-17 ESV) 16 *All Scripture is breathed out by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, 17 that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work*.
         2. Are we equipped for EVERY good work or not?
         3. Does it apply to every good work except modesty?
      3. Was it ambiguous to the Israelites?
         1. (Exo 28:43 ESV) *43 and they shall be on Aaron and on his sons when they go into the tent of meeting or when they come near the altar to minister in the Holy Place, lest they bear guilt and die. This shall be a statute forever for him and for his offspring after him*.
         2. They understood exactly what meant.
      4. What about the Septuagint translators?
         1. 72 Jewish scholars, native Hebrew speakers.
         2. Fluent in Greek.
         3. Third century BC, translated the Books of Moses into Greek.
         4. Can you guess how they translated “yarek”?
         5. Yes, “thigh”, with the Greek word “μηρός”
      5. What about the Hebrew scholars involved in English translation?
         1. I have nearly 37 English translations in my library.
         2. Everyone of them translates the word “yarek” “thigh”.
         3. Brett has Hebrew guys:
            1. I spent a tremendous amount of time testing what I had taught about the thigh before, with both the definitions supplied by the Hebrew lexicons and the context where this word was found. I consulted brethren, friends of mine that are well studied in the Hebrew language to see if I was missing something. They assured me that I was not – that I was correct in understanding that I had misused these words.
            2. Who are these Hebrew guys that are “well studied” in the language?

And how do they justify disagreeing with the consensus of centuries of Hebrew scholarship?

* + - * 1. By the way, LOGICAL FALLACY. Argument from authority.
      1. The word is not ambiguous—except to Brett and, perhaps, his Hebrew guys.
  1. Brett is desperate for the word to mean genitals and buttocks.
     1. If he can force that definition on the word, then that frees him from having to draw a line. If frees him from having to preach difficult lessons that call for brethren who dress immodestly to repent. It frees him from getting beat-up by worldly brethren who insist on running around half-naked despite what God says as they lash out against the truth.
        1. It makes it easier for him
     2. Regarding “Yarek”:
        1. “Does it [“thigh,” gbn] mean that in Exodus 28? I don’t – I don’t believe that it does; I certainly couldn’t prove that it does. And this is the point— I cannot bind what I cannot prove. I can prove that baptism is a burial, it is an immersion, based upon the word; that’s what it means.”
  2. Brett can’t insist that the word means “reproductive bits” because that would defeat his purpose of creating ambiguity.
     1. He insists we know that exposing the reproductive bits and the backside is nakedness.
        1. I would ask him, if God’s word is so ambiguous in exodus 28:42 in defining nakedness, how do we know he is not ambiguous elsewhere in defining nakedness?
        2. Brett how do we know for sure that bare reproductive bits and backsides is nakedness?
        3. I challenge him to answer that question. If he does, he’ll find himself in a conundrum.
     2. And he finds himself in a conundrum here by even suggesting that “yarek” could mean anything else but thighs in this context.
        1. Again, Brett wants the word to mean loins, or the reproductive bits.
        2. (Exo 28:42 ESV) 42 *You shall make for them linen undergarments to cover their naked flesh. They shall reach from the* ***hips*** *to the thighs*;
           1. Hips: (*mot-na-yim*):

Lions (BDB)

Loins (Gesenisus)

Hips, loin (HALOT).

* + - * 1. Yarek” Brett says:

Brown-Driver-and-Briggs say it means the loin, the base— those proceeding from the loins or the descendants or the extreme parts.

Gesenius says it means the buttocks, it means the most remote region.

HALOT says it refers to the base of a lampstand.

* + - 1. Do you see his dilemma?
         1. He essentially has the two words meaning the same thing.
         2. So, the passage says make them linen undergarments; they shall reach from loins to the loins, or the hips to the hips.
         3. Brethren, if you find yourself forcing God’s word to say silly things like this, please understand you are on the wrong path.
  1. Examine Words with multiple meanings.
     1. Called polysemes or homonyms, depending on if they have related meanings or not. Common in English, Hebrew and Greek.
        1. Hebrew “head” (rosh):
           1. Head of body.
           2. Top/summit/ beginning
        2. Greek “flesh” (sarx):
           1. Flesh-literal body tissue
           2. Human body as a whole
           3. Desires of the flesh.
        3. English “bank”:
           1. He will drive 180 mph into the bank of the turn; you can bank on it.
           2. He drove to the bank with a stringer of fish.
           3. He drove to the bank with the weekly deposit.

Context determines what “bank” means, and we can know what it means from the context.

* + - 1. Let’s try Brett’s reasoning with BAPTISM.
         1. “I can prove that baptism is a burial, it is an immersion, based upon the word; that’s what it means.”
         2. I can prove that yarek is a thigh; it is the fleshy part of the upper leg, based upon the word; that’s what it means.
         3. He says the Greek word baptize means “a burial.”

I challenge Brett to find a lexicographer who defines “*baptizo*” as a burial.

Maybe there is one. Point me to it, if so.

* + - * 1. **Βαπτίζω: dip, plunge, to be drowned, flooded, overwhelm, to be drenched, soaked in wine, *disable*, getting into deep water (LSJ).**
        2. **To wash oneself, bathe (Thayer).**
        3. Notice:

“And so it clearly doesn’t necessarily always mean the thigh. Does it mean that in Exodus 28? I don’t – I don’t believe that it does; I certainly couldn’t prove that it does. And this is the point— I cannot bind what I cannot prove.”

“And so it [baptism] clearly doesn’t necessarily always mean a burial. Does it mean that in Acts 2? I don’t – I don’t believe that it does; I certainly couldn’t prove that it does. And this is the point— I cannot bind what I cannot prove.”

* + - * 1. If we can know for sure what “yarek” means in Exodus 28:42 because it has multiple meanings, then we can’t know for sure what baptism means in Acts 2:38 because it has multiple meanings.
        2. With this kind of reasoning, God’s expressed will, to which he holds us accountable, with which he threatens us with eternal destruction, is completely unknowable. Who can believe it.
        3. Brett has the gall to say, “And I know that young people will not respect, and they will often lose their faith -if they see us misusing the Scriptures to teach what we want them to say.”
        4. What he means is those who do not follow his convoluted reasoning and follow him in determining that God is ambiguous, uncertain in ex. 28 are misusing the scriptures to teach, not what they actually say, but what we want them to say, and hence we threaten the faith of the young.

Our young are not stupid. With their fresh minds perhaps they see better then we do. I can assure you of this, they see through this charade. That has been demonstrated to me. And I thank God for the young who engage their minds to deal honestly with their heavenly father’s will.

No, Brett, insisting that thigh means thigh in Ex. 28 does not threaten the faith of our young. What actually threatens their faith is when grown men, so-called gospel preachers cave to the world and try to convince them that God’s word is ambiguous. For when you convince them it is ambiguous, you undermine their confidence in it, and it will become meaningless to them, and they will fall away.

Teaching like this does not edify the young. It fails the young.

What the young need is strong leadership in the home and in the church—leadership that is centered in what the bible says.

Our children’s faith is developing. They need us. They need us to stand strong in a world gone mad with sin.

Parents, don’t cave to this nonsense.

Young folks, don’t allow adults, those who are supposed to be responsible, just because they hold positions of leadership, undermine your faith in the bible. Believe God. Trust him.

1. BRETT’S USE OF LEXICONS
   1. He quotes from, or rather he cites, four Hebrew lexicons that define “yarek”.
      1. Brett says, “Strong’s says that it’s a word that means to be soft by euphemism of the generative parts.” What it actually says is:
         1. from an unused root mean. to *be soft*; the *thigh* (from its fleshy *softness*); by euphem. the *generative parts*; fig. a *shank, flank, side*:—× body, loins, shaft, side, thigh.[[6]](#footnote-6)
         2. he attempts to leave the impression that the sacred writers were perhaps using the word euphemistically to avoid being graphic.
         3. Not true for many reasons, because the word “loins” used in the passage refers to the reproductive bits.
      2. Brett says, “When The Word Book of the Old Testament says that it is actually- it is translated thigh, but it also means loin or base.”
         1. ***Thigh, loin, side, base (theological word book of the old testament).***
      3. Brett says, “Brown-Driver-and-Briggs say it means the loin, the base— those proceeding from the loins or the descendants or the extreme parts.”
         1. **thigh, loin, side, base**
            1. **1.** *thigh*,

מִמָּתְנַיִם וְעַד־יְרֵכַיִם Ex 28:42 (P)[[7]](#footnote-7)

* + - * 1. And HALOT is- is making us aware of that. It refers to the base of a lamp stand. I know what my base is, it’s not my thighs.

the fleshy part of the **upper thigh** (:: מָתְנַיִם): [[8]](#footnote-8)

from the hips to the thighs Ex 28:42[[9]](#footnote-9)

metaph

**side** (Dhorme *Emploi* 98) a) of the altar Lv 1:11 2K 16:14[[10]](#footnote-10)

base of lampstand (with קָנֶה shaft) Ex 25:31 37:17 Nu 8:4.[[11]](#footnote-11)

No Brett, your base is not your thighs. In fact, it is no part of you.

* + 1. The lexicon’s Brett cited to not support his error. In fact, they refute his error.
    2. The lexical consensus is that “yarek” means thighs in Exodus 28:41
  1. Stan Cox on Exodus 28:42.
     1. Note from PPT slide, slide #10, ([Thoughts on Modesty.ppt](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fsoundteaching.org%2Fppt%2FThoughts%2520on%2520Modesty.ppt&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK))
        1. Note: Well aware that this was ceremonial dress. However, note that the linen trousers had a practical purpose! To cover their nakedness as they ascended to the altar. The phrase is an inclusive Hebrew idiom, indicating a covering complete to the knee.
     2. “Things to Conside,” slide #17, ([Thoughts on Modesty.ppt](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fsoundteaching.org%2Fppt%2FThoughts%2520on%2520Modesty.ppt&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK))
        1. Dress that does not cover the chest, midriff and thigh is not modest, and should not be worn by any Christian.
        2. Dress that accentuates the body by tight fit or style can incite lust, and should not be worn by any Christian.
        3. The occasion is irrelevant. Modesty should not be compromised because of swimming, athletic activities, school costumes, etc.
        4. Consider the danger of becoming an occasion of stumbling to other Christians.

1. CONSEQUENCES OF BRETT’S ERROR (not exhaustive)
   * 1. To be consistent, he must either withdraw from those who disagree with him or place modesty in Romans 14 as an issue to which God is indifferent.
        1. Those who disagree with him are binding were God has not bound, according to Brett’s doctrine.
           1. What’s it going to be, Brett?
     2. He has made it harder for godly parents to hold the line on modesty.
        1. Some kiddos will hear Brett’s sermon and use it as a weapon to convince their parents to allow them to raise the hem line.
        2. “Well, brother Brett says we can’t draw the line. And if you do you’re binding were God didn’t bind”
     3. For the sisters who are of a mind to wear miniskirts or their Daisy-Dukes to worship a Holy Father, go to the Southside church of Christ in Blue Springs MO where Brett preaches. Neither he nor the elders will say anything to you. They can’t say anything because they can’t draw the line. We can’t be sure what constitutes nakedness.
     4. Now, Brett will tell you that he believes a miniskirt is immodest, and he’ll tell you that it’s immodest because it exposes the thigh.
     5. But it’s simply lip service. It’s only his opinion. Again, he can’t draw the line.
     6. In fact, he goes on and on in the second sermon about how important modesty is and that we don’t have a free reign to wear whatever we want, and blah, blah, blah.
     7. Notice;
        1. This doesn’t mean that we can throw caution to the wind and have no way to know what is or isn’t modest outside of nudity. The New Testament is filled with commands and requirements that do not specify a hard and fast line, but rather require discernment.
           1. Nonsensical
        2. All of this is about- knowing more and growing, knowing more and growing. And the growth happens when we take the knowledge and we apply it or we obey it; we change; we transform. This is how we are going to dress modestly. Yes, it’s not always just a specific line that is there. It is that the Lord is leading us down this path of becoming more and more like him.
           1. Incoherent
     8. It’s all lip-service.
        1. (Isa 29:13 ESV) 13 *And the Lord said: "Because this people draw near with their mouth and honor me with their lips, while their hearts are far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment taught by men*,
        2. It’s not another way to get to the same point. Brett has erased the point.
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