

# The False Pen of the Scribe: When Culture and Kin Redraw God's Lines

---

## Introduction:

1. [C] Scripture Reading: Jeremiah 8:4-12.
2. This section is a devastating indictment against Israel. Their refusal to repent was as senseless as a man who falls but refuses to rise (8:4). A good man may stumble (Psa. 37:24), but he will not persist—he repents quickly.
3. “Will one turn away and not return” (v. 4). It is like veering off the path, and when this person knows he is going in the wrong direction, he doesn’t change his course, continuing headstrong into the wrong direction—like a warhorse charging into certain death. Persistent sin prefers the wrong direction.
4. Israel was a nation of perpetual backsliding because they held fast to deceit (v.5) and “no man repented” (v.6). Migratory birds follow their built-in compass and return (v. 7); they know their time, but Israel’s moral compass was perverted, and they liked it that way.
5. This leads to the striking accusation in v.8: “The false pen of the scribe certainly works falsehood.” **What does it mean?**
  - a. The scribes were supposed to copy and teach God's law accurately. But now, God says their pen writes lies. They hadn’t stopped quoting the law—they just subtly rewrote its meaning, likely to please the people or cover up sin.
  - b. Their wisdom became worthless (v.9) because they rejected the Word, while claiming to teach it.
6. Purpose of this message: To warn against tampering with God’s Word—especially when motivated by family ties—and to uphold the unchanging standard of divine truth.

## Discussion:

### I. [C] THE DANGER OF DOCTRINAL DRIFT IS ALWAYS PRESENT – Hebrews 2:1-3

- A. Doctrinal drift is not necessarily a violent rejection of truth...but can be a subtle departure or neglect. While doctrine doesn’t change, our grip on it can be loosened. Our ears toward it can become deaf. This verse calls us to heed and warns that **doctrinal drift doesn’t begin with heresy, but hesitation.**
- B. This is a message we need today—to return to what we have known. Rather, we are finding a domino effect of once-respected gospel preachers apologizing for long-held positions. Other unscriptural and strange teachings are being promoted as well (such as on forgiveness).
- C. Likewise, the scribes and “wise men” in Israel once claimed to uphold the law. But over time, they began **rewriting, reinterpreting, and removing its power from the nation.**
- D. Apostasy doesn’t always shout loud defiance through a megaphone.
  1. Sometimes it is cloaked in *false humility*. Claiming to have an “Apollo’s Moment” is not humility when biblical clarity is replaced with confusion. Humility is not found in *doctrinal retreat*.
  2. Humility is not doing a spiritual about-face, giving up clarity and Scripture to protect a child’s erroneous position. Humility does not throw Jesus under the bus to keep family peace; pride does. (Matthew 10:32-36). The line between *humility* and *heresy* is often played out in the tie that binds us to Jesus or family loyalty.

### II. [C] WHEN FAMILY BLOODLINES ERASES GOD’S LINE

- A. Matthew 10:37 — Family over Christ is unworthy

1. The issue is not just affection—it's **authority**.
2. When a preacher starts **protecting his child** over preaching the truth, he is no longer fit to teach.
3. After Aaron's sons were punished by fire, Moses reminded Aaron that those who come before God must regard God as holy and glorify Him—Aaron held his peace (Lev. 10:3).

B. [cl] Eli's downfall — 1 Samuel 2:29-34; 3:13

1. *"Why do you honor your sons more than Me?"*
2. Eli refused to restrain his sons. God judged him for it.

C. [cl] Solomon's apostasy — 1 Kings 11:4

1. Not a young man when he fell, but **an older father** whose heart was turned by his wives.
2. You can start wise and end ruined if your loyalty drifts.

### III. [C] REBRANDING EVIL WITH A HOLY LABEL.

- A. When God's standards are inconvenient, men often relabel sin as sincerity, repackage compromise as compassion, and present *confusion* as humility. The devil rarely destroys the force of the truth with one blow; rather, he gives it a facelift. He essentially rebranded the Tree of Knowledge as wisdom's doorway—"you will be like God, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 3:5). It was the first act of doctrinal repackaging, *but a lie with a halo is still a lie*.
- B. Isaiah 5:20 warns that this isn't wisdom—it's a curse. The scribes of Jeremiah's day (Jer. 8:8) edited God's law with what He calls a "false pen." They did not deny Scripture outright—they rewrote it under the banner of being wise.
  1. God explicitly warned against changing God's law, whether by expansion or reduction, "Whatever I command you, be careful to observe it; you shall not add to it nor take away from it." (Deut. 12:32)
  2. Isaiah 5:20 and Jeremiah 8:8 go hand-in-hand: evil relabeled, truth rewritten. But wisdom that erases God's line is not wisdom—it's war on the Word. The scribes used their pen not to preserve truth but to protect a position.
  3. Likewise, modern scribes aren't denying Scripture—they're restyling it. In Jeremiah 8:8, they claimed wisdom while gutting the standard. Key Observations from Jeremiah 8
    - a) [C] **They claimed to be wise.** *"How can you say, 'We are wise...'"*  
They presented themselves as careful, prudent handlers of God's law.
    - b) **They claimed to possess the law.** *"...and the law of the Lord is with us."*  
Like some modern teachers, they spoke **as if they were upholding truth** even while they altered its meaning. This is why we say, "Test what you hear with what you read."
    - c) [C] **They rewrote it.** *"...the false pen of the scribe certainly works falsehood."*  
They didn't throw Scripture away—they **rebranded** it, **softened** it, or **twisted** it to fit their narrative.
    - d) **They rejected it.** God calls it a rejection. *"They have rejected the word of the Lord."*  
Even if they quote Scripture, when they redefine its implications, **they're rejecting it** in God's eyes.
    - e) [C] **God strips their claim of wisdom.** *"So what wisdom do they have?"*  
The moment a man rewrites God's word, his **"wisdom"** is exposed as foolishness (cf. 1 Cor. 3:19).
- C. Today, preachers are doing the same, not on parchment but with a pulpit.
  1. When Brett Hogland introduced his mistaken view on Exodus 28:42 in May 2025, Jeremiah Cox followed suit, embracing it at the 84<sup>th</sup> Street church in OK, defending it on May 25, 2025, on "Reflections of Modesty."

2. The domino effect continued in August when Stan Cox, preaching at West Side in Fort Worth, expressed regret for having used Exodus 28:42 to define thigh exposure as nakedness, stating he's no longer sure the view is biblically defensible.<sup>1</sup> While still wanting the thigh to be covered, he effectively places question marks where God has placed periods. When the OT teaching of nakedness and shame is erased, the New Testament no longer has an anchor (cf. Rom. 15:4).
3. This underscores the need for churches and individuals to uphold the truth of God's Word against the rising tide of cultural and ecclesiastical compromise. It is troubling when hero-worshippers follow preachers into error. Equally so when friends and bloodlines erase divinely drawn lines in Scripture. *When family becomes the filter, Scripture becomes obscured in fog.*

#### IV. [C] WHEN WORDS ARE WOUNDED: THE VIOLENCE OF LEXICAL BUTCHERY

- A. A new wave of confusion isn't coming from the outside—it's being carved up from pulpits and study desks. Rather than deny Scripture outright, some **hack away at words** until meaning bleeds out. This is not a deeper study—it's doctrinal sabotage.
  1. It might take the form of redefining words to mean something outside of their context. For example, if my bias is based on John Calvin rather than Jesus Christ, I will force my hand to rewrite 1 John 2:2, "And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world" to "...not for ours only but also for the whole **world of chosen believers.**" (cf. 1 Tim. 2:4)
  2. It might take the form of replacing "Redeemer" with a more generic word, "deliverer."
  3. It might butcher the word "repent" to mean "feel sorry" and cut away any meaning that calls for a radical reversal of behavior.
  4. It might reduce "agape" love as simply being brotherly appreciation rather than preserving the sacrificial tone of the word. In every case, Lexical butchery is to mangle meaning.
- B. **LEXICAL BUTCHERY** carves up a word's *possible* meanings to mutilate its *actual* meaning in context, insisting on ambiguity where God gave clarity. As physical butchery mangles *flesh*, lexical butchery mangles *meaning*—often to suit a theological bias, support a modern narrative, or reduce Scripture's force.
  1. This is what was done with the Hebrew term *yārēk*. **The context of Exodus 28:42** is part of God's explicit instruction for covering nakedness, and to insist there is ambiguity is to paint God as hard to please, giving the death penalty for violating these instructions (28:43). Cover the thigh to not die→thigh left undefined→you will die if the thigh is uncovered!
  2. It parallels the lexical butchery in 2000 when several preachers sacrificed God's clear teaching in Genesis 1 on *the days of creation* to align with a popular teacher. It didn't matter then, when false teachers paraded forth various definitions of the Hebrew word "yom" (day), Genesis 1 still teaches that God created the world in six literal solar days. Likewise, Exodus 28:42 still teaches that the thigh, when left uncovered, is sinful and shameful due to nakedness.
- C. **Lexical butchery** takes the **range** of a word and treats it like a **buffet**—picking what supports the desired conclusion, while ignoring the **context that governs meaning**.
  1. [C] Would they treat the word **baptism** this way? Will they argue that since baptism can mean "immerse," "wash," or even "overwhelm," and is used metaphorically of *suffering* (Mark 10:38), as well as being coupled with the Holy Spirit and fire (Matt. 3:11), that insisting **baptism for the remission of sins** in Acts 2:38 is water is indefensible?

<sup>1</sup> Sermon, "My Convictions Regarding Modesty." August 4, 2025. [My Convictions Regarding Modesty](#)

- a) Those who do not like water baptism insist on Holy Spirit baptism. One person even told me that he was baptized in the Word every time he reads it!
  - b) If we abandon contextual *precision* for lexical *possibilities*, we will have no guardrails left in biblical interpretation.
  - c) This material is concerned with something **bigger than modesty—it's a hermeneutical collapse**. When we elevate *ambiguity* over *contextual clarity*, any command becomes negotiable.
2. [C] As Peter warned, the **unstable twist**—or more literally, **distort, wrench, or torture**—the Scriptures to their own destruction (2 Peter 3:16). This isn't rightly dividing the word of truth (2 Tim. 2:15)—it's **exegetical** violence with an **eisegetical** cleaver. It's not study—it's slaughter.

2 Peter 3:16	Lexical Butchery
"Hard to understand"	Appeals to complexity to create doubt
"Untaught and unstable"	Not anchored in sound hermeneutics
"Twist to their own destruction"	Mutilate meaning under the guise of interpretation
"As they do also the rest of the Scriptures"	Shows this is a repeated, systemic pattern

Just as in Peter's day, modern teachers twist Scripture by taking the **lexicon's breadth** and overriding the **context's clarity**. They sound scholarly but behave **irresponsibly**, leading others into confusion and error.

Brothers and sisters, the Holy Spirit not only forewarned of the drift away from doctrinal surety—such as we are seeing in our time when men twist Scripture, when clarity is traded for cleverness, and when context is sacrificed on the altar of personal desire, but let's also hear Paul's charge to Timothy in light of the present hour... (2 Timothy 4:1-5.

What Paul wrote to Timothy still speaks to every heart today: the truth will be either endured—or exchanged. The gospel will be either obeyed—or replaced.

It is our choice to listen to sound doctrine, or be turned to fables? If you are not a Christian, will you accept the inspired pen to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, repent from living a life toward sin, turning to Jesus, confessing His name before men, and being immersed in water to have your sins washed away (Acts 22:16)? If you have been out of duty with Christ, will you repent, return, confess that sin, and walk faithfully with Christ?

**LESSON 2. When God defines our duty, we should not ignore it or replace it with something else. When God defines nakedness in terms of what must be covered, we must not pretend He left it undefined.** I've listened to what these men have spoken and feel like Jeremiah in 8:6...they do not speak aright.

For those who want to butcher the meaning of "thigh" in Exodus 28:42 with a vague understanding I've found no translation to support anything but thigh. Even the looser versions **retain** the anatomical meaning, affirming the **specificity of the Hebrew term**. Any claim that "we can't be sure it means thigh" **is not supported by translation history or linguistic evidence**. The thigh terminates at the knee. Therefore, by definition, the line is drawn at the knee.

**V. [C] ANCHORED IN GENESIS: SHAMEFACEDNESS HAS A HISTORY—Romans 15:4**

- A. Erasing or obscuring ancient, inspired teaching destabilizes New Testament doctrine. It opens the door to justifying immodesty—turning sacred garments into little more than Daisy Duke's shorts.
  - B. In the area of modesty, I would challenge anyone to prove from the New Testament alone that wearing a miniskirt is sinful apart from anchoring "propriety" or "*shamefacedness*" (1 Tim. 2:9) in Genesis 3:21, Exodus 28:42, and Isaiah 47:2-3. Show how holiness necessarily violates this choice of clothing!
1. [C] When infidels attack faith, they often level their arsenal against the first 11 chapters of the Bible. They attack the foundation to attack the credibility of the Bible. "The days cannot be literal," "Science teaches millions of years," "No global flood," "Tower of Babel is fiction, language communication evolved from grunts and growling to grammar and Greek philosophy!"
    - a) [cl] **Genesis 1** – undermined → man becomes just another animal
    - b) [cl] **Genesis 2** – ignored → marriage definitions become redefined
    - c) [cl] **Genesis 3** – reinterpreted → shame becomes subjective
    - d) **The Skeptic** says: "Man, independent of God, determines truth. One person's belief is as valid as the next. We can't know why we exist, etc."
    - e) **Result: FAITH is fractured** (2 Peter 3:5–7; Psalm 11:3)
  2. [C] Modesty Begins at the Fall (Genesis 3:7, 10, 21)
    - a) [cl] Man's first instinct after sin? Cover his nakedness.
    - b) [cl] God's first act of grace? Clothe man with adequate covering (Gen. 3:21)
    - c) The fig leaves were not enough (Gen. 3:7 vs. 3:21)
    - d) This event is foundational to understanding modesty and shamefacedness.
  3. [C] The Word "Shamefacedness" (1 Timothy 2:9, KJV)
    - a) Paul isn't inventing this concept—it's anchored in Genesis. Remove Genesis 3, and you erase the roots of this concept.
    - b) [cl] Greek: *aidōs*— "as a moral feeling, *reverence, awe, respect for the feeling or opinion of others or for one's own conscience, and so shame, self-respect*" (LSJ). The last part of this definition comes alive in Genesis 3:7–10. Shamefacedness isn't shyness—it's the honorable restraint that springs from reverence for God and respect for others. In Eden, standing naked—or inadequately clothed—wrecked Adam and Eve's conscience before each other and before God. True self-respect recognizes and keeps the boundaries that define shame.
    - c) [C] Those who promote relaxed standards may still quote 1 Timothy 2:9, but they strip it of its weight by shrouding its Old Testament moorings in manufactured doubt.
    - d) To question God's covering in Genesis is to confuse Paul's command in 1 Timothy.  
**No Genesis—no shame. No shame—no modesty. No modesty—no holiness. Erase the**

*foundation, and the structure collapses.*

The battle for Genesis is the battle for godly thinking about everything.

- e) As the meaning of anything is tied to its origin, with Genesis being a book of origins, it is therefore a book of meaning.
4. [C] Read again Jeremiah 8:8-9. The False versus True Scribe
- a) Modern scribes reinterpret clear Scripture (like Exodus 28:42 or 1 Timothy 2:9) to avoid conflict with culture, or to excuse family members. They still carry Bibles, still speak softly about “principles,” but the line of truth has been moved.
  - b) [C,C] Jeremiah 8:4–9 sets the moral tone: this is not just error—it is treachery against God’s revelation.
  - c) Stan Cox’s former conviction was based on clarity. He preached a sermon on June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2024, entitled, “Straight Answers to Questions About Modesty.”<sup>2</sup> He said:
    - (1) “Does God draw strong lines in determining what is modest and what isn’t?... People say today, ‘There are no lines drawn in Scripture. I disagree with that.’”
    - (2) “This is a problem I have with much preaching on the subject of modesty. Okay, we ought to be modest, but God really doesn’t draw a line on what modesty is. Where in scripture do you ever find God giving a command requiring you to do something, but does not give you the information that you need to obey the command? Where in scripture would that happen? ‘Don’t do it.’ Well, how do I keep from doing it, or what is it, or when have I gone over the line? ‘Well, I’m not going to deal with that, you’re just going to have to figure that out for yourself.’ No, He doesn’t do that at all. God’s manner of dealing with man is consistent with regard to all of our life.”
    - (3) After quoting 2 Timothy 3:16, “Modesty is righteous. You want to know what modesty is? The word of God tells you what modesty is so that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto every good work, and this idea that I intend to dress modestly, but God hasn’t made it clear enough, that’s almost Blasphemous in my eyes. If God hasn’t told us what is modest, where the line is to be drawn, what isn’t modest, what if I accidentally disobey because I just don’t know it, or I just don’t understand it clearly enough? The Scripture shows us that God does not act that way.”
    - (4) “The clear teaching of God’s word...insufficient dress, which constitutes nakedness as well. And one of those, just to give you an example, there’s nakedness in the uncovered thigh. So you want to draw a line? ‘Well, I’m not going to draw a line. The Bible doesn’t draw a line. We can’t go to the Old Testament.’ Draw a line? I tell you we can go to the Old Testament to find out what nakedness is and what God considers nakedness, and God said in Exodus chapter 28, not a matter of ritual, not a matter because they were high priests, not a matter of keeping the old Covenant, but rather, make Aaron and his sons linen britches so that when they come up on the altar above everyone else to offer up sacrifices to God they will have their nakedness covered. And so britches were made from the waist to the thigh.”
    - (5) Now, after his son says he can no longer use Exodus 28:42 to draw a line, Stan says, “And so again, in my last 35 years of preaching, I’ve had one inclination to teach the

---

<sup>2</sup> Sermon, “Straight Answers to Questions About Modesty.” June 30, 2024. [Straight Answers to Questions About Modesty - YouTube](#)



passage affirms the covering of the thigh to the knee. But in these recent examinations that were brought on because others ... I find that I cannot say that it's the only conclusion that we can make, nor can I affirm that it is the certain one...I need to apologize for misusing this in the past. Just as Jeremiah felt the necessity of apologizing for it and as Brett felt the necessity for apologizing for it, I apologize for what I have taught on this matter and misleading you in any way."

- C. Preachers are not called to **pad the pulpit with pillows of indecision**, but to sound the trumpet clearly (1 Cor. 14:8). When a teacher shifts from bold biblical reasoning to ambiguity, the sheep are left unguarded, and the wolves find an opening.

## VI. [C] BIBLICAL WARNINGS AGAINST REDRAWING GOD'S LINE

- A. Jeremiah 8:8–9 — False scribes reject the word
1. They say, "*We are wise... the law is with us*"—but their pens write falsehood.
  2. They edited God's law to make it fit the times and protect their interests.
- B. Deuteronomy 4:2; Proverbs 30:6; Revelation 22:18–19
1. God's Word is not open to revision—even by preachers, parents, or scholars.
- C. Isaiah 5:20 — "Woe to those who call evil good..."
1. When standards of modesty are dismissed or compromised under the name of "grace" or "uncertainty," we're witnessing a moral inversion.

## VII. [C] THE COST OF REDRAWING GOD'S LINE

- A. Jeremiah 8:8–12, a terrible cost followed by bringing in moral corruption, even of the priests and prophets, to the uprooting of a nation. Like Jeremiah, I mourn for the damage this kind of preaching is doing to the Lord's Bride (Jer. 8:21).
- B. [C] 1 Kings 2:36–38 — **Shimei** (SHIM-eye) was the Benjamite who cursed David when fleeing from Absalom (2 Sam. 16:5–13). After Solomon became king, Shimei was spared on one condition:
1. "Build yourself a house in Jerusalem and dwell there, and do not go out from there anywhere." A line of life and safety was drawn clearly before him. Leaving the city would cost him his life.
  2. [cl] 1 Kin. 2:39–40. Three years later, didn't give Shimei a "better understanding of boundaries" but evidently he thought he had when he chose to depart and cross over the line the king had drawn. The fact that he had a personal situation with slave who ran away to Gath didn't change the king's line. Trying to redefine "day" or "cross" or the Kidron" would not change his punishment either.
  3. [cl] When Solomon heard, he reminded Shimei of the clear line he had agreed to and ordered his execution (1 Kin. 2:42–46). Because the times change doesn't mean the king's law does.
    - a) Shimei's *safety* was within the king's boundary — leaving it brought judgment.
    - b) Likewise, God's **moral and doctrinal boundaries** are not suggestions. When men "redraw" them to suit family, culture, or convenience, they leave the place of safety.
  4. Just as Shimei could not plead ignorance or good intentions, neither can we when stepping outside God's revealed line. **Point:** *The King's line was his life. Crossing it was death. God's moral lines are no different. 2 John 9*
- C. [cl] Romans 16:17 — Mark and avoid those who cause divisions
1. If a man starts calling clarity "uncertainty," **that's division**. If we wouldn't let a denominational preacher enshroud baptism with obscurity, why allow a brother to do the same with modesty?

2. As a preacher, if I ever abandoned the clarity of God's word to follow family error, to justify a family member's sin, don't encourage me, don't thumbs-up the message on FB, call for my repentance or my resignation.

### VIII. THE UNCHANGING STANDARD STANDS

- A. Exodus 28:42 still defines nakedness.
  1. God said the thigh must be covered—nothing has changed.
- B. Genesis 3 still shows God's corrective clothing.
  1. Fig leaves = man's effort. Tunics = God's standard.
- C. 1 Timothy 2:9 still demands modesty and propriety.
  1. Godly shamefacedness knows where the line is—**because Scripture draws it.**
  2. The thigh is still covered because this quality is anchored in the Old Testament doctrine of modesty as much as marriage is anchored in the Genesis model of Adam and Eve.

### *Conclusion:*

1. The standard still stands. Godly shamefacedness knows where the line is—**because Scripture draws it.** Those who tremble at the word of God readily see it and will abide by it. Those who don't, won't.
2. **Keep Your Pen Pure** – Are you a faithful scribe—or a false one? Will you bend the Word for family, friends, or culture? **Let God be true and every man a liar—even if that man is your son.**
3. Don't blur the vision. Don't edit the lines. Live by faith, and faith lives by hearing the word of God, not rewriting it.
4. [C] *"Write the vision and make it plain on tablets, that he may run who reads it."* (Habakkuk 2:2) Walking by faith received message and takes the action prescribed. Won't you do that tonight and obey the message of the King?