

Q & A About Faulty Assumptions, Part 2

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 12 August 2018

Preacher: Marvin Wiseman

[0 : 00] will be in the evening in the book of Psalms. Please turn to Psalm 19. And in Psalm 19, we'll be looking at verses 7 through 14.

The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul. The testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.

The precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart. The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever. The judgments of the Lord are true. They are righteous altogether.

They are more desirable than gold, yes, than much fine gold, sweeter also than honey and the drippings of the honeycomb.

[1 : 20] Moreover, by them your servant is warned. In keeping them there is great reward. Who can discern his errors?

Acquip me of hidden faults. Also keep back your servant from presumptuous sins. Let them not rule over me.

Then I will be blameless, and I shall be acquitted of great transgression. Let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in your sight, O Lord, my rock and my redeemer.

We have scarcely gotten underway a new topic that we are engaging, and it has to do with what we are calling faulty assumptions.

And faulty assumptions have been made in the past, and continue to be made with the result that people who are hearing or are recipients of those false assumptions often consider them to be true and build doctrine upon them and attempt to follow that doctrine when all the while they are on shaky ground because the assumption upon which that doctrine was based was not really valid.

[2 : 58] So there are a couple of things that we want to refer to before we actually go into the subject and I've got some questions that have been submitted in writing that we need to deal with as well.

So please be advised by way of reminding you that two items to bear in mind as we engage the faulty assumptions responsible for much of the doctrine that divides Christendom.

And we should have absolutely no difficulty in understanding how Christendom is divided. We shared with you just a couple of weeks ago a book that was called The Handbook of Denominations in which there were listed some 250 different denominations, large and small, that exist all across this country.

And of course if you go out of the United States to other parts of the world, particularly Europe, you will find many more that can be added to that. And they are all over the map doctrinally.

They are everywhere from A to Z. And many of them completely contradict what others have written about doctrine and what they suppose to be true.

[4 : 12] And this being the case, it becomes intuitively obvious that out of all of these different statements that are made regarding what is perceived to be true doctrine, particularly with those that completely contradict one another, somebody has to be wrong.

Today, however, we are living in an age that is unparalleled in many respects to any that have gone by.

And one of the things incorporated in this particular age is referred to as religious pluralism. It's nothing more than applying, I guess what you could say, political correctness to religion.

And the idea is that all religions, regardless of what they assume to be true, are basically legitimate and not to be criticized in any way, shape, or form.

Because if you believe something, all that matters is not whether it is objectively true or not. All that matters is that you believe it.

[5 : 31] And you should not be subjected to criticism or questioning of any kind. It should just be accepted. That's religious pluralism. That legitimizes all religious faiths, no matter what they are.

Legitimacy is assigned to them. That way, nobody has to be wrong. Isn't that nice? You don't have to hurt anybody's feelings by telling them they're wrong in what they believe.

By the way, there's a statement that ought to be entered into this discussion. And that is one that was, I don't know that it was originated by Bill Fay, but he was the one from whom I first heard it.

And the statement was like this. If what you are now believing is actually wrong, would you want to know it? That's a very good question for probing evangelism.

But today, in accordance with what we've been talking about, and political correctness and religious diversity, that would not even be a legitimate kind of question, because whatever you believe is not wrong.

[6 : 40] If you believe it, that makes it right. That's also, of course, a study in subjectivity that allows you to make your choices, and it's valid.

So objective reality has nothing to do with it. And this is precisely where we are. And it is proliferating on our college and university campuses and have been for about the last 10 years.

And it's producing all kinds of, should I say, oddities, to say the least. So this is what we're dealing with in this particular culture. And when you talk about faulty assumptions, that would not fit in with this, because so far as that kind of thinking is concerned, there are no assumptions that are faulty.

If it's something that you assume to be true, put it down. Log it as true. It's okay. You go with it. And that's kind of crazy that that's where we are.

So, historically, I'm going to just kind of ignore all of the political correctness and religious diversity and et cetera, and just pretend that it doesn't happen.

[7 : 50] Okay, maybe this is a bad dream and it'll pass away. So those two things that we have to keep in mind, first of all, is that those who do or who have made faulty assumptions did so out of sincerity and an honest effort to interpret the scriptures, at least in the vast majority of cases.

There may have been a charlatan or a manipulator in there somewhere that was just trying to manipulate people and get their own way. But by and large, I think we can safely say that going all the way back to the first century, those who interpreted scripture and came up with what they believed was the interpretation of a given passage did so in good faith.

They were not trying to deceive anyone. They were actually trying to propagate what they believed was true. But as we have also learned, sincerity is no guarantee for truth.

If you go into your bathroom and start fumbling around in the medicine cabinet without turning on the appropriate lights, and you pick up a bottle that you think is supposed to have your prescribed medication in it, but instead it has an entirely different content, and you take it, you are not going to get the result that you would have gotten had you taken the right content.

You'll get a different result. That's called objectivity, and that's the way it works. You cannot say, well, I have been made terribly ill because I took the wrong medication.

[9 : 23] That's not fair. That's life. Nobody ever said that life is fair. But that's reality, and sincerity is not going to override a bad decision, and it doesn't make any difference how sincere you are.

You're still going to suffer the consequences of having taken the wrong medication. And illustrations like that could be given ad infinitum, and all I'm trying to say is, yes, you ought to be sincere.

Of course, you ought to be honest and truthful, and you ought to be pursuing what you are in a legitimate vein, and doing it with the right attitude. But even that, and all of those things are good and necessary, but they do not guarantee truth, because truth is what is, even if nobody believes it.

If something is true, it is true. If nobody believes it, it's still true. So, those who made faulty assumptions did so out of sincerity and an honest effort to interpret the Scriptures, at least in the majority of cases.

And secondly, those who made faulty assumptions, and I'm going all the way back now to the 1st and 2nd century, what is referred to as the church fathers, those who made faulty assumptions in the past were disadvantaged due to the canon of Scripture not having reached a recognized conclusion, and it didn't, until about the 4th or 5th century.

[10 : 54] There were books in the Bible that were still under question as regards their canonicity as late as the 4th and 5th century. And we did not arrive until, did not arrive to a really settled canon.

That is, by the canon of Scripture, we simply mean those books that are found in the Bible that we have come to recognize as belonging there.

They are called canonical books. And the subject has to do with the canonicity of Scripture. And it simply boils down to, does this particular book belong in the Bible or not?

Was this inspired of God? Or was it just written by man? And you need to understand, that the 66 books that we refer to as being canonical, 39 in the Old Testament, 27 in the New Testament, represent but a very tiny percentage of all of the writings that were made available during this same time that these were being collected.

There are all kinds of books that are not in the Bible, and this leads some to say, well, we don't have a complete Bible. Parts of the Bible are missing. Well, we are satisfied, we evangelicals are satisfied, that all of the books we have in the Bible belong there.

[12 : 23] And there are none that are omitted or left out. There are hundreds, even thousands, of other writings written many times by Christians along religious or theological lines that were never accepted or recognized as canonical, as having come from God.

And canonicity is a study in itself which we certainly don't have time to undertake, but it is very, very important to recognize that we have a completed canon.

But many of the faulty assumptions that were made by church fathers, and I refer to these church fathers as first and second and third century individuals like Jerome and like Chrysostom and St. Augustine and Justin Martyr and on and on you could name them.

They've all contributed valuable writings, but they are not in Scripture. And many of them interpreted passages of Scripture and came up with their interpretations and they are still available to this day.

Some of them were embraced by other believers and some of them were not. So, these things need to be kept in mind. And when it comes to establishing the canon of Scripture, the position that we take and that I feel we have no alternative but to take, is that God himself had to superintend regarding the books that were inserted into our Bible and accepted as canonical.

[14 : 05] the God who inspired the original autographs. And by the original autographs, we mean that when Moses began writing, whatever it was that Moses actually physically wrote, that was the original autograph.

As far as we know, these are not in existence anywhere. When the Apostle Paul took up pen or instructed his amanuensis, like an executive with a secretary to take notes and to write Scripture, then it was under the inspiration of the Spirit of God.

And if God did not superintend over the insertion of these books in the Bible and the exclusion of books that he did not inspire, had he not done that, the whole purpose of divine revelation collapses.

You cannot have a Bible because what the Bible is about, more than anything else, it is about authoritative information.

It isn't just information, and it isn't just authority, it is authoritative information. If God did not superintend the process, excluding what was not inspired of him, and including all that is inspired of him, were he not to do that, the whole purpose of revelation is defeated.

[15 : 39] Years ago, shortly after I was discharged from the army, still living in Washington State, in Olympia, I worked for a local radio station there, and I was having a conversation one time at lunch, and I was reading my New Testament, and this is the New Testament that all of the inductees in the military got a little pocket New Testament from the Gideons, and I was just flipping through it as we were having lunch, and one of my co-workers always says, what's that you got there?

I said, oh, just New Testament, just scanning it, reading something, you believe that stuff? I said, well, yeah, yeah, I believe it, this is the Bible, don't you believe it?

He said, I believe parts of it, parts? What parts? The parts I can agree with.

That's the way a lot of people look at the Bible. They read something, and if it seems reasonable to them, then they'll buy it. But if it doesn't, like maybe a miracle turning water into wine or something like that, I don't believe that stuff.

You know who one of the greatest disbelievers of biblical truth was? Thomas Jefferson, very intelligent man, generally considered to be the father of the Declaration of Independence.

[17 : 06] But he completely discounted the miracles of Christ, and I have in my library a Bible that's called the Jeffersonian Bible, and he excised passages of scripture that had to do with the supernatural because he considered it not becoming not worthy of Jesus, but he bought the ethical part.

And as great a mind as his was, it was flawed, and Thomas Jefferson had some faulty conclusions of his own, some faulty assumptions.

And secondly, those who made faulty assumptions were disadvantaged due to the canon of scripture not having reached a recognized conclusion. And as I mentioned, it did do that in about the third or fourth century.

So be advised, then, that men did not determine the books of the Bible to be admitted or rejected. They merely recognized them as being inspired.

Canonicity had to be determined by God who inspired the writers to write. If God did not personally ordain and guide the contents of the Bible, then the entire effort of revelation is defeated because no credible authority can be realized.

[18 : 23] So we take the Bible at face value, Genesis through revelation, allowing, of course, for figurative language that does occur throughout the Bible.

But by and large, it is to be faced and interpreted literally, taken at face value, that it means what it says and it says what it means. And when you do that, about 90% of the Bible makes perfectly good sense when you approach it that way.

Here's the problem. Here's where the faulty assumptions come in. Inspiration of Scripture requires its infallibility and its inerrancy.

But, it does not extend to the interpretation of what was written under inspiration. In other words, when men write about what the Bible says, their writings are not inspired.

Their writings are just their writings. I can write a text or a couple of pages interpreting what I think is a passage of Scripture and it may or may not be accurate, but I can assure you this, it is not inspired.

[19 : 43] It may be inspiring to read like some poetry is, but that doesn't mean it's inspired. For something to be inspiring is one thing, but for it to be inspired of God so that it's protected from error, that's an entirely different thing.

The only thing we have on the planet that comes under that category is the Word of God. And that's one reason it is called the Word of God because that is precisely what it is.

So, faulty assumptions have arisen by the carload simply because those who are interpreting the Bible are not inspired.

They are just applying human wisdom usually to the best of their ability to the extent that they are able to understand it and they come up with the conclusions that they reach and then these conclusions are usually held and put forth by intelligent, respectable, honorable individuals whom many people respect in a given community and the tendency is then for them as what we would call lay people to sign on to what this accomplished, learned person has written about what these texts of scripture mean.

And that's where you get your denominations. that's where they've all come from. Every one of them. Large and small. The thing that divides denominations and sects, and I'm talking about S-E-C-T-S, sects, and conventions and conferences and synods and groups and whatever you want to call them, the thing that divides all of them, that keeps them from coming together, is that they can't agree on doctrine.

[21 : 43] And in a sense, that's not bad because if you don't have conviction about your doctrine, then it isn't doctrine worth having. We need conviction.

Conviction is the certainty that you have. You are able to go to the mat for a conviction as opposed to an opinion.

an opinion, maybe it can be flexible, it can be altered, you can change it, but a conviction, a conviction needs to be something that you're willing to go to the mat for.

And if you happen to be a believer in Jesus Christ, those who have allowed themselves to be martyred for the cause of Christ, rather than deny him, we're operating out of a conviction, certainly not out of a convenience, not out of a preference, not out of an opinion, there are things worth dying for.

There are things more precious than life, and they have to do with truth. That's our most precious possession. So, in dealing with this whole subject of faulty assumptions, I want to give you a little more time now for Q&A.;

[23 : 11] Actually, this is, but you won't be asking the questions, it's already been asked in the paper, and somebody submitted this in writing, and it has to do with angels.

And if you read theology, most of you don't, but those of us who have engaged in reading a lot of theology, know that the subject of angels services a lot of times, there are over 300 references to angels in the Bible.

And in the book of Revelation alone, I think there are 40 or 50 references to angelic beings. And the question that is asked here has to do with, after the flood, did the demons enter Noah's descendants as they had generations before the flood?

That's a very involved kind of question, and I wish there were some way that I could give you an answer without it being involved as well, but I cannot. So we're just going to delve into this.

It's a quite fascinating thing, and I have a handout that I've made available to the monthly Bible class, and there are copies that are in the literature rack there.

[24 : 34] You may want to pick one of these up on the way out. It's called Who Are the Sons of God in Genesis 6-2. The text reads, It came to pass when men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born to them, that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were beautiful and they took wives for themselves of all whom they chose.

That's Genesis 6-2. Now we're not going to deal with that per se, but we're going to be in the Bible. So I just want to show this for your understanding and it's available back there.

This brings up a whole area of spirit beings and I don't want to elaborate too much on this because I want to allow questions from the audience as well.

We're getting into an area that we know less about than probably anything and that is the spiritual area. The scriptures make it very, very clear that there are physical beings and each of us is a physical being and there are spirit beings and spirit beings do not possess physicality.

They are real. They have objective existence, but you cannot see them. You cannot feel them or touch them. They are not material.

[25 : 51] They are immaterial. And this fact in and of itself alone leads many leading scientists today to conclude that there is no existence of anything that we are describing as spirit.

And most of the leading scientists today, particularly those who are brain scientists as they refer to themselves, are convinced that human beings do not possess a mind.

mind. We possess a brain, but we do not have a mind. We all know that the brain is about two to three pounds of gelatinous like substance, kind of looks like putty, and it's very physical, and they are able to extract the brain from a corpse and dissect it and analyze it and look at different parts of it and see abnormalities in it and all the rest of it.

But the problem with the spirit or the problem with the mind is that it has no physicality. You cannot subject it to a laboratory test of any kind.

And those scientists who consider themselves to be worth their salt will not accept anything as having objective reality if it is not subjected to measurement, evaluation, examination, like they go through in their laboratory, like they do, of course, with a physical brain.

[27 : 19] So their conclusion is you do not have a mind, you have a brain, and the brain is capable of doing everything that needs to be done for the body, including creativity and everything that goes along with it.

Interestingly enough, and I put a great deal of stock in this, as you can understand, being a pastor, and I certainly should, the Bible never uses the word brain.

uses the word mind hundreds of times, hundreds of times. And the mind is an immaterial reality that exists in your body that works in concert with your brain.

And there is the problem. How does it do that? we cannot figure that out. There has to be a bridge between the mind and the brain.

They work in tandem. But nobody has ever been able to discover what the bridge is. Would the bridge be material or immaterial?

[28 : 32] And how can you connect something that is immaterial with something that is material? I certainly do not know. If I did, I'm sure I'd be in order for a Nobel prize and whatever other prize I could come up with.

But that's part of the mystery of life. And yet, God is the one who created both the brain and the mind, and he knows perfectly well just exactly how they function.

The mind and the brain use each other, and they work off of each other. So, when it comes to these spirit beings, apparently, they were created in a sense without a body.

We don't know when they were created. Angels were brought into existence apparently before Adam and Eve were ever created in the Garden of Eden.

And we may surmise, although we cannot prove it, they probably were created before the heavens and the earth were created. Because, you see, it wasn't until physical substance was created that God had to also create time and space for physical substance to dwell in.

[29 : 44] Because that which is immaterial doesn't need time or space to occupy, and it doesn't occupy. So, before God created the heavens and the earth in Genesis 1-1, before he created man afterwards, he, apparently, had created these angelic beings.

And he made these angelic beings somewhat along the nature and the kind of his own being. And what I'm saying is, as man is made in the image and likeness of God, apparently angels were made as well in the likeness of God.

In that, we are told that God is spirit. That is, God is immaterial. Now, I know the Bible talks about God having eyes, talks about him having hands on the back, the sins are cast behind.

But this is all anthropomorphic language that is designed to communicate with humans so we can understand. But God in his essence and character is a spirit being. This is what Jesus meant when he said, God is spirit.

They that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. So, when God created these angelic beings, he created them after his own order. They were spirit. Jesus was not Jesus.

[30 : 59] He was the son of God. He was what we would call the second person of the triune Godhead. There was the Holy Spirit. There was God the Father. And these three all were spirit beings.

Jesus did not take on physicality until Bethlehem. That's when the word was made flesh and dwelt among us. A body thou hast prepared for me, the psalmist said, speaking messianically of Christ.

So, until that time, he was the son of God. He was the eternal son of God of the eternal father, but he was not Jesus. When he was born in Bethlehem, the angel told Mary, thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.

So, that is where the physicality comes in of the Godhead. But prior to that time, with the creation of angels, these are beings who have apparently a superior intellect to humans, and superior strength and wisdom to humans.

They are found 300 times in the Bible, and apparently when God created angels, he created them with volition, just as he did with human beings.

[32 : 16] That means that he gave the angels the ability to obey him, and honor him, and the ability to disobey. He made them free moral agents.

And according to Revelation chapter 12, if you'll turn to that quickly, please, this is the passage that we considered in our Revelation study.

In Revelation chapter 12, we have what appears to be the initial rebellion of Lucifer, who apparently was the chief angel of all of God's creation.

And we read in Revelation 12 that a great sign appeared in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars.

She was with child. She cried out, being in labor and in pain to give birth. And we identified this woman, of course, as Israel, as the nation. And another sign appeared in heaven, and behold, a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and on his heads were seven diadems.

[33 : 21] Now, this sounds like a really grotesque creature. And the reason it sounds so grotesque to us is because we are comparing this to what we call normal. And that's you, me.

We just have one head, and this has got seven, ten horns, and on his heads were seven diadems. And his tail swept away a third of the stars of heaven and threw them to the earth.

The dragon stood before the woman, that is Israel, who is about to give birth, and Israel is about to give birth to the Messiah, so that when she gave birth, he might devour her child.

This, of course, is speaking of the Christ child, and John, the writer of Revelation, is looking back upon this. And she gave birth to a son, a male child, who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron, and speaking of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But this angel, Lucifer, who is described as having been the greatest of all God's angelic creations, recruited a third of the angelic beings that God had created, and enticed them to follow him in rebellion against the Lord.

[34 : 32] And they did. And they were cast out, and that ties in with the question that is asked here about did the demons enter Noah's descendants that they had before the flood?

And it ties in also with another question, and the Apostles' Creed is the phrase that Christ descended into hell, where is that written in the New Testament? And it talks about the lower parts of the earth, and 1 Peter, and Jude, and Revelation 9 as well.

So we'll briefly take a look at all of those. In the fall of these angelic beings, it appears, and I want to clarify this because I say it appears, and what that means is I may be making a faulty assumption.

I don't think so, but I have no guarantees. We do not have any other way of accounting for the existence of demons, other than to suggest that the demons were the previous angels that kept not their first estate.

And Jude refers to that. So while we're in Revelation, let us come back, just a few pages, to the little tiny epistle of Jude, just one chapter long, and it is verse 5 and 6.

[36 : 06] Now I desire to remind you, though you know all things, once for all, that the Lord, after saving a people out of the land of Egypt, subsequently destroyed those who did not believe, and angels who did not keep their own domain.

I think the King James renders it, angels that did not keep their first estate. An estate is like a residence or a place where one would reside.

That is the domain. And the angels did not maintain their original domain. That is, this is something that they forfeited. They abandoned their proper abode.

He has kept in eternal bonds under darkness for the judgment of the great day.

Well, part of that judgment of the great day is found, I think, in Revelation chapter 9, where these individuals are going to be loosed from what is called the bottomless pit.

[37 : 15] sometimes it is translated the abyss. It means that it is a pit that has no bottom, and this leads some scholars to believe that this pit runs completely through the planet.

We would say like from the North Pole to the South Pole. Now, I'm not saying that's where it is, and I'm not even saying that's what it is, because the bottomless pit could be just an expression of hyperbole intended to convey the idea that this pit is really, really deep.

On the other hand, there is that possibility that it is so deep that it has no end to it. It is open at both ends, only we don't know where those are. The idea of someone, of some kind of being, being confined in this area, boggles the mind.

we are told in the revelation that when Satan is cast into the abyss or the pit, that Michael will lay hold of him with a great chain and confine him.

But how do you confine a spirit being that has no physicality with physical chain? So that idea is testing, to say the least.

[38 : 37] All we can say is, and I think this is the meaning that the writer is getting at, is that Satan is confined to this place under the authority and the dominion of God, is incarcerated and is not permitted to leave there, simply by the power of God, I don't care whether you call them chains or whatever, and he is bound there for a thousand years.

And at the end of that time, he will be released. And that's the story of Revelation 19. So these angelic beings, if they have access to the earth, and in accordance with chapter 9, they may well, because here we read that the bottomless pit in verse 2, the bottomless pit is opened, and smoke went up out of the pit like the smoke of a great furnace.

The sun and air were darkened by the smoke of the pit, and out of the smoke came forth locusts upon the earth, and power was given them, as the scorpions of the earth have power.

Well, what were these? Locusts, scorpions, some kind of giant insects, what are they? And they were told that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, nor any green thing, nor any tree, but only the men who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads.

And that, by the way, is everyone with the exception of the 144,000. They were not permitted to kill anyone, but to torment for five months, and their torment was like the torment of a scorpion when it stings a man.

[40 : 13] Verse 7 says their appearance of these was like horses. It doesn't say they're horses. It says the appearance was like horses prepared for battle, and on their heads, as it were, crowns like gold, and their faces were like the faces of men.

And they had hair like the hair of women, and their teeth were like the teeth of lions. And they had breastplates like breastplates of iron, and the sound of their wings was like the sound of chariots of many horses rushing to and fro.

And they had tails like scorpions and stings, and in their tails is their power to hurt men for five months. But they're not allowed to put anyone to death. This is some kind of subjection to an incredible kind of torture that we can't imagine.

And it is all coming upon these individuals during this tribulation period. What are these? Keep in mind that John is doing nothing more than describing what he's seen.

And what he is also saying and admitting is, I've never seen anything like this before. I have no idea what these things are. This is what they look like.

[41 : 25] And he's giving a description. The best he can do is record what these things remind him of. It looks like. But he doesn't say that's what it is.

He just says that's what comes to mind when you look at it. He's giving a very rough graphic description. of what he is seeing. Many scholars, and I happen to be in agreement with them, that these are some kind of demonic beings that are incarcerated in this place as we speak.

They are there now. They are those that kept not their first estate. They are here reserved in judgment. But apparently some of them have had access of some kind to the earth.

These apparently were the demons with whom Jesus had conflicts during his earthly ministry. When he cast demons out of individuals, you may be sure that these were previous angelic beings, our best guess, previous angelic beings who through their fall have become demonic.

And these are they that are found in certain places today where demonism is rampant. And I'm talking particularly about India, Nepal, and Tibet, and certain parts of Africa.

[42 : 55] These things seem to be more rampant there than they are anywhere. And you can talk to many credible missionaries who come back from these places and tell you some really hair-raising stories that have no human explanation available.

It appears that this is demonic activity. And when people try to say, well, when Jesus cast out these demons and the demons took someone and cast them on the ground and they were frothing at the mouth and their limbs were jerking and what that was was an epileptic seizure.

But Jesus didn't know anything about epilepsy. And neither did the people of that day. And the best doctors that were available then looked at somebody who was having a grand mal seizure, which many of you know I'm very familiar with, and they just said, well, he's possessed with a demon.

Well, I can assure you that the Lord of Glory knew all about demons and he knew all about grand mal seizures and he knew all about epilepsy. And when he cast the demon out, it was because it was a demon that was cast out.

It wasn't a neurological incident that was taking place in the brain of the individual. It was actually possessed by a demon or multiple demons.

[44 : 22] And Jesus cast out demons. He conversed with demons. He communicated with them. What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou son of God? Art thou come to torment us before the time? And the time appears to be that reserved unto judgment the angels that kept not their first estate but are consigned until they are reserved for judgment.

And that's what they were talking about. And Jesus, of course, rebuked the demons and cast them out. And, of course, the child was whole and healthy. And that happened on numerous occasions.

demonic activity is very real. And so far as the demons entering Noah's descendants as they had before the flood, we do not know.

But that is a distinct possibility. I cannot say that I have ever encountered to my knowledge a demon or anyone who was possessed with one.

I've been doing a significant amount of reading about it. and it does appear to be something that is going to characterize the end times. And one wonders whether we are coming upon that now.

[45 : 35] I do think that there are probably cases that are dismissed as mental illness that are really demon possession. And I suspect that there are plenty of cases in certain areas that are categorized as demon possession that are in fact just mental illness.

There are certain mental illnesses like schizophrenia and things related to that where the brain chemistry is physiologically altered or changed or abnormal and it can create some very horrendous circumstances and difficulties for the person experiencing it.

And it has nothing whatever to do with demons. And many of these people are under psychiatric treatment and different medications sometimes help and many times they are just pronounced incurable.

And the best psychiatrists that you can call upon are unable to deal effectively with some of those cases. We just don't know enough about it. But yes, there is demon possession and there is demon oppression.

I am not of the opinion that Christians can be possessed of demons, but Christians can certainly be oppressed by demons. And I have done some significant research into this over the last few months and it is quite apparent that there are some things taking place that we don't have any other explanation for other than to say that there is some demonic activity.

[47 : 10] And I can provide you with some literature if you want to follow up on this with a rather fascinating incident regarding a Baptist pastor who has been involved in this.

And he is an entirely of a different stripe altogether. You would not, there's no sensationalism here. He doesn't do any of this for money. There's no reward in it or anything of the kind.

But it's quite fascinating and I believe that this is going on. And demons, demons want to control. They want to work their will.

and it is always anti-Christ and it is always something that the individual feels powerless against. And it's just the kind of thing that is very hair raising.

I don't recommend that anybody dabble in this because it's related to the occult and people can open themselves to certain things. I think that this is part and parcel of what takes place in some cases with addiction.

[48 : 19] There may be demonic oppression or activity with certain cases of addiction whether it is sexual, pornographic, whether it is alcohol or drugs.

This opens the door of avenue of opportunity for demonic involvement and some people succumb to that and it is just binding. It is ruinous.

It is disastrous and these people are certainly to be pitied. And well, I did it again.

Questions? Anybody? Still didn't get through half of my notes. Any questions back here?

Anyone? Okay, in the back. I have read some commentaries that possibly the three wives of Noah's sons, they had the giant gene in those that passed through, you know, after the flood.

[49 : 33] Yeah, well, there are giants on the earth in those days. And the expression that is given, and what you'll see in this sheet about the sons of God, the author of this, Dr. David Levy, he is a Hebrew Christian and works with friends of Israel, and he takes the position, which is an ancient Jewish position, that the sons of God were, in fact, angels.

angels. They were fallen angels. And one of the things that he bases that on is the fact that any time this phrase is used, the sons of God, particularly in the book of Job, it's always in reference to angelic beings.

And if these angelic beings cohabited with human women, because the text says that the sons of God saw the daughters of men, and they were acceptable to them, were fair to them, the daughters of men refers to human women, and the angels of God refers to fallen angels.

Then you have to assume, and I've never been comfortable doing this, but apparently Dr. David Levy has, and the standard Jewish interpretation is that this is the case, but I've always thought of that as maybe being a faulty assumption, and that is to assume that God created spirit beings, angels, and gave them genitalia?

Every time angels are mentioned in the Bible, it is always accompanied with a masculine noun, or masculine pronoun, never female.

[51 : 24] There is no reason to believe, that angels can interact male and female, and produce little angels. There is no real reason to believe that.

Yet every time angels are mentioned in the masculine, they are able to assume a human form, and every time they assume a human form, it is never as a female, it is always as a male.

And they always look like a male, and dress like a male, and it would be hard to detect from any other normal male, human male. Each time, they are referred to as men.

Look like men, dress like men, walk and talk like men, ate like men. But they are angelic. They are able to assume that form.

And the reason that everyone is scared witless every time an angel appears to them, is because of the manner of their appearance. It isn't the way they look, it's that they appear where they're not supposed to be, instantaneously.

[52 : 25] You are witnessing me standing here now, and I am standing here all by myself. But if all of a sudden there appeared somebody else standing right here beside me, just like that, we would all be aback.

I would, for sure. Because we're used to people approaching us, and you see them coming, they're walking toward you, and that's how they get here. But when angels appear in the Bible, everybody is terrified, because they appear where there wasn't anybody.

And Mary was affrighted, and what did the angel tell them? They have two words, same line they use everywhere they appear to anybody. Fear not, fear not, it's okay, it's alright, because the natural inclination is to be scared witless.

Where did this person come from? And you were referred to them as a person, because they looked just like a person. So, do they have human-like genitalia that enables them to cohabit with human women, and produce as a result what the text refers to as giants?

And where else do you get these giants? And the only way that that giant thing can be interpreted is the typical word giant. is this some kind of an abnormal offspring, half-angel and half-human?

[53 : 55] That's the standard party line, at least among the Jews who've interpreted Genesis for thousands of years. I've always had some difficulty with it, because I have no indication that angels are created with physical genitalia.

people. But then maybe, maybe that's a faulty assumption on my part. Maybe they are. The text doesn't say they aren't.

So I don't know. Another question or comment? We'll have to dismiss. Over here. No, I've got the mic. Okay. All right. Back to the assumption on the mind and the brain.

And you're wondering, what would be the bridge on that? And what would that be our spirit? Unless the spirit and the mind are the same, do you say that? Or would the mind and the brain, our spirit, be the bridge between the two?

I don't know. I don't know. I just, I just, that's, to me, that is one of the greatest puzzles, one of the greatest mysteries. I am totally 100% convinced that there is materiality to our being.

[55 : 04] We've got a body. It's physical. I am equally convinced that there is immateriality to our being. And I base this on scripture and also on the fact that each and every one of us, there's a verse in 1 Corinthians where Paul says, what man knows the things of a man save the spirit of man that is in him?

Your spirit is your own private secret place where no one else has access. you are the only one who knows you really in your spirit.

And this spirit, this human spirit, is not material, it's not physical, but it is real. And when you die physically, it exits the body.

That's exactly what Jesus was talking about when he was on the cross and he said, Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit. He bowed his head and gave up the spirit.

And this is why James 2 says, the body without the spirit is dead. It is your spirit that animates your body.

[56 : 30] It is your spirit that directs your body. and your body responds to it. Your spirit, your spirit is the real brain, is the real mind of your body.

And that's where the real you lives. This is fascinating stuff. Here we are talking about ourselves. We ought to know something about ourselves, but we don't know very much.

We are really pretty ignorant about our own makeup. Isn't that something? Are you embarrassed by that? I am. I mean, I ought to know me better than that.

But I tell you, it's just, we got another comment and I'm going to quit. I promise. I've often said this, there is a verse in the Psalms that says, surely we are fearfully and wonderfully made.

And I'm here to tell you, if ever the Bible made an understatement, that's it. you don't know the half of you. Wow.

[57 : 37] That's, all right, it's just mind-boggling. And listen, if that's what we are, think of what God is. He's a being without limitations.

Was there another question? I don't want to make a comment. So, years ago I kind of learned the spirit of our age is this relativism and you've got your truth and all that, everything's an opinion.

But it's easy in our language to kind of communicate that and saying, when we're talking to somebody, say, you know, I'm a Christian and I believe that Jesus rose from the dead.

Or that Jesus Christ is God. We're talking about moral issues. I believe that homosexuality is wrong or abortion is wrong. But that kind of communicates in a way that relativism, that, well, this is my opinion.

But I've kind of learned over the years to speak a little bit more authoritatively and not prefix those things. When I'm talking to people, I'm not prefix with, well, I believe this or I believe that.

[58 : 39] But just saying things very directly, you know, Jesus Christ did rise from the dead. Jesus Christ is the Son of God. You know, sexual immorality is wrong.

It's not just that I believe that it's wrong. It's not that it's wrong for me. It's wrong for everybody. And so being a little bit more careful about how we communicate to people and being more authoritative in how we communicate these things.

Yeah, I appreciate that. Thank you. Someone said everybody is entitled to their own opinion, but nobody is entitled to their own facts.

Facts. You can't have it that way. Facts are stubborn things, and they just won't go away. Facts is what's true, whether anyone believes it or not.

Opinions, preferences, sure, we all have them. You're entitled to them. Nobody has a right to dictate to you what your preferences ought to be. That's within the freedom of the individual.

[59 : 42] people. But facts are what facts are, and that's why we make such a thing about the Bible, because we regard it as the overarching authority that covers everything, everywhere, everyone.

Yes? I will say, just to follow up, it is more difficult, because it is a bit more confrontational, when people are fine with you believing that Jesus Christ is God or whatever, but when you make emphatic statements about truths, people sometimes are unhappy about that.

Yes, and this has often been a comeback, and I've heard this before, and I especially heard it from some of my old buddies that I used to run around with before I went in the army, some of the old high school crowd, and when I came out of the army, I came out as a believer, because I'd gotten saved, and I had three months left in the army, and I'd come back, and I had a long list of my old cronies from high school.

I was going to contact everyone. I could just see them lining up and waiting for me to lead them to the Lord. You know, you talk about naive. I was naive, and you know what so many of them told me?

Hey, Wiseman, hey, man, I'm really glad for you. That's good. That's great, but it's not for me. That's not for me. And that was the opinion that many of them had.

[61 : 06] I'm happy for you that you found something that fulfills you and that you can believe in it, but that's not for me. And that's where some people are coming from to this day.

So would you stand please? Father, as we conclude this service, we do so with a fixation of all.

Because what we are talking about is something that you've been pleased to reveal, and yet we know so very little about it. We don't even understand that when you created Adam, and you had that body of clay, that you breathed into him the breath of life, and Adam became a living soul.

We just cannot fathom that kind of activity. That's the God you are, and you are a God of no limitations. Whatsoever pleases you to do is what you were able to do, and you always do that which is in keeping with your character and your integrity and your very being, and we are so grateful to be people living under your authority and under the revelation that you've been pleased to give us.

And we trust that as we continue to pursue it, you will provide us with an enlightenment that we cannot get from human minds. In Christ's name we pray. Amen. I have toCO do