






# Annual Question & Answer

 Various Passages  
 Pastor Jeremy Thomas  
 December 7 & 14, 2016  
 fbgbible.org

 Fredericksburg Bible Church  
107 East Austin Street  
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624  
(830) 997-8834

## Annual Q & A

1. **Adam and Eve were mortal before the fall and I think I understand they would have lived forever had they not disobeyed. There will be mortal man at the end of the millennial reign. They will have a sin nature and cannot go into the eternal state unless given a body of incorruption, correct?**

Adam and Eve were created incorrupt but corruptible. At the Fall they were corrupted and acquired a sin nature (propensity to sin, disposition to sin) and were subjected to death. Those alive at the end of the millennium will have a sin nature. To enter into the eternal state, they must have an incorrupt and incorruptible body. A resurrection body meets this criterion as does some other kind of body that we do not know about.

2. **Gen 1:28. Adam and Eve were blessed by God and told to be fruitful and multiply. Could this have happened before the fall? Can mortals without a sin nature procreate?**

Adam and Eve could have procreated prior to the Fall. Mortals without a sin nature can procreate. Theoretically, Jesus could have procreated and there would have been nothing sinful about it.

3. **You spoke earlier this year regarding the sons of God not being angels in the pre-flood period, Gen 6:2. Commentaries agree and refer to these as godly men marrying ungodly women? However, sons of God used in Job 1:6, 2:1, 38:7 are angels as described in the commentaries. Also, the Hebrew for sons, BEN, is used in Gen 6:2 and in the Job passages. The Gen 6 sons of God are often considered to be angels on the basis of four arguments. First, the sons of God in Job 1 and 2 are angels, therefore the sons of God in Gen 6 must also be angels. Second, it's a one-way marriage, the sons of God went into the daughters of men. Third, the verb took to themselves seems to imply force. Fourth, the results of the marriage are a strange race of men. However, this identification is highly unlikely for the following nine reasons.**

First, God created distinct kinds to procreate after their own kind. For angels to procreate with human women would violate the created kinds. If this happened with angels and humans, then why could it not have happened between various animals? That opens the door for evolution. Second, the introduction of angels as sons of God in the narrative has no prior contextual evidence. Third, sons of God is used of good angels in Job 1 and 2 but it is never used of evil angels. For the sons of God to be angels would require a second fall of angels, the first between Gen 1 and 2 and the second in Gen 6. There is no evidence in Scripture for two falls of angels (cf Rev 12). Fourth, the reason God flooded the world was not angels but man. Note carefully the repeated statements that the flood was coming because of man's sin, not an angelic infiltration. Fifth, each dispensation ends with a judgment on man because of his failure to live up to the revelation given in that dispensation. The flood is the end of the dispensation of conscience. It would not be consistent to say the dispensation ended because of evil perpetrated by angels. Sixth, people often blame the fall on Satan and now they are blaming the flood on Satan. However, Scripture says the blame of each rests squarely on man, not Satan. Seventh, the offspring of the intermarriage are not giants or strange offspring but mighty men on the earth, men of renown. This means nothing more than men who rebelled against God. Eighth, it is much better to view the sons of God as sons of the godly line of Seth that began to call on God through sacrifice (Gen 4:26) but at some point began to be corrupted through marriage with ungodly women from the line of Cain. The warning is against the corrupting influence of an unbeliever on a believer in marriage. The results are the loss of approaching God by blood sacrifice. Ninth, sons of God is always a positive reference to either the nation Israel as the son of God, of Jesus as the son of God, and of Church saints as the sons of God. It is never used of Satan or demons.

4. **How do you interpret Jude 7 in light of your view that the sons of God in Gen 6 are not angels?**

I'm glad you would bring this up. I would add 2 Peter 2:4-9 and 1 Peter 3:19-20. The angels cohabiting with human women view, again, is the most common view and is the oldest view. It is a view I held until this year. There are other views, like the dynastic rulers view and the Sethite-Cainite but I thought these views were weak. It was easy for me to accept the arguments of the angels cohabiting view since that is what I was taught and several NT verses seemed to confirm it as I looked at them through that lens. Let me add that upon researching this issue I discovered that the basis for the angelic cohabitation view is extrabiblical writings like 1 Enoch, Jubilees, Pseudepigrapha like 2 Enoch, Baruch, The Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, works found at Qumran, Philo, Josephus, et al. and that the dynastic rulers view was a view held among the Jews that has merit and the Sethite-Cainite view was developed after the time of Christ and also has merit. And let me add that this is not a major doctrinal issue but it can have important repercussions for what is possible in this world or what God will allow. All the arguments I made last week were general, men seem to be in view, not angels and sons of God always, without exception has a positive connotation and refers either to good angels or Christians and the singular Son

of God always, without exception, refers to Jesus. So if the sons of God are angels in Gen 6:2, 4 then there must be a second fall of at least some angels. 1 Enoch says it was 200 angels. This has lots of problems. A litany of views and ideas abound. Some even claimed that the results of the cohabitation were demons. My view is essentially that the sons of God are the Sethites, they are the believers that began calling on the name of the LORD in the time of Enosh, and the daughters of men are simply women in that time who were beautiful unbelievers. These believing men were marrying these beautiful unbelieving women with the result that apostasy was increasing to the point that only one family was left on earth that approached God through sacrifice. The mass of sin was corrupting the earth. In that light, what do I do with Jude 6-7? Jude 6-7 is probably the most common proof text for the sons of God being angels in Gen 6. One of the problems is simply understanding why Jude wrote so that we understand the point and don't extract something foreign to his argument. Why did Jude write? To encourage believers to defend the faith against false teachers that were infiltrating the assembly. How does Jude do this? First, in verses 3-4 by direct exhortation. Verse 3, "I felt the necessity to write to you appealing that you contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all handed down to the saints." Why? Verse 4, "For certain persons have crept in unnoticed, those who's condemnation was written about long beforehand, ungodly persons who turn the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ." So the problem was a small group of false teachers creeping in among believers and causing them to fall away. The believers need to earnestly defend the faith against these false teachers and stand strong. Second, in vv 5-7 he uses three distinct examples from the past where a small group infiltrated a larger group and caused a portion of them to fall away resulting in divine judgment. Each verse is a distinct example following this pattern. The first example is Jude 5, the small group of infiltrators were Korah and her followers, the larger group was the rest of Israel, many were drawn aside, the result was judgment as God destroyed them in the wilderness. Verse 5 is the first example of a small group infiltrating a larger group and causing many to fall away and come under judgment. The second example is Jude 6, the small group is Satan, the larger group is the angels, Satan drew a 1/3 of the angels aside, the result was judgment, God has reserved them for final judgment. It's another example of a small group infiltrating a larger group and causing many to fall away and coming under judgment. The third example is Jude 7, the small group is the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, the larger group are the cities around them, many of which were drawn aside, the result was judgment as God destroyed not only Sodom and Gomorrah but also all the cities of the valley or circle, including Admah and Zeboiim, excepting Zoar, where Lot escaped to. It's the third example of a small group infiltrating a larger group and causing many others to fall away and come under judgment. This is the basic teaching of Jude in warning believers of the very real threat of a small group of false teachers coming into an assembly. Throughout history rebels have drawn others aside into their rebellion and the result has been judgment. Therefore, we should contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints and not be turned aside to rebellion.

That's the straightforward teaching of this passage. What commentators often do, and what is under dispute are three things. In verse 6, what event is in view with the angels? Is this the Gen 6 cohabitation or is it the Gen 2-3 fall of angels? In verse 7, who are "these" who "indulged in gross immorality and went after strange flesh?" Is this a reference back to the angels in verse 6 or is it a reference to the other cities or the two prior examples? And what, if any, is the connection between Jude 6 and 7? How is the Greek  $\omega\varsigma$  functioning at the beginning of verse 7 and what is the role of the connective  $\tau\epsilon$  in verse 6? The angels cohabiting with human women view of Gen 6 says that verse 6 is a reference to the sons of God coming into the daughters of men and creating the hybrid offspring. This is viewed as an attack on the seed line. They further argue from 2 Pet 2:4 that these angels were cast into a place called Tartarus where they remain confined. They also argue that 1 Pet 3:19-20 says that Jesus went and preached to these spirits in Tartarus after His death on the cross. They sometimes argue from 1 Cor 11:10 that this is the reason women must wear a sign of authority on their head. At the last they argue that in verse 7 the "these" who "indulged in gross immorality" as Sodom and Gomorrah are the angels of verse 6 which are the sons of God who came into the daughters of men in Gen 6:2. They excuse Matt 22:30 from the equation by saying that it only means angels in heaven don't marry but that it doesn't say angels on earth don't marry. By this mode of reasoning they seek to prove that the sons of God in Gen 6 are angels. This all gets very involved.

There are problems with this view. First, if you posit that verse 6 has the event of Gen 6 in view then you are having to posit either one of two things; a) that there is a second fall of angels, or b) that the angels in view were already fallen but still referred to as sons of God, an unattested use of sons of God. If you opt for the former, that this is a second fall of angels, then how are you going to prove that? In everything I read it is brought up but nobody discusses it and the reason is because no other passage clearly teaches a second fall of angels. Second, verse 7 begins with "just as," in the translation. This is the Greek adverb  $\omega\varsigma$ . It can be comparative but the grammarians disagree. It is not showing a comparison between what the angels did in verse 6 and what men did in verse 7. It is an interrogative and should be translated "how." It is giving a third distinct example of rebellion. In other words, you cannot read the Sodom and Gomorrah event of going after strange flesh back into what the angels did in verse 6. Nothing is stated in that respect in verse 6 anyway. What is stated is that they left their proper abode. This means they rebelled against God's authority in heaven. That is what the fall of angels is all about. What the men did at Sodom and Gomorrah was intensively go after homosexual relations. That was also a rebellion. But the angels did no such thing. They rebelled against God's authority in heaven.

Verse 8 really sums it up by saying, "Yet in the same way these men, also by dreaming, defile the flesh, and reject authority, and revile angelic majesties." They all dreamed up forms of rebellion. Three rebellious acts are described. The angels rejected authority in verse 6. The men of Sodom and Gomorrah defiled the flesh in verse 7. And the last expression, "revile angelic majesties" is literally in the Greek

“blasphemed glory.” It refers to what Korah and her followers did in the wilderness at the tabernacle. They blasphemed God’s glory. So verse 8 sums up the three distinct examples and illustrations of rebellion stirred up by false teachers. It really has nothing to do with angels going after strange flesh. It is simply three examples of a small group of rebels that infiltrated a larger group and led a number of them astray such that they all came under God’s judgment, or are reserved for judgment, as the angels.

The objection is that in verse 7 the pronoun “these” is plural masculine and agrees with angels in verse 6 and so must refer to angels. This is trivializing the grammatical issues. It is an issue, but the  $\tau\epsilon$  in verse 6 is also an issue and it is connecting the angels in verse 6 to Israel in verse 5 and all three verses are one sentence anyway. The only connection between the three examples is that they are all examples of rebellion. The best grammarians see that there are three distinct examples here that really only share one thing in common, rebellion. The pronoun “these” in verse 7 is not just a reference to the angels because of the  $\tau\epsilon$  in verse 6 which connects it with verse 5. Therefore “these” refers to the two prior examples of rebellion. In other words, all three are examples of rebellion. The teaching is clear; repeatedly throughout history a small group of rebels have been a threat because their rebellion draws aside a number from a larger group with the end result that God judges. Therefore, we need to take false teaching and the rebellion it brings seriously in the local church.

Often 1 Peter 2:4 is brought in to argue that the angels in Gen 6 were locked away in a place called Tartarus because of the seriousness of what they tried to do distorting the human gene pool. That idea should be very suspect in your mind since it would require angels when they manifest as men to have gonads that produce cells that undergo the special process of meiosis resulting in haploid 23 chromosomes in a sperm cell that is capable of aligning and uniting with a female haploid 23 chromosome in her egg to produce an offspring. Even minor chromosomal abnormalities in humans can cause death or serious medical problems for the offspring. The fertilization and development issues are extremely complex in the chemistry, biology and physics. To say that angels could do this is bordering on insanity and a Rosemary’s baby scenario. To say that God allowed it makes us question why God never allowed it again. The point is major problems persist. But when you look at this expression in 2:4, “For if God did not spare angels when they sinned, but cast them into *tartarus* (Gk) and committed them to pits of darkness, reserved for judgment” you have to interpret this in terms of the overall argument Peter is making and his conclusive statement in 2:9, “then the Lord knows how to rescue the godly from temptation, and to keep the unrighteousness under punishment for the day of judgment.” The statements of verse 4 merely mean that the angels who fell with Satan can in no way escape judgment even though they are still active at this time. It does not mean that certain angels did a dastardly sin that resulted in them being locked away in a special compartment. There is nothing about that anywhere in the text. That is being brought to the text by the person who is assuming what they are trying to prove in the first place. The tension point that Peter is bringing up is the fact that God

has not yet judged fallen angels and because of that temptation abounds. But just as He is able to deliver the godly from temptation, so He is also able to keep the unrighteous, including fallen angels, under His just penalty until the day comes for Him to judge them. They will not escape judgment.

The reference in 1 Pet 3:19-20 that Christ, when He died, "went and made a proclamation to the spirits now in prison," which they interpret as *tartarus*, is a reading into the text something the holder of this view wants to see. These spirits could just as well be the spirits of the humans who died in the flood. Verse 20 would point in this direction since there was only one way to be saved, in the ark. There is nothing here about demonic spirits. That is only in the mind of the person who already has concluded that the sons of God in Gen 6 are angels. But Peter's point is that God will judge and make everything right. Bringing abstract theology and mythological ideas into these texts is dangerous and leads to strange doctrines and worthless disputes. And by the way, the text never says the Nephilim were the result of the intermarriage, only that they were on the earth in that day, and afterward (Numb 13:33). The results of the intermarriage were not Nephilim but mighty men of renown (*gibborim*). The term is used of Nimrod in Gen 10:8, a mighty one in the sense of being a tyrant, a rebel against God. The results of a believer marrying an unbeliever often result in offspring that are rebels against God. That is what happened when the believing Sethite line began to intermarry beautiful pagan girls. The only family on earth that approached God through sacrifice was the family of Noah. If sin continued to progress soon no sacrifice would be offered for the sin that was corrupting men, beasts and the earth and God would have totally exterminated the planet. To rescue the human race and animals and cleanse the earth He sent the Flood.

**5. How many resurrections are there? When are OT saints resurrected?**

- a. Two (Dan 12:2; Matt 25:46; John 5:28, 29)
  - i. Unto Everlasting Life
    1. Christ, the first fruits (1 Cor 15:23)
    2. Those who are Christ's at His coming (1 Cor 15:23)
    3. The two witnesses (Rev 11:11)
    4. The OT saints (Dan 12:2)
    5. The Tribulation saints (Rev 20:4-6)
    6. The Millennial saints (1 Cor 15:50ff?)
  - ii. Unto Everlasting Death

1. The Anti-Christ and False Prophet (Rev 13:3, 12, 14; 17:8, 10, 11; 19:20-21)
2. All Unbelievers (Rev 20:5; 11-15)

6. **Does Luke 16:26 teach that believers will be able to see unbelievers suffering in the afterlife?**

That does not seem to harmonize with the Scriptural description of the afterlife as only happiness. Also, some try to give comfort to people who have lost loved ones by telling them their loved ones can see them on earth. I don't find this in the Bible but Luke 16:26 is interesting. Can you shed some light? First, the subject of Luke 16 is the Rich Man and Lazarus. In life the Rich Man had good things and Lazarus was poor and a beggar. When the men died poor Lazarus went to Abraham's bosom where there is blessing and the Rich Man went to Hades where there was suffering. In Hades the Rich Man saw Abraham and cried out to him for relief. But there was a great chasm fixed and Abraham said the man could not cross over. The man then requested that Abraham send someone to his brothers to warn them so that they would not end up in Hades. But Abraham said, "They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them." But the man said, "No, but if someone goes back from the dead they will repent." But Abraham said, "If they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets they will not be persuaded even if someone comes back from the dead." This text is highly debated, whether it is a parable or not. To me it doesn't make a difference either way. Much speculation has been made from this text on the afterlife. The only safe conclusion is that there are two places people end up, in heavenly bliss or in anguish. The passage is not about communication by sight or voice across the boundary between heavenly bliss and anguish. The main point is almost always lost in this. What is the main point? It goes back to 16:14. The Pharisees loved money. Who does the Rich Man represent? The Pharisees, lovers of money. They were rich and thought their riches were a sign of the blessing of God. What's the point? The Pharisees were sorely mistaken. Material riches were not a sign of the blessing of God. They were completely lost. Why? Because they did not believe Moses and the Prophets. If they had they would have repented at the preaching of John and Jesus. And even if someone was raised from the dead is prophetic of the fact that even after Jesus' resurrection they would not repent. Why would they not repent? Because they did not believe Moses and the Prophets. They key to receiving Jesus is receiving Moses and the Prophets who spoke of Jesus. What bearing does this passage have on believers seeing unbelievers or vice versa. None. There is no indication in Scripture that believers will see unbelievers in anguish or that they can see their loved ones on earth. Speculative ideas should never be used to comfort others in their loss of loved ones. The comfort is given in John 14:1-3, that where He is we will be also and 1 Thess 4:13-18, that at the rapture-resurrection we will be re-united with our believing loved ones. This is the all-sufficient comfort.

7. **How long from Creation to the Fall?**

We don't know. I don't think it was very long. Whitcomb said not more than 30 days.

**8. How long from Creation to the Flood?**

1,656 based on the tight genealogy of Gen 5 and the formula X was so many years old when Y was born. X lived so many more years and died. Then Y was so many years old when J was born. Y lived so many more years and died. And so forth and so on. Also, Jude says Enoch was the seventh from Adam. I take this and the formula as excluding any possible gaps in this genealogy and the math adds up to 1,656 years from Creation to the Flood.

**9. If a person proclaims Christ as their Savior and lives accordingly but later on in life denounces Him as a fraud and a lie—and does this openly even on their deathbed...Does that mean they never truly accepted Christ to begin with? Is it possible to truly believe and then not?**

They may or may not be saved. When a person believes in Christ God imputes Christ's righteousness to that believers account in heaven. Impute means to credit. It's a legal declaration. Now I can't go up there and check the books but if the saved person then sins or denies God or Christ it cannot change the fact that God has legally declared Him righteous. They are eternally secure. The person can be led astray by the world, the flesh and the devil. That is why there are so many exhortations to not be led astray. That is why there are so many exhortations to abide in His word and there is instruction on how to live the Christian life. These very exhortations prove that there is no guarantee that a Christian will live the Christian life, separate from the world or even continue to believe. A genuine believer may outright deny Him, denounce Him as a fraud and a lie and still be saved. The Scriptures say in 2 Tim 2, "even if we deny Him, He will not deny Himself" and John 10 says, "I give them eternal life, and they will never perish, no one will snatch them out of My hand; My Father who has given them to Me, is greater than all; and no one is able to snatch them out of My Father's hand," and in Rom 8 "nothing can separate us from the love of Christ, neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing will be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." So even if we deny Him, He will not denounce us because He made a legal declaration of righteous at the moment of faith in Christ. Some examples of believers who were led astray by the world, the flesh and the devil may surprise you. In the OT, Lot, who loved Sodom and Gomorrah, loved the world, and did not want to leave, is said by Scripture to be a believer. Moses murdered an Egyptian and is certainly a believer. David committed adultery and murder and was a believer. Solomon, who worshipped God at the beginning, ended worshipping idols in pagan temples. Peter, who was a believer, was so strongly influenced by Satan that Jesus could say to him, "Get behind Me Satan." In 1 Timothy 1:20 two believers, Hymenaeus and Alexander are named as believers, yet blasphemed God and Paul turned them over to Satan. In Acts 5 Ananias and Sapphira committed the sin unto death. In 1 Cor 15 some believers at Corinth no longer



believed in the resurrection from the dead. All these were believers who did not finish well. They did not persevere to the end in good deeds or in faith. Yet they were saved. Because of that they came under divine discipline. Hebrews 12 says that those who do not receive God's discipline are not His sons. My point is that the person may or may not be a believer. Their behavior and denials are not determinative but God's judicial declaration in heaven.

The problem today is that the false doctrines of Lordship Salvation and Perseverance of the Saints is so widespread that many people think that if a person is really a Christian then they will never deny Him or will always come back to Him or will not commit certain sins. Those lies are contrary to the passages and people I mentioned. They are actually strange doctrines pawned off as orthodoxy to most of Christendom. They are a false gospel. John MacArthur teaches it. John Piper. John Stott. R. C. Sproul. Al Mohler. And on and on and on. They all say "it's faith alone that saves but the faith that saves is never alone." They want to give you the gospel and then pull it away from you putting you on a performance basis. That is a false gospel. Even Ryrie blew it on his note on James 2:24, he said there are two tickets to heaven; the ticket of faith and the ticket of works. That is a lie! It is human nature to want to be able to determine from one's behavior whether they are a Christian or not but that puts the focus inward rather than outward on Christ. You are not to look into your heart but out to Christ. You are not going to find righteousness in your heart. You look out to Christ to find righteousness. He is our righteousness. To make true Christianity an evaluation of one's heart righteousness is to reduce it to the same level as every false religion on the planet. Christianity is not a pet list of do's and don'ts particular for certain Christians living in certain places and times who have certain taboos or social norms. To live is Christ. It is no longer I who live but Christ lives in me, the life I live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me. So while Christians *should* live by faith they don't always do so and when they don't it is not necessarily an indicator that they are unsaved. They may be, they may not be. The sad thing in the case of whoever asked this, is you really have no assurance of the eternal destiny of the person you are asking about. That's not an ideal situation to be in. You would like to have more confidence and if the person was living by faith you would have more confidence. But God knows the person's heart even if we don't and if that person truly believed then they are justified, credited with the perfect righteousness of Christ and will never perish.

10. **Does 1 Cor 7:13-14 mean that an unbelieving husband and child will be saved under the service and faith of the believing wife and mother?**

No, no one can be saved under the faith of another, not even a child. The issue of infant and young child salvation is solved another way. The situation at Corinth was that when the gospel came to Corinth in several marriages only one of the marriage partners came to faith. Thus, they were a believing and unbelieving couple. One problem at Corinth was asceticism. They thought that it detracted from

holiness to touch an unbeliever. Therefore believers should divorce their unbelieving spouses. Paul denies that. His point is that the very fact that these unbelieving spouses and children were in the same home with a believer set them apart as being more likely to become believers because of the constant testimony of the believing spouse or parent. No one can be saved under the faith of another, not even children. Each person is individually responsible.

**11. To what extent does the New Covenant with Israel in Jer 31:31-34 apply to the Church?**

Avoiding the spiritualizing of the text. Jer 31:31-34 promises that God in the future will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and Judah that is not like the Mosaic Covenant, which covenant they broke. In this covenant He will put His law within them and on their heart He will write it and He will be their God and they will be His people. They will not teach each man his neighbor saying know the Lord, for they shall all know Him from the least to the greatest. For He will forgive their iniquity and will remember their sin no more. The New Covenant has been a continual debate among dispensationalists. There are three basic views; single new covenant Israel only, two new covenants, one with Israel and one with the Church and spiritual blessings mediated by Christ to all who believe with fulfillment to Israel in the future. I take the third view, that spiritual blessings are being mediated by Christ to all who believe with fulfillment to all Israel in the future. This view does not spiritualize the text. It is the text. To spiritualize the text means to assign it a meaning that is not the authors intent. The literal, grammatical, historical interpretation of a text is the only meaning. And the literal, grammatical, historical interpretation of the relevant texts is that the spiritual blessings of the New Covenant, such as forgiveness of sins and the indwelling Spirit, are being mediated by Christ to the Church. 1 Cor 11:23ff is the Lord's Supper and if the bread is for us then the cup/blood is for us. This cup is His new covenant blood and not a portion of it. There seems to be no way around the present tense "This is My body...This cup is the new covenant in My blood." 2 Cor 3:6, we are ministers of the NC, the contrast is between the Mosaic Covenant and the New Covenant; the letter kills, the Spirit gives life, the ministry of the Mosaic Covenant came in letters engraved on stones with glory but the ministry of the New Covenant came by the Spirit with even more glory; the ministry of the Mosaic Covenant brought condemnation but the ministry of the New Covenant brought righteousness. This New Covenant we are ministering is said to be the gospel according to 2 Cor 4:1, 3. Therefore, the NC is directly connected to and part and parcel of the gospel which centers on the death of Christ. Rom 11:11-25 is the Olive Tree. It teaches that Gentiles are partakers of the blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant, and in particular the blessing aspect, which is amplified by the New Covenant. After the fullness of the Gentiles has been brought in then all Israel will be saved as fulfillment of the New Covenant, "For the Deliverer will come from Zion, He will remove ungodliness from Jacob. This is My covenant with them, when I remove their sins." Here too the New Covenant is directly connected to the gospel. Hebrews 7-12 makes many connections between the NC and, at the very least, Jewish believers in the Church. Heb 7:22, Jesus has

become the guarantee of a better covenant by which He presently exercises His high priesthood from the heavenly temple and through which we presently draw near to God. He began this priesthood when He made sacrifice for sins on the cross and the NC is therefore, very much in effect. Heb 8:6 He is presently the mediator of a better covenant enacted on better promises. Heb 8:13, the new covenant made the Mosaic covenant obsolete. The Mosaic sacrifices were worthless after the sacrifice of Christ. The Jewish believers in Hebrews were thinking of going back to the Mosaic sacrificial system but that would not benefit them spiritually. The sacrifice of Christ established Christ's mediation of new covenant from heaven enacted on better promises. He entered into the holy temple in heaven through the blood of His sacrifice which is NC blood. There is no division in the blood. In Heb 9:12 through His blood He obtained eternal redemption. The application of this blood by the Spirit cleanses the conscience. In Heb 9:15, through His mediation of the new covenant we have the promise of an eternal inheritance. In Heb 9:16 the new covenant is ratified by His blood and effected by His death and at the moment of His death. Jesus said at the Last Supper, this cup is the new covenant in my blood which is for you, including Judas Iscariot, the atonement is unlimited. All four gospels record this. Heb 9:22 without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness. His shed blood is the basis of all forgiveness. With it He cleansed the heavenly things, not the mere copies on earth. He is now mediating the blessings of the new covenant from heaven. The Mosaic covenant was an earthly covenant that ended at the cross and the new covenant is a heavenly covenant that began at the cross. If it is not in effect now, what were the Jewish believers supposed to go to if they left the Mosaic system? Obviously Christ and His very much better sacrifice which ratified the new covenant and by which He mediates new covenant blessings of forgiveness and cleansing. This line of thought continues in Hebrews and there is more, much more in those chapters. So the conclusion that spiritual blessings of Israel's new covenant are now being mediated to Jewish and Gentile believers in the Church is not a spiritualization of the text but the result of literal, grammatical, historical hermeneutics. To make an application is not a spiritualization. This was predicted in the Abrahamic Covenant and explained in the New Covenant and all of the unconditional covenants are in effect from the moment they are ratified, though not fulfilled until the millennium.

**12. When do Tribulation believers get evaluated/rewarded? They've missed the Judgment Seat of Christ and won't be at the Great White Throne, so when?**

Tribulation believers will get evaluated/rewarded at the Second Coming. Dan 12:2; Matt 25:45-25:46 parables deal with two things, entrance of Tribulation believers vs non-entrance of non-believers and evaluation/reward of believers upon entrance.

**13. Do you think God will allow Israel to be attacked to a strong degree during the church age?**

Well, it's already happened. The destruction of Jerusalem in AD70 was a strong attack on Israel near the beginning of the Church age. Over a million Jews perished and it caused the exile of Israel from the land. The Holocaust was a strong attack on Israel at the end of the church age. Over 6 million Jews perished and it caused the return of Israel to the land. So yes, God has allowed Israel to be attacked to a strong degree twice during the Church age; one at the beginning and one at the end and they are both prophetically significant. The reason these attacks are prophetically significant is because they are present outworkings of the Land Covenant. Because they rejected their Messiah they were exiled from the Land in AD70; in preparation for the reception of the Messiah they were returned to the land in unbelief in 1948. They are very significant because they show us that the Land Covenant has not been put on hold during the Church age but is presently in effect. It hasn't been fulfilled but it is in effect. The Land remains a vital concern of God even though covenant theology denies it. It's interesting, I remember Bruce Waltke, who was at one time a Hebrew professor at DTS but left dispensationalism for covenant theology, I remember him saying that if he could find just one promise of the land in the NT then he would be a dispensationalist. Of course, the NT talks about the restoration of the temple, Jerusalem and the Jews and where else is that going to be but the Land of Israel? But he left DTS because he was there in the 60's when Morris and Whitcomb wrote their famous book, *The Genesis Flood*, and that book had an explosive effect on the academic community, and Waltke wanted to maintain his scholarly reputation with the elite academics at Harvard and so he invented the Ruin-Reconstruction view of Genesis and this just obliterated this man's eyesight. He began to reject the distinction between Israel and the Church. He left dispensationalism. He left DTS. He became a Reformed, covenant theologian and eventually denied creation, opting for an evolutionary view under the guise of the framework hypothesis of Genesis 1 and was fired from Reformed Theological Seminary in 2010. This is one of the most esteemed Hebrew scholars in the world and my point is that these guys don't like the implications of reading the text literally and so they begin to depart and then it's just a downward spiral. These people suffer a shipwreck of the faith. And that's why Paul said that he was striving to run the race well and asked others to pray that he would finish the course and the ministry that was given him. Because Paul knew how easy it is to start veering off of the truth and before you know it you are way far gone. I have seen this so many times with theologians. Men like Clark Pinnock who once believed in the sovereignty of God, although it was a bit aberrant, but then he veered off and now he's full bore into process theology, the idea that God is in process and He is learning as we make decisions because if God knew in advance the decisions we would make then man wouldn't be truly free...It is really interesting to see Paul's concern that he stay the course, run the race well, and so forth so practically played out right before our eyes. It is not easy to stay the course, lots of people veer off, lots of theologians veer off. So one way you want to envision what we are in is a race. We are all running a race and the race began at the moment of faith and it ends when you die or the rapture, whichever comes first, and there is no guarantee that you are going to run the race well, or finish the race. That's

why we keep getting warned in the NT epistles not to give in to the flesh, not to turn aside to the world, not to give in to the devil. These are all obstacles that are trying to cause you to stumble and fall and fail in the Christian life. This is why it's so important to be in the word every day. You wouldn't do too well in a race if you weren't paying attention to how you were running the race. And you won't do too well in the Christian life if you aren't paying attention to the word of God. You have to keep a constant, disciplined focus on the Lord and His word, just as you would have to keep a disciplined focus in a race if you are going to finish that race well. Otherwise you veer, you stumble, you fall and the rest is history. Not every Christian perseveres to the end but those who do will be rewarded greatly. Stay the course. Don't quit. Keep motivated. Get in the word. Stay in the word. So yes, God has allowed Israel to be strongly attacked during the Church age and it is prophetically significant because it is directly tied to the outworking of the Land Covenant.

Do I think He will allow this again during the Church age? No. I think the Holocaust was the big one. I think it set Israel on an inevitable course of return to the land that is setting everything up for the Tribulation time and the great conflicts of that time like the Battle of Gog and Campaign of Armageddon.

**14. What does it mean they will “eat their flesh and drink their blood” in Ezek 39?**

Ezekiel 39 describes the aftermath of the Battle of Gog. In that battle God will destroy the enemies of Israel and their corpses will lie on the mountains of Israel. Ezekiel 39:4; 17-20 describes God as providing these corpses as food for the birds of the air and the beasts of the field. The aftermath of this battle will dovetail with that of the Battle of Armageddon as described in Matt 24:28, “wherever the corpse is, there the vultures will gather,” and Rev 19:17-18. The mass of dead corpses are a supper for the birds and beasts and a sacrifice on the mountains of Israel of the enemies of Israel. These scavengers will cleanse the earth of dead corpses in preparation for the millennial kingdom.

**15. Do you have any suggestions, mnemonic devices, etc. for memorizing scripture and connecting the text with the chapter/verse citation? I can often remember the content but not where to find it. (OK, I can usually connect it to OT or NT, but sometimes nothing more specific.) Not really, of course, chapter and verse divisions are not original. They were added during the Middle Ages. I wouldn't require people to memorize the address if I were the teacher. I would require them to learn the text.**

There are a few things to say here. First, the word of God is powerful but only when rightly understood/interpreted. Many people memorize a verse for the meaning they bring to it, which is not the meaning. It becomes nothing more than something that makes them feel good, even though it is not true and therefore not powerful. Second, it's preferable to memorize paragraphs rather than verses

since verses tend to be taken out of context. When the NT authors quote the OT they often do this, for example in Acts 2:17ff Peter quotes Joel 2:28ff. It is a paragraph in the Hebrew Bible. When you memorize the paragraph it compasses the verse giving context so that it is less likely to be misunderstood/misinterpreted and misused. Third, I have found that familiarity with the flow of a book's argument helps me recall where a verse/passage is. I have the advantage of spending a lot more time in the text than the average pastor, much more the average believer. For me, breaking down a book into an outline is the most helpful way to remember where a verse/passage is within that book's argument and therefore it's proper interpretation. I think God expects us to live in His word every day, to make it the number one priority in life and that every problem we face can be handled by the all-sufficient word of God and the reason we fail is because we don't know this book. I focus more on learning outlines and arguments than chapters and verses.

**16. What about the teaching of some of the teachers on KHCB radio station? Are there any red flags I should know of?**

I'm not going to point out any of the positives simply because this question is about the red flags so keep that in mind. I could say varying amounts of good about these people but I'm not doing that here. Adrian Rogers. Rogers is Southern Baptist. He was the president of the Southern Baptist Convention three times and the pastor of a Southern Baptist church. He was conservative in his theology. Red flags would be legalism on certain issues like drinking and tobacco use. He also thought that Church age believers were under the Ten Commandments, confusing Israel with the Church. Overall he was a typical southern Baptist and so those two issues along with a few others would be red flags. Nancy Demoss Wolgemuth also has a Baptist background. She has a couple of radio programs. Red flags would be her questionable association with contemplative mystic Richard Foster and Catholic monk, Brother Lawrence. Her doctrines of meditation to receive inspiration are a part of spiritual formation techniques rooted in witchcraft. She also opens her teaching to men through radio broadcast contradicting the Scriptures plain teaching that a woman should not teach or exercise authority over a man. Charles Stanley is also a Southern Baptist. He was the president of the Southern Baptist Convention twice and the pastor of a Southern Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia. As far as I can tell he is dispensational in his theology but being a public pastor he has come under scrutiny and accused by some as being a false teacher. I don't know any particulars. Chuck Swindol was president of Dallas Theological Seminary for a while. He is dispensational in his theology. Alistair Begg is okay as far as I know. Tony Evans is a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary and a pastor. A red flag is that he is an advocate of kingdom-now theology and what sounds like Lordship Salvation. David Jeremiah is a pastor of a Southern Baptist church. He's a graduate of Cedarville and Dallas Theological Seminary. Red flags are he has come under scrutiny for his questionable association with TBN alongside Paul Crouch and other prosperity gospel preachers. He has also appeared with Roma Downey, a devout Catholic mystic.

Warren Wiersbe is good. J. Vernon McGee is good. The only other thing I will say is I've been approached recently with the prospect of having my sermons broken down into 30 minute segments for a web-based Internet Radio Station with other sound free grace, classic dispensational Bible teachers. This is being done by a man named Brad Oullette who has been in radio for over 27 years, with the help of his wife Sara. If you would like to be praying for this ministry he hopes to launch this radio station by Summer of 2017.