

Angels and Demons, Part 5

Jack Hughes

April 23, 2006

This morning we are going to go back. You see, we're trying to finish this series on angels and demons, but it's just not happening as fast as we thought it [would].

If I were to ask you this question: Who is Lucifer? You would probably say, "Lucifer is Satan or the devil." Yeah. If I were to [say] finish this sentence: The five "I wills" of... Satan. OK, good. How about this? Satan was cast down to... earth. Good. Here's another one. Satan was the "anointed" or "covering"... cherub. See, man, you guys are just in the groove! The first service—I don't know if they were sleeping or if they were just the younger, less-informed people, or the less responsive people, but [they didn't really respond.] So, yeah, "cherub" is the correct answer.

You've [probably read about or heard people talking about] Christians being demon-possessed, being controlled by demons, [or having] demons inside of them. [These people] can't seem to get control of their lives and they need those demons to be cast out.

You have to ask yourself: Why are things like [the five "I wills" of Satan and Christian demon possession] taught? Well, they're taught because of two basic reasons. First, people misinterpret the Scriptures; or, second, they ignore the Scriptures altogether and base what they believe on their experience.

Now, if you've been here in the last couple of months, you've noticed that we've gotten to Luke 8 and the text of the Gerasene demoniac. I can't wait to get to [that text] because it's a really great text. But, as I got there, I thought, "You know, we should probably do a little series on angels and demons so that people can understand what the Bible teaches about the angelic realm—about demons, Satan, and how they play a part in our lives. And so, we've addressed those issues.

This morning [as part of that series on angels and demons], we're going to do two odd topics. And, the reason [for this] is [that] as I was talking to people, [they] kept bringing certain issues up. I didn't really want to preach on [those issues], but I realized, "No, I need to do this, because a lot of people are asking questions about it." So, this morning is kind of a fill-in-the-gap sermon on a couple [of] strange topics. One of them doesn't really even have that much importance, but I think it is important to look at just because it's in the Word of God [and] it's important to understand the Word of God. Hopefully there will be some blessing in the process.

Now, if you remember when Paul went to Thessalonica, it says at the beginning of Acts 17 that he went there and he and Silas were persecuted. And so, they then left Thessalonica and went to Berea. Luke, who wrote the Gospel of Acts, tells us this in Acts 17:10–11:

The brethren immediately sent Paul and Silas away by night to Berea, and when they arrived, they went into the synagogue of the Jews. Now these were more noble-minded than those in Thessalonica, for they received the word with great eagerness, examining the Scriptures daily to see whether these things were so.

Luke describes [the people at Berea] as "more noble-minded" than the Thessalonians for two reasons: 1) they received what Paul was saying "with great eagerness"; and 2) everything Paul said, they examined it by the text of Scripture to see whether it was so. And you know what? You and I need to be Bereans. We need to be Bereans.

Most of us probably are aware, or are familiar with the text in 2 Timothy 2:15, [where] Paul is speaking to Timothy and to all Christians that we need to “be diligent to present [ourselves] approved to God as [workmen] who [do] not need to be ashamed, accurately handling the word of truth.” In other words, we need to handle [it as] the Greek says, “with precision, to cut it straight” so that we don’t misrepresent God’s Word.

Now, you probably know [that] when anybody comes up here to preach —when any of the guys come up to preach—we don’t just sit in the pew [that] Sunday morning and right before we’re supposed to come up here, think, “OK. What am I going to preach on next?” and then walk up here and look in [the Bible] and just kind of do the “gift of gab” thing. No, there’s quite a bit of study that goes on behind the scenes. We have some training in interpretation, and exegesis, and languages, and how to go about getting the goodies out of the Bible. We spend quite a few hours trying to get all of this information.

Then, once we get all of this information, we find out what a text says and what it means. We then begin to synthesize it, and distill it down, and illustrate it, and streamline it, and try to make it as clear as we can so that we can give it to you in a little, short time period. But, just so you know, there’s always a lot more that goes into a sermon than just what you hear. You hear the end of it all. It’s kind of like going to a nice bakery [where] they have one of those really exotic cakes. Well, I just want you to know, that cake didn’t come out of a box that way. There’s a baker back there who has some training, he has some skill, he has ingredients, he has tools, and he has labored to put that cake together. You just show up and get the end product.

This morning I want to bring you in on the preparation of studying the Bible. What we’re going to do is to look at two issues that I think have been grossly misunderstood by many Christians, and see what the Scriptures say. I could just give you the end product, but that wouldn’t be very satisfying to you. In a case like this, you’re going to want to know how [we get to the end product].

So, what we're going to do is we're going to look at two dishes. Of course, the ingredients always need to come from the Word of God, so we need to look at that. But, the two dishes we're going to see if the Scriptures can produce are: Can we get satanic soup from Ezekiel 28 and Isaiah 14? And, can we make demon-stuffed Christian pie from the New Testament? Those are going to be our two dishes. We're going to see if we can validly say that Ezekiel and Isaiah teach in a couple of texts that Satan is actually there and being talked about. And, then we're going to talk about demon-stuffed Christian pie. That is: Can Christians be demon-possessed?

So, first we want to talk about: Can you make satanic soup from Ezekiel 28 and Isaiah 14. Turn to Isaiah 14. I want you to know [that] we're just going to read this and move right into Ezekiel. I'll tell you why in a second. Turn to Isaiah 14 and look at verse 12. Don't look at the context—that would ruin everything. Look at Isaiah 14:12[-15]:

How you have fallen from heaven, O star of the morning, son of the dawn! You have been cut down to the earth, You who have weakened the nations! But you said in your heart, "I will ascend to heaven; I will raise my throne above the stars of God, And I will sit on the mount of assembly In the recesses of the north. I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will make myself like the Most High." Nevertheless you will be thrust down to Sheol, To the recesses of the pit.

And everybody knows this is referring to... the king of Babylon. You're thinking, "Well, are you sure?" If you have the King James [version of the Bible], where it says "star of the morning" [in the NASB], it says "Lucifer." That's where they get that title: "Lucifer" means "shining one." Actually, it's "star of the morning," and it just so happens that Jesus is the "star of the morning." The "star of the morning" is when the sun starts to come up and the sky begins to get light, what happens is the dimmest stars begin to fade first, and the last and brightest star is the "bright morning star"—the brightest, most preeminent one.

Now, when you look at this, it can be seen, for instance from Isaiah 14:12 and on down, there's a reference to *someone* falling from heaven, someone who has "weakened the nations," someone [who] is being so proud [as] to think that they were a god, someone needing to be "thrust down to Sheol, To the recesses of the pit." This text, divorced from its context, has [been] interpreted as literally referring to Satan.

We also see the five "I wills" here. We all have heard the five "I wills" of Satan. Yet, the context in Isaiah 13:1, 19 [and] 14:4, 22 all say the king of Babylon is in view. Besides, the Bible says that Satan still has access to heaven, he is the leader of the world forces of darkness in the heavenly places [see Ephesians 6:12], and in Revelation 12[:1–9], he's still in heaven and he gets cast down then to earth. So the question is: Does Isaiah 14:12–15 refer to Satan or not?

I just want you to know: I don't think so. I am quite certain it does not. Now, I know when you hear me say that, some of you [gasp and think,] "But my study Bible says right here by famous pastor-theologian so-and-so..." I just want you to know: I realize this. There are a lot of godly guys, a lot of great theologians, [who] disagree with me on this, [but] there are a lot of them who are right, though.

I want you to look at Ezekiel 28. Now, I just mentioned Isaiah because [it] is the weakest of the two texts. What we're going to do is we're going to tackle the big, bad text, which seems to be really explicit, which is Ezekiel 28. So, if you have your Bible, turn to Ezekiel 28, and [I'm] going to show you how you might work through this passage to see whether or not it refers to Satan. I'm going to show you why I don't think it refers to Satan: because you cannot apply standard Bible study principles to this text and come away saying it does. So, let's look and see what Ezekiel 28 says, starting in the middle of verse 12 because the first part of verse 12 kind of ruins it. So, we'll just look at the middle of verse 12, again ignoring that near context for the moment.

Thus says the Lord GOD, "You had the seal of perfection, Full of wisdom and perfect in beauty. You were in Eden, the garden of God; Every precious stone was your covering: The ruby, the topaz and the diamond; The beryl, the onyx and the jasper; The lapis lazuli, the turquoise and the emerald; And the gold, the workmanship of your settings and sockets, as in you. On the day that you were created They were prepared. You were the anointed cherub who covers, And I placed you there. You were on the holy mountain of God; You walked in the midst of the stones of fire. You were blameless in your ways From the day you were created Until unrighteousness was found in you. By the abundance of your trade You were internally filled with violence, And you sinned; Therefore I have cast you as profane From the mountain of God. And I have destroyed you, O covering cherub, From the midst of the stones of fire. Your heart was lifted up because of your beauty; You corrupted your wisdom by reason of your splendor. I cast you to the ground. [28:12–17]

And we'll just leave the end of the verse off. OK. There it is. Now, almost all study Bibles, and about half the commentaries you might read, [when] you come to this passage, say, "Well, this is talking about Satan here." Actually, there are three views. These are the three views that people take concerning this passage. The not-very-popular view is that these two passages, [Ezekiel 28] and Isaiah 14, refer to Satan *exclusively*. That means they *only* refer to Satan. [The] second view is yes, it refers to Satan, but only secondarily, or what is called "typologically," or indirectly to the king of Tyre.

Now, I hate to do this to you because I don't like jargon. You know, I purposely try and stay away from [terms like] "superlapsarianism" because I know when I say [things like] that everybody instantly falls asleep. But we need to talk about some terms here. We need to talk about what a "type"

is, an Old Testament “type,” [such as] when I say [that] view two sees Satan as “typologically” referring to the king of Tyre, or the king of Tyre typologically referring to Satan.

In the Old Testament, there are things called “types.” This isn’t too hard; you can understand this. I’ll give you an example. A “type” is something such as the bronze serpent that is spoken of in Numbers 21[:6–9]. If you remember what happens, the people sinned, God sent fiery serpents among them, they were bitten, they were all starting to die, they cry out to Moses, Moses cries out to God, and God [tells him to] make a bronze serpent, set it up on a pole, [and] lift it up there so that the medical profession today will have a symbol. And, so that [everyone] who looks on the bronze serpent will then be healed of their mortal and physical problem, their sickness from being bitten by these serpents.

Well, it just so happens [that] in John 3:14, Jesus is speaking to Nicodemus, and He says, “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.” And the whole point is this: the people in the Old Testament were physically ill, looked at the serpent, and were healed physically. Jesus is telling Nicodemus [that] the Son of Man is going to be lifted up on the cross, crucified, [and] those who look to Him for salvation will be healed spiritually. So, Christ is the ultimate, or greater, fulfillment of the Old Testament type. The thing in the Old Testament is called the “type,” and the New Testament thing is the “antitype.” So, view two is saying that the king of Tyre is a “type” and that Satan is the greater and ultimate fulfillment, or the “antitype.”

Then there’s a third view [of the Ezekiel 28 text]. The third view says that this text does not refer to Satan either directly or indirectly. That’s my view. I think that’s the correct view. Now, why would I say that? Well, it doesn’t mean [that if] you take view three you [think] Satan has nothing to do with the passage. We know that all unbelievers are of their “father the devil,” they do the works of their father [see John 8:44], and Satan is working in the “sons of disobedience” [Ephesians 2:2], so, of course, that would be true of the king of Tyre as well. But, what it *does* mean is that this

text has no *literal* fulfillment to Satan's fall in history before Genesis 3 and that we should not go to this passage to form our doctrine of Satan because it does not refer to him directly, or secondarily, or even typologically.

Now, if you've gone to a Bible study class, or if you have gone to one of my "how to prepare a Bible study" classes or sermons, or a "how to study the Bible" class, or read a book on a big, fancy field called "hermeneutics"—which means the principles of studying the Bible—you know that the king of all Bible study principles is what? Context. Man, context is *king*. Everybody knows that. And it's king because the meaning of a passage is primarily determined upon its near context. Then, from there you can go out to far context—its surrounding chapters—then you can go to the context of the whole book, then you can go to all the other books written by the same author, then maybe to the whole testament, and then to the whole Bible.

So, you have these "spheres" of context. But the most important, the most *authoritative* [of these spheres], is the near context. In other words, out of all the principles you might use to study the Bible, the one you put the most weight on is context. Now, there's an exception. The exception is if you have an Old Testament text that is interpreted by a New Testament author. Then you have an inspired interpretation, and that's what [the Old Testament text] means, because [the New Testament text] says so.

Ezekiel 26, the far context of Ezekiel 28, talks about Tyre's destruction. Ezekiel 27 is a lament over Tyre's demise. Ezekiel 28 is a prediction of the king's ruin and judgment. It can be easily seen that the king of Tyre and his kingdom are in view. How do you know that? Well, all you have to do is look at the context and you can see in Ezekiel 26:2–4, 7, 15, and 27:2–3, 8, 32, and 28:2, 12 that it is speaking of the king of Tyre and his kingdom. That is about as much near context proof [as] you could possibly conjure up. You could also add to this the fact that in Ezekiel 26:2, 27:2, 28:2, 9, 12, it describes the person being spoken of as a "man," not a demon. The overwhelming information from the far and near contexts tells us that Ezekiel is talking about a man—the king of Tyre.

What does this mean? This means that view one is dead. It's dead. You can't explain away this mountain of material just because you want this text to refer to Satan. So that leaves us with two views. The two views are: One, that the king of Tyre typifies Satan; that Satan is the ultimate fulfillment or person that is being pictured by the king of Tyre. Two: [There's] view three that [says] Satan is not in the text at all directly.

Let me give you a list of problems I have with view two. And see, I want you to know [that] I'm talking about this because during this series on angels and demons, people [have] come up to me and [asked], "Hey, how come you haven't talked about Ezekiel 28? You've never quoted that passage." Or, "You know, I've been looking [in the Bible] and, are you going to talk about Isaiah 14?" Well, I didn't want to! And they're wondering [why] I'm not extracting a little information from there. Well, I don't think it refers to Satan, that's why. "Oh," and then they say, "Well, why?"

Well, [these are] the reasons I can't take view two. One, because it violates the far context, which says the king of Tyre is in view. Satan is never mentioned. Two, it violates the near, immediate context, which says the king of Tyre is in view, and Satan isn't mentioned. Three, it violates the flow of the text. For instance, when this text is quoted as referring to Satan, the first part of verse 12 and the last part of verse 17—and some people think it goes all the way to [verse] 19—are conveniently left off. Why? Well, look at the first part of verse 12: "Son of man, take up a lamentation over the king of Tyre and say to him. . . ." That kind of puts a damper on the Satan view, doesn't it? And if you look at verse 17, at the end of the verse: "I put you before kings, That they may see you." Who saw Satan fall from heaven? What kings were around then in Genesis, before Genesis 3:1? Nad[ie] [none]. See, that's a problem.

This puts a damper on the Satan view because the text says the king of Tyre is being discussed. And yes, men did see him judged. He was judged in the sight of men, but Satan [was not]. And if you add verses 18–19, then you have to deal with verse 18, which says: "I have turned you to ashes on the earth In the eyes of all who see you." When did that happen to Satan?

If this is talking about Satan's fall, when did that happen to him? That's a problem, isn't it? Or, verse 19, that goes on to say, "All who know you among the peoples Are appalled at you; You have become terrified And you will cease to be forever." Now, has that already happened? All the people were appalled? See, that's a problem, isn't it? That is a problem.

Four, you have to invent a special kind of—and I hate to throw out this term, but I don't know what else to call it—"genre." Do you know that term? Some of you English teachers are going, "I know what that word means." Genre just means [that] in the Bible, [and] in all literature, you have different kinds of literature. In the Bible, for instance, you have prophecy, historical narrative, law, [and] parables. Those are called different "genres," or literary types. And so, in order to make Ezekiel 28 and Isaiah 14 (though we aren't looking at that [text] directly) refer to Satan, you have to invent a very special and convoluted literary type.

Let me explain what I mean [by asking] you a few questions. Ezekiel was what? A prophet. And, in this section, Ezekiel is doing what? Prophesying. He is predicting the future. He is telling us what is going to happen to the king of Tyre. And, it just so happens, he is writing in Hebrew poetry. Most of you probably have Bibles [with you] and you'll notice that if you go back to about the middle of Ezekiel 27 in verse 24, it's in block text, and then when you get into verse 25, all of a sudden it's indented. That tells you that it has switched from regular prose to Hebrew poetry. So [Ezekiel is] not only giving a lament, or talking about the demise of the king of Tyre, he's doing it in Hebrew poetry that is also prophecy. OK? Which is not a problem—that happens all over the Bible. But if this text refers to Satan's fall from heaven and his judgment before Genesis 3, then what kind of text would this have to be? Historical narrative because it's telling us what already happened in the past. And so, what is it? Prophecy or historical narrative?

It gets worse. View two says the king of Tyre is a "type." Now, if you were to get a hermeneutics book—a book that tells you how to study the Bible—and you studied up on types, you would learn certain things about

types. “Types” refer to Christ. They have an Old Testament type and a New Testament antitype, or fulfillment in Christ. But, of course, [Ezekiel 28] would have to be an exception. And so would Isaiah 14 if it refers to Satan. [They] would be the only two types in the Bible that refer to Satan.

And do you see [another] problem here? There’s a huge problem. Why? [There’s a problem] because in a type, the type is mentioned [in the Old Testament] and then in the New Testament the antitype is given. But if this is talking about Satan’s fall, the antitype was given and then the type. It’s backward. Not only does it *not* refer to Christ, *not* have a New Testament fulfillment, [but] the antitype came before the type. I don’t know about you, but I have a problem with that. That is a problem. That’s beyond what I can swallow. I just want to put my fingers in my ears and go, “La, la, la.” I can’t do that one.

Now, if Ezekiel 28 and Isaiah 14 refer to Satan, they would have to be a kind of poetry that is typological, but not referring to Christ, not having a type given before the antitype, not having a New Testament fulfillment. It would have to be a prophetic passage predicting the future and at the *same time* be historical narrative, telling us what happened in the past. And, you know what? I don’t think that kind of passage exists. That sounds schizophrenic to me. But if you take view two, you’ve got to believe that. It’s the only way it works, unless you think it’s the Satan-only view and then you have this huge contextual mountain to explain away. So, you see, these things just can’t be. If this text is telling us about the events of the past when Satan was judged, it can’t be telling us about the future and what’s going to happen on two different, weird planes.

Five, there is nothing in the text, if you look in verse 11, where it says, “Again the word of the LORD came to me saying...” and then verse 12: “Son of man, take up a lamentation of the king of Tyre and say to him, ‘Thus says...’ ” Right there between “him” and “thus says the Lord GOD,” you have to assume that it’s now talking about Satan. For what reason in the text? There isn’t any. And then, it’s speaking of Satan all the way down until you get to the middle of verse 17 and then after it says, “I cast you

to the ground,” chop! Now it’s speaking of the king of Tyre again. Why? Because Satan was never put before kings that they [“may see”] him. And if you want to include verses 18–19, the question is: Did God bring fire from the midst of [Satan] and burn him to the ground, to ashes, in the sight of men? See, it just doesn’t work well. You can’t just go through the Bible and splice up verses so that it’s convenient to your view.

Now, some take a literal interpretation of certain phrases or words found in the text, and [that] is really the strongest argument for Ezekiel 28 referring to Satan. They say, “Ah ha, Jack! But context *is* king, and context *does* say these certain things. And obviously, they *can’t* refer to the king of Tyre if you take them literally.” So how do you answer that? Don’t take them literally.

Just so you know, it doesn’t matter what view you take, there’re a whole bunch of things in here you have to believe are figurative. All commentators say, “Yeah, Ezekiel is saturated with figurative language, both in the far and near context.” And if you take the Satan view, you have to say this is figurative and that is figurative. And if you take the non-Satan view you have to say this is figurative and that is figurative. The difference is this: What view do you have to spiritualize the most for? What view best fits the context? That is the issue.

Let’s look at some of the phrases that seem to appear to refer to Satan. Look at verse 12: “You had the seal of perfection, Full of wisdom and perfect in beauty.” Now, we know that Satan was created perfect, like everything God created, and he then rebelled against God. We know that. And, [we] could say, “OK. Well, that’s good. But, how do we know for certain that’s referring to Satan? See, that doesn’t prove anything.”

And you’d say, “Yeah, but, you can’t go saying that the king of Tyre and his kingdom was perfect.” Well, what does the context say? What does the king of all interpretive principles say? Let’s look. You could say that this whole perfection business is just indicative of the exalted position of the king of Tyre, [and] his pride [in] thinking that his kingdom was just the greatest kingdom on earth. Kind of the Mohammad Ali thing, you know,

“I’m the greatest!” [The king of Tyre] is thinking his wealth, his protected island, and his kingdom are just perfect.

Now, why would anybody say that? Well, first of all, because in Ezekiel 16:14, Jerusalem is described by Ezekiel as being perfect. But, even more so, if you look at Ezekiel 27:3, notice what it says there: “And say to Tyre, who dwells at the entrance to the sea, merchant of the peoples to many coastlands, ‘Thus says the Lord GOD, ‘O Tyre, you have said, ‘I am perfect in beauty.’”” Huh. [Verse] 4: “Your borders are in the heart of the seas; Your builders have perfected your beauty.” Look down at verse 11: “The sons of Arvad and your army were on your walls, all around, and the Gammadim were in your towers. They hung their shields on your walls all around; they perfected your beauty.” So, that takes out that phrase, because we have three references in the near context speaking of the same person that use the same phrase. So, not a big deal.

But you say, “But wait! What about verse 13? Look there. [It says,] ‘You were in Eden, the garden of God.’ Ah ha! Not only that, [it says:] ‘Every precious stone was your covering: The ruby, the topaz and the diamond; The beryl, the onyx and the jasper; The lapis lazuli, the turquoise and the emerald; And the gold, the workmanship of your settings and sockets, Was in you. On the day that you were created They were prepared.’ ”

OK. “Ah ha!” you say, “Satan was in the Garden of Eden—we know he was in the Garden of Eden from Genesis. Therefore, this could not be a reference to the king of Tyre.” Unless, it can be proven that “Eden” is being spoken of figuratively to describe some lush place *like* the Garden of Eden. And you say, “Well, how do you know that?” Well, we can go to the wider context of the Old Testament [and] we can see in Isaiah 51:3 [that] the word “Eden” is figuratively used to describe the restoration of the wilderness around Jerusalem when it becomes a lush, forested place. We can also look in Joel 2:3, when “Eden” is used to describe the lush growth around Jerusalem which is destroyed in the day of the Lord.

“Yeah,” someone says, “that’s fine for Isaiah and that’s fine for Joel, but what about Ezekiel?” Well, it just so happens that Ezekiel uses the word

“Eden” in several other places. As a matter of fact, Ezekiel uses it in Ezekiel 31:9, 16, 18 [and] 36:35—all figuratively to refer to lush, forested areas which are like Eden.

The question is: Why would Ezekiel refer to the kingdom of Tyre as “Eden”? Well, if you do a little background study [and] find out about what Tyre was like, you will discover that Tyre was an island [located] one-half mile off the shore of the Mediterranean coast just north of Israel in what is now Lebanon. And, at that time, Tyre was known for its magnificent timber industry, because the whole place was just saturated with forests. The Bible talks about if you were to take all the wood in Lebanon and burn it, it would not be a sacrifice enough for God [see Isaiah 40:16]. That was a huge statement because the whole thing was just saturated with trees. It was lush; it was forested. It was where David and Solomon bought all their timber and lumber to build the temple. That is how Hiram, the king of Tyre, became so wealthy, because they were buying lumber and renting craftsmen from Tyre, [which] had the best craftsmen and the most building materials.

So, now we can see, not only from the context of the Old Testament as a whole, but from Ezekiel, that Ezekiel and the other [books] never use “Eden” in a literal way, but always figuratively to describe lush, forested areas, which Tyre was. Therefore, that’s not a problem.

“Yeah,” you say, “but what about the precious stones stuff? [Ezekiel 28:13 says:] ‘Every precious stone was your covering: The ruby, the topaz and the diamond...’ ” You might have heard that Satan was kind of like a walking gem shop. That he was covered [with gems]—kind of like the dragon in *The Hobbit*, with just gems all around him. ([If] you wonder[ed] where Tolkien got that idea, there you go.) But do you really think Satan is covered with stones? Most commentators, even those who take [view two] say, “No, this is *figuratively* speaking of his beauty.” So, why don’t we just apply it to the person who’s mentioned in the context, the king of Tyre?

But then you say, “Oh, but Jack, how in the world are you going to deal with the ‘anointed cherub who covers’ in verse 14? [It says:] ‘And I placed

you there. You were on the holy mountain of God; You walked in the midst of the stones of fire.’ ” Well, you have to realize this: if you take view two—think about this—if you take view two, [which says] the king of Tyre is a type of Satan, you still have to explain how every one of these phrases applies to the king of Tyre. Every one. And once you do that, why apply it to Satan? See? It matches the context. [Ezekiel is] using all of this figurative language, as we have shown. And, if we had more time we could look [at all of it]. (By the way, if you want to look into this more, I have a whole paper I’ve written on this. It’s big, it’s detailed, and you can just submerge yourself into the pit of this study if you want. You can call the office and get it.)

You say, “OK, what about the cherub thing?” [Do] you know how many other places “anointed cherubs” are mentioned in the Bible? [None]. The “covering cherub” is never mentioned. How about the “mountain of God” and the “stones of fire”? Never mentioned. This is what is called a “hapax legomenon,” that is, the single. . . (Ha! Sorry. I can’t help it—seminary made me this way.) This is a single occurrence. These things aren’t mentioned anywhere else in the Bible, so you can’t say, “Well, this means this.” How do you know? This is the only place it appears. You can’t say, “We know Satan is a cherub, therefore this must be referring to him.” How do you know he’s a cherub? He’s never called a cherub anywhere else. He’s never called an angel, he’s never called a demon. “Oh.”

But then, what happens is, people a lot of times like to say this: “Well, Jack, this is very handy for your view, because obviously all of the best stuff on our view, you just spiritualize it and make it go away. That is not fair! With all of our biggest artillery, you’re saying, ‘Well, that’s figurative,’ which is handy for you.” Well, actually, if you take view two, you have to spiritualize about ten times more material than I do.

So, how can you do that? You see, the burden of proof is on those who think [the passage] refers to Satan, because then you have to take all of those *explicit* references in the near and far context to the king of Tyre, and say, “Well, it’s not the king, it’s not the king, it’s not the king.” Or, you

have to do the contextual suicide thing and start hacking up verses with no reason to from the text. I just can't do that. Then you have to deal with phrases [like]: "I cast you to the ground" [and] "I put you before kings" and all of these other phrases in there which couldn't literally refer to Satan, so you have to spiritualize them anyway. You're spiritualizing a lot more.

So, if you wondered why, in our talk of angels and demons and Satan that I never talked about Satan and referred to him as "Lucifer," and you thought, "Huh. He forgot one of [Satan's] names." No, I didn't. If you ever wondered why I didn't talk about the five "I wills" of... the king of Babylon. If you ever wondered why I didn't mention Satan as the "anointed cherub who covers," you know what? Now you know. Now you know. And, you know what? You can disagree with me, and you can still get to heaven—you'll get your right view later. But that's just a nutshell of why I believe what I believe. And, although we spent the most amount of time on this, this is the least important thing [we're talking about today]. You can still get to heaven and have any one of the three views.

But, we're going to talk about something a little bit more important, a little bit more relevant, I think, to our lives. And that is: Can you make demon-stuffed pie out of a Christian? Can a Christian be demon-possessed? We talked about earlier that demon possession is when one or more demons inhabits a person and totally controls them from within. Can that happen to a Christian?

Fred Dickason, who is supposed to be an expert on this subject, says in his work *Demon Possession and the Christian*, "Having researched the evidence in a broad fashion by proper application of both biblical and clinical parameters, we may come to the valid conclusion that Christians can be demonized." Later in his book, he goes on to say, "We must note that those who deny that Christians can be demonized generally are those who have not had counseling experience with the demonized. Their stance is largely theoretical." What's he's saying there is, "Listen, you can't go to the Bible and actually answer the question. You've got to have some experiences with demon-possessed people in your office." And remember, we talked about

that in detail. I'm not going to go [over that again]. If you weren't here for the rest of the series, [we noted that] Satan is willing to give you experiences in order to deceive you. And, of course, the Bible is the sole authority for all doctrine, not experience, not clinical research—definitely not.

When I read those who say they have experience with Christians being demon-possessed, I like to ask this question: How do you know they're Christians? How do you know? That is a huge question, isn't it? I mean, the pastors here would *love* to know for certain if someone is saved. We beg God to tell us. We have somebody come into the office, he says he is a Christian and then in his life he lives like an unbeliever. Is he saved or not? Groan. It's such a nightmare. You know why it's a nightmare? It's a nightmare because we have to give [that person] counsel. You know what? If he doesn't know Christ, the counsel is, "Repent! Believe!" But if he is a Christian, he has the Holy Spirit in him, he has "everything pertaining to life and godliness" [2 Peter 1:3], "no temptation has overtaken [him] but such as is common to man" [1 Corinthians 10:13]. He has all the resources he needs, all we need to do is show him the Word of God, encourage him, help him apply [the Word], get him some ways to figure out the text, disciple him, and he will grow out of that sin that he is entangled in.

But if he isn't a Christian, he *only* sins, he is held captive by Satan to do his will [see 2 Timothy 2:26], he is a "[son] of disobedience" [see Ephesians 2:2], a child of hell, he is blind to the spiritual truth, he can't understand the things of God [see 1 Corinthians 2:14], and he cannot please God [see Romans 8:8]. If you're going to counsel somebody, it's really good if you can tell for certain he is a Christian. I wish I had a scanner [that could determine Christian or non-Christian]. We keep looking in the Christian magazines to see if there is one. You know, we could just [scan them] or say, "OK. Poke your finger here. Oh, you're a Christian. OK, this is the counsel for you."

The problem is, when people come in because they have a demon or whatever, they're entangled in sin. They have this profession that says, "I love the Lord; I'm a Christian," but their life says, "I'm not a Christian."

So the question is: How can you know for certain when somebody says, “I’ve had experience with Christians.” How do you know he is a Christian? You know, there are some things that can make you reasonably sure. For instance, [first], if somebody professes to know Christ, that’s the starting block, but eighty-five percent of Americans [say] that. The second thing is [that] he has a clear understanding of the gospel and how one is saved by grace. He has a past life experience that shows him growing in the Lord, and serving the Lord, and pursuing holiness, and he has a present life which shows that he is a new creature in Christ, he loves God, is sensitive to the things of God, and wants to do what’s right.

Now, if you have those things, you can be reasonably sure [a person is a Christian], but you can’t be absolutely certain. And so, when you’re reading stories of clinical evidences of Christians who have demons, assuming that they did have a demon, I just want you to know [that] you can’t know for certain someone else is saved. You can only be *reasonably* certain.

But, you know what? You don’t need clinical evidence. You don’t need to talk to anybody to know this issue, because the Word of God settles it crystal clear. Christians *cannot* be demon-possessed. Let me give you seven reasons [why they can’t be demon-possessed]. And, again, there aren’t seven reasons because seven is a good biblical number, it’s just how many came up. Here we go. (We’re going to race through these kind of quickly, because you guys probably want to have lunch eventually.)

One: You can’t be demon-possessed if you’re a Christian because of your relationship to God. For instance, in Romans 8:15, it talks about us having the “spirit of adoption.” In Romans 8:16, it talks about us being “children of God.” In Galatians 3:26, it says, “You are all sons of God through faith in Christ.” In Ephesians 1:5, it talks about believers being predestined “to adoption as sons.” We’re sons of God! Now, is it reasonable to say that God is going to allow a demon to take one of His children and totally control him? No! Would you let some evil guy take your child? No. No.

Two: A Christian can't be demon-possessed because God possesses believers. In Acts 20:28, when Paul is saying, "Be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock," you know that God has made you overseers. He describes God's church as the church that God purchased with His own blood—the blood of His own Son. He purchased [you]—He owns you, if you are a believer. First Corinthians 6:20 says, "You have been bought with a price" if you are a believer. First Corinthians 7:23 [says], "You were bought with a price." First Peter 2:9 [says], "You are a CHOSEN RACE, A royal PRIESTHOOD, A HOLY NATION, A PEOPLE FOR God's OWN POSSESSION." Now, is it reasonable to assume that a demon or Satan could take one of God Almighty's possessions away from Him? I don't think so. As a matter of fact, I know so.

Three: A Christian can't be demon-possessed because God has promised to protect [us]. In John 10:11–15, Jesus describes Himself as the shepherd. He says:

I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd lays down His life for the sheep. He who is a hired hand, and not a shepherd, who is not the owner of the sheep, sees the wolf coming, and leaves the sheep and flees, and the wolf snatches them and scatters them. He flees because he is a hired hand and he is not concerned about the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and I know My own and My own know Me, even as the Father knows Me and I know the Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep.

Listen, Jesus is the "good shepherd" of those who are His, and He's not going to let anybody—any demon—snatch them, because He is the perfect shepherd.

Do you remember what Jesus prayed in John 17:15 of those who would believe in Him? "I do not ask You," speaking to the Father, "to take them out of the world, but to keep them from the evil one." Do you think God answered that prayer? Sure He did. [In] 2 Thessalonians 3:3, Paul says,

“But the Lord is faithful, and He will strengthen and protect you from the evil one.” That’s what Paul says in 2 Thessalonians 3:3. In 1 John 5:18, John says, “We know that no one who is born of God sins; but He who was born of God keeps him, and the evil one *does not touch him*” [emphasis added]. Now, I don’t know how much more “touched” you could be than to have a demon dwelling in you and totally controlling you. That’s about as touched as you can get. What do these verses teach us? God is the one who is actively protecting believers from the evil one. It just says it flat out.

Four: A Christian can’t be demon-possessed because he abides in Christ ([see] Romans 6:11, 8:1; 2 Corinthians 5:17). Colossians 3:3 says, “For you have died and your life is hidden with Christ in God.” (And again, all these verses I’m giving you are just samples, by the way.) Now, if a believer is in Christ, and the demon is in the believer, then what does that mean? Can a demon be “hidden with Christ in God”? No. But you [may] say, “Well, Jack, demon possession is a *spatial* thing, where they inhabit the physical bodies of believers now, but being in Christ is a *positional* thing, and is a spiritual thing, and [this] is not talking spatially.” OK, let’s move on.

Five: A Christian can’t be demon-possessed because of Christ’s abiding presence in the individual persons of believers who live in time and space. In Romans 8:10 [it says], “If Christ is *in you*” [emphasis added]. Second Corinthians 13:5 [says]: “Test yourself to see if you are in the faith; examine yourselves! Or do you not recognize this about yourselves, that Jesus Christ is *in you*—unless indeed you failed the test?” [emphasis added]. Colossians 1:27 [says]: “To whom God willed to make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ *in you*, the hope of glory” [emphasis added]. Do you mean to tell me that Christ is in me, [and] some demon wants to come in, too, and they’re going to share an apartment? Come on.

Six: A Christian cannot be demon-possessed because the Holy Spirit abides in every true believer. The Scriptures teach that all believers are born by the Spirit, ([see] John 3:3–6); and “by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body” (1 Corinthians 12:12–13). [This is] the idea of our bodies

[being] a temple—you are a temple of God, the Holy Spirit dwells in you. Now, is God going to let a demon inhabit His temple? After believing the gospel message, all believers, it says, are “sealed for the day of redemption” by the Holy Spirit [Ephesians 4:30].

I’m telling you: once you come to Christ, you have the Holy Spirit and it’s never leaving you. “Sealing” illustrates ownership, possession, and protection. You can look at Romans 8:9–11, which talks about every true believer [having] God’s Spirit in them. If they don’t have God’s Spirit in them they aren’t Christ’s, but every true believer has the Spirit who indwells them individually. In 1 Corinthians 3:16 [it says]: “Do you not know that you are a temple of God and that the Spirit of God dwells in you?” Second Timothy 1:14 [says]: “Guard, through the Holy Spirit who dwells in us, the treasure which has been entrusted to you.” You mean to tell me that a demon is going to come in there with the Holy Spirit in there, with Christ in there? Not on your life. Not on your life.

Seven: A Christian cannot be demon-possessed because he is responsible and able to obey God. What do I mean by that? I mean this: When you come to Christ, you’re given everything you need to live for God. *Everything* you need to live for God. There is nothing that you need to obey God that is lacking—you have all sufficient grace for “every good deed” [2 Corinthians 9:8].

Neil Anderson, though, a so-called expert in the field [of demon possession] resorts to clinical evidence in his book *The Bondage Breaker* to support his view. He says:

As a believer, Sheila had obviously lost control in her eating habits, in her sexual behavior, in her devotional life. She wasn’t growing spiritually; she was shrinking. She didn’t sing [or] read the Scriptures because she couldn’t sing and read the Scriptures. She was blocked from doing so because of spiritual bondage.

Really? Bruce Jackson, in an *Alliance Life* article entitled “Hope For Those in Bondage,” says, “I began to learn through the Scriptures and through insights prompted by the Holy Spirit how Satan is destroying people. In counseling, I have encountered people who could not get over certain besetting sins or degrading situations.” Bruce, of course, is relying not merely on the Scriptures, but on “insights.” He’s receiving direct revelation from God, who’s telling him, “Oh, this person’s saved, but they have a demon.” His counseling experiences have “told” him so.

Anderson really goes off the doctrinal error fence when he says this: “Many Christians today, who cannot control their lives in some area wallow in self-blame instead of acting responsibly to solve the problem.” But, you know, when I read that, I think, “Well, how can they ‘act responsibly’ if they can’t help it?” [Anderson continues]: “They berate themselves and punish themselves for not having the willpower to break a bad habit. But instead, they should be resisting Satan in the area where he has obviously robbed them of control.” Well, Neil, if they’re “robbed of control” how can they control the situation?

He goes on to say, “Anything bad which you cannot stop doing, or anything good which you cannot make yourself do, could be an area of demonic control.” Listen, what does 1 Corinthians 10:13 say?

No temptation has overtaken you but such as is common to man; and God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted beyond what you are able, but with the temptation will provide the way of escape also, so that you may be able to endure it.

That’s what God says. Second Peter 1:3 says, “Seeing that His divine power has granted to us everything pertaining to life and godliness,” so you can obey Him in any way that you need to. Philippians 2:12–13 talks about God working in us to do His will and “His good pleasure.” James 1:14 says: “But each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust.”

In other words, you're never, ever to blame your sin on Satan or demons. It's always your fault. People come into my office and say, "Well, I've got this problem and I've got a demon." No, you've got rebellion. Now, if you don't know Christ, then, yes, Satan is the master of your life, he is your lord and you are "held captive by him to do his will" [2 Timothy 2:26]. But if you know Christ, [you are given] "everything pertaining to life and godliness" [2 Peter 1:3], and "each one is tempted when he is carried away... by his own lusts" [James 1:14]. Listen to what Romans 6:17–18 says: "But thanks be to God that though you *were* slaves of sin, you became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching to which you were committed, and having been freed from sin, you became slaves of righteousness" [emphasis added]. That is what a Christian is.

So, why can't a believer be demon-possessed? 1) Because of a believer's relationship to God; 2) God's possession of the believer; 3) God's protection of the believer; 4) the believer's abiding presence in Christ; 5) Christ abiding in the [believer]; 6) the Holy Spirit abiding in the [believer]; and 7) [Christians] are responsible and able to obey God in every situation. That's why. Now, if you're out there thinking, "Well, Jack. That is a lot of stuff." You ain't just a-kiddin'. I even had to cut some out to have mercy on you.

But if you're out there and you're thinking to yourself, "Jack, I don't know what to say about this because when I look at my life, I see I'm out of control. I've never been in control. I've never been able to have any victory over sin in my life. I may get rid of one sin [but] I adopt another. And, my whole life just seems like I'm enslaved." Well, you may need Christ. You may need to give your life to Christ for the *first time*. You may need the Holy Spirit within you. You may need regeneration, transformation—to become a new creature, to be born again. That may be your problem.

When you do that, God will give you everything you need "pertaining to life and godliness." And, again, it doesn't mean that you [are] instantly perfect, but you have everything you need to become perfect. There's no longer an excuse anymore. You're freed from sin, and you become a "slave

of righteousness” [Romans 6:18], and that begins to work out by God’s grace in your life.

OK, enough. Let’s pray.

Father, we thank You for what we were able to look at today. Father, I know that some of these issues do not have a lot of eternal consequence, [but], Father, we just want to honor You. We want to understand Your Word. We want to look up every doctrine and every view and hunt it all down in Your Word. We want to be Bereans. We want to “handle accurately the word of truth” [see 2 Timothy 2:15]. We want to be able to minister to people accurately. And, Father, I just thank You that Your Word is so clear, that Christians cannot be demon-possessed—it would be an impossibility. There are just too many things that stand in the way. It’s such a good security to know that we are Yours and the evil one does not touch us. And, Father, we also want to pray for those here who might not know You. If they don’t, I pray that they would cry out, trusting in Jesus to save them, relying on His death, His blood shed on the cross, and His resurrection power. That they would trust in that alone to save them. And that You, by Your grace, would save them and make them new. We pray this in Christ’s name, Amen.