

neral Topics :: Is the current Todd Bently thing an avenue in which christian may be killed in the public arena - posted by deltadom (),

Is the current Todd Bently thing an avenue in which christian may be killed in the public arena - posted by deltadom (),

With the Todd bentley thing violence is a major part of it in Gods name!

What happens if this is extended, if someone is killed

I have been trying to find the verse that they will kill you in Gods name is this circus not a means by which christians may kill other christians.

If punching and kicking christians in the head is fine, then what about killing other christians in a public arena.

We live in a age of video games and tv violence.

We are flooded with it!

I have been also thinking about the scripture that relates to the times of Noah.

It is interesting to note that Todd Bentley has been calling and praying for Angels.

In the book of Genesis Fallen Angels mate with humans.

In the bible in Revelation it talks about babylon being a place filled with birds or demons!

It has been interesting not to note just the things but every aspect, what will the ramifications of Todd Bentleys revival be in the church what doctrines will they despise.

It is interesting to look at this in a future light aswell as a current one.

I doubt that Todd Bentley will not be the last of his kind! Will it increase further like this until the Antichrist is the end of the chain!

Another thing has been false speaking in tongues.

The Emergant Church, other movements have come out of the Toronto Blessing!

What heresy are we in for next!

These are just a few thoughts!

I have been trying to clarify them with the actual verses but need to find them and may update them!

Re: Is the current Todd Bently thing an avenue in which christian may be killed in th - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/18 2

Quote:

deltadom wrote:

In the book of Genesis Fallen Angels mate with humans.

In light of what Jesus said about angels not marrying or given in marriage what scriptures have you found to prove what you have stated.

I'm not saying whether you are right or wrong just would like to know how you validate your statement?

Thanks!

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2008/7/18 22:56

Genesis 6:4

4 There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown.

from this statement! in the bible!

Re 18:2 - Show Context

And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/7/18 23:01

But Jesus said the angels cannot marry or be given in marriage. How do you know they are not asexual?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/7/19 0:20

Quote:
-----In light of what Jesus said about angels not marrying or given in marriage what scriptures have you found to prove what you have stated.

I think Dom is referring to the Nephtalim. Keep in mind that marriage is a covenant and has nothing really to do with fornication. I think Dom is referring to Genesis 6 which lends very strongly to the possibility of fallen angels taking on human form. Satan, the anointed cherub, took on the form of a serpent and spoke to Eve. This is a radical transformation when you consider how the Cherubim are described in the Revelation.

We could be entertaining angels unawares. Angels ate food with Abraham. They can transform themselves into an angel of light. Yet there are some that left their *habitation* and are now in chains of darkness. Noah was 'perfect' in his generations. The sons of God are referred to in Job 38 as the angelic host. This is likely why God destroyed the earth; all flesh had corrupted its way.

When the angels came to Sodom; what did the people do? You will recall also that they smote the people with blindness and then the people began to scratch at the door in their lusts. This was a supernatural move that had to show that they were not mere men. God DESTROYED them totally from the earth, as their sin had *reached to heaven*.

So we see a pattern here of lust driven people falling into unimaginably unspeakable and shameful behavior.

And the LORD said, My Spirit shall not strive with man forever, for he is indeed flesh; yet his days shall be one hundred and twenty years. There were giants on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown. (Genesis 6:3-4)

This was the first instance of this phenomena.

There were giants on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown. (Genesis 6:4)

The second case is found when the spies returned:

There we saw the giants; and we were like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight. (Numbers 13:33)

I am of the opinion that Numbers 13:33 came about as a result of Lot asking God not to destroy ZOAR. The seed of wickedness was in Zoar as it was the other cities of the plain. Lot's compromise may have well allowed this 'leaven' to manifest again in the land as referred to again in Numbers 13:33.

It is a frightful warning, I think, of what wickedness without mixture can produce. The old world was destroyed for a reason. The only thing left at that point is the absolute unbridled judgment of God. I Josephus' works it is said to have been the view of antiquity that those spoken of in Genesis 6 were fallen angels.

Re: Entertaining Fables, on: 2008/7/19 1:26

Gen 6:4 There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bore children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. (KJV)

Gen 6:4 The giants were in the earth in those days, and even afterwards when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore to them; they were heroes which existed from ancient time, the men of name. (LITV...which is my preference of English translations of the Word of God)

The question whether the "sons of Elohim" were celestial or terrestrial sons of God (angels or pious men of the family of Seth) can only be determined from the context, and from the substance of the passage itself, that is to say, from what is related respecting the conduct of the sons of God and its results. That the connection does not favour the idea of their being angels, is acknowledged even by those who adopt this view. "It cannot be denied," says Delitzsch, "that the connection of Gen_6:1-8 with Gen 4 necessitates the assumption, that such intermarriages (of the Sethite and Cainite families) did take place about the time of the flood (cf. Mat_24:38; Luk_17:27); and the prohibition of mixed marriages under the law (Exo_34:16; cf. Gen_27:46; Gen_28:1.) also favours the same idea." But this "assumption" is placed beyond all doubt, by what is here related of the sons of God. In Gen_6:2 it is stated that "the sons of God saw the daughters of men, that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose," i.e., of any with whose beauty they were charmed; and these wives bare children to them (Gen_6:4). Now "to take a wife" is a standing expression throughout the whole of the Old Testament for the marriage relation established by God at the creation, and is never applied to angels. For Christ Himself distinctly states that the angels cannot marry (Mat_22:30; Mar_12:25; cf. Luk_20:34.).

And in the second place, there is a considerable difference between the act of eating on the part of the angels of God who appeared in human shape, and the taking of wives and begetting of children on the part of sinning angels. We are quite unable also to accept as historical testimony, the myths of the heathen respecting demigods, sons of gods, and the begetting of children on the part of their gods, or the fables of the book of Enoch (ch. 6ff.) about the 200 angels, with their leaders, who lusted after the beautiful and delicate daughters of men, and who came down from heaven and took to themselves wives, with whom they begat giants of 3000 (or according to one MS 300) cubits in height. (Keil & Delitzsch Commentary on the Old Testament)

Gen 6:4

There were giants in the earth - nephilim, from naphal, "he fell." Those who had apostatized or fallen from the true religion. The Septuagint translate the original word by "earth-born," which literally signifies earth-born, and which we, following them, term giants, without having any reference to the meaning of the word, which we generally conceive to signify persons of enormous stature. But the word when properly understood makes a very just distinction between the sons of men and the sons of God; those were the nephilim, the fallen earth-born men, with the animal and devilish mind. These were the sons of God, who were born from above; children of the kingdom, because children of God. Hence we may suppose originated the different appellatives given to sinners and saints; the former were termed, earth-born, and the latter, saints, persons not of the earth, or separated from the earth.

The same became mighty men - men of renown - gibborim, which we render mighty men, signifies properly conquerors, heroes, from gabar, "he prevailed, was victorious." and "men of the name," which we render men of renown, renominati, twice named, as the word implies, having one name which they derived from their fathers, and another which they acquired by their daring exploits and enterprises.

It may be necessary to remark here that our translators have rendered seven different Hebrew words by the one term giants, viz., nephilim, gibborim, enachim, rephaim, emim, and zamzummim; by which appellatives are probably meant in general persons of great knowledge, piety, courage, wickedness, etc., and not men of enormous stature, as is generally conjectured.

(Adam Clarke)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/7/19 6:57

Although I think K&D and Adam Clarke are useful, I disagree with them in this case. Only in modern scholarship do men take the view that these were the sons of Seth. Josephus' gives us insight into what the Jews believed in the 1st Century about Genesis 6.

(Antiq 1.III.1) For many angels (11) of God accompanied with women, and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, that these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians call giants. But Noah was very uneasy at what they did; and being displeased at their conduct, persuaded them to change their dispositions and their acts for the better: but seeing they did not yield to him, but were slaves to their wicked pleasures, he was afraid they would kill him, together with his wife and children, and those they had married; so he departed out of that land.

On the Giants in the land...

(Antiq 5.II.3) For which reason they removed their camp to Hebron; and when they had taken it, they slew all the inhabitants. There were till then left the race of giants, who had bodies so large, and countenances so entirely different from other men, that they were surprising to the sight, and terrible to the hearing. The bones of these men are still shown to this very day, unlike to any credible relations of other men.

There is a footnote in Josephus' works (11) that states that it was the constant view of antiquity that the sons of God were angels. That is what the people always understood Moses to mean. Again, only in relatively recent times has this been interpreted to mean the 'sons of Seth'. I think we do ourselves a disservice to underestimate both the fallen angels and fallen man's capacity for wickedness.

It is only significant to consider in our times because human beings are growing more wicked by the day and are beginning to overthrow the various measures God took to prevent the level of wickedness found in Genesis 6 and Sodom and Gomorrah.

Indeed angels are not married and given in marriage, but that is the design of angels. It was never God's design to violate this order. However, And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

These are two basic categories of angels:

- 1) Faithful
- 2) Fallen

Of those that are Fallen there are two categories:

- 1) Bound
- 2) Loosed

The angels that are 'bound' are these spoken of by Jude. Why are they bound? And the angels which kept not their first estate, but *left their own habitation*.

Habitation is *oikeion* and it is only ever used in 2 places in the New Testament; Jude and II Cor. 5:2, For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven. here we see that the term means 'body'. K&D are quick to dismiss such a notion, but the evidence is not in their favor at all. Just because the pagans entertained bizarre notions of gods and angels is no sufficient cause for altering our interpretation of scripture.

Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh. Here 'strange' flesh is heteros meaning 'other flesh'. We get heterosexual from this word. Were these men that surrounded the city heterosexual? Why then did they reject Lot's daughters? What sense were they 'heteros

'? This word usage is also odd because we think of Sodom as a city of sodomites. We would be looking for 'homo' (same flesh). It is my position that they knew they were angels and that is why they scratched at the door; they wanted to 'know them' carnally.

It has been my view that the reason for the dismissal is purely a desire to maintain an academic reputation so as not to be charged with superfluous ideas or something.

For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished: But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. (II Peter 3:5-7)

Re: Is the current Todd Bently thing an avenue in which christian may be killed in th - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/

Quote:

-----We live in a age of video games and tv violence.

I have been wondering whether this is the very thing that has desensitized Christian people to accept violence with no objection? Especially, as in the case of Bently kicking people in the head? Listen! If there would be any preacher in my presence who would brag about doing something like this, I would walk out and be very verbal about my dislike of him!!! This is cruel! Have people become so calloused they will just laugh at it?!!!! Now I love humor and love to laugh - as all my friends know - but this stinks to high heaven! And it smells like kettle of fish that has gotten real ripe after sitting in the sun a couple of days! and from the sound of it they are eating it! uuuugggghhh!

ginnyrose

(PS: I keep saying I will not post any more about Bently...reckon I am a woman and therefore have the ability to change my mind and do so on occasion!)

Re: Is the current Todd Bently thing an avenue in which christian may be killed in th - posted by FireinmyBones1 (), on:

I do have a very quick question that is not asked in sarcasm or with any intent to stir up trouble. I have listened to the sermon "The Gift of Faith" by Todd Bentley and have in fact known of many of these stories for about three years now. I am not an advocate of punching people in prayer or harming people in the name of faith. Do I believe that the Lord sometimes asks us to do strange things as an act of faith when praying for others. Of course. Paul's handkerchief's and aprons were strange mediums of prayer - for that is specifically what the Bible calls them. Jesus using his saliva on two different occasions while praying for the sick is likewise a strange medium of prayer. However, we need not ever make formulas out of the methods of men who were being led of the Spirit moment by moment. Certainly the main and most scriptural method for praying for the sick is through the laying on of hands and anointing with oil - as taught and demonstrated by Jesus and the apostles.

I do have to ask, however . . . the pictures of individuals, christians, and past revivalists that are kept on this site - I'm assuming that the moderator's and such are in support of these men and women. Are you aware, that there are images of Smith Wigglesworth, his birth place, his grave etc... on this site? Are you also aware that Smith Wigglesworth was also well known for employing violent methods in prayer? It is well known and documented that he punched a man in the stomach who was suffering with stomach cancer. It is also documented that he once kicked a baby back three rows of pews in a meeting. He is also known as picking a corpse up out of the coffin and slamming it against the wall three different times. These are just the more well-known accounts, but there are more.

How can we criticize Bentley's behaviour while ignoring the behaviour of men from the past who have done some of the same things. Certainly Wigglesworth was viewed through the same lenses by some in his day as many today view Bentley. He was just as radical and offensive in his day. Is this an example of us sanitizing our past while demonizing our present?

Again, I am not saying this in support of what Todd Bentley has done. I'm just seeking an honest answer.

Thanks for taking the time to read and think on this...

-Jeff

Re: Unwarily Entertaining Fables, on: 2008/7/20 0:01

Matthew Henry wrote:

Mixed marriages (Gen.6:2): The sons of God (that is, the professors of religion, who were called by the name of the Lord, and called upon that name), married the daughters of men, that is, those that were profane, and strangers to God and godliness.

The posterity of Seth did not keep by themselves, as they ought to have done, both for the preservation of their own purity and in detestation of the apostasy. They intermingled themselves with the excommunicated race of Cain: They took them wives of all that they chose. But what was amiss in these marriages?

(1.) They chose only by the eye: They saw that they were fair, which was all they looked at.

(2.) They followed the choice which their own corrupt affections made: they took all that they chose, without advice and consideration. But,

(3.) That which proved of such bad consequence to them was that they married strange wives, were unequally yoked with unbelievers, 2Co.6:14. This was forbidden to Israel, Deu.7:3, Deu.7:4. It was the unhappy occasion of Solomon's apostasy (1Ki.11:1-4), and was of bad consequence to the Jews after their return out of Babylon, Ezra 9:1-2.

Note, Professors of religion, in marrying both themselves and their children, should make conscience of keeping within the bounds of profession. The bad will sooner debauch the good than the good reform the bad. Those that profess themselves the children of God must not marry without his consent, which they have not if they join in affinity with his enemies.

This follows so much more closely to Biblical principles and Biblical teaching than that of fallen angels taking wives for themselves.

I admit, it seems more interesting that demons could take a wife, and it lends much more "credibility" to those fabrications of Hollywood movies whereby demons invade earth to destroy it.

It makes far more sense that Satan used the tactic of infiltration to destroy from within. A house on a bad foundation will always fall. And, as Henry pointed out, Solomon fell prey to that tactic as well. If at first you succeed, use the same tactic.

Furthermore, the concept that women and demons can engage in actual, physical sexual intercourse must be rejected, for several reasons.

First, demons are nonsexual beings. As a unique category of non-material beings, they are incapable of having sexual relationships with corporeal sexual beings, producing biological offspring. As Dr. J. Sidlow Baxter put it, Let us be frank and explicit. The angels are bodiless, purely spiritual beings, and sexless. Being bodiless and sexless means that they are without sex organs, and that they are therefore absolutely incapable of sensuous experiences or sexual processes; nor are they capable of procreation or reproduction in any way whatever.

Nowhere in Scripture is there any reference to fallen angels being able to produce human bodies. And nowhere does Scripture affirm that the bodies Gods angels take on are capable of sexual reproduction. To say that demons can create real bodies with DNA and fertile sperm to say that demons have creative power, which is an exclusively divine prerogative. To create is the prerogative of the Creator, not of any creature, angelic or human. While a biblical world view would allow for fallen angels to possess human beings, it does not support the notion that a demon possessed person can produce offspring that are part demon, part human.

Second, if demons could have sex with women in ancient times, we have no assurance that they cannot do so in modern times. If demons do, in fact, have the capability of creating real bodies with real sperm, we have no assurance that the people we encounter every day are fully human.

Third, it is interesting to note that in the account of an event which occurred 800 years after the Flood, the term Nephilim was used to describe the descendants of Anak (Num. 13:33). While proponents of the mutant theory sometimes point to the phrase and also afterward (Gen. 6:4) to try to deal with this problem, they only succeed in transferring the same problem to another passage. Furthermore, Numbers 13:33 poses a special difficulty for the mutant theory. Moses authored both Genesis and Numbers, yet Moses gave no indication that Nephilim means something different in Numbers than in Genesis. This entails either that not all mutants were destroyed in the Flood, in which case the Scripture is in error with respect to the extent of the judgment, or that mutants were produced again after the Flood, in which case we actually have scriptural precedent by which we might hypothesize that such mutants are being produced again today.

Fourth, it is worth noting that Genesis 1 makes it clear that all of God's living creations were designed to reproduce according to their own kinds. Mutants would have no place God's expressed creative purposes. Some have argued that angels may have been created originally with an inherent capacity to become human, but the Bible nowhere teaches this notion and Genesis 1 militates against it. Others have argued that because demon-humans had no place in God's expressed creative order, they would have conspired to contaminate the human race in order to thwart God's plan for humanity's redemption. Therefore, God brought the Flood for the purpose of restoring the purity of the human bloodline. But this presupposes that Satan is capable of usurping God's prerogative in creation, which is not possible as I have already pointed out.

Fifth, the scriptural perspective is that the Flood was solely a judgment on humanity, as opposed to a judgment on fallen angels or demon-humans.

Sixth, the mutant theory creates very serious questions pertaining to the spiritual accountability of the demon-humans, and their relation to humanity's redemption. Angels rebelled individually, are judged individually, and no plan of redemption is offered to them in Scripture. On the other hand, humans fell corporately in Adam, are judged corporately in Adam, and are redeemed corporately through the second Adam, Jesus Christ. We have no biblical way for determining what category the demon-humans fit into whether they are to be judged as angels or as men, or more significantly, whether they might be among those for whom Christ died.

Seventh, no other verses in Scripture explicitly support the view that demons can have sexual relations with women. While advocates point to 1 Peter 3:19-20, 2 Peter 2:4, and Jude 6 to support this theory, a quick review of these passages demonstrates that they do not establish the position. In Jude 1:6,7 is a simple comparison, not angels and humans intermingling, but factually and historically both "indulged in gross immorality." It was man that "went after strange flesh." Angels don't have flesh. Reading the account of Sodom and Gomorrah you see there that actual human beings, not fallen angels, are involved. Just as the angels that fell and sin and will be severely judged, so will these men, also fallen and sinful, will be so judged. There's nothing to suggest here that angels can have sexual relations with human beings. Nor is that ever suggested anywhere in Scripture. The plain reading of the account in Gen. 6 is that it is speaking of human beings only - people (as has already been pointed out).

The better interpretation is that sons of God simply refers to the godly descendants of Seth, and daughters of men to the ungodly descendants of Cain. Dr. Gleason Archer explains, What Genesis 6:1-2,4 records is the first occurrence of mixed marriage between believers and unbelievers, with the characteristic result of such unions: complete loss of testimony for the Lord and a total surrender of moral standards. In other words, sons of God in this passage were descendants of the godly line of Seth. Instead of remaining true to God and loyal to their spiritual heritage, they allowed themselves to be enticed by the beauty of ungodly women who were daughters of men that is, of the tradition and example of Cain.

Critics of this view say that sometimes the Bible refers to angels as sons of God; therefore sons of God in this passage may refer to angels. Yet, that term is explicitly applied to good angels (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). The only other references applying the term or a related term to angels are in Psalms 29:1 and 89:6-7. In all of these places the term appears to refer to angels who praise and glorify God. Archer notes, The term sons of God (ben elohim transliterated from Hebrew) is used in the Old Testament of either angels or men who are true believers, committed to the service of God. The use of the Hebrew term to refer to humans who love and worship God is well established in Scripture (see, for example, Deut. 14:1; 32:5; Ps. 73:15; Hos. 1:10).

Another objection is that the Nephilim are considered to be giants. But, the Hebrew is more often and contextually translated men of renown. The NIV Study Bible note for Genesis 6:4 says, In men's eyes they were the heroes of old, men of renown, but in God's eyes they were sinners (fallen ones) ripe for judgment. Even if the Hebrew could be translated giant

s, there is no necessity of giving the Nephilim demonic paternity. While such concepts are common in Greek mythology, they are foreign to a Christian worldview.

Re: Denouncement - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/20 0:24

Quote:
-----I have listened to the sermon "The Gift of Faith" by Todd Bentley and have in fact known of many of these stories for about three years now.

And you would still come and in essence defend the man? It's not a pointed question brother, honestly, but I am having a great deal of difficulty with this whole matter.

Quote:
-----I am not an advocate of punching people in prayer or harming people in the name of faith. Do I believe that the Lord sometimes asks us to do strange things as an act of faith when praying for others.

Why couple these together? It is yet another "but" and 'strange' things is now becoming all encompassing, like kicking an older woman in the face with your biker boot.

Those things you list, those things the scripture states are in no way near .. I cannot believe this needs to be even put to discussion or that I would even attempt it ...

Quote:
-----I do have to ask, however . . . the pictures of individuals, christians, and past revivalists that are kept on this site - I'm assuming that the moderator's and such are in support of these men and women.

That is an assumption and not entirely inaccurate. Support is something altogether different. I know where you are going with this so ...

Quote:
-----Are you aware, that there are images of Smith Wigglesworth, his birth place, his grave etc... on this site? Are you also aware that Smith Wigglesworth was also well known for employing violent methods in prayer? It is well known and documented that he punched a man in the stomach who was suffering with stomach cancer.

Yes, I am aware of this. What is your point? There is something a bit disingenuous despite what you stated at the start with this. There are a multitude of variables that make drawing comparisons between Wigglesworth and Bentley practically impossible. I don't like this at all ...

Rather than facing the facts of the matter you would turn this into a very bad comparison. Rather than respond to the two threads where the link to the man's own words are plainly displayed and not refute them out of hand ... Do we need to add in *all* the content from all the threads and postings? All the spurious things, the laughter and the demonic possession shown as ... what? "God's 'new thing'? Where does it end? Another ten postings of his own words and notions, readily available as source material? Shall I go on?

What is uncanny and unbelievable to me is that you have been here for some time brother and shared many things with us all ... what has happened, what has you equivocating and drawing comparisons and in essence downplaying such outrageous and incredible things, *even if they are but lies and exaggerations*? This kicking a woman, a woman, an *elderly woman* ... in ... the ... *face*. With his "Biker boot". It's ridiculous to try and string it out, if I put it in **bold** letters would it make

ke any difference at all? Does it need to become as absurd in the retelling of it to take note of the cruel crassness of it? Is the church a bar now, where the alcohol impaired tell tale tales or should we just chalk it up to being 'drunk in the spirit' and therefore can dispatch it, "He was kinda buzzed that night ..." Should we go to scripture and rehash a thousand pages to denounce the obvious ... ?

Quote:
-----It is also documented that he once kicked a baby back three rows of pews in a meeting. He is also known as picking a corpse up out of the coffin and slamming it against the wall three different times. These are just the more well-known accounts, but there are more.

"Documented"? Never heard of this one but the outrage would be the same if it was so ... a baby ...

Not everything on this site is "supported" as you put it, it is there and we are here, open to discuss whatever might be. If it needs to be said I find Wigglesworth an enigmatic and have stated as much in the past, have no reason to defend him nor would I. To get bogged down into a comparison in this manner would be folly. One is behind us, the other is before us and you can blame the blessed/cursed technology for making things even more exacting than what is reported or written or even "documented". It is right before our own eyes from the man's own lips.

This is the height of audacity and blasphemy to be stating that 'god' told him to kick a woman in the face. That this so difficult to grasp, that this is not enough all on its own to put every mile of distance to even the notion of considering anything this man says or does, to not throw the whole thing on to the rubbish pile ...

Why didn't the media pick up on this? Where is the ACLU?

Where are the Christians?

Why is the best that can be said from the silence that ensued after it posted from you and others is only;

Quote:
-----... I am not saying this in support of what Todd Bentley has done.

That's it? Why do I get this sense of "Well, you know ..." that fading off to nowhere reply not just here but in general. That people actually are laughing about this and not outraged, nor have the guts to confront the man because he supposedly is the center piece of this so called 'revival'? Are we pleasing men?

This is what cults are made of.

Just in case this is being picked up by those who have not been exposed to it, watch for yourself;

(<http://www.sliceoflaodicea.com/?cat15>) Todd Bentley's Strange "Revival" Continues

Have gone to great lengths, even hyperbole in the sense of pressing the point to its breaking point and fully recognize why I am doing so. It is not just this particular incident, it is a symptom of the greater problem. That the sheep are being deluded and as Ginny put it, are being or have become *desensitized* to such an incredible degree that something like this can even be given a pass. Why? Because the real likelihood is that it never happened? Then he is lying, boldly, even happily all in the Name of the Lord, no, even worse, he is giving credit to his '*gift of faith*' and that the *Lord* told him to do it! This isn't 'strange' at all, it is demonic as is so completely evident from his bobbing head doll with accompanying silly grin antics at the end of the clip. The man is possessed and would have you all "come and get some".

We should be in mourning over what is happening to the church of Jesus Christ in this hour and yet ... there is equivocating. I fear for you brother and I fear for others, would to God I could just throw up my arms and say "Well, you know ...". "It's just those silly _____". The ramifications, the sheep, the unbelievers ... the testimony of Jesus. The world is watching.

Dear Brethren, I beseech you ... run.

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid1724>) Run For Your Life

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2008/7/20 9:34

When I saw this thread, I thought "great, yet another Todd Bentley thread." So, I finally decided to do some research.

I've scoured web site after web site and cannot find one instance where this man has either preached or acknowledged the gospel of the Cross. Therefore, this circus act cannot be called revival. At best, it is Finneyesque hucksterism.

Bentley neither calls for nor exhibits true Christian humility. Every preacher of true revival has been a humble servant of Christ. From the reformation to the Welsh Revival, all the great heroes of the faith have displayed humility in the face of God's gracious outpourings. Bentley boasts of kicking old women in the face, smashing legs and running people over. He speaks of diamond and gold falling from heaven (BTW, why doesn't he use that to fund his "revival" rather than asking for money?). Says Todd, in his scripture twisting way, "You see, I want to be fruitful; I want to be far above. I want to be a conqueror; I want to be a mountain of strength; I want to be greatness. You know, we like that word greatness. Well, he who dwells in the secret place of the Most High automatically comes into everything that the Almighty is. It happens." Todd wants to be God! At least the word of faith guys say "we are LITTLE gods." Seems to me the Scriptures speak of another that wanted the same thing (as the church lady says) could it be . . . Satan?

This is the third in a long series of "revivals" to come. At least Pensecola had some Gospel preaching. This is Satan's greatest enticement of this age. Our race is always seeking ways to feel good. I fell into this trap during the "Toronto Outpouring," but God in His mercy graciously brought me out of it. I pray for the Christians who attend these meetings, may God guide them to the truth, in spite of Satan and his tool, Todd Bentley.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/7/20 10:04

Quote:

-----At best, it is Finneyesque hucksterism.

Brother, to be truthful, I really don't understand the association between Charles Finney and this Lakeland thing. The two are completely night and day, and your hasty analogy, I dare say demonstrates that you might not fully understand what kind of a man Finney was, what he preached, or the fruit of God resulting from his conversions and ministry.

Disagree with Finney's theology if you wish (I don't completely agree with some of Finney's views myself), but I feel it is far beneath us to make such crude a comparison between Lakeland and Oberlin.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/7/20 10:18

Quote:

-----First, demons are nonsexual beings. As a unique category of non-material beings, they are incapable of having sexual relationships with corporeal sexual beings, producing biological offspring. As Dr. J. Sidlow Baxter put it, Let us be frank and explicit. The angels are bodiless, purely spiritual beings, and sexless. Being bodiless and sexless means that they are without sex organs, and that they are therefore absolutely incapable of sensual experiences or sexual processes; nor are they capable of procreation or reproduction in any way whatever.

There is no way to substantiate this statement at all because we do not know the extent of the powers of the angelic host; we only know that they are greater in power and might than we are. I am often challenged by the thought that Satan was able to brew up a biological sickness for Job to take him to the outskirts of misery without dying. This took an incredible insight.

I suppose it best that we may agree to disagree. I don't think it is edifying to delve into these subjects too long. I would o

nly say that we need to be vigilant and understand that there is a level of wickedness coming that will be, "as it was in the days of Noah". I am alarmed when I hear angels being referred to in T.B's ministry like they are. Living near the home of the KC Prophets I have heard of this type of stuff before and it can get very ugly. This is one of the reasons why I think I distanced myself almost unconsciously for many years. ;-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/7/20 10:20

Quote:

-----but I feel it is far beneath us to make such crude a comparison between Lakeland and Oberlin.

I would also say the same about comparing T.B to Smith Wigglesworth.

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2008/7/20 13:52

Brother,

You are right I have not heard Bentley deny the doctrine of original sin nor of the substitutionary atonement. I repent of accusing him of these heresies.

Re: - posted by FireinmyBones1 (), on: 2008/7/20 15:52

in response to davyman,

Dear brother, I apologize if my posts as of late have been contentious or in any way have been interpreted as coming from a heart seeking to provoke arguments or any other such thing. I simply read the original post and from the posters point of view it seems...well it seems as though he sees emerging pentecostals as mindless maniacs who would begin en-masse using such violent prayer methods that people will begin dropping dead. This is not only an offense to the thousands of God-fearing, Jesus-exalting, balanced by the Spirit Pentecostal people out there, it's also tragically imaginative. Not all of us are out there punching people in the face and whatnot...there are plenty of us who love Jesus with all of our hearts and live our lives to see Jesus Christ receive the reward of His sufferings.

If my comparisons of Bentley to Wigglesworth offended you, I apologize. It just seems to me that we often overlook the errors of former generations and in fact lift these people up as proto-types of what a true revivalist should look like. Often times these same characters have the same, sometimes lesser, and sometimes greater character flaws as the men and women we condemn in the present tense. Time seems to erase their errors and causes us to be able to separate the "holy from the profane". I firmly believe that many of the individuals we now condemn will be the heroes and proto-types tomorrow.

Certainly I know that it is a difficult thing to attempt to bring balance in the midst of criticism yet at the same time, retain a position of "not agreeing with everything". I suppose my attempts on this site have been to try to bring balance to the criticism coming forth, yet continue to promote genuine, Biblical revival and a Berean-like heart. The reason being is that sometimes even when we are correct in our discernment and criticisms, we develop unhealthy attitudes. Sometimes a feeding frenzy of sorts is sparked and anything remotely appearing to have a remote appearance of a slight resemblance to Lakeland or any other such movement becomes "spurious" and/or "heretical". It is important to be students of the word and rightly divide, yet at the same time to do so in a manner that does not become something that is the very anti-thesis of what we are attempting to promote.

These are just my thoughts on the matter. If any of my posts have been too contentious or are perceived as not coming from a Christ-like heart, please correct me and I will forever change the subject . . . I really mean that.

God bless you guys,

Jeff

Re: - posted by FireinmyBones1 (), on: 2008/7/20 15:55

I apologize - the last post should have been addressed to CRSSCHK

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/7/20 16:16

Quote:

-----Not all of us are out there punching people in the face and whatnot.

You say 'punching people in the face' like it's a bad thing.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/7/20 20:30

When TB hits someone hard enough to knock out their tooth is that wrong, or is he actually operating on a spiritual level that most people can't understand?

Fireinmybones, you may find that what you allow Todd Bently to do, you would never allow yourself to willingly do. This rewiring of our moral sense is a psychological ability of cult figures. They are able to do things to people, and to us, that if we did them to others, we personally would feel some measure of guilt or at least uncertainty. Yet they do these things with our approval, and even admiration. Rather than convicting us, their ministry causes us to enlarge our own capacity for moral ambiguity to accommodate them. This is a subtle bargain that is sold as a "new thing." Perhaps we accept the breaking or infringement past decent moral boundaries because we wonder if such radical demonstrations might just be that 'first century faith' we are hungry for.

Just something to think about.

Respectfully,

MC

Re: Misnomers - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/20 21:26

Hi Jeff,

Would hate for you to lose the greater point in all this. There is no offense, or being offended nor great worry over things being contentious. It is ultimately not about my opinion or Wigglesworth or any of these subcategories.

Balance.

Somewhere along the line there was a mention of times where both the baby and the bathwater have got to go. And this is one of them. This thing is so lopsided as to have broken the scale and if anything it is the very issue that you bring forth, that;

Quote:

----- ... it seems as though he sees emerging pentecostals as mindless maniacs who would begin en-masse using such violent prayer methods that people will be beginning dropping dead. This is not only an offense to the thousands of God-fearing, Jesus-exalting, balanced by the Spirit Pentecostal people out there, it's also tragically imaginative.

That those could be deceived just as well. "Emerging Pentecostals" ... I fear the word structure to tell you the truth, yet another label for something unnecessary, already conjuring ideas and ... imaginations of their own. Why must things be squared off into these camps? We are, or ought to be Bible believing Christians and nothing more, nor nothing less.

Putting things this way gives one a leg up on the other and squares off, seemingly, into separate realms of those who have

ve differing ideas of the supernatural to put in great sweeping generalities. If we must push the 'balance' it ought to be here. The leaning or over leaning is codified by what R.C Ryle stated;

There is a silly readiness in every direction to believe everybody who talks cleverly, lovingly, and earnestly, and a determination to forget that Satan often masquerades himself "as an angel of light" (2 Corinthians 11:14). There is a wide-spread "gullibility" among professing Christians: every heretic who tells his story plausibly is sure to be believed, and everybody who doubts him is called a persecutor and a narrow-minded man.

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id24530&forum35) The Best Safeguard Against False Doctrine

What is tragically imaginative is that which is passing for Christianity in this day and that it is being led by and promoted, taught by these men of dubious distinction *is the issue*. They are the focal point and seem to love it to be so. There is little getting past it. But it is those things that they allow their vain imaginations to run with and then turn out as teaching or as 'matter of fact' that is causing all these alarms and bells and whistles to go off amongst, dare I say the more sober minded amongst us.

Brother, this word is what is "coming to me" lately;

Apathy
AP'ATHY, n.

Want of feeling; an utter privation of passion, or insensibility to pain; applied either to the body or the mind. As applied to the mind, it is stoicism, a calmness of mind incapable of being ruffled by pleasure, pain or passion. In the first ages of the church, the christians adopted the term to express a contempt of earthly concerns.

Quietism is apathy disguised under the appearance of devotion.

~~~~~

Was talking with a brother about this and *maybe it is quietism after all that is the larger issue, at least by this definition. More concerned over appearance and Christian sentiment (a very contorted one at that) then at what all this spells.*

So rather than outrage at the outrageous the thing is given a balance treatment. It is beyond my comprehension. This is not preaching and it is not the gospel and it is neither the Lord nor anything that the scriptures teach. It is a show and one for Christians that have not trained their conscience to discern truth from error. Dear brother, I was once caught up in this similitude of the faith, taking in these notions as that which is representative of the faith once delivered to the saints. But thank God He did not allow me to dwell there long. There is an obligation to anybody that comes to this setting to try and educate them to where this is in error and where it all leads.

My concerns are those of Art Katz;

*From identical meetings others report unmistakable benefit, instant release from depression and other dogged personality disorders and disabilities upon receiving 'the blessing'. We are not in a position to categorically condemn as deceptive the ostensible benefits to which many testify. God is always free to bless whom He will bless. But our point is that if the enemy can succeed in bringing the Church to viewing benefit as the determinant by which something is judged to be of God, we may well have been brought to the very ground of deception itself.*

*For myself, I would choose to keep my distance from such phenomena, trusting that whatever I might be missing is not greater than what I am protecting ...*

*Whatever the future will reveal of the present revival phenomenon, perhaps the greatest will be the profound repentance of broken thousands upon recognizing their susceptibility to deception, their lack of elementary discernment, and their haste to run after demonstrations of power in atmospheres so contrary to God's known holiness and character.*

*Clearly, a power is at work. The question is, whose? Who is it that is mediating an alternative and lesser joy to the immature, the carnal, and the undiscerning? We are already discomfited to learn of the loss of interest, even the repudiation of apostolic vision once held by those who have received 'the blessing'—as if the one were somehow antithetical or*

*opposed to the other! Assuming that our fears are exaggerated and that the present phenomenon is of God, though admittedly marred only by certain excesses, in what ways will future 'lying signs and wonders' be different from that with which we are presently being confronted? By what criteria will these differences be identified? Are we presently at the level of maturity and discernment by which these important distinctions can be made?*

"Taken from Ben Israel Newsletter – Spring 1995"

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id23439&forum40&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id23439&forum40&post_id&refreshGo)) Some Cautionary Thoughts on the Present Revival -katz

And I don't think they are even strong enough in this situation.

The comparisons again, before I forget. If you go back through the postings on even the men mentioned (Finney, Wigglesworth) there is no sparing or undue, lavish supporting of them. They are subject to those same criticisms and questions as any. There is no dodge. The comparisons stop at character flaws and in this case and others like it, in flawed character. These are characters indeed, ones that shouldn't be given any heed except to denounce their antics and teaching and making a mockery of the faith.

**Re: Roots - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/7/20 21:39**

Quote:  
-----This rewiring of our moral sense is a psychological ability of cult figures. They are able to do things to people, and to us, that if we did them to others, we personally would feel some measure of guilt or at least uncertainty. Yet they do these things with our approval, and even admiration. Rather than convicting us, their ministry causes us to enlarge our own capacity for moral ambiguity to accommodate them. This is a subtle bargain that is sold as a "new thing."  
-----

Didn't see this as I went to post. Well said, it is these things and that desensitizing that Ginnyrose spoke of ... I would never have believed it, though the scriptures speak to it so well, that in the last days ... that it would look like this.

Edit: It's a strange thing that this is so overt that we haven't even delved into the finer aspects of pride, boasting, of exaggeration and lying. Those things that would normally fill up pages of content. The whole facade is too glaring to even approach it.

**Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2008/7/21 0:34**

Quote:  
-----More concerned over appearance and Christian sentiment (a very contorted one at that) then at what all this spells.  
-----

A few weeks ago I was with a friend in his store one night late after hours. A man walks in through the unlocked front door, and explains that his car had broken down and needed some money to call a cab. Without hesitation I handed him some cash and shook his hand. He thanked me, left with a surprised look on his face.

After he left, my friend commended my generosity. It felt good to be thought of as generous.

But a few minutes later the Lord convicted me over the reality of my own heart. He showed me that the real reason I gave that poor fellow some money to was to get rid of him. Ever since then I keep thinking about that incident. How deep does the corruption in my heart persist?

I find that such pitiful disinterest carries over into spiritual issues as well. Being nonchalant is a wonderful way of slipping away from conflict and discussion.

Meanwhile, I would never dream of allowing those I honestly care about near such ministries as TB. (I didn't reach that conclusion instantly.) Therein lies the hypocrisy of having a too "generous orthodoxy." By being outwardly liberal towards



terrible things others are tragically being snared by, things I privately wouldn't allow my own children to even look at, I can appear sympathetic and generous all the while I don't give a darn about people.

Brothers it isn't always arrogance that sparks debate...sometimes it takes a selfless love to be willing to risk a fight. Engaging people sincerely, contending for their well being earnestly, takes time, and energy. It interrupts the plans I had for myself today. Yet I would do that for my own children without hesitation...I should be willing to do so for others to some extent as well.

MC

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/7/21 10:12**

Quote:

-----I suppose it best that we may agree to disagree.  
-----

As this statement of mine has come into question privately to me let me clarify that I do not casually "agree do disagree" when topics are of sufficient warrant to cross swords. Those that have known me in these forums over the years will know this. My original posts were to discuss Dom's points as he set a few of them out as some had questioned him. I had no intention of creating a polemic debate on Genesis 6. As I stated in my posts the view of antiquity, as far as we know, was that the sons of God in Genesis 6 referred to the angels.

The world that then was was destroyed with a mighty judgment beyond our comprehension. I do not believe that God did this because sinners married saints. Fornication and unbridled lust almost always degenerates into some level of demonic activity. This is how Solomon fell. Again, this is a crisis hour and a time of apostasy. We need to beware of the extent to which man is capable of sinning.

But I cannot fight this argument. Todd Bentley is already assisting folk in promoting the idea that Muslims and other false religions 'know Jesus', they just don't (edited) know him sufficiently. his latest Sid Roth appearance affirms this. 'That' is going to be the front lines of this battle, in my opinion. The enemy has tried before to introduce Universalism through so-called Charismatic leaders. This is where our sights have to be, I think. I will stand shoulder to shoulder in that contention for the faith. ;-)

**Re:, on: 2008/7/21 12:29**

I'll just say it plainly... while it is true that we can not judge another's heart, out of the mouth the heart speaks. And out of Bentley's mouth have come spiritual lies (aka false doctrines), and violence (relating stories about kicking people in the face etc...), as well as cussing from the stage.

So according to scripture, his heart is filled with lies, violence and profanity.

Since the Holy Spirit can not live in accord with such things, I think even Bentley's salvation is suspect. He may sincerely believe he is saved, but he is NOT showing the fruits of the Spirit. No fruit, no salvation.

And I'll go even further... anyone who attempts to defend this man is either totally ignorant of scripture or deceived. Period.

Stong talk, I know. But this thing is just ridiculous. There is no evidence from that stage that God is in this at all.

I think this is a cult worse than the Mormons or JW's.

Krispy