

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: peaceable kingdom or the sword?****peaceable kingdom or the sword?, on: 2004/2/13 5:56**

Isaiah 11: 6 The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.

Matt 10:34 "Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword.

The little child is, of course, Jesus, the "Prince of Peace." The metaphorical implication of Isaiah is that the world will come to learn peaceful ways through following after Christ. In Matt. Jesus seems to be saying the opposite, that he came to divide the flock from the wolves. Both are prophetic statements, but they are in conflict.

What are we to make of this?

Jake

**Re: peaceable kingdom or the sword? - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/16 2:47**

Only if you force them to synchronise in a single point of time. If you force them together in the same period you have a timetable clash, if you put them in different periods you have a schedule. The conflict is in the interpreter not the prophecies.

**Re: peaceable kingdom or the sword? - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/2/16 6:52**

Ever wonder why the disciples were always asking Jesus about when he was going to set up his kingdom? It's because, in all the OT prophecies, it was never implied that there would be any length of time between Jesus' death and resurrection, and His millennial reign. This is known as the "mystery of the church age." Nobody knew the church age was coming. But it did. So by interpreting the prophecies the way you have, so that it shows contradiction, is incorrect. It was the way the disciples would have interpreted it, and that's why they were always a little confused.

When Messiah came the first time, it was to die for the sins of mankind and bring peace. When He comes the second time, he brings war. Your prophecies refer to two different time periods.

And if you think that God is being deliberately confusing in these passages, remember: God created time, so God is outside of time; whereas we see things happening in a specific order, God sees no order to things in this way. It would be flawed to say that God saw everything happening "at once", though, because the phrase "at once" again implies time. This concept is impossible for our finite minds to grasp entirely, but I hope I have explained it enough that you understand what I am trying to say.

As far as scriptural basis for what I just said, look at Ecclesiastes 3:11. It says

Quote:  
-----He has made everything beautiful in its time; also he has put eternity into man's mind, yet so that he cannot find out what God has done from the beginning to the end.  
-----

That's RSV, by the way. What this is saying is that we, having finite minds, can not understand eternity, and yet we have this concept of it in our minds because *God put it there especially*.

Neat stuff, but now I've wandered quite off topic. I'll stop now.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: peaceable kingdom or the sword?**

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/16 6:58**

Thanks 'Mork' :-D

Quote:  
-----It would be flawed to say that God saw everything happening "at once", though, because the phrase "at once" again implies time. T  
his concept is impossible for our finite minds to grasp entirely  
-----

Well said, we could copy and paste this statement and that scripture refrence to a broad number of topics.

Na Nu, Na Nu

**Re: peaceable kingdom, on: 2004/2/17 5:44**

Shazbot, Clutch and Philologos:

I thought about the time reference possiblity, but it doesn't work. Isaiah is refering to the first earthly visit of Jesus, and s  
o is Matt.

Isaiah 11:1 And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots:

In Matt., Jesus is talking to his disciples about how He will be received, and the effect of His teachings on believers and  
unbelievers. So, both verses refer to the life of Jesus on earth, and not the second coming. Both refer to how He will aff  
ect humans, but one says He will lead us into peace, and the other, into division.

If you have another interpretation, I'd like to hear it.

Jake

**Re: conflict in the Bible, on: 2004/2/17 5:54**

Philologos wrote:

"The conflict is in the interpreter not the prophecies."

I expected you to say this. When your presumption is that the Bible is inerrent, then it is a foregone conclusion that any  
apparent contradictions are due to conflict in the reader's interpretation.

This is a tautology, not a belief system.

Jake

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/17 7:00**

I expected you to say this. When your presumption is that the Bible is inerrent, then it is a foregone conclusion that any  
pparent contradictions are due to conflict in the reader's interpretation.

This is a tautology, not a belief system.

Hi Jake

I'm not sure how you are using tautology here; it is a grammatical terms meaning saying the same thing twice.

However, you are right when you say that I presume the Bible is inerrent. However, I wasn't born with that attitude; I acq  
uired it. I acquired it by examining things which were capable of examination. I began to read the Bible 45 years ago. I  
have found no proven contradictions. Things which I thought were contradictions, on greater examination, I found to be  
perfectly compatible when I changed my viewpoint.

I don't know how neo-quakers regard early church history; it is a mixed bag to be sure. Fox had little knowledge of it; Barclay was a mine of information with his classical education. The reason I mention this is that you are not the first person to notice this apparent anomaly. It is a testimony to the honesty of the early copiers that they did not 'reconcile' these kinds of statements by snipping and trimming. They knew that viewed from a certain perspective these things would be apparent anomalies, but they knew that the Spirit of God who inspired these writings could only be consistent with Himself and with the witness in their hearts that they were handling the word of God. They always gave God, the benefit of a ny doubt. Where they could not 'reconcile' Bible truths they doubted themselves rather than the scripture itself.

We are not wiser in our day, although we have more information than they. Knowledge however is not wisdom. I position myself with these great saints of yesteryear. When I cannot stomach my interpretation of scripture I add a little seasoning called humility, it makes the whole dish delightfully edible. Wikip we know it part.

Your own presuppositions, I presume, are for gradualism. In every way and by every day we are getting better and better. Or if not better, at least 'progressing' towards the idyllic scenes of Isaiah. Evangelical Christians have many different perspectives on the Second Coming, but I think we can presume that they all expect His Coming to be physical and personal in fulfillment of the angel's words that "this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come again in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." In like manner would include physical and personal.

So Evangelicals, generally, do not expect a gradual progression toward a golden age, but catastrophic interventions from heaven. It was the universal testimony of the earliest Christians that such interventions included judgment and consequent punishment and reward. A resurrection of the just and of the unjust. War and peace. Heaven and hell. I am speaking in the most general of terms here.

The Lord constantly tried to manage the expectations of his disciples. He was not a military messiah intent on armed conflict with Rome. His reign would be a reign of peace. This peace would not be a gradual development but a heavenly imposition. The new creation would come forth through 'birth pains'.

There is no contradiction here, just a continual sharpening of the focus for future events. You are saying it is a contradiction to predict birth pains and a new baby; not at all.

**Re: Peaceable Kingdom or the sword, on: 2004/2/17 7:24**

So, one interpretation of these two prophecies, taken together, could be that Jesus divides humanity, as noted in Matt., but that eventually He leads mankind into peace and a 1000 year reign, according to Isaiah. There well may be "birth pains" in this process, as you say. Note that Jesus' second coming does not have to be literal from this perspective, but it could be that Jesus' spirit comes to be prevalent in all of mankind (at least what is left of it after the tribulations.)

Jake

**Re: tautology, on: 2004/2/17 7:38**

In logic a tautology is a statement composed of simpler statements in a fashion that makes it logically true whether the simpler statements are factually true or false.

So, saying that, Since the Bible is inerrant, any and all perceived contradictions are the result of error made by the interpreter, is a tautology.

Jake

**Re:, on: 2004/2/17 8:08**

Philologos wrote:

"the Spirit of God who inspired these writings could only be consistent with Himself and with the witness in their hearts that they were handling the word of God."

Question: How did those inspired by God to record the Bible know that the Words were truly from God and not of themselves?

elves?

I have been asked this question alot when I mention continuing revelation and the role of the Holy Spirit in Quakerism. I don't have a good answer other than to say something like, I know it when it happens.

Jake

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/17 9:19**

Jake asked Question: How did those inspired by God to record the Bible know that the Words were truly from God and not of themselves?

Jake, I think the answer is that sometimes they didn't and often when they did they didn't understand the full significance of what they said and wrote. Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

It was the common witness of the saints, not that of individuals, which was the guarantee. You may have noticed statements such as 'we have the mind of Christ'. This is we, not I; the mind of Christ is revealed in the saints not in a saint. Similarly 'the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you' is a reference to the community rather than an individual; this is 'ye' plural, have received 'an anointing' singular. This is one anointing shared by the saints, not an anointing enjoyed by an individual saint.

These are important distinctions, and I have looked for them in Barclay, but not found that he specifically recognises of this feature.

We should also note that John's comment above from 1 John is referring not to mankind in general but to those who have been born of God.

**Re: peaceful kingdom or sword - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/2/17 16:09**

Every time I finally think I've tidied an issue up into a nice, neat resolution, it unravels. God is so cool.

Ok, I've ruminated on this and found two possible solutions, and no opinion in myself as to the truth or falsehood of either.

1. Jesus' teaching brought peace to many, and inflamed many others. Pharisees thought they finally had figured out how to earn salvation, and were very depressed and angered, when after going to all the trouble to tithe even to a tenth of their kitchen seasonings, some guy came and told them that, not only were their donations completely worthless, but also that it was impossible to earn salvation. Tax collectors, which are analogous to today's mafia, felt that their deeds of extortion and larceny rendered their salvation impossible, that they had done too many bad deeds to ever see Paradise. Jesus came and told them that anyone could have eternal life *for free*, and that it didn't matter how bad you had been, it only mattered if you wanted to be good, and wanted it enough to work towards it.\*

So we could say that this is one of those paradoxes meant to throw off those who studied the prophecies from the correct interpretation before the proper time to make it known. Jesus came to bring both peace and war-- certainly we still have both peace and war in different parts of the world today. Australia is peaceful, and Africa is warring, just as an example.

2. Just because Jesus ascended to heaven, doesn't mean that He isn't still descended from Jesse. First, my first explanation will need revision: particularly, reversing when war will come and when peace will come, for we still see war today, and we will see no more war during the Millennial Reign of Christ or indeed anytime after that. The first verse refers to the Second Advent, the second verse refers to the First.

I am not guaranteeing that these conclusions are error-free, and I probably should have stated the same in my last posting. I also hope I have explained my ideas clearly enough for everyone else to understand them, I have a bad habit of bei

ng unconsciously ambiguous at times.

\*here I am trying to present the most neutral stance of Faith v. Works, as that is not the issue here.

**Re:, on: 2004/2/18 10:37**

Isaiah 2

2 And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.

3 And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

4 And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Hmmm

God teaches, we learn war no more.

I find this passage very interesting because it doesn't include eternal damnation. People give up their idols and evil ways because God teaches them His ways. They are "rebuked" but not condemned.

But it also says Many people, not all, go up on the mountain, indicating that sinners need to seek God.

Lastly, the passage offers hope that humankind can follow God into a peaceful future.

Jake

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/18 12:09**

hi jake

you write I find this passage very interesting because it doesn't include eternal damnation. People give up their idols and evil ways because God teaches them His ways. They are "rebuked" but not condemned.

still on the pick and mix counter I see.

**Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/2/18 12:51**

Peaceful future.....I don't think so!

21"Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. 22But I say to you, it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment than for you. 23And you, Capernaum, who are exalted to heaven, will be brought down to Hades; for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. 24But I say to you that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for you."

30Let both grow together until the harvest, and at the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, "First gather together the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them, but gather the wheat into my barn.""

41The Son of Man will send out His angels, and they will gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and those who practice lawlessness, 42and will cast them into the furnace of fire. There will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.

45 "Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his master made ruler over his household, to give them food in due season?"

ason? 46Blessed is that servant whom his master, when he comes, will find so doing. 47Assuredly, I say to you that he will make him ruler over all his goods. 48But if that evil servant says in his heart, "My master is delaying his coming," 49 and begins to beat his fellow servants, and to eat and drink with the drunkards, 50the master of that servant will come on a day when he is not looking for him and at an hour that he is not aware of, 51and will cut him in two and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

That's just a quick perusing of a few chapters of Matthew. I'm really starting to wonder about your claim to having read the Bible, Jake. Maybe you read it in the same way I read Hamlet in high school? Passing my eyes over the words didn't lead to much comprehension.

**Re:, on: 2004/2/18 13:03**

Ron, Nobody:

Hey, I didn't say this was a definitive passage, just an interesting one. But it does present a scriptural alternative to the hell and damnation point that fundamentalists keep bashing over the heads of others. (By the way, scaring people with threats, otherwise known as coercion, doesn't work.)

How do you reconcile this passage with the rest of the Bible, particularly the passages Nobody presents? Or is it your point that the Bible is inconsistent?!

Jake

**Re: - posted by shazbot, on: 2004/2/18 17:08**

Your way of interpreting is very shaky in places.

What does any of that last bit have to do with the supposed contradiction that is central to this discussion? I'm missing the connection here, and I'm a little confused.

**Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/2/19 5:21**

Last night I put my homework down and started in Isaiah 1 and read through 2. It took all of 15 minutes to put the passage you're disputing over into some context. All through Isaiah 1 God talks about how disgusting and worthless Judah has become. He offers them hope that after the wicked are purged from among them that there can be restoration.

24Therefore the Lord says,  
The LORD of hosts, the Mighty One of Israel,  
"Ah, I will rid Myself of My adversaries,  
And take vengeance on My enemies.  
25I will turn My hand against you,  
And thoroughly purge away your dross,  
And take away all your alloy.  
26I will restore your judges as at the first,  
And your counselors as at the beginning.  
Afterward you shall be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city."

It seems obvious to a premillennial classic dispensationalist that what is being said is the following in these two chapters. Much of Israel has resisted God. This continued through the NT time and up to the present. There will come a time when God will purge the wicked from among them and restore Jerusalem as the capital in the millennial reign. The Jews will be given a second chance at the end in the tribulation and many will be saved (thus all the talk of 12,000 from each tribe being sealed, etc).

So to take a prophecy that seems to be about Jerusalem in the millennium and say that it contradicts other passages where Jesus comes to cause division or judge is ridiculous. There is a time for everything. One cannot look at Jesus with the little children and think Him a feminine weakling who could never judge or rule. Nor can one read His words to the Pharisees and think that He was constantly full of anger and judgement. He is a King and therefore He has times of tenderness and times of wrath just like any other king. His enemies will not go unpunished nor will his faithful servants be neglected. He is the perfect King. His justice will blow our minds. We will praise Him as our loved ones are cast into hell because we will see Him in His true holiness and righteousness.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: peaceable kingdom or the sword?**

Perspective is another thing to consider. If he came back right now to separate the sheep from the goats the sheep would see it as a glorious return of their loving saviour while the goats would see it as a sudden act of violence- though they will come to see that it is a just damnation and that they deserve it. Notice that the rich man didn't even try to argue his case from hell to Abraham. He had accepted his judgement and simply tried to save his loved ones who still had a chance. That's an interesting turn for a proud rich man who was constantly concerned about his own success and appearance .

Funny how you missed the part in the first chapter where the enemies were removed (dross implies heat and burning, right?) and then the section in chapter two goes from there. So there is hope for a peaceful future for the faithful after the goats are removed by God.