



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Jerusalem's final desolations

Jerusalem's final desolations - posted by docs (), on: 2014/6/16 12:51

Jerusalem's final desolations.

In response to the question, "When will these things be (the destruction of the temple), and what will be the sign of Your coming and of the end of the age?" (Matthew 24:3), Jesus begins His famous Olivet Discourse and even a casual reading of His prophetic reply shows that the land of Palestine and the city of Jerusalem will play a prominent role in the events at the end of the age.

If upon seeing the abomination spoken of by Daniel the prophet the people in Judea are to flee then the land of Palestine and the city of Jerusalem in the land of Palestine will be prominent because the AOD will take place in Jerusalem (Matthew 24:15-16, Mark 13:14). This is the time when Jerusalem will be surrounded by armies intent on her desolation and is when those in Judea are urged to flee (Luke 21:20-21).

The catch is that many of these things took place in or around 70 A.D yet these events didn't result and culminate in the second advent of Christ which is how the Olivet Discourse ends. So Christ's prophecies were not entirely and exhaustively fulfilled because they didn't result in His coming at the end of the age. The age didn't end at the destruction and rout of Jerusalem by Titus and his armies. Desecrations and abominations were performed but not by the final man of sin destined to perform these things at the end of the age. And it didn't set off a chain of events that led to the Day of the Lord and the return of Christ. So in keeping with the near far fulfillment of prophecy, a more exhaustive and complete fulfillment of these prophesied things lies yet in the future.

The long interim in between the two advents of Christ was unforeseen.

24 - and they will fall by the edge of the sword, and will be led captive into all the nations; and Jerusalem will be trampled under foot by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

25 - And there will be signs in sun and moon and stars, and upon the earth dismay among nations, in perplexity at the roaring of the sea and the waves,

26 - men fainting from fear and the expectation of the things which are coming upon the world; for the powers of the heavens will be shaken,

27 - And then they will see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. (Luke 21:24-27)

No one knew the exile would last for almost the duration of an age but it has and yet the prophecies have not been exhaustively fulfilled because they only will be when Christ returns. The appearance of the Messiah was to be when Jerusalem was liberated from its final eschatological enemies following a final trampling by hostile Gentile world powers.

Quoting,

"Perspectives concerning Jerusalem and the temple reflected, not only in the Prophets, but also in the Dead Sea Scrolls, confirm that Jesus and the early church would not have been alone in their expectation of an imminent judgment threatening Jerusalem and the temple. It is well known that the community of Qumran (the sect that produced the scrolls) had already retreated to the desert in this expectation. And why not? It was the uniform perspective of the prophets. The eschatological desolations of Jerusalem was a persistent theme of the prophets, particularly vivid in the apocalyptic prophecy of Daniel, a book of profound influence in first century apocalypticism. The Qumran sectaries took as primary the literal interpretation of the scripture (though also recognizing a richness of spiritual type, figure, and foreshadow). Such literal interpretation convinced them then, as we remain expectant now (on much the same biblical basis), of an eschatological assembly in the wilderness (more on this later)."

"Prominent in this apocalyptic view was the concept of the pre-messianic woes, called in later times 'the footsteps of the Messiah.' This theme has survived in some orthodox circles of late and modern Judaism. It is what we know in terms of Jeremiah's prophecy as the 'time of Jacob's trouble' (Jer 30:7), and in Jesus' Olivet prophecy (

based primarily on the book of Daniel) as "the great tribulation" (Dan 12:1; Mt 24:21). Whatever variations of detail, this essential apocalyptic perspective (of a climatic Day of the Lord preceded by a brief period of unparalleled judgment and persecution) was standard among Jews subscribing to the inerrancy of scripture and its literal interpretation."

"In Paul's perspective, as true of all the early church, the time is short; the world cataclysm is at hand. The prophets and the Jewish apocalypses of Daniel and Revelation speak with one voice concerning a final world crises centered on the controversy of Jerusalem. (See paper: "The Significance of Jerusalem"). In all the prophets, the Day of the Lord and the preliminary birth pangs ("Jacob's trouble"; "Zion's travail") are inextricably tied to an unequalled time of international distress that begins in Jerusalem."

"And from Paul's perspective, though the coming of Messiah is not immediately "at hand" (imminent, or presently upon; 2Thes 2:3); it is, however, impending. And like the prophets and the apocalypticist, Paul is clear that apart from impending events connected with Jerusalem (the temple in "Judea") there can be no return of Messiah."

"Let us be clear: apart from Jerusalem's final desolations there can be no Day of the Lord and return of Jesus! . This is of greatest significance, because it underscores where we are today. We have come full circle, and like Paul and the early church, we labor under the shadow of an imminent destruction of Jerusalem, "a cup of trembling," that is soon to plunge all nations into the final crises. Once more Jerusalem is at the crossroads of history, and this defines our role, stewardship, and task. "They that understand among the people shall instruct many" (Dan 11:33)." (END)

doc: Instead, many people have been wrongfully instructed that Palestine and Jerusalem and world shaking events emanating from there have nothing whatsoever to do with biblical eschatology and the return of Christ. How wrong can they be! Near far fulfillment of prophecy, the theological "sensus plenior" must be taken into account however for all the pieces of the puzzle to fit. The near far characteristic of prophecy is the nature of many prophecies to be speaking of an event in the immediate future while at the same time speaking of a complete and exhaustive fulfillment in the eschatological future. Yet here we are. What can be said to those who advocate that the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. was the final and total erasing of Jerusalem from having any prophetic or redemptive relevance at all? If the nation was taken onto exile and remained there so long why stop all conversations there? That hasn't been the end of the story. Jerusalem is once again surrounded by hostile nations and powers and armies intent on her destruction and the Son of Man is yet to return. In the near far fulfillment of prophecy the far fulfillment is staring us in the face.

On the centrality and significance of Jerusalem in prophecy - <http://the.mysteryofisrael.org/courses/apocalyptic-evangelism-2002/the-centrality-and-significance-of-jerusalem>

Re: Jerusalem's final desolations - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/16 14:12

The destruction of the temple WAS the end of an age.

And Jesus did return to Jerusalem in a cloud of judgment.

I agree that the 2nd coming is yet future however mt 24 is about 70 AD-- all of it. It contains some apocalyptic language which is somewhat cryptic but it is clear what Jesus is talking about.

Re: 2nd and 3rd comings? - posted by docs (), on: 2014/6/16 16:22

"The destruction of the temple WAS the end of an age."

"And Jesus did return to Jerusalem in a cloud of judgment."

"I agree that the 2nd coming is yet future however mt 24 is about 70 AD-- all of it. It contains some apocalyptic language which is somewhat cryptic but it is clear what Jesus is talking about." (END)

Which age ended with the destruction of the temple? I prefer to think that the OT age and era ended when Christ made His atonement and was resurrected not 40 or so years later.

Christ said you won't see me again until you say blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. When Jerusalem was judged in 70 A.D in face of the awful judgements I doubt many were saying, "Hallelujah, blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord!"

If Christ did return to Jerusalem in a cloud of judgment then that was His second coming because the second time you go somewhere is known as the second time you go somewhere. So if this scenario and line of reasoning is true then His return to Jerusalem at the end of the age to Jerusalem would be His third coming. All of Matthew 24 being about 70 A.D. is not borne out by scripture and the near far fulfillment characteristic of biblical prophecy.

It's my opinion, and I stress my opinion, that none of these beliefs, even if true, change the place and significance Jerusalem and the Jewish presence in Palestine will play in events at the end of the age. The controversy surrounding the Jewish presence and the city is going to continue to grow in intensity and scope as it continues to threaten world peace. The prophets and Jesus have told us in advance.

Re: , on: 2014/6/16 17:04

Docs writes.....

"If Christ did return to Jerusalem in a cloud of judgment then that was His second coming because the second time you go somewhere is known as the second time you go somewhere."

That made me smile because of the simplicity of the statement. IT makes it hard to refute..... bro Frank

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/16 21:32

Well, there is coming and then there is COMING. When Jesus wrestled with Jacob (at least I believe it was Jesus) was that a "coming?"

Re: Letting things be - posted by docs (), on: 2014/6/17 7:34

"Well, there is coming and then there is COMING. When Jesus wrestled with Jacob (at least I believe it was Jesus) was that a "coming?"

It wasn't a coming in the sense that the NT speaks of the second coming of Christ. Many times when someone has a doctrinal premise wrong or out of kilter then they have to come up with other innovations along the line so as to make the basic premise work. So we see an innovation that says Christ came again to Jerusalem in 70 A.D but this "coming" was not a "COMING." Where did Christ teach He would "come" again before His second "COMING?" Why not just let things be? It reminds me of the innovation the pre-tribulation rapture theory came up with to make their premise work regarding the rapture and the second coming. It is innovatively taught that when Christ comes to rapture His church this is His "coming" for His people while His second coming will be His "appearing" for all to see. The early church nor the NT makes any such divisions between His coming and His appearing. They are speaking of the same thing so why not just let things be and dispense with the extra innovations that are any times employed to make a wrongful basic premise appear valid. Christ said Israel would not see Him again until they proclaim blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord. That didn't happen in 70 A.D. so Christ couldn't have come to Israel again at that time. Matthew 24 ends with the second coming of the Son of Man and isn't about an invisible "coming" in 70 A.D. that is not the same thing as His second "COMING" at the end of the age. Why not just let things be?

Meanwhile, if 70 A.D. was the time Israel fell by the sword and was led captive into all the nations (Luke 21:24) why is it that they are back in the land and again Jerusalem is surrounded by hostile neighbors and armies intent on wresting control of it away from the present occupants?

"But when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that her desolation is at hand." (Luke 21:20)

If this happened once before but the parousia didn't occur why is it beginning to play out again like the first time around yet the Son of Man hasn't returned? I'm just of the opinion that it is an insightful clue as to the times and seasons the church finds itself in. Things seem to be working out like the prophets said they would in the times and seasons leading to the second coming. Without a final eschatological assault on Israel and Jerusalem by its enemies Jesus won't be returning. The final desolations of Jerusalem before the appearance of the Messiah was a common theme of the prophets and widely accepted by the nation. Christ said nothing to declare this as being a wrong conception of future events.

Re: Letting things be - posted by davidc (), on: 2014/6/17 16:09

Three times, Docs, you have asked "Why not let things be?". Twice regarding TMK's preterist view and once regarding the pre-trib rapture view. Perhaps you've been listening to Paul McCartney sermons!!

"Why not let it be?" is an interesting question, and it seems that you are suggesting that all other views of last days should be ignored and all should agree with your interpretation. The scriptures are not so simple in interpretation, especially prophesy.

You criticise the preterist view as follows:

" Many times when someone has a doctrinal premise wrong or out of kilter then they have to come up with other innovations along the line so as to make the basic premise work. So we see an innovation that says Christ came again to Jerusalem in 70 A.D"

Yet to go along with your own view, one has to accept another "innovation"; what you call "the near far fulfillment characteristic of biblical prophecy."

Don't get me wrong, I agree with this method of prophecy interpretation, but it is an "innovation" just the same designed, as you said, "to make the basic premise work". I personally would not go along with the Preterist view. My own views of the last days have already been expressed on this forum.

But we all have to find some way to understand prophetic scripture, and this usually results in a methodical doctrinal viewpoint, strongly or loosely held.

We are all exhorted to search the scriptures and to be good Bereans, not "to let things be".

In Him

David

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/18 7:38

quote: "TMK's preterist view"

Well, I would say *partial* preterist view. I still believe Jesus' second coming is future. Full preterists believe the second coming/rapture occurred around 70 AD.

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2014/6/18 15:12

I do apologise to you my brother, and look forward to seeing you (and Him) in the clouds on that glorious day.

david

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/6/18 15:23

Absolutely no apologies necessary and amen!!

Re: davidc - letting things be - posted by docs (), on: 2014/6/18 18:55

Three times, Docs, you have asked "Why not let things be?". Twice regarding TMK's preterist view and once regarding the pre-trib rapture view. Perhaps you've been listening to Paul McCartney sermons!!

"Why not let it be?" is an interesting question, and it seems that you are suggesting that all other views of last days should be ignored and all should agree with your interpretation. The scriptures are not so simple in interpretation, especially prophesy.

You criticise the preterist view as follows:

" Many times when someone has a doctrinal premise wrong or out of kilter then they have to come up with other innovations along the line so as to make the basic premise work. So we see an innovation that says Christ came again to Jerusalem in 70 A.D"

Yet to go along with your own view, one has to accept another "innovation"; what you call "the near far fulfillment characteristic of biblical prophecy."

Don't get me wrong, I agree with this method of prophecy interpretation, but it is an "innovation" just the same designed, as you said, "to make the basic premise work". I personally would not go along with the Preterist view. My own views of the last days have already been expressed on this forum.

But we all have to find some way to understand prophetic scripture, and this usually results in a methodical doctrinal viewpoint, strongly or loosely held.

We are all exhorted to search the scriptures and to be good Bereans, not "to let things be".

In Him

David
(END)

I don't always get posts and wording correct. I had a vague feeling I may have used the term "Why not let things be?" a bit much and maybe been a bit edgy (if so I apologize) but whatever. I didn't know McCartney was doing sermons these days but ha, maybe he can help me get a "Paperback Writer to help me edit better!

David: "Why not let it be?" is an interesting question, and it seems that you are suggesting that all other views of last days should be ignored and all should agree with your interpretation. The scriptures are not so simple in interpretation, especially prophecy.

Doc: If that is what you came away with then it's not what I meant to imply. My, "Why not let it be?," was referring to the practice of changing basic meanings and rearranging long held views so as to make one's particular view appear valid after obvious inconsistencies in that view have been pointed out. By reply it was said that there is a "coming" of Christ that occurred in 70 A.D. and that coming doesn't nullify that there will be another "COMING" of Christ at His second advent. I don't see where the New Testament and the Olivet Discourse makes a division between a "coming" of Christ that was to happen in 70 A.D. and a "COMING" of Christ later at His second coming. So why not just let it be? There's no reason for these type of changes.

The pre-trib rapture view strongly advocates that at the pre-trib rapture this will be Christ "coming" for His church while the second coming will be His "appearing." Never before until the 1830s was this type of division seen as regards the coming of Christ. The New Testament nowhere draws a distinction between the coming of Christ and the appearing of Christ. The future coming and the appearing have always been speaking of the same thing. So why not just let things be instead of trying to come up with an innovative way to make the pre-trib scenario work?

David: Yet to go along with your own view, one has to accept another "innovation"; what you call "the near far fulfillment characteristic of biblical prophecy."

Don't get me wrong, I agree with this method of prophecy interpretation, but it is an "innovation" just the same designed, as you said, "to make the basic premise work". I personally would not go along with the Preterist view. My own views of the last days have already been expressed on this forum.

Doc: I don't see the near far fulfillment of prophecy as an innovation. It is a long studied, widely accepted, exegetically sound and fundamental characteristic of biblical prophecy. It is part of the very nature and make up of prophecy itself. It needs no extra added attractions or qualification or improvisations added to it. It speaks for itself and is its own best apologetic. It's part of the basic premise itself if you will.

The Hebrew prophets and the early church saw the Day of the Lord as occurring at the end of the tribulation. This was the accepted doctrine during all of church history. In 1937 Alexander Reese published, "The Approaching Advent of Christ." In his book, Reese pointed out that Paul had instructed the church to be on guard for the day of the Lord (1 Thes 5:2, 6-8), as also Peter exhorts believers to be always "looking for and hasting to the coming of the day of the Lord" (2Pet 3:12 ASV). Reese documented how this would hardly make sense if the church has been removed from the earth seven years before a post-tribulational day of the Lord. After 1937 many of the pretribulationist leaders had to get around the inconsistency Reese pointed out so they changed the timing of the Day of the Lord from what it had always been. From 1937 onward they advocated that the Day of the Lord will really begin when the pre-trib rapture occurs and t

he Day of the Lord will cover the entire span of the final seven years instead of occurring at the end. The 1917 edition of the Scofield Bible openly states the Day of the Lord occurs at the end of the tribulation while the 1967 Scofield edition states that the Day of the Lord begins with the pre-trib rapture. The day of the Lord would now be seen as starting with the imminent, unsigned, pretribulation rapture. In this way, both the rapture and the day of the Lord could be seen as coming suddenly, unexpectedly, and without preceding signs, "like a thief in the night" (1Thes 5:2; 2Pet 3:10). It seemed the perfect solution to a flawed doctrinal scenario. That is what I call an INNOVATION carried out so as to get around inconsistencies in the pre-trib view. The Day of the Lord was never seen in this way before but these presumptive innovations have been made without many even realizing the changes that had to be made to make the basic premise of the pre-trib rapture still appear valid. They should have just let things be in my opinion.

David: But we all have to find some way to understand prophetic scripture, and this usually results in a methodical doctrinal viewpoint, strongly or loosely held.

We are all exhorted to search the scriptures and to be good Bereans, not "to let things be".

Doc: My exhortation or wording "why not let it be" was not meant in the way you took it. I have tried to show that. I would rather let sound established doctrines be as they are than resort to innovative changes and additions and the changing of basic meanings. I prefer to not go that far. After much study, the Bereans might say some of the presumptive changes seen should never have been made.

Re: - posted by budgie, on: 2014/6/18 21:14

My question to those regarding the belief of the aod being fulfilled in 70 ad
Jesus referred to Daniel as to the aod

In Daniel it clearly shows that Jesus destroys the person that commits the abomination and this aligns with Thessalonians and Revelations

If the aod and the destruction of Jerusalem was fulfilled in 70 ad then who was this Antichrist and the false prophet and why has the rapture not taken place as promised and the tribulation is not yet fulfilled

When Jesus came the first time he appeared to men the same as when he comes again comes again the second time Jesus does not say anywhere in scripture that he is coming before the tribulation but he does clearly say he is coming after the tribulation

Loud shout loud trumpet raising us up at the last day

Jesus was first to rise in the new immortal body and afterwards those of Christ at his coming at his coming at his coming when he destroys the Antichrist

Re: - posted by David (), on: 2014/6/19 18:42

Thanks Docs for taking the time to reply to my post.

I was just concerned about your use of the question "why not let it be?" But you have clarified what you meant by this well.

I won't be drawn into a pre/post trib rapture discussion as this is not the subject of your thread, and anyway, most people have already made up their own minds on this subject and don't need badgering.

But please write more on Jerusalem in the end times. I find it edifying.

David

Re: Thank you David - posted by Docs (), on: 2014/6/20 4:21

Thank you for your gracious reply. I'm likely on the outs with a few people but I was just trying to take an objective look at the history of development of certain doctrines regarding the end.

Anyway, I'm of the mind that the "controversy of Zion" centering on Jerusalem is an international hot potato in the political realm and isn't going away any time soon and will only grow in intensity. Jerusalem plays a very prominent place in eschatological prophecy but has been spiritualized away by many to mean something different than Jerusalem. Yet it doesn't mean something different. It means the city and much heartbreak remains in the future regarding the final calamity and fire it and that nation will pass through.

Of possible interest to you might be this link regarding the myth of Zion's inviolability that sees Jerusalem as a place of refuge:

<http://the.mysteryofisrael.org/2014/03/26/zions-inviolability-jerusalem-as-a-place-of-refuge>

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2014/6/20 19:36

The article by Reg Kelly is very enlightening and edifying. How could it not be when the man speaks so much from scripture. I especially like and agree with his understanding of antichrist, that he is a man, resurrected; this came out in another thread a few weeks ago.

I agree with you docs, that a lot of scripture is being wrongly spiritualised until its very meaning and intention is reversed. Jerusalem in scripture is Jerusalem, the city, not the church. Israel is Israel, the future inheritor of the earthly promises of Christ. The church, which is His body is inheritor in Christ of all spiritual blessings in the heavens.

But the will and purpose of God is:

Eph 1:10 That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him:

This is Christ's kingdom and He will reign 1000 years, and then deliver up the kingdom to his Father, the God may be all in all. Even so come Lord Jesus.

Re: we the gentiles were from a wild olive tree and we were grafted into the True Olive tree - posted by budgie, on: 201

Oh how sad that we boast as if we are better, we forget what Paul said, Do Not Boast, we who were from a wild tree were grafted into the true olive tree because some of the branches were broken off.

My question is this (what is the true Olive tree that is made up of Jew and Gentile)

Only One True Tree One True Church

Eph 2:12 That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

Eph 2:13 But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

Eph 2:14 For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;

Rom 11:16 For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches.

Rom 11:17 And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

Rom 11:18 Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

Rom 11:19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

Rom 11:20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:

Rom 11:21 For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

Rom 11:22 Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.

Rom 11:23 And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again.

Rom 11:24 For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?

Rom 11:25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.

Rom 11:26 And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob:

The Church, The Tree is made up of the Believing Jew and Believing Gentile

The unbelieving Jew and unbelieving Gentile are not part of the True Tree

Yes there is Jerusalem and there is the Church that started in Jerusalem, it was all Jewish at its beginning

Re: Jerusalem's final desolations, on: 2014/6/24 15:50

rome.....romanism.....Constantine, 315 ad.

THAT was the abomination that causes desolation;

worshipping an IDOL of the Son of God?

inventing a new 'religion'....romanism, with its extra-canonical apostasies, superstitions, mary idolatry, its barbarous crusades, that impact us even today?

roman priests, who a vast number are predatory homosexual child molesters?

what more of a satanic swirl parading as religion would you want.....excepting, of course....islam.

God is love and mercy, putting up with this mess for 1700 years, Blessed be His Name!

Re: it is sad when the words of Jesus are ignored - posted by budgie, on: 2014/6/28 5:40

When one reads Matthew 24 and hears the words of Jesus Himself one must take notice

Mat 24:15 When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)

Mat 24:16 Then let them which be in Judaea flee into the mountains:

Mat 24:17 Let him which is on the housetop not come down to take any thing out of his house:

Jesus himself referred to Daniel as to the Abomination and to the Tribulation.

When one does what Jesus says and reads all of the Book of Daniel one so clearly sees that there is one vision to be fulfilled, there is a man that causes the abomination and again it so clearly says that this same man that causes this desolation is destroyed by Jesus at His Coming and that Daniel will be raised from the grave at this Coming.

For those that say that all of Daniel is fulfilled and that the man that caused the Abomination has been destroyed already by Jesus when He came there is a major problem.

They have disregarded the words of Jesus.

Read all of Daniel, see the last vision to be fulfilled, see that Jesus was referring to this and see that when it is fulfilled Jesus will be ruling and reigning and the Man of Perdition will be in the lake of fire.

No where in scripture do you find that the last vision has been fulfilled.