



Scriptures and Doctrine :: The millennial Kingdom

The millennial Kingdom - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/23 9:18

So I was reading Ezekiel and noticed when the last temple is built and The Lord comes back to reign that the sacrifices will begin again. What is the purpose of those?

Also there is a man called "the prince" who is not Jesus and has to prepare sacrifices for his sins and the sins of the nation on Israel. Who is he?

Re: The millennial Kingdom - posted by savannah, on: 2014/8/23 10:17

A THIRD TEMPLE? by S.E. Murel

Since AD 70, many Jews have longed for a rebuilding of the Temple. Some people in the Christian community encourage such a construction. The concept and prophetic expectations for a third Jewish Temple to be rebuilt in Jerusalem is being promoted today. Recent publications advocate a third Temple and prophetic speakers are strongly suggesting that all is ready for the Temple to be constructed. Talk goes on about how easy it would be to destroy the great Mosque of El Aksah that has occupied the site of Solomon's Temple area for 1000 years. Talk is made of secret plans for the construction of a third Temple and it is said that the very cornerstone has already been cut and dedicated. While the speculation continues it is often forgotten that God has already spoken on this whole matter.

THE NEED TO REFOCUS

It should be remembered that there was a Temple that once existed and which saw the establishment of all God's promises and purposes in Christ realized. The Temple was the second Temple rebuilt under the leadership of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Zerubbabel following the Babylonian captivity of BC 606-538. The first Temple or Solomon's Temple was destroyed in BC 586. The second Temple was built by the Jews after they returned from the Captivity. The second Temple was not as impressive as the one built by Solomon and yet the prophets arose to tell the people that the Lord would honor the second Temple by sending the Messiah to it. Here are the wonderful words of Haggai with the Divine promise:

Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land; And I will shake all nations and the Desire of all Nations shall come, and I will fill this house with the glory, saith the Lord of hosts. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former saith the Lord of Hosts, and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts (Hag 2:6-9).

Haggai was speaking at the dedication of the second Temple built by Ezra and others who returned from the great captivity. He was declaring that despite the more inferior structure the second Temple would still be honored and it was for the Lord Jesus did come to this very Temple. With the coming of the Messiah, heaven and earth shook. The shaking of heaven and earth denotes the passing of the Old Covenant and the establishment of the New Covenant. On the day of Pentecost, Peter quoted a similar prophecy from Joel to prove the same thing (Acts 2:19-21). There are some very serious theological problems for the conservative Christian if the Temple vision of Ezekiel is to be considered to be a prophetic reference to a third Temple that is literal and is to be built in the future. The following points should be considered.

Continued in the next post...

Re: EZEKIEL'S TEMPLE VISION - posted by savannah, on: 2014/8/23 10:21

EZEKIEL'S TEMPLE VISION

1. A restored third Temple would invalidate Christ's current eternal priesthood for the sons of Zadok would have the last, exalted position over Melchizedek and Aaron's priesthood. (Ezek 18:27)
2. Sin offerings would again be made by the blood of bulls and goats. It has been suggested that the sacrifices of a future third Temple during the millennium period would be for a memorial but many times in Ezekiel the sin offering is mentioned without qualification. (Ezek. 43:19, 21, 25, etc.) The word memorial is used twenty-nine times in the Old Testament and three times in the New Testament. The term is not used in the book of Ezekiel.
3. The whole purpose of Ezekiel's vision is lost if it be literal. The Lord spoke to Ezekiel and told him that the very object or purpose of the vision was to show the perfect holiness of the Lord by which the people of Israel might measure the extent of their iniquities. (Ezek. 43:10-12)
4. If Ezekiel's vision Temple is to be interpreted literally and still futuristic then circumcision must be re-established as a requirement of access to God (Ezek 44:9): "Thus saith the Lord God; No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel." Long ago the apostle Paul found it necessary to withstand Peter face to face over the very issue of the return of the Church to circumcision. (Gal 2:11 ff) Now, once again, in a very subtle way the concept of having mandatory circumcision for the people of God is being embraced within the body of Christ.
5. If Ezekiel's vision Temple is literal and futuristic, then the Lord will again dwell in a building (Ezek 43:1, 2). The New Testament teaches that the Lord does not dwell in Temples made with hands. (Acts 7:8)
6. If Ezekiel's vision Temple is to be understood literally and in the future then there will again be priests of a Levitical order who will be required to avoid woolen undergarments lest they sweat. (Ezek 44:18) These future priests must also have a hair cut according to a certain length. (Ezek 44:20) They must avoid contact with the dead (Ezek 44:31), and receive the first of the sacrificial flour in order to bestow a priestly blessing. (Ezek 44:3) The whole book of Hebrews forbids the Christian community to consider the re-establishment of a Levitical priesthood for there is a better way.
7. If Ezekiel's vision Temple is to be understood to be literal and yet future, there will be again on earth, following the Second Advent and with the Lord's approval, all that Christ came to abolish: sin, suffering, sacrifices, and death.
8. In Ezekiel 47, the highlight of the Temple vision is found in the living waters rising inside the Temple and issuing from the threshold. The river flows from the Temple, getting deeper and wider in its course as it sweeps across the country until it empties itself into the Dead Sea where it heals the waters. Everything springs to life where the water flows. Fishermen stand upon the banks of the river and fill their baskets and spread their nets. Trees of paradise flourish on either bank yielding a continuous harvest of fruit and yielding their leaves as healing medicine. Spiritually, this could be a wonderful description of the gospel river of grace flowing from Jerusalem until it comes to cover the earth with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the seas. (Jn 2:21 cp. Jn 7:37, 38)
9. Hebrews 9 teaches that the tabernacle and of necessity, therefore, the Temple is only a type of heavenly things and figures of the true. There is no need for a literal Temple to teach anyone anything, for the reality has come in the Person of Jesus Christ. There is no need for a literal Temple to fulfill any prophetic utterances, for all that the prophets spoke has been fulfilled in the Lord.
In light of these gospel truths there is no need for the Christian community to anticipate or promote the rebuilding of a third Jewish Temple. If such a Temple is every rebuilt in the course of human history, it will not be based upon any biblical mandate.

Re: , on: 2014/8/23 14:59

The early church fathers, those who heard the apostle John teach, said the anti-Christ would stand in the temple and proclaim himself to be God during a literal 7 year tribulation, before a literal millennial reign of Christ.

Pre-Millennialism Ken Johnson

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b25M-Xz74Dw>

all Ken Johnson's youtube videos here:

http://www.youtube.com/user/biblefactsorg/videos?view=0&sort=dd&shelf_id=0

Bible facts site:

www.biblefacts.org

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/23 22:19

The idea of a rebuilt temple with animal sacrifices should be repellant to any Christian.

Re: , on: 2014/8/24 0:54

Here are some more quotes to consider.

Quote:
-----Justin Martyr (AD 100-165) in his Dialogue With Trypho c. AD 140, a Jewish man, made the following premillennial statement: "But I and others, who are right-minded Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare."

Quote:
----- Two of the greatest ante-Nicene fathers were Irenaeus and Tertullian (AD 160-230). Irenaeus grew up in Asia Minor and was discipled by Polycarp, who knew the Apostle John. Irenaeus had a very extensive view of Bible prophecy in his last five chapters of Against Heresies, which were suppressed throughout the Middle Ages by anti-premillennialists and rediscovered in 1571. (7)The restoration of a more literal interpretation and reading of the early church fathers by many post-Reformationists led to a revival of premillennialism in the early 1600s. (8) Irenaeus' writings played a key role because of their clear premillennial statements. "John, therefore, did distinctly foresee the first 'resurrection of the just,' and the inheritance in the kingdom of the earth," he says, "and what the prophets have prophesied concerning it harmonize."

quote source: <http://www.ldolphin.org/premillhist.html>

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/24 8:00

I can't access YouTube so I won't be able to watch those.

Savannah and TMK,

Both of you tell me what those prophecies don't mean. What is their interpretation if not literal and futuristic?

The truth is that I never have studied Ezekiel so now that I am, I am having difficulty reconciling what it says with what I standardly thought. In Isaiah I asked myself the question, "will some form of the law be back in place during the millennial reign?" And again I see it in Ezekiel.

Not trying to pick a fight here but it would be nice to ask questions to people who can answer them.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/24 11:02

Havoc--

Some people believe the Ezekiel passage is literal and some think it has spiritual application.

I think the whole of scripture especially Hebrews would negate any reason to reinstate animal sacrifices.

I am sure you could read tomes supporting both views and obviously there is disagreement in the Christianity about this.

There are actually some Christian groups who are trying to breed a perfect red heifer to use when temple sacrifices are reinstated. Preposterous in my opinion of course.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/24 11:13

http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third_Temple

Re: , on: 2014/8/24 12:11

From this video I posted:

Papias AD 70-155

Fragment 6 - After the resurrection of the dead, Jesus will personally reign for one thousand years. I was taught this by the Apostle John, himself.

Tertullian AD 190-210

Against Marcion 3.25 - The Millennial Reign, resurrection, and New Jerusalem are literal.

Irenaeus AD 178

Against Heresies 5.35 - The Resurrection of the Just takes place after the destruction of the Antichrist and all nations under his rule. Many believers will make it through the Tribulation and replenish the earth. The new heavens and earth will be created, and then the new Jerusalem will descend. These are all literal things, and Christians who allegorize them are immature.

Against Heresies 5.25 - In 2 Thessalonians, the "falling away" is an apostasy and there will be a literal rebuilt temple. In Matthew 24, the "abomination spoken by Daniel" is the Antichrist sitting in the temple as if he were Christ. The abomination will start in the middle of Daniel's 70th week and last for a literal three years and six months. The little horn is the Antichrist.

Against Heresies 5.26 - The Roman Empire will first be divided and then be dissolved. Ten Kings will arise from what used to be the Roman empire. The Antichrist slays three kings and is then the eighth king among them.

Against Heresies 5.30 - The name of the Antichrist equals 666 if spelled out in Greek. Don't try to find out the number of the name until the ten kings arise.

Barnabas

Epistle of Barnabas 16:5-7 - You can perceive that their hope is vain. Furthermore the Lord said, "Behold, they who destroy this temple, even they will again build it up once more." This prophecy was fulfilled because the Jews went to war against their enemy. But even though they are now no more than servants to Rome, they will return and rebuild the temple. It was revealed that the city of Jerusalem, the temple, and the people of Israel were to be given up.

Prophecies:

-Roman Empire split then divided - AD 395-476

-Return of the Jews - AD 1948

-Rebuilt Jerusalem Temple - _____

-Rise of the ten nations - _____

-Rise of the Antichrist - _____

-Seven-year Tribulation - _____

-Physical return of Jesus to rule for 1,000 years - _____

Premillennialism was replaced with Amillennialism in the third century.

Cyprian, AD 250

Epistle 67 - Cyprian states the prophecies of the Antichrist foretold of heresies rising up in the church at the end of the world. He speculates the prophecy of the church's end-time apostasy is starting in Rome.

If we were Premillennialists from the first century to the third, what happened in the third century to change all of that?

-The Schism of Nepos, AD 290

Basically Gnostic teaching of a Millennial "indulgence" pushed the Church in an Amillennial direction.

Taken from video by Ken Johnson:

Pre-Millennialism Ken Johnson

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b25M-Xz74Dw>

-Sorry for the long post just wanted to get most of this video out there in text for anybody interested without access. Blessings

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/24 20:25

Jesus and the apostles are clear that believers gathered together comprise the new temple.

John 4:21-24 Jesus said to her, "Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father. You worship what you do not know; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father is seeking such to worship Him. God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth."

Re: , on: 2014/8/24 21:10

I think it can be dualistic. A physical temple with spiritual temples (people) going about it. Jesus has a physical body, but also a life-giving spirit. God is Spirit and yet he dwells in a temple in heaven.

As for the Prince offering sacrifices. I don't know. I tend to think it's Jesus offering memorial sacrifices. Scripture for that might be Jesus being baptized with John's baptism of repentance, which he didn't need.

Can Jesus offer sacrifices as the Prince of the Ezekiel's temple, and also be the real and true Lamb of God? maybe dualistic again here. Both covenants were everlasting (Olam Heb, Aionios Grk.) and Jesus said

"For truly I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or stroke shall pass from the Law until all is accomplished.

(Matthew 5:18 NASB)

The Law is not a means of justification, but it is an instructor that hasn't ceased to be that for anyone, and went until the eternal state, New Heavens and New Earth, 7000 AM onward.

just some ideas

blessings

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/25 6:23

Noah-

Just wondering where you get the idea that Jesus is living in a temple in heaven. I am sure there may be verses you have to support this but not sure what they are.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/25 8:40

TMK,

Please sir. Rather than negate just about everything everyone says on this, please offer an alternative explanation. Thanks.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/25 8:58

I did-- see below. The "third temple" is made up of believers-- described as living stones.

You certainly don't have to accept that explanation. The idea of Jesus offering "memorial sacrifices" is repugnant to me. Doesn't have to be repugnant to you, however.

All I asked Noah was to show me where in scripture it says that Jesus resides in a temple in heaven. I am not sure where that is.

Re: , on: 2014/8/25 10:40

And the temple of God which is in heaven was opened; and the ark of His covenant appeared in His temple, and there were flashes of lightning and sounds and peals of thunder and an earthquake and a great hailstorm.
(Revelation 11:19 NASB)

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/25 11:25

Thanks Noah

Re: , on: 2014/8/25 11:42

no problem.

also about Eze 44:1-3.

Then He brought me back by the way of the outer gate of the sanctuary, which faces the east; and it was shut. The LORD said to me, "This gate shall be shut; it shall not be opened, and no one shall enter by it, for the LORD God of Israel has entered by it; therefore it shall be shut. "As for the prince, he shall sit in it as prince to eat bread before the LORD; he shall enter by way of the porch of the gate and shall go out by the same way."
(Ezekiel 44:1-3 NASB)

The Prince here sits in the outer East Gate to eat bread before the Lord. Like a child with his father. It seems only the Prince can enter through the east "porch gate" of this outer east gate. I'm not sure though.

also Eze 46:1-3. there's something to it I think.

But the people have a different command:

"When the prince enters, he shall go in by way of the porch of the gate and go out by the same way. "But when the people of the land come before the LORD at the appointed feasts, he who enters by way of the north gate to worship shall go out by way of the south gate. And he who enters by way of the south gate shall go out by way of the north gate. No one shall return by way of the gate by which he entered but shall go straight out. "When they go in, the prince shall go in among them; and when they go out, he shall go out.
(Ezekiel 46:8-10 NASB)

Re: , on: 2014/8/25 15:01

I thought this was interesting from Matthew Henry's commentary:

Quote:

Matthew Henry's Commentary
Ezekiel 44:1

"Then he brought me back the way of the gate of the outward sanctuary which looketh toward the east; and it was shut."
44:1

This chapter contains ordinances relative to the true priests. The prince evidently means Christ, and the words in ver. 2, may remind us that no other can enter heaven, the true sanctuary, as Christ did; namely, by virtue of his own excellency, and his personal holiness, righteousness, and strength. He who is the Brightness of Jehovah's glory entered by his own holiness; but that way is shut to the whole human race, and we all must enter as sinners, by faith in his blood, and by the power of his grace.

Ezekiel 44:2

Then said the LORD unto me; This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the LORD, the God of Israel, hath entered in by it, therefore it shall be shut.

Ezekiel 44:3

It is for the prince; the prince, he shall sit in it to eat bread before the LORD; he shall enter by the way of the porch of that gate, and shall go out by the way of the same.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/25 15:47

Hi Noah--

I am not sure if you read all of Mr Henry's commentary on Ezekiel 40 and onward- coincidentally I checked him out as well and he does seem to lean toward a non-literal interpretation of these passages.

One problem that he and other commentators note is that the size of the temple described by Ezekiel is larger than the entire city of Jerusalem and the size of the city he describes is problematic as well.

Re: , on: 2014/8/25 16:20

TMK no I didn't. non literal hmm. yeah I noticed the beginning of the section on the Ezekiel Temple seemed like it was a different landscape:

In the twenty-fifth year of our exile, at the beginning of the year, on the tenth of the month, in the fourteenth year after that the city was taken, on that same day the hand of the LORD was upon me and He brought me there. In the visions of God He brought me into the land of Israel and set me on a very high mountain, and on it to the south there was a structure like a city.

(Ezekiel 40:1-2 NASB)

very high mountain doesn't seem like present day Jerusalem.

Re: Changes in the landscape at Christ's coming - posted by docs (), on: 2014/8/26 0:25

"very high mountain doesn't seem like present day Jerusalem."

Perhaps the changes in the landscape that are to occur at Christ's second advent could help explain things.

Zechariah 14:4 - And in that day His feet will stand on the Mount of Olives, which is in front of Jerusalem on the east; and the Mount of Olives will be split in its middle from east to west by a very large valley, so that half of the mountain will move toward the north and the other half toward the south.

Also,

Zechariah 14:8 - 10

8 - And it will come about in that day that living waters will flow out of Jerusalem, half of them toward the eastern sea and the other half toward the western sea; it will be in summer as well as in winter

9 - And the Lord will be king over all the earth; in that day the Lord will be the only one, and His name the only one.

10 - All the land will be changed into a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem; but Jerusalem will rise and remain on its site from Benjamin's Gate as far as the place of the First Gate to the Corner Gate, and from the Tower of Hananel to the king's wine presses.

The Mount of Olives will split at Christ's return, the life giving waters will appear and a large portion of the land will become a plain while at the same time Jerusalem will rise ("but Jerusalem will rise") although maintaining its present location. The land becoming a plain and Jerusalem rising will give Jerusalem a place of prominence as even a physical mountain compared to the rest that has become a low plain. These are not spiritual allegories symbolizing deeper truth but are a description of the days when the mountain of the house of the Lord which is Jerusalem (see Isaiah 2:1, Daniel 9:16) will be established as the chief of the mountains and will be raised ("and Jerusalem will rise") above the hills; and all the nations will stream to it and many people will come and say let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob" (Isaiah 2:2-3)

Could the house of the God of Jacob be a new temple that Ezekiel saw instead of automatically presuming it refers to the church or some deeper spiritual truth or the like? And this temple would be located on an elevated Jerusalem that stands higher than the rest of the hills and plains. So it won't be present day Jerusalem. Rather it will be a physically changed Jerusalem that was changed at Christ's second advent as He returned to the nation from whence He left. If Ezekiel saw the house of the God of Jacob located on a high mountain which is a physically changed and elevated Jerusalem according to Zechariah then God's word once again astonishingly fits and correlates itself together in perfect harmony with itself. Isaiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah's portrayals are woven together perfectly. Amen!

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/26 7:30

Brothers,

I would encourage you to read chapters 40 to the end of Ezekiel.

There are 2 different gates.

The eastern gate attached to the outer wall, gaining access to the outer court is the one by which the Lord entered and will always be shut.

The eastern gate leading to the inner court (contained within the outer court) can be opened by the prince and the people can only enter there on the Sabbath, with the prince.

Also, the prince will father children, therefore he cannot be Christ. The prince will not perform any priestly duties, which we know Christ has already done for us. Lastly, the prince only owns a small portion of Israel, although it is large than what anyone else owns. This seems to say to me that the prince is only a man--an exalted man, but a man nonetheless.

TMK,

I understand your human-temple statement, but that really isn't a commentary on Ezekiel. I am asking you to take Ezekiel and point-for-point define what it is saying.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/26 9:13

Hi havok--

Man I wish I could do that but far better men than me admit it is exceedingly difficult to do so. Recall this was a vision granted to Ezekiel. The vision with all its grandeur may be pointing to something spiritual. Matthew Henry calls it a mystical vision.

I don't believe that the New Jerusalem is a literal cube shaped city either, but is rather a representation of the perfect Bride of Christ.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/26 13:24

Here is a not-so-long article that discusses the problems with a literal interpretation and sets forth an interesting alternative explanation that seems plausible:

<http://www.equip.org/articles/making-sense-ezekiels-temple-vision/#christian-books-1>

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/26 14:07

Great article TMK.

From the article:

"Choosing a Hermeneutical Strategy. In choosing among these options, we are compelled to decide between differing hermeneutical priorities. One of the chief hermeneutical principles recommended by dispensationalist scholars is that of maintaining a consistently literal interpretation. This would mean that "spiritualizing" the text must be seen as a departure from the most faithful handling of Scripture. Therefore, dispensationalists argue for a literal, physical building to be established in fulfillment of Ezekiel's vision. Since the temple erected after Ezekiel's time did not fit Ezekiel's description, they believe that there must be another temple in the future that will do so more admirably.

It would be easier to accept this theory if we did not have the New Testament to guide our thinking. The most obvious problem presented here is that the book of Hebrews (e.g., 10:1-18) speaks of the death of Christ on the cross as a termination of the efficacy of bloody animal sacrifices, such as those Israel offered in the temple. If Ezekiel's vision applies to a future time, why do we again find the offering of animal sacrifices?

The dispensationalist answer is that the millennial sacrifices will not be intended to atone for sins. The blood of Christ precludes any need for that. Just as the Old Testament sacrifices anticipated the death of Christ as a future event, it is suggested the future millennial sacrifices will commemorate the death of Christ as a past event.

The text of Ezekiel, however, seems to preclude this, since the various offerings in the temple are said to "make atonement for the house of Israel" (45:17).¹ Thus, the sacrifices are presented as an atonement for sin, not as a memorial. Christ Himself recommended the use of wine and bread to commemorate His death (1 Cor. 11:24-26). Why would God replace this with animal sacrifices in which God never found any particular pleasure (Ps. 40:6; 51:16; Heb. 10:6)?

Further, Ezekiel says that "the prince" will offer a sin offering "for himself and for all the people" (45:22). If the prince is required to offer sacrifices for his own sins, this would militate against any theory that identifies him with Christ, who never sinned."

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/26 15:19

I am not a dispensationalist at all.

But I disagree with this article.

And I definitely have a hard time agreeing that this prophecy was fulfilled in Christ.

Quote:
-----How then are we to understand the temple vision? First, one might reasonably refer to the vision as that which "might have been" had the Jewish exiles in Babylon exhibited a more thorough repentance than they did. There is an indication that the realization of this vision in Is

Israel's future was contingent on the people being sufficiently ashamed, or repentant, of their past sins: "Son of man, describe the temple to the house of Israel, that they may be ashamed of their iniquities; and let them measure the pattern. And if they are ashamed of all that they have done, make known to them the design of the temple" (Ezek. 43:10-11).

Having just studied the entire book of Ezekiel, this phrase (or ones similar to it) - "that they may be ashamed of their iniquities" - occurs several times. (chapters 16 and 32) and you most certainly cannot apply that thinking to those chapters.

So the foundational precept for this article is not even applicable.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/26 15:48

You could be right havok.

Personally I must resist any interpretation that affirms that there will be literal animal sacrifices sanctioned by God in some future temple. That seems to go smack against what Jesus taught and what the apostles taught.

But that's just me, of course. I don't really have a dog in the fight because even if the literal interpretation is true and they started construction of this ginormous temple (larger than the area of the current city of Jerusalem) today, I would not be alive to see the first sacrifice.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/26 15:55

havok, I did not realize the article was longer than what I had read. I too disagree with that interpretation. The article gives brief descriptions of different interpretations. I lean toward this one:

"Is It the Church? Some Christian commentators have understood the content of these chapters as an apocalyptic vision, which is best interpreted spiritually. They point out that the church, in the New Testament, is often referred to as God's temple or habitation. Each Christian is a living stone (1 Pet. 2:5), built, along with others, upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (Eph. 2:20) into a temple of God (1 Cor. 3:16). On this view, the features of temple worship—priests, altars, sacrifices, blood rituals—would be seen as pertaining to spiritual, rather than literal, realities, and applied to our worship of God in the present time. In particular, the description of the river, in chapter 47, would seem to support a nonliteral interpretation. If this is the correct view, we would be required either to see many of the tedious details as being either superfluous or as corresponding to spiritual ideas that would be very difficult to identify with confidence."

As in the book of Revelation, the book of Ezekiel has much in it that is symbolic and has spiritual application. My thoughts.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/26 20:10

Also I must confess that I am up for a spiritual application; however I would like to know what it means if that were true...lol

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/27 7:14

So what was the purpose of the animal sacrifices in the OT then?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/27 11:12

I would say as a temporary covering for sins and a preshadowing of Christ's ultimate sacrifice.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/27 12:22

According to Romans, Galatians, Hebrews and other books, the sacrifices did not take away or cover sins. They were strictly shadows of Christ to come. Like the writer of Hebrews said, if they took away sin, then you could cease from offering them.

I was reading an article on GotQuestions.org and they said that if there are sacrifices during the millenium, that it would strictly be for pointing at Jesus (who would be physically present) as a memorial/reminder of the seriousness of sin and the sacrifice He made.

While I can certainly agree with that, it really doesn't explicitly say that, so I will have to do more digging to see if I am missing something or if there is a more viable understanding of what is going on in those passages.

I keep running into 2 issues:

- 1) A Literal interpretation that lacks in the ability to directly show how these things will come to pass or have come to pass, but includes an explanation on the level of details regarding to the meaning of everything in those chapters.
- 2) A spiritual interpretation that uses these passages to show how they apply to the church, but no explanation of the level of detail nor the meanings of the details for those chapters.

Both views are lacking in details connecting them to NT passages. At least as far as I can tell.

Meanwhile I am banging my head against the wall hoping I will understand...lol.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2014/8/27 12:33

I agree that the OT sacrifices did not remit sins but were rather a "covering."

My wife has recently been reading through the Left Behind novels (again) and I suppose it would be nice if everything was laid out literally like that. When I first read them years ago I bought into and even taught those timelines and literal renderings. The Got Questions site approaches things from a dispensational mainstream viewpoint which is certainly their prerogative.

Then several years back I exposed myself to differing teachings regarding eschatology. As a result I am fairly agnostic on the issue, i.e. It doesn't really matter to me one way or the other.

Good luck understanding it all and don't bang your head too hard.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2014/8/27 13:05

Quote:
-----I was reading an article on GotQuestions.org and they said that if there are sacrifices during the millenium, that it would strictly be for pointing at Jesus (who would be physically present) as a memorial/reminder of the seriousness of sin and the sacrifice He made.

As the CRI article points out, there are verses that say the sacrifices are for atonement. I personally cannot reconcile such a thought of literal animal sacrifices in the future, with the NT teaching on Christ's ultimate sacrifice. But I know this is not an issue over which to divide.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2014/8/27 15:41

Right. That is what I am saying. It doesn't explicitly say that.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/5/22 9:25

One thing I noticed recently about this:

A literal interpretation of Ezekiel 40 et seq. would necessitate that it take place after the second coming of Christ.

Jesus said in Matthew that in the resurrection there would be no marriage.

Yet in Ezekiel 44:22 there is an instruction as to who the priests should and should not marry; in another passage there is mention of a blessing being on one's house, implying a family.

This would seem incompatible with the statement of Jesus in Matthew.

Re: , on: 2015/5/22 13:30

The millennial Kingdom, such an interesting topic. Many different perspectives, many mysteries. I took the time to reach all the posts, since this was an older thread resurrected. :)

Quote:

-----Anon/Noah stated: Premillennialism was replaced with Amillennialism in the third century.

I'm not certain of the historicity of Amillennialism. It's my current position though.

Quote:

-----TMK/Todd said:One problem that he (Matthew Henry) and other commentators note is that the size of the temple described by Ezekiel is larger than the entire city of Jerusalem and the size of the city he describes is problematic as well.

Interesting insight. I've never heard this before. Awesome.

Quote:

-----TMK/Todd said: I would say as a temporary covering for sins and a preshadowing of Christ's ultimate sacrifice.

I wouldn't go as far as say it's even a 'covering' but I would agree with the later that OT sacrifices are 'foreshadowing of Christ's sacrifice'.

Quote:

-----Havok said: A spiritual interpretation that uses these passages to show how they apply to the church, but no explanation of the level of detail nor the meanings of the details for those chapters.

I agree with this too. I believe in a more spiritual interpretation of Ezekiel passages but it's application is difficult. Could be prayers of the saints, could be communion as Oracio seemed to hint. I'm not sure the actual application of Ezekiel.

This is a great discussion. I don't have much to add to it since there are many mysteries that I've embraced.

Re: The third Temple - posted by budgie, on: 2015/5/25 2:42

There is a good sermon to listen to by Steve Hickey at the following link

<http://www.churchatthegate.com/messages.php>

It is a free mp3 download and the title is regarding the 3rd Temple

Wes Hall also has some brilliant audio sermons on IHOP regarding Ezekiel and the Temple and sacrifices

Re: In reply to havok20x post - posted by budgie, on: 2015/5/25 2:46

So what was the purpose of the animal sacrifices in the OT then?

There were many sacrifices that were made for the simple plan of worship to God, God was and is Holy and sacrifices were made way before the 10 commandments for the act of worship and fellowship with God. God is Holy and the Sacrifices show this Truth.

Something to think about