

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Third temple - Is it the church?****Third temple - Is it the church?, on: 2016/4/7 19:43**

The temple came to mind as I was reading in a previous post that what is literal does not have to be natural (or physical) but it can be spiritual. In these three verses I would understand the temple as spiritual.

1.

Thessalonians 2:4

he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God.

Here I think of a false teaching (or false teacher) trying to take over the church.

2.

In Acts 15 the apostles are discussing how the gentile believers need to be accepted in the church. And concerning the church James in Acts 15:15 refers to Amos 9:11,12

11. In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old:

12. That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name, saith the LORD that doeth this.

Here we see the NT explanation of an OT prophecy where the restored tent of David is the church.

3.

John 2:19-21

19. Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

20. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?

21. But he spake of the temple of his body.

Here the Jews understood the temple as physical but Jesus meant his body that is also the church spiritually. (1 Corinthians 12:27)

There is an interesting article (text sermon) on Sermonindex by Charles Alexander talking about prophecies of the third temple. <http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=article&aid=22433>

I would be interested to see how everyone views this topic, the verses and the article.

Zsuzsanna

Re: Third temple - Is it the church?, on: 2016/4/7 21:29

It will take some time to read, but quickly scanning it, he has some good points. Will reply more, later.

Re: , on: 2016/4/8 0:19

Hi Zsuzsanna

Welcome to this forum, may we be able to encourage and build each other up for the Glory of God

I haven't studied your question properly, what I give you is more an opinion and some references to look up

The Body is not the same as the "Church" The "Church" is the "Ekklesia" which means an assembly of people that are called out. Jesus builds this Ekklesia and it belongs to Him (Matthew 16:18)

About the third temple: "The architecture of the temple is described in detail in Chapters 40 to 42 of Ezekiel." (From Wikipedia.) That seems to be a physical building.

Hope that helps a bit

Re: , on: 2016/4/8 1:26

Hi Markuskiwi,

I have always wondered why you say "the Body is not the same as the Church"?

These two scriptures indicate the Body of Christ is the same as the Church of Christ.

Col_1:18 And HE IS THE HEAD OF THE BODY, THE CHURCH: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

Col_1:24 Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh FOR HIS BODY'S SAKE, WHICH IS THE CHURCH:

Ekklesia means "called out ones", referring to those who have been called out of their sin, selfishness and the world (meaning the world system and values and everything that is not of Christ). It also means that we have been called out from under the power of darkness into the kingdom of His dear Son.

1Th 2:12 That ye would walk worthy of God, who hath called you unto his kingdom and glory.

Col_1:13 Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son:

Just wondering how you see the Church of Christ and the Body of Christ as different entities? So then, who makes up the Body and who makes up the Church in your thinking? Since you brought it up again, can you explain? I am really curious.

I am still reading about Ezekiel's temple. I don't think it is a future physical temple. Maybe it was one that should have been built after the Babylonian captivity. Not sure yet, but Ezekiel talks about animal sacrifices, mandatory physical circumcision, separation between the Jews and Gentiles, owning slaves again and a Temple only for the Jews, in chapters 43 to 46.

Through Christ we have a BETTER COVENANT, based on BETTER PROMISES all because of the BETTER SACRIFICE.

Heb_8:6 But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a BETTER COVENANT, which was established upon BETTER PROMISES.

I don't see this as an end times physical Temple, especially since God does not dwell in temples made with hands, He dwells in His Body, we are the Temple of God (2 Cor 6:16). A body must have a Head and a Head must have a Body.

Re: , on: 2016/4/8 3:16

Thanks J - good points
Will do a bit more study ;)

Re: What is the church?, on: 2016/4/10 11:34

Hi marcuskiwi,

Thanks for your insight.

I agree that the church naturally is an assembly of people. But it is also spiritual. It is

- a spiritual building1Peter 2:5
- a body of ChristEphesians 5:30-32
- a kingdom of GodColossians 1:13
- a bride Revelations21:9-11
- a priesthood 1Peter 2:5

- temple of God Ephesians 2:19-22, Matthew 18:20

Zsuzsanna

Re: Ezekiel's temple, on: 2016/4/10 13:58

When I am trying to understand the Bible my starting point is Christ.

Jesus said that the OT scriptures testify of Him. John 5:39

Paul also used the OT scriptures to show Christ to the Jews. Acts 18:28

In the letter to the Hebrews Paul explains that Jesus is the sacrifice for our sins and we don't need animal sacrifices any more Hebrews 10.

It is difficult to understand what the temple in Ezekiel's vision means. Many times in the Bible OT scriptures are explained by NT scriptures.

Questions to the forum:

Is there any NT scripture that refers to Ezekiel's vision?

Is there any NT scripture that refers to a future physical temple to be built?

Re: Third temple - Is it the church? - posted by RogerB (), on: 2016/4/10 15:25

Anyone can build a temple. Whether or not it's for God's purpose is another story. I see in some of the Jewish newspapers that the rebuilding of Solomon's temple is in the plans. Of course it's not for the church.

There is a desire for a certain someone to sit on David's throne and thereby claiming to be the anointed one.

Think about it. How else can the one on the white horse deceive unless he is sitting on a throne, and releasing the word, "...come and hear the message of God from Zion.." The false Christ comes first. "the law will be going forth from Zion.." but it won't be the law you want to hear.

Re: A thorough look at Ezekiel's temple - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/10 15:59

Presented from a premillennial view, the info and comments on this website are pretty thorough and inclusive of the questions that arise from this long debated portion of scripture. There's more than enough to read and consider.

<https://hipandthigh.wordpress.com/category/ezeziels-temple/>

Re: - posted by elected (), on: 2016/4/10 18:12

Hi Zsuzsanna,

The prophecy of Ezekiel talks about a third temple that will be built in Jerusalem for the Jews not for the Church. We know from the NT that Christians whether Jews or Gentiles are the true spiritual temple of God. So God is not concerned about physical temples today but he is building his true and everlasting spiritual house.

In Romans 11:25 Paul says, "For I do not desire, brethren, that you should be ignorant of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own opinion, that blindness in part has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in, and so all Israel will be saved, as it is written:

"The Deliverer will come out of Zion, And He will turn away ungodliness from Jacob; For this is My Covenant with them, When I take away their sins."

It's pretty clear from these verses that all Israel will be saved when Christ comes back.

The messianic hope of the Jews is still alive today, many of them wait for the coming Messiah, even though not all of them but this hope will increase more as the Jews realize that they need the Messiah to save them. They will build the third temple according to Ezekiel and in the middle of tribulation period Antichrist will seat in the temple and desecrate it. This can't be a spiritual temple sister, because Christ seats as King in his spiritual and holy temple.

Another thing to consider is that many of the early Church Fathers believed in that Anti-Christ will seat in the temple that the Jews will build, so this teaching has the support of those Church Fathers who kept the apostolic teaching of John I like Irenaeus etc.

And they did not believe the modern fiction of dispensianalism that we will be raptured before the great tribulation. The Church always has gone and will go thru tribulation, that's the will of our Father and that's the teachings of the Apostles.

Blessings Sister,

Re: Church Fathers' view, on: 2016/4/11 3:37

Thank you all for the responses so far.

I would like to be like the Bereans and compare everything I read on this thread with the scriptures to see whether they are so. Sometimes it takes a longer time for me to answer....

I agree with Julius, I see the scriptural proofs from the same angle.

RogerB I appreciate your comment, I am not sure that I understand the last section right. It seems to tell me that when a coming deception is prophesied we should not strive to tell everyone the truth, because we would somehow "go against God" by doing so. If you meant this I strongly disagree, if not please forgive me.

Thanks Doc for the comprehensive collection of ideas on the topic, I will chew on these a little longer.

This is a kind and clear explanation Brother Elected and you brought up verses to support your point. I'd like to further discuss these in a later post. About the church fathers I found an article here: <http://georgekouri.publishpath.com/the-early-church-fathers-and-the-last-days-of-the-jewish-age>

This article examines the views of several church fathers about the future role of the Jews, and its conclusion essentially conflicts your information.

Blessings,
Zsuzsanna

Re: For Tozsu - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/11 7:43

I have opinions I want to share from my point of view which is basically the premill view of the scriptures and prophecy. To me eschatology is not at all unimportant and irrelevant because I see the eschatological events described in prophecy as the Lord and Christ putting the finishing touches on what they began at Christ's first advent and Calvary. It's hardly a fruitless endeavor in my opinion to try and determine how the last events of earth's present history will unfold before the second advent of Christ and the more we can determine beforehand can serve us in adequate foresight and preparation for the role the church is to play during this time. I will take your three points and give my take on them. It's not that hard to be polite and civil if folks want to so in that spirit I offer my comments.

/1.

Thessalonians 2:4

he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God.

Here I think of a false teaching (or false teacher) trying to take over the church. (END)

Paul's reference in II Thess 2:4 is a quote taken directly from Daniel 11:36:

36 And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god and shall speak monstrous things against the God of gods: and he will prosper until the indignation is finished, for that which is decreed will be done.

Compared with II Thess 2:4:

4 who opposes and exalts himself above every so-called god or object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, displaying himself as being God.

The personage spoken of in Daniel 11:36 to the end of the chapter is describing this specific individual who Paul refers to in II Thess 2:3-4. Almost every time, over 30 instances, the personage is described by the use of personal pronouns (HE, HIM). Many believe that the description of this person actually begins in Daniel 11:21 but nonetheless Paul's referen

ce in II Thess 2:4 is taken from Daniel 11:36 and the two passages bear striking similarity to each other. In Daniel this personage is seen as a deceitful, conquering and plundering individual whose heart is set against the holy covenant (Dan 11:28,32) and who in the end declares and exalts and magnifies himself above every god. I believe he will be the full and fleshly manifestation of the mystery of iniquity which through history has exalted and magnified itself above God or object of worship. It's the mystery of iniquity coming to a full and final manifestation in this personage just as Christ was the full and complete manifestation of the mystery of godliness. So it seems scripture portrays the person in II Thess 2:4 as much more than just a false teaching or teacher trying to take over the church. II Thess 2:4 is not the only place this person (HE, HIM) is spoken of. He's spoken of also in Revelation 13. Scripture never portrays this king who exalts himself above every god as doing so in Ezekiel's temple that you speak of.

/2.

In Acts 15 the apostles are discussing how the gentile believers need to be accepted in the church. And concerning the church James in Acts 15:15 refers to Amos 9:11,12

11. In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old:

12. That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by my name, saith the LORD that doeth this.

Here we see the NT explanation of an OT prophecy where the restored tent of David is the church. (END)

But since it speaks of the church or believers in Jesus Christ it does not therefore for that reason cancel any outstanding promises and prophecies still unfulfilled regarding the nation of Israel. The Gospel revealed a mystery and after the events at the household of Cornelius the early church had this mystery as part and parcel of their apostolic proclamation. To be specific the revealed mystery was the Gentiles are now also fellow-heirs and fellow-members of the body, and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (Eph 3:6). The early church nowhere said this fact of Gentile inclusion somehow meant the prophecies regarding Israel's future should be spiritualized or cancelled and nullified. Christ ascended from Israel and will return to Israel and sit on the throne of David and then the tabernacle of David, which includes Gentiles, will be fully restored.

/3.

John 2:19-21

19. Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

20. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days?

21. But he spake of the temple of his body.

Here the Jews understood the temple as physical but Jesus meant his body that is also the church spiritually. (1 Corinthians 12:27)

There is an interesting article (text sermon) on Sermonindex by Charles Alexander talking about prophecies of the third temple. <http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=article&aid=22433>

I would be interested to see how everyone views this topic, the verses and the article. (END)

The temple of God is indeed the church made up of each individual believer. That is a COMPLETELY SEPARATE ISSUE from the belief that in the last days the Jewish people will rebuild a physical temple in a vain effort to once again please the God of their fathers. It's commonly asked how can a last days temple be physical when the temple of God is a spiritual temple made up of the church and its members. The two are separate issues not even related to one another. The man of sin and lawlessness who enters a temple and proclaims himself to be god is never portrayed as doing so in the temple Ezekiel speaks of. No one who believes a physical temple will be rebuilt denies that the church is the temple of God indwelt by His Spirit. The issues are separate but often confused when a careful reading of the premill view could clear up the issue quickly. And there are millions and millions of premill believers who are not dispensational in their view. These two are also often confused meaning many think that if you are premill then you are automatically dispensational also with believing in a pre-tribulation rapture etc. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Thank you for your thoughts. Reply any time you may feel inclined.

Blessings.

Re: Thank you also Tozsu - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/11 8:03

Your irenic attitude and what I see as the softness of your words is good and encouraging. I may be out of place here but recent discussions have shown that a few folks here are not polite or civil when a different view is presented regarding some of the subject matter you are discussing but that are a minority. I sense that your and my view may differ but you have every right to express your views and especially in the civil way you have. I will defend that right even if I disagree with the view. Meanwhile, who am I to venture and say what I just did but anyway, thank you bro. Now let me get back to my proper place here.

Re: , on: 2016/4/11 9:51

I believe eschatology is important too, only insofar as some beliefs deny the gospel and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. It is very subtle, yet that is the end result of the doctrine.

Other beliefs have the Church consorting with the political systems of this world and leaning on the arm of the flesh to bring about God's "will" on earth.

Any theology that embraces these two things should be rejected.

Re: Well I'm clear - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/11 10:17

I believe neither nor does the premill view.

Re: answers (Re:for Tozsu), on: 2016/4/14 4:28

Thanks, docs, here are some more answers to the three points:

1./

antichrists (plural) = people who deny Christ

antichrist (singular) = spirit of antichrist or one or more individuals controlled by this spirit.

1John 2:18, 1John 2:22, 1John 4:3, 2John 1:7

In Thessalonians 2:3 the greek word antropos is used which also can be seen generally as a type of man. Maybe a man that has this spirit behind him. One of such was described in Dan 11:36.

Since John speaks about antichrist as a spirit, it is easy to imagine that this spirit enters in the church which is also spiritual. That's what I meant by false teaching.

2./

" But since it speaks of the church or believers in Jesus Christ it does not therefore for that reason cancel any outstanding promises and prophecies still unfulfilled regarding the nation of Israel."

Outstanding promises?

For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us. 2 Corinthians 1:20

For more references on how the promises were fulfilled in Christ please see this excellent article by John Piper <http://www.desiringgod.org/articles/how-christ-fulfilled-and-ended-the-old-testament-regime>

" The early church nowhere said this fact of Gentile inclusion somehow meant the prophecies regarding Israel's future should be spiritualized or cancelled and nullified"

The tabernacle of David WAS restored for Israel (jews and the gentiles). That IS a fulfillment. Only the jews that opposed Jesus said that He came to cancel and nullify their law and the prophets but Jesus said that he came to FULFILL (spiritualize?) the law and the prophets. (Matthew 5:17) I believe that a jewish person can have all the promises fulfilled right now if he/she recognizes Jesus as Lord.

3./

So if the church is the third temple then all the prophecies about a third temple in the Bible refer to the church, then there are no prophecies for a physical third temple.

Zsuzsanna

Re: Thank you Tozsu - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/14 9:52

Thanks for your time and effort. I don't have the time to reply right now but I will try and get back to you pretty quick.

Blessings this day.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2016/4/15 11:22

To me it seems that if we said the third temple was the church, we make scripture that before seemed pretty clear very hard to understand. In my opinion, that is enough to cast that theory into pretty serious doubt. For example, Matthew 24:15 and its companion verses in Daniel. If I say that church is the third temple, then the passages make much less sense than they did before and I am left trying to figure out who is this prince that is to come, and where or what is the holy place in which he is going to stand. The church is not a physical building as such and is worldwide. The straight forward reading of the text now makes no sense and becomes hard to interpret. I am sure we could apply that same interpretation logic to other passages as well.

The presence of a temple does not imply that the worship that is going on there is necessarily what God would desire as worship to Him. Scripture is clear, I think, that all Jews and Gentiles alike who will be saved, will be saved by faith in Christ. So a third temple is simply one of the events that must happen. How that looks in the geopolitical climate is anyone's guess, but I can tell you that the fortunes of entire nations can change overnight and the climate of the world is prone to rapid change.

Re: Answer to point #1 - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/16 9:02

/Thanks, docs, here are some more answers to the three points:

1./
antichrists (plural) = people who deny Christ
antichrist (singular) = spirit of antichrist or one or more individuals controlled by this spirit.
1John 2:18, 1John 2:22, 1John 4:3, 2John 1:7

In Thessalonians 2:3 the greek word antropos is used which also can be seen generally as a type of man. Maybe a man that has this spirit behind him. One of such was described in Dan 11:36.

Since John speaks about antichrist as a spirit, it is easy to imagine that this spirit enters in the church which is also spiritual. That's what I meant by false teaching. END)

John said the spirit of antichrist was now already in the world. This does not preclude the prophecies that portray a single personage being indwelt by this spirit at the end of the age. I don't believe Daniel did not describe just "such a person" in Daniel 11:36. It's no accident or coincidence Paul went to Daniel 11:36 to life his reference. This is the very same PERSON Paul took his reference from in II Thess 2:4. Compare Daniel 11:36-37, II Thess 2:4.

From Daniel 11:36 to the end of the chapter this person is described, the same person as II Thess 2:4, and the personal pronoun HE, Him is used over and over to describe him. Many commentators now believe this person actually begins to be described in Daniel 11:21. In Daniel 11:45 this person comes to his end between the seas and the glorious holy mountain which is Jerusalem. How can false teaching in the church come to its end between the seas and Jerusalem?

He's also known as,

- the little horn - Dan 7:8
- the horn that wages war against the saints and overcomes them - Dan 7:21
- a small horn which grows exceedingly great - Dan 8:9
- he one who removes the regular sacrifice - Dan 8:11
- the prince who is to come who performs the abomination of desolation - Dan 9:24-27; Matt 24:15
- a despicable person - Dan 11:21

- one who sets his heart against the holy covenant - Dan 11:28
- a willful king who does as he pleases - Dan 11:36
- a willful king who magnifies himself above every god - Dan 11:36
- the man of lawlessness - II Thess 2:3
- the son of destruction - II Thess 2:3
- the beast rising out of the sea - Revelation 13
- one to be slain by Christ at His coming - Isaiah 11:4 compared with II Thess 2:8

And again, Paul's reference in II Thess 2:4 is taken directly from the description of the willful king who exalts himself above all gods found in Daniel 11:36. It's not portrayed in Daniel 11:36 as being "such a person" found in II Thess 2:4. It is THE person Paul refers to. The full and complete manifestation of the mystery of iniquity (the spirit of antichrist) dwelling within a PERSON at the end of the age.

Thank the Lord for Rev 12:11!!!

Re: , on: 2016/4/16 10:37

Dear elected, I am sorry for waiting so long to answer your points. It took me some time to look into Ezekiel's prophecy and its commentaries etc.

"The prophecy of Ezekiel talks about a third temple that will be built in Jerusalem for the Jews not for the Church." I agree except instead of "third temple" I would say "temple" because Ezekiel wrote this prophecy after the first temple was destroyed but before the second temple was built. This was a picture of a temple to be built in OT times since it contained animal sacrifices and in the NT those are useless. While the description of the temple is mostly physical especially towards the end there are symbolic elements such as the river flowing from the temple.

"We know from the NT that Christians whether Jews or Gentiles are the true spiritual temple of God. So God is not concerned about physical temples today but he is building his true and everlasting spiritual house."

I agree.

"It's pretty clear from these verses that all Israel will be saved when Christ comes back."

In my opinion these verses are talking about the first and not the second coming. The partial blinding of the Jews was mainly during Jesus' trial and death because these events needed to take place for the salvation of the Gentiles. There is a certain hardness in the Jewish people today towards Jesus but I am not sure this is what "partial blinding" refers to in the verse. I believe the partial blinding probably lasted till Pentecost because on that day 3000 were pricked in their heart after recognizing what they did to the Messiah.

I plan to address Daniel, the Antichrist, the tribulation and the definition of Israel in another post.

God bless you brother,
Zsuzsanna

Re: , on: 2016/4/16 10:55

Was doing a search on the Tabernacle of David and found many links. This conversation really stood out.

http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=35351&forum=35&start=60&viewmode=flat&order=1

Re: Matthew 24, on: 2016/4/16 11:06

twayneb

Thanks for taking part in this conversation. I see that the mainstream explanation makes the scriptures pretty clear to you. I used to think the same way but even then I had to put some scriptures in the back of my mind because they could not be explained such as Matthew 24:34.

I understand that if a new information doesn't fit our theory we seriously question that information. However we can also be inspired to examine that information for truthfulness and change our theory or perhaps set up a new theory according to the new information. In the case of setting up a new theory some already explained data need to be reexamined.

Alternative theory:

In verses Matthew 24:4-14 Jesus talks about wars coming, the destruction of the temple, the fierce persecution of the church by the Romans, and the free spreading the gospel after that persecution is over. In verses 14-23 he talks about the days of the destruction of the temple. The disciples receive specific instruction how to save themselves when the Roman army is coming against Jerusalem. In verses 23-28 he warns the disciples not to be deceived about his coming and describes what it will be like. Verses 29-31 are about how the old testament system would fall and His church (or the kingdom) will shine and spread throughout the ages. Verses 32-35 tells the disciples that these things (end of OT system) are near and will happen in their life time.

In the verses after this he talks about his second coming and the end of the world and how to be ready for it.

I plan to show a matching alternative theory for Daniel's prophecy in the next post.

Zsuzsanna

Re: , on: 2016/4/16 11:13

Twisting and misrepresenting the clear Word of the Lord is satan's work as demonstrated here by J and the gang. See ms it never ends does it.

Re: Basically a useless post (edited) - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/16 11:38

The post mentioning j and the gang is really a post minus any scriptural usage to reply to the discussion going on. It didn't add an iota of anything positive to the comments and was also used as an opportunity to personally attack one particular person. It's as if Greg has not kindly and patiently said anything recently. How long will it go on?

Re: Bereans , on: 2016/4/16 13:32

Notdarkyet

We are trying to be like the Bereans examining theories about what the scriptures might mean. The purpose is to come closer to the truth. You do not need to fear that the "clear Word of the Lord" will be refuted because it can not be. It will protect itself. I would be interested in your interpretation of the Word and whether it stands the examination using the whole scriptures. You can also examine all views here and bring up valid argument from the scriptures. If you feel that certain views are shoved down your throat it is because of my personal pride for that I apologize and try to be more humble.

Zsuzsanna

Re: Post cancelled - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/17 8:50

Based on wrong perceptions.

Have a good day in the Lord.

Re: Daniel 11, on: 2016/4/17 15:07

In my understanding the prophecy in Daniel 11 was fulfilled about between the 6th and the 2nd centuries BC. The predictions accurately match the historical events that took place that time and describe among others a person named Antiochus Epiphanes.

Here you can read side by side the prophecy in Daniel 11 and the corresponding historical events. <http://www.angelfire.com/nt/theology/daniel-11.html>

Besides Antiochus Epiphanes in 2Thess. 2:4 Paul could also be referencing an other person in Isaias 14:13-14 and the ruler of Tirus in Ezekiel 28:1. These were kings that thought they were God. Such were some Roman emperors also.

There were antichrist type people throughout the history. I believe that 2Thess. 2:4 points to that similarity. I believe this verse in 1 John refers to a spirit. If it was a person it would be about 2000 years old.

1John 4:3

3And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

Zsuzsanna

Re: 1 John 4:3, on: 2016/4/17 15:19

(Adding to previous post)

Or it is a person but came long time ago.

z

Re: tabernacle of David, on: 2016/4/17 15:45

I loved to read that conversation. Thanks Julius

Zsuzsanna

Re: , on: 2016/4/17 15:46

The future prophesized events in the scriptures have all now been fulfilled. The end is behind us and we are now living in paradise restored. The invisible kingdom had been established with the invisible king reigning over the spiritual ethereal vapour like domain. Yes we can all see it, clear as can be.

Re: , on: 2016/4/17 15:54

Hi Zsuzsanna,

Did you read it or did you mean you are going to read it? It was quite good. A lot of people do not understand why the Tabernacle of David was mentioned in Acts 15. I thought it was very enlightening.

Blessings to you.

Re: , on: 2016/4/17 15:59

Rev, stop it your making sense and negating the agenda. of J and T. (Must be the same person or follow the same religion)

Re: Antiochus fulfilled much but falls short - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/17 16:05

My take is that much of it may have been fulfilled but not all of it could pertain to the historical Antiochus. Many who take this view seem to disregard the near/far fulfillment aspect and characteristic of much Biblical prophecy. The events foretold many times had a partial or near fulfillment in the immediate circumstances and life of the prophet and the nation yet the prophecies many times also spoke to and hearkened to a later complete and exhaustive fulfillment. So Antiochus, while fulfilling many of the prophecies, was still just a type of a distant and exhaustive eschatological fulfillment in the future. It can be demonstrated easily that many prophecies follow this same characteristic of near/far fulfillment.

Plus, it is said that after desecrating the altar by offering a pig sacrifice on it that Antiochus also erected a statue of Zeus in the temple. So Antiochus did not exalt himself and magnify himself above every god or so called god of worship. He pointed to Zeus to be worshipped and was thus keeping in line with the religion he knew. The man of lawlessness/son of perdition Paul spoke of will do far more than that as the spirit of antichrist long active in the world will find its full indwelling and manifestation in one person. It will be the mystery of iniquity come to full blossom, magnifying and exalting itself above god or so called object of worship as it particularly and specifically wars against the mystery of godliness that came to a full manifestation in Christ - "great is the mystery of godliness: He (Christ) was revealed in the flesh, and was vindicated in the Spirit" (I Tim 3:16.) The mystery of iniquity, opposing all gods but itself, can't possibly have been exhaustively fulfilled in Antiochus since he forced worship of Zeus. In the eschatological future, the willful king, the despicable person, the man of lawless/son of perdition, we will see the continuing struggle between the two competing seeds first mentioned in Gen 3:15 and the seed of iniquity, the manifestation of the mystery of iniquity, will find a final and full manifestation. It will be the final outworking of the ancient controversy began in Gen 3:15.

*Rev 12:11!

Thanks.

Re: almost agree, on: 2016/4/17 16:19

"The future prophesized events in the scriptures have all now been fulfilled.Â " Not all only Daniel 11 and maybe some others

"The end is behind us and we are now living in paradise restored."

The end of the OT system is behind us, and through the blood relationship with God is restored for Jews as well as gentiles.(Hebrews 4:16)(although the fullness of it will come later 1 Corinthians 13:12)

"The invisible kingdom had been established with the invisible king reigning"

Invisible kingdom: church (Luke 17:21), Invisible king: Jesus (Bible)

"Reining over the spiritual ethereal vapour like domain."

Reigning over the spiritual kingdom (John 4:24)

Re: Tsuzanna , on: 2016/4/17 16:20

Sister just curious. Are you seeing the events as described in Matthew 24 being fulfilled in 70 AD. Not trying to get into a n argument here.

But wanted to hold off on posting something until I understood it what your views were regarding Matthew 24.

Brother Blaine

Re: Basically another useless post - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/17 16:29

/Rev, stop it your making sense and negating the agenda. of J and T. (Must be the same person or follow the same religion)

It offers no scripture or comments of its own but is made for the sole purpose of demeaning in a personal way other posters.

Do you have any views Notdarkyet that you are able to articulate and write out and not provide a link to or copy and paste? Or do you consider dropping in with personally demeaning remarks about other posters a sound statement of your views? What are your views and why do you never take time to write them out and express them in a civil and engaging manner as the others here try to do?

Re: Tabernacle of David, on: 2016/4/17 16:32

Yes I've read most of the posts. What I liked was the sincerity and love in that thread, the topic itself was uplifting and enlightening, I finished with the feeling that God loves me. Theologically I did not know which points to agree with but I think I got the main message which is how the tabernacle of David represented more direct relationship to God than the tabernacle of Moses and so it was a type of the church or Jesus himself.

Re: Matthew 24, on: 2016/4/17 16:37

Bear,
Not all. Some of the events, yes. Please see detailed in a previous post under alternative theory. (Please see it as only a theory to be discussed)

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2016/4/17 17:24

Quote:
-----In verses Matthew 24:4-14 Jesus talks about wars coming , the destruction of the temple, the fierce persecution of the church by the Romans, and the free spreading the gospel after that persecution is over. In verses 14-23 he talks about the days of the destruction of the temple. The disciples receive specific instruction how to save themselves when the Roman army is coming against Jerusalem. In verses 23-28 he warns the disciples not to be deceived about his coming and describes what it will be like. Verses 29-31 are about how the old testament system would fall and His church (or the kingdom) will shine and spread throughout the ages. Verses 32-35 tells the disciples that these things (end of OT system) are near and will happen in their life time.
In the verses after this he talks about his second coming and the end of the world and how to be ready for it.

Thank you for your perspective, but I am having a bit of trouble with some of your interpretation. For example, I cannot reason how you say verses 29-31 of Matt. 24 speak of the change of covenant from law to grace. It seems to me with the other verses, you are reading an opinion into the verses, giving them that flavor. Matthew does not clearly indicate that verse 15 and following speak of the destruction of 70 A.D.. One must read that interpretation into the text in my opinion. What one reads into the text can very heavily effect ones interpretation. I do know that Daniel speaks of the people of the prince that is to come, which I take to mean that there is a relationship between the destruction of 70 A.D. and the abomination that makes desolate, but that they are not the same event. Two time periods and two different people. One in 70AD, and the other by the prince that is to come.

I don't think that Matt. 24:34 is difficult to interpret, but I think many traditional eschatology teachers have read into it something that may not be there. The budding fig tree, in my opinion, is not Israel becoming a nation. There is no clear reason for it to be. Instead, it is an analogy of our seeing the signs and knowing the time is at hand. Likewise, I do not think "this generation" is those who were live when Israel became a state again. Again, we would have to read something into the text for that interpretation. Instead, it is that generation that sees what was just mentioned previous to that statement...The person that sees all of these signs taking place, including the sun being darkened and the moon not giving her light.

Just my opinion.

Re: Tsuzanna, on: 2016/4/17 17:42

Sister thank you for responding to my question. I was going to post something but I think I will hold for now. I do not want to interrupt the flow of the conversation here.

Re: , on: 2016/4/17 17:50

Blaine states

"do not want to interrupt the flow of the conversation here."

Please, please stop the flow of this scripture twisting and misleading cesspool of false doctrine being promoted here by the wwe tag team of Sermon Index

Re: Notdarkyet, on: 2016/4/17 19:13

Brother please check out my thread on The Shaking of All Things. I think you will see what I believe regarding the end times. Also God is literally shaking things up (sorry I could not resist that).

Right now we have greater concerns. Namely the Lord Jesus is getting ready to return soon.

Re: , on: 2016/4/17 19:29

Thank you Blaine

I already responded to your very excellent post with a few puns of my own. Sorry did not mean to derail your insightful commentary and scriptures posted

Re: , on: 2016/4/17 23:46

Great point Twayne B,

In fact, I just got through reading a chapter of Mideast Beast, the book I'm reading right now from Joel Richardson on the Islamic Antichrist & he is going through all of these passages. And this one particular in Daniel is amazing because the historians site that the Roman Wmpire as Far East as Jerusalem & beyond by 70 AD was not Roman/Italian Ethnos people's. The Roman Empire was basically expanding by this era essentially through hired mercenaries of the people's from the surrounding local/regions where they took expansion territory. And there is great record actually that the "actual Romans" tried to stop it, but the Syrians & surrounding Arab people's as essentially hired mercenaries he such a hate for the Jews they would not (sound familiar?). And there is extensive proof of this. So the same "Ethnos" (Arabs) who were of that time destroying Jerusalem will again at the end. I have been wondering why I am going to Isreal now at the clearing of the Lord for the first time at 40 years old in a few months. These could be the beginnings of some rapid acceleration events on the time lock of our Lord at the end (and yes, the last days started at Christ's ascension, but there's 2 different words used in the original language & the one that was the root word when the Angel told Daniel "these things refer to the time of the End" mean like "the end of the end" or "the very end", not just "the last days" in general). - FYI.

Even so, come quickly Lord Jesus!

Re: Matthew 24, on: 2016/4/17 23:57

Dear twayneb,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express in more details why I have this opinion about Matthew 24.

"I cannot reason how you say verses 29-31 of Matt. 24 speak of the change of covenant from law to grace".

It's the fulfillment of the law, the whole world of the Jews is shaken (spiritually spoken) and passes away (but there is life waiting for them in Jesus) almost in an apocalyptic way the sun darkens etc. These are images symbolizing that a great change is taking place in the spiritual realm. In the physical realm their centre of worship is gone and they cease to exist on the land as a nation many will be killed. It is quite shocking, the same way as the darkening of the sun would be shocking.

"I do know that Daniel speaks of the people of the prince that is to come, which I take to mean that there is a relationship between the destruction of 70 A.D. and the abomination that makes desolate, but that they are not the same event. Two

time periods and two different people. One in 70AD, and the other by the prince that is to come."
I would like to explore this later. Will continue...

Re: Matthew 24, on: 2016/4/18 0:18

"It seems to me with the other verses, you are reading an opinion into the verses, giving them that flavor. Matthew does not clearly indicate that verse 15 and following speak of the destruction of 70 A.D.. One must read that interpretation into the text in my opinion. What one reads into the text can very heavily effect ones interpretation" I give some more explanation below, I try to read into the text as little as possible. Also I might be wrong about things, please keep pointing out the weakest parts so I can either explain them or change my theory.

The disciples asked three questions to Jesus, not long after He prophesied about the destruction of the temple.

1. When shall these things be? (Is it reasonable to assume that they meant: when will the temple be destroyed?)

2 - 3 What will be the sign of His coming and the end of the world.

It seems to me that they might have thought all three would happen at the same time.

Now we know the time when the temple was destroyed (it's 70 AD). We also know that his second coming and the end of the world has not yet come. (Nobody has seen him coming back and the world remained sort of the same.)

In the first part of the chapter Jesus talks about the destruction of the temple and the fearful times surrounding that event, the early forming of the church in the midst of persecution, occasionally gives outlook to the future of the church (verse 14), and gives lots of signs that the disciples should watch for, and also assures them that these troublous times do not signify his second coming. This part ends with verse 34.

Starting with verse 36 he talks about his second coming which can happen literally any time without any sign, that's why we have to be always ready.

It is my impression from reading this chapter that Jesus was telling the disciples that all those "troubles" have to happen before his coming back.

I will continue, (sorry I have trouble posting longer texts)

Re: Matthew 24, on: 2016/4/18 0:35

For us this information is not as important as it was for the disciples since we already know that "these things" happened (in the disciples' lifetime) and we would not think by mistake that "these things" signify the second coming that we still are expectantly looking forward to.

I wholeheartedly agree with Blain that we should be prepared to his second coming and that it can happen any time. (I've read the "shaking" post) But my opinion differs from his about how we should prepare. I do not think we should look for signs and events that precede the second coming (it was maybe a good idea for the disciples in Jesus' time).

I would prepare as Jesus had always taught:

- keep oil in the lamp
- confess him to the people
- preach the gospel
- live a holy life
- keep his commandments
- abide in him
- etc.

My preparation would not necessarily mean staying up to date with current politics.

That's the world, brothers, but we are supposed to keep our eyes on Jesus.

(Only my opinion),

God bless,

Zsuzsanna

Re: Matthew 24, on: 2016/4/18 0:48

Lastly:

"I don't think that Matt. 24:34 is difficult to interpret, but I think many traditional eschatology teachers have read into it something that may not be there. The budding fig tree, in my opinion, is not Israel becoming a nation. There is no clear reason for it to be. Instead, it is an analogy of our seeing the signs and knowing the time is at hand. An likewise, I do not think "this generation" is those who were live when Israel became a state again. Again, we would have to read something into the text for that interpretation. " " "

I agree.

Re: The two seeds - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/18 10:25

"Hardly enough could be said about Gen 3:15. It is the seed bed, not only of the gospel but of the whole comprehensive mystery of God that is finished with the 7th trumpet (Rev 10:7). The two seeds establish the two lines of men by which the plan of redemption can be traced from beginning to end. It is more than Messiah and Satan. It anticipates the line of the ungodly making up the city of man, mystery Babylon, and the line of the children of the Spirit who are headed up in the Messiah who form corporately the city of God, the heavenly Zion."

"These two lines are really two natures, the nature of Satan in fallen man and the nature of God in His saints. These two natures that run through the whole of humanity come to their fullness and perfection in a personal incarnation in the two princes of Dan 9:25-26. Both the seed of the serpent and the woman's seed are ordained to come to ultimate perfection and final manifestation in a personal incarnation. Paul will speak of the "mystery of godliness" (1Tim 3:16) and its antithesis, the "mystery of iniquity" (2Thes 2:7). The mystery of iniquity that is presently working, comes to final revelation in the "man of sin" after the one who is restraining is removed. As Jesus would be the ultimate Seed of the woman who perfects in His humanity the mystery of godliness, so also the seed of the serpent must come to a similar fullness of Satan in the flesh. Thus, the two princes of Dan 9:25-26 fulfill two distinct mysteries that bound the present age between the two comings of Christ." (R. Kelly)

Re: Daniel 9:24-27, on: 2016/4/21 17:05

twayneb said:

"I do know that Daniel speaks of the people of the prince that is to come, which I take to mean that there is a relationship between the destruction of 70 A.D. and the abomination that makes desolate, but that they are not the same event. Two time periods and two different people. One in 70AD, and the other by the prince that is to come."

In Luke 20-21 it is literally said that the army is the one that makes desolate please compare to Matthew 24:15-16 and Daniel 9:24-27. And it IS talking about the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem in 70 AD.

Alternative theory:

Daniel 9:24-27

24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

In 70 weeks these were accomplished by Jesus and he was also anointed to be the king over his people the church, the kingdom of God.

25

Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

The Messiah Prince is Jesus, his coming is the first coming. The 70 weeks in year-weeks are $70 \times 7 = 490$ years. According to Nehemiah 2:1-8 in the 20th year of king Artaxerxes he received command to build the city.

Artaxerxes began to reign in 465BC (wikipedia). So the command was in 445 BC.

26

And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

After 69 ($7+62 = 69$) weeks that is 483 ($69 \times 7 = 483$) years by 37AD, (-445+483=37) Jesus died on the cross and

after this the Romans (these were the people of the next ruler) came and destroyed the city (Jerusalem) and the sanctuary (temple) until they completed desolation which is determined by God.

27

And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

He (JESUS) confirmed the covenant with many (his first Jewish followers) during his ministry for about 3 years. Then (in the middle of the 7 years) by his death on the cross he stopped the temple sacrifices and after this through war the temple and the city was completely destroyed.

Re: Full circle - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/21 17:37

/ He (JESUS) confirmed the covenant with many (his first Jewish followers) during his ministry for about 3 years. Then (in the middle of the 7 years) by his death on the cross he stopped the temple sacrifices and after this through war the temple and the city was completely destroyed./

The temple sacrifices were not stopped until 70 AD about 37 years later. So this view that Jesus stopped the sacrifices mid week has a gap theory also of 37 years.

The temple and city were destroyed but why have we come almost full circle with Jerusalem being filled again with a Jewish presence and surrounded by hostile armies intent on its destruction and the genocide of its inhabitants? 70 AD stares us in the face again and the Son of Man has not returned which He said would occur when these things happen.

Re: , on: 2016/4/21 18:51

After Jesus' death the animal sacrifices had no meaning to God. Daniel 9 doesn't say that the destruction will be done in the next 7 years but it says it is being destroyed until it comes to an end because its end is determined.

Can a prophecy be partially fulfilled? I think it's only fulfilled when it's 100% fulfilled, otherwise it is unfulfilled. Daniel 11 is fulfilled in the times of Antiochus IV who thought of himself that he was Zeus and named himself Epiphanes the manifestation of God. And Daniel 9:24-27 was fulfilled 490 years after the starting of the reconstruction of Jerusalem, and some years after till the city and the sanctuary came to an end.

After that God has one people (Jews and Gentiles) in Christ.

Ephesians 2:14

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

(Edited for better grammar)

Re: , on: 2016/4/21 19:04

Antiochus doesn't fit the description of the antichrist in multiple passages. That's a "forced fit". When you really study it out, a European revised Roman Empire doesn't fit either. Islam fits ALL the prophetic references like a glove. Antiochus was like what 70 AD was: a "foretaste" initial fulfillment picture of a greater, larger, more perfectly fit, eschatological apocalyptic end times final full fulfillment.

Re: , on: 2016/4/21 19:16

I put this link to a chart previously in the thread did you read it? <http://www.angelfire.com/nt/theology/daniel-11.html> It is pretty convincing to me. Some skeptics even attack the authenticity of the book of Daniel because they say it must have been written after the events, as those events are depicted with very high accuracy.

Re: , on: 2016/4/21 20:45

Again, I am not disagreeing that Antiochus Epiphanes was "a fulfillment" of the prophecy. Just saying that he is not "THE" ultimate end times fulfillment. And too many other prophetic passages show that there's more yet to be fulfilled, & in the context of the parallels in Daniel that tell this same prophetic story. Trust me, what's coming on the earth in the antichrist in size & scope makes Antiochus Epiphanes pale in comparison as far as scope/reach/sheer numbers/magnitude/etc.

Re: Is there a precedent for double fulfillment in the bible?, on: 2016/4/22 0:22

As I was asking this question, I found this interesting article about double fulfillment. <http://www.christian-faith.com/a-question-about-the-double-fulfillment-hermeneutic/>

The article explores the possibility of double fulfillment and tries to find a case in the Bible but CAN'T FIND ANY. Is it wise for us to assume that Bible prophecies fulfill more than ones when we can't find an example for that in the Bible?

Regarding the temple being the church the last commenter for this same article named Toni Muse said in January 2016: "I forgot to comment on your question about the "temple" in 2 Thessalonians 2. The Greek word that Paul used that has been transliterated as temple is "naos". Paul never used "naos" to describe the physical temple, but only when talking about the body of Christ as being the temple of God. Food for thought!"

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 0:53

The "never a double fulfillment example in scripture" thing is misinformed & just not true. there are multiple clear examples of this. Here's something Joel Richardson wrote recently in an email discussion on this subject:

A good example might be when Peter cites Joel 3 and applies it to the day of Pentecost. But contextually just read it, Joel's prophecy is tied to the celestial signs in the sky, (the moon turning to blood etc.) and the Day of the Lord. The Book of Revelation written minimally 20 years (more like 40) after Pentecost places these events in the future. Spiritual fulfillment, literal fulfillment. Both are true. One never changes the original meaning. At times, the Apostles brought clarity to OT passages, but never do they ever abrogate the words of God.

Another example is Jesus quoting literally half of a portion of Isaiah 61. Right in the middle He stopped and said this has been fulfilled in your midst. Yet the full context of the passage concerns the day of the Lord's vengeance. This portion has not yet happened. All agree. Ultimately, Jesus came and set captives are etc. But true and ultimate freedom does not come until all of the captives are free and fully free.

Again, Amos 9 is another example. You (some) insist it was "fulfilled" and thus has no future application. Yet read the rest of the prophecy. What do you do with verse 15? You have no basis to say it was fulfilled as in no longer has any literal application.

The fact that this was the manner that Jews interpreted Scripture is fairly well agree upon. In modern terms, the Rabbis practice what is sometimes called PARDES. It is arguably a subtle variation of their practices in ancient times. You can read about this hear: <http://www.fishingtheabyss.com/archives/40>

There are many many more as well.

God Bless,

Jeff

Re: Is there a precedent for double fulfillment in the bible?, on: 2016/4/22 3:38

In Acts 2:16 on the day of Pentecost Peter refers to Joel 2:28-32. Joel says that in the last days the Holy Spirit will be poured out. The HS came on the day of Pentecost. (Just as Jesus promised in John 14:26) This prophecy of Joel was fulfilled only once. After that Peter quotes Joel's prophecy about the darkening of the sun etc. (destruction of the temple), that must happen before the returning of the Lord, (and it did happen once in 70 AD) so they should repent and believe in the Lord.

Where is the double fulfillment?

Experts don't all agree that Revelations was written after 70 AD. Some say it was written before, in that case the future tense of darkening of the sun (which refers to the events in 70 AD) is understandable.

When Jesus read a portion of Isaiah 61 in Luke 4:18-19 about why he came it was fulfilled once. Jesus did not come another time in history to heal the brokenhearted and free the captives etc. When Jesus will come back he will come with a different mission: to judge

Where is the double fulfillment?

Amos 9 is talking about the destruction of the house of Israel (70 AD) but God would leave a remnant, these are the faithful ones, those that know the Father and the Son, these are going to be blessed forever.

Matthew 5:5 Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth.

Where is the double fulfillment?

I highly appreciate the knowledge of the Jewish People about the Old Testament. The techniques that they apply seem efficient and reasonable.

I would trust a Jewish commentary about e.g. Genesis, however I as a Christian would not follow a Jewish interpretation of prophecies. Most of the prophecies in the Bible are about Jesus the Messiah and his kingdom.

The Jewish people who till this day do not recognize Jesus as Messiah could not possibly understand those prophecies.

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 8:42

It's almost as if you didn't read my post?

ANOTHER example is Malachi 4, where it's written of "Elijah to come" it's in the context of the Day of the Lord, & John the Baptist came in the Spirit of Elijah, but clearly there is another fulfillment to come just before the return of the Lord ("the Day of the Lord"). Unless you are a "hyper-preterist", & believe that already happened too, you are forced to reinterpret scriptures that would be contradictory to your view.

What you have espoused here is hyper-preterism. You must tear Romans 11 out of your Bible, or explain it in a way that makes zero sense contextually & create different interpretive hermeneutics passage by passage to try to keep it propped up, while ignoring much of scripture. 70 AD was a foretaste. An initial down payment fulfillment. What's coming will be much larger in scope/scale/magnitude/numbers & will be the ultimate EndTimes eschatological fulfillment of Ezekiel 38 & 39, Daniel 2/7-12, Psalm 83, Isaiah, Micah 5, Revelation 12-13 & 17, etc. I have been studying this night & day for awhile & have written on this extensively in the forums. When you really close in & compare scripture with scripture, preterism just shows more and more and more flaws/issues/inconsistencies. And I don't have it all figured out, but I know preterism is not the answer/truth. Both by a pure, deep, focused study of scripture & for a host of other reasons that come out of it as its fruit/logic/necessary ultimate conclusions/etc.

God Bless,
Jeff

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 11:59

I have read your post and answered every point of it.

The purpose of this thread is to present an alternative theory of interpreting the scriptures, so that the readers would be inspired to search the scriptures as the Bereans did and test both (or all) theories. Everyone is free to draw his own conclusion. Arguments are natural to this process but those need to be about the scriptures and as between brothers not enemies, so that we all would learn and come closer to the truth.

2Thessalonians 3:16

16Now the Lord of peace himself give you peace always by all means. The Lord be with you all.

God bless everyone,
Zsuzsanna

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 12:42

Zsuzsanna,

I completely support you in your attitude towards searching the scriptures. I hope Jeff can learn something from your Berean approach and stop with the "labels", straw men and invectives.

Jeff? Can you search the scriptures as Zsuzsanna indicated, as a brother and not an enemy?

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 13:03

I do and I have and I am. But those get explained away through the preterist paradigm. I ain't studying the Quran to evaluate these things, but the Bible. All of it. Interesting fact too: what "scriptures" were the Bereans searching to see if those things were true? They didn't yet have the NT by the way. They were studying the prophets. They only had the Law & the Prophets (Jesus said "if we don't believe them, we won't believe even though a man were raised from the dead").

I'm speaking as a brother & a friend. The argument of preterism seems to BY FAR have the strongest, most persistent, most vocal, repetitive, unyielding, voice in the forums over the last couple months at least. So, while others may be wiser, older, better spoken, etc. since I am studying this subject exclusively for awhile, I'm going to speak to the issue/view of preterism. The world is reading these forums. I think it is a grievous error & has always led to eventual rotten fruit & a misunderstanding & advocates/necessitates an irresponsible hermeneutic approach of hyper allegorization that affects a lot of things & leaves people with a "make it up as you go" case that is as weak (once you dig in to all of the word in context, you know, like the Bereans did with their OT scriptures of the prophets?) as the Pre-Trib case. So while I love every true brother (& the lost, my enemies, etc.) I think Preterism is a dangerous slippery slope. A "gateway drug" that leads to other ills in Bible interpretation. So I will not sugar coat or pad that.

God Bless,
Jeff

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 13:49

Jeff, are you considering everyone who does not believe in a physical 1,000 year millenium as Preterist? Does that make sense? Amillennialists don't believe in a 1,000 year millenium as far as I know.

What is your criteria for one to be a Preterist?

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 14:21

No, I am not saying that. People say they are advocating for a figurative (present) millineum, but then go on to espouse the basic Tennants of Preterism. I define Preterism as it is technically definitionally defined: prophecy in the past. See the short article below:

The Menace of Radical Preterism
BY WAYNE JACKSON

The word "eschatology" derives from the Greek word, eschatos, meaning "elast." It has to do with the biblical doctrine of "elast" or "end-of-time" things. The term embraces such matters as the return of Christ, the end of the world, the day of judgment, and the resurrection of the dead.

One philosophy of eschatology is known as "preterism." The term "preter" issues from an original form meaning "past." Preterism, therefore, is an interpretive ideology which views major portions of Bible prophecy, traditionally associated with the termination of earth's history, as having been fulfilled already.

But the term "preterism" is flexible. Some scholars, for instance, have dated the book of Revelation in the late sixties A.D. They contend that virtually the whole of the Apocalypse, therefore, was fulfilled by A.D. 70 "when Judaism was destroyed by the invading Roman armies. A more moderate form of preterism moves the fulfillment of Revelation forward somewhat. These scholars hold that while Revelation was penned near the end of the first century, the major focus of the book is upon the fall of the Roman Empire (A.D. 476); consequently they feel there is little beyond that date that is previewed in the final book of the New Testament.

While we do not agree with either of these concepts of the book of Revelation, we consider them to be relatively harmless. They represent ideas upon which good men can honestly disagree with no significant error being involved.

On the other hand, there is a form of preterism that is quite heretical. This theory argues that all Bible prophecy has been fulfilled; nothing remains on the prophetic calendar.

This radical preterism was championed by James Stuart Russell (1816-95), a Congregational clergyman in England. Russell authored a book titled, *The Parousia*, (from a Greek word meaning "coming" or "presence"), which first appeared in 1878. Russell set forth the idea that the second coming of Christ, the judgment day, etc., are not future events at the end of the current dispensation. Rather, prophecies relating to these matters were fulfilled with Jerusalem's fall in A.D. 70. There is, therefore, no future "second coming" of Christ. Moreover, there will be no resurrection of the human body. Also, the final judgment and the end of the world have occurred already "with the destruction of Jerusalem.

Advocates of this bizarre dogma claim that the preterist movement is growing wildly. It probably is expanding somewhat though likely not as prolifically as its apologists would like everyone to believe. Occasionally the sect will get a thrust when a prominent name becomes identified with it. For example, noted theologian R. C. Sproul has apparently thrown his hat into the preterist ring "at least to some degree. Recently he characterized J. S. Russell's book as "one of the most important treatments on Biblical eschatology that is available to the church today" (quoted in *The Christian News* 1999, 17).

Radical preterism (also known as "realized eschatology" or the "A.D. 70 doctrine") is so "off the wall" biblically speaking that one wonders how anyone ever falls for it. But they do. And, as exasperating as it is, the doctrine needs to be addressed from time to time. One writer, in reviewing the A.D. 70 heresy, recently quipped that dealing with preterism is like cleaning the kitty litter box; one hates to fool with it, but it has to be done. He can just be thankful that cats aren't larger than they are.

The Basis for the Dogma

Preterists strive for consistency in their view of Bible prophecy. The goal is admirable. But when a series of propositions is linked, and they are grounded on the same faulty foundation, when one of them topples "like dominos in a line" they all fall. So it is with the A.D. 70 theory.

Here is the problem. In studying the New Testament material relative to the "coming" of Christ, preterists note that:

there are passages which seem to speak of the nearness of the Lord's coming "from a first-century vantage point (cf. James 5:8); they observe that there are texts which indicate a "coming" in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 (cf. Matthew 24:30); combining these, they conclude that the Savior's "second coming" must have transpired in A.D. 70; and furthermore, since the Scriptures are clear as to the fact that the resurrection of the dead, the judgment day, and the end of the world will all occur on the day the Lord returns, the advocates of realized eschatology are forced to "spiritualize" these several happenings, contending that all will take place at the same time. In this "interpretive" process, a whole host of biblical terms must be redefined in order to make them fit the scheme. And so, while preterists attempt to be consistent, it is nonetheless a sad reality that they are consistently wrong!

Prophetic Imminence

A major fallacy of the preterist mentality is a failure to recognize the elasticity of chronological jargon within the context of biblical prophecy. It is a rather common trait in prophetic language that an event, while literally in the remote future, may be described as near. The purpose in this sort of language is to emphasize the certainty of the prophecy's fulfillment.

Obadiah, for instance, foretold the final day of earth's history. Concerning that event, he said: "For the day of Jehovah is near upon all the nations" (v. 15). This cannot refer to some local judgment, for "all nations" are to be involved. And yet, the event is depicted as "near."

There are numerous prophecies of this nature, including passages like James 5:8 "the coming of the Lord is at hand." James could not have been predicting the literally imminent return of the Savior, for such knowledge was not made available to the Lord's penmen. Not even Jesus himself knew of the time of his return to earth (Matthew 24:36).

The Components Explained and Briefly Refuted

Let us give brief consideration to the four eschatological events that are supposed to have occurred in A.D. 70: the Lord's second coming, the resurrection of the dead, the day of judgment, and the end of the world.

First, was there a sense in which Christ "came" to folks at various times and places? Yes, and no serious student of the Bible denies this. Jesus "came" on the day of Pentecost via the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (see John 14:18). The coming was representative, not literal. The Lord warned the brethren in Ephesus that if they did not repent, he would "come" to them in judgment, and they would forfeit their identity as a faithful congregation (Revelation 2:5). In describing the horrible judgment to be inflicted upon rebellious Jerusalem, Jesus, employing imagery from the Old Testament, spoke of his "coming" in power and glory (Matthew 24:30). Again, this was a representative "coming" by means of the Roman forces (cf. Matthew 22:7). Verse thirty-four of Matthew 24 clearly indicates that this event was to occur before that first-century generation passed away. For further consideration of this point, see the essay on Matthew 24.

The Lord's "second coming," however, will be as visibly apparent as his ascension back into heaven was (Acts 1:11). Indeed, he will be "revealed" (2 Thessalonians 1:7), or "appear" to all (2 Timothy 4:1; Hebrews 9:28).

It is a mistake of horrible proportions to confuse the symbolic "comings" of Christ with the "second" (cf. Hebrews 9:28) coming. And this is what the preterists do.

Secondly, it is utterly incredible that the preterists should deny the eventual resurrection of the human body "just as the Sadducees did twenty centuries ago (Acts 23:8). The entire fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians was written to counter this error: "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" (15:12).

But those who subscribe to the notion of realized eschatology spiritualize the concept of the resurrection, alleging that such references are merely to the emergence of the church from an era of anti-Christian persecution. In other words, it is the "resurrection" of a cause, not a resurrection of people.

The theory is flawed in several particulars, but consider these two points:

The Scriptures speak of the "resurrection" as involving both the good and the evil, the just and the unjust (Daniel 12:2; John 5:28-29; Acts 24:15). Where, in the preterist scheme of things, is the resurrection of the "evil"? Was the "cause" of evil to emerge at the same time as the "cause" of truth?

As noted above, the resurrection contemplated in 1 Corinthians 15 has to do with the raising of "dead ones" (masculine, plural) "not an abstract cause" (neuter, singular). Significantly, the bodily resurrection of Jesus is cited as a precursor to the general resurrection "in this very context (15:20,23). Christ charged that those who deny the resurrection of the body are ignorant of both the Scriptures and the power of God (Matthew 22:29).

Third, the Bible speaks of a coming "day of judgment" (Matthew 11:22). Preterists limit this to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. But the theory simply does not fit the facts. The devastation of A.D. 70 involved only the Jews. The final day of judgment will embrace the entire human family "past, present, and future (Acts 17:31). The citizens of ancient Nineveh will be present on the day of judgment (see Matthew 12:41), as will other pagan peoples. But these folks were not in Jerusalem in A.D. 70. How can clear passages of this nature be ignored?

Here is an interesting thought. When Paul defended his case before the Roman governor, Felix, he spoke of "the judgment to come," and the ruler was "terrified" (Acts 24:25). Why would a Roman be "terrified" with reference to the impending destruction of Judaism when he would be on the winning side, not the losing one?

Fourth, according to the preterists, the "end of the world," as this expression is employed in Bible prophecy, does not allude to the destruction of this planet. Rather, "world" has reference to the Jewish world, thus, the end of the Jewish age. This, they allege, occurred in A.D. 70.

But this view simply is not viable. Consider these two brief but potent points.

The responsibilities of the Great Commission "to teach and immerse lost souls" was commensurate with that era preceding the "end of the world" (Matthew 28:18-20). If the "end of the world" occurred in A.D. 70, then the Lord's Commission is valid no longer. This conclusion, of course, is absurd.

In the parable of the tares, Jesus taught that at "the end of the world" the "tares" (i.e., evil ones) would be removed from his kingdom and burned (Matthew 13:39-40). Did that transpire with the destruction of Judaism? It did not. The notion that the "end of the world" is past already is false.

The dogma of preterism "or realized eschatology" is erroneous from beginning to end. For a more detailed consideration of this matter, see our book, *The A.D. 70 Theory*.

A Common Method of Propagation

The doctrine of preterism is so radically unorthodox that its advocates realize that their efforts to win converts represent a formidable task. Consequently, they have developed a covert strategy that seeks to quietly spread their novel dogma until such a time when congregational take-overs can be effected. The distinctive traits of this discipling methodology are as follows.

It is alleged that this system represents an attractive, consistent method of interpretation. But there is no virtue in consistency, if one is consistently wrong!

Preterists criticize what they call "traditional" views of interpreting Bible prophecy. They suggest they have a new, exciting approach to the Scriptures "with a spiritual thrust. Of course the "new" is always intriguing to some.

The messengers of realized eschatology frequently are secretive in their approach. They select only the most promising candidates with whom to share their ideas. Eventually, then, the A.D. 70 theory will be woven subtly into classes, sermons, etc.

When ultimately confronted relative to their teachings and methods, they will argue that eschatological issues are merely a matter of opinion, and that divergent views "especially theirs" should be tolerated. This, of course, ignores plain biblical implications on these themes (cf. 2 Timothy 2:16-18; 2 Peter 3:16). If church leaders fall for this ploy, more time is gained for the indoctrination of the entire congregation.

Conclusion

Wise church leaders will inform themselves relative to the theory of preteristic eschatology. If such ideas are discovered to be circulating within a local church, the proponents of such doctrines should be dealt with quickly and firmly. It is a serious matter.

Re: Preterist criteria - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/22 19:11

/ What is your criteria for one to be a Preterist? /

Julius, after the David Curtis link, you made statements that led me to believe that you hold the view that the last days ended in 70 AD and that we are presently living in the new heavens and new earth. Plus you stated something along the lines that since Christians have everything now they shouldn't be looking forward to the future for anything. I certainly think these views place one within the Preterist view and sphere.

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 19:22

We are in the last days, docs. When the last days or "thousand years", (figurative speech for completion, totality, fulfillment) is over, and Christ finally appears in the clouds, IT'S TOO LATE TO BELIEVE IN HIM. Rev. 22:11,12 says that before He comes in the clouds, all decisions have already been made. Jesus said it will be like Noah's day (Mat. 24:37-39). In Noah's day the door of the ark closed before the flood came (Gen. 7:16). When the flood came, it was too late. To save all Jews AT THE SECOND COMING would be like saving all those outside the ark WHEN THE RAIN STARTED FALLING.

Re: , on: 2016/4/22 23:09

Amen, Julius
Z

Re: Previous views - posted by docs (), on: 2016/4/23 10:31

/We are in the last days, docs./

Well okay, but I'm pretty sure you fairly recently shared that you believe the last days ended in 70 AD and we are presently living in the new covenant new heavens and new earth. It's in the reply you made to the link savannah made to recommend the Preterist teacher David Curtis. But where that post and thread is I can't remember.

So I'm not sure why you really believe on the last days because of the past things you said regarding it only to say something different now. If I'm wrong and my memory is faulty I would gladly stand corrected.

But no problem, I just remain confused.

Peace

Re: , on: 2016/4/23 10:33

I could not have shared that because I don't believe it. Can you provide the quote? If I can see the context, maybe I can clear it up for you.