

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Make it simple****Make it simple - posted by jcheinrichs, on: 2006/1/25 12:18**

Remember that Revelation was written to an uneducated people. Generally peasants and slaves, it was written for common man...not meant to be complicated. Everything should be taken literally unless it specifically says not to (and it does a few times).

Re: Make it simple - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2006/1/25 14:01

Welcome to Sl jcheinrichs, if you would, please take the time to give us an introduction of yourself in the (<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewforum.php?forum13&2269>) Welcome & Intro forum.

Concerning your post here, I'm curious how you came to the conclusion that the seven churches were uneducated. Also, I'm wondering how the notion that they were peasants and slaves fits in with this verse concerning the Laodicean church ?

because thou sayest--I am rich, and have grown rich, and have need of nothing, and hast not known that thou art the wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked,(Rev 3:17)

In Christ,

Ron

Re: Make it simple, on: 2006/1/25 14:36

Welcome jcheinrichs.

Hope you'll enjoy posting more here and benefit in some way. I don't know what your views are on the Revelation but I know what you are saying.

You'll definitely benefit from reading all the Classic Authors offered on the Main Site.

I understand what you are saying and yes, the whole N.T. was written that way ... in the Koine Greek (the "street language" of that day) instead of the higher dialect, Hellenistic.

I'm not into anything but "simple" anymore also.

After 30 years of hanging with folks who love deep debate, the Lord showed me the same thing ... "Come unto Me as a little child" ... so that must mean a little child can understand the N.T.. I Do believe that. Besides Jn. 16:13 added.

The "you say you are rich", does not have to be financially (and more than likely isn't, for the most part) ... but in these last days ... I also see where there are large numbers who believe they "have it" spiritually or because of the 'Mega-size' of their Church, but in "spiritual reality", they have nothing, they are "blind".

Sort of like, also ... "all talk and no action", where the "blindness" would come in. Why would ya put eye salve into a rich person's eyes ?

They seem to be spiritually blind, if we look at the whole of the warning, etc. to them.

Blessed are the Poor in spirit.

Anyhow ... Welcome and Enjoy the Classics offered here.

Re: Make it simple - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/26 4:30

jcheinrichs'

Quote:
-----Remember that Revelation was written to an uneducated people. Generally peasants and slaves, it was written for common man...not meant to be complicated. Everything should be taken literally unless it specifically says not to (and it does a few times).

This sounds like a good idea except for the fact that the beginning of revelation says this is not the way to interpret the book. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John:" (Rev. 1:1, KJVS)...where the word 'sign-ify' is a brilliant translation of the Greek word 'sēmainō' which literally means to 'communicate by signs'. In other words the opening words of the Revelation tell us that this book is full of 'non-literal' information.

Ask yourself the question...

- Do I believe that Christ is literally holding seven stars?
- Do I believe that there are literally seven spirits before his throne?
- Do I believe that there is a literal lamb with seven literal eyes and seven literal horns?
- Do I believe in a literal beast which rises from the ocean?
- Do I believe in a literal 12000 from every tribe of Israel with Dan omitted?

I will be interested to hear your answers. :-)

Re:, on: 2006/1/27 2:59

Awww Ron, already ? on the poor new guy/gal's first post ?

I wanted to hear his/her view on eschatology first.

I thought we're supposed to say 'Welcome' first and then nail their posts. :lol:

Oh well, Hope they come back, cuz now you and I are both made curious about this poor new posters views.

Come on back to see jcheinrichs', that you're not mad at us.

God Bless all too.

John 16:13

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/28 12:12

Quote:
-----Come unto Me as a little child" ... so that must mean a little child can understand the N.T.. I Do believe that.

I don't believe that. The New Testament is deep, It is often complex, It is full of many things which as Peter says, "Are hard to understand which the unlearned twist as they do the rest of scripture.

But the point of coming to the Lord as a "Little child" is to come not with a simplistic view, but to come simply to receive from Him what we have no capacity in and of ourselves to obtain.

To understand the New Testament requires the very Spirit who inspired them. Our attitude should be as a little child toward the Lord in crying to Him to open up His Word, "that the eyes of our hearts might be enlightened, that we might know what is the hope of His calling and what are the riches of the glory of His inheritance in the Saints and what is the surpassing greatness of His power toward us who believe."

To come to the Bible simply does not mean simplistically. It means with a simple heart attitude toward the Lord to open up His Word and to enable us to "comprehend with all the saints what is the length, breadth, height, and depth and to know the knowledge surpassing Love of Christ."

A child like attitude comes to the Bible and cries, "Lord, I don't understand, I don't see this. Lord, show me. Enlighten me, enable me to see it".

"The soulish man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God for they are foolishness to him, neither can he know them because they are discerned spiritually"

A little child cannot understand the Bible. But a new born babe in Christ who has been regenerated and indwelt by the Spirit can.

To reduce the Bible to the level of children is to rob it of its depth, its intrinsic meaning, and its genuine complexity.

A child can understand "God made everything and loves us." But a child cannot understand creation, the fall, the Old Testament types, shadows, figures, and significance. A Child cannot understand redemption, sanctification, regeneration, and God's eternal Purpose. A child cannot understand incarnation, human living, suffering, death and resurrection in its intrinsic meaning. A child cannot understand the Hidden Manna in the Golden Pot in the Ark in the Holy of Holies. We need the Spirit for this.

It is the fallacy of many modern translations who believe if they can just make the language simple enough then people can understand it. But they cut off the fine edges, lose the significance and depth of meaning and fail to recognize that no matter how much you dumb down the Bible, it requires the Spirit's enlightenment to understand it and that a babe with the Spirit can understand complex things and enter into its depths.

In the end we all must come as a little child confessing that unless the Lord show us, we have no ability to understand. No matter our training, our degrees, our standing among men, we all must receive from the Lord.

But to come simplistically believing that "I can understand it because it is simple" is to take the opposite position and to assert our ability to know and comprehend the Bible without the Lord. It is to reduce the revelation of the Bible to our level and to deny the need for the Spirit's enlightenment by grace to bring us into its wonders and depths.

Graftedbranch

a funny comment - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 13:47

Quote:

-----I thought we're supposed to say 'Welcome' first and then nail their posts.

MeAgain, you made me chuckle!
Diane

Re:, on: 2006/1/28 15:36

Graftedbranc, Hi !

Can a little child claim this Scripture verse and be used of God to speak or learn ?

Joh 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into All truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.

Looking forward to your answer.

Happy Hugs for everyone. And hopefully more chuckles too :-D .

A merry heart maketh good like a medicine, and I sure need some 'medicating' :-P .

8-)

Re: C - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/28 15:43

Quote:

-----Can a little child claim this Scripture verse and be used of God to speak or learn ?

A little child who is regenerated and has the Spirit within him can claim anything. The issue is not age but redemption and regeneration.

When He the Spirit of Truth comes" refers to regeneration and the indwelling Spirit.

Can a little child be regenerated? Of course. There is no age limit.

But the issue is not age but our condition and standing and whether or not we are regenerated.

The issue is that the Bible is not simple but complex and deep. And only by the Spirit can we enter into it's meaning.

Surely the Lord gives His revelation according to our capacity. And an 8 year old will not be receiving revelation on many things. But the Lord Himself at age 12 sat among the scholars and teachers in the Temple and amazed them by his wisdom and understanding.

If it were simple, there would have been no amazement. If by nature a child could understand it, then it would be nothing amazing about the Lord Jesus expounding the scriptures among the scribes and priests.

The Bible has milk for the "babes in Christ" but it also has solid food for those who are mature. To reduce everything to the level of milk is to rob us of the solid food.

Graftedbranch

Re: Also, on: 2006/1/28 15:52

I've seen that people frequently quote Peter's comments about Paul's "teachings".

If you read 2 Peter 3, the 'Whole' Chapter CLOSELY, you'll see that Peter is talking about Eschatology and is saying that folks were even messing with Paul's teaching on Eschatology ... (vs 16 "speaking in them of these things")

Saying in the Greek that they .. "the 'unstable' .. "twist or pervert" .. unto their own destruction"

The Lord's definition of coming to Him as a little child wouldn't "do" what Peter says folks "do to the Scriptures".

A little child sits at the Feet of their Father, not having their own "ideas on things" and just listens as they read together.

And if they're stumped on something, they Ask the Father, what does this mean ?

If "brains" were needed, then you've cut off a 40 year old retarded man or woman.

It's "brains" that "wrest" the Scriptures, more times than not.

I gotta go now, it's Recess time, the bell rang and we got a new set of swings outside for me to play on.
Bye Bye for now :-D

Edited to add, you said ""Surely the Lord gives His revelation according to our capacity. And an 8 year old will not be receiving revelation on many things.""

Oh my, where do these thoughts come from.

I'm sorry friend, but "consecration" is what He's looking for, nothing more, to fulfill John 16:13

Samuel was how old ? And that was before what Christ has provided us by His Spirit alone.

God BLESS !!!

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 16:20

Quote:

-----A little child sits at the Feet of their Father, not having their own "ideas on things" and just listens as they read together.

Brother, I believe if you read everything previous it would be obvious that what was intended is this very thing.

A little child cries out to his Father to explain things to him. And as believers we as little children cry out to the Lord to explain these things to us.

They are not simple things. But with the Lord's unveiling we can see them. It does not require great intellect. It requires spiritual understanding.

Whether the context of Peter's words is eschatology or not, it is in fact the scriptures. And the beginning of this discussion was on the Book of Revelation which is eschatology in its finest.

And the point which was being made was that we must approach the Book of revelation in a simplistic way. But it is not a simple book and it cannot be understood by taking a simplistic "wooden literalism".

It is a book of signs with significance which reaches back to Genesis and the Prophets and requires to be accurate at least some understanding of Daniel and many other books including Leviticus.

The understanding of the book of Revelation requires first the Spirit, and along with the Spirit some diligent searching and study to acquire an understanding of the things signified.

Graftedbranch

Re:, on: 2006/1/28 17:43

Imagine that, this person jcheinrichs, posts one post on here and we're on page 2 already. :-?

Graftedbranch, You and I half agree with each other and that's good in my sight.

Your one post leaned more toward the work of the Spirit and this last sentence a combo .. but I still have to ask ... IF, just IF, for any reason under the sun that we can come up with, a person is "unable" to, as you say ... ""diligently search and study to acquire an understanding of the things signified.""

... then How would John 16:13 apply to them ? ...

Say, if they are in China, and the most that has been smuggled to them, is Parts of this book or that (if they are fortunate) ?

Would their lack of having the Whole Book, which is needed to search and study, cause them to not be able to "count (decipher/compute) the number of the beast", and would thus be 'deceived' by him or take the 'mark', because they for whatever reason did not have the whole Bible in front of them or haven't been saved long enough to 'study', before the real hard parts of the end times begin ?

Joh 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into ALL truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.

I am totally with you on, 'Study' to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

Eschatology has been my utmost favorite study for 30 years. I "bug folks" with it, Not Intentionally ... and intensive Study was part of how I draw my conclusions a large part but it was the Holy Spirit that put the zeal into me to keep on a certain trail or path with it, to come to any conclusions on Eschatology.

I just don't want anyone else out there to feel, that because they are young, mentally disabled, in a third world country, or what have you ,, that the Lord Himself, through His Holy Spirit, will not guide them into ALL truth and EVEN show the m things to come ... depending on or based on, their consecration/devotion to Him and 'His' Truth, only.

jcheinrichs, needs to come back and explain his post ... I do agree that he/she needs to do that, but at the same time ... as this has progressed to where it is ... I think our minds need to be globally inclusive, and considerate of differing mental capacities, when we talk about "study" and The Revelation or revelations of any of God's truths.

There is some alluding to/in Daniel, that what was "sealed" Will Be opened for the elect's understanding when the times come.

I also bank on that and have experienced that, as things are being unveiled, with the who's who etc. of the last times.

And, in the meantime, till it is no longer possible to, I study and then after my Bible is removed from my hands, I'll continue to trust John 16:13.

Lord Bless and I really do appreciate you brother or sister.

Love, Annie

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/28 18:15

Quote:

-----Say, if they are in China, and the most that has been smuggled to them, is Parts of this book or that (if they are fortunate) ?

In the end we have to come back to the sovereignty of God. There was a period in history for 1000 years or so when the scriptures were denied to the common man. We refer to this period as "the dark ages" and dark it was.

But at a point in time God brought in the Light through primarily one man, Martin Luther who stood against the traditions of Rome and brought in the Light of Salvation by Grace through faith and brought the Light of the Scriptures to the common man.

My son is a master of the hypothetical. Whatever you tell him, he will quickly come up with some hypothetical situation where what is said would not apply.

But God is sovereign and also just and will not hold us accountable to light which we don't have.

But we have the Light. We have the full revelation of the Truth in the scriptures and we live in an age when they are read

ily available to us and therefore we have more responsibility. To whom much is given, much is required.

God has a goal and an economy which is to produce the Body of Christ. And He has given us the Spirit and the Word as our means.

We can spend our days in speculating on what if and what about them or those people who haven't heard or don't have a bible or are under communist rule or in prison. But we have and we are responsible to God for what we have and what is given.

God is sovereign and God has His elect. And He brings the gospel to them and they believe into Him and He gives Light and Life and His Word. And if we stand and say, what about, what about, He may just pass us by and go to someone else.

I might add that the church in China is strong and flourishing and they welcome and relish any portion of the Bible or ministry they can get their hands on.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 18:51

Quote:
-----Edited to add, you said ""Surely the Lord gives His revelation according to our capacity. And an 8 year old will not be receiving revelation on many things.""

You must know some 8 year olds I don't. But few I have known can sit and discuss the "deep things of God". Most can't sit and discuss anything for more than 2 or three minutes.

What is this? God is after consecration, but consecration based in revelation. Cain had consecration but Abel had revelation.

Growth in Life and depth of understanding comes through many years of dealings with God and Light in the scriptures. We can be born of God in an instant but to be matured in Life requires day by day of contacting the Lord, calling on Him, feeding on Him in His word and the experiences of the Cross in our day to day living.

We can consecrate ourselves but on what basis? Unless we have the revelation of the truth, unless we see our union with Christ in His death and resurrection. Unless we have the knowledge that "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit" and know that He is in us and we are in Him. What is our consecration? A commitment to do what we think is right? Unless we are renewed in our concepts we will serve God not according to His will but according to our natural concepts of right and wrong.

Graftedbranch

Re:, on: 2006/1/28 18:53

Quote:

Graftedbranch wrote:

Quote:
-----Say, if they are in China, and the most that has been smuggled to them, is Parts of this book or that (if they are fortunate) ?

I might add that the church in China is strong and flourishing and they welcome and relish any portion of the Bible or ministry they can get their hands on

Graftedbranch

May it be so for us also, 'before' persecution comes.

And my "hypothetical" is more prevalent than you may be considering at the moment GB.

God richly Bless you.
Annie

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/29 11:02

Quote:

-----And my "hypothetical" is more prevalent than you may be considering at the moment GB.

:)

I am just having a difficult time getting hold of the rationale behind this. It seems as if the argument is that because everyone does not have a Bible, then the Bible is not necessary.

We might as well say that because everyone on the planet has not heard the gospel, then the gospel must not be necessary so why waste our time in missionary activity and preaching the gospel to the ends of the earth.

The Gospel is necessary for salvation and the Bible is necessary for growth in Life. And to those who are not so privileged to have access to Bibles are at a disadvantage, but God is still faithful and gives them grace and they may enjoy more of the Lord than those who have shelves full of Bibles. But this does not invalidate the need for the Bible but rather it only shows God is faithful and meets us according to our need. But to say because of this that the Bible is not so necessary is to tempt the Lord and despise His provision.

Watchman Nee spent the last 20 years of his life in a Chinese Prison and was not allowed a Bible and not even allowed to pray outwardly. But the Word of Christ dwelt in him richly and He enjoyed the Lord Jesus as grace and his joy for 20 years. And all He had was the scripture in his memory to use as fuel for prayer and communion with Christ.

Because some are imprisoned and cannot have contact with other members of the body of Christ shall we also conclude we don't need the body? We don't need to meet with the Church? We have no need for the fellowship of the Saints? This too would be preposterous.

Graftedbranch

Re:, on: 2006/1/29 12:50

Gb. You've gone too far now with your judgments.

You have totally twisted my words and it's becoming tiring and disturbing ... have you nothing better to do with your God Given Time ?

Anyone who knows me, knows I push "STUDY" more than anything and had a thread here, now gone with the older one s, called "Teach a man to fish and he'll eat forever" or "A hunger for the Word".

Your assertions are getting extremely ridiculous now and had nothing to do with what I had said.

You seem to be just in the mood to quarrel with someone. To just circle the forum, looking for who to correct.

No matter what is said at this point, you take it to extremes and accusations of things that have never entered my mind.

You don't know me, others here do, as GrannieAnnie, and my hunger and devotion to His Word is all I've lived for or has kept me 'alive' for 30 yr.s.

You seem to like debate just for the sake of debate ... and I see that as not healthy. And your 2 cents bundles are piling up in ways they shouldn't.

How easy to sit behind a computer and preach to us instead of get out there and work for Him, yet not talk about it, or blow trumpets about our works.

Have a fun day GB. I'm tired now.
Annie

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/29 14:11

Quote:
-----You have totally twisted my words and it's becoming tiring and disturbing ... have you nothing better to do with your God Given Time ?

I appologize Annie.

I got this thread confused with another one "Can the teachings of Jesus be compared to the writings of Paul"

I was not responding to anything you said but to JFEddgar's posts on the other thread. He was contending that the Bible was not necessary. I got confused and thought your comments were with regard to the other thread and I was refering back to what I thought was the original statements which were by JFEddgar.

I thought our conversation had come out of that one. It is my mistake. Sorry if I misunderstood you. YOu will notice I said , "It seems as if the argument is that because everyone does not have a Bible, then the bible is not necessary."

The argument I was refering to was the one originally posted in the other thread.

Graftedbranch

Re:, on: 2006/1/29 17:52

No problem GB.

I should come over to that thread and post against that belief also then :-).

Just that Title alone scared me Bro, so I've stayed off of it completely so far.

I'm glad it was just a mistaken identity of postings, and that I can surely understand and empathise with.

Peace brother.

Love.

Annie

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/30 7:33

Quote:

-----Joh 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into All truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come.

If we put this passage into its original context "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you. A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father." (John 16:12-16, KJVS) It becomes apparent that this word was spoken expressly to the apostles and is part of their unique commission and enabling. It is part of a package of promises with similar purpose... "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John 14:26; 15:15, KJVS) John 14-16 are the same discourse and the themes carry through the three chapters. "guiding, teaching, and reminding" of all things are part of Christ's unique authorization of the Apostles.

The fulfillment of this promise begins in "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John 20:21-23, KJVS) Luke does not record the exact words of John but describes the same resurrection meeting "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures," (Luke 24:45, KJVS) This unique "breathing upon them" and the words "receive the Holy Spirit" (receive now; aorist imperative) are not to be confused with the Spirit's coming 'into' all the believers at Pentecost.

The promise 'he shall teach you all things' has been a precious promise to many an individual but that should not hide from us the fact that these words had a unique audience and a unique application. God has certainly promised to guide us and to speak to us but his guidance and his speaking do not have the special authority of the acts and words of the Apostles; God's words to 'me' must never be given the status of 'inspiration' that we accord to the scriptures and our doctrines must be based upon the scripture not our personal revelations.

Re:, on: 2006/1/30 12:22

Not that it matters a hill of beans to you or anyone else Ron, but I don't agree with you on this one, except for the last sentence. That last sentence is good.

I don't think there are special graces that only the Apostles had, (except for your last sentence), that we have not also been promised by Jesus. That idea sounds a little Catholic to me.

The Spirit of Truth's job is the same with ALL of His children and His works 'through us' are the same (only we limit that) and these signs shall accompany "them who believe in MY Name" "the works that I do, ye shall" etc. etc. Only our "self" consciousness/centeredness keeps us from demonstrating the life of Christ as He would have His Life manifested on earth through us. And His "Truth" preached, being from His Spirit of Truth. He 'wants' The Whole of Truth to

o be known and preached in the world ... so He would not withhold what He is from us, He can't withhold what He is from us ... He IS The Truth.

We can't write one Chapter into the Bible, but we can believe the 'Spirit of Truth' will do His Work in leading us into all truth and even show us things to come ... IF our "wills" (preconceived notions) allow. Only 'we' hinder what all that He wants us to be or have in Him or how we're used of Him.

I appreciate many of your works, quite a bit and have grown to respect you because of the Godhead thread, as in All to His Glory.
Thanks.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/31 0:35

bro Ron

you wrote

Quote:

-----Ask yourself the question...

Do I believe that Christ is literally holding seven stars?

Do I believe that there are literally seven spirits before his throne?

Do I believe that there is a literal lamb with seven literal eyes and seven literal horns?

Do I believe in a literal beast which rises from the ocean?

Do I believe in a literal 12000 from every tribe of Israel with Dan omitted?

John was in the Spirit when he was shown these things right? so he saw them as they were in fact in the Spirit. we may not see them in the natural but in the Spirit, Christ was/is holding the seven stars in His hand, and walking among the 7 candlesticks, the beast does come out of the sea etc. now these things may not appear in the natural as they do in the Spirit but the Revelation is indeed literal in the Spirit.

why would the Lord say He called out 12000 from each tribe to total 144000 if that wasn't the number He really meant? :-?

in the numbering is Jacob's 12 sons in genesis 49 these are the names mentioned: reuben, simeon, levi, judah, zebulun, issachar, dan, gad, naphtali, joseph and benjamin and asher. this is when jacob says his last words to them all before he dies. before that jacob blesses manasseh and ephraim. how is it then that in numbers chapters 1 and 7 at the census of the children of israel and the presentation of the offerings to the Lord of the leaders of the tribes, joseph and benjamin's names do not appear but instead manasseh and ephraim appear? when the land is divided up, all the names appear except for joseph.

i don't know about you bro Ron but i'm lost as to why the Lord would have it so, i've not asked Him about it though.

what is it to us if He should decide not to list the names of benjamin and joseph at the census (He did literally do this), or the name of joseph at the division of the land and then not list dan in revelation 7? :-?

perhaps you can help me figure that one out :-? :-?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/31 4:35

Ironman

Quote:

-----John was in the Spirit when he was shown these things right? so he saw them as they were in fact in the Spirit. we may not see them in the natural but in the Spirit, Christ was/is holding the seven stars in His hand, and walking among the 7 candlesticks, the beast does come out of the sea etc. now these things may not appear in the natural as they do in the Spirit but the Revelation is indeed literal in the Spirit.

I may get into trouble for this... oftentimes the words of scripture are not aimed at our head but at our hearts. This is why I so often say 'Bible words don't have definitions, they have histories'. We are not intended to construct a mental picture of the descriptions found in the Revelation but we are to react to them at the level of our inner consciousness. You say '

John saw them as they were in the Spirit'; certainly he did, but he saw them 'as they were, in the Spirit' in the specific word-pictures which were best designed to speak to those who needed to hear. Notice with the letters to the 7 churches how each time the 'writer' introduces himself differently:

Ephesus: "Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus write; These things saith he that holdeth the seven stars in his right hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks; "

Smyrna: "And unto the angel of the church in Smyrna write; These things saith the first and the last, which was dead, and is alive; "

Thyatira: "Rev. 2:18 (KJVS) And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira write; These things saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet are like fine brass; "

Sardis: "Rev. 3:1 (KJVS) And unto the angel of the church in Sardis write; These things saith he that hath the seven Spirits of God, and the seven stars; I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead."

Philadelphia: "Rev. 3:7 (KJVS) And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth; "

Laodicea: "Rev. 3:14 (KJVS) And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God; "Of course, He is all of these things but He "speaks to our condition" as the Quakers used to say. That means he doesn't just lob words into space but that He applies them particularly to where we are. My old Bible College principal used to say that 'Jesus stood for 'Just Exactly Suits Us Sinners'. He just Exactly Suits Us Saints' too. He reveals Himself in unique roles at unique times.

Words evoke memories and emotions and the book of the Revelation was not written to people 'with time on their hands and a peculiar aptitude for solving puzzles' but to a panting, huddling flock who were at risk of their lives. They did not 'need' a timetable of events for the distant future but a 'word in season' which would touch them deeply and evoke memories of God's faithfulness and power. This would be far too simplistic but I can sum up the book of the Revelation in a single six single-syllable word sentence... **"God is still on the throne"**. The 'sign-language' of the Revelation is designed to communicate that truth again and again and again. (The word 'throne/thrones' permeates the whole book. Rev. 1:4; 3:21; 4:2-6,9-10; 5:1,6-7,11,13; 6:16; 7:9-11,15,17; 8:3; 12:5; 14:3,5; 16:17; 19:4-5; 20:4,11; 21:5; 22:1,3. In fact, it uses the word 'throne/s' more than twice as frequently as any other book in the Bible)

Your phrase 'literal in the Spirit' might be interpreted to mean 'there are literally seven Spirits before the throne, but the word 'seven' is sign-language for 'completeness' in the Revelation; it is used constantly...Rev. 1:4,11-13,16,20-2:1; 3:1; 4:5; 5:1,5-6; 8:2,6; 10:3-4; 11:13; 12:3; 13:1; 15:1,6-16:1; 17:1,3,7,9-11; 21:9. Do I think this book is designed just for 'seven churches' No. Do I think He only hold 'seven' churches in his right hand. No. Do I think there is actually a 'lamb with seven horns and seven eyes'? No. Do I believe in a literal 'great red dragon having seven heads and seven crowns'? No. Do I believe in the truth which these images stir in my heart? Passionately!

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/31 8:26

Ron:

I believe you are correct in asserting the particular context of the promises mentioned in John. That is the promise to the disciples that the comforter would, "bring to their remembrance all things which He had said. And thus we have the gospels, etc.

But what was specific to them also finds a general application as well. These things are found and repeated and applied to all the saints in the epistles.

John tells us in 1 John "you have no need that anyone should teach you but you have an anointing... Speaking of the Anointing Spirit.

Paul prays that "they would be given a Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him, the eye of their hearts being enlightened, etc.

Paul prayed that they be strengthened by His Spirit into the inner man... That they may be made strong to comprehend and to know the knowledge surpassing love of Christ.

Every experience of Christ Paul had He labored that those in his care would enter into the same as well. And by experience of Christ I don't mean particular outward manifestations such as Christ appearing to Him from the heavens but the experiences of Christ as their indwelling Life and all sufficient supply. All of Paul's outward experience were to lead Him into the inward reality of Christ. And this is the burden of all the epistles.

Speaking of many of these things in John 17 the Lord said, "Father, I pray not for these alone, but also for all those who shall believe into me through their word, that They may be One..."

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/1/31 9:15

Quote:
-----Do I think this book is designed just for 'seven churches' No. Do I think He only hold 'seven' churches in his right hand. No. Do I think there is actually a 'lamb with seven horns and seven eyes'? No. Do I believe in a literal 'great red dragon having seven heads and seven crowns'? No. Do I believe in the truth which these images stir in my heart? Passionately!

Quote:
-----This is why I so often say 'Bible words don't have definitions, they have histories'.

Really scrambling to find any word at the moment.
Thank you Ron.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/31 9:34

Quote:
-----Really scrambling to find any word at the moment.

Why can we not just take the words of John in the opening of Revelation?

Rev. 1:1 "The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave to Him to show to His slaves the things which must quickly take place; and He made it known by signs.."

We are told by John that these things are communicated by signs.

I like the footnote in the Rcv:

"The revelation of this book is composed mainly of signs, i.e., symbols with spiritual significance, such as the seven lampstands, signifying the churches; the seven stars, signifying the messengers of the churches, etc. Even the New Jerusalem is a sign, signifying the ultimate consummation of God's economy. This book, then is a book of signs through which the revelation is made known to us."

If we let scripture interpret scripture, we will be spared much confusion.

If we approach the book in the way it is intended, then our question will be, "Lord, what do these signs signify?" In this way the book will be opened up to us.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/31 10:55

Graftedbranch's

Quote:
-----I bleive you are correct in asserting the particular context of the promises mentioned in John. That is the promise to the diciples that the comforter would, "bring to their remembrance all things which He had said. And thus we have the gospels, etc.

But what was specific to them also finds a general application as well. These things are found and repeated and applied to all the saints in the epistles. ??John tells us in 1 JOhn "you have no need that anyone should teach you but you have an anointing... Speaking of the Anointing Spirit.

I think the setting of the verses we are using makes it crystal clear. "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

(John 14:25-26, KJVS) This is a very specific statement to bring to the remembrance of the disciples the things that Christ has specifically said to them. I think it is important to get the sense of the context earlier context too. "Jesus answered him, Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice. Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you."

(John 13:38-14:2, KJVS) I really don't know how you folk not using the KJV will ever see these kinds of things ;-) but notice the switch from the singular 'thou' to the plural 'you'. He is not now speaking to the disciples as individuals but the group. He continues in this use of the plural right through this passage with the exception of his words to Philip where he reverts to 'thou' then switching back to 'you' "Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believe thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works."

(John 14:9-10, KJVS) It is this sense of the body of his disciples which prevails through this section culminating in the plurals... "These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."

(John 14:25-26, KJVS) It is the body of the apostles/disciples which is in view at this point and I think we do well to notice that this was not a personal promise to an individual but a corporate promise to a group of men.

It is true that there are measures in which we may apply these words to our own comfort but the main purpose of them here is to authenticate the later writings of the apostles and those who were endorsed by them. The subsequent section in John 16 follows the same pattern. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come."

(John 16:12-13, KJVS) This is another verse which may be received as a personal encouragement but the thrust of the verse is that the 'now' of their current experience would have to be transformed by the coming of the Spirit. The reasons why they could not 'bear' what he wanted to say to them were many I suspect, but it is noteworthy that again we are in the territory of the plurals, 'you'.

This theme of collective promise and responsibility is seen in the other verse you quoted.

Quote:
-----John tells us in 1 JOhn "you have no need that anyone should teach you but you have an anointing... Speaking of the Anointing Spirit.

In 2 and 3 John we have the singulars 'thee' and 'thou' but not in 1 John. Here it is not said that 'thou hast an anointing' but that 'ye have an anointing'. Neither does it say 'you have anointings'. There is safety in the multitude of counsellors. This is why we need to take notice of the whole church of Christ worldwide and down the centuries. This why we need to read Calvin and Fox and Wesley. In the specifics I doubt that anyone would want to say that, as individuals, any of these men were 'infallible'. They most certainly had need for 'teachers' as do we all but the teachers are part of the body which has received 'the anointing'. It is also important to note that, as far as I am aware, nowhere does the New Testament refer to an individual 'anointing'. The oil from our great Melchizedekian high-priest has flowed from the head to the body; there is only one anointing and all his children share in it.

Another famous verse used to support the idea of 'infallible' individuals is Paul's statement "but we have the mind of Christ". Notice, again however that he does not say 'I have the mind of Christ' (1 Cor 2:16) God's guidance and blessing upon our lives and his personal words to our hearts are very precious blessings but these promises in the John 14-16 discourse are laying the foundation for the canon of scripture and we must not mistake their purpose.

The importance of the 'faithful carriers' of the truth is found again in Christ's prayer in John 17. Where prayer is made for just two kinds of people: "I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine."

(John 17:9, KJVS)

"Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;"

(John 17:20, KJVS) Apparently Christ has only prayed for those whose faith is based on the words of his apostles. My personal revelations, right or wrong, have no such prayer backing.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/31 11:05

Ironman's

Quote:

-----why would the Lord say He called out 12000 from each tribe to total 144000 if that wasn't the number He really meant?

This is a really important question and the answer has to do with the whole philosophy of how we interpret the literally genre known as 'apocalyptic'. There are different kinds of writings in the scripture; narrative (story line), poetic, didactic (teaching), apocalyptic. The word 'revelation' in Greek is "apokalupsis" which simply means an 'taking off the cover'. Bible students interpret the poet genre is a less literal sense eg Psalms. 98:8 (KJVS) Let the floods clap their hands: let the hills be joyful together

Is. 55:12 (KJVS) For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. I don't think I have ever met anyone who thought that Psalm 98 that the 'floods' have hands or that they can clap them. We might expect the poetic genre in the Psalms but it is clear that the prophet Isaiah is employing the same kind of genre in the predictions of the future. Why would be interpret Psalm 99 figuratively but Isaiah literally?

We have to keep our eyes open because Isaiah's prophecies do contain 'literal predictions' and the Psalms, even though being of the poetic genre, also contain literal statements. We have moved into the realm of interpretation of the scriptures. We may have different brethren who are equally strong on the 'inspiration' of the scripture but who differ in the way they interpret that scripture. eg... "Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret? I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied: for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret, that the church may receive edifying. Wherefore let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue pray that he may interpret. If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret."

(1Cor. 12:30; 14:5,13,27, KJVS)...the word 'interpret' here obviously means to give the sense of what was spoken in an 'unknown language'. But the word is also used in "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

(Luke 24:27, KJVS)

and some versions will use the word 'interpret' here. "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself."

(Luke 24:27, ASV) Now it is obvious that in Luke's gospel he is not using the word in the sense of 'translating' from one language into another but Christ is 'giving the sense' of what those ancient scriptures had said. The word translated 'interpret' in the above references is 'dihermeneuo'. We can see the word 'hermeneutic' here and 'hermeneutic's is the study of the way in which scripture is to be 'interpreted'.

One of our 'friends' here on SI occasionally accuses me of being a 'literalist'; he thinks I am too literal in my 'interpretation' of scripture. I have no doubt that there are folks here who don't think I am 'literalist' enough.:-) There is a general consensus on SI that the scriptures were verbally inspired and are without error but we also have some folks who do not believe that to be true. For most of us when difference emerge they are due to different principles of 'hermeneutics' (and so metimes to no hermeneutics at all!)

The question remains how do we 'hermeneut' (interpret) the apocalyptic genre? The is another equally important question 'were these 'revelations' given to provide a time-table for the future so that we would know what was going to happen? Here is an interesting verse relating to the purpose of prophecy: "Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he."

(John 13:19, KJVS) Apparently some future predictions are given to that when they are fulfilled we shall believe in Christ's power and person. These 'predictions' were not given to warn or to prepare a schedule of future events but so that wh

en they were fulfilled we would know that these things had not taken God by surprise. It sounds to me as though that sense might play in the Revelation. These things are not given as predictions so that we could create our time-tables.

I need to get onto the 12000, so I will leave this here...

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/31 11:28

Quote:
-----It is also important to note that, as far as I am aware, nowhere does the New Testament refer to an individual 'anointing'. The oil from our great Melchizedekian high-priest has flowed from the head to the body; there is only one anointing and all his children share in it.

Amen brother, I believe you have the right sense here. There is only one Anointing and only One anointing Spirit. And we all share in this One anointing Spirit.

IT is obvious in the context of 1 John that He could not be implying that we as individuals have no need of any teaching from any other source as that would render even his own epistle irrelevant and unneeded.

IT would also undermine the need of any at any time to preach and teach and minister Christ at all. And those who take this verse to imply they can be a lone individual with no need of the Body of Christ are quite mistaken. And those who boast that "I only read the Bible and don't read anyone else" are setting aside the work of the Spirit in all of His Saints throughout church history who have been given Light in the Word for the whole Body to enjoy and profit from.

On the other hand this Anointing, while common to all is specifically known and enjoyed within the individual believer. If we have no participation in it as individuals, then there is no corporate participation either.

IT is as the Believers 'dwell together in unity" that the Anointing Spirit is poured down to the length of the garment.

And it is in the context of the body that we as individuals enjoy participation in this Anointing Spirit. but the anointing Spirit is not "in the room". He is not in the building. He is within us. He is in our individual regenerated spirit and corporately we enjoy Him as the anointing Spirit together in unity and the "one accord". The Spirit who is within me is the same Spirit in all the other members.

But what is meant then by, "you have no need that anyone should teach you?" Surely it does not mean that we have no need of teachers, but in the end, the Spirit is indeed our One Teacher. And He does so through the Body, through all His members who receive the Light from the Word and who in the gatherings of the Saints express what they receive in a corporate way.

But in the end, even if through the other members of the Body, It is the indwelling Spirit within us as individuals who witness to these things and brings their reality into our experience. And the Spirit within us reacts to those things which are taught or spoken which are not according to the truth and are not flowing from the Spirit.

A brother shares something with us and the Spirit in our spirit reacts and we cannot receive it. And another brother speaks and we are one with them and the Spirit says "Amen".

We may read a Christian book and read some things that sound good, but the Spirit within us says, no!. There is no life in it. There is something amiss. Yet another we may read and the Spirit within us says, "Amen". There is an agreement in our spirit and there is the testimony of the Spirit within us and it leads us to go to the scriptures and compare and search out and confirm.

In this way the Spirit in all things is our real and genuine Teacher. He is the One who enlightens us in His Word, He is the One who imparts Christ into us and leads us. And He is the One who guards us and keeps us. And if we are not living in our spirit and walking by the Spirit and minding the Spirit we will be easily led astray.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/31 11:55

Ironman's

Quote:

-----why would the Lord say He called out 12000 from each tribe to total 144000 if that wasn't the number He really meant?

We are working with symbolic numbers here. The whole people of the Old Covenant were 12 clans. The shewbread signified that the whole nation was given to God but in their individual significance. The number 12 seems to link with rule and government and 12 seems to take on the nature of 'the whole'. Consequently the number is always 12; the whole covenant people of God. The 12 clans originally included Levi but Levi was set apart for the service of God and then would have left 11, but the number is made up to 12 again because the clan of Joseph is sub-divided into Ephraim and Manasseh.

The clan of Benjamin was almost wiped out early in Israel's history and became almost indistinguishable from Judah, so the southern kingdom is referred to in scriptures as 'Judah' although it was actually 'Judah and Benjamin' but the number has to be kept to 12 so the constituent parts keep changing.

The original census in Numbers has Joseph, subdivided in Ephraim and Manasseh (Num 1:32), Benjamin is there (Num 1:36) but Levi is specifically excluded (Num 1:47), in all there are 12 clans. Numbers 7 has Ephraim (another name for the clan of Joseph) and Benjamin is there too (Num 7:60) The blessing of Gen 49 which is before the separation of Levi has just Joseph rather than his two sons of Ephraim and Manasseh.

Ezekiel, which is also apocalyptic has the clans back under their original names in Ezek 48 but has Joseph (reunited rather than Ephraim and Manasseh) and Levi is back in the list; the total is 12. Ezekiel has the whole 12 clans on the western side of Jordan rather than on both sides; is this literal or figurative?

The omission of Dan from the list in Revelation may give us a clue to the symbolism at work here. Dan was the clan who most quickly embraced idolatry and 'is not counted' among the Covenant people. Paris Reidhead's 'shekels and shirt' sermon is all about the tribe of Dan and their apostasy. See also 1Kings 12:29-30. For the omission of Dan from the Revelation list is a symbolic way of saying that 'apostates' are excluded from the covenant community.

This map will show the (<http://www.bible.ca/maps/maps-joshua-saul.htm>) the settlement of the 12 tribes.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/31 12:13

bro Ron

you wrote :

Quote:

-----I may get into trouble for this... oftentimes the words of scripture are not aimed at our head but at our hearts.

someone get a whip ready,Ron's acting bad! :-P

Quote:

-----Of course, He is all of these things but He "speaks to our condition" as the Quakers used to say. That means he doesn't just lob words into space but that He applies them particularly to where we are. My old Bible College principal used to say that 'Jesus stood for 'Just Exactly Suits Us Sinners'. He just Exactly Suits Us Saints' too. He reveals Himself in unique roles at unique times.

i agree bro, the 7 churches are representative of 7 different spiritual states. the way He introduces Himself to 7 churches is somehow related to how they will be dealt with if they need to repent (thought that was interesting)to the church at ephesus He said He was the one who walked among the 7 golden candlesticks and then says if they don't repent He will tak

e away their candlestick etc.

Quote:
-----Words evoke memories and emotions and the book of the Revelation was not written to people 'with time on their hands and a peculiar aptitude for solving puzzles' but to a panting, huddling flock who were at risk of their lives. They did not 'need' a timetable of events for the distant future but a 'word in season' which would touch them deeply and evoke memories of God's faithfulness and power. This would be far too simplistic but I can sum up the book of the Revelation in a single six single-syllable word sentence...

i see what you're saying here but my approach to all this is as bro graftedbranch said later on, something to the effect of in seeing all this (or in my case seeing it all literally) causes me to seek the Lord and say "Lord what does this all mean? ??" the 7 stars Christ is holding are the 7 candlesticks are the 7 churches so that's explained. isn't that the purpose of the Lord having this book written that way to evoke powerful memories of God's power and compel us to seek Him more earnestly? that's the effect it has on me so i'm not trying to solve the puzzle, just seeking the Lord to reveal to me it's meaning (at least as much as He would have me know)

bro Ron if i were as smart and learned as yourself i'd have asked you for the not so simplistic explanation :-P however being foolish and unlearned simple is good for me...simple is best lest my brain be overwhelmed :-?

Quote:
-----Your phrase 'literal in the Spirit' might be interpreted to mean 'there are literally seven Spirits before the throne, but the word 'seven' is sign-language for 'completeness' in the Revelation; it is used constantly...Rev. 1:4,11-13,16,20-2:1; 3:1; 4:5; 5:1,5-6; 8:2,6; 10:3-4; 11:13; 12:3; 13:1; 15:1,6-16:1; 17:1,3,7,9-11; 21:9. Do I think this book is designed just for 'seven churches' No. Do I think He only hold 'seven' churches in his right hand . No. Do I think there is actually a 'lamb with seven horns and seven eyes'? No. Do I believe in a literal 'great red dragon having seven heads and seven crowns'? No. Do I believe in the truth which these images stir in my heart? Passionately!

well if we've established that the 7 churches are representative of spiritual conditions then there are 7 different types of saints in these days. or at least that's how i see it. i see it has being 7 Spirits before the throne which are completeness. i guess we disagree on that part but like you i do believe the truth which those images stir in my heart as passionately as you do.

if i'm wrong about this i pray the Lord sets me straight to His glory and if you are then i pray the same. AMEN.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/31 12:27

bro Ron

Quote:
-----One of our 'friends' here on SI occasionally accuses me of being a 'literalist'; he thinks I am too literal in my 'interpretation' of scripture. I have no doubt that there

gasp NO, who would that be? :-P

Quote:
----- I have no doubt that there are folks here who don't think I am 'literalist' enough.

gasps again like who?? ;-)

Quote:
-----Apparently some future predictions are given to that when they are fulfilled we shall believe in Christ's power and person. These 'predictions' were not given to warn or to prepare a schedule of future events but so that when they were fulfilled we would know that these things had not taken God by surprise. It sounds to me as though that sense might play in the Revelation. These things are not given as predictions so that we could

create our time-tables.

God is still on the throne i assume? i feel that.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/31 14:00

bro Ron
ah you're a wealth of knowledge bro

Quote:
-----We are working with symbolic numbers here. The whole people of the Old Covenant were 12 clans. The shewbread signified that the whole nation was given to God but in their individual significance. The number 12 seems to link with rule and government and 12 seems to take on the nature of 'the whole'. Consequently the number is always 12; the whole covenant people of God. The 12 clans originally included Levi but Levi was set apart for the service of God and then would have left 11, but the number is made up to 12 again because the clan of Joseph is sub-divided into Ephraim and Manasseh.

the original 12 tribes minus levi's since they were to tend to the tabernacle. then add the divided tribe of Joseph. the Lord led me through that and brought this back to my remembrance through this discussion.

Quote:
-----The clan of Benjamin was almost wiped out early in Israel's history and became almost indistinguishable from Judah, so the southern kingdom is referred to in scriptures as 'Judah' although it was actually 'Judah and Benjamin' but the number has to be kept to 12 so the constituent parts keep changing.

then the nation of Israel fought against the tribe of Benjamin after that incident with the Levite's concubine in Judges 19. We'll have to look at Ezekiel 48 more closely though.

Quote:
-----The omission of Dan from the list in Revelation may give us a clue to the symbolism at work here. Dan was the clan who most quickly embraced idolatry and 'is not counted' among the Covenant people. Paris Reidhead's 'shekels and shirt' sermon is all about the tribe of Dan and their apostasy. See also 1 Kings 12:29-30. For the omission of Dan from the Revelation list is a symbolic way of saying that 'apostates' are excluded from the covenant community.

mmm didn't know about the tribe of Dan being the first to embrace idolatry...makes sense that such idolaters wouldn't be included among those in the covenant...thanks bro Ron!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/31 15:13

Ironman
The wise know how little they know, but the really wise know that they don't even know how little 'the little they know' really is. :-D

Just a couple of controversial contributions from Charles Spurgeon; A biblical preacher, he told his congregation, 'wants to have souls saved and Christians quickened and therefore he does not for ever pour out the vials, and blow the trumpets of prophecy. Some hearers are crazy after the mysteries of the future. Well, there are two or three brethren in London who are always trumpeting and vialing. Go and hear them if you want it, I have something else to do' (Vol. 21, 91).

Again, addressing the students at his college, he says:
'I am greedy after witnesses for the glorious gospel of the blessed God. O that Christ crucified were the universal burden of men of God. Your guess at the number of the beast, your Napoleonic speculations, your conjectures concerning a personal Antichrist—forgive me, I count them but mere bones for dogs; while men are dying and hell is filling, it seems to me the veriest drivel to be muttering about an Armageddon at Sebastopol, or Sadowa or Sedan, and peeping between

in the folded leaves of destiny to discover the fate of Germany. Blessed are they who read and hear the words of the prophecy of the Revelation, but the like blessing has evidently not fallen on those who pretend to expound it, for generation after generation of them have been proved to be in error by the mere lapse of time, and the present race will follow to the same inglorious sepulchre' (Lectures to my Students, First Series, 1887, 83).

'There is a whole Book of Revelation which I do not understand, but which I fully believe' (Vol. 45' 402), 'I scarcely consider myself qualified to explain any part of the Book of Revelation, and none of the expositions I have ever seen entice me to attempt the task, (Vol. 21, 313).

Only fools and madmen are positive in their interpretations of the Apocalypse' (The Sword and Trowel, 1867, p. 470).

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2006/1/31 15:20

Oh... That's about all I can say to those quote from Spurgeon.

I was thinking not too long ago... There has never been a revival birthed by prophecy teaching that I know of and yet we have SOOO much of it in this time. I don't think prophecy is worthless or you are a madman if you teach it but I do think I agree with Spurgeons heart in this matter... let's preach the Gospel to the lost.

Re:, on: 2006/1/31 16:32

Oh Lord, can it be just a coincidence, that I just came out of my quiet time and the Lord was showing me "The Mix" that is just now being birthed in the world of the Spiritual with the Scientific, etc and the complexities of it and the subtle deceitfulness of it, because it all sounds so right then to come here and once again find that almost 1/5th of the Bible AGAIN is being thrown out ... as in Eschatology.

I don't expect those of Spurgeon's time or any other time in mankind's history to see the urgency or "signs" that are now being "revealed" in these days, because that was not the case in their lifetimes as it is now ... but we are 'that' generation, that will see the fulfillment, and the "Strong Delusion" and if "Most" will be deceived and Fall Away from Truth ... then to throw it out for a lack of study or understanding or interest, is the most dangerous move a person of 'these days' can do.

Saving souls is #1, but without a firm foundation and "apokalupto" from the Holy Spirit on a daily basis of what is going on out there, in the setting up of this last stage of History, then we don't stand a chance. Rev 19:10 ... for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.

How much did Jesus warn us about the last days ?

He says twice, in Matt 24 and Mark 13, "I have told you "ALL" things" regarding the last days. Then there's Paul, Peter and Jude and John ... what do we do with them ?

Do we throw that much of just the N.T. away ?

Or the Spirit of prophecy's job, to keep us from "being deceived" in these days and those days yet to come, when the "spiritual" will be so demonically intertwined with the 'real', that only those who "have understanding" will be able to make it to the end.

Apply your heart to understanding, we're commanded, and all the more as we see that day approaching, we can add.

What was sealed at Daniel's time is now being revealed, chunk by chunk, but we don't care to "go there" with our thinking or studies.

It will mean the difference of whether we are given over to the strong delusion or not.

What more can I say ?

Only that we are 'commanded' to keep watch of these things.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/31 19:05

In case any should think Spurgeon was indifferent to eschatology.....from a letter from Spurgeon to the editor of Messia h's Herald, written in 1874:

Å'The more I read the Scriptures as to the future, the less I am able to dogmatise. I see conversion of the world, and the personal pre-millennial reign, and the sudden coming, and the judgment, and several other grand points; but I cannot put them into order, nor has anyone else done so yet. I believe every prophetic work I have ever seen (and I have read very many) to be wrong in some points. I feel more at home in preaching Christ crucified than upon any other theme, and I do believe He will draw all men unto HimÅ' (Pike, vol. 5, 133).

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/1/31 19:57

bro Ron

Quote:
-----The wise know how little they know, but the really wise know that they don't even know how little 'the little they know' really is.

yes indeed :smart:

i think the # priority is the preaching of the gospel as sis annie said and at the same time we must not be ignorant of what's going on. there is a balance which must be maintained and each one of us ought to seek the Lord earnestly lest we go off into left field somewhere.

Re:, on: 2006/1/31 20:42

I like what the ECFs said about Eschatology.

Should I post it ?

But what I'd really like to know is, where is the person who graced us with this thread to begin with :-x ? Ha.

I still say though Ron, that Jesus did rap it up pretty clearly in Matt 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21, if that's all ya had on hand to read.

Literally too. ;-)

Keep the Peace.

Annie

Re:, on: 2006/1/31 21:27

Oh Ron, just to show you how "distracted" I am ... I went off line to fill out some medical papers and it hit me ... I have one of Spurgeon's books on the Second Coming of Christ.

Just copy and paste this into Google ... Charles Spurgeon Second Coming of Christ.

You'll find he had a Lot to say about it.

Thanks

Annie

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/1 6:57

ironman's

Quote:
-----i think the # priority is the preaching of the gospel as sis annie said and at the same time we must not be ignorant of what's going on . there is a balance which must be maintained and each one of us ought to seek the Lord earnestly lest we go off into left field somewhere.

If I may quote Spurgeon again...

Quote:
-----Your guess at the number of the beast, your Napoleonic speculations, your conjectures concerning a personal Antichrist — forgive me, I count them but mere bones for dogs; while men are dying and hell is filling, it seems to me the veriest drivel to be muttering about an Armageddon at **Sebastopol**, or **Sadowa** or **Sedan**, and peeping between the folded leaves of destiny to discover the fate of Germany.

The reason I posted this is to remind us that godly men in every age have been quite convinced that they were living in 'the end of the age' and that the world events they saw around them were positive proof.

Spurgeon is referring to

SIEGE OF SEBASTOPOL (SEVASTOPOL) 1854 - 1855

After the British Victory at The Battle of Alma, the British and French force advanced onto Sebastopol. The Russian Fortress naval base was laid under siege. The Bombardment began on October 17th. The Allied Commanders General Lord Raglan and General Francois Canrobert. Decided to Bombard the Fortress as they did not possess enough forces to take it by storm. A British naval Squadron under the Command of Admiral Sir Edmund Lyons bombarded Sebastopol from the sea. An attempt was made to relieve Sebastopol by the Russians by attacking the British Supply port of Balaclava on the 25th October but this attempt failed. Prince Menshikov again tried an attack eleven days later on the Heights of Inkerman but this again was beaten off. A third attempt to dislodge the British force, was made on the 16th of August 1855 at the Chernaya river but failed. Several allied attempts in the spring of 1855 to take Sebastopol by storm failed. Finally on the 8th of September the French commanded by General Aimable Pelissier took Malakhov a fortification at the southern end of Sebastopol. The British under their new commander General Simpson (Lord Raglan had died) attacked and took the Redan, only to lose it again. On the 11th of September the Russian abandoned Sebastopol blowing up the defences and all shipping in the harbour. This event ended the war. Although the Russian force was still in tact and not defeated. Czar Alexander II after the death of his father on March 2nd 1856 signed the final peace terms at the Congress of Paris on March 30th 1856.

Battle Of Sadowa, - 1866

Prussian victory over the Austrian army 13 km/8 mi northwest of Hradec Kralove (German K^oniggr^utz) 3 July 1866, ending the Seven Weeks' War. It confirmed Prussian hegemony over the German states and led to the formation of the North German Confederation 1867. It is named after the nearby village of Sadowa (Czech Sadov^á) in the Czech Republic.

Battle of Sedan - 1870

(Sept. 1, 1870), decisive defeat of the French army in the Franco-German War, which led to the fall of the Second French Empire; it was fought at the French border fortress of Sedan on the Meuse River, between 120,000 French troops under Marshal Mac-Mahon and more than 200,000 German troops under General Helmuth von Moltke. I was just wanting to point out that every generation has looked at the circumstances of their day and said 'this is it'. I vividly recall the Israeli blue and white flag flying over Jerusalem and saying to a gathering of young people "I do not expect to see my 30th birthday"; I was 25 at the time... I am now chasing 64!

I am not disillusioned although at that time I was an ardent pre-mill, pre-trib Scofield-ite. The context of the Spurgeon quote is important; C I Scofield's dates are 1843-1921. You will see the era in which Spurgeon was preaching was an era much given to the study of the Second Coming and the dates of all Spurgeon's famous battles are part of the context. There were tremendous shifts in World History during this period and the trend was to interpret these events in the light of the Second Coming. Many regarded Napoleon as 'the antichrist'. Many regarded Hitler as the same. I once listened to a discourse which proved that Kissinger was the 'antichrist'.

It seems that at every stage of church history and particularly at times of international disruption the saints say 'hey, this fits, we are really in the last days now'. I don't despise these various prophetic schedules. I listen to them and, so far, at the end of each explanation I have had to say 'thank you, but I am still unconvinced'. Some folk think this is because I have a position to defend; I have no 'position'.

I was reading the Revelation again this morning and the atmosphere immediately alerts the heart...“The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent a nd signified it by his angel unto his servant John: Who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand. John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne;”

(Rev. 1:1-4, KJVS)I have underlined two key phrases. I believe these words with all my heart. I know that he will come quickly and that the time is at hand. I also know that approximately 60 generations of my fellow believers have read these words and felt the same way that I do, and that fact, at least, ought to temper my convictions that my generation now has the definitive interpretation of the Revelation.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/1 8:58

Quote:
-----It seems that at every stage of church history and particularly at times of international disruption the saints say 'hey, this fits, we are really in the last days now'. I don't despise these various prophetic schedules. I listen to them and, so far, at the end of each explanation I have had to say 'thank you, but I am still unconvinced'. Some folk think this is because I have a position to defend; I have no 'position'.

I think you are right here without a doubt that every stage of human history folk believed they lived in the last days. For me, the matter is settled when I consider the 2 signs in Daniel 12:4.

But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased

It seems that the "time of the end" will be characterized by *many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased*.

Understand that in no way am I on any kind of pretrib band wagon or any of that, but I wish to consider these two signs to see if it were possible that our time is different than any other time in human history. I have often wondered what a person from Babel to the early 1800's would do if they were suddenly walking the streets of New York City or a like city at night.

seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro...

"to and fro" is Hebrew Strong's 7751. shuwt, shoot; a prim. root; prop. to push forth; (but used only fig.) to lash, i.e. (the sea with oars) to row; by impl. to travel:--go (about, through, to and fro), mariner, rower, run to and fro.

I think the key here is the word 'many'. This is the Hebrew adjective 'Rab' and it is translated mostly as *much, many, and great*. Here is a list from studylights source:

much
many
abounding in
more numerous than
abundant, enough
great
strong
greater than adv
much, exceedingly n m

No matter how we look at this passage it has to be saying that either many will be traveling or that there will be much traveling or 'abundant' travel. The steam engine launched the human race into an era of mechanized mass transit. This is a term unheard of to my knowledge before the steam engine. Folk traveled on foot or by animal. Keep in mind that even the passenger train in many parts of the West is an outdated mode of travel. Most have their own means of mechanized travel. Truly we live in the times of planes, trains, and automobiles. Even civilians can travel to space if a few multi-millionaires have their way. The many shall run to and fro that we experience as a matter of course in our daily lives is without p

parallel in human history.

knowledge shall be increased

Not a lot to get excited about with the word knowledge here, but the word 'increased' is worth looking at.

Here are some places of interest where we find the word appearing:

And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth. (Genesis 1:22)

And the flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters increased, and bare up the ark, and it was lift up above the earth. (Genesis 7:17)

And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the face of the waters. (Genesis 7:18)

From these early glimpses into the word for 'increased' it seems that knowledge will be increased upon the earth as to deluge the planet with knowledge. It was only 500 years ago that man was fighting with sword and spear and that books were written out by hand. What about our times? Do we fit the description of a 'deluge' of knowledge upon the earth?

Consider what Larry Page and Sergey Brin, founders of Google desire to provide access to *ALL HUMAN KNOWLEDGE* as part of their vision. As I am typing this there are 110,000+ servers that comprise Google's server farms and they have an entire copy of the publically accessible Internet on those servers. Some believe it is the world's most powerful supercomputer as it is capable of searching, sorting, and highlighting your search request, based on YOUR tendencies through over 8,000,000,000 web pages in 1/2 second. They have spiders that crawl the net constantly updating it. They save EVERY search you have ever performed. They currently are well under way in digitizing the University of Michigan and other huge libraries (of millions of volumes) to make them accessible. They want ALL HUMAN KNOWLEDGE to be available eventually, say in the next 20 years. To TOP that they want this info available via satellite to solar powered hand held devices anywhere in the world. The technology is well under way. Consider also their translation capabilities and suddenly we live in a world where anyone can access all available human knowledge including closed captioning of TV shows and movies-- all SEARCHABLE and on their servers. and if that is not enough, they want the entire genome of nature digitized and all of our DNA online and searchable. This is another project under way. What will the world be like when a person could do a search on their DNA? A lot of secrets are going to come to light if this ever happens and the world will plunge into mass chaos in my estimation, the likes of which probably have not been known since before the flood. As it was in the days of Noah... well maybe?

Enough rambling...

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/1 14:51

Robert W's

Quote:

-----It seems that the "time of the end" will be characterized by many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased.

Wouldn't that mean that every succeeding generation is 'more' likely to be the last generation? In the logical sense, of course, every generation is more likely to be the last generation than the one before it. But the point I am making is that since the time of the Renaissance each generation has 'stood on the shoulders of the previous one' and seen further? This seeing 'further' has usually resulted in more and more travel so every succeeding generation is more and more characterized by your qualifying factors.

Is this just saying "...for now our salvation is nearer than when we first believed." This statement always brings a smile but sometimes we need to hear the obvious. :-)

Re: Importance by Volume, on: 2006/2/1 15:14

Typing "Charles Spurgeon Second Coming of Christ" into "Google" gives plenty of what he had to say and about his books by that title and that his view was pre-mill/post-trib ... but that's not the point here.

Most of these men, Spurgeon included, believed in Imminence, and that was absolutely impossible to be fulfilled in their day or even in ours.

The belief of Imminence is not Biblical.

Imminence teaches "any minute now", but The Word teaches, "after these things ... then..".

When before in history was the technology in place for a 'mark' of the beast or for ALL eyes to see the goings on of the two witnesses, etc. ?

How could any former generation possibly know about micro-chips, internet, and so on.

Or see the Ecumenical Movement {or global religion or Religious Alliance} as it's been forming. Or the Apostasy we've been in for the last 20 years. "Truth being thrown into the streets"

Even in my lifetime, I remember the talk of fear of having a Catholic in the White House.

Daniel's "sealed" visions, Are being revealed 'as' or just before things are taking place.

Some are seeing things before they happen, only because they believe John 16:13 is also for us today.

If we've put 'every' single Scripture reference, of end times significance, from O.T. to New, into one File or folder, we'd have been connecting the dots for at least 20 years now.

Discerning and Holding The Word by one hand and The Spirit of Truth by the other. Depending on both equally.

I'd only put as much emphasis on a "teaching" as the Word of God does itself.

I don't see the Bible having chapters and books written about woman's head coverings, or other topics we bring up every day.

But more is in The Book about the end times than any other teaching we hold to as Christians.

I judge the weight of this doctrine by the amount of Scripture there is on it, in the Word.

And how it more than implies, that without an accurate view of "those days" one risks total deception and damnation. They wrote that out plainly enough.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/1 15:29

Quote:
-----Is this just saying "...for now our salvation is nearer than when we first believed." This statement always brings a smile but sometimes we need to hear the obvious.

Yes. This is why I am not one to try to set dates or anything weird like that. I think, in my mind, that the two indicators are exceedingly true since the Renaissance. I agree that every generation since likely said that knowledge is increasing and since the exploration of Columbus and the like they saw it as an indicator of increased travel. Books could be taken to remote jungles and so could mechanized travel.

So I suppose it would be fair to say that Daniel 12:4 has been unfolding since Gutenberg. But I think it is also fair to say that this train is gaining momentum and that it appears that we are fastly undoing the 'preventative judgments' (;-) I'm borrowing this term from a dear brother) that were implemented by God to slow man's wickedness or if I can put it another way; 'the speed at which our Old Man (the old man) is refreshing itself in its blatant wickedness is progressing.' In other words the 'refresh rate' is increasing exponentially. And as it seems to be my personality to draw conclusions from the data, it seems we are fast heading towards the time described in Genesis 6. We have passed up Babel and undone that and are fast working on man's lifespan. We have already undone the pain 'multiplied' in childbearing for those who have access to pain management techniques. When all of those measures are effectively circumvented, what will the world be like? :-?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/1 15:46

Quote:
-----he belief of Imminence is not Biblical.
Imminence teaches "any minute now", but The Word teaches, "after these things ... then..".

Imminent means 'overhanging'; that there is no necessary preceding event. It does not mean 'any minute now' but simply that there is no necessary scriptural event which must occur before the Coming.

Quote:
-----Typing "Charles Spurgeon Second Coming of Christ" into "Google" gives plenty of what he had to say and about his books by that title and that his view was pre-mill/post-trib ... but that's not the point here.

No one was able to make any of these labels stick when he was alive. I advise caution now that he is dead.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/1 15:54

RobertW's

Quote:
-----'the speed at which our Old Man (the old man) is refreshing itself in its blatant wickedness is progressing.'

I'm not sure I see the 'Old Man' like this. The 'Old Man' is steady state, it is in the individual that that 'refreshing' takes place rather than in society.

This will high-jack the thread. :-) If you want to pursue the 'Old Man' line we could move to the (http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id9297&forum36) Original Sin? Adam or Me? thread.

Re:, on: 2006/2/1 16:57

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----he belief of Imminence is not Biblical.
Imminence teaches "any minute now", but The Word teaches, "after these things ... then..".

Imminent means 'overhanging'; that there is no necessary preceding event. It does not mean 'any minute now' but simply that there is no necessary scriptural event which must occur before the Coming.

Quote:

-----Typing "Charles Spurgeon Second Coming of Christ" into "Google" gives plenty of what he had to say and about his books by that title and that his view was pre-mill/post-trib ... but that's not the point here.

No one was able to make any of these labels stick when he was alive. I advise caution now that he is dead.

Hia Ron, to quote you ""It does not mean 'any minute now' but simply that there is no necessary scriptural event which must occur before the Coming.""

In the minds of those who believe in Imminence, both how I define their belief and how you just did are synonymous.

About Spurgeon's book, as I said on the previous page, I have it and read it, so any caution you've suggested would have to refer to my ability to understand what I read, as in, am I dyslexic or something :-D .

Lord knows anymore who is and who isn't, especially in reading each other's posts.

god bless. (as in small g in godhead :)

Love youse guys.
Annie

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/1 17:22

Quote:

-----In the minds of those who believe in Imminence, both how I define their belief and how you just did are synonymous.

I believe in imminence but not in your definition of it. I am not looking for any preceding signs but for His coming.

Re:, on: 2006/2/1 17:31

Hia Ron,

So what is your take on 2Th 2:2-3 That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed {apokaluptō}, the son of perdition

?

Re:, on: 2006/2/1 17:45

Ya know, at the same time we go page to page, I'm still wondering what jcheinrichs is doing through all of this.

I've gone through as many thoughts on that as the other thoughts brought out on this thread thus far. Ha.

He's either sitting back laughing, forgot he posted here, afraid to come back or wish he could have added the usual verb age to the title of this thread, but didn't dare.

I guess I'm the only one who's curious where jcheinrichs is ... Ho. :-?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/2 5:10

Quote:

-----So what is your take on 2Th 2:2-3

Although these awaited fulfillment in Paul's day there is a measure in which they have all seen some fulfillment today.

e.g. as a matter of interpretation, the translators of the KJV believed the 'man of sin' was the Roman Catholic Church and the 'epistle dedicatory' enshrines this belief;...the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself abroad in the farthest parts of Christendom, by writing in defence of the Truth, (which hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed...I am not saying that I agree with them but I can't say that they were wrong either; I just don't know.

Re:, on: 2006/2/2 13:20

Hia Ron, appreciate your reply.

I guess if we keep reading further into 2 thess 2, and do the cross-referencing, we see that this person is the antiChrist.

But as you said, we see that from not 'that' many years ago and backward, even our Commentators in e-sword, have this as the pope or Rome.

I don't believe the antiChrist is the pope.
But one may be the false prophet, as some call it/him.

Thanks again for taking the time with this.

Back to you jcheinrichs . :smart:

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/2 14:15

bro Ron

Quote:

-----I was just wanting to point out that every generation has looked at the circumstances of their day and said 'this is it'. I vividly recall the Israeli blue and white flag flying over Jerusalem and saying to a gathering of young people "I do not expect to see my 30th birthday"; I was 25 at the time... I am now chasing 64!

64? i thought you were older than that for some reason :-P i guess we do sometimes get lost in it all. then we lean to our own understanding as opposed to truly seeking the Lord for clarity on what's going on in relation to the end times etc. i say we seek the Lord and His will. i was watching a show on the history channel (i'm a buff) on the antichrist and i was quite surprised at who was listed among the potentials, henry kissinger? so evidently there's a lot of focus on this but little clarity as most conclusions are from men's wisdom.

thanks bro

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/3 5:04

Quote:

-----I don't believe the antiChrist is the pope.

I quoted the Epistle Dedicatory' without explanation. Many of the reformers (and others since) have regarded the 'Papacy as anti-christ'. It was not the 'man' (the pope) but the institution (papacy) which is foundational to the Roman Catholic Church.

Others have seen Islam as antichrist:“and every spirit that doth not confess Jesus Christ in the flesh having come, of God it is not; and this is that of the antichrist, which ye heard that it doth come, and now in the world it is already.” (1John 4:3, YNG)

Re:, on: 2006/2/4 1:46

Yes that's true Ron. Just a look into our e-sword commentaries have this belief because of the persecution of Protestants ... understandable.

But that there is one coming, who will be a "he", is in The Word and earliest of the early church fathers. That man of perdition is yet to make his grand debut.

The sooner that all comes about, the sooner we'll be able to count on Christ's Return.

Our Blessed Hope. Amen, that no one can rob us of.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/4 4:55

Quote:

-----But that there is one coming, who will be a "he", is in The Word and earliest of the early church fathers.

The 'earliest of the early church fathers' were writing well before the (<http://www.religionfacts.com/christianity/history/papacy.htm>) Development of the Papacy. The doctrine of the supremacy of the pope finally reached its height in the late 13th century, when Pope Boniface VIII claimed full religious and secular authority over every human being.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/12 19:36

bro Ron
you said

Quote:

-----We are working with symbolic numbers here. The whole people of the Old Covenant were 12 clans. The shewbread signified that the whole nation was given to God but in their individual significance. The number 12 seems to link with rule and government and 12 seems to take on the nature of 'the whole'. Consequently the number is always 12; the whole covenant people of God. The 12 clans originally included Levi but Levi was set apart for the service of God and then would have left 11, but the number is made up to 12 again because the clan of Joseph is sub-divided into Ephraim and Manasseh.

if the number is symbolic, then shouldn't the mentioned tribe also be symbolic? it seems a little weird to me to have 1200 as being symbolic and yet the mentioned tribe being real :-? also it seems to me that whatever is symbolic is said to be so and the explanation for what it is is given like the 7 stars and candlesticks.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/13 5:33

Quote:
-----if the number is symbolic, then shouldn't the mentioned tribe also be symbolic? it seems a little weird to me to have 12000 as being symbolic and yet the mentioned tribe being real also it seems to me that whatever is symbolic is said to be so and the explanation for what it is is given like the 7 stars and candlesticks.

Nowhere does it say that the Lamb is symbolic, but we all believe it is. The book begins by saying it is in symbols. The difference is that sometimes the symbols are interpreted and sometime not. Take a look at Rev 13 and ask the question 'do I think this is literal?'

Re:, on: 2006/2/13 7:36

I think the point is, HE didn't intend the symbology to remain unsolved by those who would live through that time.

He spoke in parables, He said, to hide wisdom from the proud, basically, but understanding was intended for the humble or his true Disciples that followed Him.

We believe the Lamb is symbolic, because as we read further, we see the Lamb for Who is He, by "what is written". By hermeneutics.

The same with Rev. 13 or The Revelation as a whole actually. That when pieced together with Dan, and other O.T. Prophets, Matt, Mark, Luke, Thess., Peter ... give us the theme of a world power and one who will one day rule over it and so forth. He said, "Behold, I have told you 'all' things." Paul said, "I would not have you to be ignorant" and also both he and Peter make statement along those lines, that we have been adequately educated on what is to come.

The Revelation was not written to remain a mystery until the Lord Returns to explain it to us, it was written to get us through it by 'understanding the times'.
Something Jesus always stressed, that He wanted us to know, be conscious of, to watch and to be wise during.

There can be great confidence that He will apokalupto the whole of it to us, as we go along. And that is what He's promised and even now is doing.

We've got one foot into this Book already, so the "unveiling" has begun, to those who's eyes are anxious and believing to see, without pre-held preferences of belief. The more child like the faith and anticipation of "His" plans (not ours) the more apokalupto.

If we're willing to go through it, He'll definitely be faithful to show us the steps ahead of us ... before they come. That's a promise of His.

He'll never leave us in the dark. Never ever.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/13 8:47

MeAgain's

Quote:
-----The Revelation was not written to remain a mystery until the Lord Returns to explain it to us, it was written to get us through it by 'understanding the times'.

I'm not sure that this is the case. Do we need to 'understand the times' in order to get us through them? If so, given the various interpretations held by different saints, I'm not sure it has 'worked'. Do we think that the Revelation will only have its point during the last 'seven years' or so of time? Given that over 1900 years has passed since John penned this prophecy and the final 7 years will be the time when this book 'comes into its own', as some surmise, the best percentages we can derive are that less than 0.04% of its potential readers (timewise) would really benefit from its truths and that is presuming that everyone who reads it during the final seven years will understand it. This calculation may seem complicated but its just my way of saying the percentage of people who will 'get... through it by understanding the times' really is tiny.

As I said somewhere earlier the underlying theme of the Revelation is 'God is still on the Throne'. This truth has been immediately available to 100% of its readers since it was written.

I read it constantly, but I am not trying to deduce a timetable from it. There is an interesting insight into the 'purpose of prophecy' (I once started a thread on that topic...) in John's gospel "And now I have told you before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye might believe." (John 14:29 KJVS) This is not the same as saying 'so that you will be ready for it'. Apparently one of the reasons is so that when 'the times' arrive we will recall His words and know that it is all in hand. I think this is the main purpose of the Revelation.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/13 11:42

bro Ron

Quote:

Nowhere does it say that the Lamb is symbolic, but we all believe it is. The book begins by saying it is in symbols. The difference is that sometimes the symbols are interpreted and sometime not. Take a look at Rev 13 and ask the question 'do I think this is literal?'

the first part of revelation 13 speaks to the false trinity, the dragon (satan) playing God, giving authority to the second (leopard/bear) playing the false son and the last one which spoke like the dragon and exercised the dragon's power being a false holy spirit or rather the unholy spirit. will we see said beasts rise up, not sure but i wouldn't be surprised by it at all, in fact that would be a rather grand entrance on the beasts' part to get everyone's attention...

however do you think the worship of beast is literal? what of the mark without which noone can buy or sell? :-? what of the plagues and judgements which come as the trumpets are sounded and as the bowls are poured? :-?

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2006/2/13 12:22

Quote:

As I said somewhere earlier the underlying theme of the Revelation is 'God is still on the Throne'. This truth has been immediately available to 100% of its readers since it was written.
.

Exactly! "Blessed is he who reads and those who hear the words of the prophecy" Rev 1:3

This is the only book of the bible that specifically promises a blessing to those who read and "hear" what the book is saying. I get no "blessing" from the idea that the book is for the future and mainly for the Jews of the future.

Ironman, about the "144,000". If you will note in Rev 7:4 That John "heard the number of those who were sealed..." But after he heard the descriptions of the tribes what happened?

"After these things I LOOKED, and BEHOLD, A GREAT MULTITUDE which no one could count..."

I understand this to be the very group of people that he "heard" in symbolic language was Israel, But when he "looked" he saw the entire church old covenant and new covenant.

One more thing about the 144,000, if this is literal language that describes them, then how does one reconcile Rev 14:1-7 with this group of people? What I mean is nowhere in the bible are we told Israel is a group of chaste (VIRGIN) men. What no women in the 144,000?

Who are the "144,000 virgins" of Rev 14? Paul tells us the answer to that in 2 Cor 11:2 "... for I betrothed you (the CHURCH) to one husband, so that to Christ I might present you as a pure virgin."

This is all symbolism, and if you dwell on the symbolism, the answers will come, and so will the "blessing".

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/13 12:31

Quote:
-----however do you think the worship of beast is literal?what of the mark without which noone can buy or sell?

Perhaps I haven't made this clear yet... but I think the book of the Revelation, like the apocalyptic portions of Daniel and Zechariah, is full of symbols. ;-)

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/13 12:42

bro Ron

Quote:
-----Perhaps I haven't made this clear yet... but I think the book of the Revelation, like the apocalyptic portions of Daniel and Zechariah, is full of symbols.

i think you have made it clear, my small brain simply can't get around it that's all :-P

also bro Ron what of the bowls of anger and the plagues that come with them, what about the earthquakes and the bloody hail, and the death of large portions of humanity? these are all the Lord's judgements right? when has the Lord ever pronounced judgement and it only been symbolic ie not ever occurred? did Egypt then not suffer the 10 plagues? was Israel not destroyed time and time again? :-?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/13 13:17

bro Jimbob

Quote:
-----Ironman, about the "144,000". If you will note in Rev 7:4 That John "heard the number of those who were sealed..." But after he heard the descriptions of the tribes what happened?

Quote:
-----"After these things I LOOKED, and BEHOLD, A GREAT MULTITUDE which no one could count..."

Quote:
-----I understand this to be the very group of people that he "heard" in symbolic language was Israel, But when he "looked" he saw the entire church old covenant and new covenant.

John said he heard the number of them that were sealed of the 12 tribes of Israel, this is not the whole nation of Israel but a select 144000 who had no relations with women FROM the nation of Israel. note then he says AFTER this (seems to be a separate even being talked of here) then there was the great multitude which he saw from all the other tongues, nations and kindreds which were NOT of Israel which says to me that the 144000 are separate from the multitude in ethnicity, the multitude is the church while the 144000 are Jews. if the 144000 are from the tribe of Israel then why does the word then go on to speak of all the other nations and tongues being part of the great multitude which noone could number?

Quote:
-----One more thing about the 144,000,if this is literal language that describes them, then how does one reconcile Rev 14:1-7 with this group of people? What I mean is nowhere in the bible are we told Israel is a group of chaste(VIRGIN)men. What no women in the 144,000?

again bro Jimbob these men are the firstfruits or men not the whole nation of Israel as stated in rev 14 vs 4.and yes they are all men.

EDIT
i could be wrong about the above in light of this:
the 144000 in chapt 7 are from the 12 tribes of Israel (doesn't say that they are virgins here) but these ones here in chapt 14 are the firstfruits of men and are virgins (not from the nation of Israel), seems like 2 different groups perhaps. if they were the same why in the 1 instance is it 144000 from the 12 tribes and the other 144000 the firstfruits of men? also the 144000 from Israel are sealed and are called the servants of the father while the 144000 in chapt 14 are said to be sealed with the Father's name on their foreheads. i've been checking out watchman nee's study on the revelation here and it's been quite eye-opening.

if the Lord leads, check it out.

<http://ministrybooks.com/books.cfm?id=%23%24%28%2D%26%0A>

it seems to me a certain amount of understanding comes with the promise of blessing as it pertains to the book of revelation. i mean even the heathen can hear, what blessing can they obtain from it? so then are the plagues that come with the trumpets and bowls symbolic too? where has the Lord pronounced judgement in the past and the judgement only been symbolic?

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2006/2/13 14:39

Ironman, hey if you get a blessing from believing that there are 144,000 jewish virgins in heaven, more power to you, Just remember that your little group of saints, EXCLUDES all of the old testament people like MOSES, DAVID,ISAIAH, etc. ...Because they weren't virgins.

Now I will repeat who the virgins are one more time..." for I betrothed you to one husband, so that to Christ I might present you as a pure VIRGIN." 2 Cor 11:2

The Church is the virgin,not the 144,000, this is SYMBOLISM! A "sign or symbol" does not point towards itself, but away from itself to something else.

Rev. 14:1, "Then I looked, and behold, the Lamb was standing on Mount Zion, and with Him 144,000..."

If the 144,000 is literal, Then Jesus Christ is a literal sheep. Think about it.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/13 14:50

bro Jimbob
like i said in the last post i'm probably wrong about this

Quote:
-----Ironman, hey if you get a blessing from believing that there are 144,000 jewish virgins in heaven, more power to you, Just remember that your little group of saints, EXCLUDES all of the old testament people like MOSES, DAVID,ISAIAH, etc....Because they weren't virgins.

i said that (in the edited version of my last post) that the 144000 in chapt 7 are from the 12 tribes of Israel, they are not the WHOLE nation of Israel just a part of it. then the 144000 in chapt 14 is not called from the 12 tribes of Israel, but the firstfruits of all men and they are virgins, chapt 7 doesn't say that the 144000 from Israel are virgins in fact, being a virgin is not considered a good thing except of course before marriage! also these 144000 in chapt 14 are purchased/redeemed from all men by the lamb, the O.T. saints were not redeemed this way at all, seems like a separate 144000 altogether.

also if the 144000 in chapt 14 represents the whole church in heaven already, then why the need for endurance and keeping the commandments of the Lord in vs 12 of chapt 14? that's why it says they are a firstfruits, the firstfruits can't be the whole shabang bro.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/13 15:12

Quote:
-----also bro Ron what of the bowls of anger and the plagues that come with them, what about the earthquakes and the bloody hail, and the death of large portions of humanity? these are all the Lord's judgements right? when has the Lord ever pronounced judgement and it only been symbolic ie not ever occurred? did Egypt then not suffer the 10 plagues? was Israel not destroyed time and time again?

Symbolism doesn't mean that there isn't a matching reality, it just means that we won't see 'bowls of altar ashes' tumbling through the skies.

Re: Make it simple, on: 2006/2/13 21:08

Quote:
-----if the 144000 are from the tribe of Israel then why does the word then go on to speak of all the other nations and tongues being part of the great multitude which noone could number?

Hi Ironman,

This might be the answer to your question....

Acts 2:5

And there were dwelling in Jerusalem **Jews, devout men from every nation of those under the heaven,**

Do you remember that Moses was married to an Ethiopian woman? Might this be another part of the whole picture?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/14 0:12

bro Ron

Quote:
-----Symbolism doesn't mean that there isn't a matching reality, it just means that we won't see 'bowls of altar ashes' tumbling through the skies.

you had me trippin there for a minute :-P

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/14 0:16

sis Dorcas

i understand about moses marrying an ethiopian and there being jews who are from different nations but are still jews. the multitude which couldn't be numbered is made up of gentiles it seems to me. also those 144000 are servants of God it says, sealed for a certain work which required heavenly intervention so the earth wouldn't be harmed during the time they were being sealed.

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2006/2/14 4:40

Quote:

IRONMAN wrote:

that's why it says they are a firstfruits, the firstfruits can't be the whole shabang bro.

Do a word search on "first fruits" in the new testament, you will see the word refers to Christ and His church. Not 144,000 Jews, not literal....

Re: Make it simple, on: 2006/2/14 8:28

I'm still trying to picture what jcheinrichs is doing ... aren't you ? Ha !

Oh, did I hear someone ask, who's jcheinrichs ?

Well, all we know is that, he's only posted once so far and that was 8 pages ago.

rotflmho ~ :lol:

Re: - posted by amos54, on: 2006/2/14 8:49

You guys all make me laugh!

Do any of you find it odd that the most posts are on whether or not the bible is simple... what really matters?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/14 11:36

bro Jimbob

i said a couple of posts back that there were or seemed to be at least 2 separate groups of 144000, 144000 from the 12 tribes of Israel which are not virgins (chapt 7) then 144000 of the firstfruits of all men and these are virgins, they are gentiles bro not Jews. Now i ask again, if this is symbolic of the whole church, then why does the word then say later on in chapter 14 this

13 Then I heard a voice from heaven saying to me, F80 "Write: 'Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from now on.' " "Yes," says the Spirit, "that they may rest from their labors, and their works follow them." 14 Then I looked, and behold, a white cloud, and on the cloud sat One like the Son of Man, having on His head a golden crown, and in His hand a sharp sickle. 15 And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to Him who sat on the cloud, "Thrust in Your sickle and reap, for the time has come for You F81 to reap, for the harvest of the earth is ripe."

if there are people still dying even after the firstfruits have been taken up, then that says that the whole Church has not yet made it to heaven and there are still some on the earth, therefore the assertion that the 144000 in chapt 14 is the church is wrong. also i looked up first fruits in the N.T. and as per the kjv there are 7 references.

here are a couple of examples of how the firstfruits like the name suggests that it's a portion of the whole. originally in the O.T. the very first fruits that were ripe in the season were collected up and given up to God, all the fruit didn't ripen at once.

1 Corinthians 15:20-34 20 But now Christ is risen from the dead, and has become the firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep

Christ is not every dead person but He was the first to be resurrected, there are yet many who await the resurrection.

1 Corinthians 16:13-18 13 Watch, stand fast in the faith, be brave, be strong. 14 Let all that you do be done with love. 15 I urge you, brethren--you know the household of Stephanas, that it is the firstfruits of Achaia, and that they have devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints-- 16 that you also submit to such, and to everyone who works and labors with us.

The house of the man named here was the first in the province of Achaia to convert to Christianity, the whole province didn't convert with him.

i hope that clears it up. there are 2 groups of 144000, in chapt 7 it is a group of Jews in chapt 14 it is the firstfruits of the church. and also after this firstfruits is taken up to heaven, there are still saints left on earth who will be martyred so the whole church is not in heaven at this time. it seems to me though bro that a lot of people are waiting to be raptured, i think most are waiting in vain because there is much work to be done first. the Church is in nowise going to escape a general persecution wherever she may be in the world, even here in America people will be martyred for Christ. the fact that a lot of people will still be here when such things happen i think is going to add to the great falling away because many expecting to be raptured will be so disillusioned when they are left behind and will reject Christ.

personally, i want to stay behind and work. The Lord's made it plain i'll be here a while working so it makes easier to want it. i want to be used of God to whatever degree He desires, if it be the crown of martyrdom, i'll take it, in fact i want it. whatever other glory the Lord wants me to have in heaven as a result of whatever He uses me for here i want it ALL. if the seating arrangement in heaven is such that we're arranged in rows before His throne and He wants me to be in the front, that's where i want to be, not the 3rd row, nor the 2nd, but the 1st one.

Re: Make it simple, on: 2006/2/14 13:54

Hi Ironman,

Maybe I shouldn't have commented, but, if the Church is made up of all nationalities of people whose first birth has become less relevant than their second birth, then whether they were Jews or Gentiles originally, may vanish without trace, even though the fact of Jews being saved, and having a 'special' place in history, is, of course, indubitable. I am still trying to work out what difference it makes, but, Paul did say he is a Jew who is one inwardly - so that makes us *all* Jews inwardly.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/14 17:14

sis dorcas

Quote:
-----Maybe I shouldn't have commented, but, if the Church is made up of all nationalities of people whose first birth has become less relevant than their second birth, then whether they were Jews or Gentiles originally, may vanish without trace, even though the fact of Jews being saved, and having a 'special' place in history, is, of course, indubitable. I am still trying to work out what difference it makes, but, Paul did say he is a Jew who is one inwardly - so that makes us all Jews inwardly.

you know i'm not sure what difference it makes save for the fact that Jews are God's chosen people while we're grafted in. i don't think that we become Jews inwardly when we come to Christ, i think Paul here is talking about how the outward signs don't make one a Jew but the circumcision of the heart does though. On this side it seems that there will always be that distinction between Jew and gentile and it serves some purpose in God's plan.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/2/15 16:25

Quote:
-----Maybe I shouldn't have commented, but, if the Church is made up of all nationalities of people whose first birth has become less relevant than their second birth, then whether they were Jews or Gentiles originally, may vanish without trace, even though the fact of Jews being saved, and having a 'special' place in history, is, of course, indubitable. I am still trying to work out what difference it makes, but, Paul did say he is a Jew who is one inwardly - so that makes us all Jews inwardly.

It is written that "In Him (Christ) there can be no Jew, Greek, barbarian, sythian, slave, or freemam."

In Christ's death on the Cross He terminated in Himself all the distinctions. And in Him was created the "One New Man", in whom there can be no Jew, Greek, etc.

Distinctions of race, nationality, social status, etc. were abolished in Christ's death on the Cross and in resurrection the ONE New Man is brought into being. In the One New Man Christ is All and in all. There is none of these things. But all are the same having the same Life, the Same Lord, the Same hope, the same everything.

Graftedbranch

The Four Horsemen of The Revelations of Jesus Christ - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/15 17:52

May I give you all something to think about. I've always been curious of the four horsemen so I made a study on them and found that since Revelations can interpret itself to a point I needed to look at how some parts of revelation meshed with other parts. So I linked the four horsemen with the Historical part of the Book

The Revelations of Jesus Christ Chapter 6: the Seals.

1st Seal

Rev 6:1 And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seals, and I heard, as it were the noise of thunder, one of the four beasts saying, come and see.

Rev 6:2 And I saw, and behold a white horse: and he that sat on him had a **bow**; and a **crown** was given unto him: and he went forth conquering, and to conquer.

I refer this horse to Jesus in chapter 12: 5-9 which describes Jesus winning the battle and conquered Satan.

Greek Definitions:

5115. toxon tox'-on from the base of 5088; a **bow** (apparently as the simplest **fabric**):--bow.

4735. stephanos stef'-an-os from an apparently primary stepho (to twine or wreath); a chaplet (as a badge of royalty, a prize in the public games or a symbol of honor generally; but more conspicuous and elaborate than the simple fillet, 123 8), literally or figuratively:--crown.

The word for white is the same word to explain Jesus on the mount of transfiguration in Matt. 17:2

The bow in his hand is like a ribbon in the form of a bow, like one would receive as a prize (blue ribbon or bow is for first place). This would make sense because He has a crown which is also a prize.

2nd Seal

Rev 6:3 and when he had opened the second seal, I heard the second beast say, Come and see.

Rev 6:4 and there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take **peace** from the earth, and that they should **kill** one another: and there was given unto him a great **sword**.

4969. sphazo sfad'-zo a primary verb; to butcher (especially an animal for food or in sacrifice) or (generally) to slaughter, or (specially), to maim (violently):--**kill**, slay, wound.

1515. eirene i-ray'-nay probably from a primary verb eiro (to join); **peace** (literally or figuratively); by implication, prosperity:--one, peace, quietness, rest, + set at one again.

3162. machaira makh'-ahee-rah probably feminine of a presumed derivative of 3163; a knife, i.e. dirk; figuratively, war, judicial punishment:--**sword**.

I refer these verses to Chapter 12:10-17, which represents the World and it's hated for Christ and His Church. The color red is like blood. This is when martyrdom started to happen. Martyrs are always butchered or slaughtered.

The rider on this horse also has the same kind of sword that Jesus said to have brought and the same peace that He did not come to send in Matthew 10:34 Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.

The sword could be thought of in a judicial sense for God's Judgment.

John 3:18 He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

2919. krino kree'-no properly, to distinguish, i.e. decide (mentally or judicially); by implication, to try, condemn, punish:--avenge, conclude, condemn, damn, decree, determine, esteem, judge, go to (sue at the) law, ordain, call in question, sentence to, think.

3rd Seal

Rev 6:5 and when he had opened the third seal, I heard the third beast say, Come and see. And I beheld, and lo a black horse; and he that sat on him had a pair of **balances** in his hand.

Rev 6:6 And I heard a voice **in the midst of the four beasts** say, a measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny; and see thou hurt not the oil and the wine.

2218. zugos dzoo-gos' from the root of zeugnumi. 1) a yoke a) a **yoke** that is put on draught cattle b) metaph., used of any burden or bondage 1) as that of slavery 2) of troublesome laws imposed on one, esp. of the Mosaic law, hence the name is so transferred to the commands of Christ as to contrast them with the commands of the Pharisees which were a veritable 'yoke'; yet even Christ's commands must be submitted to, though easier to be kept 2) a balance, **pair of scales**.

I refer this horse to Chapter 12: 10-17 also, since it doesn't say if there is any time between the two horses. This one represents persecution both economically, and Spiritually of Israel and the Church. This horse is bringing economic persecution as governments are in charge of the economy.

Note: this balance could also be a yoke in which God yokes us with Israel.

Note: the voice was heard in the **midst of the four beasts**, which would be the Lamb speaking.

4th Seal

Rev 6:7 And when he had opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of the fourth beast say, Come and see.

Rev 6:8 And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him. And power was given unto them over the fourth part of the earth, to **kill with sword**, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth.

615. apokteino ap-ok-ti'-no from 575 and kteino 1) **to kill** in any way whatever a) to destroy, to allow to perish 2) metaph. to extinguish, abolish a) to inflict mortal death b) to deprive of spiritual life and procure eternal misery in hell

4501. rhomphaia hrom-fah'-yah probably of foreign origin; a sabre, i.e. a long and broad cutlass (any weapon of the kind, literally or figuratively):--**sword**.

Note: The rider is the only one who is named with the one who follows.

I refer these verses to Chapter 13:

Since there are two characters in this passage, they could be compared to the Anti-Christ and the false prophet. The world has always tried to extinguish or abolish and even destroy the Jews and it also hates the true church of Christ since it hate Him first of all.

Re: The 144,000 & the twelve tribes of Israel - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/15 18:00

144,000 The following list, is not a list of Israel or the twelve tribes of Israel, but rather it is a picture. If it were a list of Israel, it must begin with Reuben. Because Reuben was the first born. Number two on the list would be Ephraim, but he has been left out. That's a bit like leaving out Washington DC from the states of America. Dan is also left out, while Joseph has been included, but there is no tribe of Joseph, because Joseph gave his inheritance to his two sons, Ephraim and Manassah, who are themselves both tribes, but there is no such thing as the tribe of Joseph.

The tribe of Levi has been included, but Levi was never included, because they were priests, they didn't own any land, and therefore had no inheritance. NO this is not a list of Israel at all, this is another picture. The first born in this list is Judah. The leader of this picture is Judah.

Two or three chapters of Genesis describe why each tribe was called by the name it was, it goes into the details of how the mother felt the day she got pregnant, how she felt when she was having the baby, and why the mother called the child that name. The events around the birth of those boys were so arranged by God, that when you put the names together, you suddenly hear the whole gospel in the names of those boys. Now we can understand why one has to be left out here, and one has to be left out there, because they do not fit this picture. This picture is an unfolding revelation of Jesus Christ.

The first name is Judah. Judah means Praised or celebrated.

The second name is Reuben. The name Reuben means Behold a Son.

The third one is called Gad. Gad means a Great Company,

The fourth name is Asher. The name Asher means 'Happy', 'Joy filled'.

The fifth name is Naphtali. Naphtali means to wrestle and overcome.

The sixth name is Manasseh. Manasseh means 'forgetting'. Joseph gave that name to his son – remember when Joseph was sold down the river to Egypt and thrown into prison as a slave, finally after it was all over, he was made prime minister, he married and had his son Manasseh – finally I have forgotten all my troubles, and I have forgotten all the ill that was done to me.

The seventh name is Simeon. Simeon means 'hearing' 'My sheep hear my voice' this is another key verse to the early part of Revelation – He who has ears to hear, let him hear

The eighth name is Levi. Levi means 'joined to'.

The ninth name is Issachar. Issachar means 'A price was paid'.

The tenth named is Zebulon which means a dwelling-place. Ephesians 2.20 says that we have become the dwelling place of God through the Spirit.

The eleventh mentioned is Joseph. Joseph means 'Adding, fruitful' Remember, there is no tribe of Joseph. He gave his inheritance to his sons.

Then lastly number twelve Benjamin. Rachel died giving birth to Benjamin, and as she was dying, she took the little child, and because of the horror and agony of her death, she named him "Banoni" and Banoni means 'Son of my deep sorrow'. The Father would have none of it, and he changed the name of Banoni to Benjamin, which means 'Son of my right hand'. This is a perfect picture of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the Banoni-Benjamin. He is the Son of my sorrow, and after the sorrow was over, he arose again and became the Son of his Father's right hand.

And so this great company could be looked at from all those twelve different angles, and you could say, this is the Israel of God, Israel is not a nation like India or France, but it is a nation of believers with a heartfelt faith for God. All through the Old Testament Israel is seen as the vine. Jesus said I am the true vine! In other words I am the true Israel of God. The Israel of God can only be found in Jesus. The Bible is about HIM, and the book of Revelation is about Him. The first sentence in the book of Revelation states, "This is the revelation of Jesus Christ.

The true Israel of God starts with the promise made to Abraham. The Israel of God is made up of all of the Old Testament believers that are looking forward to the promised Messiah. The promise is completed in the finished work of Christ. Now when all of the gentiles, that is, all of the Jews and non Jews, that are cut off from God's covenant in Christ. When all of the gentiles have come in, then Israel will be completed and saved. God told Jacob to change his name from Jacob to Israel. A lot of Hebrew names have different variations of meanings Israel means 'To be a prince with God' Israel also means 'To rule with God.' Israel also means, 'To be ruled by God' Therefore for a man to be part of God's Israel, and to rule with God, the man must first be broken and ruled by God.

The Lion of the Tribe of Judah leads Israel, the complete Church of God. Now it says that each one of them was sealed. A seal in the Bible speaks of ownership. Many slaves had the name of their owner stamped on to their forehead. They were sealed, they were owned, and if someone owned you, they looked after you.

What about the number, 144,000? We are back to those 12's again. 3×4 is 12, and 3×4 is 12, 12×12 is 144,? So we are back again to the 12 of the Old Testament, 12 of the New Testament, and 12×12 gives us 144, but then it is $10 \times 10 \times 10$. Ten is the perfection of number. You count 1-10, stop at 10 and begin at 1 again, so 10 is the perfection of number. Times 3 is the symbolic number of the Tri-unity. 144,000 gives me an idea, it does not speak of a number, and the idea is **the perfect completed Church of the Old Testament and New Testament, the completed Israel of God the holy nation of all believers since the promise to Abraham.** Within this number of 144,000 all of Israel is saved. You will notice that John said he heard the number, he didn't see it This idea of the 144,000 being the whole Church and saved Israel makes sense because we see the next part of the chapter from V:9 as the rapture taking place.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/16 0:05

bro logic
you said:

Quote:
-----144,000 The following list, is not a list of Israel or the twelve tribes of Israel, but rather it is a picture. If it were a list of Israel, it must begin with Reuben. Because Reuben was the first born. Number two on the list would be Ephraim, but he has been left out. That's a bit like leaving out Washington DC from the states of America. Dan is also left out, while Joseph has been included, but there is no tribe of Joseph, because Joseph gave his inheritance to his two sons, Ephraim and Manassah, who are themselves both tribes, but there is no such thing as the tribe of Joseph.

but the word says

And I heard the number of them which were sealed: and there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel.

all the tribes says the word. then also i think it's important to look at what Israel said to his sons before he died. he said to his firstborn Reuben in genesis chapt 49:

3 Reuben, thou art my firstborn, my might, and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power: 4 Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel; because thou wentest up to thy father's bed; therefore thou defiledst thou it: he went up to my couch.

thou shalt not excel means that he wouldn't be of much significance because of what he did in defiling his father's bed. i think this is a hint if not a/the reason as to why Reuben isn't mentioned first.

but then Jacob said this of Judah in the same chapter:

8 Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. 9 Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up? 10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. 11 Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: 12 His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk.

Christ came from the tribe of Judah, perhaps this is why Judah is mentioned first in addition to what Jacob said?

bro Ron (philologos) mentioned a couple of pages back that the tribe of Dan was the one which embraced idolatry first and it's exclusion here may have to do with how God hates idolatry. something to think about.

i think levi is left out in past times because as the tribes were listed it may have had to do with the land and distribution thereof.

Quote:
-----And so this great company could be looked at from all those twelve different angles, and you could say, this is the Israel of God, Israel is not a nation like India or France, but it is a nation of believers with a heartfelt faith for God. All through the Old Testament Israel is seen as the vine. Jesus said I am the true vine! In other words I am the true Israel of God. The Israel of God can only be found in Jesus. The Bible is about HIM, and the book of Revelation is about Him. The first sentence in the book of Revelation states, "This is the revelation of Jesus Christ."

is this replacement theology? it seems to me that there is a distinction somehow between the Jew and the Gentile as it pertains to the Lord's purposes on this side. so to say the church is Israel isn't true at all. it seems rather weird that we're one in Christ but we are still on some levels for God's purposes, Jews and Gentiles.

Quote:
-----What about the number, 144,000? We are back to those 12's again. 3x4 is 12, and 3 x 4 is 12, 12 x 12 is 144.? So we are back again to the 12 of the Old Testament, 12 of the New Testament, and 12 x 12 gives us 144, but then it is x10 x10 x10. Ten is the perfection of number. You count 1-10, stop at 10 and begin at 1 again, so 10 is the perfection of number. Times 3 is the symbolic number of the Tri-unity. 144,000 gives me an idea, it does not speak of a number, and the idea is the perfect completed Church of the Old Testament and New Testament, the completed Israel of God the holy nation of all believers since the promise to Abraham. Within this number of 144,000 all of Israel is saved. You will notice that John said he heard the number, he didn't see it. This idea of the 144,000 being the whole Church and saved Israel makes sense because we see the next part of the chapter from V:9 as the rapture taking place.

well it seems to me that in chapt 14 there is another 144000 which is the firstfruits of all men which are all virgins which are separate from the 144000 from Israel. also it doesn't make sense for this 144000 in chapt 14 to be a symbol of the whole church because later on in chapt 14 the word says this in chapt 14 vs 13:

Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: F23 Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.

if the whole church is in heaven at this time (assuming the 144000 virgins in chapt 14 or the 144000 in chapt 7 are a symbol of the church) then why would there still be people dying for the Lord on earth after the rapture in vs 9 of chapt 7 in chapt 14 ? i've asked this a couple of times before and not gotten an answer, can someone explain this? :-? :-?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/16 13:43

Quote:
-----is this replacement theology? it seems to me that there is a distinction somehow between the Jew and the Gentile as it pertains to the Lord's purposes on this side. so to say the church is Israel isn't true at all. it seems rather weird that we're one in Christ but we are still on some level for God's purposes, Jews and Gentiles.

What does Paul mean when he says, "Israel of God"?

They are the true people of God.

Romans 4:12 And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.

Colosians 2:11 In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

Both Jews and Gentiles?

Yes, only as long as they are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands

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

Ephesians explains this most in both chapt. 2 & 3

If the "Israel of God" implies Christians and only Christians make up the Church...isn't Paul calling the Church the "True" Israel of God?

Yes, but don't forget that the actual Nation of Israel (even though unsaved) remains his also.

Don't get caught up in the replacement theology which is the church today is replaces Israel. Some promises in the Bible can be only for the Nation of Israel.

Gen. 12:3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

He still claims Israel as His:

Isaiah 43:1 But now thus saith the LORD that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine.

The whole end times revolve around the Nation Israel. In the end He will save them because they are His also.

Quote:
-----if the whole church is in heaven at this time (assuming the 144000 virgins in chapt 14 or the 144000 in chapt 7 are a symbol of the church) then why would there still be people dying for the Lord on earth after the rapture in vs 9 of chapt 7 in chapt 14 ? i've asked this a couple of times before and not gotten an answer, can someone explain this?

in Rev. 8:1 "And when he had opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven about the space of half an hour." This half hour is half a season, so therefor it would mark a division of the 7 years. A division of the False peace with the wrath of the devil which is the persecution of the true Church from Gods' wrath. We are not appointed to wrath. I don't think it smack dab in the middle, but some where in between.

notice

Rev. 10:7 But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.

Then
Rev 11:15 And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever.

So
This would be a jump to the final end.
Chapters 12-16 is a whole new Vision of the same thing.

then
Capt. 17 tells about the "Mystery" vv17:5
Chapt. 18:1 "**And after these things** I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was as lightened with his glory."
In Chapt 19 another **And after these things**
Chapt.20 the word "then" could also be an "**And after these things**"

Remember the Bowl & the Trumpets are all in the 6th and 7th seal and the bowls are all in the 6th and 7th trumpet. You can't read Revelations as chronologically linear in time from chapter to chapter although some chapters are.

Notice: the same three things happening in three different chapters.

Rev 8:5 And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings, and an earthquake.

Rev 11:19 And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunders, and an earthquake, and great hail.

Rev 16:18 And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, so great.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/16 18:13

Quote:
-----Don't get caught up in the replacement theology which is the church today is replacing Israel. Some promises in the Bible can be only for the Nation of Israel.

Israel, as a nation, was the creation of the Sinai covenant. "Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel."

(Ex 19:5-6 KJVS) Of that 'first' covenant the writer to the Hebrews declares...Heb. 8:7 (KJVS) For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.

Heb. 8:13 (KJVS) In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

Heb. 9:1 (KJVS) Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.

Heb. 10:9 (KJVS) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. If 'to take away the first so that he may establish the second' is not 'replacement', what is it?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/16 19:02

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----If 'to take away the first so that he may establish the second' is not 'replacement', what is it?

Replacement Theology is not true. It basically teaches that the church has completely replaced Israel in God's plan. Adherents of Replacement Theology believe that the Jews are no longer God's chosen people and God does not have specific future plans for the nation of Israel.

Heb. 8:7 (KJVS) For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.

Heb. 8:13 (KJVS) In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

Heb. 9:1 (KJVS) Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.

Heb. 10:9 (KJVS) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

But

Jer. 31:31 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a **new covenant** with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:...

Jer 31:33 But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, **I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts;** and will be their God, and they shall be my people

Jer 31:34 And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

It is the same Law but the only difference between the Old and New covenant is that **the New is written on our hearts** and the Old is on stone.

When it was on stone, we couldn't keep it because we had to keep the law by our flesh.

Romans 8:3 "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:"

Re:Simple jcheinrichs ?, on: 2006/2/16 20:58

Excuse me just a minute I have another message for jcheinrichs.

Hey bro jcheinrichs, if your icon is a guy, praying on his face, I hope that's true, cuz you started this.

Thanks loads :-(.

Shalom & Agape.

Annie

Ding - Resume 9th Round.

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2006/2/17 5:11

The problem with the dispensational idea of separate plans for the church and Israel, is that the new testament writers repeatedly took scriptures that were given specifically to the Jews (along with Jewish rites and ceremonies) and re-interpret and apply them to the Church, proving for us 'replacement' types that there is only one people of God.

Logic wrote;

Jer. 31:31 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a **new covenant** with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:...

Jer 31:33 But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, **I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts**; and will be their God, and they shall be my people
Jer 31:34 And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

It is the same Law but the only difference between the Old and New covenant is that **the New is written on our hearts** and the Old is on stone.

When it was on stone, we couldn't keep it because we had to keep the law by our flesh.

Please note that you also just took a scripture written to the Jews and applied it to the Church.(WE couldn't keep it...)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/17 5:28

Quote:
-----Replacement Theology is not true. It basically teaches that the church has completely replaced Israel in God's plan. Adherents of Replacement Theology believe that the Jews are no longer God's chosen people and God does not have specific future plans for the nation of Israel.

It is of course, its opponents who call it 'replacement theology'. I have been accused of this little list of crimes above, but I think of myself as as a subscriber to 'fulfillment theology'.

Quote:
-----Jer. 31:31 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:..

Now if you are going to quote this section you really ought not to break off in the middle of it...“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord:”
(Jer 31:31-32 KJVS)...where it states quite clearly that the new covenant would not be 'according to the old covenant'; in other words 'quite different'.

This passage refers to the Northern Kingdom of Israel (house of Israel) and to the Southern Kingdom of Judah (house of Judah). In 722BC the Northern kingdom walked out of history and into legend.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/17 12:17

bro Logic

Quote:

-----Remember the Bowl & the Trumpets are all in the 6th and 7th seal and the bBowls are all in the 6th and 7th trumpet.

this is something to think about, in the study on the revelation by watchman nee i've been going through he says that the 7 trumpets are part of the opening of the 7th seal and that the 7 bowls are a part of the last trumpet.

Quote:

-----You can't read Revelations as chronologicly linier in time from chapter to chapter although some chapters are.

still unsure of this part though but will look into it, i hadn't thought of this though.

thanks bro

replacement theology what? - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/17 12:31

brethren it seems to me that there are still some things which the Lord can only do through the Jews and not the gentiles so there is still a distinction in that regard. we as gentiles can't build the Lord's temple in the future so that it may be desecrated by the antichrist. we have been grafted in and in time the Jews will be brought back into the olive tree. we haven't replaced the Jews because they will be grafted back in and the tree will be complete.

from romans 11

**17 And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, F4
4 and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; 18 Boast not against the branches. But if tho
u boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. 19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I
might be grafted in. 20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highmi
nded, but fear: 21 For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. 22 Behold t
herefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou con
tinue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. 23 And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, s
hall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in again. 24 For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild
by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the n
atural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree? 25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of t
his mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness F45 in part is happened to Israel, until t
he fulness of the Gentiles be come in. 26 And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out o
f Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: 27 For this is my covenant unto them, when I
shall take away their sins. 28 As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the el
ection, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes. 29 For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. 30 For
as ye in times past have not believed F46 God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: 31 Even so
have these also now not believed, F47 that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. 32 For God hath co
ncluded F48 them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.**

Re: Define a Jew - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/17 20:39

Quote:

-----there are still some things which the Lord can only do through the Jews and not the gentiles

What Jews would this be referring to?

Actually, what is a Jew?

Are they defined by religion, nationality, culture, or geneology?
What about proselytes - those whose ancestors adopted Judaism?
What about Jews who have integrated with other cultures through dispersions?

And would a modern definition of "Jew" be the same as that used in Scripture - descendent of the House of Judah... Is that important?

Why did geneological records get lost if ancestral line was important to God's fulfillment?

It seems to get very complicated when we try to define this people group.
Diane

Re:, on: 2006/2/17 20:54

Ironman said

Quote:
-----we haven't replaced the Jews because they will be grafted back in and the tree will be complete.

I hate to say this, but, narrow is the way that leads to salvation and few there be who find it. A person's ethnicity, nationality, or previous religion is not going to help them.... that's the WHOLE point. We ALL lay EVERYTHING down. We come as individual *people* to the Lord, one by one by one.

The Jews (I like Logic's description of this, but I don't know what anyone else thinks of it.) who are saved and grafted back into the olive tree, will, like the rest of us be the ones God always knew would accept the Messaiah. We are as incomplete without them, as they are without us.

Diane,

It occurred to me today there may yet be a scientific way of defining 'Jew' before the end arrives, if DNA analysis continues to develop. I'm not suggesting this would be a *good* thing, but, the alternative is 'the Lord knows the hearts that are His'.... (which in the end is all that matters....)... which also takes it right out of human control.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/18 4:22

jimbob wrote:

Quote:
-----The problem with the dispensational idea of separate plans for the church and Israel, is that the new testament writers repeatedly took scriptures that were given specifically to the Jews (along with Jewish rites and ceremonies) and re-interpret and apply them to the Church, proving for us 'replacement' types that there is only one people of God.

Read Romans 11. God hasn't forgotten them and will graft them back in. So we really haven't replaced them but only for the time being.

I have a question: Do you think that God has totally disowned Israel and totally replaced Israel with His Church, never to take Israel back?

jimbob wrote:

Quote:
-----Please note that you also just took a scripture written to the Jews and applied it to the Church.(WE couldn't keep it...)

I figured you would know what I mean when I said we couldn't keep it. But Like all of humanity, The children of Israel couldn't keep the Law written on stone.

I related to all of humanity because God still uses His law written on stone to convict all people of sin. God puts all humanity under His law.

How does God prove our sins? He uses the Law.

Our sins are the evidence of the Law that God uses against us. If our sins haven't been washed away by His atoning blood, then the evidence against us will condemn us on the Day of Judgment. How is the Law used? The Law is used to show us that **we** cannot uphold the law and **we** are incapable to do it and that we need to be changed from within in order to accomplish the Law. The Law not only shows **us** that **we** sin, it also shows us why **we** need to be changed most of all

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/2/18 5:23

Quote:
-----Actually, what is a Jew?

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

Rom 2:28-29

Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him.

God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.
Joh 4:20-24

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.
Gal 3:28

Re: Jews - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/2/18 6:19

Quote:
-----Do you think that God has totally disowned Israel and totally replaced Israel with His Church

Quote:
-----true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit

It would seem that all are included in the grace offered by God.

Another question:
Rev. 2:9 the "slander of those who say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan."
Rev. 3:9 "who claim to be Jews but are not."

Who are these people?
Are these words for today?
What kind of slander might this be?
Am I treading on dangerous territory by asking this?
Diane

Re: sorry to be nit picky, but I Love the WORD of GOD - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/18 6:22

sorry to be nit picky, but I Love the WORD of GOD and I am a word smith.

crsschk wrote:

Quote:

-----God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. Joh 4:20-24

that version which says "God is a Spirit"?is in error because John 4:24 should read "God is spirit. . . ." , not "a spirit," or "the Spirit," but "spirit"—as to God's essence or nature (qualitative).

The literal reading of John 4:24 is: "God is spirit" (*pneuma ho theos*). The word "spirit" (*pneuma*) is an anarthrous predicate nominative that comes before the subject (lit: "spirit the God"), hence grammatically, "spirit" cannot be translated in definite: "a spirit,," but rather qualitative: "spirit," denoting as to the quality of God- namely as to His nature: He is spirit, thus the text does not read: has a spirit but is spirit.

God **has** a Spirit whom we call "the Holy Spirit"

God has flesh in whom we call "Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ"

But God the Father is totally other than, neither "a Spirit" nor flesh.

And you didn't answer my question, Do you think that God has totally disowned Israel and totally replaced Israel with His Church?

Jews who are not jews are the ones that aren't circumcised in the heart.

Phil. 3:3 For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.

Colos. 2:11 In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/18 7:40

logic's

Quote:

-----that version which says "God is a Spirit"?is in error because John 4:24 should read "God is spirit. . . ." , not "a spirit," or "the Spirit," but "spirit"—as to God's essence or nature (qualitative).

I too love words and the word of God, hence my logo. As far as I can see the NASB was the first version to omit the 'definite article' and has been followed subsequently by most versions, including the NKJV but I think you are right to say that the KJV can be bettered here.

I am not so comfortable with the deductions that you seem to be making from it.

Quote:

-----He is spirit, thus the text does not read: has a spirit but is spirit.

God **has** a Spirit whom we call "the Holy Spirit"

God has flesh in whom we call "Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ"

But God the Father is totally other than, neither "a Spirit" nor flesh.

I am not sure what point you are making here. The neither text has 'has (a) spirit' *pneuma o theos* The plainest sense would seem to be 'God is Spirit'. We have had some struggles elsewhere on SI regarding Trinitarian views and I want to be sure I understand what you are saying here.

John 4:24 is NOT saying "God has a Spirit whom we call 'the Holy Spirit'" It is simply saying that God's nature is 'spirit' rather than any physical. The context remember is 'where we should worship Him'. The point of the Lord's comment is that the 'place' is irrelevant because 'God is Spirit'.

Your statement that God has a Spirit whom we call the 'Holy Spirit, is unfortunate. God does not have 'a spirit' in the way that you and I 'have a spirit'. In Trinitarian terms 'God is Spirit' is applicable to each person of the godhead. The Father is Spirit, The Word is Spirit, and the Spirit is Spirit. The Word became flesh but did not thereby cease to be Spirit. The Father has never 'become' flesh, nor has the Spirit.

When we refer to men having a body and a soul and a spirit, these are constituent 'parts' of what it means to be human. Death separates these constituents and resurrection re-unites them. So we would never say 'Man is Spirit' we would have to say 'man has a spirit'. Nor can we really say 'man is flesh'. to be 'pedantic' we really ought to say that 'man has flesh'. If man is anything, he is soul. God has no 'constituent parts'. The Father is wholly God, the Word is wholly God, the Spirit is wholly God.

To say, as you do, that God is 'neither a spirit nor flesh' is confusing. I would need you either to omit the indefinite article or supply it both times. If you mean mean 'God is not a spirit, and God is not a body' I would have to say that I disagree with you. God is Spirit. 'Flesh or Spirit' is a continuing contrast of John's record. This passage is simply repeating this contrast; God is not physically located ie in flesh, but is Spirit and hence must be worshipped in spirit and truth.

Darby's 'pedantic' translation has "God a spirit; and they who worship him must worship in spirit and truth." (John 4:24 DRBY). The words in square brackets being omitted in the Greek. Consequently the original does not say either 'God has' or 'God is' spirit. The reader is expected to supply the verb. I suggest that the most obvious choice would be 'is'.

Re: When the 1/3 Marches In., on: 2006/2/18 8:04

When are the unbelieving Jews saved ?

Zech. 12:2 Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem.

Zech. 12:3 And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people: all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it.

Zech. 12:4 In that day, saith the LORD, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness: and I will open mine eyes upon the house of Judah, and will smite every horse of the people with blindness.

Zech. 12:5 And the governors of Judah shall say in their heart, The inhabitants of Jerusalem shall be my strength in the LORD of hosts their God.

Zech. 12:6 In that day will I make the governors of Judah like a hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, on the right hand and on the left: and Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem.

Zech. 12:7 The LORD also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not magnify themselves against Judah.

Zech. 12:8 In that day shall the LORD defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the LORD before them.

Zech. 12:9 And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem.

Zech. 12:10 And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.

Zec 13:8 And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the LORD, two parts therein shall be cut off and die: but the third shall be left therein.

Zec 13:9 And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The LORD is my God.

Zec 14:1 Behold, the day of the LORD cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee.

Zec 14:2 For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.

Zec 14:3 Then shall the LORD go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle.

Zec 14:4 And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south.

Zec 14:5 And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal: yea, ye shall flee, like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah: and the LORD my God shall co

me, and all the saints with thee.

Zec 14:6 And it shall come to pass in that day, that the light shall not be clear, nor dark:

Zec 14:7 But it shall be one day which shall be known to the LORD, not day, nor night: but it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light.

Zec 14:8 And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be.

Zec 14:9 And the LORD shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one LORD, and his name one. Etc. of 14 ...

John 19:33 But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they broke not his legs:

John 19:34 But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water.

John 19:35 And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.

John 19:36 For these things were done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken.

John 19:37 And again another Scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced.

Rev. 1:7 Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/2/18 8:08

Quote:

-----Another question:

Rev. 2:9 the "slander of those who say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan."

Rev. 3:9 "who claim to be Jews but are not."

A good question, hadn't give it much thought.

And I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not; who asserted themselves to be the true Israel of God, Jews that were so inwardly, regenerate persons, or truly Christians; for the Christians, baptized persons (many), were by the Heathens called Jews; but these were not, they professed Christianity in words, but in works denied it; they were men of bad principles and practices, and both blasphemed the ways and doctrines of Christ themselves, and caused them to be blasphemed by others also; they were false Christians, nominal professors, and shunned persecution for the Gospel; who were not what they would be thought to be: these were the broachers of heresies in this period of time, in which there was a multitude of them, and which chiefly respected the doctrine of the Trinity, and the person of Christ; and they were introducers of Pagan and Jewish rites into the church, and were men of flagitious lives and conversations, and paved the way for the man of sin:

but are the synagogue of Satan: were the children of the devil, imitated him, and were influenced by him, and were the forerunners of antichrist, whose coming was after the working of Satan,

John Gill

Re: Blasphemy, on: 2006/2/18 8:27

Blasphemy is the key word here.

I remember we had a good thread just on "blasphemy" here last year ... where it was brought out clearly, that one who calls the workings of the Holy Spirit through a Christian, from the devil, is considered to be "blasphemy".

Dangerous ground to trod, indeed.

Vincent's Word Studies ...

"Blasphemy (βλασφημιαν)"

See on Mar_7:22. Not primarily direct blasphemy against God, but reviling at believers."

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/18 9:14

I am sorry, I apologise. I guess was thinking on the two things at once when I put the has in the God has a Spirit...and God has flesh....

So in correction:

God is a Spirit whom we call "the Holy Spirit"

God has flesh in whom we call "Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ"

Quote:
-----To say, as you do, that God is 'neither a spirit nor flesh' is confusing. I would need you either to omit the indefinite article or supply it both times. If you mean mean 'God is not a spirit, and God is not a body' I would have to say that I disagree with you. God is Spirit. 'Flesh or Spirit' is a continuing contrast of John's record. This passage is simply repeating this contrast; God is not physically located ie in flesh, but is Spirit and hence must be worshipped in spirit and truth.

To put it better I will say that God the Father Himself is not a spirit as the Holy spirit is nor in the flesh as His son still is. He is totally other than which is the very definition of the word Holy.

Jesus is sitting at the Fathers right Hand, or standing in the case of Stephen.

The Holy Spirit is omnipresent like the wind. He can also come upon us or be poured out of us as in Joel 2:28

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/18 19:54

Hi Logic,

I don't think your explanations are helping me. ;-)

Quote:
-----So in correction: "God is a Spirit whom we call "the Holy Spirit"?? God has flesh in whom we call "Lord and Savior, Jesus the Christ"

The God who is Spirit has revealed Himself to be personally and individually identified as 'The Father, The Word and the Holy Spirit'. The one we call 'the Holy Spirit' is not who John 4 is referring to. The God who is Spirit is Father, Word and Spirit. The God who is Spirit is not called 'the Holy Spirit', the God who is Spirit is Father, Word AND Holy Spirit.

I can't get a grip on the next sentence. What does 'God has flesh in whom we call' mean? The God who is Spirit, does not have 'flesh'. But 'God the Word' who is Spirit became Flesh; He did not have it, but became it. He did not cease to be spirit in becoming flesh. This is the wonder of the incarnation.

Quote:
-----To put it better I will say that God the Father Himself is not a spirit as the Holy spirit is nor in the flesh as His son still is. He is totally other than which is the very definition of the word Holy.

God the Father is Spirit in exactly the way that the Spirit is spirit, otherwise there is difference of 'substance' within the godhead and trinity is no longer trinity.

Quote:
-----Jesus is sitting at the Fathers right Hand, or standing in the case of Stephen.
The Holy Spirit is omnipresent like the wind. He can also come upon us or be poured out of us as in Joel 2:28

Your views of the godhead seem very static. How, according to the above do you understand the following quotation? "Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14:23 KJVS)

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/18 20:53

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----The God who is Spirit has revealed Himself to be personally and individually identified as 'The Father, The Word and the Holy Spirit'
. The one we call 'the Holy Spirit' is not who John 4 is referring to. The God who is Spirit is Father, Word and Spirit. The God who is Spirit is not called '
the Holy Spirit', the God who is Spirit is Father, Word AND Holy Spirit.

I know that John 4 isnt refering to the Hoy Spirit. Sounds tike you are sayng 1 is 3 when in reality God is 3 is 1.

I am sorry, but the only way my peanut brain can handle the trinity is three Personalities in unity. Or one cubed as in 1 to the 3rd power and $1 \times 3 = 1$. The Godhead consists of Father, Son Holy Spirit.

Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:

shama` Yisra'el Y@hovah 'elohiym 'echad Y@hovah

Listen, O Israel Jehova our Gods' is unified togeter as Jehova.

'elohiym = the Gods

'echad = unity or unified

Quote:
-----I can't get a grip on the next sentence. What does 'God has flesh in whom we call' mean? The God who is Spirit, does not have 'fles
h'. But 'God the Word' who is Spirit became Flesh; He did not have it, but became it. He did not cease to be spirit in becoming flesh. This is the wonder
of the incarnation.

God has flesh of whom we call the Word. Jesus is the Word.

In what form did the come as when He walked in the cool of the day with Adam, or the Word of the Lord come to prophet
s as? Did He only put flesh on when He came down to Earth? I always figured Jesus, or the Word, always had Glorified f
lesh until He came in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3).

Quote:
-----God the Father is Spirit in exactly the way that the Spirit is spirit, otherwise there is difference of 'substance' within the godhead and
trinity is no longer trinity.

What is "Spirit" anyway? I always figured spirit in the geeral sence means Attitude.

Isn't there a difference of substance? Jesus is in the flesh, the Holy Spirit is a Spirit, and God the Father is neither.
This is how I actualy figure God. If I am in ereore, PLEASE correct me. I will keep reading what you wrote to get a better
grip on it an I hope you will reiterate.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/19 12:17

hi logic

Quote:
-----Sounds tike you are sayng 1 is 3 when in reality God is 3 is 1.

Not at all. I am NOT saying either. 3 is never 1 and 1 is never 3. The trinity is 3 IN 1. To say 3 is 1 would transgress t
he trinitarian warning of "not confounding the persons nor dividing the substance". The godhead is not "1 cubed".

Quote:

-----In what form did he come as when He walked in the cool of the day with Adam, or the Word of the Lord come to prophets as? Did He only put flesh on when He came down to Earth? I always figured Jesus, or the Word, always had Glorified flesh until He came in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3).

You said in an earlier post that you liked to choose your words carefully but you are using words in a dangerously woolly way here. If you avoid the poetic 'putting on flesh' and use the biblical phrases of 'the word became flesh and dwelt among us' you would see that the incarnation took place in Mary's womb and never previously. Your 'figuring that he always had Glorified flesh' is a speculation which is not supported by the scripture and is in fact denied by the incarnation accounts. Angels take on human appearance fairly frequently in the OT but these are not incarnations. The Word appeared as the Angel of the LORD in the OT but never as an incarnation.

Quote:

-----What is "Spirit" anyway? I always figured spirit in the general sense means Attitude.

This is another case of your wrong 'figuring'. The use of the word 'spirit' as meaning 'attitude' has no biblical precedent as far as I am aware. It is always used as a concrete noun and never as an abstract mood.

Quote:

-----Isn't there a difference of substance? Jesus is in the flesh, the Holy Spirit is a Spirit, and God the Father is neither. This is how I actually figure God.

It is a vital aspect of Trinitarian doctrine that the persons of the Godhead are 'of the same substance'. This is not substance used in a chemical sense but is our struggle to 'define' what is quite beyond us. However, what the Father is, the Word is. That is the purpose of John 1:1. Whatever the Father and the Word is, so is the Spirit. These are the opening statements of the Nicene Creed: believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made:

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/19 13:20

sis Diane

i think it refers to those who are jewish by birth (wherever they may be) and those who are converts. now as far as why the genealogical records got lost if this was important to God to fulfil His plan, all can say is God knows. but the bottom line is the Jews still have a work to do for God on this side such as the rebuilding of the temple where the dome of the rock is. no gentile can do that.

yes i agree that it does get complicated when we define who the Jews are but the Lord knows them even though we may not know them all.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/19 13:25

sis Dorcas

Quote:

-----I hate to say this, but, narrow is the way that leads to salvation and few there be who find it. A person's ethnicity, nationality, or previous religion is not going to help them.... that's the WHOLE point. We ALL lay EVERYTHING down. We come as individual people to the Lord, one by one by one.

why should you hate to say that since it's true sis? we are all indeed God's people but there is still a distinction between Jew and gentile because it serves a purpose of God on this side. The Jews have always been God's chosen and that won't change. and we need them because they have an intimate knowledge of God the Father and they need us because

we know God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. So we are incomplete without them and they without us.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/19 21:19

philologos wrote:

Quote:

hi logic

Quote:

-----Sounds tike you are sayng 1 is 3 when in reality God is 3 is 1.

Not at all. I am NOT saying either. 3 is never 1 and 1 is never 3. The trinity is 3 IN 1. To say 3 is 1 would transgress the trinitarian warning of "not co
nfounding the persons nor dividing the substance". The godhead is not "1 cubed".

If it is 3 in 1 the Deuteronomy 6:4 would say Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God in one LORD: and not Hear, O Israel: T
he LORD our God is one LORD:

Quote:

-----What is "Spirit" anyway? I always figured spirit in the geeral sence means Attitude.

Quote:

-----This is another case of your wrong 'figuring'. The use of the word 'spirit' as meaning 'attitude' has no biblical precedent as far as I am aware. It is alwa
ys used as a concrete noun and never as an abstract mood.

Spirit can mean "attitude"

other than meaning spirit or breath and wind, it can also mean 1.the rational, the power by which the human being feels,
thinks, and decides

2.the disposition or influence which fills and governs the soul of any one 3. mind 4. mental disposition 5. bent

Quote:

-----Isn't there a difference of substance? Jesus is in the flesh, the Holy Spirit is a Spirit, and God the Father is neither.
This is how I actualy figure God.

Quote:

----- It is a vital aspect of Trinitarian doctrine that the persons of the Godhead are 'of the same substance'. This is not substance used i
n a chemical sense but is our struggle to 'define' what is quite beyond us. However, what the Father is, the Word is. That is the purpose of John 1:1 .
Whatever the Father and the Word is, so is the Spirit. These are the opening statements of the Nicene Creed

If they are of the same substance how or why would the Son need to do what He does in this verse:

1Corinth. 15:24 "Then comes the end, when **he will give up the kingdom to God, even the Father**; when he will have
put an end to all rule and to all authority and power.

wouldn't this be useless if they are of the same substance

Or

Ephisians 1:17 That **the God of our Lord Jesus Christ**, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and
revelation in the knowledge of him:

They wouldn't have a hierarchy of athority as in this verse.

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2006/2/20 2:54

Quote:

IRONMAN wrote:
sis Dorcas

Quote:
-----I hate to say this, but, narrow is the way that leads to salvation and few there be who find it. A person's ethnicity, nationality, or previous religion is not going to help them.... that's the WHOLE point. We ALL lay EVERYTHING down. We come as individual people to the Lord, one by one by one.

why should you hate to say that since it's true sis? we are all indeed God's people but there is still a distinction between Jew and gentile because it serves a purpose of God on this side. The Jews have always been God's chosen and that won't change. and we need them because they have an intimate knowledge of God the Father and they need us because we know God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. So we are incomplete without them and they without us.

Ironman, if the Jews had an intimate knowledge of the Father, they would love the Son. So the Church has been incomplete without Israel for 2,000 years? Nonsense.

Re:, on: 2006/2/20 3:14

I'd tread lightly here jimbob, because if you do a really good search on one of the "mysteries" that Paul is speaking of, it is of the joining of God's first Chosen people with the gentile believers.

They did come first, and us grafted in branches should never boast against the natural branches.

Paul loved to speak of this "Mystery" and it's a Blessed thing in God's Eyes and economy.

Romans 11 is just one chpt. where he gets into this "Mystery" and IRONMAN has made a Scriptural statement there ... in God's Eyes and in His Plan, we are incomplete without them and they without us ... because in the end, we make up the whole of this "mystery".

If you do a search on that word 'mystery', you'll see other places where it is used in the context of them and us together as one of God's ultimate plans, as becoming one whole. It's really a beautiful study of God's Faithfulness to His Own Words and Promises and that He completes what He started with mankind.

God Bless.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/20 4:12

Logic

Quote:
-----Spirit can mean "attitude"
other than meaning spirit or breath and wind, it can also mean 1.the rational, the power by which the human being feels, thinks, and decides 2.the disposition or influence which fills and governs the soul of any one 3. mind 4. mental disposition 5. bent

Please document this assertion scripturally.

Quote:
-----They wouldn't have a hierarchy of authority as in this verse.

Rather than go over all this again, I suggest you read the
(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id7893&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) godhead thread. That will start the story from the beginning.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/2/20 11:19

bro Jimbob

Quote:
-----Ironman, if the Jews had an intimate knowledge of the Father, they would love the Son. So the Church has been incomplete without Israel for 2,000 years? Nonsense.

they know the Father in the sense that He has dealt with them in a way much different from us and i think we could benefit from that. We are dealt with through God the Son, God dealt with them directly. well if we use the analogy of the olive tree and some of the natural branches have been cut off for the wild ones to be grafted in and then the natural ones will be grafted back, it seems to me that the tree is not yet full.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/20 11:41

Quote:
-----If you do a search on that word 'mystery', you'll see other places where it is used in the context of them and us together as one of God's ultimate plans, as becoming one whole. It's really a beautiful study of God's Faithfulness to His Own Words and Promises and that He completes what He started with mankind.

The first question here is "what kind of 'entity' is the new man?" Is the 'new man' of Eph 2:15 a man of two halves? Is it a 'weld' with a 'Gentile' piece added on to the 'Jewish' piece? Or is it an alloy in which the two become one?

The second question is "what is 'the root' of which natural Israel were part, were not a part, and may be a part if they 'believe'?" If natural Israel are the 'natural branches' can they also be the 'root'? If they are not the root, what is the root?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/2/20 15:39

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----Rather than go over all this again, I suggest you read the
(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id7893&forum36&post_id&refreshGo) godhead thread. That will start the story from the beginning.

Thanx for trying to explain the trinity, It is one area the is so mysterious for me to grasp.

I will always be looking into that subject untill
I am Face to face with Him who loved me.

1Corinth. 13:12 For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

Re:, on: 2006/2/20 15:44

Hia Ron,

First question ... No, not a weld, not "pieces added", but God's intent from the git-go. To have "a" people. All of which are called the children of Abraham. Why it's called a Mystery.

Second question ... The "root" is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world".

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/21 9:57

Quote:
-----First question ... No, not a weld, not "pieces added", but God's intent from the git-go. To have "a" people. All of which are called the children of Abraham. Why it's called a Mystery.

A biblical mystery is not mysterious just 'hidden' until the right time. If two are made one, what were the 'two' and what is the 'one' that they become in Christ?

Quote:
-----Second question ... The "root" is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world".

I don't think this fits the bill. I'm not disputing the fact that the Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world, only whether or not we have a 'Lamb' in view here. The metaphor is a 'vine tree' and my question is what is the 'root' of that vine. Christ IS the true vine, but the 'vine' includes both root and branch, so we are back to the question "what is the root?"

Let me answer my own questions, as I see it at present. The 'new man' is 'new' and had not existed prior to the cross (at the earliest). According to Ephesians at the time of the cross they were still 'two' and were 'made one body by the cross'. That is, the death of Christ made two 'one'. The next question is do they continue to exist as 'two' or are they now only 'one'?

The KJV of "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God;" (Eph 2:19 KJVS) This makes it sound as if the Gentiles have been 'added' to the saints but Darby's pe-dantic translation makes an important point "So then ye are no longer strangers and foreigners, but ye are fellow-citizens of the saints, and of the household of God;" (Eph 2:19 DRBY) I'll try to pick my way carefully through this... the Gentiles are not 'added TO the saints' but become part OF the saints which include believing Jews. The 'saints' are a group made up of Gentiles and Jews. The 'household of God' has the same all inclusive sense. The Gentile is not 'added' to the household of faith but becomes part of the 'household of faith' which includes believing Jews.

As regards the 'root' I think it has to be 'Abrahamic Faith', ie the kind of faith that Abraham displayed in Gen 15:6. This would be consistent then with the whole theme of Romans. (I think it is important to remember that Romans 9-11 cannot be detached from the main argument of Romans that 'there is no difference' (Rom 2:11, 3:22, 10:12). In Romans 4:12 Paul states that the 'Jews' had to have both circumcision and 'Abrahamic Faith', whereas the non-Jew is only required to have 'Abrahamic Faith'. Subsequently, Abraham is the 'father of all the believers'.

This is why I say I think that Abraham (or more precisely 'Abraham's Faith) is the root. Consequently, those without that faith are 'cut out' of the Vine (even once believing Gentiles) and all with that faith are grafted in.