



Scriptures and Doctrine :: for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened

for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2009/10/15 11:58

Quote:
-----Matthew 24:22 And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.

My husband was thinking on this today and said it came to him how the lifespan dropped from Old Testament days to now.

Anyone else see a connection there?

Anyway, the time is short, Praise Jesus while it is day.

white stone

Re: for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened, on: 2009/10/15 13:05

Well we are coming up to the Day Light Savings, where the clocks will fall back, maybe it's talking about that. "The days shall be shortened". :-)

Re: - posted by jmooney6 (), on: 2009/10/15 16:49

I think that it's going to be a cosmic event, where an asteroid or comet of immense proportions is going to strike the Earth at an angle, thereby speeding up it's rotation by a couple of miles, therefore making the days shorter.

During the Tribulation, it isn't just going to be our persecution, but also many things happening that will ultimately destroy the planet as we know it.

Re: , on: 2009/10/15 17:44

Quote:
-----I think that it's going to be a cosmic event, where an asteroid or comet of immense proportions is going to strike the Earth at an angle, thereby speeding up it's rotation by a couple of miles, therefore making the days shorter. During the Tribulation, it isn't just going to be our persecution, but also many things happening that will ultimately destroy the planet as we know it.

Fist of all, the earth is not a planet. We have no scientific evidence that it moves or spins. The entire counsel of Scripture says that the earth is fixed and does not move.

<http://www.geocentrism.com/possible.htm>

2. This is a good discussion of we are all right with God and living in the state of grace. Otherwise, attention must be focused on living in the grace of God and living free of grave sin.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened

Re: , on: 2009/10/15 18:19

Quote:
-----First of all, the earth is not a planet. We have no scientific evidence that it moves or spins. The entire counsel of Scripture says that the earth is fixed and does not move.

Can you give us some of those Scriptures for scientific studying? Please and thank you.

Re: , on: 2009/10/15 18:23

Quote:
-----I think that it's going to be a cosmic event, where an asteroid or comet of immense proportions is going to strike

Since I believe that these "end times" happened long ago, did you know that in the Annals of the Jewish War by Josephus circa 60 AD that there was a Comet that brightened the night sky for the space of a year? That was just one of the "signs" that were being exhibited at that time.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/10/15 18:55

Hello,

Has anyone thought that this is merely referring to fixed time itself? The passage reads, "*And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened*" (Matthew 24:22). It seems to be speaking of the days be shortened (and not *solar* days).

The verse prior to this shows that this undoubtedly refers to the period of "great tribulation:" "*For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be*" (Matthew 24:21). I have always understood this passage to mean that those days (of "great tribulation") would be "cut short" because the Lord Himself will end them when He returns.

Quote:
-----First of all, the earth is not a planet. We have no scientific evidence that it moves or spins. The entire counsel of Scripture says that the earth is fixed and does not move.

<http://www.geocentrism.com/possible.htm>

I'm not sure what you mean. The Earth is a planet. It has been photographed and videotaped from space, from the moon, and from mechanical probes that are sent to other planets. In fact, many of these videos actually show the motion of the Earth compared to the moon, sun and stars in the background. In fact, the photographs of the Earth from distant satellites and probes show it precisely where it is supposed to be in regard to its revolution around the sun. The revolution around the sun accounts for the seasons (along with the tilt of the Earth as it spins on its axis).

The rotation of the Earth is proven every time you use a cell phone and GPS device (that relies on satellites for communication). In addition, it is seen every time you step outside and see the "celestial sphere" move across the night sky (from east to west). The fact that the stars, moon, sun and even comets (that are themselves in motion) move through the sky shows that the Earth is rotating.

If you don't think that the Earth is a *planet* -- then what do you think that it is?

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2009/10/15 20:14

Quote:
-----Has anyone thought that this is merely referring to fixed time itself? The passage reads, "*And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened*" (Matthew 24:22). It seems to be speaking of the days be shortened (and not solar days).

I agree. I have always thought it was the number of days that would be shortened, not the length of the day itself. But I h

ave been wrong before and am sure I will be again. :-)

Re: , on: 2009/10/15 20:27

Quote:

-----Can you give us some of those Scriptures for scientific studying? Please and thank you.

Sure. Here you go:

The Earth Does Not Move

When interpreted literally, the Scriptures teach us that the earth does not move. Should we interpret the Scriptures literally? The rule of St. Augustine, teaches "not to depart from the literal and obvious sense, except only where reason makes it untenable or necessity requires; a rule to which it is the more necessary to adhere strictly in these times, when the thirst for novelty and unrestrained freedom of thought make the danger of error most real and proximate."

In other words, we are to interpret the Scriptures literally unless there is a compelling reason to interpret them otherwise. For example, Matt. 16:18 (Peter is the rock); Matt. 19:9 (remarriage after divorce is adultery); Matt. 26:26-28 ("this is my body"); John 6:51-58 ("eat my flesh"; "drink my blood"); John 3:5 (born of water means baptism); John 20:23 ("whose sins you forgive are forgiven"); 1 Peter 3:21 ("baptism saves you"); and James 5:14-15 ("anoint the sick with oil to save them and forgive their sins").

We must also remember that the Scriptures were dictated to the sacred writers by the Holy Ghost. Thus, we take God's Word for what it says, for He is the author of Scripture. There does not seem to be a compelling reason to depart from the literal and obvious sense of the following Scriptures which teach, both implicitly and explicitly, that the earth does not move.

Certainly, a literal interpretation is not untenable, nor does necessity require an alternative interpretation (because science has not disproved the geocentric theory; in fact, science also provides more evidence for geocentrism):

1 Sam. 2:8 "For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and on them he has set the world."

2 Sam. 22:16; Psalm 18:15 "Then the channels of the sea were seen, the foundations of the world were laid bare... " (Describing the earth as having "foundations" is consistent with an earth that is fixed and established and does not move, as many Scriptures reveal).

1 Chron. 16:30 "yea, the world stands firm, never to be moved." This and many other passages say very plainly that the earth does not move.

Job 26:7 "He stretches out the north over the void, and hangs the earth upon nothing."

Job 38:4; cf. Job 9:6 "Where were you when I laid the foundation of the earth?"

Psalm 8:29 "...when he marked out the foundations of the earth."

Psalm 93:1 "Yea, the world is established; it shall never be moved."

Psalm 96:10 "Yea, the world is established, it shall never be moved."

Psalm 102:25 "Of old thou didst lay the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands."

Psalm 104:5 "Thou didst set the earth on its foundations, so that it should never be shaken."

Psalm 119:90 "thou has established the earth, and it stands firm."

Isaiah 24:18 "...for the windows of heaven are opened, and the foundations of the earth tremble."

Isaiah 48:13 – “My hand laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand spread out the heavens...”

Isaiah 66:1 – “Thus says the Lord: ‘Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool.’”

When the Scriptures say the world is “established” (in Hebrew, “kun”), it indicates that the establishment is ongoing. See, for example, 1 Chron. 22:10, Judges 16:26,29 and Ezra 3:3 where “kun” is used to explain an ongoing lack of motion.

The only time Scripture says the earth will “move” (in Hebrew, “mot” - see “mot” in Job 41:23; Psalm 125:1; 140:10; and Isa. 41:7) is in the context of the end of the world, where God will come in judgment (e.g. Psalm 76:8). This coincides with the apocalyptic literature of, inter alia, Matt. 24:29-30 and 2 Peter 3:10-13, but never suggests actual motion.

Gen. 1:1-5; 14-19 - God created the earth on the first day, and the sun, moon and stars on the fourth day. God created them to “give light upon the earth.” The heavenly bodies were therefore created for the earth, to adorn it, and to mark its seasons. The earth is God’s focal point. This ordering is another indicator that the earth is the center of the universe. How could the sun be the center, if it wasn’t created until the fourth day? This also raises the question: How did the earth have “evening and morning” on days one to three, before the sun was created on day four? Scripture reveals this is because the universe has light that is independent of the sun and stars. In fact, St. Thomas Aquinas hypothesized that God created the sun and stars on day four from this effusive light that He created on day one (just like God created man on day six from the dirt He created on day one). This effusive light is what brought about the “evening and morning” periods of days one through three.

Job 38:18-20,24 – in these verses, although Job knows the sun gives light, God asks Job “where is the way to the dwelling of light” and “where is the way the light is divided?” Job cannot answer God’s questions. Why can’t he, if Job knows that the sun gives light? God is referring to the light He created without any dimensional source. For example, Psalm 74:16 says “You have prepared the light and the sun,” which distinguishes the two sources of light. Ecclesiastes 12:1-2 also says “Remember your Creator...before the sun and the light, and the moon and the stars are darkened.” The sacred writer distinguishes between “the sun” and “the light,” and also indicates that there are four separate sources of light.

Gen. 1:1; 2:1,4; Psalm 113:6; Jer. 10:11; 32:17; 51:48; Joel 3:16; Hag. 2:6,21; Jud. 13:18; cf. Psalm 102:25; Isaiah 24:18; 48:13 – here are some examples where God distinguishes “between the heavens and the earth.” The earth is unique and distinguishable from the rest of the heavens.

Gen. 14:19,22; Ex. 20:11; 31:17; Deut. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28; 2 Sam. 18:9; 2 Kings 19:15; 2 Chron. 2:2; Ez. 5:11; Psalms 69:34; 115:15; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 146:6; Isaiah 37:16; Jer. 23:24; 33:25; 4 Ez. 2:14; 6:38; Tob. 7:18; 1 Macc. 2:37; Jud. 7:28; 9:12; Matt. 5:18; 11:25; 24:35; Mark 13:31; Luke 10:21; 16:17; 21:33; Acts 17:24; Rev. 14:7; cf. Matt. 28:18; Eph. 4:8-10; Phil. 2:10; Col. 1:16 – more examples where God distinguishes between “heaven and earth.” The Scriptures clearly teach that the earth is unique among the rest of the universe.

John 17:24 – Jesus says “...behold my glory which thou hast given me in thy love for me before the foundation of the world.” Jesus’ language also suggests a world that has a firm, unmovable foundation.

Re: , on: 2009/10/15 20:29

The Sun, Moon and Stars Move

Joshua 10:12-14 – “Then spoke Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord gave the Amorites over to the men of Israel; and he said in the sight of Israel, ‘Sun, stand thou still at Gibeon, and thou Moon in the valley of Aijalon.’ And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the nation took vengeance on their enemies. Is this not written in the Book of Jashar? The sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and did not hasten to go down for about a whole day. There has been no day like it before or since, when the Lord hearkened to the voice of a man; for the Lord fought for Israel.” This is the most powerful passage which supports a geocentric view of the universe. This passage clearly says that both the sun and moon stopped moving. This is the literal reading of the passage, and the passage does not warrant a figurative or phenomenological interpretation. Why? First, the book of Joshua was written to record actual historical events in the history of Israel (as opposed to figurative or poetic literature found elsewhere in Scripture), and there is no compelling reason to interpret it other than literally. Second, heliocentrists believe the moon moves. Therefore, it would be contradictory

for them to claim that Joshua told the moon to stand still literally, but told the sun to stand still figuratively. The most reasonable conclusion is that both the moon and sun were moving, and both the moon and sun stopped moving at Joshua's command. Finally, Joshua records that the sun stopped over Gibeon, while the moon stopped over Aijalon. These are two distinct points on the earth which confirm the coordinates of cessation of movement of the sun and moon. There are other Scriptures which also indicate that the sun, moon and stars are moving:

Judges 5:20 – "From heaven fought the stars, from their courses they fought against Sisera."

Judges 5:31 – "So perish all thine enemies, O Lord! But thy friends be like the sun as he rises in his might."

2 Kings 20:11 – "And Isaiah the prophet cried to the Lord; and he brought the shadow back ten steps, by which the sun had declined on the dial of Ahaz."

Job 9:7 – "who commands the sun, and it does not rise."

Psalm 19:5-6 – "In them he has set a tent for the sun, which comes forth like a bridegroom leaving his chamber, and like a strong man runs its course with joy. Its rising is from the end of the heavens, and its circuit to the end of them; and there is nothing hid from its heat."

Psalm 104:19 – "Thou hast made the moon to mark the seasons; the sun knows its time for setting."

Eccles. 1:5 – "The sun rises and the sun goes down, and hastens to the place where it rises."

Wis. 13:2 – "but they supposed that either fire or wind or swift air, or the circle of the stars, or turbulent water, or the luminaries of heaven were the gods that rule the world."

Sir. 43:2 – "The sun, when it appears, making proclamation as it goes forth, is a marvelous instrument, the work of the Most High."

Sir. 43:5 – "Great is the Lord who made it; and at his command it hastens on its course."

Sir. 46:4 – "Was not the sun held back by his hand? And did not one day become as long as two?"

Isaiah 38:7-8 – "This is the sign to you from the Lord, that the Lord will do this thing that he has promised: Behold, I will make the shadow cast by the declining sun on the dial of Ahaz turn back ten steps. So the sun turned back on the dial the ten steps by which it had declined."

Hab. 3:11 – "The sun and moon stood still in their habitation, at the light of thine arrows as they sped, at the flash of thy glittering spear."

1 Esdras 4:34 – "The earth is vast, and heaven is high, and the sun is swift in its course, for it makes the circuit of the heavens and returns to its place in one day."

James 1:11 – "for the sun rises with its scorching heat..."

Jude 13: - "wandering stars for whom the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved forever." A "wandering star" is called a "planet." If the earth does not wander, it is not a planet.

Mark 16:2 – the Apostle says "And very early on the first day of the week they went to the tomb when the sun had risen." Mark is drawing a clear parallel between the risen sun and the risen Son at this poignant moment when the women discovered that Jesus had risen from the dead. Just as the sun rises literally, so Jesus rose literally as well. Scripture also refers to Jesus as the "Sun of Justice" (see Mal. 4:2).

Gen. 1:14-15, 17 – God said, "let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens"; and "God set them in the firmament of the heavens." Geocentrists generally believe that God placed the stars and planets in the "firmament" (which scientists often call the "aether") described by Moses in Genesis. The firmament is a shell containing the heavenly bodies and rotates around a fixed earth.

Dan. 12:3 – “And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever.” This demonstrates that there is a relationship between the stars and the firmament, and yet a distinction between the two as well (the stars have been placed in the firmament).

Sir. 43:1 – “the pride of the heavenly heights is the clear firmament...” This text suggests that the firmament is clear (not visible), and that the firmament shows the “heavenly heights” (the stars, which are imbedded in the firmament).

Gen. 15:12,17; 19:23; 28:11; 32:31; Ex. 17:12; 22:3,26; Lev. 22:7; Num. 2:3; Deut. 11:30; 16:6; 23:11; 24:13; 24:15; Josh. 1:4; 8:29; 10:12,13,27; 12:1; Judges 9:33; 14:18; 19:14; 2 Sam. 2:24; 3:35; 23:4; 1 Kings 22:36; 2 Chron. 18:34; Psalm 50:1; 104:22; 113:3; Isa. 13:10; 41:25; 45:6; 59:19; 60:20; Jer. 15:9; Dan. 6:14; Amos 8:9; Jonah 4:8; Mic. 3:6; Nah. 3:17; Mal. 1:11; Matt. 5:45; 13:6; Mark 1:32; 4:6; 16:2; Luke 4:40; Eph. 4:26 – more examples where the sun “rises,” “sets,” “goes up,” and “goes down.”

Re: , on: 2009/10/15 20:32

Current Science Excludes Geocentrism Through Unproven Assumptions

by Mark Wyatt
April 10, 2008

Astronomy has not disproven geocentrism. In fact astronomy has provided a lot of evidence that supports geocentrism. Cosmology has created models, based on many unproven assumptions, that would make the observations of astronomy reject geocentrism. But if we took alternate assumptions, then those same observations would support geocentrism. What are some of those assumptions (let's look at 3)?

1. Isotropy- the universe looks the same in any direction (and from any place)
2. Homogeneity- The make-up of the universe is more or less the same everywhere.

Points 1 and 2 taken together are called the Cosmological Principle. Since it is a "principle", this means that pretty much all cosmologists, astronomers, etc. will make this assumption. Wikipedia simplifies that Cosmological Principle "on a large scale the universe is pretty much the same everywhere". What does Wikipedia call on for support?

Observed isotropy of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB), combined with the Copernican principle

And what is the Copernican "Principle"? (again from the Wikipedia article on the Copernican Principle)

In cosmology, the Copernican principle, named after Nicolaus Copernicus, states the Earth is not in a central, specially favoured position. More recently, the principle is generalised to the simple statement that humans are not privileged observers. In this sense, it is equivalent to the mediocrity principle, with significant implications in the philosophy of science.

Sounds a little circular to me!

What does Stephen Hawking say about these principles (A Brief History of Time)? My emphasis:
Stephen Hawking

...all this evidence that the universe looks the same whichever direction we look in might seem to suggest there is something special about our place in the universe. In particular, it might seem that if we observe all other galaxies to be moving away from us, then we must be at the center of the universe.

He does provide an alternative view, though:

There is, however, an alternate explanation: the universe might look the same in every direction as seen from any other galaxy, too. This, as we have seen, was Friedmann's second assumption. We have no scientific evidence for, or against, this assumption. We believe it only on grounds of modesty: it would be most remarkable if the universe looked the same in every direction around us, but not around other points in the universe.

Let us continue on the assumptions.

3. The nature of redshift- two leading ones are expansion of the universe and gravitational interpretation. The big bang model of course chooses the first one.

Interestingly, a top cosmologist named George Ellis created a model with earth at one of two centers. Paul Davies editor of Nature magazine commented on the results:

Often the simplest of observations will have the most profound consequences. It has long been a cornerstone of modern science, to say nothing of man's cosmic outlook, that the Earth attends a modest star that shines in an undistinguished part of a run-of-the-mill galaxy. Life arose spontaneously and man evolved on this miscellaneous clump of matter and now directs his own destiny without outside help. This cosmic model is supported by the Big-Bang and Expanding Universe concepts, which in turn are buttressed by the simple observation that astronomers see redshifts wherever they look.

These redshifts are due, of course, to matter flying away from us under the impetus of the Big Bang. But redshifts can also arise from the gravitational attraction of mass. If the Earth were at the center of the universe, the attraction of the surrounding mass of stars would also produce redshifts wherever we looked! The argument advanced by George Ellis in this article is more complex than this, but his basic thrust is to put man back into a favored position in the cosmos. His new theory seems quite consistent with our astronomical observations, even though it clashes with the thought that we are godless and making it on our own.

Let's see what George Ellis, himself said regarding his theory.

George Ellis, a famous cosmologist, in Scientific American, "Thinking Globally, Acting Universally", October 1995

People need to be aware that there is a range of models that could explain the observations," Ellis argues. "For instance, I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its center, and you cannot disprove it based on observations." Ellis has published a paper on this. "You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds. In my view there is absolutely nothing wrong in that. What I want to bring into the open is the fact that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide that."

Interestingly enough, what do you think the title of Paul Davie's piece regarding George Ellis' model was? Interesting New Interpretation of Redshifts? No. Unique New Model Supports Earth's Centrality? No.

It was titled:

Cosmic Heresy?
Nature, 273:336, 1978

When Marcus Chown investigated the apparent alignment of the CMB and our ecliptic, what did he title his article? CMB aligned with Earth? No. Apparent Correlation of CMB and Solar System? No.

He called it:

Marcus Chown,
Axis of Evil Warps Cosmic Background,
New Scientist, October 22, 2005

What did Edwin Hubble write when he first discovered redshifts moving away from the earth everywhere he looked? Wow, look, we may be in the center? No. Hey we appear to have a central position, but maybe there are alternate explanations? No.

He Said (The Observational Approach to Cosmology):

"...Such a condition would imply that we occupy a unique position in the universe, analogous, in a sense, to the ancient conception of a central Earth...This hypothesis cannot be disproved, but it is unwelcome and would only be accepted as a last resort in order to save the phenomena. Therefore we disregard this possibility.... the unwelcome position of a favored location must be avoided at all costs.... such a favored position is intolerable...Therefore, in order to restore homogeneity, and to escape the horror of a unique position...must be compensated by spatial curvature. There seems

to be no other escape."

You have to understand the history behind many of the observations and their interpretations, especially the Hubble quote. Edwin Hubble resisted general relativity for a long time. He also initially resisted the interpretation of redshift as expansion (or velocity to be more general). Recall an alternate interpretation of redshift is gravitation (as discussed in the Paul Davies quote).

What the Hubble quote implies is that rejecting general relativity (which allowed the "spatial curvature" and expansion) and redshift as expansion leads to an earth in a "unique position" (i.e., "centrally located"). an earth in a "unique position" is a "horror", "intolerable", etc., though "the hypothesis cannot be disproved" (Davies and Hawking) and in fact "appears consistent with our astronomical observations" (Davies). So, rather than deal with an observationally (and also dynamically) viable option, so-called 'objective Science' chooses to "disregard this possibility".

The point is that the cosmology which excludes geocentrism is created by choosing certain of all the assumptions that need to be made (and cannot be verified). Making other assumptions turn our observations into us being at or near the center. Galileo Was Wrong has quote after quote where scientist after scientist state explicitly that they will disregard observations of centrality (or non-movement). Galileo Was Wrong also demonstrates that it is dynamically and kinetically possible.

Re: - posted by IWantAnguish (), on: 2009/10/16 0:20

interesting