

Scriptures and Doctrine :: ISRAEL INTERCESSORS INJUNCTION: an examination

ISRAEL INTERCESSORS INJUNCTION: an examination - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/22 13:54

Dr Eukel

My purpose in these posting is really to insist upon biblical justification for your assumptions. **And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.** (Isa 8:19-20 KJV) This admonition has application not only for the overtly demonic but for all declarations of 'truth'. Is what you are assuming derived from the scriptures?

For some of us the very identification of Jew and Israel is a debatable point. When you say 'Jews' do you mean the seed of Abraham or the followers of Moses? If we are speaking about the first then I qualify; **And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.** (Gal 3:29 KJV) If we are talking about the Sinai Covenant and its Law, including all the feasts, then that era has passed away. It no longer has any legitimacy; it is old currency and no longer legal tender. **Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.** (Gal 3:19 KJV) The law plainly 'was added' and only 'until the seed should come'. I might quote the whole of Hebrews but it is known well enough. As a time-dated comment **In that he saith, A new covenant he hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away.** (Heb 8:13 ASV) Hebrews was probably written shortly before the destruction of the Temple. Meanwhile, the fact that some of the Feasts required specific sacrifices means that it has not been possible to conduct some of these feast in accordance with the original instructions for over 1900 years.

If your reference to a study of the feasts relates to an exposition of the pictures of Christ and His work i.e. typology then I would be interested to hear what you have to say. If your study relates to the current, *necessary*, practise of such Feasts then I would say it is inappropriate at best. It is that word 'should' which has alarmed me from the beginning. If the feasts become necessary how about the sacrifices? The Sinai Covenant was integral with the Aaronic priesthood; they cannot exist separately. **For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.** (Heb 7:12 KJV) That Covenant was also locked into promises regarding the promised land which causes me to question claims made by the modern Israeli nation state. The Sinai Covenant is no longer operative; it has no more legitimacy than the priestcraft inventions of Catholicism or Orthodox Christendom.

I hold no official function or office on this site so the opinions expressed here are my own and not that of the site or of any SI members, however in the pattern of our forums it is important that we do not try to build bridges on assumptions; such bridges are likely to be somewhat unstable. As an example of the assumptions may I quote...

Quote:

----- Rav Sha'ul as he was known by his Jewish peers understood that "emissary" was not a title per se, but his calling to the goyim.

Do you have any evidence for saying that **our beloved brother Paul**, as he was known to his peer Peter, was ever recognized as Rav Sha'ul?

In your posting to the Intercession forum you state

Quote:

----- We invite you to respond to this INJUNCTION to INTERCEDE for ISRAEL. Post your prayers, here.

I am familiar with the biblical concept of the closed door and the prayer closet, but cannot imagine what your injunction requires in this sense. Are you suggesting that prayers for 'Israel' (when we have defined the word) be displayed on this site? What biblical basis is there for such a concept?

I think I would be much more comfortable if I could understand 'where you are coming from' and perhaps more importantly 'where are you heading'.

Israel Intercessors Injunction . An Examination? - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/22 18:34

Shalom, Ron ... Yesha'Yahu (Isa) 8:19-20 is within a long contextual passage from 8:1 - 10:12. v-19-20 in the Complete Jewish Bible read as follows: "So when they tell you to consult those squeaking, squawking mediums and fortune-tellers; you are to answer, 'Shouldn't a people seek their GOD? Must the living ask the dead for teaching and instruction?' For they will indeed give you this unenlightened suggestion."

However, Ron, as I re-read your assumptions, it is clear that you have assumed incorrectly I might add based on GOD's Eternal Promises clearly revealed in Scripture, that Jews and Israel no longer have a place in your economy. Psalm 122:6 apparently does not resonate in your spirit nor does Psalm 133 as far as it relates to the Jew and Israel. Galations 3:21 (just 2 more verses beyond your isolated quote from King Jimmy at v19) reads, "Does this mean that the legal part of the Torah stands in opposition to GOD's promises? Heaven forbid! For if the legal part of the Torah which GOD gave had had in itself the power to give life, then righteousness really would have come by legalistically following such a Torah. But instead, the TaNaKh shuts up everything under sin; so that what had been promised might be given, on the ground of YESHUA The Messiah's trusting faithfulness, to those who continue trustingly faithful." Furthermore, Ron, when you quote Messianic Jews (Hebrews) 8:13 in the ASV, you again fail to acknowledge the context. The "new" in verse 13 is a direct reference to the "new" in verse 8, which is quoting from the First Covenant at Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 31:30-34(31-34 in King Jimmy) Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Israel Intercessors Injunction . An Examination? - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/23 3:15

Dr Eukel
Grace and peace.

Quote:
----- However, Ron, as I re-read your assumptions, it is clear that you have assumed incorrectly I might add based on GOD's Eternal Promises clearly revealed in Scripture, that Jews and Israel no longer have a place in your economy. Psalm 122:6 apparently does not resonate in your spirit nor does Psalm 133 as far as it relates to the Jew and Israel.

I am fully aware of the contexts of the verses I quoted. Is your version of the Bible intended as a translation or a Targum? What you have quoted is not even a paraphrase but a running commentary on the inspired text. The commentary is certainly not inspired. I find great blessing in both of these psalms but I take my definitions of Jew and Israel from our beloved brother Paul;

For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is circumcision that which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that which is of the heart, by the Spirit, not by the letter; and his praise is not from men, but from God. (Rom 2:28-29 NASB)
and

Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. (Rom 9:6-8 KJV)

For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. 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. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. (Gal 3:27-29 KJV)

The Jerusalem for whose children I pray peace **For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. (Gal 4:25-26 KJV)** is *Jerusalem above* and the mountain to which I have come is not Sinai **For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, (Heb 12:18 KJV)** but the heavenly Jerusalem **But ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, To the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel. (Heb 12:22-24 KJV)**

Quote:
----- Furthermore, Ron, when you quote Messianic Jews (Hebrews) 8:13 in the ASV, you again fail to acknowledge the context. The "new" in verse 13 is a direct reference to the "new" in verse 8, which is quoting from the First Covenant at Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 31:30-34(31-34 in King Jimmy)

I did not 'fail to acknowledge the context'. I specifically said that the context was the whole book of Hebrews and that the part I quoted was merely illustrative. The 'first covenant' of Jeremiah 31 is the Sinai Covenant. Are you saying it is something different? Look at the context **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 KJV) What other covenant could this be other than Sinai? God's judgement here is that they 'broke His covenant'. God held true to His covenant commitment until all was fulfilled in Christ.

I still don't understand whether you regard yourself as a Jewish Christian or a Christian Jew.

Re: Israel Intercessors Injunction: An Examination? - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/23 8:11

Shalom, Ron ...

The dialogue has taken us far from the Scriptural mitzvot of praying for Israel/Jerusalem (Psalm 122:6) and far from the anointing running down Aaron's beard (Psalm 133).

You asked in the beginning of your most recent remarks about the version of Scripture I quoted. You asked a question, but chose to answer it yourself based on your assumptions. I clearly identified the Complete Jewish Bible as a primary source for my quoting Scripture (though my library has many translations to choose from, including several in Hebrew).

Ron, here is my simple question (it appears that some are watching who desire only the KISS principle):

When you ask a question that you obviously do not know the answer to, and you choose then to answer it on your own have you knowingly or unknowingly diminished, diluted and even destroyed two men made in the image of GOD - one the translator of the CJB, Dr David Sterns, and secondly Rabbi Eukel who references it?

I await your response?

Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/23 9:18

Quote:
-----When you ask a question that you obviously do not know the answer to, and you choose then to answer it on your own have you knowingly or unknowingly diminished, diluted and even destroyed two men made in the image of GOD - one the translator of the CJB, Dr David Sterns, and secondly Rabbi Eukel who references it?

Dr Eukel

Grace and peace.

What an fascinating concept. Where on earth do you get it from? These notes are on a forum which, as you will know, is a market place. The atmosphere here is of repartee and sometimes excited dialogue but not disrespectful. Am I not to question your assertions? This is not a pulpit but a market place. My simple answer to your question 'have I diminished, diluted or destroyed two men in the image of God' is 'of course not but now that I perceive your sensitivity I will moderate my boisterous style.

I am still awaiting answers to questions I cannot answer myself. If you don't want me to answer them myself perhaps you would do so.

As regards the KISS principle, this is a market place and with all such places some will listen, some will return to hear more, some will mock, and some will just walk away. It's the way these forums work. In fact part of the purpose is for people to just stand and listen and hopefully take some thoughts away to consider more carefully elsewhere. They are a remarkable electronic equivalent of a 1st century means of communication.

Israel Intercessors Injunction: A Marketplace Examination? - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/23 12:35

Shalom, Ron ...

I appreciate your acknowledging that even in the marketplace of ideas that the lively exchange still requires, as Believers, both in style and substance that we manifest the fruit of GOD's Spirit. Not even in this "remarkable electronic equivalent of a 1st century communication" do we, as Believers, get to set aside the truth we are emissaries of The Most High GOD's Son, HaMASHIACH YESHUA.

Ron, when you ask a question and answer on your own (incorrectly and disingenuously, by the way) all in the same paragraph, you have not left open the door to have your question answered. The truth, then, is, though you have asked in a question form, you do not intend to have it answered by anyone other than yourself. I believe you know that

techniques as a "strawman argument." You set up a weak antagonist and then blow it down with your razor-like repartee.

Ron, let's be truthful here. Forums like this, despite the best oversight of moderators, can and often do degenerate into disrespectful dialogue. Some, yes, is a perceived disrespect. None-the-less, you recognized that you needed, even as a moderator, to "moderate my boisterious style." Thank you. I appreciate that a man of your vast learning and quick references to KingJimmy still has not let the "letter killeth."

I am reminded of two little boys talking. One says to the other, "I have to go to the hospital tomorrow for surgery." "What are they going to do?," says the other boy. "Circumscion," is the reply. "Oh, said the other boy, I had that done when I was eight days old." "Did it hurt," asked the boy facing surgery. The reply came, "Couldn't walk for a whole year!"

Ron, would appreciate knowing more about you, your family, your heritage in The LORD and in what capacities you serve as an emissary for YESHUA (Jesus) The KING of kings and LORD of lords now. Thank you. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Israel Intercessors Injunction: A Marketplace Examination? - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/23 13:11

Dr Eukel

Grace and peace.

Quote:
-----Ron, when you ask a question and answer on your own (incorrectly and disingenuously, by the way) all in the same paragraph, you have not left open the door to have your question answered.

Disingenuous: having secret motives, dishonest, insincere.

When you accuse me of disingenuousness are you knowingly or unknowingly diminishing, diluting and even destroying a man made in the image of GOD?

Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth? Rabbi Nicodemus

BTW

Quote:
-----None-the-less, you recognized that you needed, even as a moderator, to "moderate my boisterious style."

I am not a moderator on this site.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/23 15:09

Quote:
-----Ron, when you ask a question and answer on your own (incorrectly and disingenuously, by the way) all in the same paragraph, you have not left open the door to have your question answered.

It's usually my policy to defend my opinions and leave personal accusations unanswered, but in this case I want to return briefly to this. I do not defend myself. God knows whether or not I wrote in sincerity, honesty and without guile; I shall be content for Him to judge.

There is however, a basic misunderstanding here. The accusation is made on the basis that I asked a question the answer of which I already knew; this is what has drawn the accusation of being disingenuous. The asking and answering of a question is however is not dishonesty it is a "literary device" employed often in teaching and frequently in the writings of Paul. It was a method used by the peripatetic philosophers of the day to instruct by means of questions. The reason we have so many questions in Paul's letters is that the very asking of a question engages the intellect and demands that at the hearer "think through" the next points. In fact some of the questions in Romans were not aimed at their apparent targets at all but were the means of providing answers to the saints in Rome. When you have a free moment or two you might like to count the question marks in Romans alone. And most have them have immediate answers.

e.g. **And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; Who will render to every man according to his deeds:** (Rom 2:3-6 KJV)

Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written. (Rom 2: 21-24 KJV) There you have the question and answer but this is not dishonesty, but a simple 'literary device'.

This is simply a process of communicating logical thought and taking the listener with you.

Neither were my points straw-men. This is a device in debate where one man sets up an argument by putting words into the mouth of his opponent and then demolishing the argument. The straw-man is set up simply to be knocked down; it is a designed misrepresentation. This again would be simple dishonesty. For myself I have **...renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.** (2Co 4:2 KJV)

I believe such debating tools would be utterly abominable to a herald of the gospel. I believe a bible teacher ought to have a soft heart and a hard head, and never to get them the other way around. As God helps I shall pursue this course.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/23 15:48

Quote:

-----I believe such debating tools would be utterly abominable to a herald of the gospel

Sorry Bro. Ron, I may have missed what you mean here. Would this mean that Q and A is a bad method to use when preaching? I try to think that when preaching, just about anything is on the table if it is used lawfully and lovingly. ;-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/23 16:33

Quote:

-----Quote:

I believe such debating tools would be utterly abominable to a herald of the gospel

Sorry Bro. Ron, I may have missed what you mean here. Would this mean that Q and A is a bad method to use when preaching? I try to think that when preaching, just about anything is on the table if it is used lawfully and lovingly.

No, not at all. I think questions and answers is an excellent way of teaching and with strong biblical precedent.

I was saying that the 'straw-man' approach debating tool would be dishonest. (In case folks in modern project management (PM) are reading this I had better explain.) In PM the straw-man is used as a concept of someone setting up an initial idea with the thought of attracting penetrating criticism, but this has changed the notion of a straw-man. In debate the straw-man technique was 'to consciously misrepresent your opponent's argument' in such a way that it could easily be attacked. It was an intellectual dishonesty used to beat an opponent rather than to genuinely answer his argument. It was, as I said, set up to be knocked down. The impression on the hearers is that you have now demolished your opponent's arguments even before he speaks, while the reality is the listeners have not heard his arguments only your parody of them.

Sorry if I confused in the previous post.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/23 16:51

Quote:
-----The impression on the hearers is that you have now demolished your opponent's arguments even before he speaks, while the reality is the3 listeners have not heard his arguments only your parody of them.

We see this all the time and it is quite aggravating because truth is not the objective. I understand what you meant now.

God Bless,

-Robert

Jewish Roots Enfolding Israel Intercession Injunction - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 10:40

Shalom ... I will offer my thoughts on this thread under the forum "Jewish Roots." I invite you there. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel