

## Miracles that follow the plow :: International Prayer Call For Israel

### International Prayer Call For Israel - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2017/1/15 8:24

Prayers for Israel, NOW...International Prayer Call:

A conference is being held in Paris by over 70 nations (Paris Peace Talks)...with the possible intention of trying to divide the land of Israel. Opportunity to pray for the peace and protection of Israel...and the nations to understand that God loves Israel...(He will arise and defend her, though the nation's rage, He will intervene by His Mighty Hand...)

+++

12 hour prayer call, beginning at 2 am EST, 1am Central, 12 midnight Mountain and 11 pm PST.

#### 12 HOUR PRAYER CALL

regarding Israel and "Paris Peace Talks"

Tomorrow, Sunday, January 15

2 am-2 pm Eastern USA Time

8 am-8 pm Central European (Paris) Time

From USA Dial: 563-999-2010.

Access Code - 425496#

### Re: International Prayer Call For Israel - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/15 9:33

"Of all the promises made to the patriarchs it was that of the land that was the most prominent and decisive."

By one scholar's count, "land" is the forth most frequent or substantive noun in the Tanak (Torah). He notes that it is more dominant statistically than the idea of covenant. More than one thousand times the land ("eretz") of Israel is either stated or implied. Of the 250 times that "covenant" (brit) is mentioned, in 70 percent of those instances (177 times) "covenant" is either directly or indirectly connected to the land of Israel. Of the 74 times that brit appears in the Torah, 73 percent of those times (54) include the gift of the land, either explicitly or implicitly. In other words, when the biblical God calls out a people for Himself, he does so in an earthly way, by making the gift of particular land an integral aspect of that calling.

Soulen has observed,

“As the story of the Exodus shows, God's curse does not necessarily fall upon all parties in equal measure. God can single out the nations for curse, according to the saying, “The one who curses you I will curse” (Genesis 12:3). The Scriptures return often to two negative images of the Gentiles: as idolaters and as blood enemies of Israel and Israel's God. These two negative characteristics are joined at the root, because both stem from the nation's rejection of the truth that the Lord, the God of Israel, is God. Because this truth is manifest for all to see in the works of the Lord on Israel's behalf and in creation (Psalms 117, 126), the Gentiles are without excuse. They cannot claim to be idolaters and enemies of Israel “by nature.” Rather, the nations become these things historically because of their unwillingness to accept God's blessings in solidarity with the people of Israel.”

("The New Christian Zionism: Fresh Perspectives on Israel and the Land" - Craig Blaising, Darrell Bock, David Rudolph, Joel Willits & others. 2016, Ch 2, "A History of Christian Zionism," 48-49. Inter Varsity Press)

Soulen, Kendall R., "The God of Israel and Christian Theology." 1996, Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 426 S. Fifth St, Box 1209, Minneapolis, MN (55440),. Chapter 7, “The Scriptures: Curse And Redemption, 145.)

**Re: , on: 2017/1/15 10:18**

I'm not sure what the implications of the Paris conference will be. But I sense that this conference could be prophetically strategic in the overall plan of God.

This morning I woke up with a sense of expectation that Jesus will soon return. That we may very well be the generation that will see His return. Everything that is happening on the Earth is a result of God working after the counsel of his own will. Thus this conference in Paris did not take God by surprise. If anything God is orchestrating this and other events to bring about the soon return of his son Jesus Christ.

Again something my thoughts from the wall.

Bro Blaine

**Re: International Prayer Call For Israel - posted by narrowpath, on: 2017/1/15 16:16**

I fear for our neighbouring country France. The whole constitution and mindset of this nation is radically secular. They have a large Jewish community and a much larger Muslim minority. Nobody who touches the integrity of Israel will get away with it.

**Re: , on: 2017/1/15 20:50**

One of my contacts sent a text saying that a storm hit Paris France on the heels of the peace conference. It seems that much of the power grid in Paris is down and people are without power. Trying to verify this through Google.

If this is true. Then for sure this would be God's response to the conference to divide Israel.

Bro Blaine

**Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2017/1/15 21:34**

Israeli officials cheer "weakened" Paris peace summit declaration

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/israeli-officials-cheer-weakened-paris-peace-summit-declaration/>

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/15 22:18**

So does that mean the end is not as near as we thought a few posts ago?

I continue as always to fail to see why we continue to get all worked up over headlines. This 70 nation deal was not even really a headline.

Why don't we just leave God be and let him do what he wants when he wants? The 1st century saints thought he was coming soon and they were wrong. We continue to think he is coming soon and he may be yet he may not be.

The duty of the 1st century saints, and ours, is to simply always be ready.

If we do that little thing, which we should be doing anyway if we love the Lord, even if we knew he was not coming for 10 million years, we will be ok.

**Re: Todd , on: 2017/1/15 22:38**

We are always commanded by Jesus to be on the alert. We continually watch for the seasons in expectation that He will soon return. Thus always the exhortation of Luke that says look up for your redemption draweth nigh.

Bro Blaine

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/15 22:51**

Yes bear but in that Luke passage per the direct context he was talking about 70 AD. "When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies..."

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/16 5:41**

It was not even a headline maybe for the press corps of this world. It's like the persecution and extermination of Christians in Middle Eastern countries today. Today's press corps has paid scant attention to it because they choose to do so.

I also continue to fail to see why the notion that nothing really can be known about eschatology so "just be ready" continues to be a somewhat popular notion. God has opened volumes and volumes to the church regarding soteriology and ecclesiology but the notion for some reason is that when it comes to eschatology that the Lord is going to keep the church dumbed down and in the dark. The notion found in so many quarters is you won't understand much of anything so just be ready. It seems that really has no scriptural legs to stand on and was not part of the thinking of the former prophets or of Jesus or of Paul. The more we can learn from a pretty simple and basic 101 order of events from the scriptures that can then serve to increase our understanding and readiness. If these times and events are to not to come like a thief upon the church it's seems logical and sound to think that is because the church has become endowed with knowledge of what is revealed in scripture. That does not mean we will know every jot and tittle before it happens but the scriptures paint a much different picture of a knowledgeable and prepared church versus one just riding along in the dark content with just be ready. Sure be ready but be ready and armed with knowledge surely the Lord wants His church to have. If you feel God has concealed these things then it is the glory of kings to search out a matter (Proverbs 25:2)

A sign of the end will be a increased searching out and knowledge of the prophets:

4 But you, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the Book until the time of the end. Then many shall run to and fro and search anxiously through the Book, and knowledge of God's purposes as revealed by His prophets shall be increased and become great. (Daniel 12:4 - AMP)

**Re: Todd, on: 2017/1/16 6:37**

//Yes bear but in that Luke passage per the direct context he was talking about 70 AD. "When you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies..."//

Not so bro. Luke 21 along with the parallel passages of Matthew 24 and Mark 13 clearly point to a future coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is what Christ and His apostles taught. From my limited understanding this is found in the writings of the early church fathers. This is the position of this forum as I understand Greg's position.

2 Timothy 3:16 says,

All scripture IS INSPIRED by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness, so that the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work.

Thus there's an ongoing present inspiration of the word of God that brings relevance of scripture into one's life today. The Holy Spirit breathes His word into the soul of the believer today.

The praeterist would translate 2nd Timothy 3:16 as,

All scripture WAS INSPURED by God...

Praeterist would see scripture as nothing more than a glorified inspired history book relegating everything to 70 AD with no application to the believer today. I would even go as far as to say that many praetwrist would reject the notion of the b

aptism of the Holy Spirit and hold to a cessationist view. Thus they would not see that scripture would be speaking into the heart of the believer today.

Those who have been baptized in the Holy Spirit see that God is continually breathing his word into the believer today. Thus they would see the passages in Matthew 24, Mark 13, and Luke 21 as definitely pointing to a future return of Jesus Christ in which He will come and take His bride home.

This has been the historic position of the evangelical church. The believers in Jesus will soon see the return of their Bridegroom. This is the hope of the persecuted church. And this will be the hope of believers worldwide. That Jesus is soon coming.

Praeterism offers no such hope.

My thoughts bro.

Bro Blaine

---CAPS FOR EMPHASIS ONLY---

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/16 10:21**

Luke 21:20-28 is one complete thought. He is clearly predicting the destruction of the temple and therefore the end of the Jewish system.

And you can't explain away vs 32: "Assuredly, I say to you, THIS GENERATION will by no means pass away till ALL things take place." (My emphasis)

Jesus's words, not mine.

And I will repeat for probably the 500th time that I certainly believe in a literal future 2nd coming. It's just that Luke 21 and its parallel passages are describing something else.

**Re: Which generation shall not pass away? - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/16 10:57**

A question and answer between two believers discussing "which generation shall not pass away?"

WHICH GENERATION SHALL NOT PASS AWAY UNTIL ALL BE FULFILLED?

Question:

I have a question that I think goes along with this discussion. I have had the opportunity to talk back and forth with a leader in Preterism, as much to learn about as anything. A lot of the debate over the future of the events verses them being past relates to the passage that makes reference to "this generation." I asked how can it be past considering the state of Israel as a nation continuing in unbelief. To which he admits difficulty and has to spiritualize a lot of things but clings to how can it not be past? Jesus and the Apostles would be wrong and liars bc it must be, they must be the "this generation." My question is, from my understanding of Acts 1:6-8 that the Apostles related the return of Christ and the restoration of the physical Kingdom to the Jews as happening at the same event. Jesus never reproves them, and they have been talking for 40 days about the Kingdom so I perceive they have some knowledge of it before they ask. Now, to me how can one claim that these events are past? The amount of things that have to be spiritualized as being something found in the Church seem far too great?

Answer:

I've written something on this already. I probably should write much more on it and hope to soon, but I will send that earlier email on this topic, and it can at least serve as a start (see below). We'll talk about this when you're here, but you've tapped into one of the thorniest problems in all the study of prophecy. And while I believe your friend has made the mistake of supposing that the alternatives that he's so far considered are the only ones that exist, I can also sympathize and appreciate why he feels he has to interpret the tribulation as past, lest Jesus be represented as mistaken or in error, which would be disastrous, of course. This problem has been greatly exploited by atheists and liberal theologians to argue that Jesus, in His "humanity", expected to return soon in connection with Jerusalem's imminent destruction, but the "passing away" of that generation proved Him wrong in His expectation. On the part of those

e that have a semblance of evangelical reverence for the Lord's authority as a prophet, and for the authority of scripture, solutions have been proposed in at least four directions, and I'll try to cover those alternative views during your visit.

#### WHERE DOES SUCH A PROCESS OF SPIRITUALIZATION STOP?

Here's a copy of that earlier email where part of your question is partly covered:

Hi,

Yes, I did not go into the "generation" question in my article. I guess you could say, that from their perspective, that's our Achilles heel. Still, my thesis stands; if one is willing to spiritualize the post-tribulational coming of Jesus in the Olivet prophecy, then to be consistent, the resurrection in Daniel 12:1-2 must be spiritualized by the same rule, because both events follow the unequalled tribulation. But then where does such a process of spiritualization stop?

In my "Achilles heel" article I tried to show that when you put the tribulation in the past so that all these things can be fulfilled within the lifetime of the disciples (this generation), the preterist is forced to posit a mystical return of Christ. This alleged coming is understood in terms of an invisible return in judgment via the Roman siege of Jerusalem. But I pointed out that if the tribulation is interpreted as past, then one is forced to subject the resurrection of Daniel 12:2 to the same spiritualization, since it, no less than the coming of Mt 24:29-31, comes after the tribulation (compare Daniel 12:1-2 with Mt 24:21, 29). Not only this, but a host of OT passages show that the time of unequalled distress concludes with nothing less than the "day of the Lord", which is the transition point that realizes all the goals of the covenants of promise. All of this is dissolved if the tribulation is past, so it is no wonder that a vast volume of prophetic material must be sweepingly re-interpreted and spiritualized on such an assumption.

Such a process has no clear stopping point, as it requires not only the spiritualization, but the separation and re-allocation of many associated events, as for example the resurrection, the second coming, the day of the Lord, and the end. I think the only reason that Sproul embraced preterism is because it seemed to him the only alternative to making Christ a false prophet. He said as much in the intro to his book on Christ's return. He believes that Christ's statement that "this generation shall not pass away till all these things are fulfilled" is incapable of being understood in any other way than the lifetime of the Lord's contemporaries. This is the power of preterism among many orthodox evangelicals. The choice between past fulfillment or failed prediction has been a powerful inducement for many to turn to preterism. No neo-orthodox theologian would be guilty of such strained spiritualizing, but then liberal scholars have no trouble concluding that Jesus simply erred in His expectation that He would return within the lifetime of His disciples.

Here's what happens: A conservative evangelical believer such as Sproul becomes aware of the use that liberal and neo-orthodox critics have made of this passage and other seemingly related passages (such as "some standing here shall not taste death" etc.) in the synoptic gospels. They see the use to which these passages have been put by atheists to argue for the failure of prophecy. They see also what they regard as inadequate attempts at explanation by futurists such as Hal Lindsey, Walvoord etc. This makes them prime candidates for the appeal of preterism, which provides for a tribulation that is past by understanding Christ's post-tribulational coming as a mystical return in the form of an age ending judgment on Jerusalem, described poetically in the same kind of "apocalyptic imagery" that the OT uses to describe other historical judgments on nations, or so it is argued. They then turn to Josephus as a first century historian recording many of the general phenomena (wars, earthquakes etc.) associated with the "end" as described in the Olivet prophecy, and understood as the "end" of Jerusalem and the "Jewish age". This is how they build their case, but their motive can be noble. They are apologists for the faith, and do not want to concede any ground to unbelief. Therefore, they are naturally attracted to preterism. They fall prey to what some have called "the black and white fallacy," which assumes that the alternatives so far considered are the only ones that exist. This creates the danger of a false choice.

There may also be motives that are not so noble, as in the case of those that resent God's royal prerogative to elect unconditionally, and this can take its toll on the attitude of some towards Israel in particular, making it all too convenient to conceive of a conclusion to the age that omits any special purpose of God towards Israel as a nation of destiny. Unless his position has changed, Sproul does look for the re-engraftment of a great number of natural Israel at the end of the age, disclaiming knowledge of the particulars of how or when (I wish I had his ear).

So in coming to the passage that says "Truly I say to you, this generation shall not pass away till all these things

€™ shall be fulfilled,â€ I must preface what I think to be at work here by reminding us of the New Testament concept of Godâ€™s use of mystery as a two edged sword affecting both salvation and judgment. If we trace not only the word â€mysteryâ€™ but the related terms and concepts throughout the NT, it will appear that Godâ€™s secrets are reserved to His sovereign initiative, and are divinely calculated to stumble pride and also to wage a war of strategy against the principalities and powers. He is a God that hides Himself (Isa 45:15). Godâ€™s mystery is shut up among His own (Isa 8:14-17), but to those without, it is hidden for the purpose of judgment (Mk 4:11-12).

Can we conceive that God would use deliberate measures to protect His secret from pride? Where this characteristic of Godâ€™s use of mystery is unacknowledged, the solution that I will propose will seem as foul play. But I believe that God fully designs to speak and act in ways that are sure to confound the pride of carnal confidence. I see this as characterizing the whole ministry of Christ, particularly His puzzling commands to silence. There could have been no mystery at all if the divine intention had been so unmistakably spelled out in prophecy as some suggest; but it wasnâ€™t (1Pet 1:11), not because God was unable to reveal everything in advance, but because it was not His intention to reveal â€the mystery of His willâ€™ before the time. In the same way, it was not His intention that Christ simply explain the mystery contained in the prophetic writings concerning His two advents. He knew the secret, but was not at liberty to reveal it before the time (â€tell no man till â€). Why? One reason was for the sake of judgement on the wisdom of this age (see 1Cor 1:21 with 2:8).

So God is out to stumble pride as its own self-inflicted judgment. The means and measures by which this is accomplished is another conversation, but one thing is clear, Godâ€™s selective mode of revelation will always raise problems for a natural reason that will defy solution by mere brain power regardless of exegetical skills. It is the humility of repentance that clears the way for the entrance of light (but then again repentance is also the result of revelation as seen in the case of Paul and the future remnant of Israel; Zech 12:10). I make this point because it explains what I think underlies the larger purpose of the Father in Jesusâ€™ use of the term â€generationâ€. I am suggesting that Jesus well knew the versatility of the language and that it would be a potential source of perplexity.

Jesus well knew the versatility of this term, as evident from his unique and profound use of it in His rebuke of the Pharisees in the preceding chapter. The confrontation with the Pharisees in chapt 23 sets the stage and context for what follows on the same day in the Olivet prophecy. In Mt 23:29-36 Jesus describes a phenomenon that is far too little considered in biblical theology. It is what some have called â€corporate solidarity.â€™ Jesus cites the self-assured boast of the Pharisees, â€If we had lived in the days of our fathers, we would not have taken part with them in shedding the blood of the prophets,â€ as proof that His contemporaries are in the same generational line of those that slew the prophets. It is THIS GENERATION that remains in an unbroken continuum â€until YOU shall say blessed is He that comes in the name of the Lordâ€ (Mt 23:39). The day of national repentance ends the age enduring opposition of â€this generationâ€™.

More than an issue of mere bloodline, the concept of generation represents a particular spiritual disposition or nature. So long as this perversity of spirit and God rejection persists in the Jewish nation, so does the exile continue, and so does â€this generationâ€ remain; it only ends when â€all these thingsâ€™ shall be fulfilled. This is consistent with the use of the term in Moses and the prophets (Deut 32:5, 20 et al), in John Baptist, and it was Stephenâ€™s use of the same essential indictment, if not the precise term, that cost him his life (Acts 7:51-52; cf. also 1Thes 2:16).

Notice the Lordâ€™s unique use of â€youâ€™ in His indictment. It is the same in Stephenâ€™s apologetic. It is the generic â€youâ€™ of corporate solidarity, hence an abiding generation. It is a generation that does not escape judgment, regardless of its particular location in chronological time, â€UNTILâ€™ â€. This is why Jesus could speak of a future day of public acknowledgment of His messianic dignity, and describes it in terms of the generational â€until YOU will say.â€™ It is why He could indict His own contemporaries as present in the killing of the prophets in the very persons of their fathers (â€whom you slewâ€). And it is why Zechariah can speak particularly of the last generation of Jewish survivors of the last tribulation as â€looking on Him whom THEY have pierced,â€™ as though they were the actual historical murderers of the Messiah. And they were; because they performed it in the persons of their Jewish forebears. Thus, the surviving remnant of Jacobâ€™s trouble will see themselves as part of an ongoing generation, the generation that has always resisted the Spirit and slain the prophets. This, of course, assumes a powerful revelation, but we believe that such revelation will be amply communicated through the witness of the tribulation church. This witness, though very powerful, will not at first prevail to turn the larger part of the remnant to faith, but it will be the effectual seed that the Lord will quicken at the moment of His appearing, â€when the Deliverer comes out of Zion to turn ungodliness from Jacob.â€ Only then will they â€look on Me whom they pierced.

Finally, and here I go back to the amazing way that God hides His mysteries. It has always been striking to me that imm

Immediately after Jesus says "this generation shall not PASS AWAY till all these things be fulfilled," He then most significantly adds: "Heaven and earth shall PASS AWAY, but My Word shall never PASS AWAY." I believe that Jesus well knew and even anticipated how that "that" generation would appear to pass without the fulfillment of all these things. I believe it is precisely because He knew that His words would be pointed to by the gainsayer as evidence of the failure of prophecy that He adds the revelatory caveat that sooner would heaven and earth PASS AWAY than one jot or tittle of His word to fail or fall to the ground. Impossible! So by divine design, we are left with a choice of faith, but this need not require a choice between the false alternatives of a spiritualizing preterism or unbelief concerning the Lord's prophetic accuracy.

Yours in the Beloved.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/16 14:52**

Whoa- that was a lot to read.

The "problem" disappears if one loses their insistence that the Olivet Discourse references some future (to us) great tribulation. If that is not insisted upon, the "generation " problem disappears because the destruction of Jerusalem in 70ad was within that generation.

I am willing to concede that there may be a future tribulation but nothing in the Olivet Discourse **\*\*requires\*\*** that it must be talking about something that did not happen in 70 ad.

And no, I do not believe the 2nd coming occurred in 70ad. Jesus coming in the clouds in judgment is simply apocalyptic imagery.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/16 15:19**

Yes, it is a lot to read. I hadn't read it in a while and just happened to think of it this morning so I thought I would offer it.

One question, if Jesus coming in the clouds of judgment was apocalyptic imagery in 70 AD, will it be nothing but apocalyptic imagery when He comes at His literal second coming? If 70 AD is imagery why is the second coming to be literal? A non-Preterist would say that Matt 24:30 always has and always will be a description of His literal second coming. Personally, I don't think it will be about apocalyptic imagery on the day of His coming.

Also, there is the near/far fulfillment pattern of Bible prophecy. The Bible is full of examples that a prophecy can have an immediate and limited fulfillment in the near future when it is first given only to have a complete and exhaustive fulfillment in the far eschatological future. Jerusalem could have been surrounded by armies in 70 AD as a partial fulfillment of the Olivet prophecies and Luke 21:23-24 but it didn't end in the coming of the son of Man which is how Jesus' discourse ends. It can therefore once again be surrounded by armies in the future when the real literal second coming of the son of man is to be accomplished. The Olivet Discourse very well requires a future tribulation because immediately AFTER THE TRIBULATION OF THOSE DAYS (Matt 24:29) they will see the sign of the son of Man appear in the clouds as He comes with power and great glory. The son of man hasn't returned yet so of logical necessity and exegesis the greatest and most intense tribulation preceding this return has to still be future. (See Daniel 12:1)

Meanwhile, we need to continue to pray for Israel on our end. The nations are going to gang them in a final sinful act of opposition to the everlasting covenant and the place Israel plays within this covenant. The LAND controversy in Palestine is here to stay until all these things be accomplished. The generation of Christ's day (near) saw a partial fulfillment of these things and the generation that sees these things at the end of the age (far) will not pass until all things be fulfilled. I propose if the church overcomes its prophetic deficit of understanding and comes into a reasonable and workable amount of prophetic literacy that these things will not take it by surprise or come upon them unawares. We will understand what is taking place.

Thank you.



**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/16 16:30**

The future 2nd coming is literal I believe because that is when, in my view, the rapture occurs and the new heavens and earth are created (while we are raptured) after which we will return to the recreated earth to reign with Him forever.

But apart from all that I agree with you that we need to be standing firm with Israel.

**70 Nations Paris Peace Conference Total Dud, Anti Israel Gathering Defeated - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2017/1/17 2**

In what should have been an all-out Israel hate-fest with possibly disastrous consequences for the Jewish state, 70 nations gathered in Paris for a "peace" conference on Sunday but at the end of the day, the results were lackluster and failed to accomplish anything significant against Israel.

The conference in Paris, set forward one year ago by former French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius, was expected to have dire repercussions for Israel. Fabius envisioned it as a way of forcing Israel to accept the two-state solution. His original proposal called for France and the other nations at the conference to recognize a Palestinian state inside Israel's borders if an agreement was not signed between Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

The present incarnation of the conference was markedly toned down by the French Foreign Minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault. At a conference in Paris last June setting the parameters for Sunday's conference, the threat of recognizing a Palestinian state was removed.

Many feared Sunday's conference would be an echo of the UN Security Council Resolution 2334, passed three weeks ago, declaring Jewish presence in Judea, Samaria, and the Temple Mount to be illegal. But the conference in Paris stopped short of placing the blame entirely on Israel, concluding instead with a plea for direct negotiations. Though the final declaration made reference to the UN resolution 2334, it amended the language of the resolution which declared Israeli settlements to be "illegal". The Paris conference merely referred to the UN resolution "which clearly condemned settlement activity". No mention was made of their legal status.

Yuval Rotem, Director General of Israel's Foreign Ministry, considered the conference to be a victory for behind-the-scenes Israeli diplomacy.

"The fact that the Paris conference has no follow-up is, from our perspective the most meaningful accomplishment," Rotem told Israel Radio Monday morning. "Even though we did not attend the conference, we succeeded in getting across our position."

image: [https://www.breakingisraelnews.com/wp-content/uploads/useful\\_banner\\_manager\\_banners/471-BombardBibles-600WIDE.jpg](https://www.breakingisraelnews.com/wp-content/uploads/useful_banner_manager_banners/471-BombardBibles-600WIDE.jpg)

**Bombard Them With Bibles. Send the White House and the United Nations a Bible Now!**

Perhaps the most significant reason for Israel to breathe a sigh of relief was the specific point concerning Jerusalem. The UN resolution referred to East Jerusalem as "Palestinian territory" with Israel's claim to the Temple Mount and the Western Wall having "no legal validity". The Paris conference dialled that back considerably, warning against any acts that would "prejudge the outcome of negotiations on final status issues, including, inter alia, on Jerusalem". This ambiguous statement was also intended as a subtle warning to US President elect Donald Trump, who promised American voters and the Israeli government that he would move the US Embassy to Jerusalem.

The Paris conference also saw at least one major player having a change of heart. Britain, which played a major role in advancing the UN resolution, attended the Paris conference as an observer, choosing not to sign the final statement.

The British government released an official statement to the press, which read:

"We have particular reservations about an international conference intended to advance peace between the parties that does not involve them" indeed which is taking place against the wishes of the Israelis "and which is taking place just days before the transition to a new American President when the US will be the ultimate guarantor of any agreement. There are risks therefore that this conference hardens positions at a time when we need to be encouraging the conditions for peace. That's why we have attended in an observer status and have not signed up to the communique."



Indeed, Trump's impending inauguration loomed over the conference, dulling the anti-Israel edge. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said at his cabinet meeting on Sunday, "This conference is among the last twitches of yesterday's world. Tomorrow's world will be different and it is very near."

With four days left to Obama's presidency, Secretary of State John Kerry, who attended the Paris conference, promised Netanyahu that there would not be any follow-up action to the Paris conference and that Washington would oppose any further political action at the Security Council.

Perhaps the most telling sign that the conference was not as anti-Israel as intended was PA President Mahmoud Abbas's last-minute decision to cancel his meeting with French President Francois Hollande, scheduled for Sunday. French Authorities announced on Monday that no new date for the meeting has been scheduled.

Read more at <https://www.breakingisraelnews.com/82159/82159/#x36FqKK2g7L07UDr.99>

**Re: 70 Nations Paris Peace Conference Total Dud, Anti Israel Gathering Defeated - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/1/18**

Thanks Docs for keeping us informed on this.

Also thanks Mike for the update, which is encouraging for the time being.

Just been reading Joel again which talks about them dividing up the land and the ultimate re-gathering of Israel and of course God gathering the nations in the valley of Jehoshaphat for judgement.

Docs you made an important point here.. "The Bible is full of examples that a prophecy can have a immediate and limited fulfillment in the near future when it is first given only to have a complete and exhaustive fulfillment in the far eschatological future."

This is very true and important to understand in reading bible prophecy. This (I understand from more learned men than me) was how prophecy was understood in biblical Judaism. We see it in many places in scripture, even in the NT the apostles interpreted OT prophecy this way. For example Matthew quotes from the OT "out of Egypt I called my Son" as being fulfilled when Joseph brought Jesus back from their stay in Egypt to Israel, but we know it's immediate OT meaning was the exodus under Moses.

I see this in Joel where his prophecy starts with describing the coming Babylonian captivity, but moves right into a future more catastrophic judgement and final establishing of the Kingdom as if it is all one event, but with the benefit of other prophecy and history we know it is not one event but a series of events spread out over many years.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/18 13:32**

I very much agree with what you have spoken of regarding Jesus coming out of Egypt etc. and the great catastrophic judgement Joel speaks of. The principle that you speak of regarding a near/far fulfillment pattern of Biblical prophecy really is the rule and not the exception. Multiple examples of this principle can be found throughout the scripture and is indispensable in understanding prophecy. In this regard, if Jerusalem was surrounded by armies in 70 AD (Luke 21:20) this event still did not bring about the second coming of the son of man which is where Jesus went in His reply in the Olivet Discourse. This had a limited fulfillment in the events of 70 AD when Jerusalem was surrounded by armies but can still have a complete and exhaustive fulfillment in the future. The same with the abomination of desolation. Jesus connected His second coming with events that begin with a latter day abomination of desolation. Jesus stated, "When you SEE the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet" (Matt 24:15). Paul followed up in II Thess 2:3-4). In fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy, Antiochus performed an abomination in the temple as well as the armies of Titus in 70 AD. But neither resulted in the second coming of the son of man at the last and great trumpet (Matt 24:31, I Cor 15:52)). No great trumpet sounded in 70 AD.

It's that which is ELECT and set aside by God that Satan and the principalities and powers hate.

- Christ
- Israel and the Jews (including the land)
- Jerusalem
- The Church

All elect and set aside and therefore hated and targeted by Satan. Besides the present LAND controversy in Israel, tied in its own self to the ever present "Jewish question," no other event in history has generated such vehement hatred and opposition except the claims of the gospel itself. So I'm thinking something of a divine cause and effect must be present today regarding the land controversy which is the center piece of so much world attention and the coming epi-center of increasing world turmoil. The church therefore needs to regain at least a reasonable amount of prophetic literacy to be able to understand in more depth that these things have not been prophesied of in the dark.

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/1/18 13:35**

Quote:  
-----by TMK  
The future 2nd coming is literal I believe because that is when, in my view, the rapture occurs and the new heavens and earth are created (while we are raptured) after which we will return to the recreated earth to reign with Him forever.  
-----

Not to split hairs (...but) :, the new heaven and the new earth are not mentioned until after the judgment and starts in Rev 21:1. I'm not mentioning this to start an argument, you know that I wouldn't argue with you, Todd!!!

I don't know if I'm right or not but going by Rev 20, it seems the first resurrection (what some call the rapture) happens, then the 1000 year reign of Christ, the judgment of satan, the judgment of the dead and finally death and hell are cast into the lake of fire.

This does challenge some Christian's belief system in the end time but Revelation is part of the word of God!

God bless you and just my two cents worth, friends,  
Lisa

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/18 13:55**

It depends on how one views the "millennium".

It doesn't matter to me which view is correct, if any of them are.

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/1/18 13:58**

1 Peter 3  
10But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up. 11Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, 12Looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat? 13Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

It would appear from the above that everything is destroyed at the "Day of the Lord" and then after that there is a new heaven and new earth.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/18 14:12**

Yo TMK good man,

/It depends on how one views the "millennium".

It doesn't matter to me which view is correct, if any of them are./

Do you hold the same view toward soteriology and ecclesiology?

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/18 15:30**

Soteriology- no way. Ecclesiology- depends what you mean by that- it's a big topic.

When I say it doesn't matter to me I didn't intend to sound flippant; but the views re eschatology are so varied and nuanced that picking one as absolutely correct seems to be an impossibility- at least for me.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/18 16:13**

On trying to understand eschatology, the best advice I ever received was to find out WHAT the Day of the Lord is and WHEN it occurs. It is the hub around which all OT eschatology is built. From the preview of the prophets all roads lead to the Day of the Lord. The Day of the Lord forms the backdrop of all New Testament eschatology. The controversy the early church birthed was that after Christ's coming the Day of the Lord was then proclaimed to be the time and the day of Christ's second coming - the day of His appearing, the day of Christ. WHAT is this day and WHEN does it occur are notable markers to build one's understanding around.

**Docs - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/1/18 16:52**

Do you believe that the "Day of the Lord" is referring to the millennium and that there is a 1,000 year gap contained in the 1 Peter 3 verses that I provided ?

**Re: PP, on: 2017/1/18 17:31**

I know you addressed your question to Docs. But I have been pondering this myself.

Rev. 20 speaks of the thousand-Year millennium followed the white throne judgement. Or what some call the bema. Then there is the transition into the New Jerusalem that John writes about in Revelation 21.

Based on your questions about the verses in 1st Peter 3 it would appear to be a thousand year gap that would be the millennium. And then the destruction of the Earth and a new Earth and a new Heaven period or what Revelation 21 would be the New Jerusalem. All of this would probably come under the day of the Lord. 2 Peter 3 does say that one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years has one day in the Lord's sight.

Just my thoughts brother. I have not really fleshed all of this out in the Holy Spirit as yet.

Bro Blaine

**Re: eschatology correctness - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2017/1/19 14:11**

TMK said:

Quote:  
-----but the views re eschatology are so varied and nuanced that picking one as absolutely correct seems to be an impossibility- at least for me.  
-----

<http://www.larknews.com/archives/401>

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2017/1/19 14:27**

TrueWitness,

Awesome link!!! Thank you for it!!

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/19 17:08**

Why isn't soteriology or ecclesiology or Christology or pneumatology mocked and made fun of in this manner? Why only eschatology? If such disagreement and a wide range of views exists shouldn't the church dig in its heels and try to come to a more common consensus on the all important doctrines of last things? After all, they are recorded in scripture and are given for our instruction. Who cares what will be what just be ready remains a highly unbiblical notion not found in scripture.

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/1/19 17:41**

"Why only eschatology?"

Because it is more speculative.

There is no continuity in the history of the Church concerning eschatology. and there is no continuity today on the subject.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/19 18:18**

David-

Brother I did not mean to offend.

I have considered starting from scratch and trying to read the scriptures to study eschatology with no commentaries or footnotes but I have determined that I have so many preconceived notions in my head, from several camps, that I honestly don't think I could approach it with a clean slate. I applaud persons who can do this and would encourage them to do so.

But I do think it is a mistake to try to apply what is written in Revelation, which is a highly symbolic, complex and layered book, to headlines today. I think we have to remember it was written specifically to certain Christians who were experiencing persecution in the 1st century for their comfort and encouragement. I think much of the mysterious imagery is coded language for something they may have understood but that is lost on us today. I realize that is just my opinion and certainly some of it is yet future as to us, but even that imagery is mysterious and open to much interpretation.

**Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/1/20 4:22**

TMK wrote: "I have considered starting from scratch and trying to read the scriptures to study eschatology with no commentaries or footnotes but I have determined that I have so many preconceived notions in my head, from several camps, that I honestly don't think I could approach it with a clean slate. I applaud persons who can do this and would encourage them to do so."

I think it is a good thing to do what you considered. Yes I know we all have preconceptions, but I think it is still possible to take a fresh look at the scriptures with no thought but to understand what we are reading. We can ask the Holy Spirit to help and illuminate the truth to us.

Many times I have had to adjust my views because what I read again in this way revealed truth in a way I had not seen before.

Regarding Revelation, what you say might have some validity if it were not for the fact that a lot of what is written there is contained in and supported by numerous other passages throughout the OT. These cannot all be classified as all symbolic or allegorical, as the things written by such as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joel, etc were written to Jews living in Judah with the temple in Jerusalem. So when they spoke of Jerusalem, the land and the temple, that is exactly how they would have understood it.

Take for example Isaiah Ch.2 ....

"The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem."

"And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it."

"And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem."

"And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plow shares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

So how was this supposed to be understood to those who heard it? Surely it was understood to be the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth (AKA the Millennium). What I think we can agree on, is that this has never happened yet.

Can I also ask, those who see the return of the Lord and Day of the Lord as bringing in a New Heaven and New earth (as in 1 Peter 3) without a millennial period on earth, do you see this prophecy of Isaiah being fulfilled in the way it says with Jerusalem as the head of the nations? This is an honest question that I'm interested to understand how you see it.

**Heydave - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/1/20 8:03**

RE: /// do you see this prophecy of Isaiah being fulfilled in the way it says with Jerusalem as the head of the nations? This is an honest question that I'm interested to understand how you see it.///

Hebrews 12:22 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, 23 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, 24 And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel. 25 See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven:

Gal 4 :24 Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. 25 For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. 26 But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. 27 For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. 28 Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/20 8:23**

But does it have to be so speculative? Soteriology or ecclesiology or Christology is not overly speculative. The overly speculative forecasts have many times come from adherents of a early pre-trib rapture. Because these things have failed in the past does not mean we are obligated to continue. Why would the Lord author the scriptures and one fourth or perhaps as much as one third of those scriptures turn out to be regarding eschatology just so they could remain undecipherable and non understandable all the way until the end? All scripture is given for instruction.

It seems if there is no continuity in the church today regarding eschatology it can't be on the Lord's end.

Quoting,

"Before we despair of certainty, and resign everything over to the hopelessly disagreed prophecy experts, let us first consider whether our enemy has a vested interest in fomenting such confusion in order to keep these issues hidden from the church, and to discourage the average believer from trusting in the grace of the Spirit's help to arrive at the truth (the much neglected priesthood of every believer; 1Jn 2:27)."

**Re: proudpapa, Q & A on the Day of the Lord and the Millennium - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/20 9:15**

**Crucial Timing of the Day of the Lord**

**Question:**

Is there any backing to support the day of the Lord as the thousand year reign? The scripture says that a day is as a thousand years with the Lord. If that is what you just explained please excuse me.

**Answer:**

I see nothing that makes the thousand year reign of Christ the equivalent of the "day of the Lord". The millennium is not the "day of the Lord", but rather follows from it. The "day of the Lord" is more specific, and failure to mark its more defined character has been the source of much needless confusion and error. Let me explain.

When the particular term the "day of the Lord" is expanded to include the entire millennium, or when it is extended backwards to include the entirety of the tribulation, as in pretribulational thought, something is blurred that robs the term of its great value in interpretation, as the definitive point of division between "this age" and the millennial age that follows.

The scripture does, however, speak of the new circumstance that follows the "day of the Lord" by the less specific phrase "in that day". But I think it is more accurate and scriptural to distinguish the day of the Lord as the more definite and particular point of a sudden divine intervention at the end of the tribulation ("in one day" Isa 66:8; Ezek 39:22; Zech 3:9; 14:7; 2Thes 2:8). The "day of the Lord" is the point of the change, and the less specific phrase "in that day" is sometimes more inclusive of the conditions that follow from it. This, however, is not a distinction I would expect everyone to make, and I do not regard it as critical. But more specifically, and far more importantly, the day of the Lord marks the sudden destruction of the Antichrist (2Thes 2:8), which is also the moment of Israel's national deliverance at the end of Jacob's trouble (Jer 30:7; Dan 12:1). It is the time that the OT faithful are raised together with all who "sleep in Jesus" (Dan 12:2; 1Thes 4:14-17; 1Cor 15:23). It is the "moment" Christ's glorious return "at the last trumpet" (compare Isa 27:13; Mt 24:31; 1Thes 4:16; 2Thes 2:8; 1Cor 15:52; Rev 11:15). It all happens at once.

Whether the "day of the Lord" includes the millennium does not seem to me a crucial point of concern. However, to extend the "day of the Lord" backwards to include the tribulation supports a serious error. I'll explain.

The view that the rapture starts the day of the Lord, and that the day of the Lord therefore includes the tribulation, did not exist before the advent of the system of prophetic interpretation called "pretribulational" dispensationalism that took root in the middle of the 19th century.

Because the "day of the Lord" is so obviously related to the "blessed hope" of the church (1Thes 5:4; 2Thes 2:17; et al), it was impossible to maintain the idea that the rapture could potentially occur any moment UNLESS the "day of the Lord" could be understood to include the tribulation. There is no scripture to that effect, but to maintain the theory of a pre-trib rapture, this re-location of the day of the Lord was considered a "necessary inference". I know that sounds confusing, because it is. It is a violation of the simplicity of scripture that places the "day of the Lord" AFTER the tribulation. Let me show you why this is so important, and then you can help show someone else, should the question arise.

Many scriptures could be cited in both of the testaments to show that the day of the Lord does not include the tribulation but rather concludes it (see for example Rev 16:15 where the thief like return of the Lord is shown as still impending even so late as the sixth vial. The seventh vial then announces the arrival of "the great day of God"). But I know of no better example than Joel's prophecy, particularly when it is compared with the Lord's words in His Olivet prophecy. Listen to the language of the following scriptures, and note the key prepositions BEFORE and AFTER.

"And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, BEFORE the great and the terrible day of the Lord come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call" (Joel 2:30-32). "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, get you down; for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is NEAR (at hand; approaching, but not yet here) in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the

hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israelâ€ (Joel 3:13-16).

The same is quoted by Peter in Acts 2:20. â€œThe sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, BEFORE that great and notable day of the Lord comeâ€

But now listen to Jesus:

â€œImmediately AFTER the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great gloryâ€ (Mt 24:29-30).

Note that Jesus places the stellar upheaval and eclipse immediately AFTER the tribulation, whereas Joelâ€™s prophecy shows this as happening BEFORE the great and notable â€day of the Lordâ€™. How then can the day of the Lord be held to include the tribulation if the darkness that comes BEFORE the day of the Lord is said by Jesus to come â€immediately AFTERâ€™ the tribulation? It simply cannot be done; scripture doesnâ€™t permit it. But it must be done if pre-tribulationism is to survive.

Many have shown that to place the â€day of the Lordâ€™ AFTER the tribulation is FATAL to the pre-trib theory. In fact, the comparatively recent habit of placing the â€day of the Lordâ€™ before the tribulation was unheard of until after Alexander Reese, a missionary from New Zealand, wrote a book called â€œThe Approaching Advent of Christ: An Examination of the teaching of J.N. Darby and his Followers,â€ published in 1937. Reeseâ€™s book forced dispensationalists (those that advocate the pre-trib view of the rapture), to change their earlier view of a â€post-tribulationâ€™ day of the Lord. Henceforward, dispensationalists would place the â€day of the Lordâ€™ at the beginning of the tribulation. (Also in response to Reeseâ€™s book, pretribulationists were now forced to â€assumeâ€™ a new separation between an earlier resurrection of â€church saintsâ€ (considered as belonging to a separate body) and the resurrection of the OT faithful, which Reese showed to everyoneâ€™s admission to occur AFTER the tribulation (compare Isa 25:8; 26:19; Dan 12:2, 13).

So, according to this novel view, the OT saints are not raised at the rapture, but seven years later when Christ comes to establish His millennial rule over the nations. Astonishing, isnâ€™t it? See what a war has been raging over these things? But what is the real significance of so much confusion? Before we despair of certainty, and resign everything over to the hopelessly disagreed prophecy experts, let us first consider whether our enemy has a vested interest in fomenting such confusion in order to keep these issues hidden from the church, and to discourage the average believer from trusting in the grace of the Spiritâ€™s help to arrive at the truth (the much neglected priesthood of every believer; 1Jn 2:27). These matters have the potential to become very determinative of a great deal. A lie always costs; and this one in particular threatens to exact an ominous toll.

Later, another significant book was written in 1973 by Robert Gundry: â€œThe Church and the Tribulation.â€ Gundry exposed the impossibility of starting the â€day of the Lordâ€™ with the pre-tribulation rapture, because the rapture, as taught in the pre-tribulation scheme, must be an â€imminentâ€ (un-sigaled) event that can potentially occur any moment. Gundry proved that this is impossible; because Paul shows clearly that the â€day of the Lordâ€™ CANNOT come EXCEPT the â€Man of Sinâ€™ is first revealed (2Thes 2:1-3). Obviously, the â€day of the Lordâ€™ is not an â€imminentâ€™ event in Paulâ€™s eschatology. So what were the pre-tribulationists to do? Well, they would invent yet another gap. After Gundry, the rapture would be seen as happening sometime further back BEFORE the beginning of the â€day of the Lordâ€™ in order to allow time for the prior revelation of the â€man of sinâ€™. Thatâ€™s the new solution proposed to circumvent Gundryâ€™s otherwise decisive argument. Thereâ€™s no standard position on how long this new gap should last.

All of this goes to show the confusion that comes by a mis-location of the â€day of the Lordâ€™, and thus, the disarming loss of its safeguarding simplicity. So I am less concerned with whether one includes the millennium as part of the â€day of the Lordâ€™, as I am with the errors that follow when the day of the Lord is understood to include the tribulation. A right view of the â€day of the Lordâ€™ and its relationship to the basic events of prophecy goes further than anything else I know towards establishing the right order of events, and thus avoiding many a needless confusion. I pray that we will come to a greater clarity on this for all of these reasons and more, as the â€day of the Lordâ€™ is also a central issue in the replacement debate as well. Hope this contributes to a better understanding. I wish I had the time to be more thorough and clear, but this may help you be on the look out for some of these issues as they come up in your own study. (END)



Doc: Quoting from the response,

"A right view of the "day of the Lord" and its relationship to the basic events of prophecy goes further than anything else I know towards establishing the right order of events, and thus avoiding many a needless confusion."

I have found this to be true and very helpful.

**Re: Docs - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/1/20 9:26**

RE : /// But does it have to be so speculative? Soteriology or ecclesiology or Christology is not overly speculative.///

The other subjects do not have so many Scriptures to consider while trying to piece them together nor are the Scriptures involved with the other subjects intertwined with as much imagery.

RE : /// It seems if there is no continuity in the church today regarding eschatology it can't on the Lord's end.///

It is not just in today time that there is no continuity but there is no continuity through out history regarding the subject. for example :

Most of the Ante-Nicene writers where Pre-Millennialist though they make mention that there where amillennialist among them in that day.

But that Pre-Millennialism in that day did not include a pre-trib rapture nor was Israel as a Nation included in there eschatology, They where of the understanding that the Church had replaced Israel.

And than from Augustine to the Reformers including the Anabaptist amillennialism was the dominate understanding.

And than revivalist like Johnathan Edwards was Postmillennialist.

And than Darby and Scofield with dispensational pre-trib pre-millennialism made a big impact.

And now we seem to have alot of what is termed historic pre-millennialist (some have said Spurgeon held to this eschatology also) they reject the pre-trib views of Darby but unlike the Ante-Nicene writers what happens in the Middle East and Israel is a central tenet of there eschatology. (I have not found that to be a tenet in Ante-Nicene eschatology)

If I misrepresented any of the above it is out of ignorance and not intentional and I am open to correction.

The point is there is no continuity of thought through out Church History concerning eschatology.

edit: clarity

**Re: proudpapa - posted by Heydave (), on: 2017/1/20 10:05**

Proud papa,

Thanks for your explanation, which is saying you take these scriptures such as Isaiah 2 as allegorical. However the scripture you show in the NT regarding Zion and Jerusalem do not in my understanding show this.

Hebrews 12:22 clearly states it is talking about the 'heavenly Jerusalem, whereas Isaiah 2 is very clearly talking about a Jerusalem on earth.

In Galatians 4:24 Paul clearly says he is using these images of Sarah and Hagar as an allegory for the Law coming out of Jerusalem that was still present in the day he wrote and the New covenant coming out of Jerusalem above (Heaven.

What Isaiah is saying is there will be a new earthly Jerusalem in the future.

I'm not sure you really answered my question with these scriptures. Do you see a New Jerusalem on earth after this present earth is destroyed (as per 1 Peter 4) and do you see Isaiah 2 being fulfilled then and there, rather than in a Millennial kingdom?

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/20 10:22**

The question remains though,

Were one fourth or one third of the total scriptures that are dedicated to eschatology and last things meant to be undecipherable and always cloaked in non understanding? Up to one third of the scriptures were never meant to be understood? If the apocalyptic genre of Hebrew literature is presented in images and symbols in places does that automatically mean it was meant to forever remain a riddle as to its proper meaning?

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/20 10:31**

TMK,

You haven't offended me. I can assure you of that.

Regarding Revelation, you don't have to depend on Revelation alone to interpret its symbols etc. Revelation is filling in the details of earlier prophecies from Daniel and other prophets. The OT gives many clues as to what Revelation is speaking of. But you haven't offended me. I just remain of the opinion that the notion that you can't really understand any of it so just be ready can't be supported from scripture. It's an anomaly to me to believe that such large portions of scripture regarding the last things were inspired by God for the Church but never were intended to be understood by the Church. In the view of the OT prophets all eschatology they forecast led to the Day of the Lord - all roads lead to the Day of the Lord and this coming Day was the dominant theme in OT eschatology and was the backdrop in which NT eschatology was framed. So WHAT is the Day of the Lord and WHEN does it occur can be very valuable tools to help open our understanding in my opinion.

Blessings.

**Re: , on: 2017/1/20 10:34**

So then the question. Why put something indecipherable in scripture if God means for all of His word to be understood? Or does God mean for all of his word to be understood?

Bro Blaine

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2017/1/20 10:49**

RE : /// If the apocalyptic genre of Hebrew literature is presented in images and symbols in places does that automatically mean it was meant to forever remain a riddle as to its proper meaning?///

I am not aware of anyone that had things figured out correctly before Jesus came the first time ? Though we see now countless Scriptures pointed to it.

edit : add

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/20 11:17**

Bear wrote:

"So then the question. Why put something indecipherable in scripture if God means for all of His word to be understood? Or does God mean for all of his word to be understood?"

Maybe John's original audience DID understand it. Maybe they knew what each piece of imagery was referring to.

**Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2017/1/20 11:21**

/I am not aware of anyone that had things figured out correctly before Jesus came the first time ? Though we see now countless Scriptures pointed to it./

So is that a approval of the habit of just walking away from eschatology content with the view that it will never be understood? That may not be your view but it's very common among today's church.

The early church was not allegorical in their eschatology. That's a good clue for me as to which direction to lean. They may not have understood things correctly before Jesus came but He filled in many details as well as the writers of the epistles and John of Revelation. Much of the eschatology during church history was based on the belief that since Israel was banished and in exile without the possibility of ever returning then the passages regarding Israel must be allegorical and are best spiritualized.

"And those who have insight among the people will give understanding to the many." (Daniel 11:33)

This latter day passage speaks of believers having insight and giving this understanding to others during this time. It's a far cry of a picture than a Church groping along with no real understanding of what is occurring. How can they share their insight and understanding with others if they have no understanding of their own to begin with?

**Re: , on: 2017/1/20 11:24**

/// Maybe John's original audience DID understand it. Maybe they knew what each piece of imagery was referring to.///

So the Book of Revelation was only meant to be understood by the first century readers? But not to be understood by us ?

Then another question. Does God write a book for one generation to understand but then another generation to not understand it later?

Honestly that logic would make no sense.

Bro Blaine

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2017/1/20 11:54**

Epistles were actual letters to actual people or churches with actual problems and concerns.

Of course there are inspired truths that apply to us today. But there are also personal aspects to these letters.

When we read the epistles we are literally reading someone else's mail.