

## THE BOOK OF MATTHEW

### Lesson 82, Chapter 24 Continued 3

If the End Times matters to you; if where we likely stand in the timeline of Redemption History matters to you; then the study of Matthew chapter 24 and 25 are crucial to your understanding and I don't want to leave any stone unturned to aid in that understanding.

When we ended last week it was at a point when we were discussing the biblical requirement of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Temple to be constructed in Jerusalem in order for Daniel's End Times prophetic forecast to occur; specifically that of the Abomination of Desolation to desecrate the Temple Sanctuary. I'll start today's lesson by significantly expanding on that discussion since the Temple is central to Redemption History and it seems to be of such interest (as it should be) to Believers who wait expectantly for the triumphant return of Our Savior, Yeshua, from His current Heavenly abode.

I'll read the prophecy to you that Yeshua made to His disciples as they sat upon the Mount of Olives, no doubt listening spellbound and perhaps a little frightened.

CJB **Matthew 24:15-16** <sup>15</sup> ***"So when you see the abomination that causes devastation spoken about through the prophet Dani'el standing in the Holy Place" (let the reader understand the allusion),*** <sup>16</sup> ***"that will be the time for those in Y'hudah to escape to the hills.***

Last time we read the whole of Daniel chapter 7 where we find the primary passage to which Yeshua is pointing. However Daniel expanded upon that prophecy a little further in Daniel chapter 9. We won't read the entire chapter but I will quote for you enough of it to give us proper context.

CJB Daniel 9:20-27 <sup>20</sup> *While I was speaking, praying, confessing my own sin and the sin of my people Isra'el, and pleading before ADONAI my God for the holy mountain of my God-* <sup>21</sup> *yes, while I was speaking in prayer, the man Gavri'el, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, swooped down on me in full flight at about the time of the evening sacrifice,* <sup>22</sup> *and explained things to me. He said, "I have come now, Dani'el, to enable you to understand this vision clearly.* <sup>23</sup> *At the beginning of your prayers, an answer was given; and I have come to say what it is; because you are greatly loved. Therefore look into this answer, and understand the vision.* <sup>24</sup> *"Seventy weeks have been decreed for your people and for your holy city for putting an end to the transgression, for making an end of sin, for forgiving iniquity, for bringing in everlasting justice, for setting the seal on vision and prophet, and for anointing the Especially Holy Place.* <sup>25</sup> *Know, therefore, and discern that seven weeks [of years] will elapse between the issuing of the decree to restore and rebuild Yerushalayim until an anointed prince comes. It will remain built for sixty-two weeks [of years], with open spaces and moats; but these will be troubled times.* <sup>26</sup> *Then, after the sixty-two weeks, Mashiach will be cut off and have nothing. The people of a prince yet to come will destroy the city and the sanctuary, but his end will come with a flood, and desolations are decreed until the war is over.* <sup>27</sup> *He will make a strong covenant with leaders for one week [of years]. For half of the week he will put a stop to the sacrifice and the grain offering. On the wing of detestable things the desolator will come and continue until the already decreed destruction is poured out on the desolator."*

I sort of chuckle at this extended passage because the Angel Gabriel says: "I have come now, Daniel, to enable you to understand this vision clearly." Well, it seems to me that for Daniel and for us Gabriel's explanation is about as clear as mud. It most certainly tantalizes our thoughts, and adds some pieces to the puzzle. So when taken alongside Daniel's recorded thoughts of his chapter 7, we can extract a bit more information that aids with the timing of this event that Gabriel is speaking about.

Before we go there, I need to resurrect some things that I've spoken about from lessons in other Bible books I've taught on, so that perhaps you can better understand what you may have already read in Bible study books or even heard from pulpits, about the profound nature Book of Daniel, and why it matters so greatly to a proper faith in Christ and what our future looks like.

Close to 3 decades ago as I dove into more serious Bible studies, I began with the 19<sup>th</sup> century and earlier European Bible commentators because their works avoided the modern politics of the reborn nation of Israel (which didn't yet exist in their day), nor had WWI occurred that would reorder Europe politically and religiously. So these commentators seemed to be less agenda driven. As I worked my way up through them and to the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century commentaries a noticeable change in tone started to appear in some of them. Their approach became less a discovery of what God said and how to understand it, and more a doubt of the veracity of the Bible. As I progressed into commentaries and monologues written in the last third of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, a new breed of authors emerged who clearly are not Believers (although most don't outright admit it). These certain authors proved to be more than skeptical about the authenticity of the Bible... or at least parts of it. Coincidental with the re-birth of Israel as a nation of Jews, they also began to weave into their commentaries a not so subtle bent against the idea of Israel, or at least they amplified the thought that God was done with Israel and so the modern State of Israel and the Jews who populate it are a bother to Christian plans and ideals. I suppose, then, that I want you to take what I'm about to say as quite real but also as a caution that disturbs my peace to even have to make. But serious Bible students and God worshippers need to know these things.

I'll remind you that the Prophet Daniel lived during the time of the Babylonian conquest of Judah; he was one of thousands of Jews carried off to Babylon early in the 6th century B.C. He even served Babylon's king up in Babylon due to his business acumen, integrity, and intelligence. Surprisingly not all Bible scholars accept even this basic premise to be true. It is in vogue among modern and especially progressive Bible academics of the mid to late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries to contend that the Book of Daniel is essentially a work of fiction, written around 160 B.C. or a bit later. There are a few reasons they claim this. One is that they don't accept the basic concept of prophecy. They see it as primitive mumbo-jumbo that was written after the fact but made to appear as though it had been spoken before its fulfillment. Their evidence for this? None; it's no more than a consensus of academic opinion. They don't agree that the works of the Bible are true as written, or that they are God-inspired. The Bible, for many of them (not all), is little more than a field of scientific, language, historic or literary study like Anthropology, or Geology, or Egyptology; a field that interests them and so has become their career. Many of these same academics whose works often form the core of the materials used in some of our modern-day Seminaries and Theological Schools also don't believe in a spirit world and

therefore don't believe in God... or at least the God as presented by the Bible.

Another reason that this particular segment of modern-day Bible scholars don't believe that Daniel is authentic is because the oldest extant copies of the Hebrew Bible that we have (the Old Testament) were written down about 100 B.C. For the longest time, the oldest manuscripts we possessed were written in Greek. This might seem odd except that historical records state that the Hebrew Bible was first translated into the Greek language around 250 B.C. by scholars that lived in Alexandria, Egypt. Therefore since there were so many Greek speakers and readers in the world as compared to Hebrew speakers and readers, far more copies of the Greek manuscripts were made. So it makes sense that the odds of our discovering an ancient Bible written in Greek are greater than finding one written in Hebrew. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, changed much of the understanding about the ancient Bible; its source and origin. The dating of the biblical part of those Dead Sea documents traces to around 100 B.C. (about the same time as the Greek Bible documents). The Dead Sea Scrolls however were written in Hebrew, not Greek. The contention of these particular scholars is that because these Greek and Hebrew writings are the oldest biblical documents found to date, then it means that this could be the same time when the Bible (or parts of it) was first written. Thus, because the entire Book of Daniel as we have it today is found in both the ancient Greek manuscripts (known in the academic world as the Septuagint) and in the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls, then this proves to their minds that Daniel had to have been written about that time as well. This is significant in their view because it indicates to them that much of the Bible is a fraud or a Jewish myth, and Daniel certainly must be as well.

Of course the reality is that this is what they are predisposed to believe and so shun all evidence to the contrary. Yet this generally ignores the fact that there is no evidence or claim by the copiers of these ancient manuscripts that those thus far found are the original documents; the first edition of the Bible so to speak, written directly by the hand of the original authors. Copies of the Bible in that era were all handwritten... and had been for centuries... they had no printing presses let alone copy machines. Therefore each complete copy was expensive, took months if not years to make, and there were relatively few created. That somehow nature has preserved these ancient copied manuscripts written on animal skins and papyrus from over 2000 years ago is astounding! That the Greek translation agrees so closely to the Hebrew as found in the Dead Sea Scrolls is equally astounding as it attests to the careful accuracy and consistency of transmission of the Bible's precious words over the ages.

The Bibles that we all study from today are of course copies of copies of copies of various translations. But just because your personal Bible wasn't dug up from the ground of the Middle East 2500 years ago doesn't make it any the less trustworthy or authentic. Bottom line: if some academics begin with the premise that there is no such thing as prophecy, then they of course look at the age of these Greek and Hebrew manuscripts and declare that these must be the original manuscripts (or very close to it) when the Bible was first written. By believing in such a way it allows them to say that the fulfillment events that these Prophets supposedly prophesied had already occurred well before the authors ever wrote down their so-called prophecies.

I take a view more similar to the mainstream Bible academics of the mid-to early 20<sup>th</sup> century and before. I support the written historical evidence that the authors who claim to be the writers of the various Bible books are who they claim to be, and wrote when they claim they did. There is no doubt that the ancient people who, over the centuries, hand copied documents as voluminous as the Hebrew Bible... even if only one book of it... made the occasional spelling error, or accidentally left out or transposed a word, or some such thing (it's impossible to imagine it otherwise). As an illustration of my point, if someone were to make a handmade copy of the original Constitution of the United States of America as written in 1787 and accidentally made an error or two in the doing, that doesn't invalidate the rest of it or the Constitution's original authenticity or its purpose and meaning, and it won't confuse us (the readers) provided we read the document in its entirety with knowledge of its context and intent. This is why we must do the same when studying the Bible... Old and New Testaments... and not cherry-pick in order to reach a predetermined conclusion.

All that said, we also find that Christ clearly professed His personal trust in the Book of Daniel. He embraces to Himself Daniel's "Son of Man" concept throughout His ministry. However some Bible academics dismiss Jesus's words about the Book of Daniel as His source of the prophecy concerning the Abomination of Desolation as but the Gospel writer Matthew's over zealous attempt to put words into Yeshua's mouth that He never uttered. That is, just as they don't believe in the authenticity of the Old Testament in general, neither do they believe in the authenticity of the Gospel of Matthew. Why? Because as a baseline they don't believe in prophecy and therefore essentially don't believe any book of the Bible can be fully authentic.

So after the unveiling of an uncomfortable reality about modern Bible scholars,

let's circle back and understand that what Christ prophesied regarding the Abomination of Desolation standing in the Holy Place (the Temple Sanctuary), had indeed already happened once in the past and every Jewish child was as aware of it as they were of their far more ancient exodus from Egypt. This desecration happened nearly 2 centuries before Yeshua's time. So since prophetic fulfillment had already happened, what was it that Christ was alluding to? I find that the words that He finishes His thought with are the key. He says:

<sup>CJB</sup> **Matthew 24:15** *"So when you see the abomination that causes devastation spoken about through the prophet Dani'el standing in the Holy Place" (let the reader understand the allusion),*

"Let the reader understand the allusion". What does He mean by that? Every version of Matthew I can find has these same words so we must take them as original and authentic. Since the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanies was so well known, documented and remembered by the Jewish people, then the purpose for Christ saying this was for the people to form a mental picture of this past event that will apply to a similar but later event.

The Daniel chapter 9 passage we looked at confirms the **far** future nature of the prophecy because Gabriel speaks about the Messiah being involved in some way. It is common among Bible academics to say that by invoking Daniel this is Yeshua's way of warning about the coming destruction of the Temple by the Romans (which would happen around 35 years after His death). Yet Daniel's prophecy also predicts that this wicked prince who destroys Jerusalem and the Temple will first place an image of himself in the Temple sanctuary (the Abomination of Desolation), and then afterward this prince will himself be destroyed. Some important pieces of this prophecy did NOT happen with Rome's destruction of the Temple. The Romans certainly burned it down and dismantled its stones, but there is no recorded ritual desecration akin to what Antiochus Epiphanies had so purposely done. The Romans did not set a pagan image (an Abomination of Desolation) in the Temple sanctuary. Therefore while certain elements of Daniel's and Christ's prophecies happened in 70 A.D., not all of it did and so we must see this either as a failed prophecy or it is still ahead of us. And, to the point of this lesson, this future Temple desecration necessarily involves the existence of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Temple because Temples 1 and 2 were destroyed.

For centuries the assumption within the Church has been that this evil prince that places an Abomination of Desolation in the Temple is the Anti-Christ of the End

Times... I thoroughly agree. But 3 things must happen for this to become a reality. First, Israel must be re-born and exist as a nation. That became a reality in 1948. Second, Jerusalem must return as a Jewish held city... the capital of Israel. But also the Jews must be in control of the Temple Mount. The necessary first part of this happened in 1967, but the second part has not come about. The Temple Mount is by international agreement (including Israel's concession to it) under the control of the Jordanian Islamic Waqf. Third, the Temple must be given the international go-ahead to be re-constructed and it seems by most accounts that the location of the Temple must be where the current Islamic holy sight, the Dome of The Rock, currently stands. There is no situation on the horizon that would seem to allow for the removal of that Islamic shrine, although many modern-day Christian prophets predict an earthquake will destroy it making way for a new Temple.

Since we know from the Bible that before Messiah returns the Temple must exist and be in operation (including Levite Priests doing altar sacrifices), the Anti-Christ must also be in power and he must declare himself to be god and to go so far as to desecrate that new Jewish Temple (in a repeat of Antiochus Epiphanies' terrible act), then it seems to me that currently it would be premature to claim that we are living in the End Times since none of that has happened.

Let's re-read verses 15 - 22 to uncover some more information.

### **RE-READ MATTHEW 24:15 - 22**

The pace of what will happen in the End Times apparently is going to quicken once the Anti-Christ is revealed for who he is. Thus those who are eye witness to the Anti-Christ placing an image in the Temple, those Jews living in Judah, are to flee to the hills. Verses 17 - 20 heighten the urgency of a race for safety using mostly terms that are appropriate for 1st century times. That is, if a person is on the roof of their home, they are not to even take a moment to grab some clothes or provisions. People of modern times in Judah (Israel) won't be on their roofs. Roofs in ancient times were but another room of the house. The roofs were flat and sturdy. In hot weather people would sleep on them. They were sometimes used as the family dining room, or as a space to gather for conversation or even as a place to host guests. Next this passage speaks of someone working in the field; they must not even take the time to rush home to get a coat. So whether one is at home or at work, minutes will matter if one is to save his or her own life. This smacks of the Israelites' exodus from Egypt when it was so hurriedly done...

but even more so of Lot fleeing from Sodom. Later, many Jewish Believers fled to Pella when the Romans began their sacking of Jerusalem because they took Yeshua's warning in this passage to mean that event.

Running away means that some kind of travel is involved. If a person is all by him or herself, it will be easier for them than it will be for a pregnant woman (who probably also has other children that need her) or for a woman that is still nursing her infant because of the complexities that children necessarily add to a journey. Thus are added the words in verse 20 that one must hope this doesn't happen in the winter; again, wintertime brings more complexities and the need to gather extra clothing. Further, in Judea rain is a winter event and at altitude, snow is common. One is also to hope that the Anti-Christ doesn't double down on his desecration of the Temple by choosing a Sabbath on which to do it (but I imagine he could well choose it to be on a Sabbath to further mock God and inflict surprise on the Jewish people). Sabbath, being a holy day of ceasing, will in some ways leave the Jews even less prepared (and probably more hesitant to travel) than the other 6 days of the week. After all, it is Jewish Tradition that one is to travel no further than a Sabbath Day's walk on the Sabbath... which generally speaking is within the boundaries of the town in which one resides. Thus to flee to the hills will be felt as violating God's Sabbath laws (especially for the more observant Jews).

Of course to Yeshua's listeners and Matthew's readers these words from Jesus eliminate any possibility that He could possibly be talking about something from the past. There is also the strong hint of something else that will be said outright later: Yeshua doesn't know when this will happen. Verse 21 sums things up in a rather general way. In the CJB the verse begins "for there will be trouble..." Nearly all other English versions say something more familiar:

<sup>KJV</sup> **Matthew 24:21** *For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.*

The Greek word that the CJB translates as trouble and all other versions translate as tribulation is *thlipsis*. The Greek lexicons explain this word literally means a pressure from something being pressed together. But when it is used as a metaphor, it refers to oppression or affliction. Here in verse 21 the modifier "great" precedes "tribulation". That is, it says "great tribulation". OK; let's examine what amounts to a Christian myth. Most any standard study of the End Times at some point speaks of The Tribulation and The Great Tribulation. These two terms

are usually capitalized and presented as referring to two different named events in Redemption History. The Tribulation represents a specific event where things get really bad; The Great Tribulation represents a specific and separate event when things are even worse than the human mind can imagine. The reality is that the article "the" isn't present before either term and the better translations don't include it. So there is no such thing as The Tribulation or The Great Tribulation. They are not names or titles of events. Rather it is like saying you will experience pain and then later even more pain. So here Yeshua is saying that around the time the Abomination of Desolation occurs the world will see great affliction and oppression, in general. In fact this period of affliction will be worse for earth's inhabitants than has ever been known since the earth was formed at its Beginning. And (thank the Lord), it will never be repeated. This is yet another prophecy taken from Daniel.

<sup>CJB</sup> **Daniel 12:1** *"When that time comes, Mikha'el, the great prince who champions your people, will stand up; and there will be a time of distress unparalleled between the time they became a nation and that moment. At that time, your people will be delivered, everyone whose name is found written in the book."*

Daniel speaks of it a little more hopefully than Yeshua does. Daniel says that as bad as it will be, deliverance will be born out of it, although he also says that not everyone will be delivered; only those whose names are found "written in the book" (presumably meaning God's Book of Life). Yeshua on the other hand merely says that when the peak of the troubles arrives and when it seems that not a human being on earth could possibly survive it, the time will be cut short for the sake of those who have been chosen. First, what is it that limits the time of such great affliction? Not stated. It is concluded by most scholars (and I concur) that this must be speaking of divine intervention. This seems the most logical conclusion due to the stated concern that for the sake of "the chosen" the period of these great troubles is shortened. Many English versions use the term "the elect" instead of "the chosen". Mark's Gospel puts it this way:

<sup>CJB</sup> **Mark 13:20** *Indeed, if God had not limited the duration of the trouble, no one would survive; but for the sake of the elect, those whom he has chosen, he has limited it.*

So Mark uses both "the elect" and "the chosen". A good question might be: how are the days shortened, and who are the elect? Obviously God is in control over

this time of trouble on earth that defies any ability to properly describe it. So does that mean that in some way He cuts short the number of days or weeks that He foreknows this trouble will go on if He doesn't intervene? Or does He accomplish this by literally shortening the length of a day (does a day become less than 24 hours... might the spin of the earth be caused to speed up)? Could it be that the intangible sense that we humans have of time speeds up? I have heard young and old speak about how fast time seems to be flying in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, and in a very real sense. A long or short amount of time is often not perceived by humans by using the objectivity of a clock or a calendar, but rather by how it feels to us. I really don't have a strong sense of which of these Christ may be alluding to.

As for the issue of identifying the chosen: the chosen...the elect... seems to be referring to a group as opposed to individuals. Those that form a group called "the elect" have been hand-selected (chosen) by God. He decides. Jesus doesn't at this time address the criteria used on how to be one of the chosen in order to join the elect. In fact, biblically speaking, the terms the elect and the chosen are rather hazy. When we look to the Old Testament for guidance, probably the best place is Psalm 105. Verses 6 and 43 use the Hebrew word ***bachiy***, which in English is best translated as chosen. It seems to always refer to the Hebrew people in some way. I suspect that as with so much else Yeshua speaks, He says it in a meaning that is applicable in both the ***p'shat*** and in the ***remez*** senses, with the first referring to something immediate or that is surrounding Him and in the second sense as something that manifests itself in a deeper sway or at a later time. If this is the case (and I believe it to be), then in the ***p'shat*** sense the tribulation that is spoken of is meant as something that happens locally in the Holy Land, and the chosen are meant as Jewish Believers that live there. However in the ***remez*** sense the tribulation is meant as something that manifests itself in a larger all-encompassing way globally, and so the chosen refers to all Believers in Yeshua, gentile and Jew that together form the elect.

Gentiles, we must always remember that the language and the setting for the Bible in general, and for the End Times in particular, is primarily Israel-centric. What happens in Israel may spread beyond its borders, but the main action begins there. The people God deals with may involve Gentiles, but it always begins with and is focused mostly at Hebrews... members of the 12 tribes of Israel. Odd how the Christian Church has turned this biblical reality on its head. The problem with such a doctrine is that it teaches Christians the wrong things to look for, as well as the wrong places to look.

Let's read a few more verses in Matthew 24.

### **RE-READ MATTHEW 24:23 - 28**

Verse 23 begins with "at that time". At what time? This must be connected with the times of the greatest afflictions and oppressions on earth that happen in conjunction with the Anti-Christ desecrating the Temple. I think we need to be cautious and not try to add too much Western-style precision to the meaning. We should not think in terms of: OK, on Sunday the Anti-Christ announces He is god. On Monday he desecrates the Temple; so before Tuesday the Jews of Judah must flee for the hill country, etc. Some of this is going to happen in a serial order (that is, one thing causes the next thing to happen), other things will probably happen in parallel. And one of the things that is going to happen in parallel with these other bad things is that false Messiahs will appear claiming to be the true Messiah, and false prophets will arise that actually can do amazing miracles... but they won't be doing them by the power of God, but rather of the Adversary.

I must speak of something that I've encountered for a number of years, now, because I see it as having direct bearing on this warning from Yeshua about false Messiahs. We cannot and must not think we can believe in any old Christ... any old Jesus... any old Savior of our pleasurable imaginings. The biblical Jesus is the only Jesus who saves and He is the sum of all His attributes... not just the ones we like. One way of expressing this is to speak of a search for the authentic or historical Jesus, which common sense says begins with the fact that He was a Jew. I have shared in past lessons about a time many years ago that I was teaching a multi-week seminar in which my opening words the first evening were "Christ was a Jew". I left those words hanging in the air for a few seconds because I knew the impact it would have on a few in my Evangelical audience. I noticed some people shifting in their seats, but also an older man in the back of the room leaned over to his wife and mouth the words to her "that's not true". He and his wife stayed until the first break and didn't return to the classroom for the next session. The next week class resumed and the wife showed up, but her husband didn't. The following week he was back. As the seminar resumed and I was about to speak, he raised his hand and asked if he could say something; with much trepidation I called on him. He proceeded to confess that he had been a Christian all his life, and had gone to Church for many, many years, but in all that time it never occurred to him that Jesus was a Jewish man. He went home from that 1<sup>st</sup> evening, searched his Bible and after a couple of weeks proved that simple statement to himself. But at first, it had unnerved him. It turns out Christ

was someone quite different than he had thought He was, and was ready to learn about Him.

I suppose I'm sensitive to this because when a teacher long ago had unexpectedly opened my eyes to this indisputable fact, it unnerved me. But once I got over it, suddenly the door was open to thinking about Christ in a different way. Naturally, who Yeshua is goes far beyond the simple ethnic reality that He was a Jew, born to a Jewish mother and his non-biological but, nonetheless, earthly Jewish father Joseph. Probably because of the recent rise and impact of the Hebrew (or Jewish) Roots of Christianity movement, there's been a growing push-back in some sectors of the traditional Church because the idea of a thoroughly Jewish, Torah observant, Hebrew speaking Jesus that loved His people has implications that threaten centuries of Traditions and doctrines that aren't only woven into the fabric of the Church, they are the cement of the foundation of it. Thus terms like "the historical Christ" or "the Jewish Jesus" can be fighting words to some. I'm here to tell you that we all better be searching for the authentic historical Christ or we're going to discover a false Messiah instead, and be none the wiser. It may even lead to our eternal doom. In fact, Yeshua promises it.

**CJB Matthew 7:21-23 <sup>21</sup> "Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord!' will enter the Kingdom of Heaven, only those who do what my Father in heaven wants. <sup>22</sup> On that Day, many will say to me, 'Lord, Lord! Didn't we prophesy in your name? Didn't we expel demons in your name? Didn't we perform many miracles in your name?' <sup>23</sup> Then I will tell them to their faces, 'I never knew you! Get away from me, you workers of lawlessness!'**

I have news for you: these false Messiah's Yeshua is warning us about are going to be VERY convincing to Christians. They'll probably know Scripture like few do. They'll likely have an aura of goodness surrounding them and speak in a warm and gentle way that is utterly disarming. What I can easily predict is that each one of them will NOT be seen as going **against** the mainstream of Christian beliefs about the Messiah, but rather will seem to be the embodiment of them. If those false Messiahs did otherwise, they'd be quickly rejected. So by what standard will belief or disbelief of these false Messiah's be judged? No doubt for many (most?) it will be according to what they think they know about Christ, and much of that will be according to the Traditions and doctrines they have been taught about Him; comforting and familiar images that these false Messiahs... clever wolves in nearly undetectable sheep's clothing... are well aware of and will

attempt to fulfill. These false Messiahs along with false Prophets (that in some cases will likely join together to achieve either their intentional deceptions or to carry out their self-delusions) are going to be so good at what they do that Yeshua says in verse 24 they would fool the chosen (those that are part of the elect group)... if it were possible.

Next time we are going to speak about the inoculation of Believers against the deadly virus of the deception of false Messiahs that are guaranteed to be part and parcel of the End Times.