

12/16/80

Dr. MacRae discusses Premillennialism with George B. Fincke

Personally there are two things I might say to you. One is I think it is foolish for us to try to figure out all the details of the future. I think there are many things the Lord has not revealed to us . . . What's going to be 1000 years from now as far as we're concerned, the job for us is to reach souls for Him and teach them to grow in grace. As far as we personally are concerned it's not a very important thing to know what is ahead. That is in the distance.

But on the other hand there is a very important thing, and that is our attitude toward the Scripture. If we're convinced that that is God's Word and it's free from error then it's important we are willing to see what it says and are ready to stand upon it. To me that is the most important thing. So suppose we look at certain Scripture passages. You have your Bible?

Let's look at the book of Micah. I've known people who have said, No creed but the NT. I don't think that is a Christian attitude. The NT is based on the OT. Jesus said, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken. I feel it's tremendously important that we accept the OT as well as the NT as free from error and of tremendous importance. To me that is much more important than what our particular conclusion is on a particular point.

You notice that in Micah 4, you have a passage at the beginning of the chapter and v. 4 ends with the words "for the Lord Almighty has spoken" which seems to give a certain importance to the passage. Now if you look at Isa. 2 and you find it begins with the words, "This is what Isaiah the son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." I think those two statements are parallel. That is, Amos (you mean Micah) is saying, This is what the Lord has said. Of course everything Micah said is the Lord's message. But he thought this was important enough to give special stress to it.

Now the first four vv. of Isaiah 2 are almost identical with the first four vv. of Micah 4. They are almost word for word. There are slight differences. It seems to me that stresses the importance of the vision Isaiah saw. What Micah says is what the Lord Almighty has spoken, and the Lord thought it important enough to put it twice in Scripture. So it seems to me that is a matter that stresses so it's important enough for us to give careful attention to it.

Someone might say (and I used to think) here is the beginning of Isaiah's book: "This is what Isaiah son of Amos saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem." But you look back to the first chapter, and there's the introduction to Isaiah—"the vision concerning Judah and Jerusalem which Isaiah saw during the reign of . . ." Why should we have a heading like that for one chapter? And a new heading in the second and no more after that? That is to say, I'm quite convinced this heading here is just of what immediately follows. It's as if Micah had a vision and he describes it. Then Isaiah uses almost identical words. But Isaiah says, If you think I'm